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Abstract

Jean Baptiste Lang, a divorced tobacco merchant from Belgium, constructed a summer home in Mandeville, Louisiana, in the mid-1850s. The most noteworthy feature of this house (16ST248) is its cave, a semi-subterranean room which he likely used as a wine cellar. The house was continuously occupied for over a century and remained one of few examples on the north shore of Lake Pontchartrain of an original Anglo-Creole cottage. There are very few extant examples of caves in Louisiana due to the difficulty in maintaining such structures. The principal research questions addressed were (1) Can the cave be identified in the archaeological record? If it can be identified, what are its architectural details? How was it constructed? What does its construction state about the function of the cave? (2) What was stored in the cave and can this be determined archaeologically? (3) If the feature is subterranean, how well did it function in storing goods? How would it function during rain or flooding? (4) Can the detached kitchen be located as well as any associated midden? From answering these questions, the cave was interpreted to be a luxurious amenity that was in the houses of those with high social status throughout Louisiana. The excavations at the Lang-Jourdan House suggest they were for the storage of wine and other alcoholic beverages. The consumption of wine in the elite Creole society of New Orleans was an ethnic and cultural link to France. As such, the principal purpose of the cave can be linked to concepts of social prestige and hospitality.
Chapter 1: Introduction

The primary goal of the excavations at the Lang-Jourdan House Site (16ST248) was to understand the function of its cave, a semi-subterranean cellar located under a raised portion of the house. The house is also significant as it remains one of the few extant examples of the Anglo-Creole style of architecture, popular during the mid-to-late nineteenth century in Louisiana. The house was continuously occupied for over a century until it was seriously damaged by Hurricane Katrina in 2005; it was then moved to its current location and is being renovated as a house museum. As the cave was semi-subterranean, it remained in the earth and was covered with modern fill with the relocation of the house. The function of the cave throughout Louisiana and the French sphere of influence may help shed light on notions of class in Creole society as well as social prestige and hospitality.

A shovel test survey at the Lang-Jourdan House was first conducted during the autumn of 2012 under the direction of Dr. Rob Mann with the intention of relocating the cave as well as any associated midden from a possible detached kitchen. The same team returned to the site in the spring of 2013 to excavate judgmentally placed test units as well as conducting block excavations over the cave area. These excavations and the analysis of the material culture as well as archival research form the basis of my master’s thesis. The principal research questions were (1) Can the cave be identified in the archaeological record? If it can be identified, what are its architectural details? How was it constructed? What does its construction state about the function of the cave? (2) What was stored in the cave and can this be determined archaeologically? (3) If the feature is subterranean, how well did it function in storing goods? How would it function during rain or flooding? (4) Can the detached kitchen be located as well as any associated midden?
The Lang-Jourdan House was constructed circa 1852 in Mandeville on the north shore of Lake Pontchartrain (Figure 1). The house was commissioned by a wealthy tobacco merchant named Jean Baptiste Lang. Though the specifics of his biography will be discussed in Chapter 3, the following is a short summary of his life. He was born in Arlon, Belgium, in the province of Luxembourg. He immigrated to New Orleans during the 1830s where he made a successful living buying and selling tobacco. Though he owned a house in New Orleans, he had a summer home built in Mandeville due to the culture of excursions whereby wealthy individuals would temporarily escape from the heat and seasonal yellow fever epidemics during New Orleans’ summers. Lang remained in Louisiana for roughly twenty years before moving back to Belgium, where he died in 1861. The house he built in Mandeville was continuously occupied for over a century until it was seriously damaged by Hurricane Katrina in 2005 (Figure 2). It was then relocated to its current location a few blocks away and is currently being converted into a public museum with the goal of being as accurate to the original with the philosophy of “first do no harm” (Old Mandeville Historic Association 2014).

Before delving into why the Lang-Jourdan House and its cave are historically significant, it is important to first define the specifics of Creole and Anglo-Creole architecture, and by extension, the precise definition of creoles and creolization in Louisiana.

**Creolization and Creole Cottages**

There are three main definitions of creole and creolization with reference to Louisiana. The first refers to the older, traditional connotation of creole (non-capitalized) as the first generation of a colonists born in a colony (Dawdy 2000:109; Edwards 1994:157). The second refers to the process of creolization—for an individual to be acculturated into an already established creole
Figure 1 - Original Location of the Lang-Jourdan House

Figure 2 – The Lang-Jourdan House in 2010
community. In reference to Louisiana, German, Spanish, and Anglo-Americans immigrated to colonial Louisiana where they intermarried with the local French, Native American, and African/African-American inhabitants. These settlers learned French and adopted the dominant cultural practices while adding certain contributions such as cuisine and architecture (Dawdy 2000:110). The third refers to the racial process of creolization which refers to the literal reproducing of different peoples and figuratively to the conception of merging of cultures. In this definition, there is no domination of a particular ideology, both cultures and ethnicities merge into a gradual “melting pot” (Dawdy 2000:110; Edwards 1994:157).

Similarly, in reference to vernacular architecture, Creole could refer to any architectural tradition synthesized from both native and colonial cultures (Edwards 1994:157). Louisiana Creole vernacular houses are characterized by a lack of internal stairways and hallways and by full-length external galleries that serve as both outdoor rooms and passages for air circulation. These characterizations are a central attribute of domestic architecture in Louisiana from large plantations constructed by professional architects to the vernacular or folk housing built by illiterate carpenters and an untrained populace (Edwards 1994:157-158).

One of the earliest types of Creole cottages in Louisiana is referred to as the salle-et-chambre, a small parlor and bedroom cottage. To increase living area in houses, individuals added plank-walled rooms onto the ends of houses called cabinets (Wells 1973:29). Generally, there were dual cabinets on the rear of the house with a loggia dividing them, also called a ti (petite) galerie in vernacular French. The loggia was an open-air porch partially exposed to the elements that takes advantage of the prevailing winds for air circulation (Edwards 1994:158, 173; Edwards and Kariouk 2004:128). This method of expanding the salle-et-chambre with a front gallery and rear cabinet-loggia is referred to as the first expansion module of house
expansion modules of French Creole architecture (Edwards and Kariouk 2004:70-71)—the exact arrangement of the Lang-Jourdan House (Figure 3).

The Lang-Jourdan House is a side-gabled, three-bay cottage, three rooms wide and one room deep with cabinet gallery and flanking cabinets (Figure 3). The main central room is wider than a hall and originally possessed dual chimneys on each end, though only one chimney exists today. The loggia was later expanded with the incorporation of a small, outdoor patio with the later addition of a swimming pool. The walls of the house are finished in shiplap cypress planking. In Fred Kniffen’s classification of folk housing, the Lang-Jourdan House most closely resembles the Tidewater South—albeit this style is two rooms deep with a chimney appendage and built-in front gallery (Kniffen 1936:183; Kniffen 1965:565).

These attributes of Creole architecture gradually melded with the contributions of Anglo-Americans who migrated to Louisiana during the early nineteenth century. Two of the main features of this transitional stage present at the Lang-Jourdan House are a symmetrical façade (earlier Creole carpenters were largely unconcerned with symmetry) and a floor plan in which the salle more resembles a traditional American entrance hall and is flanked by chambres larger than the salle itself (National Register of Historic Places 1990). This application of a more
Figure 3 - Floor Plan of the Lang-Jourdan House illustrated by Adele Foster
symmetrical house by Louisiana Creoles could be interpreted as their desire to adopt an Anglo philosophy of order, efficacy, and capitalism (Edwards 1985:75; Ostrom 2005:3). Alternatively, the symmetrical façade could have been adopted merely out of popularity and not out of some adherence to a specific identity (Ostrom 2005:3; Upton 1996:1-2). Whatever the interpretation, because of these attributes, the Lang-Jourdan House embodies one of the few extant examples of an Anglo-Creole cottage in Louisiana.

As previously stated, the primary motive of the excavations was to understand the function of the cave. This was accomplished by oral histories, archival research, historical documents, archaeological analysis of the cave, and artifacts recovered from the site. The results of these findings are discussed in the following chapters. Chapter 2 provides the social and historical setting for where the Lang-Jourdan House was constructed and the surrounding area of Louisiana. Chapter 3 details a biography of Jean-Baptiste Lang and a history of the house to the present day. The methods in both the field and laboratory are presented in Chapter 4. Artifacts recovered from the Lang-Jourdan House are described and analyzed in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 focuses specifically on identifying the ceramic and glass vessels recovered from the cave and developing a typology for these vessels. The history and function of the cave is explored in Chapter 7 as well as concepts of class, social prestige, and the importance of wine in Creole culture. The thesis concludes with Chapter 8.
Chapter 2: The Flush Fifties: Cultural and Historical Context

During the mid-1820s, the French-Creole nobleman, politician, and renowned gambler Bernard de Marigny de Mandeville purchased the Antoine Bonnabel and Lewis Davis properties on the north shore of Lake Pontchartrain in St. Tammany Parish. On this site, he constructed Fontainebleau Plantation, now the Fontainebleau State Park. The plantation itself was prosperous, consisting of a sugar mill and brickyard. In the 1830s, Marigny acquired approximately 5,000 acres of the old English land grants along the lakeshore of Lake Pontchartrain to plan a settlement. Marigny was personally involved in the construction of public buildings, a church, market hall, and wharves (Roberts 1946:224). In 1834, Marigny had this property subdivided into a town to be named Mandeville under the direction of Louis Bringer, the Surveyor General of Louisiana (Ellis 1981:110).

John Davis, the impresario of the Orleans Theatre in New Orleans, assisted Marigny in developing the fledgling town. Davis and Marigny sold lots at an auction in New Orleans on February 24-26, 1834; 358 people bought 432 lots, each of which measured 60 x 90 feet per lot. The earliest buildings of note consisted of a hotel called The Mandeville and an extravagant casino (Roberts 1946:225). The hotel opened on July 4th of the same year with a French chef named Louis Boudro in charge of the dining facilities (St. Tammany Parish Development Board 1955:12).

From its inception, there was always a symbiotic relationship between Mandeville and New Orleans. Marigny guaranteed transportation services from Milneburg, a small community on the south shore of Lake Pontchartrain near New Orleans, via the steamboat Blackhawk at one dollar per trip (Widmer 2007:72). By July 1837, the steamboat Pontchartrain began expeditions
to Lewisburg, Madisonville, Covington, and Mandeville three days per week with regular

This culture of excursions to St. Tammany Parish has its roots in the summer epidemics
and heat experienced in New Orleans during the early nineteenth century (Brennan 2011:192;
Crété 1978:39; Roberts 1946:168). The British architect Benjamin Henry Latrobe wrote in 1818
that “those permanent residents of New Orleans who can afford it, and dread the fever, the
solitude, and the ennui of the city during July, August, and September go to the Bay of St. Louis
or to other places of public resort at that period, and do not return until the middle of October or
the beginning of November” (Latrobe 1951:147).

Yellow fever and cholera outbreaks in 1822 and 1832 caused many residents of New
Orleans to “[seek] refuge in Covington, which for salubrity of air, goodness of the water, and
many of the luxuries of the season, is not surpassed by any place of known resort in the State”
(Ellis 1981:121), according to firsthand accounts from The Palladium, the first newspaper
publication from St. Tammany Parish. Wealthy individuals would travel to Europe, others would
use this season to travel around the United States, and some would have a summer home in a
different area of the state. Everyone who could afford to leave the city would do so, leaving only
slaves, freed blacks, and destitute immigrants (Brennan 2011:192).

The severity of these outbreaks cannot be overstated. The journalist and writer Lyle
Saxon wrote of the firsthand account of a reverend named Theodore Clapp in 1832:

Many persons, even of fortune and popularity, died in their beds without aid, unnoticed and unknown, and lay there for days unburied. In almost every house might be the sick, the dying, and the dead, in the same room. All the stores, banks, and places of business were closed. There were no means, no instruments for carrying on the ordinary affairs of businesses; for all the drays, carts, carriages, hand and common wheel-barrows, as well as hearses, were employed in the
transportation of corpses, instead of cotton, sugar, and passengers (Saxon 1928:222).

By the mid-1850s, St. Tammany Parish had reached the zenith of its initial burst of popularity.

Another serious yellow fever epidemic struck New Orleans in 1853. By this time, two more steamboats, the *Lenora* and the *Jenny Lind* were making regular excursions to Covington, Madisonville, Lewisburg, and Mandeville from New Orleans at twenty-five cents a ticket. This affordable price allowed larger numbers of New Orleanians to sojourn from the miasma of the city and to temporarily leave when there was an outbreak of another epidemic. One visitor to Mandeville described the town as such in 1855:

> Those of our good citizens who have not visited this charming village, know not what a pleasant retreat it is, nor how delightful and invigorating is the trip across Lake Pontchartrain.

> A day or two since we found ourselves with a small party of particular friends, on board the good steamboat *Lenora*, Capt. Dunnica, at the lake end of the Pontchartrain Railroad, and in some two hours and a half were safely landed on the picturesque beach at Mandeville. Although the boat was crowded, the trip was most agreeable, the morning breeze feeling fresh and cool enough to make one feel like nodding and forget the heat of the city. There was also a capital fish breakfast on board, at which all varieties of the “finny tribe,” and cooked in every style, were bountifully served out.

> Arrived at Mandeville, our little party took up its march for the hospitable mansion of our of our fellow citizens, which was christened “Free and Easy Hall,” and where the day was passed only as days should be done in this hot weather, in lounging with coats, vests, and cravats off, reading, bathing, fishing, sailing, eating and drinking. We had the blessing of a charming breeze all the while, and there was not a fly or a mosquito near to “disturb or make us afraid…”

> Mandeville has grown very considerably within a year or two past and now boasts a large number of inhabitants, much increased just now by many of our most refined Creole families, who are passing the summer there (New Orleans Daily Picayune 1855).

Lyle Saxon called the thirty-year period from 1830 to 1860 the “Golden Age of Louisiana,” and his writing reflects that era.
Those were “the good old days.” With the coming of the steamboat, the wealth of the continent was carried down the Mississippi and spread out on the levee in New Orleans. In rural Louisiana the plantation system was at the peak of slaves, and the planter, with hundreds of slaves to do his labor, reaped a rich harvest. Commerce on the river, and prosperity on the plantation caused the flood of gold that New Orleans came to know…Nobody looked to the future. Everyone, it seems, made the most of the present. In New Orleans, in the flush fifties, no one foresaw the disaster and despair that was soon to come (Saxon 1928:247-248).

It was in this idyllic climate of the “flush fifties” before the Civil War that Jean-Baptiste Lang had a summer home constructed in Mandeville.
Chapter 3: A Biography of Lang and House Ownership History

Jean Baptiste Lang was born around 1810 in Arlon, the capital of the Luxembourg Province of Belgium, according to United States Census records (Figure 4) and his last will and testament (Lang 1861:250-251; U.S. Bureau of the Census 1850:86A). His parents were Martin Lang and Marguerite Bidaire. Martin Lang was a tobacconist, a profession which he taught to his son (Lang 1861:251). While still living in Belgium, he married a woman named Catherine Hausman who was born around 1816 (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1850:86A). They immigrated to the United States in the 1830s and moved to New Orleans where Lang made a career as a tobacconist. Though tobacco had been one of Louisiana’s first cash crops, there was a substantial decline in production during the 1820s due to a decrease in foreign and East Coast demand. By 1834, exports had increased but not nearly to previous levels (Crété 1978:33). Even with these levels, Lang was quite financially successful, owning cigar stores on 158 Chartres Street and 16 Toulouse Street (Cohen 1851). An advertisement in the newspaper Le Meschacébé from 1854 (Figure 6) portrays Lang’s store on Chartres as “the oldest house of its kind” selling tobacco of every variety including chewing tobacco, snuff, cigars from Havana, foreign tobacco, and an assortment of pipes of all kinds and price ranges (Lang 1854:2).

Interesting tidbits of Lang’s life can be gleaned from his letters—he was a rather portly man (based on his choice of wider furniture), he enjoyed hunting with friends outside of Biloxi, and owned shares of a Masonic lodge. A J.B. Lang is listed as being a member of the Polar Star Lodge No. 1 on the corner of Love (Rampart) and History (Kerlerec) Streets in New Orleans in 1858 (Adams and Risk 1858:108); it is likely this was the same individual.
Catherine Hausman was also successful; she made a name for herself as a modiste (dressmaker) on Royal Street (Reeves 2014). The two had at least one child together, a girl named Marie Atalie Lang born on December 11, 1843 (New Orleans Louisiana Birth Records Index 1790-1899 1843:314). The slave schedule on the 1850 United States Census (Figure 5) also states that Lang possessed three slaves: a forty-five year old black woman, a six year old mulatto male, and a four month old black male (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1850).

Lang’s marriage later ended with a particularly unpleasant divorce. Though the specific reasons are not mentioned, Hausman filed a suit for divorce on October 9, 1848 (First Judicial District Court 1848). Hausman soon after tried to seize the entirety of his estate and had a new inventory drawn when the notary refused to process the document (Reeves 2014).

The fact that a divorce even occurred is a significant event as biographies and testimonies of the time state how rare they generally were (Rightor 1900:285; Ripley 1912:91). After the termination of his marriage, Lang purchased the 2603 Lakeshore Drive lot in Mandeville in 1849 (Doriocourt 1849). As the date is not specified in records, the house was constructed some time from 1850 to 1852 though definitely completed by the latter. It is also unclear how often he resided in the house, but based on the culture of excursions in New Orleans, he probably used it as a summer home.

Lang returned to Arlon a few years after the house was completed. He died there on March 29, 1861, possibly from a flu or pneumonia. Curiously, his last will and testament makes no mention of his daughter as he clearly states that he has no children from his marriage—a likely scenario is that she died rather young and could not be found in Orleans Parish death records (Lang 1861). Whatever the case, he transferred the entirety of his estate to his friend and
agent, Laurent Durand. Because of the Civil War, Durand withheld the house from the market until 1866 in the belief that prices in Mandeville were too depressed to sell the property (Reeves 2014).

Lang’s reputation as a tobacconist must have been well established—an individual named L. Moulor published advertisements (Figure 7) in both the English and French editions of *The Opelousas Courier* stating that he was the successor of Lang and would continue the quality products of Lang’s businesses (Moulor 1869a:1; Moulor 1869b:2). Even more so, Molour purchased bilingual weekly advertisements in *The Opelousas Courier* for the entire year of 1869.

Around this time, a watercolor drawing (Figure 8) by artist P.N. Judice was used to advertise Lang’s house in Mandeville for sale (Judice 1866). However, some aspects of the house were either fabricated or exaggerated such as there being two chimneys instead of one and five windows in place of three. This means either the image was fabricated to enhance the quality of the house to make it easier to sell or the artist had not seen the house in person and used his imagination to create details about how the house could have looked (Reeves 2014). A smaller map (Figure 9) published with this drawing seems to have reversed the two *galleries*—the larger one is drawn to the back of the house and the smaller in the front. There is also a cistern depicted as a blue circle behind a corner of the house which does not presently exist. Additionally, this map shows a small two-room structure to the northwest of this house; this could possibly be the detached kitchen or *cuisine d’été*. There is an even smaller one-room structure to the left of this which could indicate a privy, though this was not confirmed archaeologically. One three room structure is indicated on the map, as well as a smaller one room structure next to it; these are probably stables and a shed.
Figure 4 - Excerpt from the 1850 U.S. Census (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1850)

Figure 5 - Excerpt from the 1850 U.S. Census on Lang’s slaves (U.S. Bureau of the Census 18
Figure 6 – Advertisement in *Le Meschacébé* (Lang 1854)

Figure 7 – Advertisement for M. Moulor in *The Opelousas Courier* (Moulor 1869b)
A Sanborn Fire Insurance Map from January 1926 (Figure 10) also depicts this possible detached kitchen, now shown slightly larger and attached to the main house structure (Sanborn Maps Co. 1926). The stables indicated by an “X” on this map is more than likely the three-bay structure to the back of the house in the map attached to the 1866 watercolor. These stables are currently converted into an apartment with an attached shed. Compared to the 1866 watercolor, the scaling is a bit off. This would either indicate that the stables were moved or simply a discrepancy from the artist. If the stables are accurate, however, this would be an anchor in time for any possible GIS. Around the 1920s or 1930s, a staircase was added to the rear-loggia of the house as it appears to be American Craftsman style (Le Breton 2012).

Another map was completed April 19, 1984, by surveyor Richard B. Edwards, who is currently company president of Mandle-Edwards Surveying (Figure 11). The previously-detached kitchen was demolished in the 1970s; as such it is not featured on this map. Recent additions to the house such as carport, outdoor patio, and swimming pool are indicated (Edwards 1984). As previously stated, the stables are probably the “Apt./Shed” shown on the map. There is also an “Old Pool” listed behind the other swimming pool; the Jourdans believe it to be a Works Progress Administration era-pool from the late 1930s or early 1940s (Jourdan 2014).

From January through March of 1996, R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc. carried out a Phase I cultural resources survey of a 200 meter square block of Mandeville for the Army Corps of Engineers and in response to a hurricane protection program that would enclose parts of the city. The authors carried out archival research about cultural resources in the project area, consisting primarily of standing architecture with limited shovel testing in the area as well (Williams, et al. 1996:i-ii).
Figure 8 - Illustration of the Lang-Jourdan House by P.N. Judice (Judice 1866)

Figure 9 - Enlarged excerpt from the Judice map of Lang’s property (Judice 1866)
Figure 10 – Reproduction of the 1926 Sanborn Map (Sanborn Maps Co. 1926)

Figure 11 - Excerpt from the 1984 Edwards Map (Edwards 1984)
In contrast to other houses surveyed, the Lang-Jourdan House was given relatively little focus by the authors; the owners are not mentioned and the house was not given a name. It was designated *Standing Structure Survey Number 52-278* with the following description and suggested historic significance:

This wood-frame, one-story building is clad with clapboard. The house is supported on brick piers. The side-gabled roof is clad with shingles. The full facade front gallery is screened. The central doorway has a transom. The windows have shutters. This building is located along Lakeshore Drive, the premier residential street in the city of Mandeville. Mandeville possesses the qualities for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as an historic district under Criteria A and C (Williams, et al. 1996:105).

Little other information was given. The condition of the house was marked as good, and the structural material was listed as having a wood frame. The only discrepancy on the part of the authors was listing the house’s construction date as circa 1900.

Significant damage to the house was dealt by Hurricane Katrina in August 2005, leaving it in a state of limbo for many years with the Jourdans unsure of what to do with the property due to the cost of repairs. The house was listed in Sally Reeves’ *Historic Survey of Mandeville, Louisiana* in 2009. The purpose of the survey was to inspect and evaluate the architecture of every house in Old Mandeville and provide historical information as well as condition of the houses (Reeves 2009). The apparent condition was described as “very poor” and the use as “abandoned” (Reeves 2009:48)

On January 27, 2011, the Mandeville City Council voted 3-2 to move the house to the Kierr Gardens at Carroll Street at a cost of $140,000. The house was moved in October of 2011 by Patterson Structural Shoring & Moving accompanied by a second-line parade (Warren 2011). As of the writing of this thesis, the house is being repaired to prevent further damage as well as being renovated with period-specific furnishings (Mathews 2013).
Chapter 4: Methodology and Fieldwork

Field Methods

Initial shovel testing began on October 6, 2012, with a team of volunteers consisting of undergraduate students, graduate students, and local individuals interested in history (Figures 12 and 13). The specific locations of the first twelve shovel test pits were based on approximate locations of the house from the 1984 Edwards map (Figure 14): the front of the house and surrounding porch (Shovel Test Pits 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, and 11), just to the west of the center of the house in an attempt to find the old chimney space (Shovel Test Pit 5), the corners of the raised cabinet at the northwest corner of the house to locate the cave (Shovel Test Pits 3, 4, 6, and 7), and the northeast corner of the house (Shovel Test Pit 12). Additionally, on October 12, 2012, a line of five shovel tests were excavated along the west side of the house in an attempt to locate the detached kitchen as depicted on the 1866 map. A grab sample of surface finds was also collected.

All of the seventeen shovel test pits were 40 centimeters by 40 centimeters in size, and the soil was dry screened through screens outfitted with ¼ inch mesh hardware cloth. All the artifacts were placed in plastic bags with provenience information written on the outside of each bag. The final depth of the shovel tests ranged from 23 to 57 centimeters below ground surface depending on when sterile soil was encountered or when obstacles such as ceramic pipes or wooden boards prevented further excavation. Each of the shovel test pits were given a form to record excavation method, recovery method, artifacts encountered, a wall profile, and Munsell soil readings. Photographs were taken of some side walls with unusual stratigraphy. After the
artifact recovery, recording and photographing, the screened soil was returned to the shovel test pit.

The same team returned to the site from January 3 to January 8, 2013 (Figure 15). A 4 meter by 4 meter block excavation was laid out around Shovel Test Pits 3 and 4 in an attempt to locate the cave. The soils and sediments in the area around the cave were assumed to be disturbed by the relocation of the house and the subsequent filling and leveling of the site. As that proved to be the case, we shovel, trowel, and hand sorted the disturbed context to recover diagnostic artifacts thought likely related to the cave.

In addition, we excavated three 1 meter by 1 meter test units near Shovel Test Pits 15 and 16 in a further effort to locate the structural remains of the detached kitchen and any associated midden (Test Units 1, 2, and 3). Finally, one .50 meter x .35 meter test pit was excavated on the southeast corner of the cave to check for the presence of artifacts and features related to the construction of the cave. A complete site map is detailed in Figure 16.

**Laboratory Methods and Analysis**

The artifacts were washed, identified, and categorized at the Louisiana State University Regional Archaeology Program laboratory and will be curated at the LSU Museum of Natural Science. All artifacts were washed with a toothbrush unless it was decided to be too fragile. If this was the case, the artifact was either dry-brushed or left alone. If the artifact was large enough, it was labeled according to the curation guidelines of the LSU Museum of Natural Science. The artifacts were divided into eight categories: ceramics, glass, metal, building materials, faunal remains, personal items, modern, and miscellaneous.
Figure 12 - Shovel test excavations from the south

Figure 13 - Shovel test excavations from the north
Figure 14 - The 12 Shovel Tests based off Approximate Locations of the Edwards Map
Figure 15 - Map of the Lang-Jourdan House Site illustrated by Rob Mann
Specifically, for ceramics, the ware (such as pearlware, whiteware, or ironstone), decoration (hand-painted or transfer-printed), form (plate, bowl, or hollowware), and alterations such as burning were recorded. After this process I cross-mended ceramics across all levels and units. Information from ceramics was attained from Ivor Noël Hume’s (1969) *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America*, Stanley South’s (1977) *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*, and
George L. Miller’s (1991) “A Revised Set of CC Index Values for Classification and Economic Scaling of English Ceramics from 1787 to 1880” in *Historical Archaeology*.

Analysis of glass consisted first of sorting the glass artifacts into either window or vessel glass and then by color. There was not enough window glass found to warrant an analysis of window thickness as a dating method. The next step was to develop a typology for the glass vessel fragments found, the specifics of which will be detailed in Chapter 6. The main references I used as such were Rex L. Wilson’s (1981) *Bottles on the Western Frontier*, Ronald R. Switzer’s (1974) *The Bertrand Bottles*, Jones and Sullivan’s (1989) *The Parks Canada Glass Glossary*, and Olive Jones’ (1971) article in *Historical Archaeology* “Glass Bottle Push-ups and Pontil Marks.”

Most of the metal artifacts found on site were too corroded as to be identifiable. Some nails could be identified as either machine-cut or wire nails. Some tin can fragments were also identified. Information on nails was acquired using William Hampton Adams’s (2002a) article in *Historic Archaeology* “Machine Cut Nails and Wire Nails: American Production and Use for Dating 19th-Century and Early-20th-Century Sites” as well as Jay D. Edwards and Tom Wells’ 1993 book *Historic Louisiana Nails: Aids to the Dating of Old Buildings*.

Building materials primarily consisted of mortar, asbestos tiles, roofing slate, ceramic floor tiles, plaster, and brick. Brick was counted, weighed, and discarded in the field.

Faunal remains were cleaned delicately, identified to the lowest possible taxonomic category by Amy Mann, and weighed. If identification to the level of species was not possible, categorizes such as *large unidentified mammal* or *unidentified avian* were utilized. Markings such as burns or scrapes were noted in comments. All faunal remains were then collected into a
list of species noting the number of identified specimens, minimum number of individuals, and weight.

Personal artifacts consisted of buttons, white clay pipe stems and bowls, and other small adornments associated with dress, and toys such as marbles. The majority of the buttons were nineteenth-century ceramic Prosser buttons and were catalogued using Roderick Sprague’s (2002) “China or Prosser Button Identification and Dating” in *Historical Archaeology*. Stanley South’s button typology in Ivor Noël Hume’s (1969) *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America* was utilized when applicable. Information about tobacco pipes was found in Charles Bradley’s (2000) “Smoking Pipes for the Archaeologist” in *Studies in Material Culture Research*.

Apparent modern artifacts such as cola cans, paper bar codes, molded plastics, and rubber washers were noted and catalogued. Contemporary artifacts that were known to be of the last few years at the ground surface or in the A Horizon were discarded in the field.

All other miscellaneous artifacts were catalogued as such, but the majority of these were left as unidentified.
Chapter 5: Artifacts Recovered

Ceramics

A total of 128 ceramic sherds were found at the Lang-Jourdan House Site, a fairly small number for a historic site; no prehistoric ceramics were recovered (Table 1). Some of these ceramics must have had a long life span, as the house was constructed in the 1850s and the date range for wares such as pearlware can date from 1775 to 1840 (Hume 1969; South 1977). The majority of sherds recovered were ironstone and soft-paste or semi-porcelain with small amounts of pearlware, whiteware, and yellowware.

The majority of the ceramics were undecorated (Table 2). One soft-paste porcelain plate excavated from the cave area was decorated with a polychrome underglaze decalcomania with gold gilded edges (Cat # 19-1). The most common decorative type was transfer-print. Other decoration types were blue edge decorated and polychrome hand-painted. None of ceramic sherds possessed identifiable makers’ marks—the most discernable was an undecorated ironstone plate that contained a British escutcheon with the word Iron (Cat # 29-1).

The most recent ware type recovered was Fiesta. Fiesta is a brand of dinnerware glazed in bright colors and manufactured by the Homer Laughlin China Company of Newell, West Virginia, first introduced in 1936. Because of both its affordability and modern design, many consumers saw it as the epitome of a successful, middle class home (Huxford and Huxford 2005). These ceramic sherds were found in Shovel Test Pit 3 and the cave area and are most likely from the mid-twentieth century occupation of the house.

The majority of the identifiable ceramics recovered were flatwares rather than hollowwares. Laurie A. Wilkie (2000:141) has suggested that this represents a higher social
status due to grilled or baked foods having more prestige than soup or stew dishes. A lack of artifacts associated with food preparation and storage also suggest this notion as food was possibly prepared elsewhere.

Table 1 - Ceramic Vessel Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sherds #</th>
<th>Sherds %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiesta</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>62.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Earthenware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-Paste or Semi-Porcelain</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 - Ceramic Vessel Breakdown by Decoration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sherds #</th>
<th>Sherds %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buff-glazed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decalcomania</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-painted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt-glazed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-printed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>85.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glass

A relatively small number (n=109) of window glass was found on site. Historical archaeologists have known for decades that the thickness of flat glass used in windows is a good temporal indicator as window glass gradually became thicker over time. There have been numerous approaches to correlate date ranges on sites based on location and manufacture by various researchers (Weiland 2009:29). However, as the sample size was moderately small, and
the dates of occupation of the house were well-known, I decided there was no real need to use such a dating method.

There was enough information on vessel glass as to warrant its own chapter which follows. In summary, a total of thirty-three bottle bases, twenty-two bottle finishes and necks, two demijohn finishes and necks, two embossed body shards, one medicine bottle, and one entirely reconstructed bottle were recovered.

**Metals**

As previously stated, metal preservation on site was quite poor. The majority of metal artifacts found were corroded chunks of rust. Items that were able to be identified were nails, tin can fragments, bullet casings, and miscellaneous brass, copper, and lead fragments. Despite the level of corrosion, numerous nails were recovered. Fifty-seven machine-cut square nails, sixty-two wire nails, and ninety-four unidentified nails were excavated; the site was too recent for hand-wrought nails (Table 3).

Wood-framed structures built from 1830 to 1860 were generally constructed almost entirely with machine-cut square nails. Structures that were built from 1860 to the late 1870s generally yield 100% to 30.2% machine-cut square nails. This lower range of machine-cut square nails to wire nails reflects the long-term occupation of the site as wire nails began to replace machine-cut square nails by the 1890s due to cost (Adams 2002a:80). As the Lang-Jourdan House was constructed in the mid-1850s and occupied for over a century, the ratio of machine-cut square nails to wire nails seems to fit with Adams’ model.

The dominant machine-cut square nail in Louisiana from c. 1836 to 1885 was the Type 8 nail as defined by Edwards and Wells. Small, square heads were most common, with the face of
the nail rounded, and the sides indented (Edwards and Wells 1993:56). The majority of machine-cut square nails from the Lang-Jourdan House correspond with this type. Types 10 and 12 of wire nails were most common in Louisiana from c.1885 to the present day. They are characterized by being face-pinched, with burrs on the same side, and cut off flat points (Edwards and Wells 1993:58-59).

The only other metal objects of note were tin can fragments (n=124). The majority of these fragments were excavated from Test Unit 2, Level 2, though a small amount was found in Test Unit 3, Level 2, Zone B, as well as Test Unit 3, Level 3. These fragments were also too corroded as to be unidentifiable. Other metal objects found were a .22 caliber cupreous shell casing, a padlock, and undeterminable brass, copper, lead fragments.

Table 3 - Metal Objects Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metal Type</th>
<th>Metal #</th>
<th>Metal %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullet Casing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can Fragments</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>17.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine-Cut Square Nails</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padlock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>51.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Nails</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>13.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire Nails</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Materials**

The most common household building material found in the field was brick which weighed 1.27 kilograms. The majority of brick was weighed and discarded in the field, but a
small amount was bagged. None of the bricks were branded with a manufacturer’s name or location. The greatest concentration of brick came from Shovel Test Pits 3 and 4, directly above the cave area.

A great deal of purple-tinted roofing slate \((n=277)\) was uniformly spread throughout the Lang-Jourdan House Site—it was recovered in every shovel test pit, the cave area, and each test unit. This is most likely the result of Hurricane Katrina and other tropical storms destroying the roof and blowing pieces of slate across the yard. Similarly, asbestos floor tiles were spread across the yard \((n=100)\). Cement and mortar accounted for a total of 149 artifacts with a total weight of 1,033.6 g. A small amount of ceramic tiles, paint chips, plaster, and window slate were also recovered (Table 4).

Table 4 - Building Materials Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials #</th>
<th>Materials %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Floor Tiles</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Tile</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar with Plaster</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint Chips</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing Slate</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rope</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Drainage Tile</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glazing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shells**

Though shells are classified as fauna, I have not included them in the section on faunal remains. The brackish water clam Rangia \((Rangia cuneata)\) was consumed by some Native
American tribes of the area and are still eaten in some parts of the country today (McIntire 1958:45, 48). However, these shells are more generally used in the construction of roadways, parking lots, and levees (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1987). I have interpreted the Rangia shells on the site as fill for paving. A total of 106 grams of Rangia shells were collected. Similarly, oysters have an extensive culinary history in Louisiana, but they are also used as fill in construction paving—the dominant species in the Gulf Coast region being the American Oyster, *Crassostrea virginica* (Hastings 2009:206). A total of 2.04 kilograms of oyster shells were collected. Both Rangia and oyster shells were recovered from almost every Shovel Test Pit and Test Unit.

**Faunal Remains**

Besides shell, the amount of faunal remained recovered from was 38.40 grams (Table 5). The total number of identified specimens was twenty-two. The total mammal weight recovered was 28 grams. Pig (*Sus scrofa*) represented 85% and unidentified mammals (possibly cow) were 15%. Both the pig and unidentified mammal bones showed possible signs of preparation in both cut marks and burning. The total bird (*Aves*) weight was 3.10 grams. Either goose (*Anserini*) or turkey (*Meleagris*) made up 52%, chicken (*Gallus gallus*) was 39%, and an unidentified species of waterfowl (*Anseriformes*) made up 10%. Turtle (*Emydidae*) plastron accounted for the total *Testudines* with 1.40 grams. Finally, the total weight of the Osteichthyes was 0.6 grams—50% was made up of the sheepshead (*Archosargus probatocephalus*) while the other 50% was unidentifiable. A total of 5.30 grams of faunal remains were unidentifiable.

All of the faunal remains found were in the same general area: Shovel Test Pits 15 and 16 as well as Test Units 2 and 3 between them. The presence of cut and burned faunal remains
concentrated specifically in this area strongly suggests the detached kitchen was once located there.

Table 5 - Species List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxa</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>NISP</th>
<th>NISP %</th>
<th>MNI #</th>
<th>MNI %</th>
<th>Wt, g</th>
<th>Wt %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Mammalia</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mammalia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anserini/Meleagris</em></td>
<td>Goose/Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gallus gallus</em></td>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Anseriformes</td>
<td>Waterfowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Aves</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emydidae</em></td>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Testudines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Archosargus probatocephalus</em></td>
<td>Sheepshead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Osteichthyes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Osteichthyes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Items**

Buttons were the most common personal item recovered at the Lang-Jourdan House, spread fairly uniformly around the site. Of these twenty, one was bone, one was brass, two were shell, four were plastic, and thirteen were ceramic Prosser buttons. Prosser buttons are high-fired ceramic “china” buttons made by tempering moist clay with quartz and pressing the mixture into cast-iron molds. This process gives the back of the button a rough, pebbly surface making it easily identifiable and separate from smooth glass buttons (Sprague 2002:111). Before the advent of Prosser buttons in the 1840s, buttons were laboriously made by hand from bone, shell, glass, or metal. A possible interpretation for the greater amount of Prosser buttons is widespread industrialization and commercialism during this time period (Sprague 2002:124). An individual
would more likely be concerned for more intricately crafted coat jacket buttons rather than the smaller, inexpensive Prosser buttons which were scattered throughout the site.

Unusual for a historic site, and especially unusual because Lang was a tobacco merchant, there were only eight white clay pipe fragments recovered from the site—one bowl and seven stem fragments. They were simple two-unit pipes consisting of a bowl and shank. Affordable and disposable, such pipes dominated the American market from the 1840s to the early 1900s and became synonymous with the later American clay pipe industry (Pfeiffer 1981:109). One may think it unusual that only these plain, austere pipes were recovered, since pipes of the late nineteenth century tended to be heavily decorated (Bradley 2000:114), and given Lang’s wealth and occupation as a tobacco merchant, one could assume he would have possessed more ornate pipes.

There are a few possibilities as to this infrequency. The aforementioned white clay pipes were affordable and disposable throughout the nineteenth century in Canada and the United States (Walker 1970:19). They may have been smoked by those who worked at Lang’s residence rather than by Lang himself. Likewise, those conventional pipes were popular amongst French Canadians, but the French Creoles in New Orleans preferred to enjoy tobacco in different forms. New Orleans’ close proximity to Cuba and other islands gave the city a Caribbean influence, and cigars were an exotic luxury for the social elite (Dawdy et al. 2008:95). As Lang’s store was classified as a “cigar store” in city directories (Cohen 1851), and several advertisements stated the quality of the store’s cigars (Lang 1854), it is quite likely he enjoyed to smoke cigars rather than pipes.
Chapter 6: Cave Excavation and Associated Vessels

The working hypothesis before excavation was that the cave would contain disturbed soils and modern earth fill due to the house being relocated. A 4 meter x 4 meter block excavation unit was laid out around the perimeter of the cave in hopes of finding the brick foundation and associated walls. Additionally, there were hopes of finding a builders’ trench around the exterior of the cave to ascertain information on how the structure was constructed.

Partial excavation of the 4 meter x 4 meter block demonstrated that the area around the cave was severely disturbed during the relocation of the house and the dirt used to fill in the area was probably nineteenth-century midden tossed under the house used to level the ground surface. This was supported by a high density of olive green bottle and demijohn fragments. Because it was deemed impractical to collect every individual artifact, diagnostic artifacts such as finishes/necks and bases were collected in addition to shards found in close association with them in the hopes of mending. A total of thirty-one olive green bottle bases, eleven olive green bottle finishes/necks, and two demijohn finish/necks were recovered from the cave area. Sixty-four olive green body shards were unable to be mended to any base or neck. Only one olive green bottle could be totally reconstructed from twenty-six fragments.

In addition to olive green glass bottle fragments, a few other vessel fragments were recovered from the cave area. One salt-glazed, Bristol-slipped ginger beer bottle finish/neck was found. Five aqua glass bottle finish/necks were recovered along with one aqua glass vessel base. Three embossed clear vessel glass shards were found along with a whole clear medicine bottle produced by the Owens manufacturing company.
Finally, a small number of other diagnostic glass vessels were found in other units. One olive green finish/neck and one aqua bottle base were found in Test Unit 2, and four olive green finishes/neck and one clear bottle finish/neck were found in Test Unit 3.

**Bottle Typology**

The typology used for classifying and documenting the bottle fragments was primarily based on Ronald R. Switzer’s (1974) *The Bertrand Bottles* with alterations when needed. There were a total of eighteen different categories for the different characteristics of each vessel fragment though not all of these categories were applicable for some artifacts. For example, an olive green bottle base would not have information on its neck or finish dimensions because it was not present.

The catalogue number and name of the artifact was the first information given, an example of the latter being “Olive Green Bottle Finish and Neck.” Next, the material of the vessels was described as either earthenware or glass. Color was then indicated. The following sections are neck, shoulder, body, and base shapes each divided into horizontal and vertical cross-sections as well as any distinctive markings. Afterwards, specific measurements were given when applicable such as the base diameter, kickup height, bore diameter, and lip height. Finally, any additional information such as pontil marks or mold seams was noted in a comments section (Appendix B: Vessels Excavated from the Lang-Jourdan House Site). A breakdown of the diagnostic vessels by color and type are shown in Tables 6 and 7 respectively.

All interpretations of the contents of these vessels are based on morphological designs and patterns from contemporaneous sources since no complete vessels were found and none were labeled with either obvious embossing or a wax or foil seal. Additionally, bottles from
Historic sites are often reused for storing items for which they were not originally intended, making concise identification of the contents difficult (Adams 2002b:50).

**Table 6 - Breakdown of Diagnostic Vessels by Color**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Materials #</th>
<th>Materials %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7 - Breakdown of Diagnostic Vessels by Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Materials #</th>
<th>Materials %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Bases</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Finishes and Necks</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demijohn Finishes and Necks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embossed Body Shards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstructed Bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demijohns**

Demijohns (also called *carboys*) are large, narrow-necked glass bottles that generally contained a capacity of two to five gallons of liquid. The shape of the vessel was globular or cylindrical and the vessel was often encased within woven wicker or wax to protect the bottle during transportation (Jones and Sullivan 1989:72; Lindsey 2014). Two demijohn finishes/necks were found in the cave area. Both were olive green with a rounded side lip and flattened string rim. One (Cat # 19-25, Figure 17) was estimated to have a rim diameter of 6.0 cm and a bore diameter of 5.0 cm. The other (Cat # 19-24) was too badly damaged to estimate size. Twenty-four demijohn fragments (Cat # 19-57) were shovel sorted from the cave area. Five shards were
mended to one, and six shards were mended to two; these body shards were unable to be mended further and did not mend to either of the demijohn finishes/necks (Figure 18).

**Ale Bottles**

One of the most common vessel styles recovered from the cave area was a dark olive green bottle cast in a dip mold that possessed a rounded side lip, down-tooled string rim, cylindrical body, and a sand-tipped pontil scar. This finish with a rounded side lip and down-tooled string rim is commonly known as a mineral or double oil finish when describing bottles in general but called an export finish when used on a beer bottle (Jones and Sullivan 1989:79; Lindsey 2014; Wilson 1981:5). Seven of these necks/finishes (Cat #s 19-14, 19-15, 19-16, 19-17, 19-18, 19-19, 19-20) possessed extremely similar dimensions in terms of average bore diameter, lip and string-rim height, as well as finish height. One (Cat # 19-15) still possessed a muselet (cork wire) to seal the bottle, though the cork itself was missing (Figure 19).

The two most common bottle bases recovered from the cave area are the same dark olive green color with a concave, round base and a cylindrical, round body. The first type had an average basal diameter of 6.5 cm. The average kickup height of the first type was 2.2 cm. The second type was just slightly larger with an average basal diameter of 7.7 cm. The average kickup height of the second type was 2.4 cm. These bases were cast in a dip mold with an orange peel textured, sand-tipped pontil mark in the center (Figure 20). As these necks/finishes and bases were the most common diagnostic fragments excavated from the cave area, I assume they were originally from the same bottle though none were able to be mended.

The dimensions are almost identical to the Class I, Type 3 bottles recovered from the Bertrand (Switzer 1974:17-18). Switzer himself was unable to determine if this type of bottles
contained ale though they were morphologically similar to the other ale bottles recovered from
the ship (Switzer 1974:9). Chronologically, the ale bottles from the Bertrand date from around
the 1860s and were similar to other contemporaneous ale bottles such as the beer bottles found at
Fort Union and Fort Laramie during the late nineteenth century (Wilson 1981:2-3). Based on
these morphological characteristics, I interpret these vessel fragments from the Lang-Jourdan
cave area to be ale bottles.

Champagne Bottles

The design of champagne bottles has stayed fairly uniform over the last few centuries. The bottle originally referred to the vessel that contained the sparkling wine produced in the
Champagne region of France but is also used by archaeologists and collectors for the general
shape of the bottle. These bottles are almost always olive green and have thicker glass than wine
bottles to withstand internal pressure due to carbonation. They have a moderate height with long
sloping sides which is usually topped by a champagne style single-banded finish (Jones and
Sullivan 1989:79, 83; Lindsey 2014). Additionally, champagne bottles are distinguished by
possessing a large mamelon, a prominent protrusion at the tip of the pushup. Though other wine
bottles may have a mamelon, the ones on champagne bottles are much more pronounced (Jones

Three finishes/necks recovered from the cave area were olive green and had champagne
finishes. Two of these (Cat # 19-22 and 19-23) possessed the same dimensions of bore diameter,
lip, string-rim, and finish height. These finishes/necks had a sloped top with a flattened string rim
(Figure 21). The other (Cat # 19-21) had a smaller lip height but with a flattened top. Likewise,
three olive green bottles based recovered from the cave area also had pronounced mamelons.
Two of these bases (Cat # 19-55 and 19-56) had very similar basal diameter and kickup heights. Both had a heavy patina and were free-blown. The other (Cat # 19-53) was slightly larger than the previous two but was instead blown in a dip mold.

Knowing these champagne bottles were either free-blown or blown in a dip mold firmly sets production date of these bottles at the mid to late nineteenth century (Jones and Sullivan 1989:26; Miller and Sullivan 1984:88-89). Though these vessels have the morphological characteristics of champagne bottles, this does not necessarily mean they contained sparkling wine from the Champagne region of France (Jones 1986:13). However, most champagne bottles of this time period contained French wine (Jones and Sullivan 1989:79; Lindsey 2014).

Wine Bottles

Save for the demijohns and champagne bottles, the vessels at the Lang-Jourdan House that contained wine are almost certainly *Bordeaux* type bottles, also called *claret* bottles. *Bordeaux* bottles are olive green and are characterized by a champagne finish, a tall body with cylindrical sides, a moderately steep shoulder, and a moderate to deep pushup with a slight mamelon (Lindsey 2014; Wilson 1981:19-20). This style of bottle is most similar to the Class III, Type 2 bottles recovered from the *Bertrand* (Switzer 1974:23-26); these bottles were French in origin and date from 1864 to 1865. *Bordeaux* bottles were also excavated at the late-nineteenth century frontier post of Fort Union, New Mexico; these bottles were catalogued as “Type 55 (French wine bottle)” and possessed similar dimensions as the ones recovered from the *Bertrand* (Wilson 1981:20-21).

Certain bottle bases (Cat # 19-26 and 19-27) recovered from the *cave* area were most certainly from *Bordeaux* bottles. These bottles were light olive green, free-blown, possessed a
sand-tipped pontil rod scar, and massive kick-ups (Figure 23). The first had a basal diameter of 7.6 cm with a kickup height of 8.3 cm; the other a basal diameter of 5.5 cm with a kickup height of 6.2 cm. Two finishes and necks (Cat #27-6 and 27-7) are likewise from Bordeaux bottles. They are light olive green, free-blown, with a champagne finish, tall body, and steeped shoulders (Figure 22).

**Miscellaneous Bottles**

The following bottles did not have enough information for a heading of their own; some of these categories include bitters bottles, ginger beer bottles, and medicine bottles.

A dark olive green bottle finish and neck (Cat # 19-13) almost certainly represents a bitters bottle based on its large, flattened side lip and a down-tooled and rounded string lip (Switzer 1974:34-35; Wilson 1981:23-24). These bottles were often blown in a two-piece mold and are characterized by a tall, square body and short neck. The style depicted on this finish and neck was most common between 1850 and 1880, which fits easily within the occupation dates of the Lang-Jourdan House (Lindsey 2014). Bitters were initially formulated to have medicinal value and contained a variety of substances such as gentian root, hops, quinine, and bitter orange peel along with aromatic herbal flavorings and an alcohol content as high as forty percent. Manufactures in the nineteenth century marketed bitters as being able to cure just about everything, including constipation, diarrhea, cholera, and malaria despite contemporary knowledge stating it had little medicinal value (Polak 1997:84; Wilson 1981:23).

The only non-glass vessel excavated from the *cave* area was the finish and neck of a salt-glazed, Bristol-glazed ginger beer bottle (Cat # 19-11). The technique of Bristol glazing was developed in Bristol, England, in 1835 and was quickly emulated by American potters. The glaze
Figure 17 - Demijohn Finish and Neck (Cat # 19-25)

Figure 18 - Demijohn Fragments (Cat # 19-57)
Figure 19 - Ale Bottle Finishes and Necks (Cat #s 19-14 through 19-19)

Figure 20 - Ale Bottle Bases (Cat #s 19-30 through 19-33)
Figure 21 - Champagne Bottle Finish and Necks (Cat #s 19-22 and 19-23)

Figure 22 - Wine Bottle Finish and Necks (Cat #s 27-6 and 27-7)
Figure 23 - Wine Bottle Bases (Cat # 19-26 and 19-27)
is made using zinc oxide and only requires a single firing, which gives the vessel a polished, creamy glaze. Bristol-slipped stoneware generally dates to the nineteenth-century and was almost completed replaced by 1900 (Greer 1981:264; Hume 1969:324) which again places this fragment in the mid nineteenth-century occupation of the Lang-Jourdan House.

A small, clear medicine bottle (Cat # 19-72) recovered from the cave area was the only bottle with an identifiable maker’s mark—the logo of the Owens-Illinois Glass Company, an oval surrounded by a diamond. The Owens-Illinois Glass Company was founded in 1929 after the Owens Glass Company merged with the Illinois Glass Company (Lockhart 2004:24-25). The bottle has a height of 7.3 cm and a capacity of 3.5 ounces. It possesses a continuous thread lip, rounded string-rim, and a cylindrical, oval body. This particular bottle has two number fives on both sides of the Owens-Illinois logo. The first number represents the plant code and the following number is the date code. The first five is suggested by Julian Harrison Toulouse (1971:395) to mean this bottle was manufactured by a plant in Charlotte, Michigan, which ran from 1965 to the present day. The other five represents the year of manufacture, though this could mean 1965 or 1975 as the decade is not specified. Likewise, all dates from the method are approximated because of the imprecise nature of his graph (Lockhart 2004:27).

These bottle fragments excavated from the cave area can be firmly dated from the mid nineteenth to early twentieth century. These vessels contained everything from Bordeaux reds, champagne, ale, bitters, and medicine interpreted from the morphological characteristics of the bottles. The following chapter will detail exactly how these bottles were stored as well as larger issues of wine and hospitality in French Creole Louisiana.
Chapter 7: Of Caves and Class, Cordials and Cordiality

A secure, cool location in which to store wine is a notion that goes back as far as the production of wine itself. Sealed jars of wine were found in the Areni-1 cave complex in Vayots Dzor, Armenia, dating to around 4100 BCE (Berkowitz 1996). Cellars have ranged from simple wooden basements under meager houses to magnificent stone butteries beneath castles. The cave, derived from Latin cavus meaning a concave or cavity, has its origin in France and spread, through the process of colonization, to Canada and Louisiana.

Though it is far beyond the scope of this paper to trace the history of wine cellars from France to New France, the cave in traditional Canadian and mixed Canadien/Métis homes has been well-documented in history and archaeology (Gauthier-Larouche 1974; Hébert 2007; Lessard and Marquis 1972). The primary function of the cave in Canada was a cellar built below a house to be used for the storage of foodstuffs as well as wine, tobacco, and other valuables. Though they share similar names and etymology, the cave was a different structure than the caveau, also called the cavreau or caveau à legumes, which was external to the house and used primarily as a root cellar for the storage of vegetables (Hébert 2007:66).

The following Canadian historians and etymologists have written about the history and function of the cave, and the translations are my own. Michel Lessard and Huguette Marquis (1972:690) defined it as “lieu voûté ou partie d'un bâtiment qui est au-dessous du rez-de-chaussée résultant d'une excavation sous le premier plancher” (a vaulted room under a building’s ground floor resulting from digging below the first floor). Georges Gauthier-Larouche (1974:257) called it “une excavation sous les poutres intérieures (an opening under the floorboards).”
The *cave* was a common feature of Canadian houses during the nineteenth century and was often a pit dug below the floor of a house. As a result, the ceiling of the *cave* was the underside of the floor. In more complex *caves* the walls were reinforced with either wood or stone and divided into sections. The floor was generally made of compacted earth (Hébert 2007:66-67).

Similar to Canada, the *cave* made its way to Louisiana through Francophone cultural transmission. Dr. Jay Edwards and Nicolas Keriouk in their book *A Creole Lexicon: Architecture, Landscape, People* define the *cave* as such:

*Cave:* 1) France: a cellar, a subterranean room or space. 2) Upper Louisiana [also known as the Illinois Country in the upper Mississippi River Valley]: a root cellar, basement. 3) In reference to the raised Creole houses of Lower Louisiana: a secure pantry room in the *rez-de-chaussée* or ground floor, used for storing wine and foodstuffs. 4) Louisiana: a space used for storing wine under a *cabinet*, even when the house is not raised more than a foot or two. 5) The brick-enclosed base for a cistern or *pigeonnier*, where wine and perishable foodstuffs were stored (Edwards and Kariouk 2004:48).

From these definitions, it is clear that the function of the *cave* changed over time and location. Most of the *caves* in the state of Louisiana are a continuum between the third and fourth definitions depending on whether or not the house was raised. But the *cave* at the Lang-Jourdan House is unique because it combines aspects from the first, fourth, and five definitions—the structure was subterranean, it was primarily used to store wine and other beverages under a *cabinet*, and it was lined with brick. These are not the only attributes that make the structure significant.

As the *cabinet* of the Lang-Jourdan House was raised, the *cave* lies directly underneath the floor of the *cabinet* (Figure 24). The wooden floorboards and floor joists of the *cabinet* form the “ceiling” of the *cave*. Machine-cut square nails driven into of the wooden floor joists likely
functioned as hooks from which items could be hung. The walls and floor of the cave were lined with brick. Personal communication with the Jourdans demonstrates that the function of the cave did change over time. For instance, during their occupation of the house during the late twentieth century, it was used to store their hot water heater (Jourdan 2014).

However, the cave suffered significant damages when the house was relocated (Figure 25). The southeast corner of the cave was the only corner still intact. Both the east and south brick walls were roughly half of their original length. The bricks were laid horizontal on the southern wall and vertical on the eastern wall. For the largest section of the eastern wall, the bricks were laid perpendicular to the foundation. Bricks positioned at a forty-five degree angle beside the walls were interpreted to be a drainage system.

As previously stated, the majority of the cave was destroyed during the razing and relocation of the house; a large pile of bricks by the apartments are likely from the cave (Jourdan 2014). After the house was relocated, the earth was paved by a bulldozer and later leveled with fill dirt to cap and level the surface of the site. This would explain the substantial disturbance of the cave area and as to why there were bottle fragments there. There is no logical reason to store broken bottle fragments in one’s own cellar. The bottles were probably thrown under the house after being consumed, and their location in the cave area is a secondary or tertiary context due to the leveling of the site.

The cave at the Lang-Jourdan House was undeniably well-designed by whomever had it constructed. The builder had definitely taken the high water table and tropical storms of Louisiana into consideration. As such, the assertion brought by Edwards and Keriouk that the “cave, or semi subterranean cellar, so popular in France and Canada could not be reproduced in
Figure 24 – Exterior of the raised *cabinet* and the *cave*
Figure 25 - Southeast corner, brick floor, and drain of the cave
Southern Louisiana, where a few feet of digging brought one to the water table” (Edwards and Kariouk 2004:xxii) is clearly false. A similar statement was echoed by Liliane Crété: “None of the houses, not even the more recently built ones, had cellars, for in New Orleans one had only to plunge a spade into the ground to strike water” (Crété 1978:42-43).

**Louisiana Caves both Extant and Extinct**

When researching the concept of the *cave*, it was surprising to see how few extant examples there were in Louisiana, and as of the writing of this thesis, no comprehensive analysis of Louisiana *caves* has yet been written.

Because of the political and legal system of civil law in Louisiana, property, contractual, business, and marriage documents are all chronicled and stored in archives (Kinsella 1994). These documents included public auction sales of property throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Auctioneers would commission engineers to survey and illustrate the property beforehand, and these images would later be archived by the notary’s office (Toledano 2010:29).

As such, the New Orleans Notarial Archives contains building contracts as far back as 1767. Of the nearly 14,000 records in these building contacts from ranging from 1767 to 1970, only nine contain the mention of *caves*. However, it was impossible to discern which of these structures were still in existence since the only location given was the street name. In addition to these buildings, I was able to locate three other extant examples from architectural volumes (Appendix A: *Caves* Located in New Orleans and Surrounding Neighborhoods).

The majority of these houses were Creole cottages or townhouses constructed in New Orleans during the late eighteenth and early to mid-nineteenth centuries—the period from 1796
to 1822 defined as the “Boom Period of New Orleans’ Hospitality” (Dawdy et al. 2008:26). The addition or construction of a cave greatly increased the price of the residence compared to similar house types. Likewise, for each of houses that possessed descriptions about the caves, the authors would almost always mention their rarity and significance (Christovich and Evans 1995:120; Gross et al. 2007:67). The builders of the two houses on Bourbon and North Rampart Streets, François Correjolles and Jean Chaigneau, were described as “some of the best architects and builders of the day” (Christovich and Toledano 2003:59) As such, one can assume these caves were for wealthy individuals and were rare amenities.

The Creole aspect of the cave is most evident in the work of two architectural examples. Pierre Olivier and Francois Muro, who constructed the O’Brien Cottage on Kerlerec Street, were free men of color who constructed hundreds of buildings ranging from Creole cottages to double-story brick homes (Christovich and Toledano 2003:vi). Rosette Rochon was a free woman of color who was one of the first investors in the Faubourg Marigny. The Creole Cottage she owned on Dauphine Street was raised and contained a cave (Christovich and Evans 1995:120).

From what can be ascertained of the houses’ architectural styles, the caves tended to follow the third and fourth definitions of Edwards and Keriouk’s lexicon. The Bourgoyne House and the Cooper-Thomann House were clearly described as having their caves under the staircase (Gross et al. 2007:40, 48) while the O'Brien Cottage cave was built under one of the cabinets (Gross et al. 2007:66-67). The houses on Royal, Bourbon, and Dauphine Streets listed in the building contracts were likely elevated Creole cottages with the caves under the cabinets based on how they were described.
“Hurrah for Bordeaux Wine!”

Philosophers, authors, scientists, and social critics have been writing about wine for centuries. The French literary theorist and semiotician Roland Barthes wrote in *Mythologies* that wine was a *boisson-totem* or “totem drink” for the French. To Barthes, the production and consumption of wine is a quintessentially French practice. Wine is the great social equalizer, allowing the peasant to work in the fields with less travail and for the intellectual to loosen his snobbishness to converse with said worker (Barthes 1972:58)—albeit said with the same level of pretentiousness by Barthes. Red wine could also be considered sacred, its sanguine element associated with communion during the Last Supper (Barthes 1972:58). Finally, wine is associated with refreshment and satiation, so much so that the French are willing to ignore alcohol’s harmful health effects, and a meal without wine is considered exotic and bizarre (Barthes 1972:59-60).

Likewise, the importance of wine in Louisiana Creole culture cannot be overstated. Wine was not just a commodity; it was a political, ethnic, and cultural link back to France. During the spring of 1731, Edme-Gatien Salmon was appointed to the role of *commissaire-ordonnateur* of New Orleans; the function of this office was to govern the commercial, political, and judicial matters of the fledgling colony (Clark 1970:46; De Ville 1986:298). A hurricane in August of 1732 destroyed much of Salmon’s administrative documents. Salmon composed a letter to the French government stating the need for a building to protect such documents. After nine days, he wrote another letter, this time severely stressing the importance of wine and it storage in Louisiana as in the opening lines:
“Sir,

The difficulty of keeping wine here during hot weather because we cannot construct cellars (my emphasis), and the experience I had with the wine which I had saved for the hospitalized sick, of which some casks were spoiled, as well as [the wine] for my own use, having lost three casks, these things have determined me to build a vaulted brick building on the ground floor, adjoining the house I occupy…

My intent had been only to build an attic [above], but the rain which falls here in abundance often gets my papers and books wet; the last time, they were greatly damaged by the hurricane, the rain having come in all directions. This has determined me to build a room on the ground floor for the wine, and [instead of an attic] an office in which to house the papers and books, where I will be able to work with them” (De Ville 1986:299).

A reply from France never arrived, but the building was successfully completed by 1735, with Governor Bienville reporting that it was “necessary in order to keep Salmon’s papers.” There is some humor in the fact that the first archival building in Louisiana was erected in order to store wine, and almost as an afterthought, the colony’s “papers and books.”

Salmon’s letter also mentions the perceived impossibility of the construction of cellars in early eighteenth century New Orleans. The article in which this letter was cited, “Louisiana's First Archives Building: A Compromise with Wine in 1733” by Winston de Ville, annotates the italicized words stating, “Due, of course, to the high water table. It was probably not until the early twentieth century that underground cellars were built in New Orleans” (De Ville 1986:299). As stated in the previous section, caves are mentioned in New Orleans building contracts as early as 1796.

In addition to Salmon’s archives, another New Orleans structure with a confirmed subterranean structure was the Jesuit plantation on Felicity Street, formerly the plantation of Bienville. The Jesuits replaced the governor’s home with their monastery during the 1730s. When an inventory of the property was catalogued, one of the first architectural descriptions was

Even though New Orleans experienced economic hardships during the 1730s, annual wine and liquor consumption averaged 416 pints per person. Residents preferred Bordeaux wine and cognac brandy which were, of course, obtainable only in France. The Company of The Indies possessed a total monopoly on these goods (as well as tobacco and slaves) from 1717 to 1731. When the company went bankrupt, the colony was given complete economic control to the French crown. Demand for French wine never decreased and Louisiana cost France hundreds of thousands of livres annually (Clark 1970:61; Taylor 2002:386).

As a result of the Seven Years’ War, France ceded Louisiana to Spain in the 1763 Treaty of Paris. Much of the Creole population resented being under Spanish control. On March 23, 1766, the governor Antonio de Ulloa decreed that the colony would no longer trade with France or its colonies. Worse for his popularity, he ruled that wine could only be imported from Spain (Wilds et al. 1996:13). Inevitably, there was a rebellion in the fall of 1768. A group of armed Creoles fortified with both wine and muskets began protesting with the chant “Hurrah for the King! Hurrah for Good King Louis! Hurrah for Bordeaux wine! To hell with Catalanian rotgut!” (Crété 1978:14).

In addition to wine, hospitality and generosity to guests was a Creole virtue. “Hospitality was a cult in Louisiana,” writes Liliane Crété, “and the guest was treated like a sacred object. [Guests] sometimes lingered on for a couple of months without the hosts displaying the least sign that they had overstayed their welcome” (Crété 1978:96-97). Benjamin Henry Latrobe lamented in an 1819 journal entry that “the opportunities of growing rich by more active, extensive, and
intelligent modes of agriculture and commerce has diminished the hospitality, destroyed the leisure, and added more selfishness to the character of the Creoles” (Latrobe 1951:32).

Hospitality towards guests and tourists (as in the form of fine alcohols and tobacco) was one of the hallmarks of New Orleans from the colonial to the postbellum eras (Dawdy et al. 2008:46). It seems no surprise than Lang meant to continue that tradition across the lake during the summer months.
Jean-Baptiste Lang probably would not have thought his summer house in a burgeoning town across the lake from New Orleans would have lasted for over a hundred and fifty years. When he walked over to the raised *cabinet* of his cottage, and crept downward into the *cave* to fill a carafe of Bordeaux from a demijohn to entertain his guests, or grabbed a midnight cordial of port or sherry, the cellar was probably nothing more than a convenience. Likewise, to the family of Will Jourdan, the subterranean structure was merely used as storage for their hot water heater, no more significant than my own washroom. However, the historical and archaeological record indicates that these structures were not only rare throughout southern Louisiana, but an indication of social prestige throughout the French Creole world.

The purpose of this thesis was to determine the function of the *cave* at the Lang-Jourdan House. As previously mentioned, the specific research questions addressed were: (1) Can the *cave* be identified in the archaeological record? If it can be identified, what are its architectural details? How was it constructed? What does its construction state about the function of the *cave*? (2) What was stored in the *cave* and can this be determined archaeologically? (3) If the feature is subterranean, how well did it function in storing goods? How would it function during rain or flooding? (4) Can the detached kitchen be located as well as any associated midden? Furthermore, will the presence of such determine the function of the *cave*? The conclusions to these questions are summarized below.

Portions of the *cave* at the Lang-Jourdan House Site were located on January 5, 2013. Though the house was relocated months before, parts of the *cave’s* foundation remained in the earth. As the structure was located directly under a raised *cabinet*, the ceiling of the *cave* was the
floorboards of the *cabinet*. Machine-cut square nails of the mid-nineteenth century hammered into the walls suggest the notion that objects could be hung from them. The walls and floor of the *cave* were constructed of brick.

The high concentration of glass bottle fragments dating from the mid-nineteenth to the early twentieth century in the *cave* area suggest that its primary function was for the storage of wine and other alcoholic beverages. The reason such shards were present is most likely due to the fact that the bottles were thrown under the house when the contents were consumed; when the house was relocated, this previously undisturbed earth was leveled into the subterranean area by bulldozers. The lack of ceramic containers for storage of foodstuffs further suggests its purpose was more than mundane cold storage.

Taking into consideration the high water table and tropical storms of southern Louisiana, it seems impractical to construct a basement. However, the brick floor and drainage system of the *cave* suggest it was well designed and constructed by someone who anticipated the problems of Louisiana’s climate. Contemporary accounts by the family of Will Jourdan state that the room rarely flooded and was only damaged due to one of the deadliest storms in recorded history.

Though no structural remains of the detached kitchen were located, Test Units 2 and 3 contained artifacts of a late nineteenth century to early twentieth century domestic midden. Household serving ceramics were encountered in the forms of soft-paste porcelain, ironstone, and yellowware. Culinary bottle shards were also present. In addition, the highest concentration of faunal remains were found in these units, the assemblage consisted of pig, chicken, turkey, and fish with cut marks or burning present. These artifacts suggest there was once a detached kitchen, though further excavations could indicate structural features.
The *cave* can then be interpreted as a luxurious amenity that was in the houses of those with high social status throughout Louisiana. Though they may have originated as simple root cellars in Upper Louisiana, the excavations at the Lang-Jourdan House suggest they were for the storage of wine and other alcoholic beverages. The consumption of wine in the elite Creole society of New Orleans was an ethnic and cultural link to France. As such, the principal purpose of the *cave* can be linked to concepts of social prestige and hospitality.
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Appendix A: *Caves* Located in New Orleans and Surrounding Neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Owner/Name</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magazine</td>
<td>Gravier, Nicholas</td>
<td>Delery, Francois</td>
<td>&quot;Brick house with a stage. 40 x 28; w/gallery, 2 caves&quot; &quot;large cellar in masonry&quot;</td>
<td>Spanish Colonial</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>(Christovich and Swanson 1998:9; New Orleans Notarial Archives 2014:Qt. Proc. p. 197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourbon</td>
<td>Lebarre, J.T. Feullatre</td>
<td>Correjolles and Chaigneau</td>
<td>&quot;Maison de 4 piece, galerie cave, cabinet, chambre sur cave, grenier&quot;</td>
<td>Creole Cottage</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>(New Orleans Notarial Archives 2014:007/435)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rampart</td>
<td>Deverges, Pierre</td>
<td>Correjolles and Chaigneau</td>
<td>&quot;Maison 28'4&quot; x 45', 4 prime rooms; galleries et cabinets w/jalousie doors, cave&quot;</td>
<td>Creole Cottage</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>(New Orleans Notarial Archives 2014:007/381)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourbon</td>
<td>Bourgoyne House</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Cave is an outdoor pantry under the covered loggia&quot;</td>
<td>Creole Mansion</td>
<td>c1830</td>
<td>(Gross, et al. 2007:40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faubourg Marigny</td>
<td>Bobouam, Francois</td>
<td>Poree, Francois</td>
<td>&quot;House 4 rooms, 18.5' x 16.10', glazed gallery, 2 cab 6x10 w/caves; 4 bay&quot;</td>
<td>Creole Cottage</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>(New Orleans Notarial Archives 2014:7/79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baronne</td>
<td>Clay, Jean Francis</td>
<td>Fils, Francois</td>
<td>&quot;House, 29' Baronne x 45 Hevia, 11'10&quot; high; 4 rooms, gall, cabinet, cave&quot;</td>
<td>Creole Cottage</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>(New Orleans Notarial Archives 2014:22:58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bywater</td>
<td>Cooper-Thommann House</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;cave or storage closet under the staircase&quot;</td>
<td>Creole Townhouse</td>
<td>c1840</td>
<td>(Gross, et al. 2007:48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Owner/Name</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerlerec</td>
<td>Martinez, Charles O’Brien Cottage</td>
<td>Olivier and Muro</td>
<td>&quot;1 cabinet over a cave&quot; &quot;cave, or storage room; a rare feature to survive, it makes the house even more valuable&quot;</td>
<td>Galleried Creole Cottage</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>(Gross, et al. 2007:66-67; New Orleans Notarial Archives 2014:086/429)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Mascaro, Antonio Chaigneau, Alf, and Dre</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Masion basse en brigues, double, dormers, overhang, 4 rooms, 2 caves&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>(New Orleans Notarial Archives 2014:#66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carondelet</td>
<td>Vidici, Philippe Gobet, Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Move a house to from Carondelet or Derb; Add kitchen, 25x4, cave or cistern&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>(New Orleans Notarial Archives 2014:3:73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauphine</td>
<td>Rochon, Rosette</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Elevated from the ground and had a cave&quot;</td>
<td>Creole Cottage</td>
<td>c1860</td>
<td>(Christovich and Evans 1995:120)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: Vessels Excavated from the Lang-Jourdan House Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Catalogue Name</th>
<th>Neck Shape</th>
<th>Shoulder Shape</th>
<th>Body Shape</th>
<th>Base Shape</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Neck Finish Type</th>
<th>Base Diameter</th>
<th>Kickup Height</th>
<th>Bottle Height</th>
<th>Bore Diameter</th>
<th>Lip Height</th>
<th>String-Rim Height</th>
<th>Finish Height</th>
<th>Neck-Finish Height</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-11</td>
<td>Salt-Glazed, Bristol-Slipped Ginger Beer/Ale Bottle Finish and Neck</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8 cm</td>
<td>2.0 cm</td>
<td>2.0 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-13</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Finish and Neck</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 cm</td>
<td>1.7 cm</td>
<td>0.4 cm</td>
<td>2.1 cm</td>
<td>4.6 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-14</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Finish</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7 cm</td>
<td>1.3 cm</td>
<td>0.5 cm</td>
<td>1.8 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-15</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Finish and Neck with Cork Wire</td>
<td>cgu</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8 cm</td>
<td>1.3 cm</td>
<td>0.5 cm</td>
<td>1.8 cm</td>
<td>7.4 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-16</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Finish and Neck</td>
<td>cgu</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7 cm</td>
<td>1.2 cm</td>
<td>0.5 cm</td>
<td>1.7 cm</td>
<td>7.3 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-17</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Finish and Neck</td>
<td>cgu</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 cm</td>
<td>1.2 cm</td>
<td>0.5 cm</td>
<td>1.7 cm</td>
<td>7.2 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-18</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Finish and Neck</td>
<td>cg</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 cm</td>
<td>1.4 cm</td>
<td>0.5 cm</td>
<td>1.9 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-19</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Finish and Neck</td>
<td>cg</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7 cm</td>
<td>1.2 cm</td>
<td>0.4 cm</td>
<td>1.6 cm</td>
<td>7.3 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Catalogue Name</td>
<td>Neck Shape</td>
<td>Shoulder Shape</td>
<td>Body Shape</td>
<td>Base Shape</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Neck Finish Type</td>
<td>Base Diameter</td>
<td>Kickup Height</td>
<td>Bottle Diameter</td>
<td>Bore Height</td>
<td>Lip Height</td>
<td>String-Rim Height</td>
<td>Finish Height</td>
<td>Neck-Finish Height</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Finish and Neck</td>
<td>cg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.8 cm</td>
<td>1.3 cm</td>
<td>0.4 cm</td>
<td>1.7 cm</td>
<td>7.4 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rounded side lip, Down-tooled string-rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Finish and Neck</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.8 cm</td>
<td>0.2 cm</td>
<td>0.9 cm</td>
<td>1.1 cm</td>
<td>7.6 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Champagne finish, Flat top, Flattened string-rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Champagne Finish and Neck</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.7 cm</td>
<td>0.6 cm</td>
<td>0.9 cm</td>
<td>1.5 cm</td>
<td>7.3 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Champagne finish, Sloped top, Flattened string-rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-23</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Champagne Finish and Neck</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.7 cm</td>
<td>0.6 cm</td>
<td>0.9 cm</td>
<td>1.5 cm</td>
<td>7.3 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Champagne finish, Sloped top, Flattened string-rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>Olive Green Demijohn Finish and Neck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.7 cm</td>
<td>0.6 cm</td>
<td>1.3 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very damaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25</td>
<td>Olive Green Demijohn Finish and Neck</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.0 cm</td>
<td>1.1 cm</td>
<td>2.0 cm</td>
<td>3.1 cm</td>
<td>7.4 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rounded side lip, Flattened string-rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td></td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6 cm</td>
<td>8.3 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Free-blow, Sand-tipped pontil rod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-27</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td></td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5 cm</td>
<td>6.2 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Free-blow, Sand-tipped pontil rod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-28</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td></td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6 cm</td>
<td>2.4 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Free-blow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-29</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td></td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.9 cm</td>
<td>4.8 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Free-blow, Slight mamelion, Large Kickup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-30</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td></td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4 cm</td>
<td>2.1 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Catalogue Name</td>
<td>Neck Shape</td>
<td>Shoulder Shape</td>
<td>Body Shape</td>
<td>Base Shape</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Neck Finish Type</td>
<td>Base Diameter</td>
<td>Kickup Height</td>
<td>Bottle Height</td>
<td>Bore Diameter</td>
<td>Lip Height</td>
<td>String-Rim Height</td>
<td>Finish Height</td>
<td>Neck-Finish Height</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-31</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.5 cm</td>
<td>2.2 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-32</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.4 cm</td>
<td>2.2 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-33</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.5 cm</td>
<td>2.2 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-34</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.5 cm</td>
<td>2.2 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-35</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.7 cm</td>
<td>2.5 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-36</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.4 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dip mold, Hole in center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-37</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>8.0 cm</td>
<td>0.8 cm</td>
<td>Two piece mold with separate base plate with cup bottom mold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-38</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.5 cm</td>
<td>2.3 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-39</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.5 cm</td>
<td>2.4 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-40</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>7.5 cm</td>
<td>2.3 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-41</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>7.4 cm</td>
<td>2.3 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-42</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>8.0 cm</td>
<td>2.5 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-43</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.5 cm</td>
<td>2.3 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-44</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.5 cm</td>
<td>2.1 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-45</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.5 cm</td>
<td>2.3 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Catalogue Name</td>
<td>Neck Shape</td>
<td>Shoulder Shape</td>
<td>Body Shape</td>
<td>Base Shape</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Neck Finish Type</td>
<td>Base Diameter</td>
<td>Kickup Height</td>
<td>Bottle Height</td>
<td>Bore Diameter</td>
<td>Lip Height</td>
<td>String-Rim Height</td>
<td>Finish Height</td>
<td>Neck-Finish Height</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-46</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>7.8 cm</td>
<td>2.1 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-47</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>7.8 cm</td>
<td>2.6 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-48</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.5 cm</td>
<td>2.4 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-49</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.8 cm</td>
<td>2.1 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-50</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.4 cm</td>
<td>2.1 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-51</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.5 cm</td>
<td>2.2 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-52</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>6.6 cm</td>
<td>2.3 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-53</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>7.8 cm</td>
<td>4.3 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Mamelion kickup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-54</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>7.3 cm</td>
<td>4.3 cm</td>
<td>Free-blown, Pontil mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-55</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>7.6 cm</td>
<td>3.4 cm</td>
<td>Free-blown, Mamelion kickup, Strong patina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-56</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Base</td>
<td>aj</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>7.3 cm</td>
<td>3.3 cm</td>
<td>Free-blown, Mamelion kickup, Strong patina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-60</td>
<td>Olive Green Glass Bottle</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td>af</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7 cm</td>
<td>30.7 cm</td>
<td>1.9 cm</td>
<td>1.7 cm</td>
<td>1.7 cm</td>
<td>7.3 cm</td>
<td>Dip mold, Flattened side lip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-61</td>
<td>Aqua Glass Vessel Finish and Neck</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.5 cm</td>
<td>1.1 cm</td>
<td>0.5 cm</td>
<td>1.6 cm</td>
<td>Flattened side lip, Down-tooled string-rim, Medicine bottle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-62</td>
<td>Aqua Glass Vessel Finish and Neck</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.0 cm</td>
<td>0.8 cm</td>
<td>0.8 cm</td>
<td>Rounded lip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Catalogue Name</td>
<td>Neck Shape</td>
<td>Shoulder Shape</td>
<td>Body Shape</td>
<td>Base Shape</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Neck Finish Type</td>
<td>Base Diameter</td>
<td>Kickup Height</td>
<td>Bottle Height</td>
<td>Bore Diameter</td>
<td>Lip Height</td>
<td>String-Rim Height</td>
<td>Finish Height</td>
<td>Neck-Finish Height</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-63</td>
<td>Aqua Glass Vessel Finish and Neck</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td>No lip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-64</td>
<td>Aqua Glass Vessel Finish and Neck</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 cm</td>
<td>0.5 cm</td>
<td>0.5 cm</td>
<td>No lip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-65</td>
<td>Aqua Glass Vessel Finish and Neck</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td>No lip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-66</td>
<td>Aqua Glass Vessel Base</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>cju</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Golthic/culinary-style bottle, Bare-iron pontil scar</td>
<td></td>
<td>No lip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-71-1</td>
<td>Embossed Clear Vessel Glass</td>
<td>aqz</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>5.1 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern, with valve scar</td>
<td></td>
<td>No lip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-71-2</td>
<td>Embossed Clear Vessel Glass</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>4.0 cm</td>
<td>0.2 cm</td>
<td>Modern, with &quot;30&quot; embossed on center</td>
<td></td>
<td>No lip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-72</td>
<td>Clear Medicine Bottle</td>
<td>ag</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td>akz</td>
<td>ags</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.1 cm</td>
<td>7.3 cm</td>
<td>0.9 cm</td>
<td>0.7 cm</td>
<td>0.5 cm</td>
<td>1.2 cm</td>
<td>1.4 cm</td>
<td>From the Owens, IL company, Early 1900s, Continuous thread lip, Rounded string-rim, 3.5 ounces capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-5</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Finish and Neck</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td></td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flat lip, Flattened string-rim, Champagne finish, Poorly executed</td>
<td></td>
<td>No lip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-7</td>
<td>Aqua Bottle Base</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2be</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 cm</td>
<td>0.5 cm</td>
<td>Three-piece mold, Mold seams polished away, Sand-tipped pontil rod</td>
<td></td>
<td>No lip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-6</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Finish and Neck</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rounded lip, no string-rim</td>
<td></td>
<td>No lip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Catalogue Name</td>
<td>Neck Shape</td>
<td>Shoulder Shape</td>
<td>Body Shape</td>
<td>Base Shape</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Neck Finish Type</td>
<td>Neck Finish Type</td>
<td>Base Diameter</td>
<td>Bottle Height</td>
<td>Bore Diameter</td>
<td>Lip Height</td>
<td>String-Rim Height</td>
<td>Finish Height</td>
<td>Neck-Finish Height</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-7</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Finish</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1 cm</td>
<td>1.3 cm</td>
<td>1.3 cm</td>
<td>Rounded lip, no string-rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-4</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Finish and Neck</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8 cm</td>
<td>1.5 cm</td>
<td>1.5 cm</td>
<td>Rounded lip, no string-rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-9</td>
<td>Clear Glass Bottle Finish and Neck</td>
<td>ag</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.0 cm</td>
<td>0.6 cm</td>
<td>0.6 cm</td>
<td>7.4 cm</td>
<td>V-Shaped lip (sloppily applied), No string-rim, Probably culinary bottle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>Olive Green Bottle Finish and Neck</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td>bg</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0 cm</td>
<td>0.3 cm</td>
<td>0.7 cm</td>
<td>1.7 cm</td>
<td>Three-part finish, Double-rounded string-rim (both same height), Lipping tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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