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ABSTRACT

The economic and social history of delftware tiles in North America has not yet been synthesized and the use of delftware tiles south of Virginia is even less documented. In fact, even though Charleston, South Carolina exhibits numerous examples of this decorative art, there has been very little research conducted on this topic regarding the southern city. The following thesis presents an overview of delftware tile manufacture and use in Europe and America. Narrowing in scope, it compiles all of the published information on the subject in colonial America, focusing specifically on the use of delftware tiles in Charleston. It analyzes import patterns derived from newspaper advertisements printed during 1735 to 1820 and researches twenty-three eighteenth-century examples of delftware tiles in the city. The findings of this study establish a solid foundation for future research and preservation of delftware tiles both in Charleston and North America as a whole.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

The study of decorative arts is an exploration into the social, political, and cultural contexts of the past. Providing insightful information on habits, fashions, and necessities of specific eras can help create a more comprehensive view of historical periods. Tin-glazed delftware tiles are a decorative art that served both utilitarian and stylistic sensibilities worldwide throughout the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. They acted as a fire protection mechanism within fireboxes, easy-to-clean wall decoration, an educational tool for children, and a decorative accent to rooms.¹

Manufactured in Europe, thousands of delftware tiles were brought to the American colonies with Dutch and British settlers as tokens of home and later imported as a fashionable item.²

The first half of this thesis discusses the development, manufacture, and exportation of delftware tiles from Europe to North America. It starts with a brief history of delftware tiles in Europe then segues into a description of tile use by American colonists during the

---

seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. Fragments of delftware tiles have been discovered at several eighteenth-century sites in North America, most located in eastern cities such as New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Jamestown, and Williamsburg. However, very few studies have been conducted on the use of delftware tiles in the American colonies. Printed information on the topic either appears as part of larger projects focusing on delftware in general or as individual journal articles. This thesis provides an original compilation of most of the available printed information and surviving evidence of delftware tiles’ introduction into North America.

The second half of this thesis addresses the lack of published research on delftware tiles in connection with the southern colonies. So far, sites south of Virginia have not been researched. The southern city of Charleston, South Carolina provides an excellent case study because it exhibits impressive evidence of tiles through photographs, archaeological fragments, and in-situ examples. Though the community never hosted a large Dutch population, several early residents installed Dutch and English delftware tiles into their houses as part of their quest to emulate European city traditions. Over the years, many tiles have been lost or covered up, yet clues still exist to testify of their former popularity. This thesis provides a narrative of the overall history and use of delftware tiles in Charleston by focusing on surviving physical and written evidence.

The preliminary survey of delftware tile in Charleston is the first of its kind. It documents in-situ tiles, displaced tiles, and fragments found at various eighteenth-century sites throughout the city. It addresses the questions of how the tiles were coming into the

---

Charleston, who sold them, which members of society bought them to use in dwellings, and describes the variety of colors and designs found on tiles in the city. It also utilizes published sources and interviews with professional conservators to determine the most effective and economical way to conserve these artifacts. The intention of this thesis is to provide a useful guide on delftware tiles to anyone who might use it, such as restoration contractors, archeologists, homeowners, and historic organizations. These tiles represent a prevailing legacy of two important factors in the development of colonial America; the Golden Age of Dutch intercontinental trade and Great Britain’s influence on a colonial American seaport. They deserve to be remembered and protected not only for their individual beauty and utility but also for their contribution to America’s colorful history.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERARY REVIEW

Dutch Culture in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries

This thesis focuses on a small aspect of colonial America and an even smaller aspect of Dutch culture but it is still vital to refer to sources on broader topics for historical context. To do this, three works have been consulted. The first is Simon Schama’s The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age. His volume on Holland’s seventeenth century is dense with information, particularly with regards to trade, but still fairly easy to read and navigate. Many recent sources on delftware tile cite this book in their historical narratives. It is an excellent overview of the economic and political situation throughout Holland’s Golden Age.

The next reference is an exhibition catalog entitled Remembrance of Patria: Dutch Arts and Culture in Colonial America, 1609–1776. This book was printed as a companion to the commemorative exhibit for Albany’s tri-centennial celebration. It features 350 artifacts of individual paintings, furniture, silver, gold, ceramics, textiles, prints, drawings, and architectural elements. It is very useful in studying the extent of the Dutch colonial experience in America. It also mentions use of delftware tiles in fireboxes and on walls.

---

4 Simon Schama, The Embarrassment of Riches, (Berkley: University of California Press, 1988), 375. Schama is an English historian who has written on several topics, Dutch history being the subject of at least two of his books.

The last reference for this section is The First Modern Economy: Success, Failure, and Perseverance of the Dutch economy, 1500-1815. The book focuses on analysis of major economic sectors and social structure. It also devotes a lengthy chapter to inter-continental and colonial trade. The authors compiled a comprehensive bibliography that includes Schama and many Dutch sources. This book is also cited in many of the previously mentioned sources on delftware tile. It is a good companion with Schama’s book since they offer similar information but focus on different aspects.

Delftware Tiles in the Netherlands

The published literature concerning delftware tiles actually begins with a very broad base of general ceramic and tile information. There have been countless books and articles written on the subject of ceramics, beginning in 1558 with Cavaliere Cipriano Piccolpasso’s The Three Books of the Potter’s Art. It is considered by most historians to be the first treatise on pottery published in Europe. In it, Piccolpasso describes the procedures of preparing clay, forming pottery on a wheel, glazing, and firing. He even gives recommendations for using specific minerals to produce certain colors such as manganese for purple, copper for green, tin oxide for white, antimony for yellow, antimony mixed with iron for orange, and cobalt for blue. This treatise was utilized as a guide for potters for many years and facilitated further research and published works on the subject. It is still considered a useful work of

---

8 Jan Daniel van Dam and Pieter Jan Tichelaar, Dutch Tiles in the Philadelphia Museum of Art, (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1984), 34. Piccolopasso’s book was translated and republished in 1934 by the Victoria and Albert Museum and has since been republished several times.
reference for historic pottery manufacture but does not provide much information for the
topic at hand other than its discussion of minerals used to induce particular colors.

For this study’s purpose, the broad scope of sources on ceramics has been narrowed
to include only those relevant to delftware production and use in Holland, England, and
colonial America during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries. Serious
study of Dutch delftware tiles did not begin until the late nineteenth century and is closely
intermingled with other publications on delftware in general.9 Interestingly, it was a German
from Berlin named Paul F. Knochenhauer, who first wrote about tiles from the Dutch
lowlands his 1886 book, *Niederlandische Fliesen-Ornamente* (Dutch Ornamental Tiles).10
Knochenhauer specifically focuses on wall tiles used as ornamentation and lists the names of
various patterns and designs. To do this, he consulted the pattern registry from Ravesteyn
Brothers’ factory in Utrecht as well as a pattern sheet mostly likely from Harlingen, entitled
*Alte Musterkarte* (Old Sample Card).11 With the help of Knochenhauer’s book and the rising
interest in wall tiles during the 1890s, assorted pattern names became common among
dealers and collectors. For studies on delftware tiles, this book is quite useful as a research
tool, but is very difficult to find in published form. Fortunately, most of the information
contains has been reproduced in later publications.

The next wave of literature occurred around 1916, with the introduction of the serial
*Oude Kunst* (Ancient Art), published by the Museum of Ancient Art in Brussels. Researchers
and tile historians such as Commer de Geus, Dingeman Korf, Ferrand Hudig, and Elisabeth

---

9 van Dam 1984, 33.
11 Jan Pluis, *De Nederlandse Veggel* (The Dutch Tile): *Decor En Benamingen* (Designs and Names), 1570-1930, (Leiden,
Neurdenburg began the practice of printing their work on Dutch delftware tiles in various journals. In 1924, American historians entered the field. The Associated Tile Manufacturers in Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania began a series called *Architectural Monographs on Tiles and Tilework* written by Rexford Newcomb. There were to be twelve essays written, each on a different type of tile. “Dutch Tile” was slated to be the topic of #12. Unfortunately, the series was never completed and issue seven was the last to be published.\(^{12}\)

The custom of printing research in serials and bulletins continues to this day with authors such as Jan Pluis, Arthur Lane, Ella Schaap, Jan van Damn, C. H. de Jonge, Jonathan Horne, and Ivor Noel Hume. Most of the articles published in *Connoisseur*, *Vrienden van de Nederlandse Ceramik* (Friends of the Dutch Ceramic), *Burlington Magazine*, *Magazine Antiques*, and *Tegels* (Tiles) are brief discussions on similar information found in books by these same authors. Since the books usually provide more extensive explanation, the articles are not necessarily a stand-alone resource but a way to narrow investigation towards particular writers interested in a chosen topic.

The next book specifically written on Dutch delftware tiles was *Oude Nederlandsche Plateel en Tegels* (Old Dutch Pottery and Tiles).\(^{13}\) In the book, Neurdenburg identifies three major time periods for prosperous trade in the Netherlands: 1590-1650, 1740-1800, and 1850-1920. During each of these periods, building construction increased causing an increased demand for pottery and delftware tiles. She also mentions the large range of available designs for tiles and the fact that early seventeenth-century tiles were polychrome,

---


\(^{13}\) Elisabeth Neurdenburg and Bernard Rackha, *Old Dutch Pottery and Tiles*, (London: Benn Brothers, 1923). The draft was written in Dutch by Neurdenburg and translated by Bernard Rackha.
while tiles made after 1620 tended to be blue and white due to the popularity of Chinese porcelain. This book’s general information is very helpful to researchers and is cited in most publications on this topic. However, later publications have expanded on this information, thereby depreciating the value of Neurdenburg’s book.

In 1926, tile collectors Eelco M. Vis and Commer de Geus published *Althobollandische Fliesen*, a picture book of tiles with broad guidelines for dating techniques. Most of the information in this book likely derived from Hein Hamer’s personal study of his own vast tile collection and his experience in approximating dates for specific patterns. In 1933, Vis and de Geus published an updated volume, this time with an introduction by tile historian Ferrand W. Hudig. Hudig provides a historical overview of tile manufacturing in specific cities but does not attempt to definitively say if certain types of tiles came from certain cities. These two volumes are important as milestones that promoted ways of identifying tile age and have been mentioned by later publications. The information, however, is limited to very broad time frames and specific studies have since been conducted to provide more detailed identification methods. The second volume is more significant because of Hudig’s contribution. As he had previously published his own extensive research in 1929, his introduction for the volume serves more as a very brief summary of the topic rather than offer any new information.

15 van Dam 1984, 34.
17 van Dam 1984, 37.
Hudig’s 1929 book, entitled *Delfter Fayence* (Delft Faience), showcases his extensive archival research on tile history and production.\(^{18}\) Although Hudig studied tileworks by city, he does not attempt to connect production houses to certain tile types or motifs. His book still appears to be very useful for in-depth research on delftware tiles by the fact that it is widely cited by later publications on the subject. This thesis utilized Hudig’s information in conjunction with other important sources.

In 1930, Jean Justice published a *Dictionary of Marks and Monograms of Delft Pottery*.\(^{19}\) This book continues the path set by Hudig in offering identification of common tile manufacturers in Holland as well as explanations on the production of tin-glazed tiles. Justice’s book is a helpful guide for comparison of makers mark but it is not a complete catalog of all known marks and it is rarely cited in later literature. Most of the information in Justice’s book is found elsewhere in more comprehensive form.

The next major breakthrough in delftware tile studies came with Dingeman Korf’s *Tegels* (Tiles) published in 1959.\(^{20}\) According to Korf’s introduction, there was not enough detailed literature on tiles and he intended this book to help make up for the neglect.\(^{21}\) He utilized collections at a number of Dutch museums such as the Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, the Gemeente Museum, the House of Lambert van Meerten at Delft, the Museum de Moriaan, and the Openlucht Museum. Although many of his examples are seventeenth-century tiles, he does offer a few eighteenth-century examples and briefly mentions nineteenth-century tiles. Korf very plainly states that his selection of material is


\(^{21}\) Korf 1964, 7.
subjective and, “dependent on my own taste.”22 He begins his book with information gleaned from previously published Dutch sources on firing tiles, stylistic influences, size, form, and origin.

The importance of this book stems not from Korf’s overview but his novel system of classifying tiles according to their decoration and motifs. He works his way through ornamental tiles of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, discussing and naming various patterns such as four fold, quadrate, medallion, naturalistic scenes, symmetrical pattern, vertical motif, diagonal pattern, star with tulip décor, fruit basket, pomegranate and grapes, Haarlem, mirror, and oval. Korf organized his research into groups and used those groups to present a chronology of patterns. Even though his dating can be very broad, with periods of a quarter to half a century, Korf uses this generalization to create a basic chart detailing the size, thickness, body, fired product, color, painting technique, character of painting, style of painting, corner design, and influences for tiles from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries.

There are a few problems with this method of systemizing tiles according to their decorative motif, mainly from the fact that pattern use depended on regional preferences and available artisans. They were not necessarily confined to a specific time period. However, Korf’s book does offer a complete overview of the subject and was the first publication to focus on pattern groups, thereby making it indispensable to researchers. This book is widely cited in subsequent literature on delftware tiles. Korf has since published

22 Korf 1964, 5.
many more books on more specific types of delftware tiles, such as pre-1695 majolica tiles, and is considered a renowned expert.\textsuperscript{23}

Over the next few years, many books and articles appeared on Dutch delftware tiles but most of the information seems to be repeated from earlier sources. A few notable exceptions are Anne Berendsen’s \textit{Tiles: A General History}, published in 1967 and C. H. de Jonge’s \textit{Nederlandse Tegels (Dutch tiles)}, first published in 1971 and later translated by P.S. Falla.\textsuperscript{24} Berendsen covers the exportation and influence of Dutch tiles abroad more extensively than any of her predecessors, while Jonge provides a very detailed bibliography that includes most of the important sources to date, English and Dutch. Both books are worthwhile sources for the study of delftware tiles and are widely cited in successive bibliographies.

A very significant resource was published in 1984 by the Philadelphia Museum of Art. \textit{Dutch Tiles in the Philadelphia Museum of Art} is a comprehensive study on the tiles in the museum’s collection, prepared for the exhibition of the tiles that same year.\textsuperscript{25} It includes essays by leading scholars Jan Daniel van Dam and Pieter Jan Tichelaar on background history, tile production, floor tiles, and various patterns of flora and fauna, figures, land and sea, ornamental, picture, and corner motifs. These essays are remarkable in that they pull together information from virtually every published source on delftware tile, as evidenced by the extensive bibliography. Yet the scholars also included new research on the development of the tile industry in the Netherlands, the change in use of tiles throughout the centuries,

\textsuperscript{23} van Dam 1984, 34.
\textsuperscript{24} Anne Berendsen, \textit{Tiles: A General History}, (New York : Viking Press, 1967); For full citation, see de Jonge, on page 1.
\textsuperscript{25} For full citation, see van Dam on page 5.
and the factors that caused changes in tile appearance. The information provided in this book is a true representation of all available knowledge on the subject. For this reason, it is cited in most subsequent literature up to the present day.

The book also features a catalogue prepared by Ella Schaap, Robert Chambers, Marjorie Lee Hendrix, and Joan Pierpoline. Each tile in the museum’s collection is illustrated with accompanying information on its historical narrative and physical data. The color photographs throughout the book are very useful to researchers interested in various color schemes and tone deviation. Since the Philadelphia Museum of Art houses one of the largest collections in the world, eclipsed only by the Victoria and Albert Museum in England and the Nederlands Tegelmuseum in Holland, this catalogue serves as one of the most comprehensive surveys of delftware tiles. It is a vital component to any study on the subject and has greatly helped this thesis with historical information and structure of surveys.

It was during the 1980s and 1990s that interest in delftware tiles seems to have spiked. Many scholars began publishing research, both new and derived from older sources. In 1987, Cees van Sabben and Jan Hollem co-authored *Antieke Tegels* (Antique Tiles), offering illustrations and identifications of over 1,200 tiles. In 1993, Steven Braat, J Hilkhuijsen, and M. Kersten published *Museum Huis Lambert van Meeren*, an illustrated guide to the Delft Museum and its excellent collection of delftware tiles and portrait paintings. These are both helpful surveys of antique tiles, however, they are written in Dutch and have yet to be translated into English. For the purposes of this study, the author has not consulted their content.

---

In 1994, Ella Schaap entered new territory with the publication of *Bloemen op Tegels in de Gouden Eeuw* (*Dutch Floral Tiles in the Golden Age and Their Botanical Prints*). This is considered the pioneering study of floral decoration on delftware tiles of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It features color photographs of tiles alongside black and white botany sketches of the same plant with explanations of specific motifs. It is an extremely specialized aspect of delftware tiles that is broadly utilized by tile experts, historically inclined botanists, tile enthusiasts, and collectors. Schaap consulted a wide variety of resources to develop her arguments, as evidenced by her inclusive bibliography.

That same year, Jan Pluis published *Bijbeltegels* (*Tile Bible*). Pluis is one of the most renowned scholars on delftware tiles. He has published multiple books and articles on various aspects of the subject. A few have been translated into English but unfortunately this particular work only offers a German translation with an English summary. It is considered to be one of the standard books on the topic for Dutch-speaking scholars because Pluis includes tiles from all over the world and links their motifs to Dutch and English engravings.

Pluis published another important work a few years later in 1997, entitled *De Nederlandse Tegel* (*The Dutch Tile): Decors En Benamingen (Designs and Names), 1570-1930. The purpose of this book was to expand on his earlier research and address the issue of pattern identification. Since the publication of Knochenhauer’s book, art-historians, dealers, and collectors had used existing terminology to describe types and motifs but when that didn’t
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29 This book was especially useful for identification of tiles from the case study on 2 Ladson, which display floral designs.
31 For full citation, see Pluis on page 6.
suffice, they would also invent their own names. By the 1980s, there was no unified or universally accepted catalog of pattern names.\textsuperscript{32}

Pluis’ 1997 book was and still is considered to be the most comprehensive study of Dutch tiles ever undertaken and has become the standard work on the subject. In it, he summarizes the evolution of the Dutch tile from 1570 to 1930, treating the various periods of tile production on an equal footing. The book features an exhaustive list of tile types, names, places of manufacture, and date. Pluis used forty-one of the earliest known pattern books from Rotterdam, Amsterdam, Utrecht, Harlingen, and Makkum in order to develop his list. The book also contains a comprehensive glossary, bibliography and index that rivals the publication put out by the Philadelphia Museum of Art. Due to the book’s encyclopedic material, this was one of my premiere sources for the study of Dutch delftware tile in Charleston, South Carolina for information on all aspects of tile production, use, history, and especially identification.

Also in 1997, well-respected tile scholar Hans van Lemmen published his own comprehensive work.\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Delftware Tiles} is not a complete bible like Pluis’ works, but it does serve as a great introduction to the subject with color photographs and information on ceramic precursors, Dutch and English delftware tiles, themes and subjects, manufacturers, methods of production, imitations, and a discussion on modern delft tiles. It does not offer any new research but references information from earlier sources on this topic in an organized and succinct manner.

\textsuperscript{32}Pluis 1997, 10.
There have been a few notable recent publications on Dutch delftware tiles. In 2002, Alun Graves published *Tiles and Tilework.* This book presents an illustrated survey of the use of tiles in interior design through the ages, from medieval to modern times. The chapter devoted to Delftware and its influence focuses mainly on the rise and use of Delftware in Europe. Jan Daniel van Dam’s *Delfsse Porceleyne: Dutch Delftware, 1620-1850,* published in 2004 does focus on Dutch delftware in general but devotes some time and energy to tiles. The 2006 edition of *The Grove Encyclopedia of Decorative Arts* contains a surprisingly detailed summary of tile types, history, and uses, divided up by country. These three books illustrate a current trend in Dutch delftware research to simply reassemble past research and market it anew.

**Delftware Tiles in Great Britain**

Although this thesis will mainly focus on Dutch delftware tiles in Charleston, British delftware tiles were also used in fireboxes around the city, and some still exist in-situ. Therefore, resources on British ceramics were consulted, mainly in regards to the production and exportation. However, these sources were not utilized in as in-depth a manner as those on Dutch delftware tiles.

The first modern book published on seventeenth and eighteenth-century British potters was Llewellyn Jewitt’s *Ceramic Art of Great Britain* in 1878. The next significant publication came from a tile factory worker from Sevres named Louis Marc Solon. Solon

---

had immigrated to England in 1870 to work at Minton in Staffordshire. From his
experience, he wrote *The Art of the Old English Potter* in 1906. In 1891, John Eliot Hodgkin
and Edith Hodgkin co-authored *Early English Pottery, Named, Dated, and Inscribed*. In 1920,
W. J. Pountney published his research in *Old Bristol Potteries*. These books were published
years ago, they are still considered useful references due to their wide gamut of examples and
specimens.

In 1927, the English Ceramic Circle was founded to publish new research on British
ceramics and enamels in their journal *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle*. There are many
helpful articles in this journal that focus on various tile manufacturers in Liverpool, Bristol,
and London. The ECC is still active today and boasts of worldwide collectors, dealers,
curators, archeologists, and historians as members.

Along with the *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle*, Arthur Lane’s *A Guide to a
Collection of Tiles*, is an important resource for studies involving British delftware tiles.
Published in 1960, the book effectively catalogs all of the tiles owned and displayed by the
Victoria and Albert Museum. This collection houses a variety of tiles from medieval to
nineteenth-century examples, including Dutch delftware. For this reason, the book is often
cited in literature on Dutch delftware tiles and has been a helpful reference for this thesis
with regards to comparison of tiles found in British colonies and ones found in England.

---

Company Ltd., 1891).
Anthony Ray is a scholar worth individual mention because he provides information not readily found elsewhere. In *English Delftware Pottery*, published in 1968, Ray includes a tentative list of Dutch potters working in London between 1676 and 1716.44 In *Liverpool Printed Tiles*, published in 1994, Ray discusses the Liverpool tile industry, particularly focusing on Sadler and Green, the invention of transfer-printing, fable tiles, neo-classical tiles, theatrical tiles, pattern tiles, and border tiles.45 The book also includes photographs of tiles from each of the aforementioned categories and a select bibliography of mostly articles out of the *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle, Burlington Magazine, and Connoisseur*. Ray’s publications are very useful for investigating specific manufacturing firms and cities involved in England’s tile industry.

Other important works on British delftware in general include Malcolm C. Watkins’ 1960 publication of *North Devon Pottery and Its Export to America in the 17th Century*, F.H. Garner and Michael Archer’s 1984 publication *English Delftware*, Michael Archer’s solo 1997 publication *Delftware: The Tin-Glazed Earthenware of the British Isles*, and the tri-authored 2008 publication *London’s Delftware Industry: The Tin-glazed Pottery Industries of Southwark and Lambeth*.46 All of these books focus on various aspects of British delftware tiles have helped answer questions about existing British tiles in Charleston.

---
Delftware Tiles in Colonial America

There are very few sources that deal solely with delftware tiles in America. Most are focused on delftware in general. However, a few direct mentions have been found and even the general sources typically mention tiles in passing. In 1967, the Conference on Historic Site Archeology published their lectures presented at the Sixth and Seventh Annual Conferences.\(^47\) J. Paul Hudson spoke on “The Importance of Archeology at Jamestown, Virginia: Site of the First Successful English Settlement in the New World.”\(^48\) He specifically stated that evidence was found that suggested many houses in Jamestown had fireplaces decorated with Dutch delftware tiles that showed “scenes of happy children at play.”\(^49\) He does not specify if they were imported but this is implied since the colonists relied heavily on England for supplies and did not have the facilities to manufacture tiles. Although this source does not offer much information, these fragments are the earliest known examples of delftware tile in the United States.

There are many more decorative art publications that focus on Jamestown’s colonial neighbor, Williamsburg, Virginia. In 1977, Ivor Noël Hume published *Early English Delftware from London and Virginia.*\(^50\) Hume is the former Chief Archaeologist and Director of the Department of Archaeology at Colonial Williamsburg and a founding fellow of the American Society of Historical Archaeology. John Austin published a more specific study

with *British Delft at Williamsburg* in 1994.\(^{51}\) Both of these catalogs are concerned with
delftware in general but they do mention the use and existence of tiles at Williamsburg,
particularly Austin who focuses a section on the tiles in Colonial Williamsburg’s museum
collection.\(^{52}\) For each tile shown, Austin also includes its type, origin, date, size, description,
provenance, whether it has been featured in previous publications, and other relevant
information. Hume also discusses these museum tiles, but his scope includes other parts of
Virginia besides Williamsburg. These are very helpful resources because they not only
mention delftware tiles in a British colony, but they also venture further to provide
provenance information on individual tiles that illustrates the trade relations between the
colonies and Great Britain as well as the aesthetic tastes of eighteenth-century Virginians.

In 1969, Hume broadened his focus with the publication of *A Guide to Artifacts of
Colonial America*.\(^{53}\) This book is cited in virtually every colonial-era site study of North
America and is much used by historical archaeologists, museum curators, collectors, and
social historians. A recent edition boasts a new preface, updated references, and corrections
based on subsequent research.\(^{54}\) Hume’s guide is one of the most useful and accurate
references on identifying artifacts recovered from Anglo-American colonial sites. This book
is helpful because it includes sections on English and Dutch delftware fireplace tiles,
focusing on their typical motifs, identification, and importation from Europe as well as citing
areas in colonial America that were known to display these decorative arts.

\(^{51}\) For full citation, see Austin on page 1.
\(^{52}\) Austin, 274-283.
\(^{54}\) Hume 2001, 33, 286-294.
In February 1982, Suzanne C. Hamilton, part of the education division at the Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum published a very brief article in the Magazine Antiques. Entitled “Decorative Fireplace Tiles Used in America,” Hamilton states that tin-glazed tiles were common in the fireplaces of wealthy Americans during the eighteenth century. She recorded 102 fireplaces that still contained tile, each built prior to 1800 and scattered throughout eleven states. However, in the article Hamilton does not go into detail about her survey and only mentions three out of the eleven states by name. The pages following the text show color photographs of a few of the houses and their fireplaces. Although this statistic is very helpful as the first solid numerical estimate of existing delftware tile outside of Charleston, it is also an exercise in frustration because Hamilton does not offer any further information on her course of research or any sources she utilized. This is due to the fact that Magazine Antiques is not a scholarly publication and only recently began requiring sources and citations.

In the November 1991 issue of the Journal of Southern Decorative Arts, Bradford L. Rauschenberg published an article entitled, “Brick and Tile Manufacturing in the South Carolina Low Country, 1750-1800.” Rauschenberg does not suggest that South Carolinians were making their own delftware tile, but he does address an interesting point that J. Paul Hudson also spoke of at The Conference on Historic Site Archeology in 1967. Both Jamestown and the Low country of South Carolina were places that saw the production of pottery, bricks, and tile. Most of these would be fairly rough and used for construction or

55 Hamilton, 468-475. For full citation, see Hamilton on page 1.
57 Hudson, 29.
basic needs. The tiles mentioned by Rauschenberg and Hudson would either have been used on floors or roofs, neither of which are covered in this thesis. However, it is helpful to note that South Carolinians were not importing all kinds of tile, simply the ornamental and decorative types, which raises the question of why they chose to spend money on such an item.

In 1993, John Cotter, Daniel Roberts, and Michael Parrington published their findings on a long-standing archeological dig in *The Buried Past: An Archeological History of Philadelphia*. This book is about excavations at 150 colonial sites in and around Philadelphia. It is a great resource because the authors document finding delftware tile at several of the sites. The index is not very helpful and the information within is divided up by site and somewhat scattered. However, it serves as an excellent survey of Philadelphians who displayed delftware tile in their fireplaces. The authors briefly discuss the history and owners of each site, thereby making it easier to ascertain the social standing of particular families. Since one goal of this thesis has been to determine the type of people who used delftware tiles in Charleston, this archeological report, along with a similar one prepared on New York City in 2001 called *Unearthing Gotham*, provides helpful comparisons.

One useful compilation resource published on delftware tiles in America is *Ceramics in America*. Robert Hunter began the publication in 2001 as an annual collection of essays and research papers written by the leading authorities in ceramics. Hunter was the founding director of the Center for Archaeological Research at The College of William and Mary and
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59 Cotter 1992, 82, 85, 93, 143.
assistant curator of Ceramics and Glass under John Austin in the Department of Collections at Colonial Williamsburg. In the 2006 volume, two articles discuss delftware tiles. Ivor Noël Hume wrote “Neither Landskip nor Scripture: Collecting Dutch Maritime Tiles,” and Beverly A. Staube wrote about “A Wretched Tile” from Jamestown. Although both articles are rather brief, they present new and on-going scholarship in the field of delftware tiles rather than just recycling previously known information.

**Delftware Tiles in Charleston**

The published resources that actually mention delftware tile in Charleston are mostly interior photography books or articles of the coffee table variety produced to showcase the city’s famous houses owned by the wealthy elite. Samuel and Narcissa Chamberlain wrote the first of these books in 1956 entitled *Southern Interiors of Charleston*. They do not mention delftware tiles in the text but some are visible in pictures of the Branford-Horry house, John Edwards house, William Elliot house, and the James Hartley house. In 1986, John Bivins, Jr. wrote an article for the *Journal of Early Southern Decorative Arts*, entitled “Charleston Rococo Interiors, 1765-1776: The ‘Sommers’ Carver.” He briefly mentions the presence of English delftware tile in the Miles Brewton House as it is shown in one of the pictures. The second book, published in 1995, is J. Thomas Savage’s *The Charleston Interior*. The photographs in this book also document the existence of delftware and English delftware, this time in the John Fullerton house, William Elliot house, and the Miles Brewton house. The third and

---


final picture book is Susan Sully’s *Charleston: Architecture and Interiors*, published in 2007. Sully’s photographs show delftware and English delftware in the Branford-Horry house and the Capers-Motte house (see fig. 2.1 and 2.2).

These sources are the only published documentation available for delftware tile in Charleston. They do not offer much more than blurbs for textual information, but they do show houses that still have intact delftware tile in their fireplaces rather than just archeological fragments. It is for this reason that these books are valuable for this thesis. When used in conjunction with the list of possible sites for delftware tile compiled mainly from people’s memory, the books provide confirmation.

---

Conclusion

As evidenced by the literature discussed above, there is a great deal of information available on broad topics such as delftware in general, Dutch cultural history, and the conservation of architectural tiles. There are also numerous resources specifically on Dutch and English delftware tiles. There are even a few studies published that include information on delftware tiles found in colonial American cities such as Williamsburg, Philadelphia, and Jamestown. However, there is no study that specifically documents and catalogs delftware tiles in a particular city. There is certainly no existing scholarship on the valuable cache of delftware tiles in Charleston, South Carolina. After consulting that cache and compiling the findings, this thesis presents its results in the first source of printed information about Charlestonians and their use of delftware tiles.
CHAPTER THREE
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Delftware Tiles in the Netherlands

Although ceramic tiles have been produced and used since the Roman Empire, tile making as an industry did not solidify until the sixteenth century. Even then, most tile production centers were found mainly in Spain, Italy, and Flanders. The first tiles made in the Netherlands were mostly lead-glazed floor tiles used only by the wealthiest citizens.66 During the Eighty Years’ War (1568-1648) between the Northern and Southern Netherlands, many people fled to the northern provinces. Among these refugees were Italian and Flemish tilemakers who brought along their knowledge and techniques. The integration of such artisans helped invigorate the Dutch tile industry to become a worldwide sensation.67

The first change implemented by the fledgling tile industry was to use tin glaze on majolica floor tiles rather than lead glaze. The second change occurred between the years 1550 and 1590, when builders started to use tiles as wall covering and decoration instead of flooring. This was partially in response to the fact that many Dutch cities were built on water and houses often suffered from problems caused by rising damp. In accordance with their high standards of cleanliness, the Dutch favored easy-to-clean surfaces as a way to combat the accumulation of filth.68 The change also responded to the frugal Dutchman’s
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67 de Jonge, 1; van Dam 1984, 16.
68 van Dam 1984, 20; van Lemmen 1997, 36; Schama, 375.
dislike of the new glaze’s low durability and its tendency to wear away quickly.\textsuperscript{69} These early wall tiles were made out of coarse red clay and were rather large, measuring 140 mm by 140 mm and up to 18 mm in thickness.\textsuperscript{70} They still resembled Flemish majolica designs with complex borders and large central scenes painted in orange, yellow, green, and blue (see fig. 3.1). Until about the mid seventeenth century, Dutch potters even followed the Flemish practice of coating painted tiles with a transparent glaze called \textit{kwaart}, in order to give tiles a greater brilliance.\textsuperscript{71}

The third change in the tile industry stemmed from the Dutch capture of the Portuguese carrack San Jago on its return from China in 1602. The ship held many exotic items, including porcelain, which soon entranced the wealthy and middle class Dutch burghers. With the establishment of the Dutch East India Company and the colonization of the Indonesian Islands, Far East trade became an extremely profitable reality for many merchants. From 1620 to 1640, they imported large quantities of Chinese porcelain, effectively overshadowing the native tile industry. In response, Dutch tilemakers strove to emulate porcelain’s smooth white finish and blue glaze, quite different from the current

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{69} Tyler, 8.
  \item \textsuperscript{70} van Lemmen 1997, 46; Pluis 1997, 71.
  \item \textsuperscript{71} van Lemmen 1997, 46, 49.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
trend of majolica polychrome motifs. They made significant breakthroughs in porcelain imitations, specifically with one type of ceramic called faience.\textsuperscript{72} This discovery instigated an explosion of growth within the tile industry that established ceramic factories in Gouda, Amsterdam, Haarlem, Delft, Rotterdam, Makkum, and Utrecht in order to provide sufficient numbers of tiles to meet demand. Due to the prolific factories in the city of Delft, faience became better known worldwide as delftware. Today, the name delftware is an indication of the specific styles, designs, tin-glazing, and production techniques described in this thesis.\textsuperscript{73}

Delftware tiles are different than majolica tiles in clay content, size, color scheme, and design.\textsuperscript{74} Dutch potters used a more refined type of yellow clay as opposed to the majolica red clay in order to produce progressively thinner and slightly smaller tiles.\textsuperscript{75} Around the third quarter of the seventeenth century, the overall sizes of tiles decreased from the average majolica size of about 140 mm by 140 mm to 130 mm by 130 mm. From 1830 onwards, tiles grew larger to measure approximately 150 mm by 150 mm.\textsuperscript{76} The thickness of tiles changed more drastically than the overall dimensions. Up to 1630, tiles measured anywhere from 12 mm to 18 mm in thickness. From 1640 to 1680, they gradually became thinner until they measured about 7 mm to 8 mm in thickness. By the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the thickness of tiles ranged from approximately 5 mm to 10 mm.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{73} Wilcoxen, 54.
\textsuperscript{74} Wilcoxen, 67. This topic will be covered more in-depth in the later section on production process.
\textsuperscript{75} van Dam 1984, 20.
\textsuperscript{76} Pluis 1997, 57; van Lemmen 1997, 49. Until the introduction of the metric system in the 1820s, Dutch potters referred to the average size of 130 mm by 130 mm as \textit{vijf duim}, meaning thirteen centimeters. The term \textit{duim} continued to be used as a term for centimeter until the twentieth century.
\textsuperscript{77} Pluis 1997, 71; Korf 1964, 34.
Most early seventeenth-century delftware tiles were decorated with a base glaze of white tin, blue-on-white or purple-on-white images, large corner motifs, and intricate borders. Central designs included Chinese imitation patterns, portraits of famous persons such as the Princes of Orange and William the Silent, soldiers, horsemen, flowers, fruit, and animals. A few tiles did exhibit multiple in-fill colors reminiscent of Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, and Flemish majolica polychrome designs but even these images were outlined with strong blue and or purple. Around 1630 to 1640, Asian motifs fell out of favor and were replaced with a plethora of smaller quintessential Dutch images such as landscapes, Biblical scenes, children’s games, ships, mythological scenes, and daily life scenes.

The amount of new designs introduced per year during the last half of the seventeenth century is comparable to the annual introduction of new wallpaper patterns today. Some potters continued to paint polychrome designs but blue and purple dominated as the most popular colors. In place of borders, tiles began to
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78 de Jonge, 37-44.
79 Korf 1964, 34.
80 van Lemmen 1997, 46, 49, 57-87; de Jonge, 45-53; van Dam 1984, 30.
81 Korf 1964, 46.
display either diminutive corner motifs, mainly spider’s heads and ox-heads, or no corner designs at all with blank white space surrounding the new central designs. According to a 1703 builder’s dictionary,

The ancient Dutch Tyles were…painted with some antick Figures, and sometimes with the Postures of Soldiers, etc. And sometimes with Compartments, and in them some irregular Flourishes; but in general they were nothing so well done (not with so lively Colours) as the modern ones. The modern Dutch Tyles…seem to be better glaz’d and those that are painted (for some are only white) are done with more curious Figures and more lively Colours than the ancient ones: But both these sorts seem to be made of the same whitish Clay as our white glaz’d Earthen Ware. The modern ones are commonly painted with Birds, Flowers, etc. and sometimes with Histories out of the New Testament.

By the mid-seventeenth century, tilemakers stopped applying a final *kwaart* glaze in order to save money. In fact, this decrease in number of glaze coatings and the introduction of smaller central designs were ways to help tilemakers save clay and pigment so they could remain competitive in the rapidly growing industry. Evidently, the sacrifices paid off since delftware replaced majolica as the most common type of tile in the Netherlands by 1660 and would continue to be so up through the eighteenth century. From 1670 to 1750, delftware tiles even experienced a growing popularity among European aristocracy as well as use by middle class Dutch burghers.
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82 van Lemmen 1997, 46, 49; Korf 1964, 34, 40. Interestingly, a set of biblical tiles found at Drayton Hall Plantation in South Carolina measure 2.3 mm to 4.13 mm in thickness. They are dated by tile expert Helen Williams to be mid-eighteenth century. Clearly, Korf’s and Pluis’ measurements are not absolute but more of an average. These tiles and the other fragments found out at Drayton Hall are discussed in greater detail in Appendix A.

83 Hume 2001, 286.

84 van Lemmen 1997, 49.
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86 van Lemmen 1997, 50, 52. During the second half of seventeenth century, the Chinese civil war disrupted Europe’s trade with China and so native tilemakers began manufacturing what they called super de luxe tiles with polychrome Chinese/Japanese Imari and Kakiemon motifs. These were more expensive and manufactured primarily for wealthy and aristocratic Europeans.
Many of the traditional designs, color schemes, and layouts made popular in the seventeenth century lasted into the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Blue-on-white designs remained in-demand but painters also produced significant amounts of polychrome images.87 Tilemakers began pairing various corner motifs with specific subjects such as rosettes with flowerpots, and carnations with either Biblical or landscape scenes. Other popular corner motifs included variations on earlier motifs such as the ox-head and spider-head as well as new motifs like the winged leaf, volute, three dot, fretwork, quarter star, quarter circle, quarter rosette, heart, flower, leaf, aigrette, and feathered corner.88 The only foreign image regularly used on these later tiles was the fleur-de-lis.89 In the eighteenth century, tilemakers began using borders again, such as rococo, medallions, and accolades. These changed very little until the 1860s when ornamental tiles began to display borders copied directly from popular wallpaper borders.90

Surviving physical evidence has shown that city dwellers tended to install tiles with simple motifs while rural customers liked richly decorated tiles.91 No matter the design preference, delftware tiles addressed four main concerns of any Dutch household, rich or
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87 Korf 1964, 34.
89 Korf 1964, 34, 44.
90 Pluis 1997, 39.
91 van Dam 1984, 29.
poor. First of all, they offered hygienic and easy-to-clean surfaces for staircases, baseboards, wainscots, whole walls, and other areas where dirt commonly collected. Second, the tiles acted as a fire protection mechanism in fireplaces and candle niches while radiating heat back into the room. The previously mentioned 1703 builder’s dictionary notes that “The ancient Dutch Tyles were used for Chimney Foot-paces... The modern Dutch Tyles are commonly us’d instead of Chimney –cornerstones (being plaister’d up in the Jaumbs).”\textsuperscript{92} Third, the tiles brightened up interior spaces by adding richly colorful accents. Finally, the intriguing scenes helped educate children on nature, folktales, bible stories, and Dutch culture (see fig.3.4 and 3.5).\textsuperscript{93}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure3.png}
\caption{Figure 3.5 Watercolor by Mary Ellen Best of the Zwijnshoofd Hotel kitchen in Arnhem, 1838. Hans van Lemmen, \textit{Delftware Tiles}, (Woodstock, NY: Overlook, 1997), 39.}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure3.png}
\caption{Figure 3.4 Smuiger in the Nederlands Tegelmuseum, originally from a house in Wormer, eighteenth century. Hans van Lemmen, \textit{Delftware Tiles}, (Woodstock, NY: Overlook, 1997), 38.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{92} Hume 2001, 286.
\textsuperscript{93} de Jonge, 15; van Lemmen 1997, 36.
In addition to manufacturing and utilizing these tiles in their own buildings, the Dutch also exported tiles to other European countries and New World colonies. In fact, tiles were one of the most popular exports during the Golden Age of Dutch Commerce. By the end of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, foreign high profile commissions further expanded the tile export market. However, the Dutch did not own exclusive rights to the tile industry. England turned out to be the Netherlands’ main competitor, particularly after 1750, when England took over as the pioneer in tile technology.

**Delftware Tiles in England**

Although the development of the delftware tile industry is often attributed solely to Dutch potters and manufacturers, other countries were cultivating their own delftware tile productions in the late sixteen and early seventeenth centuries. In particular, émigré potters in England established factories at London, Bristol, and Liverpool as early as 1567. For the most part, the English tile trade closely follows the development of the Dutch tile trade but eventually it does create

---

94 van Lemmen 1997, 52; van Dam 1984, 30.
95 van Dam 1984, 31.
and produce unique tiles. Early seventeenth-century London delftware tiles were cut in a square and averaged 13mm to 16mm in thickness, similar to their Dutch counterparts. Those manufactured in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries averaged a thickness of 6.5 mm with slightly beveled edges. At first, all three centers in England produced tiles with direct copies or variations on early Dutch designs. Eventually, potters in Bristol and Liverpool developed their own unique designs and painting techniques.


For the most part, Bristol potters produced tiles that were similar to London products, with cobalt blue or manganese purple color schemes and Dutch style flower baskets, birds, human figures, or landscapes. However, they also offered a more
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98 Hume 2001, 286, 288. This practice of English potters directly copying Dutch patterns increases the difficulty of determining the exact origin of a specific tile. To the undiscerning eye, there is often little difference between a Dutch tile and its English copy. One of the major differences that scholars point out is that Dutch tiles have careful and natural foliage while English tiles have horizontal bars for leaves brushed or sponged across a trunk drawn of a single vertical line. Other differences in technique can help illuminate the true country of origin but researchers need to constantly be aware that all tiles are slightly different due to individual artistry.
99 Tyler, 8-9; Hume 2001, 288.
100 Bedford, 47.
distinctive pattern called the *bianco sopra bianco*. This pattern, developed around 1725, showcased a blue-gray background color overlaid with a thick white foliate border and polychrome images (see fig. 3.7). Another design credited to the Bristol factories was the depiction of trees as small whirlwinds on tiles manufactured from 1750-1765, much different than the naturalistic Dutch portrayal of vegetation.¹⁰¹ Some Bristol tiles also displayed the Fazackerley Palette of black or brown outlines filled in with pastel colors such as slate blue, olive green, orange, yellow, dull red, and violet.¹⁰² English potters used this painting technique from 1750 to about 1765, departing from the monochromatic color schemes popular at that time.

While London and Bristol housed very successful potteries, Liverpool turned out to be a unique pottery center. By the mid-eighteenth century, Liverpool potters were well known for producing a variety of superior tiles, including those with polychrome images.¹⁰³ In 1756, an engraver and printer named John Sadler drastically changed the industry by devising a way to better compete with Dutch products. He recognized how to use the well-known method of transfer-printing for faster decoration of delftware, porcelain, and glass.¹⁰⁴ With this technique, Sadler could print up to one hundred tiles in a hour as opposed to the thirty minutes needed to hand-paint one tile. The firing process was faster too since transfer-printed tiles only needed fifty minutes in a muffle-kiln to set as opposed to the two days in a standard kiln needed by hand-painted tiles.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰¹ Hume 2001, 288. Fragments found on site at the Heyward Washington House in Charleston, SC have this Bianca Sopra Bianca technique. The house is discussed in Appendix A.
¹⁰² Hume 2001, 290.
¹⁰³ Ray 1994, 1; Bedford, 20.
¹⁰⁴ Bivins, 104; Ray 1994, 1.
¹⁰⁵ Ray 1994, 5; Hume 2001, 292
The process effectively imprinted a tile’s white over-glaze with black or red scenes inspired by engravings of chinoiserie, pastoral scenes, and popular theatrical personalities.\textsuperscript{106} The first Sadler tiles were printed from woodblocks or line engravings and displayed imitations of Dutch designs in heavy blue, purple, or brown. Most of the center images were bordered by rococo borders such as the \textit{Louis XV}. In comparison with hand-painted designs, the woodblock images were rather clumsy and dull so Sadler quickly moved on to print tile designs from copper plates. The tiles printed with the new method had much sharper pictures, their own individual border, and a signature by Sadler himself. In 1761, Sadler partnered with Guy Green. Together they developed “upwards of 100 designs,” many with the popular \textit{88} border.\textsuperscript{107} In 1770, Sadler retired and Green maintained the successful business by introducing new designs based on fables, neoclassical motifs, and theatrical portraits of popular late eighteenth-century thespians. He finally retired around 1790 and so ended the age of transfer-printing images onto tiles.\textsuperscript{108}

\textsuperscript{106} Hume 2001, 292.
\textsuperscript{107} Ray 1994, 9.
\textsuperscript{108} Ray 1994, 5, 6, 9, 13; In response to decreasing sales, factories began producing supplement wares that were more durable, lighter, and decorated with newly favored rococo and neoclassical motifs. Most of the replacements came in the form of white salt-glazed stoneware, creamware, Wedgwood, and cheap Chinese
Many of the items manufactured during these years were not kept for domestic consumption but exported to other countries. This was not a new practice since English potters had been exporting tin-glazed earthenware as early as 1674 to places like Scotland, Ireland, Barbados, and the “King’s plantations,” which referred to either the West Indies or colonial America.\textsuperscript{109} Scotland decided to join the delftware industry by focusing on the market abroad rather than within its own borders. In 1748, a pothouse was established at Delftfield in Glasgow for the sole purpose of exporting delftware to the Caribbean Islands and the American Colonies.\textsuperscript{110} It is this factory that has strong ties to Williamsburg, Virginia as evidenced by invoices that specifically identify ware from Delftfield and archaeological artifacts found at the colonial Williamsburg site.\textsuperscript{111}

The manufacture and use of delftware tiles in the Netherlands, England, and other places in Europe lasted until the mid-nineteenth century. As with any industry, success only lasts as long as technology does not supply an improved replacement. Delftware products suffered from a number of inherent flaws. The soft glaze often chipped and the porous clay body was prone to fractures. For merchants, this fragility meant constant sales of replacement pieces as long as investors could play on people’s greed to live better than their income.\textsuperscript{112} However, by the third quarter of the eighteenth century, delftware’s target market of middle and lower class people soon tired of the cost and started looking for other

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Delftware Tile Manufacture} & \textbf{Uses} \\
\hline
\textbf{Netherlands} & \textbf{Architecture, furniture, and household items} \\
\hline
\textbf{England} & \textbf{Architecture, furniture, and household items} \\
\hline
\textbf{Staffordshire} & \textbf{Architecture, furniture, and household items} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Comparison of delftware tile manufacturing in the Netherlands, England, and Staffordshire.}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{110} Tyler, 11; Austin, 15; Gerhauser, 10.
\textsuperscript{111} Austin, 15-16.
\textsuperscript{112} Tyler, 11.
options. Tiles were gradually replaced by cheaper décor such as machine printed wallpaper and stucco.\textsuperscript{113} By the dawn of the nineteenth century, the delftware fever in England and her dependents had come to an end.\textsuperscript{114} The Art Nouveau movement helped briefly revive the delftware tile industry from 1890 to 1910 with its advocacy of elaborate and colorful household decorations but the tiles never again reached the popularity they experienced in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Luckily for modern scholars, delftware items have survived in various conditions allowing us a chance study one of the marvels of seventeenth-century Dutch innovation.\textsuperscript{115}

\textit{Production Process}

The production of tin-glazed delftware tiles falls under the category of Dutch faience due to its firing techniques and use of white opaque tin glaze as a surface coating.\textsuperscript{116} It began with the collection of clay from nearby riverbeds. Marl was added to mixtures as secondary clay around 1625 in attempts to strengthen the clay body and allow for it to be cut into thinner blocks.\textsuperscript{117} In 1650, the mixture was perfected with the addition of liquid slip blending that helped achieve a buff coloring. In this procedure, also called washing the clay, specific quantities of different clays were packed into a container with water. The slurry was then poured through sieves into settling basins where it would sediment, decant, and dry.\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{113} Bedford, 62; Gerhauser, 10-11.
\textsuperscript{114} Gerhauser, 10-11.
\textsuperscript{116} Wilcoxen, 68.
\textsuperscript{117} de Jonge, 10.
\textsuperscript{118} Neurdenburg, 9.
The very bottom layers of clay were taken out, cut into rectangular sections, and left to finish drying for a year.\textsuperscript{119}

After seasoning for at least one winter, the clay was kneaded through a pug mill to evenly distribute moisture and increase plasticity.\textsuperscript{120} The resulting lumps were taken to a tilemaker who proceeded to beat the clay one more time before flattening the mix and cutting it into rough squares. These squares were put into wooden or iron frames to mold the needed shape and thickness.

Once formed, the clay blocks were removed from the molds, dried, and stacked. When the moisture decreased more than 50\%, the tiles were rolled, flattened, and stacked a second time, probably close to the kiln for more thorough drying.

Before they completely dried, the tiles were cut into squares slightly larger than 130 mm by 130 mm.\textsuperscript{121}

Once dry, the raw tiles were placed on the floor of the furnace for their first firing. Glazed and

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image1}
\caption{1737, tile picture of 154 tiles depicting the tile factory in Bolsward. Elisabeth Neurdenburg and Bernard Rackham, \textit{Old Dutch Pottery and Tiles}, (London: Benn Brothers, 1923), plate XV.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{119} van Dam 1984, 38; van Lemmen 1997, 44.
\textsuperscript{120} de Jonge, 10
unglazed tiles were fired together, for approximately thirty to forty hours, reaching a temperature of 1000 degrees Centigrade.122 The post-firing cooling stage took about three days. This first firing created soft bodied, porous, yellow biscuit tiles out of the raw clay.123 The biscuit tiles were taken out, checked for cracks and sorted by ringing.124 The tiles deemed good were moderately drenched with water, a process called baptizing, and then coated on one side with a white liquid tin-glaze. The thick glaze dried quickly and the tiles were put back into the kiln for their second firing. This “glost” firing produced a smooth white finish for decoration.125

The next step involved preparation for painting images and motifs. Painters laid paper stencils called pouncing patterns or spons onto the glazed surface and dusted the tile with powdered pumice or charcoal to transfer the pattern.126 The outline was hand drawn with fine brushes called trekkers, using a cobalt blue or manganese purple outline paint called trekverf. Larger brushes, called dieper, were used to apply subsequent colors for in-fill of the image.127

Once the decoration was complete, the tiles were put back into the kiln and fired for a final time. This step in the process was actually the most important since it could potentially ruin all of the previous hard work if not carefully monitored by the kilnmaster. The paints would slightly spread into the background glaze in order to produce the soft lines specific to delftware called “in-glaze design.”128 This third firing was common in delftware.
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122 de Jonge, 12; van Lemmen 1997, 44.
123 Durbin, 30.
124 de Jonge, 12; Korf 1964, 13.
125 van Dam 1984, 40.
126 de Jonge, 12; Durbin, 31.
127 de Jonge, 12; Durbin, 31; Korf 1964, 14-15; van Dam 1984, 41.
128 van Lemmen 1997, 46; Durbin, 31; van Dam 1984, 41.
tile manufacturing up to the mid-seventeenth century. Post 1650, tiles were decorated with all colors after the initial firing and only received one glaze firing. The factories at Delft were the exception. In cases of gold and red, they continued to fire tiles a third time at 600 degrees to 800 degrees since these two colors could not withstand higher temperatures. When the tiles were finally finished and cooled, they were taken out and inspected for imperfections and weaknesses. Since tilemaking was not an exact science, sometimes only fifteen percent of the tiles were deemed acceptable to sell to clients. The second tier tiles were sold at a reduced price while the most flawed specimens were thrown out and the process began again.

Figure 3.10 The tools for manufacture. Top row, left to right: tile frame with rolling pin, biscuit fired tiles, face and reverse, lumps of raw glaze. Middle row: dipped tile, spon, pounce, tile with pounced design. Bottom row: trekker, tile with outline drawn, fully painted tile, glost fired tile (Jan Pluis, De Nederlandse Tegel: Decors En Benamingen, 1570-1930, (Leiden: Nederlands Tegelmuseum/Primavera Pers, 1997), 89.

129 Durbin, 31.
130 de Jonge, 13; van Lemmen 1997, 52.
131 van Dam 1984, 41.
CHAPTER FOUR
DELFWARE TILES IN NORTH AMERICA

This section is significantly longer than the previous discussions on the history of tin-glazed delftware tiles in Europe as it is a summary of the available material on delftware tiles in North America during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. The residences and sites mentioned in this section are located in the northeast and middle-Atlantic states. The exclusion of southern states is intentional because there are no recorded studies on delftware tiles south of Virginia. Therefore, this section only addresses the popularity of delftware tiles in the Hudson River Valley, New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Jamestown, and Williamsburg, Virginia. Although this chapter does not mention Charleston, it does provide contextual understanding for the later discussion of that particular city’s adoption of tile decoration in regards to contemporary colonies and their residents.

Colonial Trade Network

As previously mentioned, England was not the only European country involved with colonial North American trade. For the first half of the seventeenth century the Netherlands was actually the most enterprising European nation with a “highly effective mercantile hegemony.” The 1609 truce between Spain and the Netherlands opened up opportunities for settlement in the new world. Official documents show that prior to 1614, thirteen Dutch merchants were granted exclusive trade rights for having, “discovered and found with…five ships…during the present year certain New Lands situate… between New

\[132\] Wilcoxen, 14, 49.
France and Virginia.” 133 In 1614, the Dutch established a trading post near present-day Albany called Fort Nassau. Once the Dutch West India Company was chartered in 1621, it began sending agents to Fort Nassau and other outposts in the colonies. Dutchmen flooded the area along the Hudson, Connecticut and Delaware Rivers and christened it New Netherland. In 1644, the New Netherland Board of Accounts reported that Dutch traders had been active along the Atlantic coast since 1598.134

Naval prowess and enthusiastic pioneers helped the Dutch develop an extensive trade network between the Netherlands and North American colonies nearly sixty years before the English took over as the main influence in 1664. Even with their government officially out of power in North America, the Dutch maintained trade connections with colonists throughout three Anglo-Dutch wars. It was not until the last quarter of the seventeenth century that England surpassed the Netherlands as the leading maritime power and was able to enforce restrictions against trading with other European countries. 135

133 Wilcoxen, 14.
134 Wilcoxen, 13.
135 Wilcoxen, 13.
One of the cases that prompted such trade restrictions occurred in January of 1673 when Southwark potters appealed to the House of Lords for an act that would prohibit the importation of foreign ceramic wares into England.\(^{136}\) Interestingly, they argued that all the necessary materials such as lead, kelp, and tin were of English origin and that “the Dutch could not make this ware without English earth.”\(^{137}\) They also claimed that English potters were the first to perfect delftware and Dutch tradesmen had learned the techniques from English potters living in Holland. Their strongest grievance was a belief that the Dutch “got the profitable part of the trade wholly from us” due to mismanagement of the industry in England.\(^{138}\) The Southwark potters went on to self-righteously state that they didn’t pretend to make Cologneware, tiles, and Chinaware but instead manufactured white painted Gallawayware for native consumption and exportation to Scotland, Ireland, Barbados, the West Indies, and the American colonies.\(^{139}\) Clearly the potters were not only concerned with competition between imported and native goods but also with competition abroad in the markets of England’s colonies.

In spite of this complaint and others like it, the Dutch actively participated in colonial trade well into the eighteenth century, sometimes through smuggling and other questionable means.\(^{140}\) The high number of Dutch artifacts found at seventeenth and eighteenth-century sites along the entire Atlantic seaboard, suggests that North American colonists were not averse to trading behind England’s back. In their enthusiasm to become

\(^{136}\) Hume 1977, 12.


\(^{138}\) Ninth Report of the Royal Commission, 34.

\(^{139}\) Hume, 1977, 12; Edwards, 25.

\(^{140}\) Wilcoxen, 16, 49.
a new Europe, they evidently embraced any trade, however illicit, that would provide the right tools for this establishment.

**Seventeenth Century**

Delftware tiles reached North America by the mid-seventeenth century through the commerce of Dutch settlers. In the 1640s, a third wave of Dutch immigrants began settling in the northern colonies. The new arrivals were mostly families who wanted to replicate the bourgeois comfort of their homeland in the new world. They instigated the transformation of outposts such as New Amsterdam into small towns by building Dutch structures and importing familiar Dutch household furnishings. While most new immigrants became farmers, millers, or shopkeepers, many did accumulate significant wealth and were able to purchase traditional Dutch tokens of success.\(^{141}\) The high volume of surviving artifacts illustrates that they were quite successful “in reestablishing the comfort and sophistication of everyday life in the Netherlands.”\(^{142}\)

Delftware tiles were among the household imports into early Dutch settlements. Direct trade from the Netherlands to New Amsterdam bypassed England’s embargoes on importation of European delftware into the American colonies.\(^ {143}\) As was common in Europe, Dutch settlers used delftware tiles to decorate their hearths, stairs, and baseboards. The tiles seem to have been used almost universally among the populace, both rich and

---


\(^ {143}\) Hume 2001, 287.
middle class. Travelers passing through the area recorded this distinctive practice and others, leaving behind valuable first-hand accounts of American Dutch interiors.  

When Benjamin Bullivant visited the Hudson River Valley area in 1697, he recorded his observations of Dutch culture in a travel journal. His description of house interiors specifically mentions that, “The chimneys…with Dutch tyles on each side the fire place, carried up very high. They also tyle theyr sides of ye staircase, and bottom of windows…” Settlers called this type of fireplace a true Dutch fireplace. It typically protruded from the wall and displayed tiles on the whole surface of the chimneypiece. Recreated examples of seventeenth-century Dutch fireplaces such as this were displayed in the Frisian Room at the Art Institute of Chicago in 1924 and in the Het Scheepje Room at the Philadelphia Museum of Art in 1984 (see fig. 4.2).  

![Figure 4.2 Het Scheepje Room at the Philadelphia Museum of Art.](www.corbisimages.com/Enlargement/IH019666.html)
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145 Blackburn, 152.  
146 Diskant, 3; “A Dutch Dwelling Room,” Bulletin of the Art Institute of Chicago 18, no. 9 (December 1924): 111.
In accordance with written sources such as Bullivant’s travel journal and other correspondence, archaeologists have uncovered hundreds of delftware tile fragments from early North American houses. While most of these fragments were manufactured in the eighteenth century, a few date as early as 1640. \footnote{Cantwell, 177. It is possible that tiles were being imported earlier than 1640, however, there is not enough information available on the lifestyle of the first Dutch immigrants to support or reject this question; Jason D. Moser, Al Luckenbach, Sherri M. Marsh, and Donna Ware, “Impermanent Architecture of Providence, Maryland,” in “Constructing Image, Identity, and Place,” Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture 9, (2003): 206; Hume 2001, 293.} As would be expected, the Hudson River valley offers the most sites with delftware tile fragments. Excavations of the Fort Orange site in Albany, New York revealed several delftware tile fragments that dated from about 1651. These fragments are blue on white with ox-head corner motifs. The central scenes range from children’s games to animals. More fragments were found directly across the river, at a Native American site that was abandoned in 1645. \footnote{Huey, 434-435.} The presence of delftware tiles at that site serves as a testament to the trade relations between Dutch settlers and Indians. It also implies that immigrating families were either bringing the tiles with them or importing decorative goods and building materials very soon after arrival so they could build their houses in Dutch style.

In addition to the valley, there are several sites on the island of Manhattan where seventeenth-century delftware tiles have been found. Archaeologists working at the Stadt Huys site unearthed fragments from two separate tiles. One tile depicts a blue on white scene of a standing soldier with fleur-de-lis corner motifs and dates from 1630 to 1650. The other tile shows a blue on white scene of a mythical mer-lion with ox head corner motifs and dates from 1650 to 1700. \footnote{Gerhauser, 86-87.} Excavations into a privy pit on Pearl Street in the Financial
District uncovered tiles with scenes of fighting soldiers on horseback. The fragments have small ox-head corner motifs, which helped provide a date for the privy’s infill due to the fact that potters began using smaller ox-heads around 1650, only a few years before van Tienhoven destroyed the existing house on the site. More fragments with small ox-head corner motifs were found on a lot that belonged to Paulus Leendertsen van der Grift in 1649. These came from a tile that depicted a ship, probably a reference to the Netherlands’ naval prowess. Nautical scenes later became one of the most recognizable designs for delftware tiles made in the eighteenth century.

Fragments of seventeenth-century delftware tiles have also been found at colonial sites outside the traditional Dutch New York and New Jersey area. Excavations of surveyor Robert Burle’s 1650 house in Providence, Maryland unearthed several fragments although only one had an identifiable design. It displays a soldier that was based on engravings from De Gheyn’s seventeenth-century military manual Exercise in Arms. Three sites with similar soldier tiles, van Sweringen’s “Council Chamber,” the Country House, and Smith’s Town Land, are located nearby in St. Mary’s City, Maryland. In fact, soldier tiles with small ox-head corner motifs have been found as far south as Virginia at Jamestown and Martin’s Hundred.
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150 Cantwell, 170-171.
151 Huey, 435.
152 Moser, 206. This manual was published in 1609 and is one of many examples where Dutch and English potters borrowed designs from well-known publications such as Aesop’s Fables, the Bible, and other contemporary literature.
Most delftware tiles and fragments found at mid-seventeenth-century sites in North America probably came directly from the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{154} They all follow the pattern of an unadorned white background with a central scene painted in blue or purple. This scene typically consists of a small single figure or a group of figures. From 1650 onward, the central scenes and figures begin to grow progressively larger. Tiles manufactured around the turn of the century display a significant decrease in blank space covered over by prominent human figures, double concentric circle borders, corner motifs, and new designs such as biblical scenes, horses, shepherds, milkmaids, landscapes, ships, harbors, mermaids, and sea monsters.\textsuperscript{155}

By the dawn of the eighteenth century, the use of delftware tiles and other Dutch cultural nuances spread throughout North American settlements due to the high esteem in which other colonists held Dutch settlers. As a race, they were considered the most democratic, prosperous, and enlightened of all Europeans.\textsuperscript{156} As immigrants, they were seen as role models for the proverbial “American ideal,” given their overall prosperity and influence in the colonies.\textsuperscript{157} Other European colonists, including the English, began adopting aspects of the efficient and tidy Dutch lifestyle. Delftware tiles were one of the

\textsuperscript{154} Hume 2001, 292. According to Hume, there is no evidence at this time that English-made delftware tiles were being imported before the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. However, given the difficulty of determining exactly where an individual tile was manufactured, he is basing this assertion on the typically Dutch corner motifs and central designs employed on the archaeological fragments mentioned above. Since potters in England were manufacturing English delftware by this time, it is possible that they were importing it to the American colonies but unlikely as no physical evidence has been found for confirmation.

\textsuperscript{155} Hume 2001, 292-293.

\textsuperscript{156} Annette Stott, “The Dutch Dwelling Room in Turn-of-the-Century America,” Winterthur Portfolio 37, no.4 (Winter 2002): 221.

\textsuperscript{157} Cantwell, 177. Many of the prominent positions in colonial governments were held by Dutch settlers, particularly in the northeastern colonies; Blackburn, 38.
most widespread legacies and with time, became another status symbol employed by upper-class citizens to express their civility and wealth.

_Eighteenth Century_

Newspapers provide helpful information on the dispersion of delftware tiles through colonial commerce. Advertisements for tiles began appearing in northern cities such as Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Williamsburg as early as 1716.158 The _Boston News-Letter_ announced the sale of “Fine Holland Tiles,” on April 23, 1716 and “Several Sorts of Neat Dutch Tiles,” in May 1725. The _Boston Gazette_ published numerous advertisements over the course of the eighteenth century beginning in September 1729, when merchant Jacob Royalls placed an advertisement that he had “Very good Figured Dutch Tyle for Chimneys, to be Sold by the Dozen,” at his Union Street shop. In February 1738, Captain Stephen Richards of Queen Street advertised the sale of “All sorts of Dutch Tyles viz, Scripture (round and square), Landskips [landscapes] of divers sorts, Sea Monsters, Horsemen, Soldiers, Diamond, etc.”

In the 1750s, advertisements for delftware tiles increased all over the colonies. This rise in popularity was mostly due to the creation of American Dutch style fireplaces which combined elements of true Dutch and English styles. The middle and lower classes found these new fireplaces more affordable to decorate because only one to two rows of tiles were needed for inside the jamb or inside the firebox. The rest of the chimney wall, which would previously have been covered in tile, was plastered and whitewashed instead. The height of

the mantel remained the same as with Netherlandish fireplaces at thirteen tiles high, the equivalent of six Amsterdam feet or sixty-six American inches.\textsuperscript{159} In the 1760s, more English house wares and furnishings were adopted with the prosperity experienced at the end of the French and Indian wars. Delftware tiles, however, were one of the few traditional Dutch items that colonists continued to use after this changeover. They even grew in popularity due to the entrance of English delftware tiles into the commercial market.\textsuperscript{160}

Around 1761, English delftware tiles entered the market advertised as “English Chimney Tiles,” and “red & white, and blue & white English Chimney Tiles.” This competition did not stifle Dutch delftware trade as evidenced by the notice placed in the Virginia Gazette on July 25, 1766 by Norfolk merchants Balfour and Barraud. They wanted to let the public know of their recent ceramic imports, specifically mentioning Dutch tiles.\textsuperscript{161} New York newspapers offer some of the latest advertisements such as the New York Gazette and the Weekly Mercury which printed a notice from Isaac Conro on October 29, 1770 that he
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\textsuperscript{159} Huey, 435.
\textsuperscript{160} Blackburn, 40, 150.
\textsuperscript{161} Hume 2001, 33.
was selling “chimney tyle,” to any interested public.162 On December 17, 1772 the *New York Mercury* printed an advertisement that merchant Andrew Marschalk was selling “A Few very neat Scripture and Landskip Chimney Tiles,” at his store on Cannon’s Dock.163 In addition to providing information on merchants who sold delftware tiles, these advertisements often give the country of exportation. Interestingly, a significant portion of the advertised shipments came from the Netherlands, illustrating that colonists were not obeying England’s restrictions on trade with other countries even before the American Revolution.164

Investigations of eighteenth-century historic buildings and sites have revealed physical evidence of delftware tiles, mostly in the form of archaeological fragments. At Williamsburg, Virginia, hundreds of fragments have been found in both public and private buildings. Excavations of the Governor’s Palace uncovered blue and purple Dutch manufactured fragments that displayed biblical scenes and European landscapes. In contrast, purple-on-white fragments were also found at the site of a sixteen-foot frame building on the Peyton Randolph property. It was determined that these came from a small corner fireplace that functioned in a dependency (see fig. 4.4).165
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163 Gerhauser, 88; Gottesman, 90.
164 There is no record of any domestic potteries that were producing decorative tin-glaze tile at that time.
165 Austin, 29.
In Philadelphia, a 1953 excavation discovered some intriguing fragments at the site of Benjamin Franklin’s house. Two pieces of a purple and blue tile showed what looked to be a man holding the end of a kite string. It was impossible to tell because of the missing piece. Archaeologists excitedly theorized that perhaps Franklin has commissioned a tile to memorialize his electricity experiment. However, upon further research, archaeologists eventually identified the image as a popular eighteenth-century Dutch scene of a shepherd holding a staff over his shoulder.\footnote{Cotter 1992, 93.} Other artifacts from Franklin Court and the nearby Market Street Rental Properties included fourteen undecorated tiles, two fragments of a purple decorated tile, and two fragments of a blue decorated tile.\footnote{Cotter 1992, 143.} A few years later, in 1980, archaeological investigations of William Penn’s Slate Roof House site revealed late seventeenth and early eighteenth century manganese-on-white delftware tile fragments with spider’s head corner motifs. These fragments matched William J. Clark’s 1867 pencil sketch
of three broken delftware tiles from the house’s fireplace, drawn a few months after its demolition.  

At the Cornelius van Voorhis site in New York, blue and white fragments were found as part of a 1702 house. One fragment displays a pastoral scene with a shepherdess, a goat, and an unidentified man. Its corner motifs are spider-heads. A second fragment displays a woman with a flower basket and a gentleman with a sword. It was concluded that these two were from the same manufacture. A third fragment was from later tiles. It was dated from 1750 to 1775 and depicts an urn, stylized garland, and an acanthus cartouche. This scene is found in eighteenth-century Dutch pattern books but the corner motif on this fragment is identical to those used on Liverpool tiles so it could be an English copy of a popular Dutch pattern.

Investigations at the site of the Philipsburg Manor millpond in Sleepy Hollow, New York also revealed a fragment of unknown origin. It displays a nautical scene bordered by octagonal lines. This border and the carnation corner motifs are similar to styles produced in Liverpool around 1760 to 1790. However, the tiles could have been manufactured at Bristol or London since is not always possible to definitively state where a tile was manufactured due to the widespread use of popular scenes and corner motifs.

Relatively complete tiles do exist, usually in museums or private collections, due to rescue and sometimes pilferage from condemned houses prior to demolition. The Philip P. Schuyler house in Albany, New York is the oldest urban Dutch dwelling in the country for

---

168 Cotter 1992, 82, 85.  
169 Blackburn, 198.  
170 Gerhauser, 87-88.  
171 Gerhauser, 88.
which a historical photograph exists.\textsuperscript{172} This house, built between 1664 and 1667, originally had a true Dutch fireplace. Around 1760, the Schuyler family renovated their fireplace to meet the new standards. They installed blue on white and manganese on white biblical delftware tiles in the fireboxes. The house was demolished in 1887 but the tiles were saved and given to the Albany Institute of History and Art where they are currently on display.\textsuperscript{173} The Beekman Mansion in New York City was built in 1763 and featured blue and white scripture tiles with ox-head corner motifs in at least one of its fireplaces. It was torn down in 1874 but two panels of twenty-eight delftware tiles were saved and given to the New York Historical Society.\textsuperscript{174} Black transfer-print tiles showing three peasant men drinking and smoking around a small table were taken out of the General Joseph Palmer House in Germantown, Massachusetts as it was being moved in 1868. Tiles also survive from the Tuckerman House in Amherst, MA and from the John King House in Abington, Mass.\textsuperscript{175}

Original in-situ examples of delftware tiles are rare but a little over a hundred cases have been recorded in eleven states along the eastern coast of North America. Surprisingly, Massachusetts has the largest amount with approximately forty-four. It is also home to one of the best in situ examples of polychrome scripture Liverpool transfer-print tiles at the Jeremiah Lee Mansion in Marblehead.\textsuperscript{176} Pennsylvania comes in second place with fourteen houses, New York has thirteen, Connecticut has nine, Rhode Island has six, New Hampshire

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{172} Blackburn, 86.
\item \textsuperscript{173} Blackburn, 86, 152.
\item \textsuperscript{174} Gerhauser, 88. The biblical scenes on these tiles were very popular with both Dutch and English consumers from 1725 to circa 1750.
\item \textsuperscript{175} Leslie Gerhauser, personal correspondence with author, Charleston, SC, November 2, 2009.
\item \textsuperscript{176} Rebecca Bounds of Historic Deerfield, MA, personal correspondence with author, Charleston, SC, September 8, 2009.
\end{itemize}
has five, Delaware has three, Maryland has two and New Jersey and Tennessee both have one. 177

Most of these dwellings have been turned into house museums. The van Alen house in Columbia County, New York was constructed in 1737 with an early prototype of the American Dutch fireplace. 178 In the 1980s, the house was restored to its original appearance and now serves as a museum for early Dutch architecture and lifestyle. 179 The Turner-Ingersoll house in Salem, Massachusetts, better known as the House of Seven Gables, was built around 1668 and most likely underwent fireplace alterations around the 1750s. Nearly two hundred years later, it was featured in a 1941 exhibition for the Carnegie Institute called “American Rooms in Miniature.” 180 It was restored in the early twentieth century and now serves as a museum. The Wentworth-Gardner House, built around 1760 in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, has numerous fireplace tiles with biblical scenes, sea creatures, landscape, animals, and pastoral scenes. The van Cortlandt Manor House, built circa 1748 in Croton-on-Hudson, New York has purple scripture tiles. 181 Other museum houses with tile include the Philip van Rensselaer Mansion, Albany, New York, the Philipse Manor Hall in Yonkers, New York, the DeWint House in Tappan, New York, the Odgen-Codman House in Lincoln, Massachusetts, and the Warner House in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. 182

177 Hamilton, 468. According to Hamilton, South Carolina only has four in-situ examples of delftware tile. This is one of the aspects addressed by this thesis study in later chapters.

178 See picture on pg. 51.

179 Blackburn, 150.
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182 Rebecca Bounds of Historic Deerfield, MA, personal correspondence with author, Charleston, SC, September 8, 2009; Leslie Gerhauser, personal correspondence with author, Charleston, SC, November 2, 2009. While house museums are excellent venues for viewing tiles in their historical context, the tiles may not be completely original. Most houses undergo extensive restorations back to the specified period of
Nineteenth Century

Delftware tiles stayed popular into the first two decades of the nineteenth century, nearly one hundred and fifty years after England’s takeover of New Netherland.\textsuperscript{183} By the 1820s, European tile manufactures were going out of business due to the introduction of machine-produced wallpaper and stucco as a cheaper alternative for wall decoration.\textsuperscript{184} This cessation of production stopped much of the tile importation into the colonies. Some people removed in-situ delftware tiles and replaced them with neoclassical and Greek revival ceramics while others simply left them in place to be covered up by coal-burning stoves during the 1880s. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s poem “To a Child,” provides a glimpse of Dutch biblical and Liverpool transfer-print tiles still in place around his firebox in 1842.\textsuperscript{185}

The 1870s saw a brief resurgence in the use of tiles when working class Americans attempted to recreate wealthy Dutch dining rooms as a way to feminize the rooms. Around the turn of the century, American tile maker Henry Chapman Mercer took the renewed interest a step further and began manufacturing copies of delftware tiles at the Moravian Pottery and Tile Works in Doylestown, Pennsylvania. An avid collector of seventeenth and eighteenth century Dutch delftware tiles, he created relief copies of flat antique tiles in his collection, often replacing the Dutch center images with scenes he considered to be more significant. Therefore many of the reported eighteenth-century installations have been reformatted or are actually nineteenth-century recreations.

\textsuperscript{183} Blackburn, 40. This is quite amazing considering that most household elements of Dutch culture were eventually fazed out in favor of the more popular English fashions.

\textsuperscript{184} Hume 2001, 63; van Dam 1984, 31.

\textsuperscript{185} Hamilton, 471. The relevant part of the poem is as follows, “Dear child! How radiant on thy mother’s knee, with merry making eyes and jocund smiles thou gazest at the painted tiles…”
American. Mercer even decorated his house at Fonthill and other nearby buildings with a mixture of his Americanized copies and original European delftware tiles.\textsuperscript{186}

This revived interest quickly passed and delftware tiles never again resumed the widespread popularity they experienced in the mid-eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{187} Yet, the continued presence of delftware tiles nearly two hundred and fifty years after their initial heyday, represents the effectiveness of Dutch and English colonization in North America and serves as a unique remnant of early American material culture.

\textsuperscript{186} Stott, 222; van Lemmen 1997, 143.
\textsuperscript{187} Stott, 222.
CHAPTER FIVE
DELFTWARE TILES IN CHARLESTON

While the previous chapters have provided historical background for tin-glazed delftware tiles in Europe and North America, the rest of this thesis will focus specifically on the history and use of delftware tiles in Charleston, South Carolina. Much of the information in this section comes from primary sources such as historical printed accounts and archaeological artifacts. The information compiled from these resources illustrates a general picture of the delftware tile industry in eighteenth-century Charleston, including its period of significance, active traders, local merchants, and a profile of the Charlestonians who installed tile in their houses.

Period of Significance

Written and physical evidence shows the period of significance for these tiles to be from 1735 to 1820. The most helpful print sources of information are advertisements placed in local newspapers by merchants. These notices often provide information about the port of origination, the names of the captains and ships who brought in the shipments, the color and type of delftware tile to be sold, and the merchant who sold the wares. Archival research has revealed other sources of information that mention delftware tiles, such as purchase receipts, family memoirs, and inventories. However, these items are relatively rare and do not exist for all the sites discussed in this thesis.
The time period for which archaeological evidence of delftware tiles in Charleston exists is much more restricted than that of printed information. Most of the artifacts are in fragmentary form and have been found at the sites of eighteenth-century buildings that date between 1740 and 1780. The earliest known record of a specific building in connection with delftware tiles is the Charles Pinckney double house. Prior to construction in 1746, Pinckney listed four hundred and eighty “Dutch Tiles for Chimneys,” in his detailed estimate of required building materials.188 Another early site to definitively have tiles is the Exchange Building. In 1965, archaeologist John Miller discovered about sixteen delftware tile fragments in the building’s cellar.189 Unfortunately, Miller died before he could write up his notes so the information retained from his investigation is rather spotty and unclear. Years later, during the 1979-1980 renovation of the building, archeologist Elaine Herold of the Charleston Museum uncovered several blue and white fragments in a nearby trash dump (see fig. 5.1).190 These items were embedded along in a pine-pitch layer. The existence of pine-pitch denotes a spill caused by an accident or disaster along the city’s waterfront. The time line of other artifacts in the

same layer lines up with the early 1750s. In 1752, a hurricane caused massive destruction throughout the city and its port, including spills of naval stores such as pine-pitch.\textsuperscript{191}

Therefore, the tiles were probably removed from a nearby house either right before the storm or afterwards during the clean-up operations.

Even though most of the tiles and fragments discovered in the city are often in poor condition and removed from their original installation, they still offer valuable information about a house, its residents, and the evolution of household decorative arts in Charleston. To date, all of the uncovered delftware tile artifacts have been identified as European in manufacture, supporting the contention that no native factory was producing these tiles during the eighteenth or early nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{192} Their presence also sheds additional light on the extensive trade connections established between Charleston and European ports.

\textit{Charleston’s Trade Relations with Europe}

The successful importation of delftware tiles into South Carolina was directly related to the early growth of Charleston’s economy and its development into the south’s most influential port. This development was made possible by the cultivation of trade relations with many European countries, not just England, as has previously been thought.\textsuperscript{193} The colonies of both North and South Carolina were settled after England took over New

\textsuperscript{192} Rauschenberg, 111. In his article, Rauschenberg discusses John Christian Smith’s tile factory located on his St. Thomas Parish plantation. In the fall of 1800, Smith advertised glazed and red pan tiles, favorably comparing them to counterparts from Holland and England. Although the term glazed tile is rather obscure, he is most likely referring to roofing and hearth tiles based on the description he provides as to what a person can do with his tiles.
\textsuperscript{193} Hume 2001, 287; Wilcoxen, 49.
Netherland in 1664. Therefore, settlers in the Carolinas never fully experienced the golden
age of Dutch commercialism. Nevertheless, written and physical evidence proves that
they actively traded with Dutch merchants at the end of the seventeenth century and
throughout the eighteenth century with little regard for England’s trade restrictions.

In 1685, George Muschamp, First Collector of the King’s revenue, arrived in South
Carolina to collect taxes and seize all ships suspected of trading outside the boundaries of
England’s Navigation Acts. Colonial officials vehemently refused to follow his orders
because they claimed that their proprietary government had been founded before the
passages of the acts. They simply continued to trade with whomever they pleased, exporting
pitch, tar, tobacco, rice, and lumber to European ports.

At first Charleston’s economy grew rather slowly and most of the exports were sent
to London first, then distributed to Northern Europe. However, in the 1720s the popularity
of South Carolina rice rose drastically in the European market, causing Charleston’s
economy to rapidly expand. Over the next fifty years, Charleston handled ninety percent of
both imports and exports into the southern colonies. Many Charleston merchants started
sending shipments directly to other ports, eliminating London as the middleman. During
the 1720s and 1730s, a direct line to Bristol was established for rice exportation. Twenty
years later, in the 1750s and 1760s, more routes were opened to and from Liverpool and
Scotland. By the 1780s, Charleston had active trade connections with several European

194 Wilcoxen, 49.
195 Edward McCrady, History of South Carolina Under the Proprietary Government, 1670-1719, (New York: Macmillan
and Co., 1897), 211, 213; Wilcoxen, 49.
196 James F. Shepard and Gary M. Walton, Shipping, Maritime Trade, and the Economic Growth of Colonial North
197 Jack P. Greene, Rosemary Brana-Shute, and Randy J. Sparks, eds., Money, Trade, and Power: The Evolution of
Colonial South Carolina’s Plantation Society, (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 2001), 87, 89.
countries, including The Netherlands, Germany, France, Russian, and Spain. These additional ports played a huge role in bringing delftware tiles to the city.

Ship Captains and Their Ports of Call

Newspapers offer the best and most detailed descriptions of specific delftware tile shipments into Charleston. More often than not, the advertising merchant would name the captain, ship, and port of origin that brought in his wares. However, one drawback of relying exclusively on newspaper advertisements is that they do not represent all the water traffic coming into the city. The following discussion does not presume to include all of the delftware tile shipments that came into Charleston, but merely uses the ones that were advertised in popular local papers as a general statement on the statistical trends of the industry in the city.198

According to the advertisements, London seems to have been the earliest supplier of tiles to Charleston. Captain Pollixsen brought the first advertised shipment of “white or painted tiles for chimneys,” from London on August 9, 1735.199 Yet, it was not the most active port for exporting tiles to this city. Over the next fifty-eight years, only three more shipments arrived from London to be sold in Charleston stores. During this time, though, trade connections did open up between Charleston and other British cities. Several shipments arrived from Hull, Leith, and Bristol, most containing hand-painted tiles.200 The

198 The information for this thesis was derived from advertisements published in the *South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser*, the *Charleston Morning Post*, the *City Gazette*, the *Columbian Herald*, the *Investigator*, and the *Winyaw Intelligencer* during the years 1735 to 1820. A comprehensive economic and mercantile history of Charleston would have provided helpful information for this section but one has not yet been written. There is significant material available for such a project in the future.
199 *South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser*, August 9, 1735.
200 *South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser*, May 14, 1750, August 29, 1769, March 6, 1786. Most of the advertisements refer to delftware tiles as chimney tiles. Occasionally, they offer descriptive words such as
earliest mention of Liverpool transfer-printed tiles appears on February 2, 1765, for “a quantity of neat copper-plated chimney tiles, both black and red.”201 As would be expected, trade seems to have halted completely during the American Revolution. There is no mention of any shipments originating from English ports from 1774 to 1783. However, when trade resumed in the mid-1780s, one of the first shipments of delftware tile was from Liverpool.202

By 1784, Charleston seems to have negotiated a direct line of trade to and from the Netherlands. Captains Thomas Blundell and Jan Haak brought in the first recorded shipments from Amsterdam in December of that year.203 From this point on, Amsterdam became the most popular city for exporting delftware tiles to Charleston. Surprisingly, Bordeaux, France was the second most popular port advertised in the local papers. Other European cities that joined the trade were Hamburg, Bremen, Rotterdam, St. Petersburg, and Madeira. The wide variety of ports attests to the universal acceptance of delftware tiles throughout Europe in the eighteenth century as well as Charleston’s successful international relations campaign.204

Surprisingly, the tile trade did not seem to be stymied by the privateer wars of 1793-1796. Seven advertisements were posted for importations of delftware tile during those years. Five of the shipments arrived from Amsterdam with Captain Adam Scott.205

201 South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser, February 2, 1765.
202 South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser, May 13, 1784
203 South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser, December 22, 1784.
204 For a complete list of the captains, ships, ports, and merchants, see chart in Appendix B.
205 South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser, December 20, 1794; July 7, 1795; January 19, 1796; September 8, 1796; November 14, 1796.
shipment came from Amsterdam as well, but was captained by Robert Rice.\textsuperscript{206} One ship came from an entirely different port, Rotterdam, and was captained by Elisha Small.\textsuperscript{207} Overall, the economy of Charleston experienced positive growth, due in part to French raiders who lowered the price of wholesale commodities through the illegal importation of goods.\textsuperscript{208} The trade remained fairly steady into the first decade of the early nineteenth century but slowed down noticeably by 1809. The last advertisement appeared on November 20, 1820 for “A quantity of Glazed Dutch Tiles.”\textsuperscript{209}

\textit{Merchants in Charleston}

In addition to providing names of the captains and ships that brought delftware tiles into Charleston’s port, newspaper advertisements also name several merchants that were selling the tiles in the city. Paired with receipts and account entries, these documents list at least twenty merchants and businesses active in Charleston’s delftware tile industry during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. From 1735 to 1820, individuals such as James Crokatt, George Fardo, Alexander Gillion, Peter Horry, Michael Kelly, Richard Martson, Thomas Morris, John Potter, John Schmidt, Roger Smith, and John Taylor all placed at least one advertisement for received shipments of delftware tiles. Binford and Osmond, Milner and Bedon, Nicholson and Bampfield, William and James Carsan, Lorent and Wulff, and R. and P. Smith were partner companies that did the same. Florian Charles Mey, John Schmidt, John Edwards and Company, and Vos and Graves were merchants and businesses that

\textsuperscript{206} South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser, August 27, 1793.
\textsuperscript{207} South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser, August 14, 1794.
\textsuperscript{209} South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser, November 20, 1820.
placed multiple advertisements for tiles. James Poyas and William Guerin do not appear in the newspaper advertisements but surviving records show that they sold tile to the Horry and Baker families for their countryseats. All of these men were prosperous merchants in Charleston but a few represent some of the city’s more influential and colorful characters.

James Crokatt was considered to be “one of Charleston’s major merchants in the 1720s and 1730s.” In 1735, he placed the earliest known advertisement for the sale of delftware tiles in the city. Two years later, Crokatt moved to London to assume Samuel Wragg’s position of South Carolina’s leading foreign agent. In contrast, James Poyas was a London-born merchant who moved to South Carolina in the early 1750s. He worked intermittently in Charleston from 1752 to 1762. Poyas’ account book shows multiple entries for sales to the prominent Horry family, including two purchases of tiles, most likely used at Hampton Plantation. In the 1760s, John Edwards not only imported the first advertised shipment of Liverpool transfer-print tiles into Charleston but also installed them in his own town house on Meeting Street. Among his clientele, Edwards counted the Baker family, to whom he sold tiles for installation at Archdale Hall. William Guerin, a third generation Huguenot, also sold tiles to the Baker family. Guerin made enough money in Charleston’s dry goods trade to purchase three ships for his business.

210 Shepard, 91.
213 Bivins, 104.
Commodore Alexander Gillion entered the tile trade in the early 1770s. Gillion was an Anglophobe who later commanded the South Carolina naval forces in the American Revolution. Gillion also served as a leader for the Marine Anti-Britannic Society. Probably due to his adamant patriotism and wealth, he was elected to Congress in 1793.217

One of Gillion’s employees was a German immigrant named Florian Charles Mey, perhaps the most interesting merchant listed in these ranks. In regards to the abundance of advertisements, he seems to have been the premier supplier of tiles in Charleston. However, when he first arrived in America from Danzig, Mey had no money and no prospects. Michael Kalteisen, the founder of the German Friendly Society, took Mey under his wing and found employment for him at Gillion’s store.218 Mey thrived in the job and eventually made enough money to open his own business, briefly with partner John Spaltt Cripps, and later as a solitary venture on Pinckney Street by 1784.219

As a single merchant, Mey advertised nearly two hundred notices of delftware tile from 1784 to 1808. He dealt mainly with ships coming from Amsterdam and a few other continental European cities but does not seem to have imported any goods from England.

---

217 Jackson, 5.
218 Helen M. Riley, “Michael Kalteisen and the Founding of the German Friendly Society in Charleston,” The South Carolina Historical Magazine 100, no. 1, (Jan., 1999): 47; Henry A. M. Smith, “The Ashley River: Its Seats and Settlements,” The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine 20, no. 2 (Apr., 1919): 114. In 1793, Mey purchased a house from his former employer when Gillion was forced to sell off assets in order to settle, “his financial embarrassment.” Smith does not state the price for this transaction nor whether the house was sold at a fair price so it is difficult to determine if Mey was helping out Gillion or simply participating in a lucrative real estate venture. Mey kept the property for a few years before selling it to the Middleton family in 1797.
219 “Papers of the Second Council of Safety of the Revolutionary Party in South Carolina, November 1775-March 1776,” The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine 4, no. 3 (Jul., 1903): 209; James W. Hagy, People and Professions of Charleston, South Carolina 1782-1802, (Baltimore, MD: Genealogical Publishing Company, 1992), 6, 17, 29, 43, 56, 82, 104. Mey first shows up in the 1785 city directory but he placed newspaper advertisements for goods from his own store in 1784 so it is clear that he was in business at least by that year.
He appears to have sold typical Dutch chimney tiles as evidenced by the many descriptions of cobalt blue–on-white and manganese purple-on-white. Unfortunately, he does not print prices for the tiles but simply states that they are available for disposal by cash. While the importation of these tiles occurred during the reign of English manufactured tiles, the fact that Mey advertised shipments directly from Amsterdam favors the assumption that his tiles were Dutch manufactured.220

For a period of four years, he almost exclusively sold shipments carried by Master Adam Scott in the ship *Amsterdam* from the city of Amsterdam. Around 1802, Scott switched over to the sloop *William and Mary* but continued to import shipments from Amsterdam. In 1803, Mey advertised a shipment brought in by the *William and Mary* from Amsterdam but this time captained by George Easterby. For the next few years, Easterby became Mey’s main provider of tiles from Europe until 1807 when John Taylor took over as captain of the *William and Mary*. Taylor imported at least one shipment to Charleston before Mey stopped advertising tiles. This turnover seems to convey that even though captains often changed posts, an individual ship and its route could remain stable for the merchants dependent on its cargo. Mey placed his last advertisement for delftware tiles in 1808, only a few years before they fell out of favor.221
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Decorative and Practical Uses

Delftware tiles epitomize the concept of decorative arts. Historically, Europeans, particularly the Dutch, utilized these tiles on many different surfaces including walls, baseboards, and chimneypieces because they were easy to clean, relatively cheap and available, served as educational tools for children, and added an element of beauty to dwellings. In colonial North America, delftware tiles functioned much the same but their use was limited to the inside of fireboxes. As imported goods, they were more expensive in the colonies and therefore used mainly by upper-class citizens, particularly in status-conscious Charleston.

The use of delftware tiles in Charleston is rather surprising given that the city did not have a strong tradition of Dutch settlers. However, Charlestonians loved European fashions, and viewed delftware tiles as an exotic accent to their houses. They also recognized the efficiency of a product that could reflect heat back into a room.

Figure 5.2 Second floor withdrawing room in the Heyward Washington house. Courtesy of the Charleston Museum, (photo by author).

---

222 Korf 1964, 9-10.
and act as a fire protection mechanism within fireboxes. Tiled jambs, meaning the inside edge of a firebox, were quite common in the Carolina Low Country as a practical way to express wealth and civility. These jambs were usually decorated with one or two vertical rows of figured tiles along the fireplace’s exterior edge. The rest of the interior was covered with ten or twelve vertical rows of plain white tiles on both sides of a centrally located iron fireback. The only known instance of delftware tiles used outside of a fireplace in Charleston is at Archdale Hall, where tiles were also used to line the main entrance hallway.

As evidenced by surviving artifacts, it seems that Charlestonians did not prefer a particular type or style. The delftware tiles and fragments found in the city are extremely varied. Some houses, like Hampton Plantation, displayed multiple styles and designs of tiles in one fireplace while others, like the John Drayton House at 2 Ladson Street, utilized only blue and white designs. Both Dutch and English manufactured tiles are represented, as are the two main decorating techniques of hand-painting and transfer-printing.

The majority of hand-painted tiles are blue and white but there is also a significant amount of manganese purple and white tiles (see fig. 5.3). Newspaper advertisements show that both color schemes were actively imported and advertised. Drayton Hall’s collection is unusual in that it contains fragments with both blue and purple in the design (see fig. 5.4). Tiles like this do not appear anywhere else in the city. A few fragments found at the

---

224 Bivins, 104; Dorothy S. Yoder, “Sadler-Green Tiles,” Tile Research file, Hampton Plantation State Historic Site, McClellanville, SC.
225 Emma Drayton-Grimke, “Chronicles of Archdale Hall,” unpublished manuscript, [1924], 12-13, Baker-Grimke Family Papers 11/539/8, South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston, SC. For more information on Archdale Hall, see chapter five.
Heyward-Washington house at 87 Church Street and the Nathaniel Russell house at 51 Meeting Street, attest to the existence of hand-enamed polychrome tiles (see fig. 5.5). The Heyward-Washington and Simmons-Edward house at 14 Legare Street have Bristol-manufactured bianco sopra bianco tiles, also rare commodities in Charleston (see fig. 5.6).

Transfer-print tiles were only slightly less popular than the hand-painted variety. They appeared in several houses on the peninsula including the John Edwards House at 15 Meeting Street, the William Elliot House at 75 King Street, and the Capers-Motte House at 69 Church Street. These tiles typically displayed scenes in black, red, maroon, and sepia. There are even cases of pale lavender and green fragments, such as the sea-foam fragment from the Simmons-Edward House (see fig. 5.7).

As there is no known evidence to suggest that Charlestonians were ordering specific tiles from overseas, the tile color and design most likely depended on what the merchant had in stock. Luckily for consumers, multiple shipments arrived in Charleston each year during the height of popularity for delftware tiles. These shipments came from all over Europe, bringing in new and different tiles each time. Therefore, even though Charlestonians were forced to pick from the in-store selection, they still had plenty of choices so that no house displayed the same exact tile configurations.
Figure 5.3 Eighteenth century, purple tile from Simmons-Edward house, courtesy of the Charleston Museum (photo by author).

Figure 5.4 Eighteenth century, blue, purple, and white tiles from Drayton Hall’s collection, courtesy of Drayton Hall Plantation (photo by author).

Figure 5.5 Eighteenth century, polychrome tile from Heyward Washington house, courtesy of the Charleston Museum, (photo by author)

Figure 5.6 Eighteenth century, bianco sopra bianco tile fragments from the Simmons-Edward house, courtesy of the Charleston Museum, (photo by author).
Class Profile of Owners

In addition to their aesthetic and practical values, delftware tiles in Charleston evidently acted as status markers for the elite. All of the sites in the city that have evidence of delftware tile belonged to the upper echelons of eighteenth-century society. Even though tiles were very common in Europe and not strictly upscale in New England, wealthy Charlestonians enthusiastically adopted the tiles as a way to illustrate what they considered their superior taste and culture. They did not seem to care that the high esteem in which they held delftware tiles was a relative and localized mentality. They were only concerned with who was able to afford tiles in this particular city.

Ironically, the use of tiles started to gain momentum in Charleston during the 1760s and 1770s, after Sadler and Green had invented the transfer-printing method. This new technique of decoration effectively decreased the overall price of delftware tiles in the commercial market. Lower prices facilitated the importation of hundreds of shipments of Dutch and English tiles into Charleston’s mercantile community. Given that colonists in New England and Virginia were installing tiles in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Charleston’s tardy adoption and fascination with delftware tiles could be considered a bit provincial. However, they embraced it with flair and the fashionable trend lasted in the city for about thirty years.

Around the turn of the century, delftware tiles became more affordable to the general public. Consequently, they lost their allure to wealthy Charlestonians and their overall popularity began to fall. By 1820, advertisements for tiles had stopped. The centennial celebration of 1876 briefly revived all things colonial, including delftware tiles, and several people in Charleston installed replications as a way to illustrate eighteenth-century
décor. By the time coal-burning fireplaces entered the market in the 1820s, tiles had lost their practical application and renewed popularity. Unfortunately, many sets were either removed, covered up with smaller fireboxes, or lost to damage and vandalism over the years.

Now only a fraction of the evidence survives. All of it is from houses of Charleston’s wealthier citizens. So far, almost no evidence has been found to suggest that delftware tiles were installed by either middle or lower-class Charlestonians. However, this does not mean that the tiles were never used by lower classes, only that preliminary research has not revealed any helpful information. It could be explained by the fact that houses and interiors of the wealthy are more likely to survive than those of other levels of society. It could also mean that the period of tile usage in Charleston was so brief, there was not sufficient time for the trend to trickle down to the lower classes. If tile evidence is ever found in connection with Charleston’s middle or lower classes, then further research can be conducted to reconstruct a more complete picture of the delftware tile industry in the city.

Analysis of sale prices for individual tiles actually shows that more people could afford tiles than was previously thought, just not in the same numbers that was typical of Charleston gentry. In 1761, Daniel Horry of Hampton Plantation purchased delftware tiles from merchant James Poyas on two separate occasions. The first time, he bought one set of eight dozen tiles for twenty-five shillings and ten pence and another set of five and a half dozen tiles for thirty shillings and eight and a half pence. The second time, he purchased

\footnotesize
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two and a half dozen tiles for twenty-five shillings and three and a quarter pence. In 1766, Mrs. Elizabeth Baker of Archdale Hall Plantation paid ten pounds, two shillings, and six pence to merchant Edward Jones for nine dozen delftware tiles. Later that year, her husband Richard Baker bought a dozen tiles from William Guerin for the amount of one pound and ten shillings.

With these examples, it appears that each tile was worth between three pence and two and a half shillings (equal to thirty pence). The price difference most likely depended on the design and amount of pigment, with colorful figured tiles costing more than plain white tiles. It probably depended on the method of production as well. In direct accordance with the amount of labor it took to produce one tile, hand-painted were more expensive than transfer-print tiles produced by Sadler and Green’s efficient technology.

In order for these prices to have any contextual meaning, they need to be compared with the daily wages of middle and lower classes. Unfortunately, it can be rather difficult to find statistical information on eighteenth century labor wages for the average colonist. Just recently, Dr. Nic Butler of the Charleston County Library Archives made a significant breakthrough in this topic. He received a copy of an unpublished law that was ratified on December 10, 1740, about a month after “The Great Fire,” destroyed more than three hundred dwellings throughout the city. The law regulates wages for mechanic occupations

---

as part of the relief efforts. In it, city officials denote specific wages for certain jobs, even
taking into regard varying levels of experience.

An Act for regulating the Buildings hereafter to be erected or built in Charles Town,
and for preventing Incroachments on the Streets, Lanes and public Alleys within the
said Town as the said Streets Lanes and public Alleys stood on the seventeenth day of
November last. . . . For Carpenters and Joiners Master workmen per day Two
pounds. For negro men Carpenters or Joiners per day One pound. For apprentices
white or black in the first year of their time per day seven shillings and six pence. In
the second per day Ten shillings. In the third per day fifteen shillings. In the fourth
per day One pound. For Bricklayers and Plaisterers [sic] master workmen per day
Two pounds. For Negro men per day One pound five shillings. For apprentices white
or black the same prices as are limited [sic] for Carpenters or Joiners apprentices
Negro Men labourers [sic] per day seven shillings and six pence If bricks are laid by
the thousand then per thousand Two pounds. For lathing and plaistering [sic] per
Square yard Two shillings and six pence. For Plaistering [sic] Laths five feet long per
thousand Two pounds.234

Although these wages are from 1740 rather than 1760 when the tiles were purchased, this
information is still very helpful in providing a general idea of affordability.

At first glance, it appears that it would have been very easy for laborers to afford tiles
at the above mentioned price. Based on the wages, an individual tile only amounts to
approximately one-fourth percent to six and a half percent of a laborer’s weekly pay. Even if
a customer purchased fourteen tiles to make one row on each side of the firebox, it would
still only cost him approximately two to nine percent of weekly pay as a mechanic. Perhaps
this is precisely what middle to lower classes did. However, the majority of surviving
physical evidence has shown that fireplaces in Charleston tended to display twelve to sixteen
rows of seven to eight tiles each, totaling eighty-four to one hundred and twenty-eight tiles
just one firebox. Providing that a customer followed the fashion of one or two rows of
figured tiles and the rest blank white tiles, this many tiles would still cost an him anywhere

234 South Carolina General Assembly, Engrossed Acts, Act. No. 677, December 10, 1740, South Carolina
Department of Archives and History, Columbia, SC.
from three to five pounds. For a master craftsman, who is at the top of the pay grade mentioned in the act above, a purchase like this equaled out to nearly thirty to fifty percent of his weekly income. Theoretically, he could pay for a set of tiles but the majority of his paycheck would probably go to rent, food, and other necessities. Very little would be leftover for fashionable expenses. That pastime was left up to those who could afford it.

This analysis proves that the average laborer could have easily purchased and installed a few relatively inexpensive tiles. Therefore, members of the middle class certainly could have indulged in the trend, though not to the same extent as practiced by the gentry. However, the lack of physical and written evidence in connection with middle and lower classes suggests that either these citizens did not embrace the trend like their social superiors or their tile use did not survive changing fashions. The material that has survived only associates with upper-class Charlestonians. These and other factors combine to convey the message that delftware tiles were meant to highlight elite status by the amount and designs of tiles that one could buy.
CHAPTER SIX
CASE STUDIES

Methodology

Through the consultation of archival material, archaeological reports, and physical evidence, this thesis has identified at least twenty-three individual houses in and around Charleston that displayed delftware tiles during the eighteenth century. The list does not presume to be complete but instead strives to present a compilation of new and previously recorded information for houses known to have delftware tile evidence. The houses with the most comprehensive information on the purchase, installation, re-discovery, and current condition of the tiles were chosen as case studies. The rest of the houses on the list are recorded on a color-coded map and individual survey forms in Appendix A.

The following narratives discuss the delftware tile history in four eighteenth-century Charleston dwellings. Two of the houses represent plantation gentry while the other two houses are upper class city residences within Charleston proper. Since all of the sites mentioned in this thesis are associated with upper class Charlestonians, the case studies provide insight into the trend of delftware tile use by wealthy Low Country citizens throughout the 1760s, 1770s, and 1780s. They also illuminate colors, styles, and designs found in the city. The case studies do not provide information on the use of delftware tiles by middle and lower class Charlestonians due to the fact that, as of yet, virtually no delftware tile evidence has been found at such sites.

Part of the case study discussion deals with the estimation of age and place of manufacture for the tiles and fragments. As mentioned by every major work on delftware
tiles, it is very difficult to determine a tile’s exact origin and date of manufacture.\textsuperscript{235} Only an analysis of the clay can pin point in which specific city the tile was made and even then it does not narrow down the individual factory since factories in the same city generally used the same clay pits. However, the identifying features of a tile such as size, thickness, type of clay, color, painting technique, style of painting, and corner motifs, can help narrow the time period down to a quarter century or even a decade.\textsuperscript{236} The dating and attribution assessments in this section were concluded from evaluation of the tiles and fragments using scholarly sources including Korf, Ray, and Pluis. The assessments are as close to a definitive answer as is possible at this time.

\textsuperscript{235} Hume 2001, 286.

\textsuperscript{236} The historical background of these features is discussed in greater length in chapter three of this thesis and can also be found in books by Pluis 1997, Ray 1994, van Dam 1984, van Lemmen 1997, Korf 1964, and other sources listed in the bibliography.
ARCHDALE HALL PLANTATION
BAKER-BOHUN HOUSE
North Charleston, Dorchester County, South Carolina

Site History

The Baker family was among the earliest English colonists to settle in South Carolina. From 1682 to 1901, they made their country seat on a large tract of land located along the Ashley River in Dorchester County. Over the course of two centuries, they built two houses on their land, the second being a Georgian mansion constructed sometime between 1710 and 1740 by William Baker. According to architectural historians, this house was particularly distinctive and one of the colony’s “most extraordinary but least known buildings.” In the 1760s, the family renovated the house and added newly fashionable details such as delftware tiles. The house survived unscathed through the

---

237 Elaine Bluhm Herold, “An Archaeological Survey of Archdale Plantation, Dorchester County,” Rev. ed. (Charleston: Charleston Museum, 1977), 5; Henry A. M. Smith, “The Ashley River: Its Seat and Settlements,” The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine 20, no.1, (January 1919): 27. There are some discrepancies among professionals as to the exact date of the building’s construction. Architectural Historian Charles Bayless stated that the house could be early eighteenth century while Henry Smith and Milby Burton believed the house to date after 1740 due to the fact that the area was still relatively unsettled in the early eighteenth century and would not have served as a safe haven for a wealthy Charleston family. They also refer to its similarities to Drayton Hall and Middleton Place, both of which were constructed in the 1740s.

Civil War only to suffer extensive damage during the 1886 earthquake and further degradation by heavy rains (see fig. 6.1 and 6.2). The ruins and surrounding land remained in the Baker-Grimke family until the 1960s. Eventually, the land was developed into a subdivision and the ruins sold to the Archdale Civic Association. Today, the brick foundation of Archdale Hall is all that remains of one family’s unique expression of South Carolina wealth.

Figure 6.2 The front room of Archdale Hall after the Earthquake, 1886. Courtesy of the Charleston Museum archives.

Delftware Tile History

Investigation of the Baker-Grimke family papers revealed a few rare pieces of information regarding delftware tiles. Two receipts document the purchases of “9 doz. Dutch Tyles,” on April 18, 1766 from Charleston merchant Edward Jones and “1 doz. blue

---


& white dutch tiles,” on November 20, 1766 from merchant William Guerin. Richard and Elizabeth Elliot Baker evidently bought the tiles for their renovation of the homestead.

Later that year, Elizabeth wrote her sister that, “The Parlour Chimney is finish’d all to Painting the Hearths...” So far, this is the most comprehensive documentation found that chronicles the purchase of tiles in relation to a specific house in the greater Charleston area.

It is unclear what happened to the tiles. Possibly some were salvaged in 1886 after the house was destroyed by the earthquake. In 1960, family descendant Mrs. James Snowden had three tiles from Archdale Hall in her possession. At least two small archaeological investigations have been conducted on the site but only one turned up delftware tile fragments. These, along with two intact tiles from the house, are now in the collection at The Charleston Museum. The rest of the tiles may have been sold off, given to other family members, or continue to lie undisturbed beneath the house’s ruins.

Physical Description of Tiles

So far, no visual documentation of the missing tiles has been found but one family member did leave behind a very helpful description of the tiles in place. In 1924, Emma Drayton-Grimke recorded the Baker family history with Archdale Hall serving as a background. She drew on her childhood memories to vividly recount the building’s appearance, both interior and exterior. The main entrance hall was lined with pink and black tiles that depicted, “a sailor’s departure and return loaded with gifts for his lady, who holds

---

243 Leland, 1-C.
244 Herold, 4.
out her dress to receive them." Of the dining room, she writes, "This fireplace was lined with blue and white Dutch tiles of quaint pictures from the Bible; the whale swallowing Jonah, Tobit and his dog, two women jumping over a fence and a man peeping at them through the bushes."

The tiles in the dining room are most likely those mentioned in the November 20, 1766 receipt. It is possible that the entrance hall tiles are the same as those bought on April 18, 1766, however, the receipt merely lists Dutch tiles and does not provide any further description, so this point is conjectural.

Little is known about the three tiles owned by Mrs. Snowden. Two were described as biblical tiles, possibly from the dining room fireplace, showing action shots of the whale swallowing Jonah and Joseph being lowered into the pit by his brothers. There is no record of their coloring, size, corner motifs, or suggested place of manufacture. The third tile was not described at all. Since the one and only mention of the tiles was in 1960, it is also unclear as to whether they are still owned by the family.

Luckily, there is more information available on the two tiles owned by the Charleston Museum. They are both blue on white although clearly from different design campaigns and styles. One tile depicts a landscape scene of a hut, a campanile, a fence, and some sort of grain vegetation in the foreground (see fig. 6.3). The Museum catalog card describes the two buildings as churches due to faint cross-like items on top of the buildings but these could just be part of the artisan’s style. The tile has no corner motifs and more white space than the flower tile. It measures 130 mm by 130 mm and is 7.9 mm thick.

---

245 Drayton-Grimke, 12-13. This is the only mention of delftware tiles being used for decoration outside of a fireplace in a Charleston house.
246 Drayton-Grimke, 10.
247 Leland, 1-C.
“Archdale Hall” is inscribed on the light pink clay back. According to records, a Mrs. L. L. Harby donated the tile in 1920.

Edward Allen Hyer donated the second tile to the museum a year later. It displays a vase full of flowers and traditional leaf corner motifs (see fig. 6.5). It measures 130 mm by 130 mm and is 6.4 mm thick. The cobalt blue coloring was painted directly onto the background glaze with refined brush strokes prior to a second firing. An inscription identical to that of the other tile is written on the grayish beige clay back.

Both catalog cards cite England as the place of origin for the tiles. The flower tile is recorded to have come from Bristol and dates from 1740-60. The landscape tile is not given a specific city and is broadly dated to the period of 1683 to 1883. However, these catalog cards are very old and only cite information supplied by the donor. The date range for both tiles is probably closer to the second half of the seventeenth century around 1740-60. Place of manufacture is more difficult to determine, but both tiles display tradition Dutch designs. Without knowing which shipments brought in the tiles, it is unclear as to whether they are an English imitation of Dutch designs or actually Dutch manufactured in the Netherlands. A clay content analysis would possibly provide more concrete information on this topic.

---

Pluis 1997, 141, 565. This corner motif is very similar to that displayed on C.15.00.13 on pg. 565. The style of both the corner motifs and center picture is similar to A.05.08.41 on pg. 141.
Figure 6.3 Blue and white tile from Archdale Hall, donated by Mrs. L.L. Harby, eighteenth century. Courtesy of the Charleston Museum, (photo by author).

Figure 6.4 Back of tile from Archdale Hall, donated by Mrs. L.L. Harby, eighteenth century. Courtesy of the Charleston Museum, (photo by author).

Figure 6.5 Blue and white tile from Archdale Hall, donated by Edward Allen Hyer, eighteenth century. Courtesy of the Charleston Museum (photo by author).

Figure 6.6 Back of blue and white tile from Archdale Hall, donated by Edward Allen Hyer, eighteenth century. Courtesy of the Charleston Museum (photo by author).
HAMPTON PLANTATION  
McClellanville, Charleston County, South Carolina

Site History

In 1735, third generation Huguenot Noë Serré built a Georgian manor house on Wambaw Creek in a settlement known as French Santee, north of Charleston. The house was relatively modest with four rooms on the first floor and two rooms on the second floor. Serré presented the house and surrounding land to his daughter Judith and her husband Daniel Huger Horry as a wedding present in 1757. The newlyweds made several additions to the house. First, they built two additional rooms on the second floor to match the layout of the first floor. Then they added two high-ceilinged rooms, one on either side of the house to serve as a ballroom and a formal dining room. Judith did not live very long after the marriage and Horry remarried in 1768 to heiress Harriott Pinckney. The couple continued to live in the house and oversee the plantation. In 1790, they celebrated the birth of their son and the impending visit of President George Washington by constructing a new portico onto the front of the house. With relatively few changes, the

Figure 6.7 Hampton Plantation, 1951. Courtesy of the Charleston Museum archives.

---

249 James Dillion, “United States Department of the Interior National Park Service National Register of Historic Places Inventory--Nomination Form,” (Washington, D.C., 1976): 2; Stoney 1964, 59-60. Stoney mentions that Hampton Plantation may have been named for the London villa of actor David Garrick, called Hampton House. Garrick’s house was built by Robert Adams and has a front portico that served as the prototype for the one added to Hampton Plantation in the 1790s. Stoney does point out that this theory is conjectural and is not supported by any written evidence.
house remained in this state as it passed down through the Horry family line well into the twentieth century.

In 1937, family descendant and South Carolina’s Poet Laureate Archibald Rutledge returned to live at Hampton Plantation. He immediately began renovations to add modern conveniences to the old building. To his credit, he tried to retain much of the house’s historical fabric and characteristics. He recorded the restoration experience in his memoir *Home By the River*. Upon Rutledge’s death in the 1971, his family sold the house and surrounding land to the South Carolina State Park Service. After stabilizing the building and removing modern additions, the State Park Service opened the house to public visitation.

*Delftware Tile History*

Archival evidence documents the presence of delftware tiles at Hampton Plantation as early as the 1760s. On Thursday March 12, 1761, Daniel Horry purchased, “8 dozen blue and w*é* dutch paint’d Tiles,” and “5 ½ dozen purple ditto,” from Charleston merchant James Poyas. A few months later, on August 1, 1761, he made another purchase from Poyas of “2 ½ dozen Dutch painted Tiles.” These purchases were made during the height of delftware tile popularity in the American colonies. Horry and Judith followed the current fashion trend when they included this exotic accent in the renovations of their old homestead. So far, these two entries are the earliest accounts of an actual sale of tiles in Charleston rather than just the advertisement of available products.

---

250 Bridges, 174.
251 Dillion, 2.
252 Poyas account book, 106.
Historic photographs of the house show ceramic tile in the fireplaces of four first floor rooms; the entrance hall, the dining parlor, the stenciled room, and the ballroom.\textsuperscript{254} Of these, the ballroom fireplace is the best documented. A 1902 photograph shows the left side of the fireplace as having a panel of tiles eight rows high and six rows wide with the bottom two rows incomplete. Sometime over the next six years, new tiles were installed to complete the panel as shown in a 1928 photograph of the same room. Another photograph from 1928 shows the right side panel of the fireplace as having five rows high and six rows wide of figured tiles with three bottom rows composed of white tiles and empty spaces. All of the tiles shown in these photographs appear to be Liverpool transfer-printed tiles.\textsuperscript{255}

Interestingly, a photograph from 1940 shows the same ballroom fireplace but with a mixture of transfer-printed and hand-painted delftware tiles (see fig. 6.8). This is due to Archibald Rutledge’s 1930s renovation of the house. When Rutledge first returned to his family’s country seat, he thoroughly explored the house before deciding how to proceed with renovations. The ballroom fireplace already displayed delftware tiles, but he found twenty-eight more tiles stored in dusty boxes in the west cellar.\textsuperscript{256} Evidently, these tiles were salvaged pieces from the first floor fireplaces that suffered heavy damage during the 1886 earthquake.

\textsuperscript{254} Historic photographs of the entrance hall and dining parlor show narrow glazed tiles that have no images. These tiles were removed during restoration work in the 1970s. They are clearly of English origin, as evidenced by the maker’s marks “Trent” and “Cambridge” stamped on the back of the fragments. They also resemble late nineteenth century ceramic tiles more than delftware tiles of the eighteenth century. They were probably installed after the earthquake of 1886 caused damage to the original tiled jambs in the house. Archaeological investigations have uncovered eighteenth century delftware tile fragments in the fireplaces of the entrance hall, dining parlor, and stenciled room. The 1902 and 1928 original pictures were unavailable for scanning so this thesis was not able to use the images.


\textsuperscript{256} Archibald H. Rutledge, \textit{Home by the River}, (Indianapolis: Bobs-Merrill, 1941), 65.
earthquake. After he enlarged the fireplace back to its eighteenth-century appearance, Rutledge used these newly discovered tiles as infill for any empty spaces when he re-cemented the ballroom tiles back into place.\textsuperscript{258}

The most recent photograph of the ballroom tiles in-situ comes from the archives of the South Carolina State Parks. Upon receiving the house in 1971, they documented its interior and exterior conditions. Their photograph of the ballroom fireplace shows the tiles to be in the same arrangement as in the 1940 HABS photograph (see fig.6.9). However, several tiles are missing from the left side panel most likely due to vandalism during the

\textsuperscript{257} Bridges, 174.

\textsuperscript{258} Mike Foley to Robert Mitchell and Joey Craven, July 23, 1993, Tiles Research File, Hampton Plantation State Historic Site, McClellanville, SC.
house’s period of abandonment. The remaining in-situ tiles were removed from the house during the restoration in the late 1970s for safe keeping. Workers uncovered more fragments behind nineteenth-century masonry additions and removed these for storage as well. A few are on display in the ranger station at Hampton but most are housed at the South Carolina State Park Service Resource Management Office in Columbia, South Carolina.

Physical Description of Tiles

The Poyas entries do not provide much information on the tiles purchased by Horry in 1761 other than using the term “Dutch painted tiles” and noting their colors of blue and purple. Rutledge himself provides the most in-depth written description of the tiles at Hampton, although he only discusses the ballroom fireplace. In his 1941 memoir, he describes the ballroom tiles as,

showing scenes to suit every taste, from Bacchanalia to Biblical pictures. For example, there are groups that might have come from Hogarth; there are lovely nautical scenes; there are trees and delicate wildflowers; we see David and Goliath, the Good Samaritan, nymphs and satyrs, lords, and ladies. Some of these tiles are of a rich deep blue, while others have white as a background.

---

259 Foley 1993.
261 Rutledge, 58.
He describes the tiles from the west cellar as, “like those of the fireplace in the ballroom, all perfect and all in color…Two have upon them lavender wildflowers of surpassing delicacy of color and grace…Some of the tiles are signed by the artists who made them.”262

These descriptions match many of the tiles found in the ballroom by the State Park Service when they took possession of the building in 1971. Closer inspection of the tiles revealed three different types; those with transfer-printed images, those with hand painted designs, and those with a solid white glaze. Transfer-printed tiles, made popular by Liverpool manufactures Sadler and Green, are the easiest tiles to date and identify. This is fortunate since most of the tiles in the ballroom at Hampton feature transfer-printed designs straight out of Sadler and Green’s catalog. Some of these patterns date to the early period of Sadler and Green production between 1757 and 1761 such as “A lady and Gentleman in Tartans Dancing,” “A Girl with a Basket, and a Fortune Teller with a Baby on Her Back,” “Peasant Dancing to a Fiddler Outside an Inn,” “Two Peasants Picnicking and a Girl Holding a Hay Rake,” and “The Astrologer.”263 However, most date a few years later to the period of 1761 to 1700 such as “A Macaroni at a Sale of Pictures,” “The Little Marquis and His Valet,” “A Six Week Tour to Paris,” “A Suitor Offering a Present to a Girl,” “A Peasant Woman Escorting a Drunken Man Home,” “A Pipe and Punch Party,” “A Girl with a Hurdy-Gurdy,” “A Modern Demi-Rep on the Look-out,” “The Pretty Mantua Maker,” “An Opera Girl of Paris in the Character of Flora,” “The Turkish Merchant,” “A Gallant and Country Lass, and a Man with a Stick Climbing a Stile,” and “A Pilot-Vessel Seen from the

262 Rutledge, 65.
263 Ray 1994, 25, 27, 28, 34.
There are also a few with religious scenes such as “David with the Head of Goliath.” All of the Liverpool tiles at Hampton are either black, red, or sepia. They display the rococo “Bacchanalia,” border and Hogarthian pictures that Rutledge mentions. Since the 1761 accounts of Horry’s two tile purchases specifically mention blue and purple color schemes of the hand-painted style, the Liverpool tiles must have been a later addition. Perhaps further exploration into the Horry family papers will someday reveal accounts for the purchase of these tiles.

The few tiles that are not Liverpool transfer-prints are more difficult to attribute to a specific maker or country but are more likely to be among the tiles purchased by Horry in 1761. Many of the hand-painted designs resemble popular Dutch delftware tile patterns that English manufacturers actively copied. Most of the scenes include nautical, landscape, and military themes such as “A Solider and a Camping Tent,” “A Fisherman and a Boat,” “A Small House and Three Ships Approaching,” “A Castle or Church with Three Ships Approaching,” “A Cow Beneath a Tree,” and “A Man, a Child, and a Horse.” All of these tiles are either blue on white or purple on white and resemble the description given by Rutledge of some of the ballroom and west cellar tiles. Historians at Hampton Plantation

\textsuperscript{264} Ray 1994, 32, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 45; Hester 2008.
\textsuperscript{265} Ray 1994, 36.
\textsuperscript{266} The account entries also call both purchases “Dutch” tiles. This catch-phrase was used extensively as a brand name for marketing and identification purposes. It does not necessarily mean that these particular tiles were really of Dutch manufacture but merely that they fall into the category of what is known today as delftware.
\textsuperscript{267} Rutledge, 60; Bridges, 174. Influenced by the claim of a visiting Italian artist, Rutledge was convinced that the blue tiles were thirteenth-century medieval ceramics. He also thought the tiles found in the west cellar were old enough to be antiques before they were even imported into the country and therefore too valuable to install in the house. There is no archival or archaeological evidence to support this claim. The blue tiles he spoke of were most likely those bought by Daniel Horry in 1761 and placed in the cellar after the earthquake of 1886 damaged the house and the fireplaces needed to be rebuilt.
\textsuperscript{268} Hester 2008.
State Historic Site believe the tiles to be English copies rather than true Dutch delftware.\textsuperscript{269} Given that most of the advertised tile shipments in Charleston came directly from England until about 1784, it is a reasonable claim to say these tiles may be English copies of traditional Dutch designs.

While transfer-printed and hand-painted tiles are fairly easy to date and attribute to a specific country, white tiles are exasperatingly generic. Every tile maker in Europe manufactured solid white tiles as companions to figured tiles. Without a maker’s mark, specific written account detailing the purchase of these tiles, or clay content analysis, it is almost impossible to determine their origin.\textsuperscript{270} Luckily, a timeline exists for the installation of tiles at Hampton so the white tiles most likely date to the mid to late-eighteenth century. Country of origin is still suspect although the white tiles probably came from the same shipments as the figured tiles. Photographic evidence places them in-situ at least by 1902.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{figure610.jpg}
\caption{“A Macaroni at a Sale of Pictures,” Sadler and Green Liverpool transfer-print tile from Hampton Plantation, 1765-c.1775. Courtesy of Hampton Plantation State Historic Site.}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{figure611.jpg}
\caption{“Two peasants picnicking and a girl holding a hay rake,” Sadler and Green Liverpool transfer-print tile from Hampton Plantation, 1757-1761. Courtesy of Hampton Plantation State Historic Site.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{269} Foley 1993.
\textsuperscript{270} Hume 2001, 286.
Figure 6.12 “A Girl with a Hurdy Gurdy,” Sadler and Green Liverpool transfer-print tile from Hampton Plantation, 1765-c.1775. Courtesy of Hampton Plantation State Historic Site.

Figure 6.13 “A street-scene with a fiddler and a girl dancing,” Sadler and Green Liverpool transfer-print tile from Hampton Plantation, 1757-1761. Courtesy of Hampton Plantation State Historic Site.

Figure 6.14 Purple and white tile with rural scene and spider corner motif from Hampton Plantation, eighteenth century. Courtesy of Hampton Plantation State Historic Site.

Figure 6.15 Blue and white tile with soldier and spider corner motif from Hampton Plantation, eighteenth century. Courtesy of Hampton Plantation State Historic Site.
Figure 6.16 Blue and white tile with church, ships, and spider corner motif from Hampton Plantation, eighteenth century. Courtesy of Hampton Plantation State Historic Site.

Figure 6.17 Blue and white biblical tile with ox-head corner motif from Hampton Plantation, eighteenth century. Courtesy of Hampton Plantation State Historic Site.

Figure 6.18 Purple tile with soldier, ships, and spider corner motif from Hampton Plantation, eighteenth century. Courtesy of Hampton Plantation State Historic Site.

Figure 6.19 Purple tile with houses, ships, and spider corner motif from Hampton Plantation, eighteenth century. Courtesy of Hampton Plantation State Historic Site.
JOHN DRAYTON HOUSE
2 Ladson Street: Charleston, South Carolina

Site History

The wooden Palladian townhouse at 2 Ladson Street was constructed in the 1740s on land that once belonged to Lt. Governor William Bull. In 1746, Bull bequeathed the land to his son-in-law John Drayton. It is unclear whether the house already existed or if Drayton built the house after he received the land. The east room of the second floor has a mantel piece that is very similar to those found out at Drayton Hall, the country seat of John Drayton’s family. Together, this similarity and the timeline have convinced some preservationists that Drayton built the house. However, the attribution is by no means concrete and causes some debate among professionals in the field. The only certain facts are that Drayton received the property in 1746 and sold it to John Deas sometime before 1781. Subsequent renovations in 1813 and in 1904 introduced Adamesque and Colonial Revival additions to the originally symmetrical layout. Today, this house serves as a private showcase for two hundred and fifty years of Charleston’s changing architectural taste.

---

271 Historic Charleston Foundation Staff, “Information for Guides of Historic Charleston,” Historic Charleston Foundation archives, Charleston, SC; Carter Hudgins to John Cahill, July 1, 2008, Drayton Hall Plantation, Charleston, SC.
272 Historic Charleston Foundation Staff “Historic Preservation Certification Application Part 1 for John Drayton House and Kitchen,” Historic Charleston Foundation archives, Charleston, SC.
Delftware Tile History

Unfortunately, research into the Drayton family papers has not yet revealed any written material on the original purchase and installation of these tiles. It remains unclear as to which early owner is responsible for installing the tiles and which subsequent owner covered them up with coal-burning fireboxes. Given the period of significance for delftware tiles in Charleston, it is likely that a subsequent owner installed the tiles in the mid to late-eighteenth century. During recent work on the house, restoration contractor Richard Marks found tile fragments in four of the fireboxes. Marks found two fully tiled fireboxes on the northern side of the first floor behind federally-shaped walls that were installed in the nineteenth century. Other fragments were found in the south-eastern and south-western bedrooms on the second floor. The tiles were documented in photographs and removed. The owners loaned the second floor fragments to Marks for study.

Even though scholars disagree on whether John Drayton actually built the house at 2 Ladson Street, the tiles found on site present an interesting physical connection to his family’s country residence along the Ashley River. The 2 Ladson Street fragments match the design and color of a set of fragments found at Drayton Hall Plantation. The presence of these matching sets raises several questions, including whether the tiles came from the same shipment and were purchased at the same time for two separate locations. Short of finding an eighteenth-century purchase receipt or conducting a clay-content analysis, there is little concrete evidence to provide the answer. However, since no other tiles or fragments with this exact design have been found at any other sites in Charleston, it is not only plausible but also probable that these tiles did indeed come from the same shipment. Hopefully, future research will uncover evidence to settle the question once and for all.
Physical Description of Tiles

Richard Marks has a few complete tiles from 2 Ladson Street in his possession but most of are in fragment form. The intact tiles are strong blue and white with an imperial vase design and no corner motifs (see fig. 6.20). They measure approximately seven mm in thickness and 130 mm by 130 mm overall. The exposed clay backs are yellow. The blue glaze was painted directly onto the white background glaze. The tiles have a beveled edge of eighty-five degrees. These characteristics suggest the tiles to be of Dutch manufacture from the mid to late eighteenth century.273

The fragments from 2 Ladson Street were reconstructed into five separate tiles. All of the tiles display the same overall theme of a central flower vase and share most of the characteristics such as size and coloring. However, one tile has a different border than the rest (see fig. 6.21). This tile has an octagon border rather than the stylized accolade border and quarter rosette corner motifs displayed by the other four tiles (see fig. 6.22 and 6.23).274 The cobalt blue images on all five were directly painted onto the white glaze with refined brush strokes. The clay backing of these fragments is light pink beige in coloring. Corner and side fragments have a beveled edge that is approximately 60 degrees. Measurements taken from the four mostly complete tiles indicate that intact tiles would have been between 128 mm to 132 mm square and 8 mm thick. The coloring, painting technique, corner motif, beveled edge, and size of these fragments fall into the time of late seventeenth century to early eighteenth century. The tiles may date to the earlier decades of this period as indicated

273 Korf, 34.
274 Pluis 1997, 428-429, 561. The center images are similar to those shown on pages 428-429, the corner motif is similar but not identical to C.12.00.28, , and the border is identical to A.08.08.48.
by the open space between the center picture, border, and corner motif. When discovered, the tile fragments were in relatively good condition except for lime mortar encrustation on the sides and surface dirt.

Figure 6.21 Blue and white imperial tile from 2 Ladson Street, probably Dutch manufacture, eighteenth century. Courtesy of Richard Marks, (photo by author).

Figure 6.22 Blue and white flower tile with octagon border, probably Dutch manufacture eighteenth century. Courtesy of Richard Marks, (photo by author).

Figure 6.23 Blue and white flower pot tile with accolade border and quarter rosette corner motifs from 2 Ladson Street, probably Dutch manufacture, eighteenth century. Courtesy of Richard Marks, (photo by author).

Figure 6.24 Blue and white flower pot tile with accolade border and quarter rosette corner motifs from 2 Ladson Street, probably Dutch manufacture, eighteenth century. Courtesy of Richard Marks, (photo by author).

*Korf 1964, 34; Durbin, 28.*
THE WILLIAM VANDERHORST HOUSE
54 Tradd Street: Charleston, South Carolina

Site History

The house located at 54 Tradd Street is known as the William Vanderhorst house. This three story stuccoed brick house was constructed around 1740 on a lot belonging to Vanderhorst’s wife. It is considered to be one of the earliest single houses built in Charleston and still serves as an excellent example due to its retention of the original floor plan and front public entrance. The interior underwent subsequent restorations in the 1930s and more recently in 1996.276

In addition to hosting the Vanderhorst family, the house has connections to other prominent Charlestonians. In 1796, it was home to merchant Abraham Sasportas, a Sephardic Jew who operated as a privateer in the Napoleonic Wars. In 1802, Thomas W. Bacot, Charleston’s fifth postmaster, used the house for his residence as well as business front.277 In 1916, Susan Pringle Frost bought the house to help with her rehabilitation of

277 Harriot Horry Ravenel, Charleston: The Place and the People, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1906), 471-472; Samuel Gaillard Stoney, This is Charleston: A Survey of the Architectural Heritage of a Unique American City undertaken by the Charleston Civic Services Committee (Charleston, SC: Carolina Art Association for the Charleston Civic Services Committee, 1944), 103. Local legend claims that Bacot ran the post office out of the front room.
Tradd Street. She paid for its restoration and added an iron balcony onto its front façade, rescued from a house on State Street. Although she and her family owned the house for many years, it was often rented out to tenants. The high turnover rate of residents proved to be hard on the building and its condition declined throughout the twentieth century. A restoration was undertaken in 1996 to revitalize the overall appearance of the structure.\(^{278}\)

In 1998, Mr. and Mrs. Hegenberger donated an exterior easement to Historic Charleston Foundation for the preservation of the house’s street facade.\(^{279}\)

**Delftware Tile History**

According to restoration contractor Richard Marks, delftware tiles were found in the second floor south parlor fireplace during the 1996 restoration. So far, archival research has not revealed any written accounts of the purchase or installation of the tiles, nor their subsequent cover-up. Given that the house was built in the early years of delftware tile importation into Charleston, these most likely would have been installed either by Vanderhorst himself as builder or another early owner. Unfortunately, during restoration work on the house, the tiles were removed and stolen by an unscrupulous worker. A search uncovered the tiles broken up into fragments. The owners kept the more intact tiles, sold a few, and gave the rest to Marks.\(^{280}\)

---

\(^{278}\) Historic Charleston Foundation, “United States Department of the Interior National Park Service Historic Preservation Certificate Application Part 1 - Evaluation of Significance,” in Gift Folder of Property Files on 54 Tradd Street, Historic Charleston Foundation Archives, Charleston, South Carolina.

\(^{279}\) Historic Charleston Foundation Staff “Deed of Conservation Easement,” December 29, 1998 in Gift Folder of Property Files on 54 Tradd Street, Historic Charleston Foundation Archives.

Physical Description of Tiles

The tile fragments from 54 Tradd Street are deep blue on white in color scheme and display a variation on the popular carnation corner motif (see fig. 6.25).\footnote{Pluis 1997, 567; Korf 1964, 48. This corner motif is nearly identical to C.17.00.04 as seen in Pluis and figure 38 in Korf.} Attempted reconstruction of the fragments revealed four mostly complete tiles, a number of partial tiles, and several stray pieces that did not match any others. The center images shown by reconstructed pieces are pastoral, windmill, and seascape scenes surrounded by medallion borders, representative of typical Dutch tile designs (see fig. 6.27 and 6.28).\footnote{Pluis 1997, 370, 372. The marina scenes are similar to A.03.01.37, A.03.01.46, and A.03.01.47.} The images are directly painted onto the glaze with refined brush strokes.

The clay backing of the fragments is light yellow beige in coloring. Corner and side fragments have a very slight beveled edge, approximately 85 degrees. Measurements taken from the four mostly complete tiles indicate that intact tiles would have been 129 mm to 130 mm square and approximately 6 mm thick. Although it is very difficult to fix a date and manufacture to a specific tile, the coloring, degree of beveled edge, painting technique, corner motif, and size of these tiles are congruent with Dutch delftware tiles made during the second half of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth century.\footnote{Korf 1964, 34; Durbin, 28; Neurdenburg, 39.}

Cursory examination of the fragments showed them to be in relatively good condition except for lime mortar encrustation, organic staining, tar, and old glue residue. The 54 Tradd Street tiles were used in an experiment to test possible conservation treatments. The process and results of the project are fully discussed in chapter seven of this thesis.
Figure 6.26 Blue and white tile with marina scene and carnation corner motif from 54 Tradd Street, eighteenth century. Courtesy of Richard Marks, (photo by author).

Figure 6.27 Back of blue and white tile with marina scene and carnation corner motif from 54 Tradd Street, eighteenth century. Courtesy of Richard Marks, (photo by author).

Figure 6.28 Blue and white tile with marina scene and carnation corner motif from 54 Tradd Street, eighteenth century. Courtesy of Richard Marks, (photo by author).

Figure 6.29 Blue and white tile with rural scene and carnation corner motifs from 54 Tradd Street, eighteenth century. Courtesy of Richard Marks, (photo by author).
CHAPTER SEVEN
CONSERVATION OF DELFTWARE TILES

Most of the examples of tin-glazed Dutch and English delftware tiles in Charleston are found as fragments at eighteenth-century historical sites by archeological investigations or during building restorations. Even though these artifacts are generally not whole or located in their original position, they still offer valuable information about a house and its residents, particularly in regards with changes to the house itself. Unfortunately, many of these fragments have suffered damage from use as well as staining and encrustation from time spent in the ground or hidden behind newer fireboxes. Due to the fragile nature of ceramics, it can be very tedious and painstaking for conservators to preserve these artifacts. Most of the time, fragments receive little to no treatment beyond reconstruction with glue and storage in boxes. However, current scholarship offers general guidelines that can be used to preserve tile fragments in their current condition and facilitate further restoration as needed.

This chapter discusses the process and results of employing suggested conservation methods on eighteenth century delftware tile fragments from the William Vanderhorst house in Charleston, South Carolina. The fragments were found during restoration work on the house. They were chosen for this project because they represent typical condition, date range, coloring, design, and size of tile fragments found at other eighteenth-century sites on the Charleston peninsula such as the John Smith House at 33 Broad Street, the Heyward Washington House at 87 Church Street, the Nathaniel Russell House at 51 Meeting Street, the John Drayton House at 2 Ladson Street, and the Miles Brewton House at 27 King Street.
In addition to scholarly research, guidance was provided by consultation with conservator Frances Ford in Charleston, archeologists Martha Zierden at the Charleston Museum and Sarah Stroud at Drayton Hall Plantation, and tile expert Gerrit Van Waveren in Holland. The results discovered by this conservation project prove that there are simple, affordable, and effective options for basic conservation and reuse techniques of delftware tiles.

Conservation Issues

As with most ceramics, tin-glazed delftware tiles suffer from a number of degradations, mostly due either to flaws in the manufacturing process or from exposure to dirt, soot, and soluble salts. The manufacturing and firing processes are particularly important since they sometimes generate inherent weaknesses in tiles that can lead to later issues. Deficient clay mixtures create fault lines and structural defects that may cause fractures when tiles are subjected to movement or thermal stress. Differing shrinkage rates between the clay body and the glaze appear as crazing of the glaze in the cooling period following firing. Also, if the firing temperature is too low, the glaze does not bond properly to the clay body resulting in overall brittleness of the glaze, flaking, and deformity of the design.\textsuperscript{284}

Once fired, decorated, and in use, delftware tiles suffer from other types of problems. Tiles surrounding fireplaces, as was common in Charleston, experience sudden changes in temperature that can affect the relatively soft and highly porous clay by increasing

\textsuperscript{284}Durbin, 32.
The softness and porosity also cause tiles to absorb organic discolorations such as soot and dirt, specifically where the surface is pitted from wear and along edges where glaze has flaked off to expose the clay body.\textsuperscript{286} The most serious and damaging issue with delftware tiles is the growth of salt crystals.\textsuperscript{287} Clay used for tiles and the mortar adhering tiles to a surface often have soluble salts in their make-up but these are generally passive in stable environments.\textsuperscript{288} However, if humidity levels change drastically within a short period of time, the soluble salts will re-crystallize into subflorescence causing expansion, stress fractures, and exfoliation within the clay. If the crystals burrow through to the glazed exterior, they will harden as efflorescence on the surface, causing separation of the glaze and fine disintegration.\textsuperscript{289} Metallic salts, such as lead sulphides, also cause permanent staining to the injured areas by turning them black.\textsuperscript{290}

In addition to problems caused by inferior materials, manufacturing flaws, and normal wear, archaeological fragments that have lain underground for extended periods of time also suffer from surface encrustation and soil stains. These must be removed before a

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{285} Durbin, 32  \\
\textsuperscript{286} Durbin, 107  \\
\textsuperscript{287} Susan Buys and Victoria Oakley, \textit{The Conservation and Restoration of Ceramics}, (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1993), 90; Durbin, 114.  \\
\textsuperscript{288} Maria Manuela Malhoa Gomes and João Pedro Monteiro, \textit{Azulejos Portuguese Tiles: Conservation and Restoration}, (Portugal: Ricardo Do Espirito Santo Silva Foundation, 1996), 15; van Dam 1984, 189.  \\
\textsuperscript{289} de Jonge, 13.  \\
\textsuperscript{290} Durbin, 114-115.  
\end{flushright}
true condition assessment of the tile fragments can be made. Once the fragments are relatively clean, conservators can identify major problems and determine an individualized plan of action. If unchecked, the more serious issues will continue until affected tiles are damaged beyond repair. However, both superficial and serious issues can be abated with techniques presented and discussed in recent ceramic conservation scholarship.

Established Methods of Delftware Tile and Ceramic Conservation

During the past two decades, scholarly research on ceramics has brought forth and tested many methods of conservation. There are multiple sources available on conserving ceramics in general but only a few offer direct advice on delftware tile conservation. These few sources use case studies to promote specific cleaning procedures, bonding agents, and in-fillers as effective techniques for protecting and restoring broken tiles.

A useful reference for conserving ceramic artifacts in general is *The Conservation and Restoration of Ceramics* by Susan Buys and Victoria Oakley. 291 This book provides a comprehensive look at all things ceramic, including manufacture, deterioration, preventive care, and the development of ceramic conservation. The authors detail various products available for cleaning, repair, and consolidation. For tin-glazed ceramics, they begin by listing earthenware’s characteristics, porosity, and examples. Buys and Oakley then outline necessary steps to follow when choosing and employing appropriate bonding agents specifically for that type of ceramic. For transferware, they note the difficulties in retouching the image after repair and consolidation. Although the book does not mention tiles, it does offer excellent advice for conservation of delftware and transferware in general. Its detailed

---

291 For full citation, see pg. 105.
approach and information on various solvents, bonding agents, and detergents were very helpful to this project.292

*The Journal of the American Institute for Conservation* (JAIC) has published some recent and enlightening scholarship on this subject. In a 2003 article, Michaela Neiro discusses the use of cellulose nitrate adhesives by archeologists from the 1930s to the late 1970s to stabilize fragments.293 She claims that these adhesives are beginning to fail in many old repairs and new tactics are needed to preserve artifacts. She presents a case study from Jamestown’s Colonial National Historical Park in which six objects were chosen to test the removal of cellulose nitrate adhesives. After the joints were cleaned, Paraloid B-72 was applied and tested for its compatibility with the ceramic fragment. The tests did not produce perfect results but B-72 did prove to be a cost-effective way to reconstruct unstable artifacts.

Other sources discuss more specific to tile conservation. In 1994, a joint symposium sponsored by the United Kingdom Institute for Conservation and English Heritage was held to address the need to improve and develop conservation knowledge and strategies for dealing with architectural ceramics.294 Specialists such as Hans van Lemmen and Lesley Durbin presented papers on various projects. Lemmen, one of the premier scholars on Dutch delftware tiles, wrote the only article that distinctly focuses on the conservation of delftware tiles. In “The Preservation of Delftware Tiles in British Architecture,” he gives a brief overview of the physical properties of a tile, guidelines on how to distinguish Dutch

---

292 Buys, 75, 106.
294 Jeanne Marie Teutonico, ed., *Architectural Ceramics: Their History, Manufacture, and Conservation: A Joint Symposium of English Heritage and the UKIC,* (London: James and James Ltd., 1996). These papers were published in 1996 as *Architectural Ceramics: Their History, Manufacture, and Conservation.* In the case of this project, some papers prove more helpful than others in providing advice on conservation techniques.
from English delftware tiles, and reasons for preserving in-situ specimens. However, he doesn’t provide much technical instruction for conservation methods. He merely suggests placing tiles in de-ionized water for cases when they suffer from salt penetration.

The collection’s other essays focus on different kinds of tiles and terra cotta, denoting general protective measures that can and should be taken by the owners of such elements. “The Conservation of the Spanish Tile Floor in the Lord Mayor’s Chapel, Bristol” by Carol E Brown and Jeremy Hutchings provides the most relevant information. This case study examines work on floor tiles, which utilizes different methods of conservation than those for ceramic wall tiles. However, the authors lay out effective cleaning methods for ridding floor tiles of soluble salts and waxy accretion. They mixed distilled water with Sepiolite or Laponite to test as poultices. For solvents, they tested Industrial Methylated Spirit (IMS), White Spirit, Methylene Chloride, an alkaline stone cleaning gel, distilled water, and the non-ionic detergent Synperonic ‘N’. In this case, the Sepiolite poultice turned out to be the most effective and preferred method. This description is very useful to the project at hand as a starting place for gathering information on cleaning tiles. Interest in these topics has continued in publications such as "Tiles and Architectural Ceramics Society (TACS) and the Journal of Architectural Conservation (JAC)."

---

296 Lemmen, 31.
298 Brown, 116-117.
One of the more useful recent sources on restoring tiles is *Azulejos Portuguese Tiles: Conservation and Restoration*, by Maria Manuela Malhoa Gomes and Joao Pedro Monteiro.\(^\text{299}\)

This book is helpful to this study because it records the restoration process of seventeenth-century Portuguese azulejos from the Chavões Palace at Cartaxo. Since azulejos are Portuguese tin-glazed ceramic tiles very similar in time frame, ingredients, manufacture, and use to delftware tiles of the Netherlands, their conservation offers a compatible process.\(^\text{300}\)

Just as Lemmen suggested, conservators soaked tiles in distilled water to eliminate soluble salts.\(^\text{301}\) Then, they removed organic material using 1,1,1-trichloroethylene (trisolve), propanone (acetone), ethyl alcohol, and hydrogen peroxide in a slightly basic medium. For cleaning purposes, they employed a wet process where various solvents were paired with distilled water at 75 degrees Celsius or 167 degrees Fahrenheit to soften the adhesive. Fragments were mended using organic consolidators such as Plexigum N80 or Paraloid B-72. Gaps were filled in with dental plaster and synthetic paste. Since the panels of tiles were to be re-installed at their original location in the palace, the conservators chose to manufacture new tiles for empty spaces as well as touch up any missing glaze.\(^\text{302}\)

The last and most relevant reference for delftware tile conservation is Leslie Durbin’s 2005 publication, *Architectural Tiles: Conservation and Restoration*.\(^\text{303}\) This manual uses several case studies to provide excellent hands-on advice and practical guidance on conservation and restoration techniques of architectural tiles. Revealing his craftsman origins, Durbin discuss all aspects of conservation including problems of manufacture, cleaning, replacement or

\(^\text{300}\) Gomes, 10.
\(^\text{301}\) van Lemmen 1997, 31; Gomes, 35.
\(^\text{302}\) Gomes, 35-38.
\(^\text{303}\) For full citation, see Durbin on page 38.
repair, mortars, and even tools and products. For seventeenth and eighteenth-century
delftware tiles, he recommends using Paraloid B72 as a consolidate adhesive to reassemble
fragments. If infill is needed, Durbin suggests low-density Plaster of Paris as a way to
provide a sound surface area on the tile’s backing. For cleaning, he is a proponent of the
wet process with distilled water and a non-ionic detergent such as Synperonic A. Durbin
also gives helpful instructions on how to remove stains, rust, and old adhesive from the
tiles.

This information helped identify a reasonable methodology for conserving and
preserving delftware tile fragments. The methodology was then implemented to conduct a
case study on tile fragments from the William Vanderhorst House at 54 Tradd Street and the
Charles Drayton House at 2 Ladson Street in Charleston, South Carolina. Further guidance
and support was provided by preservation professionals Frances Ford, Gerrit van Waveren
Hogervorst, Martha Zierden, and Sarah Stroud.

Case Study: 54 Tradd Street

The delftware tile fragments used in this case study were in fairly stable condition but
displayed organic staining, tar, lime mortar encrustation, and old glue residue. To treat these
problems, the fragments were subjected to cleaning, adhesive repair, and gap infill in
accordance with the information provided by Durbin and Gomes and Monteiro. The
equipment used in this procedure included Insta-Cure Cyanoacrylate Gap Filling Glue by
Hobbytown USA, Duco Cement multi-purpose household glue, B-72/Toluene in a
50g/100ml solution, HydroCal for filling material, distilled water, a 3” scalpel, a dental pick,

304 Durbin, 130.
305 Durbin, 107-108.
popsicle sticks, a stone sponge, Q-tips, wax paper, acetone, and clamps. Appropriate safety precautions were taken with the use of gloves, goggles, and an air ventilation hood.

Conservation Procedure

Step 1:
The tile fragments were soaked in distilled water for 24-36 hours to loosen surface debris and leftover lime mortar on the back (see fig. 7.2). Soaking is only an option if the tiles have been removed from their fixed position and is therefore acceptable for fragments. There was no evidence of soluble salt crystals in these fragments even though this is a typical problem with ceramics, particularly tiles. The soaking process can be used to curtail this action as long as salinity levels are carefully monitored and water changed daily.306

Figure 7.2 Tiles soaking in distilled water.

306 Gomes, 28, 35; van Dam 1984, 189.
Step 2:
The tile fragments were left to dry at room temperature for 48 hours. It is imperative to wait for the tiles to dry before starting mechanical cleaning because soaking can weaken the clay body and cause fractures and breaks. Mechanical cleaning was attempted on the first fragment that came out of the bath but this piece broke in two so cleaning was halted until all fragments were dry.

Figure 7.3 Drying tile fragments.

Step 3:
Once dry, the tile fragments were mechanically cleaned by dabbing the surfaces with distilled water and using a scalpel to remove dirt and debris. This must be carefully performed to prevent loss of clay body and broken edges on the glazed surface.

Figure 7.4 Mechanical cleaning.
Step 4:
When possible, the tile fragments were reconstructed and glued back together. Three different glues were used on three of the most complete tiles from the collection to test the effectiveness and workability of each glue. Duco Cement, recommended by Sarah Stroud and Carter Hudgins at Drayton Hall Plantation, was used on the first tile (see fig. 7.6). Insta-Cure Gap Filling Glue was used on the second tile (see fig. 7.5). A mixture of B-72 and Toluene 50g/100ml was used on the third tile. B-72 was recommended by archeologist Martha Zierden at the Charleston Museum as well as many of the sources cited in current scholarship. Unlike pre-mixed glue, B-72 must be dissolved in a solvent such as Toluene or Acetone. The ratio of glue to solvent can be manipulated depending on the strength and viscosity needed for the project at hand. For a 50g/100ml solution, the process took roughly 24 hours and was conducted in a fume hood.
Step 5:
The glue was allowed to dry and set-up at room temperature. The tile with Duco Cement was placed in a clamp for approximately 10 minutes to ensure the fragments dried in their proper place. Insta-Cure set up in under two minutes so there was no need for a clamp on this tile. The tile with the B-72 mixture was held together by hand until it seemed sturdy and then placed on wax paper to finish drying.

Step 6:
HydroCal White Gypsum Cement was used to in-fill cracks and missing pieces in the mostly complete tiles. Plaster of Paris or synthetic pastes are good alternatives. This project used plaster in its original color although pigment can be added to match the color of the clay body.

Step 7:
Any remaining adhesive residue left on the tile surface was cleaned off with acetone.
Results

For the cleaning purposes of this study, common store-bought distilled water sufficiently loosened dirt, debris, and remaining lime mortar. Once loosened, the mortar was easily removed with a scalpel and dental pick. The organic stains proved a little more difficult but most came off with careful scraping. Deeper cleaning methods using distilled water and a neutral pH, non-ionic detergent, a poultice of hydrogen peroxide 20:100 by volume, or citric acid dissolved in distilled water were not needed for these fragments.\(^\text{307}\) Rust inhibitors were also unnecessary as there was little to no rust on the fragments. Abrasive action was avoided in order to protect the fragile glazed surface but a few fragile edges were still lost during mechanical cleaning.

Of the three glues tested, Duco Cement proved to be the most effective and uncomplicated to use, with a generous set time of 10 minutes and ease of cleaning with acetone. It allowed enough time to arrange the fragments properly to ensure the best adhesion and fit. Insta-Cure was excellent for making very little mess but it set up within a minute of application and did not provide enough time to properly fit the fragments together. As a result, the tile reconstructed with this glue has larger gaps between the fragments. Although they worked quite differently, both of these glues did sufficiently bond the fragments together, making storage and protection of the artifacts much easier. They were also cheap and easy to find at local hobby stores.

The glue that did not perform as expected was the more expensive B-72/ Toluene mixture. At first, it appeared to work very similar to Duco Cement but on closer inspection, it did not bond the fragments beyond the surface glaze. Fragments that had been glued 24

\(^{307}\) Durbin, 107.
hours earlier simply broke apart along the same fracture line. This was quite astonishing considering that B-72 is a standard in tile conservation. One possible solution to this problem would be to mix up a stronger ratio with 75g/100ml or higher. Another option would be to dissolve B-72 crystals in a different solvent such as Acetone and see if this increases its strength. Either way, it is imperative that safety precautions be followed when using this type of glue. As discovered in this project, it quickly burns through plastic and can cause a difficult mess if not stored properly.

HydroCal was an excellent choice for in-fill. It only required the concentrated powder, a bowl, and water. It poured very easily into both large and small spaces. Even though it can get very messy, it is easy to shape after two minutes and any remaining residue can be carefully scraped off with a scalpel. HydroCal is also relatively inexpensive and found in most home improvement stores. It is a great way to further stabilize tiles after reconstruction, particularly those with a lot of smaller fragments and significant gaps or cracks between the pieces.

The clean-up for this project was simple and straightforward. Acetone removed all leftover glue and plaster on the tiles, tools, and around the workspace. The used distilled water was poured out, and the glues were recapped and stored for future use. Toluene solvent was returned to storage in flame retardant locker. The newly cleaned and reconstructed tiles are being returned to Mr. Marks along with this report.
Conclusion

This conservation project focused on protecting tiles in their current condition. Therefore, the techniques discussed in this chapter do not address full restoration. However, the 54 Tradd Street and 2 Ladson tiles are now ready for future restorative work including the use of watercolors or acrylic paints to replicate any instances of missing glaze. If there is a campaign to re-install the tiles, new tiles can be manufactured by a number of different companies here and in the Netherlands, to match the originals in glaze color and decoration.

The results of this project prove that there are affordable and simple ways to conserve delftware tiles fragments. The methodology outlined is very easy to follow and the equipment needed is readily available. This basic plan of action can be modified to address specific conservation issues and problems depending on each individual case. With the prevalence of delftware tile fragments found in Charleston, this information is vital to the protection of these beautiful yet ephemeral decorative artifacts.

308 Gomes, 38.
CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSION

This thesis is successful in furthering the study of delftware tiles in North America. It documents the introduction of tiles into the colonies and investigates new territory by focusing on the history of delftware tiles in Charleston, South Carolina. The results include a thorough review of published works on the use of tile in America’s colonies during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. They also contain discussions specific to Charleston, detailing both known and newly-discovered written evidence of delftware tiles, a catalog of the surviving physical evidence, and an examination of the type of eighteenth-century class members who could afford to participate in the fashionable trend.

Inquiries into the use of delftware tile in Charleston revealed some astonishing facts. Considering that Charlestonians strove to associate themselves with England more than any other nation, including their own, it is surprising that the majority of delftware tile shipments came directly from the Netherlands, not British ports. However, when Charleston’s commercial patterns are compared to those of other colonies during the eighteenth-century, this circumstance becomes understandable. Also unexpected is the prevalence of advertisements for purple and white tiles. Since fragments with this color scheme are not as common as blue and white tiles, purple tiles were once thought to be relatively rare in the city. In accordance with previously-documented physical evidence, historical records provided the necessary information to confirm the popularity of this particular color scheme.

The catalog of tiles and fragments documents the styles, colors, and designs popular with Charlestonians. The wide variety of assortment conveys that people benefited from the
abundance of tile shipments into the city and the ample selection of merchants who were actively selling tiles. These two factors allowed residents to choose among a multitude of designs and thereby personalize the decorative art.

Original receipts and account book entries were used to glean helpful information on the cost of tiles during the period of significance. Analysis of this data in comparison with a never-before published law from 1740 proved that average laborers could actually afford to buy tiles, even though there is no surviving evidence that they did so. The lack of physical evidence in connection with middle and lower classes seems to suggest that either these people deliberately chose not to install tiles or that the utility of tiles had become obsolete by the time the trend trickled down to them, replaced instead by coal burning stoves.

All of the facts discussed above indicate that delftware tiles were not simply a luxury item, but also a vehicle for which Charlestonians displayed their social status, level of wealth, and sometimes personality. Information gained from available newspaper articles, letters, and receipts provides a fascinating picture of the delftware tile industry in Charleston but not a complete one. Unfortunately, the lack of eighteenth-century written material on this subject means that valuable sources did not always survive to the present day. Further research is needed, especially in regards to any new physical evidence that may illuminate a connection between tiles and society’s lower classes.

As a master’s thesis, rather than a Ph.D. dissertation, the scope of this project was limited. It answered many questions but also raised new ones that could not be addressed within the allotted time and range. Future research opportunities are recognized throughout the thesis, particularly for further study in Charleston. The city is a major center for historic preservation and work projects uncover intriguing artifacts nearly every day. In fact, several
delftware tile fragments have been recently found during the archaeological investigations into Charleston’s original walled city.\footnote{309} Examination of these fragments can confer even more information to the burgeoning picture of delftware tiles in Charleston. History is always changing and revealing new aspects to age old questions. The quest for information regarding delftware tiles should continue to utilize established sources as well as newly discovered material in order to construct the most accurate picture of the delftware tile industry.

\footnote{309 Martha Zierden, interview by author, October 10, 2010.}
Appendix A

Catalog of Houses in Charleston, SC with Evidence of Delftware Tile

JOHN SMITH HOUSE AND OFFICE
33 Broad Street, Charleston, SC

Figure A.1. 33 Broad Street on map of Charleston peninsula, City of Charleston Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., www.charlestoncity.info.


Brief House History:

The house was originally constructed in 1787. The storefront was a later addition in 1830. In fact, the house displays the best example of an early nineteenth-century wooden storefront in Charleston. It also has surviving eighteenth-century architectural details on the upper story residence. It underwent a highly invasive restoration in the 1970s.\textsuperscript{310} Samuel Gaillard Stoney believed this house to pre-date the 1680s. He also theorized that it was the only structure in that area to survive the fire of 1740.\textsuperscript{311} Macky Hill believes the building’s foundation trenches may possibly contain evidence of Poinsett’s Tavern on Elliot Street.\textsuperscript{312}

\textsuperscript{310} Macky Hill, email to the author, October 1, 2009; Poston, 61-62; Stoney, 12; Robert Stockton, “Do You Know Your Charleston,” \textit{The Post and Courier}, Feb. 18, 1980.
\textsuperscript{311} Stoney, 12.
\textsuperscript{312} Hill email.
Delftware Tile History:
During remodeling of the house, a corner fireplace was discovered in the southwestern corner of the building hidden behind paneling. Intact blue and white tiles were found in the fireplace. An errant worker damaged several of the tiles before Macky Hill could stop him. Hill gathered up the remaining intact tiles and fragments for safekeeping and still owns them today.313

State of Artifacts:
The artifacts at the Charleston Museum are in fragment form. They are in relatively good condition. They do display loss of glaze in certain places but there appears to be no crazing or staining.

Storage Location:
Macky Hill has most of these fragments in his personal collection. The Charleston Museum has three fragments that were donated to the organization in 1978.

Photographs: Fragments courtesy of the Charleston Museum. Photographs by author. The fragments held by the Charleston Museum from 33 Broad Street are hand-painted strong blue and white tiles. They display marina scenes bordered by a double lined medallion and have variations of the ox-head corner motif. The exposed clay backs range between dark beige, light yellow. The fragments measure about six and a half mm in thickness. These characteristics are very typical of late seventeenth and early eighteenth Dutch manufactured tiles.314 Herold also cites these tiles in that time period but describes them as English. It is difficult to definitively state one way or the other since scenes like these were commonly used throughout the entire tile industry and necessarily specific.315

---

313 Elaine B. Herold, Ph.D., “Archeological and Historical Research at 33 Broad Street, Charleston, South Carolina,” (Charleston, SC: The Charleston Museum, 1984), 23; Hill email.
314 Korf, 34; Pluis 1997, 552-553. The border and corner motif is identical to C.07.00.24 to C.07.00.32 in Pluis.
315 Herold cites Hume, 1978, 210 for her reasoning. For full citation, see references at the end of this thesis.
WILLIAM BURROWS HOUSE
71 Broad Street

Figure A.3. 71 Broad Street on map of Charleston peninsula, City of Charleston Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., www.charlestoncity.info.


Brief House History:

This three and a half story wooden house was constructed in around 1772-1774 by attorney William Burrows. Due to its impressive appearance, it was often called the “Mansion house.” It could even rival the Miles Brewton and Charles Pinckney houses in the quality of interior woodwork. Burrows’ heirs sold the property to Postmaster Thomas Hall in 1784. In 1815, a free black man named Jehu Jones bought the property and turned it into a successful hotel operation known worldwide. After Jones’ death and the outbreak of the Civil War, the house became a boarding house. In 1928, the house was purchased and dismantled for preparation of its reconstruction along the Ashley River. The arrival of the Great Depression ended this scheme and the house’s elements were kept in storage for almost thirty years. Finally, the Winterthur Museum bought the drawing room in 1959 and installed it in their northern facilities.317

316 Waddell, 101.
Delftware Tile History:

When the house was being dismantled in 1928, Colonel Alston Deas observed that the fireplace in the first floor dining room had transfer-print ceramic tiles. Unfortunately, he does not mention what fate befell these tiles but one did manage to make it into the collection of the Charleston Museum.

State of the Artifacts:

The one known surviving tile is reconstructed from two pieces. The fragments are in fairly good condition, with little to no crazing, no encrustation, and no staining. It does exhibit a few places where the glaze chipped away but this a minor issue.

Storage Location:

One tile is stored in the curatorial collection of the Charleston Museum (see below). It is unknown what happened to the rest of the tiles discovered in 1928. The drawing room fireplace installed at Winterthur does display several rows of plain white tiles but there is not mention of if these tiles were also found in-situ during the dismantling or if they are a recreation based on fragment evidence and fashionable trends.

Photographs: Fragment courtesy of the Charleston Museum. Photographs by author.

The tile from 71 Broad Street that is held by the Charleston Museum is decorated in red and displays a clear transfer-print design with a rococo border. It measures 128 mm by 128 mm and is made up of yellow clay, as seen by its exposed back. The design can be traced back to famed tile makers, Sadler and Green in Liverpool. It is called “A peasant having a tooth extracted.” According to Anthony Ray, this design was first printed around 1757 to 1761. Taking these dates into consideration, it is likely that Burrows bought the fashionable tiles to install in his newly built home so as to subtly allude to his wealth.

319 Simons 1967, 194.
JOHN LINING HOUSE  
106 Broad Street, Charleston, SC


Figure A.6. 106 Broad Street on map of Charleston peninsula, City of Charleston Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., (HABS SC, 10-CHAR, 127-2). www.charlestoncity.info.

Brief House History:

The house was built prior to 1715. Additions were made throughout the twentieth century and the entire building was restored in 1972. Some claim this house to be the oldest in Charleston. It rests on lot no. 160 of the Grand Modell which was given to Huguenot James De Bordeaux. In 1715, the property was deeded to William Harvey. The house is laid out similarly to other pre-1740 houses in the city with a front office entry, chambered stair hall, and second floor formal withdrawing room. The house is named for John Lining, a man considered to be the first person in the country to conduct scientific and systematic weather observations. However, he may not have ever lived in this particular house since he and his wife only owned it for a brief period of time. Later, the house was used for the office of the Gazette of the State of South Carolina. In the 1780s, Dr. Andrew Turnbull used the house as his apothecary store.321

Delftware Tile History:

Fragments of delftware tiles were discovered at the site by members of the Preservation Society. Liz Young detailed this discovery to a Mrs. Herold in a 1979 stating that, “in the northwest room the mantle is original, and we found the adorable tiles there. I gave these to Mrs. Joe Young to keep them for the society. I supposed Henry Cauthen has them. These were found under the hearth.”322 No other written documentation has been found to explain when the tiles were installed or what happened to them after rediscovery. Several fragments were given to the Charleston Museum at some point but it is unclear exactly when this transaction took place.

321 Poston, 203.
322 Liz Young to Mrs. Herold, correspondence, March 22, 1979, Charleston Museum Archives, Charleston, SC.
State of Artifacts:
The artifacts are in fragment form. Most are in fairly good condition, with virtually no staining. However, most do sustain patches of cracked or missing glaze and crumbling clay.

Storage Location:
The tiles are stored in the Charleston Museum archaeological collections.

Photographs: Fragments courtesy of the Charleston Museum. Photographs by author.
Of the fragments from 106 Broad Street, one tile is clearly a Sadler and Green Liverpool transfer-print tile with a central image and an “88” rococo border decorated in faded brown (see fig. A.9). It measures six mm in thickness and 130 mm by 130 mm overall. It has brownish-grey exposed clay back. The design is D5-12 in Sadler and Green’s catalog entitled “A one-legged fiddler outside an inn, with a dog begging and three children watching.” This design was first produced during the company’s later years, 1765-1775.\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\) It was probably still produced after Sadler’s retirement until 1790 when Green closed down the company.

\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\) Ray 1994, 42.
The other fragments seem to be hand painted. These are all variations of blue and white. The thickness ranges from five mm to ten mm, very typical of eighteenth and nineteenth century tiles. A few fragments have straight edges while the rest have beveled edges ranging from 70 to 85 degrees. The central designs on the fragments display typical Dutch tile scenes such as castles, windmills, marinas, landscapes, ships, trees, boats, a boy looking over the town, church steeple, a boy following a man with a hat and cape, and other rural scenes. A few tile fragments do not have corner motifs at all. This is typical of eighteenth and nineteenth-century tiles.

324 Korf 1964, 34.
325 Korf 1964, 34.
The blue and white hand-painted fragments that do display a corner motif, have one of three. Type one is a quarter rosette with seven petals, solid blue center bordered by white ring.
Type 2 is a corner flower with three petals that did not appear in reference books but is probably a lily or carnation of some sort.

Type 3 is an ox-head. The tiles display two variations of this motif.
WILLIAM HARVEY HOUSE
110 Broad Street, Charleston, SC

Figure A.7. 110 Broad Street on map of Charleston peninsula, City of Charleston Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., www.charlestoncity.info.

Figure A.8. “Front Elevation South,” C.O. Greene, March 25, 1940, Library of Congress Prints and Photograph Division, (HABS SC, 10-CHAR, 104-1).

Brief House History:
William Harvey, a wealthy merchant, constructed the house around 1728. It was subsequently altered in 1800 and 1837 and renovated in 1981 and 1985. Even with all this work, it still remains one of the few intact pre-Revolutionary structures in Charleston. The house plan follows that of other pre-1740 houses in the city with a front entry office, chambered rear stair hall, and large withdrawing room on the second floor. From 1743 to 1756, Harvey leased the house to Governor James Glen. Luckily, the house escaped any great damage during the fires of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It was later owned by the Izard family, Ambassador Joel Poinsett, and Judge Mitchell King.326

Delftware Tile History:

There are a few fragments in a cabinet located in the west upper drawing room. According to the homeowner, these tiles were found in an archeological dig by the previous owners. She did not know which room they came from.

State of artifacts:

The artifacts are in fragment form and in fairly good overall condition. They do not exhibit any encrustation but do suffer from slight staining.

Storage Location:

The fragments are stored privately.

Photographs: Fragments courtesy of private owners. Photographs by Amelia Millar.

The hand-painted blue and white fragments from 110 Broad Street belonged to three different tiles. The first tile displays a flower pot with a quarter rosette corner motif. The second tile has a scene surrounded with a double lined medallion. Although the corners are mostly missing, ox-head horns are still partially visible alluding to their one-time presence. The third tile exhibits a scene inside an octagon border with a quarter rosette corner motif.
GEORGE EVELEIGH HOUSE
39 Church Street, Charleston, South Carolina

Figure A.9. “General View, Southeast Corner,” Charles N. Bayless, 1977-1979, Library of Congress Prints and Photograph Division, (HABS SC, 10-CHAR, 244-1).

Figure A.10. 39 Church Street on map of Charleston peninsula, City of Charleston Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., www.charlestoncity.info.

Brief House History:
Successful deerskin trader George Eveleigh built this house in 1743. Even though it is a few years later, the house layout is similar to 1740 houses in the city with front office and second floor formal drawing room. The only exception is that 39 Church does not have the stairwell in the back of the house but rather in the middle. This layout represents a type of English vernacular architecture that was popular before Palladio’s designs began to dominate. The house underwent renovation in 1752 to fix the damage caused by the hurricane of that year. It was also changed slightly in 1795. Even with these changes, the house still retains its original paneling and arched bowfat in the second floor drawing room. In addition to Eveleigh, other owners included wealthy planter John Bull and St. Domingo refugee Jean Louis Polony.327

Delftware Tile History:
Restoration contractor Richard Marks and his crew discovered tile ghost marks in the plaster of three fireplaces; the large first floor room, the back room, and the upstairs drawing room. Marks and his men also found fragments of blue and white tiles in those fireplaces.328 The ghost marks have since been recovered but were photo-documented by the author for the purposes of this thesis.

327 Poston, 216-217; Richard Marks, “History of the George Eveleigh House 39 Church Street,” unpub manuscript; Rogers, 58; Smith, 64-73; Waddell, 82.
328 Richard Marks, interview with author, September 8, 2009, Charleston, SC.
State of artifacts:
The tiles are in fragment form. They are in poor condition, suffering from loss of glaze and clay body. The blue and white color scheme is faded and stained from organic material.

Storage Location:
The tiles are stored by Richard Marks.

The hand-painted blue and white fragments from 39 Church Street show partial pond scenes surrounded in double-lined medallions with ox-head corner motifs. The last two photos below show the ghost marks of the tiles in the plaster.
CAPERS-MOTTE HOUSE
69 Church Street, Charleston, South Carolina

Figure A.11. “HABS Survey,” C.O. Greene, September 1940. Library of Congress Prints and Photograph Division, (HABS SC, 10-CHAR, 163-1).

Figure A.12. 69 Church Street on map of Charleston peninsula, City of Charleston Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., www.charlestoncity.info.

Brief House History:
This house was constructed around 1750. It was subsequently altered in the early nineteenth century when owners moved the front door, merged the front two rooms into a double parlor, and added a piazza on the southern side of the house. These and other changes were restored back to their 1750 configuration in 1971. It is one of the largest pre- Revolutionary houses in Charleston but even more unusual because it is essentially a double house with three full floors, an excavated cellar, and a large attic. The house was home to many of Charleston’s prominent citizens, including Richard Capers, Jordan Roche, Rebecca Brewton Motte and husband Jacob Motte, and members of the Smith family.329

Delftware Tile History:
So far, no early documentation has been found on the purchase and installation of delftware tiles in the Capers-Motte house. In-situ tiles were rediscovered behind a coal-burning stove in the drawing room in 1964. Workmen used picks to remove the stove and accidently damaged many of the tiles. The owners salvaged what they could and replaced in kind with tiles found in the yard. These tiles were black and sepia transfer-printed tiles. According to a 1978 article in English Ceramic Circle Transactions, the sepia tiles are the only such example found in the country.330 Visual evidence exists in books on Charleston’s interiors and easement files for Historic Charleston Foundation.331

329 Poston, 71-72.
330 Bridges, 176.
331 Sully, 182.
State of the Artifacts:
From the photographs, the tiles appear to be in excellent condition. A private consultation of the house could not be arranged so the author was not able to examine the tiles in person.

Storage Location:
The tiles are installed in three rooms on the first floor; the northeastern chamber, the southeastern chamber, and the southwestern chamber (shown respectively).

Photographs: Photographs courtesy of Historic Charleston Foundation archives. From the photographs, it appears that the tiles in the northeastern chamber are hand-painted blue and white tiles with a large central scene and small corner motifs. The southeastern chamber has hand-painted blue and white animals surrounded by double lined medallions with small corner motifs, possible spider-heads. The tiles in the southwestern chamber display hand-painted purple and white ships with no corner motifs.
HEYWARD WASHINGTON HOUSE
87 Church Street, Charleston, South Carolina


Figure A.14. 87 Church Street on map of Charleston peninsula, City of Charleston Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., www.charlestoncity.info.

Brief House History:
This property has a very long history. The land was originally granted to Joseph Ellicott in 1694. A prosperous gunsmith named John Milner built a complex on the site in 1740. Colonel Daniel Heyward bought the property in 1770 and sold it to his son Thomas a year later. Thomas proceeded to tear the original house down in order to build a three story structure with a central hall plan and two rooms on each side. In preparation for President George Washington’s visit to Charleston in 1791, the city rented the house for him and made several minor repairs. This visit is the reason why Washington’s name is attached to the house. It was altered in the late nineteenth century and underwent at least two restorations in the 1930s and 1970s. Today, the Heyward Washington house is a National Historic Landmark and serves as a house museum operated by the Charleston Museum.

Delftware Tile History:

Albert Simons and his company found intact delftware tiles and fragments in many of the fireplaces when they conducted restorations on the house in the 1930s. These tiles included transfer-print, figured, and plain white tiles. E. Milby Burton, the director of the Charleston Museum, contacted the Victorian and Albert Museum for information on delftware tiles and prices for recreations. He mentioned that it took ninety-six tiles to line each chimney and some recreations would need to be purchased. Evidently, the prices were too expensive because he told his V and A contact not to make any inquiries into purchase opportunities.

Today, there are tiles in three of the fireplaces. All of the fireplaces have room for ten vertical rows with eight tiles per row. Centrally-placed iron fire backs separate the rows for five on either side of the firebox. On the first floor dining room, there are two incomplete rows of white tiles but ghost marks for eight more rows. In the second floor drawing room fireplace, one row along both sides of the firebox opening display figured tiles with various animals in the center, circled borders, and corner motifs. The rest of the firebox is decorated with eight rows of white tiles. In the second floor men’s smoking room, the situation is similar to the drawing room with two rows of figured tiles and eight rows of white tiles. These figured tiles, however, display windmills and corner motifs.

State of the Artifacts:

The intact tiles that are currently in the house are in very good condition with only a few instances of staining and fading. The fragments found at the site are in fairly good condition with little to no crazing or pitting. They do exhibit some organic stains.

Storage Location:

Intact tiles are located in three of the fireplaces, as described above. Fragments that were found on site are stored in the Charleston Museum’s archaeological collections.

Photographs: Fragments courtesy of the Charleston Museum. Photographs by author.

The first set of photographs show the in-situ tiles that are currently displayed in the house. The first floor dining room has one row of figured tiles on either side of the firebox opening with the rest being plain white. The figured tiles have hand-painted blue and white animals inside double-lined medallions with small spider head corner motifs. The second floor smoking room also has one row of figured tiles on either side of the firebox with the rest being white tiles. These have hand-painted blue and white landscape and building scenes with small spider-head corner motifs. The last set of in-situ tiles are in the Washington bedroom. The only ones that survive here are a few rows of white tiles.

333 E. Milby Burton to John Sweeney, correspondence, June 9, 1958, the Charleston Museum archives, Charleston, SC.
334 E. Milby Burton to Ralph Edwards, correspondence, January 23, 1939, the Charleston Museum archives, Charleston, SC.
335 E. Milby Burton to Ralph Edwards, correspondence, March 1, 1939, the Charleston Museum archives, Charleston, SC.
The fragments held by the Charleston Museum include several different kinds of delftware tiles as shown in the following pictures.

Liverpool transfer-prints

Hand-painted blue and white designs outlined in purple
Bristol-made *bianco sopra bianco*

Hand-painted blue and white scenes with flower corner motifs and double-lined medallion borders
Transfer-printed tiles with polychrome infill
Brief House History:

The house at Drayton Hall has a long and famed history. The family began construction on the house circa 1738. In the design, the family employed many characteristic elements of Georgian-Palladio architecture such as a loggia, a large entry hall, smaller rooms flanking the hallway, a second floor formal room, and the use of flanker buildings. They did make one concession to South Carolina weather in that the ceiling heights grow progressively taller from the basement to the second floor.\textsuperscript{336} The Draytons owned the house and surrounding property for nearly two hundred and forty years. In 1974, the family sold the house to the National Trust to ensure its preservation. Today, the house serves as a museum for the Drayton family, focusing on southern plantation life during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{337} Architecturally speaking, it represents one of the best examples of Georgian-Palladian architecture in North America and is a fitting example of the taste of Charleston’s eighteenth-century gentry, though not completely representative.


Delftware Tile History:

No early documentation has been found on the use of delftware tiles at Drayton Hall. However, archaeological investigations of the site, particularly the flanker buildings, have revealed a cache of delftware tile fragments that display several different designs, motifs, and colors. This collection includes tiles with flowerpot images surrounded by accolade borders and quarter rosette corner motifs that are identical to the fragments found at the John Drayton house.

Evidently, the main house also had delftware tile at one time. In 1980, the widow and son of Mr. Frank B. Drayton donated a set of forty-seven biblical tiles to the National Trust. Drayton had removed these tiles from a bedroom in the main house for safekeeping during the 1960s because he feared that vandals would steal them from the unoccupied structure. After the tiles were donated, the National Trust sent the set to be appraised by Helen Williams, tile expert in North Hollywood, CA. Williams concluded that they dated from the mid-eighteenth century and were derived from seventeenth-century Peter H. Schut prints.

State of the Artifacts:

The biblical tiles are intact but the rest of the artifacts are in fragment form. Most are in good condition with slight crazing and pitting of the glaze. Some do exhibit missing glaze, organic staining, and mortar encrustation. One of the biblical tiles is in bad condition with nearly half of the clay back missing.

Storage Location:

The fragments and intact tiles are stored on site at Drayton Hall Plantation.

Photographs: Tiles and fragments courtesy of Drayton Hall. Photographs of the fragments by author, photographs of intact tiles by Drayton Hall Staff.

The fragments in the collection at Drayton Hall display a wide range of colors, motifs, and designs as evidenced by the following photographs.

---

338 “DPC G-01-016,” Carter Hudgins, email to author, Sept. 8, 2009. The closest mention is an entry on December 14, 1816 for “4 doz- Harth tiles,” priced at four dollars per pound. According to newspaper articles, the term “hearth tiles” referred to tile pavers placed on the ground in front of a fireplace rather than delftware tiles which were more commonly called chimney tiles. For this reason, it is unlikely that the entry was meant for delftware tiles.

339 The case of a possible connection was discussed earlier in chapter six.

340 Letitia Galbraith to Helen Williams, correspondence, Nov. 14, 1980; Letitia Galbraith to Mr. Charles Drayton and Mrs. Frank Drayton, correspondence, Nov. 14, 1980, Drayton Hall archives, Charleston, SC.

341 Helen Williams to Letitia Galbraith, correspondence, Dec. 1, 1980, Drayton Hall Plantation, Charleston, SC.
Hand-painted blue, purple, and white tiles with marina scenes and fleur-de-lis corner motifs

Blue, purple, and white tile with carnation corner motif

Hand-painted blue and white tile without border, divided into diagonal trellis

Hand-painted blue and white tile with flower central image and octagonal rococo border
Hand-painted blue and white tiles with ship scenes and ox-head corner motifs

Hand-painted blue and white tiles with flower pot central images, accolade borders, and quarter-rosette corner motifs. These are nearly identical to fragments found at 2 Ladson Street as discussed in the case study portion of this thesis.
Miscellaneous fragments of blue and white and purple and white color schemes.

Hand-painted blue and white tiles of house and landscape inside a double-lined medallion with ox-head corner motifs

Hand-painted blue and white tiles with flowers and no borders or corner motifs
The biblical tiles in Drayton Hall’s collection include the following subjects: annunciation to shepherds, resurrection of Christ (shown in top picture), baptism of Christ, head of John the Baptist, temptation in the desert, Lazarus the beggar, raising of Lazarus, Christ with women at the well, calling of a disciple, Judas and thirty pieces of silver, Judas kiss (shown in bottom picture), Christ praying in the garden, Christ taken by soldier, scourging of Christ, crucifixion, Christ and doubting Thomas, ravens feeding Elijah, man before throned bishop, and Christ and soldier.
MILES BREWTON HOUSE
27 King Street, Charleston, SC


Figure A.17. 27 King Street on map of Charleston peninsula, City of Charleston Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., www.charlestoncity.info.

Brief House History:
Wealthy merchant and slave trader Miles Brewton built this house between 1765 and 1769. It was then and still is today one of the best examples of a double-pile house in the city with seventeen foot ceilings and unparalleled interior woodwork. Interestingly, it is also an example of a house with both vernacular and professional elements such as the juxtaposition of carefully positioned orders with a localized plan. The staircase and front steps were the original inspiration for those at the Charles Pinckney house. Josiah Quincy vividly described the hall in his journal after visiting the family in 1773. Like many of Charleston's buildings, it was altered in the nineteenth century. The Pringle family owned the house at that time and made several changes in the 1820s and 1840s. From 1988 to 1992, it underwent a restoration that removed most of these changes. Today, it is considered to be the most complete Georgian town house complex in North America and has earned distinction as a National Landmark.

Delftware Tile History:
Archeology investigations from 1988 to 1989 revealed delftware tile fragments with several different colors, motifs, and designs. So far, there has been no discovery of records that might give pertinent information about the purchase and installation of these

342 Waddell, 85, 93, 94.
343 Poston, 228-229; Rogers, 69-70; Simons 36-50; Smith, 93-110; Martha A. Zierden, “Archeology of the Miles Brewton House 27 King Street,” Archeological Contributions 29, (Charleston, SC: The Charleston Museum, 2001).
344 Zierden 2001, 105.
tiles. Photographic evidence does exist, however, in several of the books on Charleston’s interiors.345

State of the Artifacts:
Today, there are intact tiles in at least one of the fireplaces in the house; that of the second floor drawing room. From a recent photograph, these tiles seem to be in good condition.346 The fragments found at the site are also in fairly good condition. After discovery, archaeologists at the Charleston Museum used a conservator’s glue called B-72 to reassemble some of the pieces. They also soaked the fragments in distilled water to remove chlorides, oven dried them, and then made sure they were properly stored away from ferrous materials.347

Storage Location:
The intact tiles are installed in the house. The fragments are stored at the Charleston Museum in their archaeological collection.

Photographs: Fragments courtesy of the Charleston Museum. Photographs by author.
The fragments from 27 King Street were too small to reconstruct any full or partially full tiles. The fragments display mostly blue and white color schemes but there is one fragment with purple and white decoration. Two fragments exhibit ox-head corner motifs while and three show a rococo border. Blank white tiles were also included in the collection.

346 Savage, 18. A private visit to the house could not be arranged so I was not able to examine the tiles up close.
347 Zierden 2001, 89.
WILLIAM ELLIOT HOUSE
75 King Street, Charleston, South Carolina

Figure A. 18. Exterior of 75 King Street. Courtesy of the Charleston County Library archives, Charleston, SC.

Figure A.19. 75 King Street on map of Charleston peninsula, City of Charleston Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., www.charlestoncity.info.

Brief House History:
William Elliott, part of a family of distinguished builders, constructed a house for his own use at 75 King Street sometime between 1729 and 1739. The simple design, thick walls, low ceilings, and paneling suggest an early construction date. Elliot’s daughters married into the Morris and Huger families, some of Charleston’s most well-known names. In fact, the Huger family built Hampton Plantation, one of the case studies discussed earlier in this thesis as having evidence of delftware tiles. The house was later restored and renovated in the 1950s and again in the mid-1980s. Even with those alterations, the house still retains much of its original woodwork. ³⁴⁸

Delftware Tile History:
During the first restoration, black transfer-printed delftware tiles were discovered behind a coal-burning stove in the dining room. As often happens with stove removals, workers caused considerable damage to the tiles before they saw them. Once noticed, work

³⁴⁸ Poston, 223; Savage, 41; Stoney, Charleston’s Historic Houses, 1953, 14-15.
was stopped and the owners tried to save the rest. They even replaced missing or damaged tiles with ones found in the yard, the basement, and a house down the street. None of these tiles are signed but most display the popular Sadler and Green “88” border as well as others produced by that company. An up-close photograph shows that many of the designs can be found in Sadler and Green’s catalog. According to Chamberlain, these tiles were most likely installed by the Elliots in the 1750s.

Restoration contractor Richard Marks and his company worked on this house for the second restoration. They found a unique tile fragment that displayed both purple and blue glaze. They shipped this fragment to the Royal Makkum factory in Holland and commissioned a replica. The replica was given to the owner and now hangs in the house.

State of the Artifacts:
The in-situ tiles appear to be in good condition. Chamberlain’s picture from 1956 shows several of the tiles missing or covered in plaster. Savage’s 1995 photograph only shows a close-up of a group of tiles so it is unclear whether or not restorations put back missing tiles (see photo below).

Storage Location:
The dining room contains in-situ black Liverpool transfer-print tiles.

Photographs: Black and white photograph courtesy of Chamberlain, all others courtesy of Richard Marks.

All of the tiles recovered from 75 King Street are black Liverpool transfer-printed tiles. All of the scenes are listed in Sadler and Green’s catalog (see Ray 1994 in references).

349 Bridges, 175.
350 Savage, 41.
351 Chamberlain, 92.
352 Richard Marks, interview with author, October 11, 2009, Charleston, SC.
353 Chamberlain, 92.
SIMMONS-EDWARD HOUSE
14 Legare Street, Charleston, South Carolina


Figure A.21. 14 Legare Street on map of Charleston peninsula, City of Charleston Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., www.charlestoncity.info.

Brief House History:
Located west of the walled city, the land underneath this house was granted in the late seventeenth century, but was not developed until the nineteenth century when wealthy planters began building townhouses in the area. In 1801, a Johns Island planter named Francis Simmons commissioned the construction of this house. He evidently played out the part of society man since his inventory shows that he furnished his house with only things befitting a proper eighteenth-century gentleman. He sold the house to merchant George Edwards in 1816. Edwards proceeded to make several alterations to the structure, including the addition of an elaborate adamesque gate. This gate’s design includes the motif of a pineapple and has since given the house its nickname of “the pineapple gate house.” Even thought the house has passed through several different owners, it still retains its integrity and neoclassical elements that make it comparable to the Nathaniel Russell and Miles Brewton houses. It is renowned nationwide for these elements as well as its excellent representation of a Charleston single house and its retention of a full set of outbuildings.354

Delftware Tile History:
An archaeological investigation in 2001 uncovered delftware tile evidence from large eighteenth-century features along the central property line and inside the kitchen building. According to Zierden’s estimated date of manufacture, these delftware tile fragments are slightly older tiles that Simmons installed in his new home. Twelve of the fragments date to

do the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Ten of the fragments date to the antebellum period, and four fragments date to the Victorian era.  

**State of the Artifacts:**

The tiles are in fragment form. Most of them are in fairly good condition with only a few examples of pitting.

**Storage Location:**

The fragments are stored at the Charleston Museum in their archaeological collection.

**Photographs:** Fragments courtesy of the Charleston Museum. Photographs by author.

The fragments found at 14 Legare Street display a wide variety of colors, designs, and motifs.

Transfer-printed tiles in green and red

---

355 Zierden, 14 Legare Street, 4.54.
Purple and white tiles with various scenery of landscapes and seascapes within double-lined medallions. The fragments exhibit either carnation or ox-head corner motifs.
Bristol-made *bianco sopra bianco*

Hand-painted blue, purple, and white tile

Hand-painted blue and white fragments with spider-head and ox-head corner motifs, respectively

Plain white tile and exposed clay back
Hand-painted blue and white fragments with various scenes in double lined medallions
JOHN FULLERTON HOUSE
15 Legare Street, Charleston, South Carolina


Figure A.23. 15 Legare Street on map of Charleston peninsula, City of Charleston Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., www.charlestoncity.info.

Brief House History:
Scottish carpenter and joiner John Fullerton bought the property from William Gibbes in 1772. He immediately began building this house. Fullerton was a very well known carpenter throughout Charleston who worked on several buildings, including installing the pews in the Circular Congregational Church. This house is an excellent example of his talent. It is one of fewer than seventy-five pre-Revolutionary houses in the city. It even sheltered some of General Cornwallis’ officers when the British occupied Charleston. Several changes were made to the house in later years, including a two story neoclassical piazza added to the western and southern facades in 1800, a Victorian addition in 1875, and a formal landscape built in 1985. However, the house was restored in 1985 and again from 1990-1991.356

356 Poston, 244; Ravenel, 38; Stoney 1944, 67.
Delftware Tile History:
No written documentation on the tiles at 15 Legare Street has been found but photographic documentation exists as recently as 1994.

State of the Artifacts:
The fragment owned by Marks is in fairly good condition with the exception of stained residue left over from the use of tape on the tile’s glazed surface. A personal visit could not be arranged so the in-situ tiles were examined by photograph. They appear to be in excellent condition as shown below.

Storage Location:
Some fragments are stored by Richard Marks. The in-situ tiles are installed in the house.

Photographs: Fragment courtesy of Richard Marks. Photograph of fragment by author; photographs of in-situ tiles courtesy of Historic Charleston Foundation archives.
The tiles in one fireplace appear to be blank white like the fragment owned by Marks. In contrast, the tiles in the other fireplace appear to be hand-painted blue and white ships with small corner motifs. A personal examination of the tiles could not be arranged, therefore a more in-depth analysis is not possible at this time.
JOHN EDWARDS HOUSE  
15 Meeting Street, Charleston, South Carolina


Figure A.25. 15 Meeting Street on map of Charleston peninsula, City of Charleston Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., www.charlestoncity.info.

**Brief House History:**

John Edwards, a local politician during the American Revolution, built this house around 1770. Edwards is an interesting figure. He served on ‘Dictator’ John Rutledge’s Privy Council and was imprisoned and exiled to St. Augustine during the war. In contrast to his hectic life, his house is relatively simple. It is representative of a Charleston double house from the 1760s and 1770s. It has an unusual rusticated wooden front with cypress siding cut and beveled to resemble stone. Later owner, George Williams Jr. conducted alterations in the late nineteenth century during which they added a semi-circular piazza. Williams claimed he needed the piazza in order to hold ice cream parties for all of the children from the Charleston Orphan house. Around the same time, Williams also landscaped the garden with gingko trees. Today, the interior Georgian details are considered some of the best in Charleston.\(^{357}\)

**Delftware Tile History:**

One of the most interesting aspects of this case study is that John Edwards sold delftware tiles in his store. In the 1760s, he placed three advertisements in the *South Carolina Gazette*. The first appears in 1765, announcing, “Just imported in the FAIR AMERICAN, John Minshal, Master from Liverpool…A quantity of neat copper-plated chimney tiles both black and red…John Edwards and Comp.”\(^{358}\) Edwards evidently liked the fashion of delftware tiles since several are displayed in his house.

---

\(^{357}\) Poston, 254; Smith, 196, 199-206; Stoney 1944, 71.

\(^{358}\) *South Carolina Gazette and Daily Advertiser*, February 2, 1765.
In her 1978 article for *English Ceramic Circle Transactions*, Daisy Bridges estimates that there were four sets of tiles installed in the house at the time of its construction. These sets include red and black Sadler and Green transfer-printed tiles as well as purple and white and blue and white hand-painted tiles.\(^{359}\) Modern photographs only show one room with in-situ tiles.\(^{360}\) At some point, the dining room tiles were rearranged to fit around an iron fireback. The second room that has delftware tiles is one of the upstairs bedrooms. These tiles are hand-painted with blue and white landscape scenes. One black and three red transfer-printed tiles are also in the fireplace, located in the top row.\(^{361}\)

**State of the Artifacts:**

Since a personal evaluation of the tiles could not be arranged, they were viewed from a photograph. They appear to be in good condition, with no visible evidence of problems.

**Storage Location:**

The tiles are installed in the house.


Although Bridges mentions other rooms with delftware tiles, the only visual documentation from this house is of the dining room as shown below.

---

\(^{359}\) Bridges, 175.

\(^{360}\) Chamberlain, 37.

\(^{361}\) Bridges, 175.
NATHANIEL RUSSELL HOUSE
51 Meeting Street, Charleston, South Carolina


Figures A.27. 51 Meeting Street on map of Charleston peninsula, City of Charleston Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., www.charlestoncity.info.

Brief House History:

The Nathaniel Russell house is one of Charleston’s most famous houses, mostly for its stunning neoclassical architecture. It is located on an original lot of the city’s Grand Modell. Russell was a merchant from Rhode Island who came to work in Charleston in the late eighteenth century. He became so successful that he amassed a large fortune by the end of his life. His house certainly reflects his wealth. Russell began construction on the three-story structure in 1808. The finished product exhibits several neoclassical characteristics such as an octagonal wing, transomed entrance, elliptical fanlights, and a balustrade parapet. It was altered in 1857, 1908, and 1915. When Historic Charleston Foundation purchased the house in 1955, they conducted a restoration. Their work paid off since the house became a National Landmark site in 1974. Historical research produced helpful information about Russell and his time period, HCF commissioned a second restoration in the 1990s.362

Delftware Tile History:
No early written evidence has been found regarding the purchase and installation of delftware tiles in the Nathaniel Russell house. However, physical evidence was found during an archaeological investigation was held in the 1990s prior to the house’s second restoration. It uncovered about a dozen delftware tile fragments from at least two separate periods of time. Nine fragments were dated to the Russell period of early nineteenth century, one dated to the antebellum era, and two were dated to the Pringle-Frost period of the early twentieth century.363

State of the Artifacts:
The delftware tiles are all in fragment form. They are in fairly good condition.

Storage Location:
The fragments are stored at the Charleston Museum in their archaeological collection.

Photographs: Tiles courtesy of the Charleston Museum, photographs by author.
Most of the fragments found at 51 Meeting Street display hand-painted blue and white scenes. The only two exceptions are a plain white tile and another with what looks to be hand-painted polychrome landscape scenery.

The blue and white fragments display images such as a maiden churning butter, a flower pot, and other unidentified images. These fragments either exhibit a quarter rosette corner motif or an ox-head corner motif. The exposed back is yellowish beige clay.
BRANFORD-HORRY HOUSE
59 Meeting Street, Charleston, South Carolina


Figure A.29. 59 Meeting Street on map of Charleston peninsula, City of Charleston Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., www.charlestoncity.info.

Brief House History:

In 1747, merchant Benjamin Savage bought a lot on Meeting Street from John Allen. Sometime around 1750, the three story brick double house was constructed with beautiful Georgian interiors. Savage gave the property and house to William Branford, a planter from St. Andrew’s Parish, upon his marriage to Savage’s niece, Elizabeth. William and Elizabeth’s grandson, Elias Horry, inherited the house in 1801. Horry made a significant fortune as a planter and the second president of the South Carolina Canal and Railroad Company. In 1830, he added a Greek revival piazza that overhangs the sidewalk. This type of piazza is not very common in Charleston but such overhangs have been allowed since passage of a law in 1700. During the mid nineteenth century, Charleston architect Louis J. Barbot lived at the house but he does not seem to have made any alterations. In fact, no major changes were made to the house after Horry. It underwent a restoration in the twentieth century.364

Delftware Tile History:

So far, no written documentation regarding the purchase and installation of the tiles in the Branford-Horry house has been found. Luckily, physical and photographic evidence does exist. Two books on Charleston interiors have photographs that show in-situ delftware tiles in the house.365 Historic Charleston Foundation also has photographic evidence of the tiles as does Glenn Keyes from his work on the house. During the last restoration, Glenn

---

364 Poston, 264; Ravenel, 236; Smith, 104, 111-112; Stoney 1944, 74; Waddell, 224.
365 Sully, 40; Chamberlain, 14.
Keyes Architects discovered some delftware tile fragments in the process. They contracted a local ceramic manufacturer to replicate the fragment for the benefit of the owners.366

State of the Artifacts:
A personal visit could not be arranged therefore the analysis of the tiles is from the photographs shown below.

Storage Location:
The tiles are installed in at least five of the house’s fireplaces.

Photographs: Photographs courtesy of Richard Marks.
These photographs show that three of the fireplaces have purple and white tiles with small corner motifs and central scenes of ships, windmills, mythical creatures, and other typical Dutch images. The fourth and fifth fireplaces have tiles with similar scenes and corner motifs, only decorated in blue and white.

366 Richard Marks, interview with author, November 8, 2009, Charleston, SC.
SANDERS HOUSE
82 Pitt Street, Charleston, South Carolina

Figure A.30. Exterior of 82 Pitt Street, 2010, (photo by author).

Figure A.31. 82 Pitt Street on map of Charleston peninsula, City of Charleston Planning and Neighborhoods Dept., www.charlestoncity.info.

Brief House History: Constructed c. 1843

The house at 82 Pitt Street was constructed around 1843 by two entrepreneurs; a barber named Septimus Sanders and a bricklayer named Joseph A. Sanders. Subsequent owners include planter William Bell and Mrs. Sarah O’Hear. Today, the house is considered an exemplary two story brick single house praised for its intricate brickwork, interior federal elements, and its intact rear dependency.367

Delftware Tile History:

The house at 82 Pitt Street presents an intriguing case. It was built after the period of significance for delftware tiles in Charleston, yet it has Liverpool transfer-printed tiles in one of the fireplaces. Therefore, the inclusion of the tiles had to be a deliberate action on the part of one of the owners. So far, it is unclear where there tiles were purchased and when they were installed. The subject deserves further exploration than was possible within the scope of this thesis.368

State of the Artifacts:

Since a personal visit could not be arranged, the tiles were evaluated from a photograph. They seem to be good condition and do not visibly suffer from any problems.

Storage Location:

The tiles are currently installed in the fireplace of the kitchen house at 82 Pitt Street.

368 Richard Marks, interview with author, October 26, 2009, Charleston, South Carolina.
Photographs: Photograph courtesy of Historic Charleston Foundation archives.

The tiles shown in the photograph below are red Liverpool transfer-printed tiles. The quality of the photograph is too poor to make out specific scenes but it is likely that these are Sadler and Green designs since they were the main producers of such tiles.
Brief House History:

The land underneath 61 Tradd Street was designated as the westernmost part of lot #60 in the Grand Modell of 1680. There is some discrepancy as to who is responsible for the construction of the three and a half story Georgian brick single house that is currently located on the property. One theory states that Jacob Motte, Treasurer of the Province, constructed this house around 1736.369 The second theory attributes the house to William Harvey based on his advertisement for the property in 1770 as having a “new-built” house.370 Architectural investigation of the house reveals evidence that the house was built in accordance with the earlier date of 1730s. By the dawn of the twentieth century, this house and its neighbors had fallen into decay. Susan Pringle Frost bought several houses along Tradd Street, 61 Tradd included, and began her rehabilitation of the buildings. Today, the house serves as one of the best examples of pre-Revolutionary construction due to its retention of original eighteenth-century elements such as cypress paneling, heart pine floors, and delftware tiles.371

Delftware Tile History:

Unfortunately, little is known about the purchase and installation of these tiles. Historic Charleston Foundation believes the tiles to be either original to the house’s construction or a very early addition. The tiles are a great example of hand-painted

370 Stoney 1944, 104.
manganese purple marina scenes. Their existence gives further physical proof of the popularity of this color scheme in Charleston.

**State of Artifacts:**

The tiles are in excellent condition, completely intact, and installed in the fireplace of the first floor parlor.

**Storage Location:**

The tiles remain in-situ at the house.

**Photographs:** Photographs by author.

All of the tiles are hand-painted manganese tiles with various marina and rural life scenes and a rococo border. While the scenes themselves include typical Dutch motifs, the border is very similar to one produced by Sadler and Green, which probably means that they are English-made.
YEAMANS HALL PLANTATION
Goose Creek, Berkeley County, South Carolina

 Brief House History: (exterior image not available)
 Sir John Yeamans constructed a house at Yeamans Hall as early as 1674. By 1695, that house was replaced with one built by Landgrave Thomas Smith II. In 1924, the Charleston Consortium purchased the surrounding property in order to build a winter resort. A few years later, in 1932, Eliza F. Smith bought the house itself and conducted extensive renovations. She gave it the name of Yeamans Hall.372

Delft Tile History:
 Unfortunately, no written or photographic evidence was found on the use of delftware tiles at Yeamans Hall. However, physical evidence exists in the form of one mostly intact tile in the Charleston Museum’s curatorial collection. This tile was donated to the museum by Mr. James O’Hear. The catalog card for the artifact records that O’Hear believed that the tile originally came from Holland. The card also compares the tile to similar ones shown in de Jonge’s book on delftware tiles, claiming that it dates to the 1670s.373

State of the Artifacts:
 The one known piece of delftware tile evidence from Yeamans Hall is one intact tile in fairly good condition.

Storage Location:
 The fragment is stored at the Charleston Museum in their curatorial collection.

Photographs: Tile courtesy of the Charleston Museum., photograph by author. The tile from Yeamans Hall displays a hand-painted blue and white scene of two fishermen on an earthen bridge with three ships and a church in the background. It also exhibits small spider head corner motifs. The tile measures 130 mm by 130 mm. The exposed back appears to be of yellow clay.

---

373 HC 71 catalog card, the Charleston Museum archives, Charleston, SC.
## Appendix B

### Advertised Shipments by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPTAIN</th>
<th>SHIP</th>
<th>PORT</th>
<th>MERCHANT</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain Polliksen</td>
<td>NG^{374}</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>James Crokatt</td>
<td>1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Ayres</td>
<td>King George</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Peter Horry</td>
<td>1736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Binford &amp; Osmond</td>
<td>1742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Charming Nancy</td>
<td>Hull and Madeira</td>
<td>Richard Marston</td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Smith</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Nicholson and Bampfield</td>
<td>1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Brownett</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Nicholson and Bampfield</td>
<td>1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Minshal</td>
<td>Fair American</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>John Edwards</td>
<td>1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Minshal</td>
<td>Fair American</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>John Edwards</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Jordan</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>John Edwards</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>W. &amp; J Carsan</td>
<td>1769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Maitland</td>
<td>Magna Carta</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Roger Smith</td>
<td>1773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Jackson</td>
<td>Glory</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>R &amp; P Smith</td>
<td>1784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Thomas Blundell</td>
<td>Johan Van Oldenbarne-Veld</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Jan Haak</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Thomas Blundell</td>
<td>Old Farmer</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^{374} NG denotes information that was not given in the newspaper advertisement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Port of Departure</th>
<th>Port of Arrival</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hutchison</td>
<td>Robert and Mary</td>
<td>Leith</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain James Lindsay</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Vos &amp; Graves</td>
<td>1787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Baas</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Coggershall</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>L’Orient</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master William Barker</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master John Baas</td>
<td>Fanny</td>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Timothy Coggershall</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Lierson</td>
<td>Nordische Lowe</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>Thomas Morris</td>
<td>1791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Robert Rice</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Robert Rice</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Elisha Small</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Adam Scott</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Adam Scott</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Adam Scott</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Adam Scott</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>John F. Schmidt</td>
<td>1796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>John F. Schmidt</td>
<td>1796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Adam Scott</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Adam Scott</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Adam Scott</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Hezekiah Bates</td>
<td>Charles and Henry</td>
<td>Bremen</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Master/Ship</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Captain/Owner</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Clark Tinkham</td>
<td>Charles and Henry</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Nathaniel Gunison</td>
<td>Blossom</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Edward Cheeseborough</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>John F. Schmidt</td>
<td>1802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Adam Scott</td>
<td>William and Mary</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. George Easterby</td>
<td>William and Mary</td>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Edward Cheeseborough</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>John F. Schmidt</td>
<td>1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. John Baas</td>
<td>John and Frances</td>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. George Easterby</td>
<td>William and Mary</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master George Easterby</td>
<td>William and Mary</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>F. C. Mey</td>
<td>1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. George Easterby</td>
<td>William and Mary</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>John and Frances</td>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. John Taylor</td>
<td>William and Mary</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>F.C. Mey</td>
<td>1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Thomas Lunt</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>John Potter</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Maitland</td>
<td>Magna Carta</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Roger Smith</td>
<td>1815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Transcribed Newspaper Advertisements 1735-1820

South-Carolina Gazette and Advertiser
August 9, 1735
Charleston, South Carolina
“Imported in Capt. Pollixsen from London, and to be sold by James Crokatt…[clothing, groceries, textiles, and]…white or painted tiles for chimnies…”

South-Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser
September 18, 1736 to September 25, 1736
Charleston, South Carolina
“This Day imported in the King George Capt. Jacob Ayers from London, and to be sold very reasonable by Peter Horry, viz…chimney tiles…”

South-Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser
December 13, 1742
Charleston, South Carolina
“Just imported, by Binford and Osmond…Dutch Chimney Tiles, Iron Backs…”

South-Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser
May 14, 1750
Charleston, South Carolina
“Just imported in the Charming Nancy, from Hull and Madera…Dutch tiles for chimneys…at my store in Broad-street. Richard Martson.”

South-Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser
January 5, 1760
Charleston, South Carolina
“The co partnership of Milner and Bedon being expired is now selling off a NINE for ONE ready money, or TEN for ONE credit, the following Articles, viz…1 white and painted tiles for chimneys…”

South-Carolina Gazette and Daily Advertiser
November 26, 1763
Charleston, South Carolina
“Now selling off By Nicholson and Bampfeild much cheaper than such goods could be bought in Charles-Town, for cash: A Large assortment of Goods imported by captains
Smith from London, and Brownette, from Bristol. N.B. This sale will continue only till the fifth of January next, as their partnership terminates this day…painted chimney tiles…”

South-Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser  
February 2, 1765  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“Just imported in the FAIR AMERICAN, John Minshal, Master, from LIVERPOOL…A quantity of neat copper-plate chimney tiles, both black and red…John Edwards and Company.”

South-Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser  
December 1, 1767  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“JUST IMPORTED, By JOHN EDWARDS, & Co. In the Fair American, JOHN MINSHALL, Master, from Liverpool, and the Nancy, Capt. JORDAN, from London:…copper-plate and common blue and white chimney tiles…”

South-Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser  
August 29, 1769  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“WILLIAM & JAMES CARSAN Have just imported…from Bristol…blue landskip Chimney TILES…”

South-Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser  
November 15, 1773  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“ROGER SMITH Has just imported per the Magna Carta, Capt. Maitland, from LONDON, A complete Cargo of GOODS, Among which are the FOLLOWING, vis…Copperplate Chimney Tiles…”

South-Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser  
Thursday May 13 to Saturday May 15, 1784  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“R. and P. Smith HAVE just received by the GLORY, Capt. Jackson, from Liverpool…white Chimney Tiles; which will be sold reasonably.”
South-Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser
December 22, 1784
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey has imported in the ship Johan Van Oldenbarne-Veld, Capt. Thomas Blundell, and in the Brig Apollo, Capt. Jan Haak, from Amsterdam, A Large Assortment of Goods, Which he will sell at a low advance, by the whole package, or by the piece for Cash or a Short Credit, At his Wholesale Warehouse, No. 18 Pinckney Street…and a variety of chimney tiles, of different colours.”

Note: This ad appears in South Carolina Gazette again on December 25 and 31, January 13 and 26, 1785 and February 10, 1785. It also appears in the Columbian Herald and the Patriotic Courier of North-America (also located in Charleston) on December 28, January 7, 20, 24, and 27, 1785.

South-Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser
April 15, 1785
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey has for sale, a large Assortment of Dry Goods, which he will dispose of at a low advance, for Cash or a Short Credit, At his wholesale Warehouse, No. 18 Pinckney Street…blue and white, purple and white, and white plain chimney tiles…”

Note: this appears in the South Carolina Gazette again on April 20, 1785 and May 6, 1785. It also appears in the State Gazette on May 2, 1785.

State Gazette of South-Carolina
November 3, 1785
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey, Has just imported from Amsterdam, by the Ship Old Farmer, Thomas Blundell, Master, The following Goods: Which he will dispose of for Ready Money at a very low advance, at his Wholesale Warehouse, No.18 Pinckney Street, viz…Blue and white, purple and white, and white chimney tiles…”

Note: This ad appears in the State Gazette again on November 7, 14, 21, and 28, 1785 and January 2 and 9, 1786. It also appears in the Charleston Evening Gazette on November 10, 12, 15, 19, and 24, 1785.

Charleston Morning Post and Daily Advertiser
March 6, 1786
Charleston, South Carolina
“Just Arrived, in the Brig Robert & Mary, from Leith [Edinburgh], Robert Hutchison, Master, and for sale on board said Brig, or at a Store on Eveleigh’s Wharf, for Cash or Produce, An
Assortment of Goods, Among which are the following, viz…Two sets of marble chimney pieces, with tiles…”

Note: Ad appears in the Charleston Morning Post on March 25 and 28, 1786.

The Charleston Morning Post and Daily Advertiser
January 15, 1787
Charleston, South Carolina
“George Fardo, No. 67, Bay, Who has also for Sale…and two elegant CHIMNEY PIECES, with Tiles, &c.”

State Gazette of South-Carolina
August 2, 1787
Charleston, South Carolina
“Vos & Graves, No. 31 Broad Street Have For Sale, A Variety of Goods, Received by the Ship United States, Captain James Lindsay, from Amsterdam, viz…white chimney tiles…”

Note: This ad appears in the State Gazette on August 8, 13, 16, and 27 and September 3, 10, and 17, 1787.

City Gazette and Daily Advertiser
January 18, 1788
Charleston, South Carolina
“Vos & Graves, No. 31 Broad Street Have For Sale, A Variety of Goods consisting of…Chimney tiles…”

Note: This ad is very similar to the one printed in the State Gazette the fall before; same merchants but no mention of where the goods came from.
It appears again in the City Gazette on January 21, 23, 25, and 28, 1788 and on February 6, 1788.

City Gazette and Daily Advertiser
July 26, 1788
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey, Has imported from Amsterdam & L’Orient, in the brig Amsterdam, John Baas, & brig Maria, Timothy Coggershall, the following Goods, Which he will dispose for ready money, tobacco or rice, at a low advance at his wholesale Warehouse, No. 40 Pinckney Street…white, blue & white and purple and white chimney tiles in small boxes…”

Note: This ad subsequently appears in the City Gazette on August 2, 9, 19, 23, and 30, 1788 and September 2, 1788.
**City Gazette and Daily Advertiser**
March 29, 1790
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey, Has imported from Amsterdam, in the brig Amsterdam, William Barker, master, the following Goods, which he will dispose of for ready money, tobacco or rice, at a low advance, at his warehouse No. 40 Pinckney Street…white, blue and white, and purple and white chimney tiles in small boxes…”

*Note:* This ad subsequently appears in the *City Gazette* on March 31, 1790 and April 3, 5, 12, 14, 17, and 20, 1790.

**City Gazette and Daily Advertiser.**
June 24, 1790
Charleston, South Carolina
“Vos & Graves, At their Warehouse St. Michale’s alley, No. 31, Have For Sale On low terms for cash, produce, and on a credit…purple figured chimney tiles…”

*Note:* This ad appears in the *City Gazette* again on June 29, 1790.

**City Gazette and Daily Advertiser**
July 21, 1791
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey, Has received by the brig Fanny, John Baas, master, from Bourdeaux, in addition to his remaining stock of Goods on hand, which he will dispose of for cash or produce, at a low advance at his store No. 40 Pinckney Street, viz…chimney tiles in small boxes…”

*Note:* This ad subsequently appears in the *City Gazette* on July 23, 28, and 30, 1791 and August 4, 1791.

**City Gazette and Daily Advertiser**
October 18, 1791
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey, Has imported from Amsterdam, in the brig South Carolina, Timothy Coggershall, master, The following Goods, Which he will dispose of for ready money, tobacco or rice, at a low advance, at his ware-house No. 40 Pinckney Street…purple and white and white chimney tiles in small boxes…”

*Note:* This ad subsequently appears in the *City Gazette* on October 22, 24, 29, 1791 and November 1, 7, 19, 21, and 28, 1791 and December 5, 1791.
City Gazette and Daily Advertiser  
December 13, 1791  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“Landing from on board the ship Nordische Lowe, capt. Lierson, from Hamburgh, the following Goods and for sale, by Thomas Morris…Dutch tiles…”  

Note: This ad appears in the City Gazette again on December 17, 1791 and January 11, 1792.

State Gazette of South-Carolina  
August 6, 1792  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“Florian Charles Mey Has imported from Amsterdam in the brig Amsterdam, Robert Rice, Master, and in the last vessel from Bourdeaux, the following Goods Which he will dispose of for ready money or produce, at a low advance, at his ware-house, No. 40 Pinckney Street, viz…Chimney tiles in small boxes…Delftware in boxes”  

Note: This ad appears in the State Gazette on August 16 and 27, 1792. It also appears in the City Gazette on August 27 and September 8, 1792.

Columbian Herald  
August 27, 1793  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“Florian Charles Mey, Has imported in the brig Amsterdam, Robert Rice, master, from Amsterdam, A General Assortment of Dutch Goods, Which he will dispose of for Ready Money or Produce, at a Moderate Advance at his Ware-House in Pinckney Street, No. 40---viz…A few boxes of chimney tiles, 8 dozen in a box--- white, blue and white, & purple and white…Delph ware in boxes…”  

Note: This ad appears again in the Columbia Herald on September 3, 1793.

South-Carolina State Gazette and Timothy's Daily Adviser  
August 14, 1794  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“Florian Charles Mey, has on hand and now received by the brig Commerce, Elisha Small, master from Rotterdam, assortment of Dutch Goods, Which he will dispose of on reasonable advance for cash at his store in Pinckney Street, viz…Delft ware in boxes…Blue and white & purple and white chimney tiles…”  

Note: This ad subsequently appears in the Columbian Herald on November 7 and 14, 1794 and December 5, 1794.
**City Gazette and Daily Advertiser**  
December 20, 1794  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“Florian Charles Mey Has imported from Amsterdam, in the brig *Amsterdam*, Adam Scott, master, The following Goods, Which he will dispose of for cash, tobacco or rice, at his ware house, No. 40 Pinckney Street…purple and white and blue and white chimney tiles…”

*Note:* This ad also appears in the *South Carolina State Gazette* on December 24, 1794.

**City Gazette and Daily Advertiser**  
July 7, 1795  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“Florian Charles Mey Has imported in the brig Amsterdam, captain Adam Scott, from Amsterdam, a general assortment of Dutch Goods, Which he will dispose of at a low advance for cash, at his Ware-House, No.40 Pinckney Street, viz…Delph Ware in boxes…White and colored chimney tiles…”

*Note:* This ad appears in the *City Gazette* again on July 28, 1795 and August 5, 8, and 15, 1795.

**City Gazette and Daily Advertiser**  
January 19, 1796  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“Florian Charles Mey Has imported in the brig *Amsterdam*, Adam Scott, master, from Amsterdam, A General Assortment of Dutch Goods, Which he will dispose of for cash at his Ware-House, No.40 Pinckney Street, viz…Delph Ware in boxes, white and coloured chimney tiles…”

*Note:* This ad appears in the *City Gazette* again on January 23 and 26, 1796 and February 6, 9, 13, 16, 24, and 27, 1796 and September 3, 10, and 21, 1796 and October 1 and 12, 1796.

**City Gazette and Daily Advertiser**  
September 8, 1796  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“John F. Schmidt, No. 79 Bay, Has imported per the Brig *Amsterdam*, Adam Scott, Master, from Amsterdam, the following for sale by the Package or Piece…Chimney Tiles…”

*Note:* This ad appears in the *City Gazette* again on September 15, 19, and 26, 1796 and October 17, 1976.
City Gazette and Daily Advertiser
November 14, 1796
Charleston, South Carolina
“John F. Schmidt, No. 79 Bay, Has imported by the last Vessels from Amsterdam…Chimney hearth tiles…”

Note: This ad appears in the City Gazette again on December 8, 1796.

City Gazette and Daily Advertiser
May 4, 1797
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey Has imported from Amsterdam, in the Brig Amsterdam, Adam Scott, Master, the following Goods, which he will dispose of for Cash, by the Package, at his Ware-House, No.40, Pinckney Street…Delft Ware in boxes…Chimney Tiles, in small boxes…”

Note: This ad appears again in the City Gazette on May 13, 16, and 18, 1797.

City Gazette and Daily Advertiser
October 25, 1797
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey Has imported in the Brig Amsterdam, Capt. Adam Scott, from Amsterdam, A General Assortment of Dutch Goods, Which he will dispose of by the Package at a low advance for Cash, at his Ware-House, No.40 Pinckney Street…White and Colored Chimney Tiles…”

Note: This ad appears in the City Gazette again on October 27, 1797 and November 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 27, and 29, 1797.

City Gazette and Daily Advertiser
September 1, 1798
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey, Has imported from Amsterdam, in the Brig Amsterdam, Adam Scott, Master, The following Goods, Which he will dispose of by the Package for ready money on delivery of the Goods, at his Ware House, No.40, Pinckney Street, viz…White, Blue and Purple Chimney Tiles…White, Blue and White, and Purple and White Chimney Tiles…”

Note: This ad appears in the City Gazette again on December 18, 1798 and January 7 and 14, 1799.
*City Gazette and Daily Advertiser*

**August 31, 1799**

Charleston, South Carolina

“F.C. Mey Has received by the last vessels from Europe, The following Goods, Which he will dispose of for the Cash, at his Ware House, in Pinckney Street…White chimney tiles…”

*Note:* This ad appears in the *City Gazette* again on September 3, 5, 10, and 21, 1799 and October 1, 1799.

---

*City Gazette and Daily Advertiser*

**February 18, 1800**

Charleston, South Carolina

“Florian Charles Mey Has imported from Bremen, In the brig *Charles and Henry*, Hezekiah Bates, master, the Following Goods, Which he will dispose of by the package, for ready money on a low advance, at his Ware-House, No.40 Pinckney Street…blue and white and purple and white Chimney Tiles…”

*Note:* This ad appears again in the *City Gazette* on February 25 and 27, 1800 and March 3, 11, 15, 18, and 26, 1800.

---

*City Gazette and Daily Advertiser*

**September 13, 1800**

Charleston, South Carolina

“Florian Charles Mey, Has imported from Amsterdam, in the brig *Charles and Henry*, Clark Tinkham, master, the following Goods Which he will dispose of for cash, by the packages at a low advance…White Chimney tiles…”

*Note:* This ad appears again in the *City Gazette* on October 7, 9, and 20, 1800 and November 8 and 12, 1800.

---

*City Gazette and Daily Advertiser*

**September 7, 1801**

Charleston, South Carolina

“Florian Charles Mey, Has imported from Amsterdam, in the Schooner *Blossom*, Nathaniel Gunison, master, The following Goods, Which he will dispose of for cash by the package at a low advance at his Ware-House, viz…white and blue and white Chimney Tiles…”

*Note:* This ad appears in the *City Gazette* again on September 9 and 23, 1801 and October 12, 19, and 26, 1801. It also appears in the *Carolina Gazette* on November 5, 1801.
City Gazette and Daily Advertiser
July 22, 1802
Charleston, South Carolina
“Imported From Amsterdam per ship Columbus, Edward Cheeseborough, master, and for sale by the package or piece by the subscriber [John F. Schmidt]…Chimney Tiles, white and figured…”

Note: This ad appeared in the City Gazette again on August 2, 5, 9, and 16, 1802 and February 4, 8, 12, and 19, 1803.

City Gazette and Daily Advertiser
July 29, 1802
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey, Has imported in the brig William and Mary, Adam Scott, master, from Amsterdam, The Following Assortment of Goods, Which are offered for sale or reasonable terms, at his Ware-House, Pinckney Street…White and figured Chimney Tiles…”

Note: This ad appeared in the City Gazette again on August 2, 5, 9, and 16, 1802 and February 4, 8, 12, and 19, 1803.

City Gazette and Daily Advertiser
March 21, 1803
Charleston, South Carolina
“Imported from Amsterdam, Per ship Columbia E. Cheeseborough, master, and for sale at the subscriber’s Store, by the piece and package, viz.” [John F. Schmidt]…Hearth and Chimney Tiles…”

Note: This ad appears in the City Gazette again on March 30, 1803 and April 4, 8, 18, 25, 27, and 29, 1803.

City Gazette and Daily Advertiser
September 1, 1803
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey, Has imported in the last vessels from Bourdeaux, and now in the brig William and Mary, Captain George Easterby, from Amsterdam, The following Goods, Which he will sell low for cash only, viz…blue and white, purple and white, and white Chimney Tiles in small boxes…”

Note: This ad appears in the City Gazette again on September 3 and 6, 1803.
City Gazette and Daily Advertiser
November 28, 1803
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey, Has imported in the ship John and Frances, captain John Baas, from Bourdeaux, The following Goods, Which he offers for the sale on reasonable terms for cash only…blue and white, purple and white and white Chimney Tiles in small boxes…”

City Gazette and Daily Advertiser
February 23, 1804
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey, Has imported in the brig William and Mary, captain George Easterby, from Amsterdam, The following Goods, Which he will dispose of for cash only…Chimney Tiles in boxes of 8 dozen…”

Note: This ad appears in the City Gazette again on February 25 and 28, 1804 and March 10 and 17, 1804.

City Gazette and Daily Advertiser
August 29, 1804
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey, Has imported in the schooner Charlotte, from Bordeaux, and now in the brig William and Mary, George Easterby, master, from Amsterdam, The following Goods, Which he will dispose of at moderate prices for cash…Chimney Tiles in boxes of 8 dozen…”

City Gazette and Daily Advertiser
May 9, 1805
Charleston, South Carolina
“Florian Charles Mey, Has imported in the brig William & Mary, Captain George Easterby from Amsterdam, and ship John & Francis, from Bourdeaux, the following Goods, which he will dispose of for cash at his store, No. 40 Pinckney Street…chimney Tiles…Chimney Tiles in boxes of 8 dozen…chimney Tiles in boxes…”

Note: This ad and similar ones appear in the City Gazette again on May 14, 1805, June 6, 1805, December 13, 1805, August 22, 25, and 29, 1806, and September 1, 3, 8, 10, 12, 15, and 17, 1806.
City Gazette and Daily Advertiser  
January 6, 1808  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“Russia Goods. The subscriber [John Potter] offers for sale, the Cargo of the ship Farmer,  
captain Thomas Lunt, direct from St. Petersburg, on the most reasonable terms, for cash or  
approved notes, only, among which are…White glazed chimney Tiles…”

City Gazette and Daily Advertiser  
June 11, 1808  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“F.C. Mey Has on hand, and offers for sale, for cash, The Following Articles, viz…blue,  
white, purple and white Chimney Tiles…”

Note: This ad appears in the City Gazette again on June 7, 14, 18, 25, and 30, 1808 and July  
6, 1808

The Investigator  
October 14, 1812  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“For Sale, The following Assortment at No. 57 East Bay. Factors and other punctual  
customers, supplied on the usual terms.” [Michael Kelly]…Tiles, Chimney…”

Note: This ad appears in The Investigator again on October 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26,  
29, and 31, 1812; November 2, 4, 5, 6, 11, 14, 21, 24, 27, and 28, 1812; December 4, 9, 22,  
and 23, 1812; February 26 and 27, 1813; and March 12, 1813.

Winyaw Intelligencer  
April 7, 1819  
Georgetown, South Carolina  
“For Sale, by John Taylor, Sen’r (from March 27)…1000 Dutch Tiles…”

City Gazette and Daily Advertiser  
November 20, 1820  
Charleston, South Carolina  
“Lorent & Wulff, offer for sale…A quantity of Glazed Dutch Tiles…”
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