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ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

THE MAKING AND REMAKING OF PORTLAND:
THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF IDENTITY AND LANDSCAPE
AT THE PORTLAND WHARF

The town of Portland, Kentucky was founded over 200 years ago as a speculative venture to profit from its advantageous location at the base of the Falls of the Ohio River. The Portland Wharf was the economic and cultural heart of the town. Throughout its history, the community has experienced much change. These changes are visible in the landscape of the Portland Wharf which reflected changes in the community’s identity.

Identity and landscape are topics that have been of great interest to archaeologists and this dissertation builds on previous works to examine identity as something that is reflected in the practices of people and can be unconscious, as well as overt. Identity can only become visible through contrast of differing aspects of culture, which is often created by researchers. The landscape is one place where the contrast necessary for making identity visible takes place, as it is where identities can be created, modified, and maintained. This study utilized archaeological, historical, and ethnographic data to examine changes to Portland’s identity and landscape over time. The archaeological analysis of deposits at two house lots at the Portland Wharf has allowed for a reconstruction of Portland’s historic landscape that when compared to that of Louisville created the necessary contrast to expose Portland’s independent identity. This identity was developed amongst Portland’s contentious and symbiotic relationship with Louisville and manifested in the landscape and the way privies were constructed.

The process of identity continues present day, as the people of Portland reach into their past to deploy versions of history that are loosely based on events that are no longer materialized in the landscape when their identity is threatened. As the community plans to reanimate the Portland Wharf landscape to create and maintain identities based on the community’s past, archaeologists must recognize their role in the process of identity and I argue that such responsibility can and should be used for activist goals for the good of the community.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Over its 200 year history, the community of Portland has changed in many different ways, as most communities do over time. Change in Portland is an ongoing process that continues today, a process that I can examine and understand. Combining historical, archaeological, and ethnographic information, my research examines the Portland community’s negotiation of identity through time and how that identity is embedded within the landscape. The landscape is an integral part of the process of identity creation, modification, and maintenance in Portland, as it materializes, instigates, and is created through change. The Portland landscape has been an important element in the process that creates, modifies, and maintains identity throughout the history of the Portland community. In this dissertation, I demonstrate how the landscape is changed by and can facilitate change to identity. I argue that identity is not just an overt expression, but is also unconscious within actions and practices of people and that identity becomes visible to researchers through contrast that we help create. Through my research, I have examined and exposed the process of identity in the landscape of Portland.

The Portland Neighborhood is located in Louisville, Kentucky. This community began as an independent town in the early nineteenth century and eventually was assimilated into the fold of Louisville’s neighborhoods. The long history of this community, the continuity of its people, and the drastic changes that took place in the landscape over time, make it particularly conducive to a diachronic examination of identity and landscape. Furthermore, its rich archaeological deposits, historical records,
and its people make it well suited for an examination of change over a long period of time and provide a picture of Portland’s past identities and landscapes. This process continues today through the continuity of Portland’s people and their relationship to the landscape and associated identities.

My research is focused on several questions: How has Portland’s landscape changed through time and what can we learn about the process of Portland’s identity in the past from it? How does the landscape relate to and influence Portland’s identity in present day? How can heritage and the landscape be used in the present to recreate, modify, and maintain Portland’s identity? Through the examination of the Portland Wharf landscape I intend to demonstrate that identity is more than conscious self-identification or expression. I argue that identity is also an unconscious process of distinction that is visible through the contrasts created by people and the researchers who study them. Identity is not just seen in the overtly distinctive styling of cultures, but it is also seen in the everyday actions and practices of culture where there is contrast or conflict. Although the landscape can be the physical place where these actions or practices take place, it can also affect and be affected by them in a dialectical relationship. Thus, the landscape can create identity, but also be created by identity. I will demonstrate that the process of identity creation, modification, and maintenance is not just frozen in time on past landscapes, but that this process is dynamic and diachronic, as present identity processes are a part of past processes. By examining identity in the landscape in both the past and the present, I will be able to better understand the process of identity creation, modification, and maintenance.
In this dissertation, I use archaeology and history to examine the historic process of inscribing and erasing identity in the landscape of the Portland Wharf site (15Jf418). I analyze stratigraphy, artifacts, archival materials, and architectural evidence to reconstruct and understand the past landscape and how it changed over time. I also examine the relationship of identity in the present to the past and the role that archaeology plays in this ongoing process. Furthermore, I investigate the modification of the present day landscape as means to maintain and recreate identity. I use ethnographic methods, such as participant observations, interviews, and surveys to understand present day community identity and its relationship to history and heritage. Thus, I examine changes to the current and historic landscape of the Portland Wharf site to understand the process of identity creation, modification, and maintenance through the landscape and its relationship to heritage and public memory.

I intend to demonstrate that changes in the landscape at the Portland Wharf affected the Portland identity over time. The landscape helped create and reinforce an identity of independence during the time Portland was an independent town, an identity that continued for some 20 years after the community was annexed by the City of Louisville. Changes to that landscape helped the City of Louisville assimilate the community in the late nineteenth century by erasing Portland’s identity and normalizing Louisville’s identity. This process was materialized in the way that Portland was developed during the nineteenth century, as compared to the way the landscape was prepared and developed when Louisville began to assert more influence and authority. The erasure or neutralization of Portland’s independent identity is evident in the
construction of privies by the Viet family in relation to the compliance of Louisville’s ordinance governing privy construction. Non-compliance with Louisville’s privy regulation is seen as a statement of Portland’s independent identity. As Louisville asserted more control and authority in Portland and changed its landscape, privies constructed by the Viet family changed showing various levels of compliance with the privy ordinance, revealing the process of identity change through the landscape.

The clearing of the Portland Wharf landscape removed the last vestiges of Portland’s nineteenth-century independent town and facilitated the forgetting of its independent identity. A new landscape created in the image of Louisville’s neighborhoods supplanted the old town landscape, fostering a new identity as a neighborhood of Louisville. Presently, many identities are deployed by residents to combat threats to Portland’s neighborhood identity, such as from the influx of new residents and the encroachment of neighboring communities. Many of these identities are somewhat liminal in that they are not anchored to or reside in the landscape. The community sought to reanimate the Portland Wharf landscape to create heritage from its forgotten nineteenth-century past and revive its independent identity.

Archaeology is seen as a way to reinterpret the past landscape, authenticate or legitimize the heritage and identities created from that landscape, and provide tangible reminders of a more prosperous Portland in the past. Thus, archaeology has an important role in the recreation of the Portland Wharf landscape and the process of identity. Through an activist approach, archaeology at the Portland Wharf can be used to benefit
and advocate for the present day Portland community. Thus, I am an active participant in the process of identity that I am studying. I can consciously use archaeology to collaborate with and benefit the community that I am studying. Most archaeologists choose their dissertation data to fit their research questions. However, I did not choose Portland for my research, it chose me.

This dissertation is organized as follows. In Chapter 2, I discuss concepts of identity and landscape and how I define them for my study. In this chapter, I also describe the many theoretical perspectives that have influenced my conception of identity and landscape and how they relate specifically to the archaeological context. Chapter 3 discusses the methods that I used throughout the dissertation, including those used for the collection and analysis of archaeological and ethnographic data. I provide a discussion of some seminal works that have influenced how I examine identity and landscape. A description of the Portland community, its general history, and the archaeology conducted at the Portland Wharf site is presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter 5 presents an archaeological analysis of the Portland Wharf landscape, focused on the interpretation of the stratigraphy and features identified in two particular areas of the site (Lots 53 and 56). The analysis provides an interpretation of changes to the Portland Wharf landscape over time. Features and artifacts are used to interpret the built environment over time and characterize the people who occupied the lots. This information is woven with historical data to reconstruct Portland’s historic landscape and present a narrative and interpretation of how it has changed over time in Chapter 6.
chapter paints a picture of the Portland Wharf landscape and highlights events that changed the landscape, especially in the late nineteenth century when Louisville began to assert more authority in Portland. Louisville’s assimilation of Portland, during that period, was aided by multiple floods that also significantly altered Portland’s landscape. Chapter 7 presents an examination of Portland’s identity through a comparison of Portland’s townscape and the way that it was developed over time to Louisville’s cityscape. Ethnic and socio-economic identities are examined through the artifacts of the people at Lots 53 and 56, with comparisons to those in Louisville. The process of identity and its relationship to the landscape are visible in Portland’s independent identity as materialized in privy construction.

An examination of Portland’s present day identities is presented in Chapter 8. The results of an ethnographic study of the community are presented, with particular attention to the identities that residents deploy and their relationship to history and the landscape. This chapter provides continuity in the process of identity between the past and the present, as I examine how the past is used and deployed to distinguish Portland from surrounding communities. Chapter 9 describes the Portland community’s attempts to recreate the Portland Wharf landscape and revive its nineteenth-century heritage and thus, its independent identity. It details the plans and process for creating Portland Wharf Park from a cleared landscape. The park is seen as a way to rematerialize and reinstate public memory of Portland’s independent history legitimized through archaeology. Furthermore, I examine the role of archaeologists in the process of heritage and identity production through the landscape, as well as our role as activists in advocating for the
Portland community. Finally, Chapter 10 presents a brief summary of the results and provides my conclusions about the process of identity and its relationship to the landscape.
CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTS OF IDENTITY AND LANDSCAPE

Although it has been a part of the city since 1852, to many Louisvillians, the Portland Neighborhood and its residents seem different. As a Louisville native, I had the same perception. Growing up in Louisville, I felt that I knew my community well and that I had pretty much seen every part of the city, however my experience of Portland was largely based on a perception created by the media and what I heard people say about the community. This perception was largely a negative one which portrayed Portland as a very distinctive and different place from other parts of Louisville, especially those of which I was most familiar.

I am really not sure if I had ever been to Portland when I was growing up, as I was not attuned to the nuances of neighborhood boundaries in the West End of Louisville, which I rarely visited. I knew that my father’s family lived in the West End (near, but not in Portland) during the early 1950s and I got some perspective of the area through his recollections, stories, and photographs. His vision of the area was quite different than the primarily African-American, poor, and crime ridden area that was portrayed in news reports. Like many families that lived in that area during the 1950s, the Stottman family was part of the “white flight” movement that saw a mass exodus of people from the inner city and West End to the new post World War II suburbs to the south and east of the city. Since then, the West End of Louisville has been a collection of neighborhoods that are predominantly African American and among the poorest in
Louisville. Although Portland is a West End Neighborhood, it is not like the others and the perceptions of it that I and most others had of it was quite different.

Growing up, my perception of Portland was that it was in the West End and that Portlanders were poor white people. My perception of them was that they were rough, trashy, and not people that I should be around. They were different and my perception of them was informed by their reputation. Portland was like a foreign land that could have on the other side of the world, not just on the other side of town. When I was asked to conduct archaeological research at the old Portland Wharf, I became interested in learning why this community seemed so different. My introduction or reintroduction to Portland made me think about identity, the way I perceived the community in the past and how my perception changed in the present. It made me think about how Portlanders identify themselves, how those outside the neighborhood identify them, and about the place that is Portland. It also made me think about what my role as an archaeologist is in the process of how identities are created, maintained, and changed in Portland.

The Archaeology of Identity

Identity appears to be a rather simple thing to define, so much so, that what we mean by identity is often assumed when archaeologists discuss or study it. Although identity could be defined a number of ways, its definition is generally associated with distinctiveness or uniqueness. This is the way that I define identity in this dissertation. My changing perceptions of the people of the Portland Neighborhood emphasize the fact that they are somehow unique or different than other communities in Louisville. Thus,
distinction is how individuals are identified and the similarity of distinction is how groups are identified. This concept of identity seems to be understood or assumed, as researchers tend to focus on the more complicated aspects of identity with regards to the process by which distinction is created. Identity becomes more complicated when we start thinking about the process of how people or groups identify themselves or are identified by others as different. How identities are created, maintained, erased, deployed, and changed is a much more complicated matter dependent on how and who is defining distinction. Thus, our efforts in studying identity have been focused on the process of identity.

Identity or expressions of identity have been of the subject of much archaeological research, as there have been many efforts to examine material culture for expressions of identity. Since archaeologists have been interested in the stylistic variations within the artifacts they study, they have used these variations and the distribution of different styles, as an expression of group identity. For example, distinctive designs on prehistoric pottery are seen as indicative of a particular culture located in a specific geographical area, or the historical archaeologist’s search for ethnic markers that are indicative of group membership. To some degree, identity has largely been assumed to be inherent in the objects that archaeologists find, in that they were made as a symbol of self-expression to differentiate or were consciously used for such purpose. More recently, archaeologists have recognized the complexity and variability of identity. Identity is contextual and situational (Conkey 1991; Potter 1999; Thomas 2002; Voss 2000). It is multifaceted, with multiple lines of intersecting cultural expressions (Wall 1999). It is constructed and
negotiated on individual and group levels (Orser 2001; Preucel 2000; Rodman 1992). In particular, it can be represented through cultural practices (Hodder and Cessford 2004; Joyce 2000; Lightfoot et al. 1998). The focus on cultural practices expands our concept of identity as being expressed in not only the things that people make and have, to also include the things that they do. Thus, our study of identity has transitioned from the simplicity of seeing distinction in material culture to understanding the process that creates difference. Eleanor Conlin Casella and Chris Fowler (2004) see that practices are not identity nor are they like an artifact that represents identity, they can illuminate the process of identity:

One concern here that might be raised here is that a certain slippage could occur between practices and identities, so that the presence of a certain cultural practice is taken to indicate the appearance of a specific identity. In a sense such a perspective has its uses—it is through shared cultural practices that individuals trace their sense of belonging within a cultural group. But practices are not identities, and while people may adopt practices affiliated to one group, that does not signal their automatic membership of the group. There exist different social strategies of identification, then, each potentially inhabited by specific social groups, but there also exist broad processes through which identities are articulated out of these different strategies....The process of the negotiation of identity becomes precisely what archaeologists observe (p.7-8).

Thus, what we see is a representation of identity produced from the process that creates, modifies, and maintains identity which is reflected in material culture and practices. The things that people make, buy, possess, and the things that they do which leave an archaeological signature are reflections or representations of the differences between people or the similarities of a group that collectively are different from other groups.
The focus on examining cultural practices not only places emphasis on the process of identity creation, but also leads us to the realization that identity is not always overt, that it is also unconscious. My perceptions of the Portland Neighborhood were in part formed by conscious overt expressions of difference such as what people from Portland say about themselves or the bumper stickers or yards signs declaring they are from Portland. However, my perceptions were greatly influenced by unconscious actions that are not overtly deployed to signify membership in the Portland community, such as how Portlanders looked, acted, or talked.

Examining identity in cultural practices has inspired many archaeologists to use practice theory, as a way to understand the origins of cultural practice (1990). Charles Orser (2004) has re-conceptualized practice theory for his historical archaeological study of race and racialization. Orser based his concept of practice theory for use in historical archaeology on the work of Timothy Pauketat (2001). Pauketat (2001:115) defines practice theory as “the continuous and historically contingent enactments or embodiments of people’s ethos, attitudes, agendas, and dispositions.” Thus, both Orser and Pauketat apply practice theory through Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of habitus (1977; 1990). This concept suggests that structures, within which individual agents operate, are created through a series of practices and experiences that accumulate through the life of individuals. These practices create a largely unconscious structure that embodies individual agents. The habitus is created over time and through processes that draw from history.
The *habitus*--embodied history, internalized as a second nature and so forgotten as history--is the active presence of the whole past of which it is the product. As such, it is what gives practices their relative autonomy with respect to external determinations of the immediate present. This accumulated capital, produces history on the basis of history and so ensures the permanence in change that makes the individual agent a world within the world (Bourdieu 1990:56).

Thus, the *habitus* is in part a product of an individual’s past. However, it is much more than a collection of historical events, it is an accumulation of experiences that can become “forgotten” as unconscious guiding forces for action or practice. The *habitus* is an agent’s essence formed from the past which functions in the present to shape their perceptions, thoughts, and actions. The *habitus* exists in an agent’s disposition, schema, know how, and competence, which are often unconscious. Thus, the concept of *habitus* provides a framework for understanding how unconscious cultural practices originate and subsequently reflect or represent identities.

 Archaeologists have been adept at finding overt expressions of identity in the archaeological record, for example when a group consciously signifies their uniqueness in material objects, such as ethnic markers. However they have struggled with the unconscious aspects of the *habitus* and the fact that not all individuals in a group have the same *habitus* (Stone 2003:39). Although Bourdieu does suggest that a group *habitus* can be formed from individuals with shared experiences, the relationship of the individual to a group and the process by which a group *habitus* is formed is less understood (Bourdieu 1984; Stone 2003). Thus, the key to understanding group *habitus* and unconscious cultural practices is finding the shared experiences of individuals than can, thus make them visible.
If we define identity as distinction or uniqueness, then to make identity visible there must be contrast. We can only really see distinction in contrast to something else otherwise we are all the same. Thus, anthropologists and archaeologists have long understood that examining distinction between cultures requires us to understand boundaries and the contrast created there (Barth 1969). In overt expressions of identity there are conscious efforts to distinguish an individual or group from others by displaying difference and emphasizing boundaries. Unconscious practices can become a representation of identity when they come into conflict with different practices or are compared and contrasted or in other words, creating boundaries which make identity visible. Thus, some attention should be paid to who is creating the contrast and boundaries to make the unconscious visible.

My perceptions of the Portland Neighborhood were initially formed by the overt expressions deployed by its residents to distinguish themselves from other neighborhoods and also by their practices of how they looked, acted, and talked in contrast to my own. It is this action of contrast and comparison that make the process of identity visible. Thus, we have to look beyond distinctive stylistic or symbolic expressions to also view practices or specific actions when contrasted as a form of identity creation, maintenance, erasure, or alteration. More overt expressions of identity are visible when the people themselves create the boundaries that make them visible to intended recipients. Unconscious practices as identity are visible when a third party creates the contrast or boundary necessary to see them. As researchers, we make identity visible in the comparisons that we make, thus what we consider identity is partly our own construction. We should
consider what identity in this form means and to whom. When we insert ourselves into the process of identity through activism, we should ask ourselves are we creating identity from the past or merely just creating an environment that promotes the process of identity?

When I look back at my initial perceptions of Portland, the one thing that really stood out in what I perceived to be what defined Portlanders was the importance of place. Even as a kid, it was evident to me that the place, that was Portland, played an important role in what distinguished Portlanders from me. I didn’t have that strong connection to a defined place like Portlanders. To me and likely them, I was just from the suburbs, but they were from a very specific place and geographic area that was central to how I defined them and how they defined themselves. Thus, the place and landscape of Portland seemed to have an important role in what ties individuals together in Portland. The common experience that ties an individual *habitus* to a group *habitus* in Portland could be place and landscape.

**Archaeology of and in the Landscape**

What is landscape? While our initial answer to this question is the traditional concept of the physical world around us, clearly there is much more to landscape. The definition of landscape is perhaps an evolving concept rather than just a thing. Certainly we can look to the landscape to see a reflection of culture, as it is a result of culture, a view which is embodied by Peirce Lewis’ often cited quote: “The human landscape is our unwitting autobiography, reflecting our tastes, our values, our aspiration, and even our fears, in tangible, visible form” (1979:12). However, it is the interrogation of the
process that creates such a landscape that leads to a conception of the landscape as a representation or an idea of culture (Jackson 1980; Cosgrove 1984). For Dennis Cosgrove “landscape denotes the external world mediated through subjective human experience...Landscape is not merely the world we see, it is a construction, a composition of that world. Landscape is a way of seeing the world.” (1984:13). Don Mitchell (1996) refines this perspective and sees landscape not only as a construction, but also as a construction used in power relations. He sees “…landscape is both a work and an erasure of work. It is therefore a social relation of labor, even as it is something that is labored over” (1996:6). Thus, landscape is a wide perspective that is both physical and cultural.

The conception of landscape used here recognizes the materiality of the landscape as a reflection, representation, and a construct of culture, the process of which can be manipulated. I am particularly interested in the construction and erasure of the landscape materially and symbolically, as an act of normalization or neutralization. Inspired by J.B. Jackson’s concern over landscape and social change, Richard Schein sees the normalizing quality of the landscape:

The cultural landscape is not merely the result of human activity. It is both a material thing and a conceptual framing of the world—a visual and spatial epistemology. As such, the cultural landscape is an important, even constitutive, part of social and cultural processes (no longer simply inert, or just detritus or spoor, but something central to the reproduction of human activity). Through its symbolic qualities, the cultural landscape serves to naturalize or concretize—to normalize—social relations. Additionally, the landscape’s normalizing, normative capabilities simultaneously make the landscape central to the ongoing production and reproduction of place and identity (2003:202).
The landscape has normative or pedagogical qualities that educate about the way things should be, thus it can serve to reinforce power structures or particular identities and be consciously used for such purposes. Changes to the landscape whether enacted purposefully or serendipitously can neutralize previous identities and naturalize or normalize new ones. It is this neutralizing and naturalizing quality of the landscape that I see at work in the landscape of the Portland Wharf as related to identity.

When I first learned about the Portland Wharf, it was known as the “ancient buried city of Portland” or the “lost city of Portland” to local archaeologists. These references to famous buried Old World cities were largely stated in jest, but they do represent some reality. Although Portland is not as famous as Pompeii, like its Old World counterparts, it is literally a buried city, as the current landscape bears little resemblance to the town that was there 100 years prior. The streets, building foundations, and sidewalks of a town lie buried beneath an unassuming landscape. These statements indicate that drastic changes have taken place at the Portland Wharf landscape and this process of change likely normalized some identities and neutralized others. While today the Portland Wharf landscape provides some clues to the process of identity formation in the present, in order to understand the normalizing qualities of the landscape, we must look at the landscape in the past and see how it has changed over time.

Archaeology is particularly well suited to provide not only a picture of the past landscape, but also a diachronic view of the process that changed it. Thus, archaeologists
have been inclined towards a landscape approach in their studies. While early works focused on the spatial qualities of the natural and built environments, archaeologists and cultural anthropologists have more recently drawn on the work of cultural geographers and social theorists to conceptualize the landscape as a unifying perspective between nature and culture, individual and community scales, and research disciplines (Ashmore and Knapp 1999; Pool and Cliggett 2008; Tilley 1994). The landscape is a perspective that provides a concept to understand a variety of cultural processes materially and non-materially.

The examination of the landscape to make the process of identity visible from the past to the present draws from a variety of landscape perspectives. Identity as action or practice can be seen in the relationship of people to the landscape or in how people experience or perceive that landscape (Lefebvre 1991; Smith 2003; Soja 1989; Tilley 1994). How people experience or perceive the landscape is how they interact with the physical landscape, natural or built (Anschuetz et al. 2001; Ashmore and Knapp 1999; Low 2000; Tilley 1994). Thus, how people move through and experience the landscape within the practices and actions of everyday life or how culturally constructed landscapes initiate experience can materialize the process of identity when contrasted with differing landscapes.

Also, the perspective of landscape, as diachronic, is important to my study, as the landscape is not frozen in time it is always changing whether physically or culturally (Bender 2002; Ingold 1993). “Landscape is time materialized. Or, better, Landscapes,
like time, never stand still” (Bender 2002:103). Thus, to view the processes of identity in the landscape, we have to study changes in the landscape through time, both in how it has changed physically and how it is perceived culturally. By examining identity in the landscape, past and present, I may be able to see continuity in the process of identity creation, modification, and maintenance. Landscapes in the present are physically constructed or reconstructed, their meanings created and recreated, and they are places of conflict or contrast. They are dynamic, politically charged, and they are always subjective (Bender 1993; 2002; Nelson and Olin 2003; Smith 2006). How the landscape articulates with present identities can give us a glimpse into the how landscapes were created or perceived in the past. Furthermore, I can view the process of identity as actions and practice through the present day landscapes and how people experience landscapes and imbue meaning in them, such as through the narratives, language, and names associated with landscapes (Basso 1996).

It is how the landscape is used in the process of identity creation, modification, and maintenance that is of particular interest for my research. I draw particularly from historical archaeologists who seek to investigate landscapes of power (Delle 1998; Leone 1984; Miller 1988; Upton 1996). Charles Orser’s (2006) examination of pedagogy as an important function of the landscape is particularly useful, as he sees the landscape as a mechanism for educating those that experience the landscape about social order. Landscape in this conception has a normalizing affect, where the landscape is used to educate about the way things should be (Schein 2003). Also, Paul Shackel’s work focuses on conflict as way that the landscape and memory can be materialized, from
which identity can be constructed (2003). This concept relates to the concept of identity previously discussed that uses contrast to make identity visible and suggests that landscapes of conflict are places where identity is created. Also drawing from Shackel, a diachronic study of identity in the landscape must consider the role of memory, as it is through public memory that the past is used in the creation and maintenance of identity in the present (2003).

Of particular interest to my study of the Portland Wharf is the perspective of archaeologists that examine the landscape of American cities in order to do archaeology of a city, rather than just archaeology in a city (Rothschild and Wall 2014). The interest here is in how cities developed and changed over time, which require archaeologists to not only think spatially and temporally, but also from a landscape perspective, as a way of seeing. We have to think about cities as landscapes and see them as a whole to understand them. Thus, when I use the term “landscape,” it is very much the physical and material places of the world. However, it is also that material place’s relationship to people and culture which make the landscape an ever changing process (Rothschild and Wall 2014). This process does not only exist in the past, but is an extension of the past into the present, as past actions helped create landscapes in the present.

Memories of the Past, Landscapes in the Present

The examination of landscape and identity in the present requires an understanding of public or cultural memory and the role of history and heritage in memory. The past has an important role in the creation of identities in the present, as
people will reach into their past to help distinguish themselves from others. The efforts to create a new park at the Portland Wharf exemplify the relationship of the past to landscape and identity as I have become a participant in the modification of the Portland Wharf landscape to revive public memory of Portland’s past and create identity. Thus, public memory of the past is an essential part of the process of identity creation, modification, and maintenance operationalized through the landscape (Johnson 2004; Price 2004; Till 2001; 2005).

Although memories are individual, they are shaped within frameworks of social institutions, such as families or communities. They can be reproduced through time unchanged, but they can also be rearranged, deformed, or modified. “Events can be recalled only if they (or their mode of narrative) fit within a framework of contemporary interests. Society, in turn, modifies recollections according to its present needs and is thus, always situated in the present. Social beliefs are collective recollections, and they relate to knowledge of the present (Weissberg 1999).

Although memory and history seem inextricably tied together, early public memory researcher Maurice Halbwachs saw the need to distinguish them. He described history as being reliant on writing and something that sets in after collective memory has disappeared. In other words, it is a transformation or evolution of memory. Thus, an intermediary such as tradition or heritage is nothing but a deformed memory that has the appearance of objectivity (Weissberg 1999:15). More recent scholars of memory view its sense of time as multilinear, where memories are not necessarily stable. Such memories
were close to everyday life that has a changing relationship with history. Pierre Nora sees this quality of memory this way:

Memory is life, borne out of living societies founded in its name. It remains in permanent evolution, open to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting, unconscious of its successive deformations, vulnerable to manipulation appropriation, susceptible to being long dormant and periodically revived (1989:8).

Thus, this notion of a “living” memory spurns the idea of static and unilineal history, instead suggesting that “societies are both constituted by their memories and, in their daily interactions, ritual, and exchanges, constitute these memories (Phillips 2004:2). Memory only has meaning in the present. “History in turn represents and reflects the past. Memory however, is “a perpetually actual phenomenon that can capture the present eternally…it claims objects, images, and space for itself, while history insists on the passing of time” (Weissberg 1999:17). Without the environment of a living society, memory becomes heritage, a reflection and representation of past memories, which in turn can be used in the creation of collective memories of present living society.

These concepts of memory form the basis of how public memory is created and how it relates to history and heritage, as used in my research. Thus, public memory is what the living society collectively remembers. “People develop a collective memory by molding, shaping, and agreeing upon what to remember” (Shackel 2001:2). The development of public memory is then subject to the struggles for control over this process. Control of public memory serves to write history and decisions on who has a voice in this history and who does not.
The Portland Wharf is a place that has been and will be central to public memory in Portland, thus central to the process that creates, modifies, and maintains Portland’s identity. Place is important in the process of public memory, as it is the manifestation of memories, where they can be inscribed on the landscape, as transmitters of memory. Karen Till (2005) describes this role of place in memory:

But places are never merely backdrops for action or containers for the past. They are fluid mosaics and moments of memory, matter, metaphor, scene, and experience that create and mediate social spaces and temporalities. Through place making, people mark social spaces as haunted sites where they can return, make contact with their loss, contain unwanted presences, or confront past injustices (2005:8).

Places are important for communicating memory through a sign and signifier relationship. Thus, memory is the ability for recollection that is cued by an “image, object, ritual, space, and action” (Valdez del Alamo and Pendergast 2000:2). The place itself, an object within a place, or the place where action occurred can elicit memory. “The place in other words, lends itself to the remembering and facilitates it at the very least, but also in certain cases embodies the memory itself (as when people engage in conjoint remembrance in the presence of certain memorials…)” (Casey 2004:32).

A place not only stimulates memory, but also affects the environment for evoking a memory. “Places of memory give a shape to that which is metaphysically absent through material and imagined settings that appear to be relatively permanent and stable in time” (Till 2005:10). Thus, there is a strong material element to places of memory through markers that are intended to memorialize, but the seemingly innocuous material
of the landscape is also laden with memory through the narratives of the living society. When people return to a place of memory, the materiality of the landscape or the narratives associated with a particular location instigate memory. Thus, the landscape becomes a place where identities are anchored and materialized. It not only facilitates public memory of the past, but also provides substance, authenticity, and legitimacy to memories of the past from which identities in the present are derived.

When the past is used in the present, it becomes heritage. Heritage is then the use of historical facts for the present, or more broadly, what matters to people that connects the past and present, such as the process of identity creation (Little and Shackel 2014:39; Shackel 2001:10). “Heritage connotes integrity, authenticity, vulnerability, and stability…Heritage is essential for creating community and cultural continuity. A nation uses heritage to create collective memory, to look for more innocent and carefree days. We remember what we perceive as good and forget the rest. Heritage can create a national mythology based on even the smallest kernel of truth” (Shackel 2001:10).

Places where heritage is used are heritage sites or landscapes. These sites or landscapes are used to create, modify, and maintain identity and thus become sites of conflict and contrast where identities become visible (Smith 2006).

The processes of identity combined with heritage landscapes illuminate a self-reflexive perspective for archaeologists, in that, as experts of the past, they are participants in the process of identity creation (Smith 2006). With this in mind, archaeologists could take the perspective of activist and help create landscapes that
create, modify, or maintain identities and could benefit communities (Atalay et al. 2014; Baumann et al. 2008; Little and Zimmerman 2010; McGuire 2008; Potter 1999; Stottman 2010). With the research proposed here, I intend to demonstrate that identity is not only visible in the landscape through contrast in actions and practices, but also that the landscape can modify and erase identities and is necessary to help maintain them. I will demonstrate that the process of identity is dynamic and diachronic. It is a process that researchers participate in and can potentially use in an activist way through the landscape.

My memory of Portland was not of a place, but instead of people who were from a particular place. Thus, my memory lacked a certain materiality, it was not rooted in a place or experience of a place. I experienced Portland through the negative narratives about people from Portland. The negative perceptions associated with that memory have persisted latently within my mind for many years. However they were not anchored to the physical place that is Portland. They persisted more as myths or warped perceptions of a place I really didn’t know or experienced. These perceptions changed drastically for me, as I actually experienced the place that is Portland and learned about its history and its people. This experience created new positive perceptions, reinforced some existing negative ones, and tied them to a place and landscape that I now know. Understanding the current plight of Portlanders, I want them to experience a landscape that they can use to modify and embolden their identities. Through an activist archaeology I want people outside of the neighborhood, who like me only knew the myth, to experience the place that is Portland and transform their perceptions.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS

In order to understand identity through the Portland Wharf site landscape from the past to present day and into the future, I utilized a variety of archaeological and archival data to reconstruct the landscape through time. As is standard in historical archaeology, the archaeological data was analyzed and interpreted in concert with archival data, such as primary and secondary historic resources. The primary resources consisted of deeds, census records, city directories, tax records, newspapers, photographs, maps, and other images. Secondary sources included books on local history, student term papers, and local history narratives. Each of these data sets were considered as equal converging lines of evidence that can be woven together to create a rich interpretation of the Portland Wharf landscape in the past and how people might have experienced it (Wylie 1993). Thus, interpretation of the archaeological record for historical archaeologists takes place in a constant back and forth between the historical and archaeological data (Leone and Potter 1988; Wylie 1999).

The key to the use of archival information in historical archaeology is this dialectical process between lines of evidence. It could be argued that contextual and interpretive approaches to archaeological research have perhaps diminished the role of archaeological data in interpretations of the past, as projects can often contain more analysis of archival resources than of the archaeological data. Concerns over the diminished role of archaeological data create a hierarchy amongst what should be equal
lines of evidence. However, this concern amounts to scorekeeping which can overshadow the real value of these data to interpreting the past. The real value to any historical archaeology project, such as this study, is the interplay between data sets. While a large amount of and reliance on archival data can and does occur, the resulting rich interpretation cannot happen without archaeology. Archaeological data not only fill in the gaps in interpretation by providing information that is otherwise unavailable, but more importantly, it forces researchers to ask different questions of their archival data, setting off a pendulum effect that produces more from that data (Leone and Potter 1988). So, while it may appear that this research, at times, seems highly dependent on archival resources, the results could not be attained without archaeology’s role in the process.

Since part of the concept of landscape used in this research is a way of seeing in a wide perspective, I will use a variety of scales of analysis to examine data. Due to the size and abundance of the data produced at urban sites, archaeologists tend to use varying scales of analysis to examine cities. Thus macro and micro perspectives are used in the archaeological study of cities, where the lives of a single family living on one urban house lot translates to larger processes of urban development and life (Rothschild and Wall 2014). The Portland Wharf site is large, encompassing several city blocks of the Portland Neighborhood, which enabled me to examine data at a community scale of analysis to document diachronic changes to the physical and cultural landscape of Portland (Cressey and Stephens 1982; Murray and Cook 2005). However, I also have been able to focus in on particular lots within the town to examine changes to this landscape at a household level of analysis (Mrozowski 1984).
Reconstructing Past Landscapes and Identity

This study is closely related to a historical and architectural analysis of “townscapes” by Elizabeth Tolbert (1999), which examined the development of towns in middle Tennessee during the nineteenth century with regards to community identity. Tolbert used historical data to reconstruct townscapes at various points in the past and to document changes to the townscape through time. The townscape for Tolbert was the defining aspects of the landscape that gave a place the look and feel of a town. For example, a townscape likely included a well-defined commercial district, transportation terminal, and iconic institutional buildings like a courthouse or church, which would distinguish it from a residential suburb. She analyzed existing architecture and the modifications made to it over time to materialize changes to the townscape identified in the historical data. Changes to the townscapes of small towns in middle Tennessee were contextualized within the lives of selected residents, business owners, and builders to examine identity. In my research, I have used a similar analysis of historical data, but also incorporated archaeological data to understand Portland’s nineteenth-century townscape.

Although Tolbert does not define the term townscape, I base the concept of townscape, as well as cityscape, used in this dissertation on various definitions of a city discussed in Rothschild and Wall (2014). A city is defined by a concentration of people in a locus, a center of transportation, economics, and politics, presence of institutions, and a built environment that features iconic structures. Thus, a townscape or cityscape is a relative of landscape, defined by the contrast of the physical urban landscape to the
surrounding rural landscape and their relationship to people and culture. By examining changes in Portland’s landscape (townscape) and the people who lived and worked there through historical and archaeological data and then comparing them to the landscape of Louisville, I created the contrast needed to make identity visible.

Tolbert’s approach is not new to archaeology. Lisa Kealhofer’s (1999) study of seventeenth and eighteenth-century Tidewater Virginia identity created through emerging colonial landscapes at household and community scales of analysis represents a similar application in archaeology. She demonstrated the relationship between the creation of a colonial identity and landscape that was distinctive from other colonies. Furthermore, a staple of landscape analysis in urban archaeology has been the examination of physical changes to the landscape, such as land filling and changes in building patterns over time, or in other words, the process of development (Purser and Shaver 2008; Rothschild and Wall 2014; Shackel 1994; Sandweiss 1996; Solari 2001; Zierden 1996). Through archaeology, particularly in the urban environment, we can document the changes made to the landscape at different times in the past and how those changes affected successive development. This approach is of particular use for my study, as I have examined changes to the landscape through stratigraphic analysis of the cultural deposits and an emphasis on locating and understanding structures and the organization of space with archaeological data.

My research has drawn much inspiration from Christopher Matthews’ (2002) work at the Bordley-Randall houselot in Annapolis, Maryland. Matthews conducted an
archaeological analysis to understand the site’s landscape over time, which he then used as a springboard into a much broader historical and architectural study to understand the role of history and tradition in Annapolis, past and present. He used the context of political economy to understand how people lived and worked in Annapolis. He demonstrated how the political economy shaped the landscape of Annapolis and its heritage. Matthews was able to organize the changes to the landscape into three major periods of Annapolis’ history, which he used to understand how people structured their lives in the landscape and how history was and is created as heritage.

While Matthews’ work had a major influence on my research conceptually and methodologically, I am more focused on identity formation and maintenance through the landscape within the context of Portland’s relationship to Louisville and other communities at the Falls, rather than with a specific focus on the political economy. I have used various aspects of Portland’s culture, including political economy, ethnicity, race, socioeconomics, etc. to examine not only how the Portland landscape was created and shaped, but also to see how the people of Portland, in particular their identity, was affected by that landscape. I have also placed more emphasis on the archaeological record, by connecting the reconstructed past landscape to practices, through the analysis of specific artifacts and features. It is not enough to merely reconstruct the landscape; it is important to understand the cultural practices within the landscape as a dialectical relationship. I examined cultural practices as manifested in the archaeological data and their role in the process of identity creation, modification, and maintenance through the landscape.
Artifacts and features thought to be associated with socio economic status, class, race, ethnicity, gender, etc. have been used by some researchers as indicators of identity. I examined archaeological remains from the Portland Wharf site with regards to such identities to supplement my understanding of Portland’s identities in the past. This analysis includes the identification of particular artifacts or patterns that may be symbolic or reflective of a particular identity, for example, “Irish” artifacts located at an Irish-American household (Brighton 2005), or place settings at the dinner table that are indicative of a female’s control over particular consumer activities in a household (Wall 1994). Artifact patterns were derived from mean percentages of particular artifact classes or categories or the presence of particular artifacts within the context of specific households. This is not to say that I emphasize specific identity markers, but through the practices of everyday life and the materials associated with those practices, we can see identity reflected in patterns that are contrasted with patterns in other contexts (Mullins 2008).

The analysis of the physical landscape will be conducted using the Harris Matrix to organize and interpret stratigraphic profiles documented at the Portland Wharf site (Harris 1979). The Harris Matrix will help elucidate stratigraphic relationships, such as the interfaces of strata, features, and more importantly, the negative events, such as intrusions into existing deposits (Lucas 2001). These relationships are graphically represented by assigning each stratum, feature, and deposit an individual context number within a horizontal designation. Context numbers are then grouped based on their relationship to the same vertical or feature associations called Master Contexts. For
example, all contexts associated with the same stratum or all contexts associated with the same feature are grouped together under one master context. Thus, a stratum, such as, the topsoil or a feature, like a privy, would be assigned a master context number.

The relationships of the master contexts to each other, based on the law of superposition, are represented as a diagram (Harris 1979). Although the Harris Matrix method was originally a graphic representation of stratigraphic relationships, I have modified it to also include temporal and functional data, in order to place the master contexts within meaningful phases that are linked to documented events that took place on the lots. The supplementary temporal and functional information was derived from the artifacts recovered from each archaeological deposit and helps to contextualize the events identified from the stratigraphic relationships (Lucas 2001).

The artifact dating techniques utilized during this analysis to establish the age of the artifact assemblages within particular deposits and the approximate date of deposition, included Mean Artifact Dating (South 1977) and Terminus Post Quem Dating (Noël Hume 1969). Mean artifact dating is derived from mean ceramic dating developed by Stanley South (1977). Mean ceramic dates are calculated by multiplying the median manufacture date for a ceramic type \( d_i \) by the number of sherds of vessels for each type \( f_i \); adding these products together; and dividing that sum by the total number of sherds or vessels \( f_1 \) (South 1977:217). The resulting date represents the average age of the artifact assemblage as represented by diagnostic artifacts.
Mean artifact dating uses the same formula, but also incorporates other diagnostic artifacts in addition to ceramics. Thus, any artifact with incept and terminal manufacturing dates could be used to calculate a mean date. In this study, the aforementioned ceramic types and container glass were used in mean artifact dating. Because the time lag for when ceramics and container glass entered the archaeological record from manufacture can be different, mean dates were calculated for ceramics and container glass separately and then a combined mean date was calculated.

In order to get a better indication of when artifacts associated with a particular stratum or feature were deposited, other dating methods like *terminus post quem* (T.P.Q.) were used in conjunction with mean dating and stratigraphic context (Noel Hume 1969). The T.P.Q. is derived from the latest beginning manufacturing date of a group of artifacts, which indicates a time after which a deposit could have been formed. The concept of TPQ suggests that the latest made artifact in an archaeological context represents the earliest date that the context could have been deposited (Noel Hume 1969:11). For example, if a context has artifacts that exhibit a date range of 1830 to 1870, then the deposit must have been created sometime after 1830.
A functional analysis of the artifacts from archaeological deposits was conducted to help understand the association of deposits with particular development episodes in the community and on individual lots. This analysis categorized artifacts into functional classifications, such as those used by Ball (1984); South (1977); and Genheimer (1995). From these techniques, patterns or trends can be identified through which the archaeological record can be interpreted or explained.

I assigned the artifacts recovered from the Portland Wharf site into functional groups to analyze the stratigraphy and features. I used functional groups to help characterize individual deposits and determine their function or relationship to actions that facilitated their creation (South 1977). Although the initial functional group studies utilized the same seven functional groups (South 1977), it has become common practice to develop more flexible functional categories that are more appropriate to a site’s context and the questions asked by the researcher (Ball 1984; Genheimer 1995).

The functional groups used in this study include the activities, arms, architecture, clothing, entertainment, furniture, kitchen, miscellaneous, and personal groups. Although faunal remains are typically associated with kitchen activities as food, unless all the remains are analyzed and their function determined, they cannot be assigned a functional category. In the case of faunal remains from the Portland Wharf site, only selected contexts had a full faunal analysis conducted and thus, faunal remains in general were not assigned to a functional group. Construction materials, such as nails and window glass, were assigned to the architecture group. The arms group comprises artifacts associated
with weapons, such as bullets, shell casings, gun flints, etc. Artifacts used in the performance of various general activities not associated with other functional groups, such as farming, gardening, and yard maintenance comprise the activities group. They often include tools, fence parts, buckets, fishing gear, or pad locks. In some cases, activities within this group may be separated as part of a more specific or refined functional group analysis. The clothing group consists of garment items such as buttons and buckles. The entertainment group consists of artifacts associated with entertainment or leisure, such as toys, game pieces, musical instruments, etc. Artifacts associated with furnishings or that were used to decorate or embellish buildings were assigned to the furniture group, these include lighting devices, chamber pots, wash basins, furniture hardware, flower pots, bric-a-brac, flower vases, etc. Artifacts used in food preparation, storage, and service including most ceramics and container glass, were assigned to the kitchen group. The personal group included artifacts typically kept on one’s person, or were used for personal hygiene, or personal activities, such as smoking pipes, coins, tokens, combs, toothbrushes, cosmetic bottles, writing accoutrements, jewelry, etc. Artifacts that could not be assigned to one of the aforementioned functional groups were assigned to the miscellaneous group.

In some cases, an analysis of the nails recovered from particular deposits was conducted to achieve a better understanding of former buildings at the site. A detailed analysis of the nails can provide more information about the construction type, roof type, and floor type. Some researchers have suggested that based on nail length frequencies one can determine if a structure was log, timber frame, or balloon frame (Wagner 1992;
Young 1991, 1994). Nail lengths are measured by pennyweight, and different nail sizes have been hypothesized to be associated with particular aspects of construction. Nail sizes are generally divided into four groups: roofing (2d-5d), siding (6d-8d), flooring (9d and 10d), and framing (12d and up) (Young 1991).

The proportions of the nail sizes distributed throughout an archaeological site can give some insight into the type of building constructed at the site. For instance, because the framing of log structures is performed with corner notching to join the logs, there is little need for heavy framing nails, 12d and larger. However, nails 8d and smaller, used in light framing around doors, flooring, shingling, finish work, lathing, and siding, are common in log structures. The structural members of timber frame buildings are mortised and tenoned together; thus, like log buildings, they do not require heavy framing nails. However, balloon frame structures use nails at the joints instead of mortise and tenon joints or corner notching, resulting in the use of a significantly greater number of large (12d and greater) nails. The number of roofing and siding nails is fairly constant in all types of construction (Stottman et al. 1997; Young 1994).

Occasionally, window glass dating was used to help determine when structures were constructed and establish building chronology. Although the use of window glass thickness for calculating dates has become a staple of archaeological analysis at historic sites (Ball 1983; Moir 1983; Roenke 1978), the utility of this analysis has been questioned by some researchers (Cohen 1992; Owens 1994; Rivers 1998; Stottman and Hockensmith 1998). Window dating formulas are based on the assumption that window
glass became gradually thicker over time until the late nineteenth century when improvements in the manufacturing process were developed. The formulas use a rate of thickness change, a date when window glass is introduced, and a weighted mean thickness from an assemblage to calculate the dates. While researchers have had a great deal of success using this method on pre-1850 historic sites, the way that later windowpanes were manufactured has led some researchers to question its applicability for use on late nineteenth-century sites. I used the window glass dating formula developed by Moir (1983) to acquire dates of construction for buildings identified in pre-1850s contexts. The Moir (1983) method uses the formula of 84.22 multiplied by the mean weighted thickness added to 1712.7.

In order to examine socio-economic status through the artifacts, economic scaling of ceramics was conducted on assemblages that consisted of enough artifacts and identifiable vessels for analysis. The use of economic scaling with ceramics has become a staple of most historical archaeological investigations of socio-economic status (Miller 1980; 1991). Ceramic price index values were developed for ceramics based on decoration, age, and price as derived from historical documents. Undecorated white ceramic dishes, known as CC wares, were established as the base line cost in the index with a value of one. Based on the price that ceramic manufacturers charged for particular ceramic vessels and decorative types at a specific time, a value above the base line value was established. For example, a ceramic dish with a value of 2.5 costs two and a half times the cost of the base line CC wares (Miller 1980).
An average ceramic price index value can be calculated for an archaeological ceramic assemblage, by weighting the values by number sherds or vessels and then deriving an average. Thus, average ceramic price index values for particular assemblages allow comparisons to be made with ceramic assemblages from other contexts and sites. While these indexes are not always an accurate indicator of socio-economic status, they are useful tools for intra and inter site comparisons of archaeological data. Furthermore, ceramic price index values can be compared to the economic capabilities of the associated households as derived from historical documents, such as tax lists and census records. Such comparisons are useful for identifying consumer habits and the investment that households made in their dishes.

It must be noted that Miller's ceramic price index values are based on the number bowls, cups, and plates within an assemblages. Plates are further indexed by size (Miller 1991). Since the size of many of the plates recovered from the Portland Wharf site could not be determined, the plate size with the lowest index value was used. Index values for 9-10 inch plates were used for all ceramic vessels identified as plates and the index value for 5-inch muffins was used for all saucers. Saucers and 5-inch muffins are relatively the same size and the difference between the two was not distinguished, although they are functionally different and saucers would generally be more expensive than muffins. The main difference between saucers and muffins is that muffins were small plates used in dining, whereas saucers were used with cups during tea.
One of the limitations of the Miller index is that it only provides values up to the 1880s. Thus, it is difficult to use the index on sites that date after the 1890s. To supplement Miller’s index for post 1890s sites, Fredrick Thomas (1988) devised an index for the period between 1890 and 1920. The Thomas index was derived from ceramic prices published in mail order catalogs and takes into account important decoration styles during the period, such as decal, gilt, and molded. The Thomas index was used in conjunction with the Miller Index for contexts that also contained late nineteenth and early twentieth century ceramics.

It should be noted that since some of the ceramics recovered at the Portland Wharf site were manufactured for long periods of time, the index date used in the analysis was based on date of occupation, as derived from diagnostic artifacts and historical data. This addresses the question of when particular types of ceramics may have been purchased, since it cannot be assumed that all ceramics were purchased at the same time and that all ceramics retain a constant value through time. In contexts where calculation of a ceramic price index was not possible, general socio-economic interpretations were made based on the proportion of ceramic types and decorations that are indicative of socio-economic status within each context, based on the assumption that more decoration is more expensive.

Using a variety of analytical tools, including dating and functional techniques, as well as mean comparisons of particular artifact types and forms, I tie the archaeological deposits to household cycles at particular houselots to examine the cultural composition
of the landscape over time (Groover 2001). For example, the examination of different patterns of nail types, functions, and distributions in conjunction with architectural related features, such as foundations, can be interpreted to understand the built environment on the landscape and changes to it over time. Changes to the built environment can be identified as events in the archaeological record, as construction, occupation, or demolition to provide an understanding of the household cycles at a particular house lot, as well as the structure of that lot. This information can be used to characterize the occupants through archival documents and ceramic price index scaling.

The results of the archaeological analysis were combined with the archival data to provide an integrated interpretation of the households, the built environment, and the landscape at specific lots and the Portland Wharf site as a whole. The interpretations are intended to weave the various lines of evidence together into a richer interpretation of the past.

**Understanding Present Identities**

In addition to understanding the past, I examine the relationship of the past to the present and how the past is used in the present for creating and maintaining identity, as well as the archaeologist’s role in this process (Bauman et al. 2008; Little and Shackles 2014; Matthews 2002; Potter 1999; Prybylski and Stottman 2010). The methods associated with the use of heritage and archaeology for the benefit of contemporary communities is largely derived from the work of applied anthropologists (Chambers 1985; Kedia and van Willigen 2005; van Willigen 1986; van Willigen et al. 1989). In
particular, my methods are most influenced by archaeologist Laurajane Smith’s (2006) application of ethnographic methods to examine the uses of heritage and archaeological information. While we as archaeologists can view how history was created and used in the past, we also need to examine our own role in how history is created and interpreted in the present. Smith conducted extensive ethnographic research utilizing interviews, questionnaires, surveys, and participant observations at heritage sites in Europe, Australia, and the United States to examine how heritage is used by those that present history to the public and its effect on those that view the presentations. Smith also examined the role that archaeologists play in the creation and presentation of heritage, as well as their role in authorized heritage discourse.

I have modeled my examination of the presentation of heritage at the Portland Wharf site, which is tied to the development of a heritage park called Portland Wharf Park, after Smith’s work. However, I have gone further and incorporate activist elements into the project and demonstrated that it is a case study in activist archaeology (Prybylski and Stottman 2010). Thus, archaeologists are not just passive participants in the heritage process, but we can be activists in how we use the past and the archaeological process to advocate for the communities in which we work (Atalay et al. 2013; Baumann et al. 2008; Jones 1997; Little and Zimmerman 2010; Stottman 2010).

In order to connect identity in the past with identity in the present, I conducted ethnographic research on current residents’ views of Portland’s identity, heritage, and history. This information was used to examine the potential for public and activist
archaeological research of the past to benefit the contemporary community through stakeholder collaboration in developing a park, public archaeological programs, heritage tourism, and exhibits. These data provide a base line of information regarding the contemporary community’s view of history, heritage, and their role in the creation of identity.

The ethnographic research is centered on these basic questions: How much do current Portland residents know or think they know about neighborhood history? How do current Portland residents perceive of their neighborhood identity? What role does history and heritage play in the construction and maintenance of the Portland Identity? How do the answers to these questions vary by length of time living in the neighborhood, age, race, and gender?

It is my hypothesis that history and heritage are important factors in the construction and maintenance of Portland’s identity, whether residents know much about their neighborhood’s history or not. I think that knowledge of neighborhood history will vary greatly based primarily on personal interest in history and that length of time living in the neighborhood does not affect that knowledge. I think that aspects of current Portland identities were derived from historical events, the details of which may have largely been forgotten from cultural memory, but fragments have either persisted or been redeployed in the identity and attitude of present-day Portlanders.
Qualitative ethnographic information was collected to discover contemporary perspectives on history, heritage, and identity (Handwerker 2001; Pelto 2013; Scrimshaw and Hurtado 1987). This research included a small representative sample of residents and former residents of Portland that approximated the general demographic make-up of the neighborhood. Although such studies are typically used to identify and define research domains, factors, and variables used in the development of more encompassing quantitative surveys and questionnaires, I have used the results in combination with other data to address my research questions (Handwerker 2001; Schensul et al. 1999). It is recognized that with such a small sample and the lack of more robust ethnographic study that my results should be considered preliminary and not necessarily reflective of all perspectives present in the neighborhood. However, they can provide insight into the process of how the present day Portland population creates and uses heritage and its relationship to identity and the landscape.

Interviews and participant observations of neighborhood meetings were used to address my research questions (Bernard 2006; Handwerker 2001; Pelto 2013; Schensul et al. 1999). Current or former residents of Portland (n=25) representing various ages, genders, races, ethnicities, and length of time living in the neighborhood were interviewed in a semi-structured format utilizing a series of eleven open ended questions (Appendix A and B). Interview participants were recruited several different ways. Most were arranged through staff and volunteers at the Portland Museum. Many of these participants are active volunteers at the museum or knew museum staff or volunteers. Other participants were recruited through my own personal connections, those of my
family, and from other interview participants. Adult residents and former residents of Portland were interviewed (Appendix A). Interviewees ranged in age from 23 to 74 years and lived in the neighborhood from 3 to 74 years. The interviewees included males (n=14), females (n=10), whites (n=21), African Americans (n=3), and Hispanic/white (n=1). Most of the interviewees were residents of the Portland Neighborhood (n=22). Former residents interviewed (n=3) were all white males.

My interview sample was rather small and comparatively showed some differences from the general Portland Neighborhood demographics. The Portland Neighborhood is estimated to have around 10,000 residents based on statistic provided by the Network Center for Community Change (2015) as derived from the 2011 Census Bureau American Community Survey. My interview population was much older (56.1) than the general neighborhood median age of 31.9. The racial/ethnic breakdown of my sample of residents also differed with whites accounting for over 80 percent of the sample and African Americans just 13.7 percent and Hispanic 4.5 percent of the sample. The neighborhood as a whole is 66.2 percent white, 30.6 percent African American and 3.2 percent other. Of the residents I interviewed most were male (56 percent) and 44 percent were female, which differed from the overall neighborhood breakdown which has slightly more females (53 percent) than males (47 percent). Although my sample is not entirely representative of the neighborhood as a whole, my sample does provide a diversity of perspectives on my research questions regarding history and identity.
Interviews were conducted at participant’s residences, workplaces, the Portland Museum, or a local tavern. All of the interviews were recorded on audio tape and then fully transcribed. Responses were organized and structured by the interview questions which were coded for general topics, including: knowledge of history, acquisition of history, identity, heritage, neighborhood boundaries, relationship with the City, and perceptions of the neighborhood (Appendix B) (Schensul et al. 1999). In some cases general response categories were created when a wide diversity of responses were given, as similar responses were grouped together in order to quantify them. The categories used and their quantification are discussed in the presentation and interpretation of the data in Chapter 8. All of the interviews were confidential per IRB requirements and participants were assigned an interview number that is keyed to basic participant demographics.

I attended neighborhood meetings, including Portland NOW (Portland’s Neighborhood Association) meetings and Portland Neighborhood Plan Task Force meetings (a committee of residents charged with developing a plan for the neighborhood through the Metro Louisville Department of Neighborhoods). I took fieldnotes at each meeting focused on topics related to the project research objectives. I also took fieldnotes at several neighborhood festivals that I attended. Additional information about specific events and controversies in the Portland Neighborhood pertaining to history, heritage, and identity was gathered from newspaper articles and editorials.
In order to better understand how the Portland community and the greater Metro Louisville community viewed the archaeological project and public programming conducted at the Portland Wharf, as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of the programming, an exit survey was given to participants in public programs during the 2005 and 2006 archaeological field seasons. The surveys collected basic information on respondents such as the zip code of their residence, Portland resident status, and age group. They concentrated on collecting information about the public programming that they participated in while at the site, an evaluation of the programs, and the effect the programs had on their perceptions of Portland and its past (Appendix C and D). Surveys were collected in 2005 (n=86) and 2006 (n=48). The data from these surveys were coded and entered into a database.

Furthermore during archaeological fieldwork, I collected information about how Portland Wharf Park was being used. A tally sheet was kept for each day of fieldwork at the Portland Wharf site recording the number of people observed in the park and activities they were engaged in while at the park, such as cycling, running/walking, participating in archaeology programs, and other activities. These categories were broken down by age and gender (Appendix E). This information was used to provide a base line for how the park was used and what impact the archaeology projects had on park usage.
The Portland Neighborhood

The Portland Neighborhood is located in the northwestern corner of Louisville, Kentucky along the Ohio River approximately two miles from the central business district. Today it roughly extends from 9th Street to the Shawnee Expressway and from Market Street north to the River (Figure 4.1). However, many Portland residents would challenge those boundaries, as is discussed in Chapter 8. Regardless, Portland generally occupies the northwestern portion of the city. The Portland Neighborhood is Louisville’s most economically depressed, as median incomes have been at or below poverty level since the 1970s (Abell 2009; John Milner and Associates 2000). This trend of poverty mirrors that seen in the neighborhoods surrounding Portland as well, known collectively as the West End. Although Portland shares the experience of poverty with the West End, it is very distinct from those communities that surround it in several ways. The most obvious of these is racial, as the surrounding communities are a mostly African-American and Portland is mostly white. The consequences of this distinction with regards to the deployment of identity and the landscape are discussed in more detail in Chapter 8. Although a large number of Portland residents have left the neighborhood over the last 40 years and there has been an influx of new residents representing a variety of ethnic and racial backgrounds, most of the neighborhood comprises multi-generational residents.
Figure 4.1. Location of the Portland Neighborhood and the Portland Wharf Site.
Portland is also very distinct in its history and heritage materialized in the large number of historic building stock still extant throughout the neighborhood. In many parts of the neighborhood, large numbers of abandoned or derelict properties can be found (Figure 4.2). The percentage of renters to homeowners has grown rapidly, much of it low rent. There also has been the increased development of government subsidized housing within the neighborhood. It is not unusual to see abandoned or rundown buildings, as absentee landlords maintain their properties poorly. This vision of Portland has led to many negative stereotypes and perceptions of the neighborhood that plague many economically depressed communities. However, despite these issues, Portland remains a strong community with a rich history and many well-maintained historic structures, all assets that can be used to help revitalize it (Figure 4.3) (John Milner and Associates 2000).
From the late eighteenth to early nineteenth century, six communities developed around the Falls of the Ohio River, including Portland, Louisville, and Shippingport in Kentucky and Jeffersonville, Clarksville, and New Albany in Indiana (Figures 4.1 and 4.4). All of these communities were inextricably tied to each other through the industries associated with the river. This dissertation will focus on the communities located on the Kentucky side of the falls, because of their relationship to Portland and the Portland Wharf archaeological site. Each of the communities, Portland, Louisville, and Shippingport, are discussed throughout the dissertation. Although the relationships between these communities were often contentious, they were all dependent on each
other in one way or another. A general context for each of these three communities is discussed below, followed by a description of the archaeological investigations conducted at Portland Wharf Park.

The history of these communities is inextricably tied to the Falls of the Ohio River which includes a series of rapids and waterfalls that drop 26 feet in elevation over two miles (Figures 4.4 and 4.5). The Falls of the Ohio River represented the only obstacle to navigation in the river between Pittsburgh and New Orleans. This unique geographical feature has been a focal point for human activity for nearly 10,000 years. Prehistoric Native Americans were drawn to the abundant and accessible natural resources around the falls. The area was first explored by Euro-Americans in the 1760s. The first Euro-American settlement took place in 1778 near the present site of Louisville,
located above the falls (Neary 2000; Thomas 1971; Yater 1987). Because the Falls made navigation of river difficult, nearly all shipping on the river began and ended or had to portage at the Falls. Louisville, Portland, and Shippingport all benefited from and in part owe their existence to the situation.

Figure 4.5. An Early Twentieth Century Post Card Showing the Falls of the Ohio River.

Louisville is Kentucky's largest metropolitan area. It was founded in 1778 during George Rogers Clark's expedition against the British in the Northwest Territories. Clark's militia accompanied a small group of settlers from Pittsburgh to Kentucky. The group set-up camp on a small island at the Falls of the Ohio River, before Clark and his men left to battle the British. The island was named Corn Island and was home to the settlers for several months. Later in 1778, the settlers moved to the Kentucky shore and laid the
foundation for a town called Louisville, which was named in honor of King Louis XVI of France, who had just pledged France's support to America during the Revolutionary War. In 1780, Louisville was granted a town charter by the Commonwealth of Virginia (Yater 1987).

Louisville's growth was very slow for the first 30 years of its existence. It was rather unhealthy place to live due to the many ponds and swamps that dotted the landscape. Its location in the western frontier left the settlement vulnerable to attacks from Native Americans throughout the remainder of the 1700s, further inhibiting its growth. Louisville would not see significant growth until the Louisiana Territory was purchased from France in 1803 (Yater 1987).

By 1803, the United States controlled the rivers between Pittsburgh and New Orleans. With the invention of the steamboat, the Ohio River became one of America’s most important shipping lanes. The falls were a natural obstacle, which made traversing the Ohio River nearly impossible by boat. Most travelers and cargo would disembark at Louisville, above the falls, and put back into the river below the falls (Freda 1996). The falls made Louisville one of the busiest ports in the country. During the period between 1810 and 1840, Louisville grew rapidly. By 1830, it replaced Lexington as the largest city in Kentucky with a population of over 11,000 (Yater 1987).

In the 1850s, Louisville strengthened its position as a mercantile center with the establishment of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad. Even the Civil War could not
slow Louisville's growth. The city was fortunately never attacked and profited handsomely from the war. It served as a base of operations and a supply distribution center for the Union Army. Local businesses and manufacturers expanded to supply the needs of war. After the war, the shipping industry began to slow and manufacturing took over spurred by the profits of war. By 1870, Louisville was a major manufacturing center and its population soared to over 100,000 (Yater 1987). The establishment of streetcar lines led to rapid suburban growth during the late 1800s and early 1900s, as the central core of Louisville became primarily commercial. Throughout the early 1900s, Louisville would experience times of prosperity and depression that paralleled that of the rest of the United States. Surviving the two world wars and a devastating flood in 1937, Louisville's growth leveled in the mid-1900s and it has remained one of America's many mid-sized cities.

Nearly twenty years after the founding of Louisville above the falls, the town of Shippingport was established west of Louisville on a peninsula of land that jutted into the river at the base of the falls (Figure 4.4). In 1806, two French boat builders, John and Louis Tarascon, moved to the Falls region. The brothers had first come to America in 1795 to escape the terror and anarchy of the French Revolution. Soon after arriving in Kentucky, the brothers purchased 45 acres of land immediately below the falls (Munro-Leighton 1979a). Financed by a number of wealthy Philadelphians, the Tarascon brothers set about planning and constructing the new town of Shippingport. By 1812, the brothers had laid out town lots and built a wharf, a shipyard, buildings for warehouses, and residences (Munro-Leighton 1979; Portland Museum 1981). Moreover,
the Tarascon Mill, the largest grist mill in the nation, was constructed (Portland Museum 1981).

The town’s location at the base of the falls helped it develop into an important shipbuilding center and port on the western waters of the frontier. Shippingport became a terminal link to river traffic from New Orleans and by 1819 its population reached five hundred, many of whom were French immigrants from New Orleans. However, the initial success and potential of Shippingport was short lived. Even with all the improvements by the Tarascon brothers, Shippingport was a financial failure (Portland Museum 1981). With increasing competition from mills and shipping in Louisville and later Portland, the Tarascons were never able to repay the loans they had received from their Philadelphian backers. In 1825, only six years after the great mill was in operation, John Tarascon was financially ruined and committed suicide (Munro-Leighton 1979; Portland Museum 1981). By the end of the 1830s, Shippingport was in a major decline, as the construction of the Portland and Louisville canal through the peninsula, in 1830, left Shippingport as an isolated island.

In one of history’s ironic twists of fate, the construction of the canal came to be the savior of at least one of Shippingport’s industries. The limestone in which the canal was excavated was found to be a perfect source for natural cement and the former Tarascon Mill was revived to grind limestone (Johnson and Parrish 2007; Portland Museum 1981; Watrous 1977). In 1842, two canal financiers took over operations of the Tarascon Mill and began production of inexpensive local cement. In 1866, the Louisville
Cement and Water Power Company was formed and continued to operate the mill until 1892. During these years all residential areas of Shippingport were removed, with only the mill and a few other industrial complexes operating on the island. Unfortunately, in 1892 an enormous fire engulfed the mill and left only the brick and stone walls (Johnson and Parrish 2007; Portland Museum 1981). During the 1920s, the Louisville Gas and Electric Company removed the last ruins of the Tarascon Mill and built a large hydroelectric plant. Much of what was Shippingport is now gone, having been removed by frequent floods and construction associated with the locks and dam and floodwall construction (Johnson and Parrish 2007).

Shippingport’s failure and decline benefited the town of Portland also founded at the base of the falls just below the peninsula (Figure 4.4). It was established by William Lytle of Cincinnati, who purchased the land in 1811 and 1813 from Henry Clay (Kleber 1992). Lytle was a major land speculator along the Ohio River, founding towns like Portland along its banks in hopes of capitalizing on the budding shipping industry along the western waterways of the frontier. The initial development of Portland was slow, as many speculators from Louisville purchased lots, but did not improve them. By the 1820s, some businesses, warehouses, and residences had been built.

The town of Portland was an immediate rival of Shippingport, its neighbor to the northeast. Because Portland had a more favorable location downstream from the falls and had a much larger harbor than the earlier settlement, it drew business from Shippingport. Furthermore, in 1818, the first major road linking the town of Louisville
above the falls with the new town of Portland, below the falls, was completed. This plank road, named the Portland and Louisville turnpike, by-passed Shippingport and made the transportation of cargo from Portland to Louisville much more convenient (Freda 1996; Munro-Leighton 1979b; Watrous 1977). Moreover, the road helped Portland’s businesses grow, since one third of the cost of shipping goods from Louisville to Louisiana came from the transfer of cargo down this road and around the falls (Munro-Leighton 1979b).

Although the portage industry was the economic catalyst for Portland, its founder William Lytle was the impetus behind the canal around the falls. Despite the construction of the canal, Portland continued to grow and prosper, as steamboats too large for the canal continued to stop in Portland. Businesses focused on the resupply and servicing of steamboats and their passengers grew and prospered along the Portland Wharf. The 1840s and 1850s was a boom time for the town, as it grew rapidly becoming one of the major ports along the Ohio River (Karem 1988; Watrous 1977).

When the Commonwealth of Kentucky incorporated Louisville as a city in 1828, Shippingport was included within its boundaries however Portland remained a separate town. Portland received its own charter from the Kentucky legislature in 1834 (Kleber 1992; Watrous 1977). Despite its previous exclusion from annexation, Portland was annexed by Louisville in 1837 (Freda 1996; Kleber 1992; Yater 1987). This annexation was short lived, as Louisville failed to fulfill the promises it made to Portland, such as connecting the community to the railroad. By 1842, Portland had sought and regained its
independence from Louisville, however the pressures of its rapid growth at this time proved to be too much for the community and it was annexed again in 1852 (Karem 1988).

Although the opening of the canal did not affect the fortunes of Portland like it did Shippingport, the enlargement and conversion of the canal to a toll free passage in the 1870s ended the portage industry that fueled Portland’s growth and made its wharf obsolete. Furthermore in 1886, a rail bridge connecting Portland with Indiana was completed, thus ending the ferry service that had been a vital part of Portland’s economy since 1812 (Freda 1996). Although Portland had endured major floods during the 1880s, there was economic incentive to rebuild the wharf area. However, by the early twentieth century, the wharf was no longer the economic engine it once was. In 1937 and again in 1945, terrible floods ravaged the “old” section of town and by the late 1940s plans for building a floodwall through the area were approved. The building of the flood levee successfully removed the last vestige of the Portland wharf.

**The Portland Wharf Site (15Jf418)**

This examination of landscape and identity in Portland will utilize archaeological data to help understand and reconstruct the physical and cultural landscape over time. This effort is focused on archaeological data collected at the Portland Wharf site (15Jf418). The Portland Wharf site encompasses three and a half former city blocks between 33rd (Fulton) Street, 37th (Gravier) Street, Missouri (Front) Street, and the river (Figure 4.1). The site consists of Portland Wharf Park, which encompasses 55 acres.
along the banks of the Ohio River, just below the falls and the entrance to the Portland Canal. It is primarily a forested environment with some open meadows. It is bounded by a railroad bridge on the east, the Ohio River on the north, a golf course on the west, and an earthen levee and elevated interstate highway on the south (Figures 4.6 and 4.7). The site was the location of the original town of Portland. It contained Portland’s wharf, commercial district, and first residences. The Portland Wharf site (15Jf418) has been the subject of archaeological investigations since 1982 and includes a large amount of data collected during several projects.
In 1982 and 1983, the University of Louisville conducted a surface reconnaissance and test excavations at the Portland Wharf site (DiBlasi 1985; Stottman and Granger 1992). At that time, four backhoe trenches were excavated in the wharf area primarily on a lot that was the site of the St. Charles Hotel (Figure 4.8). Hewn cedar log floor-joists were found intact, as were many wine bottles and glazed tiles along with institutional-grade ceramic dinnerware. Foundations and other architectural features with a wide range of artifacts dating to the nineteenth century were documented during the excavations (DiBlasi 1985; Stottman and Granger 1992). Also documented during the project were stone curbing and pavement associated with streets and walkways. Large remnants of the stone paved wharf and iron mooring rings were visible along the river’s edge at the time of the project.
Figure 4.8. Archaeologists from the University of Louisville Uncover a Building Foundation in 1982 (Courtesy Philip J. DiBlasi).

The results of these investigations demonstrated that intact archaeological deposits associated with the wharf and its businesses and residences were present at the site. However, the extent of the deposits was unknown.


Spurred by the results of the 1982-1983 investigations, the Portland community and the Metro Louisville Parks Department finally began a master planning effort in 1999 to convert the old Portland Wharf into a park that would focus on the rich archaeological resources present there. The resulting master plan for Portland Wharf Park recommended that an extensive archaeological survey of the entire park be conducted to determine the
nature and extent of the archaeological resources and make recommendations for future research and interpretation (Rhodeside and Harwell 2002). The Kentucky Archaeological Survey conducted a survey at the Portland Wharf site (15Jf418) and identified five areas with intact archaeological deposits (Figure 4.9). A total of 81 features ranging from street pavement to privies was identified within the 61 backhoe trenches excavated across the site (Figure 4.9). Artifacts dating from the early nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth century were collected from these features, as well as from demolition layers and trash middens. All of the prehistoric artifacts, which included a Late Archaic projectile point, were recovered from disturbed contexts (Stottman and Prybylski 2003).

A large area (Area A), that consists of one and a half city blocks between 33rd and 34th Streets, contained a variety of well-preserved residential and commercial archaeological deposits (Figure 4.9). Trenches placed in this area documented 53 features, including street pavement (n=10), privies (n=7), walkways (n=6), foundations (n=6), unidentified pits (n=5), unidentified pavement (n=4), postholes (n=3), cisterns (n=2), limestone slabs (n=2), trash deposits (n=2), rubble areas (n=2), a pier support (n=1), a lime deposit (n=1), a charcoal deposit (n=1), and an unidentified stain (n=1). These resources were found at depths ranging from 40 cm to 1.5 m (1.3 to 4.9 ft.) below the surface. A variety of artifacts dating from the mid-nineteenth century to the late twentieth century were recovered from this area. They consisted mostly of ceramic dishes, glass bottles, and nails (Stottman and Prybylski 2003).
Figure 4.9. Location of Survey Excavations and Areas of Intact Archaeological Deposits at the Portland Wharf Site.
The area that comprises the east quarter of a block located between Missouri and Florida Streets along the west side of 34th Street (Area B) also contained intact archaeological deposits and was the location of previous archaeological investigations conducted by the University of Louisville (Figure 4.9). A total of five features was identified in this area. They included street pavement (n=2), a cellar (n=1), a brick foundation (n=1), and an unidentified stain (n=1). An extensive demolition layer, which contained a large amount of mid-nineteenth to late twentieth century artifacts, also was documented in Area B. In this area, the archaeological deposits tended to be found at depths ranging from 50 to 65 cm (1.6 to 2.1 ft.) below the surface.

Area C is situated at Water Street and the wharf along the east side of 34th Street (Figure 4.9). A total of five features was identified in this area. They consisted of street pavement associated with Water Street (n=1), street pavement associated with the intersection of Water and 34th Streets (n=1), a large intact section of the wharf (n=1) with mooring rings (n=1), and an unidentified pit feature (n=1) (Figure 4.10). These features are buried under 1.5 m (4.9 ft.) of silt.

Area D consists of a city block south of Florida Street and north of Missouri Street between 35th and 36th Streets (Figure 4.9). This block was the location of the Rugby Distillery from the late nineteenth to early twentieth century. A total of eight features was identified in this area. They consisted of three sets of foundations (n=3), street pavement (n=2), a section of a railroad line (n=1), and unidentified pavement associated with equipment for the distilling process (n=2). The archaeological resources
documented in Area D are covered by only 45 to 50 cm (1.5 to 1.6 ft.) of overburden. The brick wall foundations documented in this area were in excellent condition.
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Figure 4.10. Stone Paving and Mooring Rings from the Old Portland Wharf.

Area E comprises the east half of the block south of Florida Street and north of Missouri Street between 36th and 37th Streets (Figure 4.9). Five features were identified in this area. They included street pavement associated with 36th Street (n=1), iron pipes
under the street (n=2), and privies (n=2). An extensive demolition layer and trash midden also was documented. These resources were found at depths ranging from 20 and 40 cm (0.6 and 1.3 ft.) below the surface. As such they were not covered with a great deal of overburden. A large amount of artifacts dating primarily from the mid-nineteenth to early twentieth centuries were recovered from Area E.

**Kentucky Archaeological Survey Data Recovery (2005)**

Based on the results of the survey project, the Kentucky Archaeological Survey conducted more intensive investigations at selected areas of the site in 2005 to determine the extent of significant archaeological resources, perform data recovery, list the site on the National Register of Historic Places, and test public archaeological programming strategies. These excavations were focused on a houselot and commercial building located in Area A. The houselot was located on 33rd Street between Florida Alley and Missouri Street at the east end of the site. The excavations consisted of three stripped blocks on Lot 56 and a linear stripped block on Lot 53 form the overburden was removed (Figure 4.11). Within these blocks, units and features were hand excavated.

The features identified at Lot 56 included the intact foundation of a late nineteenth-century shotgun house, adjacent brick sidewalk, three brick-lined privies, piers and posts for an outbuilding, and fence posts. A large portion of the foundation and sidewalk was exposed (Figure 4.12). All three privies were partially investigated, each being excavated to an approximate depth of 1.5 meters. Two privies were filled in the mid-1900s, while the third had been looted in the late twentieth century. Most of the
strata sampled at Lot 56 consisted of late nineteenth to early twentieth century demolition related middens. However, during exploration of the looted privy with a backhoe, several intact early to mid-nineteenth century occupation layers were identified extending 1 m (3.2 ft.) below the demolition zones at the rear of the houselot.

A trench was hand excavated in 1 x 1 m sections at a commercial lot located at the corner of 34th and Florida Streets at the west end of Area A at Lot 53. Features identified included a large cellar, a builder’s trench, robber’s trench, and an adjacent brick sidewalk. The cellar fill contained a numerous glass containers, white granite dishes, and nails. The fill dates to the late 1880s and 1890s, the time that the building was in disrepair and demolished. The trench bisected a part of the cellar and building foundation represented by the builder’s and robber’s trench.

**Kentucky Archaeological Survey and University of Louisville Data Recovery (2006)**

In 2006, the Kentucky Archaeological Survey and the University of Louisville archaeological fieldschool conducted additional investigations at Lot 56, focused on the deeply buried early to mid-nineteenth century deposits identified, but only minimally sampled the previous year. A 12 x 12 m area of the rear yard behind the shotgun house foundation was stripped to a depth of 1.5 m below the ground surface where blocks of hand excavated 1 x 1 m units were placed (Figures 4.11 and 4.13). Features identified included a late nineteenth century brick-lined privy, a mid to late-nineteenth century wood-lined privy, post holes, and brick deposits. Intact strata included late-nineteenth
century fill episodes and mid-nineteenth century occupation and demolition layers associated with the home of French immigrants during the 1840s and 1850s.

Figure 4.11. The Location of Survey Areas A and B, Lots 53 and 56, 2005 Excavation Areas (in Pink), and 2006 Excavation Area (in Blue) on the 1892 Sanborn Map.
Artifacts recovered during the investigations included a variety of domestic and architectural artifacts, such as nails, window glass, ceramic dishes, bottle glass, faunal remains, and personal items. These artifacts date from the early to late nineteenth century and represent some of the earliest residential occupations in Portland. Based on the excavations conducted at Lot 56, the residential history of the Portland Wharf site is represented archaeologically.
The archaeological data from the Portland Wharf site was recovered during a survey of the entire site in 2002 and subsequent excavations focused on a residential house lot (Lot 56) and a commercial lot (Lot 53) in 2005 and 2006 (Figure 4.11). Nearly 50,000 artifacts were recovered, over 100 features were documented, and 25 different strata were identified during these projects. The Portland Wharf site contains intact archaeological remains associated with the residences, stores, industry, streets, and the wharf that comprised the original town of Portland. These archaeological remains form the basis of the archaeological data used in this dissertation.
An archaeological analysis of the Portland Wharf landscape is focused on the physical and cultural aspects of the landscape. In this study, an examination of the stratigraphy, features, and artifacts within the historical and social context developed from the archival record is conducted to understand the Portland Wharf’s past landscape. A stratigraphic analysis of the archaeological deposits at the Portland Wharf site provides an understanding of the site’s development and chronology. The deposits and artifacts recovered from the Portland Wharf site will help reconstruct the historic landscape, including the natural topography, the built environment, and profiles of the people who lived there. The focus of this analysis is centered on a portion of Area A in the Portland Wharf site lying between 33rd (Fulton) and 34th (Commercial) Streets, Missouri (Front), and Water Streets (Figure 4.11). This entire area has been extensively surveyed archaeologically, although the focus of this study is on the two areas that have been the subject of the most extensive archaeological excavations. They include Lot 56, located along the west side of 33rd (Fulton) Street, and Lot 53 located along the east side of 34th (Commercial) Street (Figure 4.11). Each lot will be discussed individually and then an interpretation of the Portland Wharf landscape and residents from the archaeological remains will be presented.
Lot 56

Excavations at Lot 56 were concentrated in the middle portion of the lot along its east side. A total of 47 master contexts, representing 21 features and 26 strata, were designated at Lot 56 (Table 5.1). The features identified include posts, a foundation, a cistern, privies, builder’s trenches, a hearth, unidentified trenches, and unidentified features. The strata documented included demolition layers, fills, a yard midden, a coal deposit, transitional layers, burned layers, and subsoil. All of these are associated with various residences and outbuildings that were present on the lot from the 1820s to 1930s. The Harris Matrix constructed for the archaeological deposits from Lot 56 identified seven distinct phases of occupation and changes (Figure 5.1). Each phase is discussed below.

Phase I

Phase I includes Master context 1, the upper most strata identified at the site, which consisted of an extensive demolition fill dating to the mid-twentieth century (Table 5.2). This stratum ranged in thickness from 30 to 100 cm and contained a large amount of artifacts, consisting primarily of architectural and domestic debris. This layer was considered overburden and coincides with the clearing of buildings from the site in preparation for the construction of the flood levee in the 1940s.
Table 5.1. Master Context Descriptions for Lot 56.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Occupation Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mottled dark brown silt clay</td>
<td>Demolition fill</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Brown silt clay loam with brick, plaster, mortar, and coal</td>
<td>Demolition fill</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brown silt clay loam with plaster</td>
<td>Demolition layer</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dark brown silt clay loam with mortar</td>
<td>Demolition layer</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mottled silt clay</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Brown silt loam</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mottled brown sandy clay w/charcoal</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mottled brown silt clay</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mottled brown sandy clay</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Gray silt clay</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mottled gray ashy clay</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dark brown silt loam</td>
<td>Demolition fill</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Brick-lined circular vault</td>
<td>Privy</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>Demolition debris</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dark brown silt loam</td>
<td>Unidentified Feature</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mottled reddish brown sandy clay</td>
<td>Demolition layer</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Dark brown silt clay loam</td>
<td>Post hole</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Brick-lined circular vault</td>
<td>Cistern</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Gray silt clay</td>
<td>Post hole</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Gray silt clay</td>
<td>Post hole</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Brick and stone rubble</td>
<td>Demolition debris</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Brick-lined circular vault</td>
<td>Privy</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Brick-lined square foundation and circular vault</td>
<td>Privy</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Brick-lined circular vault</td>
<td>Privy</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Wood-lined square vault</td>
<td>Privy</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Dark brown silt clay loam</td>
<td>Post hole</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Dark brown silt loam</td>
<td>Yard midden</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Dark brown silt loam w/coal</td>
<td>Coal disposal</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mottled light brown silt clay w/brick, coal, and mortar</td>
<td>Linear feature</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Light brown sandy loam</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Brown silt clay</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Dark brown silt loam</td>
<td>Post hole</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Dark brown silt loam w/brick and mortar</td>
<td>Post hole</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Dark brown silt clay loam w/brick and charcoal</td>
<td>Demolition layer</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Mottled light brown clay w/charcoal</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Dark brown silt clay w/charcoal</td>
<td>Burned debris</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Mottled yellow brown silt clay loam w/brick and charcoal</td>
<td>Demolition layer</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Mottled gray silt clay w/charcoal</td>
<td>Burned debris</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Mottled dark brown silt clay</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Mottled brown silt loam</td>
<td>Builder’s trench</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Tan sand</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Dark brown silt clay w/brick and charcoal</td>
<td>Transition to subsoil</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Mottled yellow brown sandy clay</td>
<td>Privy builder’s trench</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Dark brown silt loam</td>
<td>Unidentified feature</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Mottled dark brown and yellow sandy clay</td>
<td>Post hole</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Dark gray brown silt clay w/charcoal</td>
<td>Burned debris</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.1. Harris Matrix Diagram and Phases for Lot 56.
Table 5.2 Date Ranges, T.P.Q., and Mean dates for Lot 56 Master Contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Context</th>
<th>Manufacturing Date Range</th>
<th>T.P.Q. Date</th>
<th>Ceramic Date</th>
<th>Glass Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1762-Present</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1830-1930</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1830-1930</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1830-Present</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1830-Present</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1830-Present</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1830-1930</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1830-1890</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1830-1930</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1830-1930</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1830-Present</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1830-1890</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1830-Present</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1830-1930</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1830-1890</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1830-1890</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1810-1913</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1762-Present</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1830-Present</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1830-1913</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1780-1913</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1830-1890</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1830-Present</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1830-1890</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1830-1890</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1830-1890</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1830-1890</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1830-1890</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1830-1890</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1780-1930</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1780-1890</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1780-1930</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1780-1890</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1762-1890</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1830-1890</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1762-1930</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1830-1870</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase II

Phase II comprises 20 Master Contexts, of which 12 were sealed by the demolition overburden and were associated with the last occupation and demolition of structures located on Lot 56 prior to land preparation for the construction of the flood levee (Figure 5.1). Master Contexts 6, 10, and 13 were strata identified in the eastern portion of the lot near 33rd (Fulton) Street. They contained a high percentage of architecture group artifacts and brick and/or mortar, and plaster within the soil matrix. The artifacts from these strata have a manufacturing date range between 1830 and the present and exhibit a T.P.Q. of 1842 (Table 5.2). A mean date of 1878 was calculated for M-6, indicating the average manufacturing age of the assemblage (Table 5.2). Based on this information, these master contexts were associated with the demolition of the shotgun house occupied by the Veit family identified on the 1884, 1892, 1905, and 1928 maps showing the lot (Figures 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5).

Also associated with the shotgun house were Master Contexts 47, 50, and 60, a stratum and features identified just below the overburden (M-1). These contexts contained primarily kitchen group artifacts, with a high percentage of architecture group artifacts. M-47 had nearly equal amounts of architecture and kitchen artifacts, while M-50 and M-60 consisted primarily of kitchen artifacts (Table 5.3). The artifacts from M-47 have a date range of 1830 to the present and a T.P.Q. of 1915 (Table 5.2). This stratum represents a yard midden just south of the shotgun house where artifacts associated with the domestic occupation and demolition or renovation activities accumulated primarily during the early twentieth century. This midden sealed a deposit of coal and cinder (M-
49) that contained a high percentage of kitchen and architecture group artifacts, with a date range of 1830-1890 and a T.P.Q. of 1830 (Table 5.2 and 5.3). M-49 represents a deposition of coal/cinder and domestic refuse within the side yard of the house. M-50 and M-60 were features with artifacts dating from 1830 to 1890 and exhibiting a T.P.Q. of 1830. M-50 was an unidentified linear depression that likely represents a low area in the rear yard of the house where artifacts accumulated during occupation in the late nineteenth century. M-60 was a brick hearth with an ashy and cinder fill that was associated with the house.

Figure 5.2. 1884 Map Showing Lots 53 and 56 (Hopkins 1884).
Figure 5.3. 1892 Sanborn Map Showing Lots 53 and 56.

Figure 5.4. 1905 Sanborn Map Showing Lots 53 and 56.
Figure 5.5. 1928 Sanborn Map Showing Lots 53 and 56.

Table 5.3. Functional Group Percentages for Phase II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Group</th>
<th>Master Context</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does not include M-21, M-25, M-27, M-32, M-46, which contained too few artifacts.
Master contexts 32 and 39 represent a stratum and feature located in the western portion of Lot 56 in what was the rear yard of the shotgun house. M-32 was a small post hole that contained few artifacts and late machine cut nails dating from 1830 to 1890 and a T.P.Q. of 1830. M-39 was a stratum of mottled clay with brick and stone rubble that contained a high percentage of kitchen and architecture artifacts, with the kitchen artifacts being predominant. The artifacts from this stratum date from 1830 to 1890 and exhibit a T.P.Q. of 1830. The presence of brick and stone rubble and a significant amount of architecture group artifacts indicate that this stratum was associated with the demolition of a structure. These master contexts suggest that an outbuilding was located in this area of Lot 56, which corresponds to an outbuilding identified on the 1892, 1905, and 1928 maps showing the lot (Figures 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5). The high percentage of kitchen group artifacts recovered from M-39 suggests that the outbuilding likely had a domestic function or that domestic refuse was deposited in this area.

Master contexts 7 and 14 were strata located in the western portion of the property behind the shotgun house covering most of the rear yard immediately behind the house (Table 5.1). Master context 14 was identified just below the overburden (M-1), while M-7 was identified just below that (Figures 5.1 and 5.6). Each of these strata contained mostly kitchen and architecture artifacts and exhibited plaster within the soil matrix (Table 5.4). Both of these master contexts have date ranges between 1830 and 1930 and exhibit the same T.P.Q. of 1842 (Table 5.2). However, M-7’s artifact assemblage appears to be older, as its mean date was 1859 compared to 1870 for M-14 (Table 5.2). These two strata contain some domestic refuse and demolition debris that accumulated in
the yard during occupation and were possibly associated with an addition made to the rear of the house in the early 1900s (Figures 5.4 and 5.5).

Figure 5.6. Stratigraphic Profile in Rear Yard behind Shotgun House.
Also located in the western portion of Lot 56 in the rear yard of the Veit shotgun house and the adjacent property to the south were master contexts 24, 33, 41, 42, and 53, representing features that were sealed by M-1, the site overburden (Figure 5.1). Master contexts 24, 41, and 42 were brick-lined privies, M33 was a brick water cistern, and M53 was a shallow pit feature partially lined in brick.

Two of the privies were located on the Veit property directly behind the shotgun house (M-42) and in the southwest corner (M-24). One privy (M-41) was located on the adjacent property to the south at the middle rear of the property. Master context M-24 contained a large number of artifacts that were primarily assigned to the kitchen group, with a smaller percentage representing the architecture and other functional groups (Table 5.3). This artifact distribution amongst functional groups indicates that the deposition was primarily domestic in nature and most likely associated with domestic refuse from the residence. The artifact assemblage from M-24 has a date range from 1830 to present day and T.P.Q. of 1930, indicating that it was primarily used during the early 1900s and was likely abandoned when the shotgun house was abandoned in 1935 (Table 5.2).

Master contexts 41 and 42 also contained a large number of artifacts, but were more evenly distributed amongst the kitchen and architecture functional groups as the kitchen group was slightly more dominant than the architecture group (Table 5.3). This artifact distribution amongst the functional groups indicates that these privies contained a large amount of domestic refuse, as well as architectural debris. The artifact assemblage
from M-41 exhibited a date range from 1762 to the present, and a T.P.Q. of 1933. The M-42 assemblage ranged in date from 1830 to present and exhibited a mean ceramic date of 1873, indicating that the artifacts were primarily manufactured during the late nineteenth century (Table 5.2). A T.P.Q. date of 1919 was derived from a coin recovered from M-42, indicating that the artifacts were deposited sometime after this date. These dates indicated that M-42 was abandoned sometime in the 1920s to 1930s and that M-41 was used up to the demolition of the structures and subsequent land filling and grading during the 1930s and 1940s.

Master context 33 was a large brick water cistern located at the southwest corner of the Veit shotgun house. A sample of artifacts collected from the feature fill was primarily assigned to the kitchen functional group, along with significant amounts of architecture and miscellaneous group artifacts (Table 5.3). This distribution of artifacts is typical of cisterns which were quickly filled with domestic refuse and cinders when they were abandoned. The artifact assemblage from M-33 has a date range of 1830 to the present and a T.P.Q. of 1903, indicating that the cistern was abandoned and filled sometime after that date, most likely associated with the demise of the house (Table 5.2).

A shallow pit-like feature (M-53) was identified behind the Veit shotgun house adjacent to M-42. The feature contained an ashy fill that was 15 cm thick and contained a small number of artifacts that were almost exclusively assigned to the architecture functional group (Table 5.3). The artifacts exhibited a date range from 1830 to 1890 and
a T.P.Q. of 1830. This feature was partially lined or edged with brick and it is likely that it was associated with the construction of the adjacent privy (M-42) during the late 1800s.

Phase II represents the occupation and demolition of the lot during the late 1800s to 1930s, which included a house, a domestic outbuilding, a cistern, and two privies. The demolition of these structures and the filling of the cistern and privies sometime in the early 1900s are also represented in Phase II. Based on archival data, Phase II represents the occupation of a shotgun house owned and occupied by Catherine Veit and by her tenants during the early 1900s. Based on archival information the house was demolished sometime between 1928 and 1931.

**Phase III**

Phase III comprises four master contexts that were documented underlying the Phase II master contexts (Figure 5.1). Master contexts 16, 17, 55, and 69 were mottled clay or sandy clay strata located in the west portion of Lot 56 in the rear yard area behind the Veit shotgun house (Figures 5.6 and 5.7) (Table 5.1). These contexts ranged in thickness from 10 cm to 40 cm and generally contained low artifact densities. Master context 16 was a mottled sandy clay that was identified throughout the rear yard of the Veit house (Figure 5.6). Most of the artifacts recovered from M-16 were assigned to the kitchen group with a much smaller percentage representing the architecture group (Table 5.4). This distribution of artifacts among the functional groups indicates that this stratum contains primarily domestic refuse. The artifact assemblage exhibited a date range from 1830 to 1930, and a T.P.Q. of 1842. Master context M-17 also was identified primarily
in the eastern portion of Lot 56 in the side (south) yard. The artifacts from M-17 were assigned primarily to the architecture and kitchen functional groups, with the architecture group accounting for just over half of the assemblage. This distribution indicates that the assemblage contains mainly architecture debris and domestic refuse. The date range of the artifact assemblage from M-17 was 1830 to 1890, with a T.P.Q. of 1830 (Tables 5.2).

Few or no artifacts were recovered from master contexts 55 and 69, a thin mottled clay identified beneath M-53 (pit feature in Phase II) and a 10-20 cm thick tan sand (Table 5.5). No dates for these contexts were available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Group</th>
<th>Master Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include M-55 or M-69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strata associated with Phase III represent fills deposited on Lot 56, mainly at the rear of the Veit shotgun house during the late 1800s. Because these fills contain mainly architectural debris and domestic refuse, they may have been associated with the demolition of structures and refuse dumping. These fills also were fairly extensive with some being as thick as 40 cm and together extended to a depth of 1.5 m below the present day ground surface. This information suggests that the fills were likely used to level the topography and may have included demolition debris that was dumped on the lot.
However, the sandy texture and extensive nature of M-16 likely indicates that it was associated with a flooding event, as the area was known to have flooded frequently during the late nineteenth century.

Table 5.5. Artifact Counts for Phase III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Master Context</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 17 55 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>38 41 2 0</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>116 250 0 0</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>16 115 4 0</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 3 0 0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td>36 16 0 0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>20 16 0 0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>226 441 6 0</strong></td>
<td><strong>673</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.7. Stratigraphic Profile of the Shotgun House Area.
Phase IV

Phase IV comprises five master contexts identified below the fills associated with Phase III and the occupation and demolition layers associated with Phase II (Figure 5.1). They include two privies (M-43 and M-44), two builder’s trenches (M-68 and M-72) (Figure 5.7), and a brick foundation (M-22) (Table 5.1).

The two privies were sealed by M-16, a likely flood deposit. Master context 43 was a circular brick-lined privy that contained a large number of artifacts (n=4,572) (Table 5.6). Most of these were assigned to the kitchen functional group, with a significant amount of furniture group artifacts also being recovered (Table 5.7). This distribution indicates that domestic refuse, such as daily waste, including faunal remains and broken glass and ceramic vessels, was deposited in the privy. The relatively high percentage of furniture group artifacts suggests that a large number of household furnishings, such as lamp chimney glass, were dumped in the privy and may be indicative of a house cleaning episode. The artifact assemblage from M-43 exhibited a date range from 1830 to 1913. A mean ceramic date of 1875 was calculated for the deposit, indicating the mean manufacturing date of the artifacts (Table 5.2). The ceramic assemblage was not very diverse, consisting primarily of whiteware and white granite, which primarily date to the mid to late-nineteenth century. It is what would be expected for a household during that period. The higher portions of white granite (54 percent) to whiteware (28 percent) indicates that ceramics purchased later in the nineteenth century were most prevalent, as white granite was most popular after the 1860s. The diagnostic artifacts provided a T.P.Q. date of 1888, which indicates that the privy was deposited
sometime after that date (Table 5.2). Given that the date was derived from a local drugstore bottle, which tends to be discarded rather quickly after use, M-43 was likely deposited sometime in the late 1880s to 1890s.

Table 5.6. Artifact Counts for Phase IV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Master Context</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 43 44 68 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>0 250 530 8 0</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>0 1,616 485 15 0</td>
<td>2,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>0 177 450 11 2</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 49 29 1 0</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td>0 2,397 72 13 0</td>
<td>2,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>0 83 171 1 0</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0 4,572 1,737 49 2</td>
<td>6,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7. Functional Group Percentages for Phase IV and V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Group</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
<th>Phase V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M-43</td>
<td>M-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include M-22, M-28, M-72, M-73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Master context 44 was a square wood plank-lined privy that also contained a large amount of artifacts, but much less than M-43 (n=1,737) (Table 5.6). Half of these were assigned to the kitchen functional group (Table 5.9). A large percentage of architecture group artifacts also was present, which was significantly more than M-43. This artifact distribution amongst the functional groups indicates that the feature was filled primarily with domestic refuse and architectural debris. A large amount of brick rubble was
documented within the privy fill as well, further indicating that the fill may have been associated with the demolition or perhaps modification of a structure. The artifact assemblage from M-44 exhibited a wide range of dates ranging from 1780 to 1913. A mean ceramic date of 1862 and a mean glass date of 1882 were calculated for the deposit, indicating the mean date of manufacture for the artifact assemblage (Table 5.2). These dates indicate that the ceramics recovered from M-44 were older than those in M-43, as there was more diversity in ceramic type exhibited, including creamware, pearlware, whiteware, and white granite refined tablewares. However, the ceramic assemblage was dominated by whiteware and white granite, as would be expected for a mid to late-nineteenth century household. When compared to the ceramics found in M-43, there was significantly more whiteware (45 percent) than white granite (16 percent) in M-44, an indication that the older whiteware ceramics were more prevalent and representative of the earlier iterations of the household. A T.P.Q. date of 1870 was derived from the presence of an improved tooled lip on a bottle and indicates that M-44 was deposited sometime after that date (Table 5.2).

Based on the diagnostic artifacts recovered from M-43 and M-44, it appears that M-44 was the initial privy constructed and used by the Veit family when they first occupied their shotgun house in 1873. However, the large amount of architecture-related artifacts and brick rubble found in the privy suggests that it was used to dispose of architectural debris associated with some type of building demolition, construction, or modification during the early years of the Veit family’s occupation of the property. This
privy was likely used into the early 1880s when it was replaced by M-43 as the household’s waste disposal feature.

Master context 22 was a brick foundation associated with the Veit shotgun house, which dates to 1873 when the house was built. Master context 68 is the builder’s trench for the brick foundation (Figures 5.1 and 5.7). Artifacts recovered from M-68 were mostly assigned to the architecture group, with the kitchen group also being represented (Table 5.7). This distribution is typical for builder’s trenches where architectural debris and some domestic refuse, produced during construction, often accumulated. The M-68 artifact assemblage exhibited a date range of 1830 to 1890 and a T.P.Q. of 1830, which is consistent with the construction of the house in 1873 (Table 5.2).

Master context 72 was a builder’s trench associated with the wood plank privy (M-44). This context was a very narrow fill between the wood planks of the privy and the surrounding strata through which the privy cuts (Figure 5.8). It represents the hole that was excavated and subsequently lined with wood planks to form the privy vault. Only two artifacts were recovered from the soil used to fill the space between the planks and the edge of the hole excavated for the vault, none of which were diagnostic.
The master contexts associated with Phase IV, with the exception of the Veit house foundation and builder’s trench (M-22 and M-68) represent features that were sealed by the fill layers associated with Phase III. M-16, a possible flood deposit, appears to have sealed the privies sometime during the 1880s. Based on the feature deposits, both privies were associated with the Veit household. Although both privies were associated with the Veit household during the late 1800s, they exhibited different deposition types and were likely not contemporaneous. M-44 contained artifacts that were slightly older and likely associated with the early iteration of the Veit household and served as the first privy on the property. It was likely replaced by M-43 sometime in the late 1880s to 1890s. M-43 was very typical of privy deposits associated with the feature’s primary
function for the disposal of nightsoil (excrement) and daily household refuse. M-44 contained a large amount of architectural debris and had far fewer artifacts than M-43. M-44 appears to have been filled with mainly demolition debris and some domestic refuse, which indicates that it was abandoned before it was completely filled via its primary function for the disposal of daily household waste. The nature of the deposits in M-44 indicates that the privy was filled rather quickly with available debris, such as construction or demolition debris.

Phase V

The master contexts associated with Phase V consists of mottled clay fills (M-18 and M-20) that were sealed by M-16 associated with Phase III and cut by the privies associated with Phase IV and thus, predate the Veit household’s occupation of the site (Table 5.1) (Figures 5.1, 5.7, and 5.9). M-18 is an extensive mottled sandy clay fill that ranged in thickness from 20 to 60 cm. A moderate amount of artifacts was recovered from M-18 and were primarily assigned to the kitchen group, while the architecture and miscellaneous groups also were well represented (Tables 5.7 and 5.8). This distribution indicates that M-18 contained primarily domestic refuse with some architectural debris and miscellaneous unidentified metal. The artifact assemblage from M-18 ranged in date from 1830-1930, with a T.P.Q. of 1869 (Table 5.2). Master context M-20 is a mottled ashy gray clay fill that ranged in thickness from 15 to 30 cm. A rather low density of artifacts was recovered from M-20 and was assigned primarily to the architecture and kitchen functional groups, with the architecture group accounting for just over half of the assemblage. This distribution indicates that the assemblage contains mainly architecture
debris and domestic refuse. The artifact assemblage from M-20 ranged from 1830 to 1930, with a T.P.Q. of 1842 (Table 5.2). Both master contexts exhibited similar mean artifact dates with M-18 being 1858 and M-20 being 1856 (Table 5.2).

![Stratigraphic Profile Showing Phase V, VI, and VII Deposits.](image)

**Figure 5.9.** Stratigraphic Profile Showing Phase V, VI, and VII Deposits.

**Table 5.8.** Artifact Counts for Phase V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Master Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The master contexts associated with Phase V were fill layers that predate the establishment of the Veit shotgun house on Lot 56 in 1873. M-18 was an extensive fill that was deposited sometime around 1870, perhaps to level the topography and for the disposal of domestic debris just prior to the construction of the Veit house. M-20 was a fill layer that was sealed by M-18 and deposited sometime between 1842 and 1869. The ashy soil matrix and presence of architecture and kitchen artifacts indicates that it was likely associated with the demolition of a domestic structure and ashes from a fireplace or burned structure. It is possible that residents or owners of neighboring lots dumped debris on the lot while it was being filled.

**Phase VI**

Phase VI comprises ten master contexts that included strata and features that were sealed by the Phase V fills. Four strata spanning 45 cm in depth (M-28, M-61, M-62, and M-63) were associated with Phase VI. Within some of these layers were post holes (M-35, M-36, M-59, and M-74), a wooden post (M-75), and a robbed-out foundation trench (M-40) (Table 5.1) (Figures 5.1; 5.9; 5.10; and 5.11). A robbed trench represents the trench excavated for the placement a building foundation and the foundation material was later removed during demolition and salvaged.

Master context 28 was a sandy clay layer with brick, cinders, mortar, and stone identified just below M-20 and isolated to a small area in the rear yard behind the Veit house. A small amount of artifacts was recovered, none of which were diagnostic (Table 5.9). Based on the presence of building materials within the layer, it was likely
associated with the demolition of a structure. No other artifacts were recovered from this feature (Table 5.10).

Figure 5.10. Stratigraphic Profile of Phase V, VI, and VII Strata and Features.

Also sealed by M-20 and M28 was M-61, a 10 to 20 cm thick strata with brick and coal inclusions that contained a large amount of artifacts (n=1,187) (Table 5.9). These artifacts were primarily assigned to the architecture group, which accounted for just over 80 percent of the assemblage (Table 5.9). The dominance of the architecture group indicates that M-61 contained a large amount of architectural debris and was associated with the demolition of a structure. The M-61 artifact assemblage exhibited a
date range of 1780 to 1930, with a T.P.Q. of 1830 and a mean date of 1852 (Table 5.2). Sealed by M-61, M-62 was a 5-15 cm thick strata that contained a moderate amount of artifacts, most of which were assigned to the architecture group (Tables 5.9 and 5.10). The M-62 artifact assemblage exhibited a date range of 1780 to 1890 and a T.P.Q. of 1840 and mean date of 1850 (Table 5.2).

![Figure 5.11. Stratigraphy from Phases VI and VII during Excavation.](image)

Table 5.9. Artifact Counts for Phase VI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Master Context</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Master context 40 was a shallow rectangular feature filled with brick rubble that was sealed by M-61 at the east edge of the rear yard area behind the Veit house. In this area, the deposits are less stratified, as the profile consisted of an extensive M-61 strata that sealed M-40 and subsequent strata associated with Phase VII (Figure 5.1). Master contexts 62 and 63 fade out towards the east and likely just ended or perhaps were disturbed by and incorporated into M-61. Master context 40 cuts into strata associated with Phase VII (M-64 and M-65). Only the west portion of M-40 was excavated, as the remainder extended into the unexcavated west wall of the unit. It extended to a depth of 18 cm below M-61 where it ended in subsoil (M-66). A small number of artifacts were recovered from M-40, which included primarily kitchen and architecture artifacts, as well as a considerable amount of brick rubble (Tables 5.9 and 5.10). The M-40 artifact assemblage exhibited a date range from 1810 to 1913, with a T.P.Q. of 1840 (Table 5.2). This feature was most likely the location of a brick footer or foundation that was robbed (removed and the brick salvaged) and filled with demolition and domestic debris when

---

**Table 5.10. Functional Group Percentages for Phase VI.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Group</th>
<th>Master Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include</td>
<td>M36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the associated structure was demolished, which was then subsequently sealed by demolition fill (M-61).

Master context 63 was a 5 to 10 cm thick charcoal layer that contained numerous (n=973) artifacts. As with the previous two strata, the artifacts were primarily assigned to the architecture group, however, the kitchen group accounted for a much higher percentage than in the previous strata (Table 5.10). This distribution indicates that M-63 contained primarily architectural debris most likely associated with the demolition of a structure, but also contained a significant amount of domestic refuse. The predominance of charcoal in the soil matrix and relatively high percentage of burned artifacts suggests that the demolished structure represented by M-63 was burned (Table 5.11). The M-63 artifact assemblage exhibited a date range of 1780 to 1930 with a T.P.Q. of 1842, indicating that the demolition occurred sometime after that date (Table 5.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Context</th>
<th>Percent Burned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11. Percentage of Burned Artifacts from Phase VI and VII Master Contexts.

Post holes (M-35, M-36, M-59, and M-74) and a wooden post (M-75) were associated with M-63 (Table 5.1) (Figures 5.10 and 5.11). Master contexts 35 and 36 were two small circular post holes (Figure 5.1). They were very shallow and arranged 15 cm apart and were located near a much larger square post hole 5 cm to the west (M-59). These features contained a small amount of artifacts, with M-35 containing the most, of
which most were assigned to the architecture and miscellaneous groups (Table 5.9). Only the M-35 artifact assemblage contained diagnostics, which ranged in date from 1830 to 1930 and had a T.P.Q. of 1830 (Table 5.2). These features most likely represent the base of small round wood posts that were probably associated with the larger post (M-59) located nearby perhaps they were used to help support the larger post. They were likely pulled during the demolition of a structure and subsequently filled when M-63 was deposited.

Master context 59 was a large 45 x 20 cm rectangular post hole that contained a partially pulled remnant of a large wood post (M-75). Based on the stratigraphic relationship of these master contexts with surrounding strata, the wood post was likely in place when M-63 was deposited and then was subsequently pulled or knocked over allowing M-63 deposits to fill the void (Figure 5.1). A small amount of artifacts was recovered from the post hole fill, which ranged in date from 1830 to 1890, with a T.P.Q. of 1830 (Table 5.2). Embedded within the wood post (M-75) was a large late machine-cut nail which has a date range of 1830 to 1890, with a T.P.Q. of 1830 (Table 5.2). M-59 and M-75 are most likely the remains of a structural post to support a porch or served as a pier support.

Master context 74 represents two identical 30 x 30 cm square post holes sealed by M-63 and located just north of M-59 and M-75. These posts were situated 25 cm apart and slightly offset forming a rough line with M-59 and M-75 (Figure 5.10). Based on their stratigraphic relationship with other contexts and the lack of any evidence of the
original posts, it is likely that M-74 represents posts that were pulled during the demolition of a structure, at which point the hole was filled with deposits from M-63. Just as M-75, these posts were most likely in place when M-63 was deposited and subsequently became filled when the posts were pulled. A small amount of artifacts was recovered from these posts, of which the diagnostics have a date range of 1830 to 1870, with a T.P.Q. of 1830 (Tables 5.2 and 5.9).

With each of the three strata associated with Phase VI, the percentage of the architecture group decreased and the percentage of domestic refuse related groups such as the kitchen group increased (Table 5.10). This distribution indicates that the later strata contained mostly architectural debris that was most likely associated with the demolition of a structure. Earlier strata contained an increasing amount of domestic refuse that suggests that it was associated with the demolition of a domestic structure and/or the domestic occupation of the site. Master context 63 indicates that the structure likely burned sometime after the 1840s. Features associated with the structure include structural posts and a robbed footer or foundation. Based on this information the archaeological deposits from Phase VI were most likely associated with the Mangin house which was established on Lot 56 in 1846 and burned in 1856.

Phase VII

Phase VII comprises three master contexts (M-64, M-65, and M-71), all of which were strata that were sealed by M-63. The stratigraphic relationship of these contexts with the structural remains of the Mangin house from Phase VI indicates that they must
predate the placement of the posts associated with the structure, as these features cut into
the Phase VII strata. These strata include an extensive fill layer (M-64), a thin
occupation layer (M-65), and a transition to subsoil (M-71) (Table 5.1) (Figures 5.1; 5.9;
5.10; and 5.11).

Master contexts 64 and 65 contained a large amount of artifacts that were
primarily assigned to the architecture and kitchen group, with the architecture group
being more dominant (Table 5.12 and 5.13). This distribution indicates that these strata
were most likely associated with the occupation and demolition of a domestic structure.
Master context 71 exhibited a similar distribution, but contained significantly fewer
artifacts. The artifact assemblages associated with these strata exhibited similar date
ranges, with artifacts dating primarily to the nineteenth century (Table 5.2). Master
context 65 exhibited the earliest T.P.Q. date (1830), while M-71 had the latest at 1842.

The master contexts from Phase VI indicate that the deposits were most likely
associated with the occupation and demolition of a domestic structure during the early to
mid-1800s. However, no features associated with a structure were identified. Because of
the relationship of the Phase VII deposits to the Phase VI structural remains, they must
predate the construction, occupation, and demolition of the Mangin house. It is possible
that structural features associated with Phase VII are located elsewhere on the site as only
a small portion of Lot 56 was excavated. However, the artifacts associated with Phase
VII indicate that a domestic structure that predates the Mangin house was located in the
area. This information corresponds with an 1834 deed for Lot 56 that mentions that
Nicholas Lanning had improved the property and built a house there. Based on the deed, Lanning’s structure had to have been built sometime before 1834 and it is possible that the structure is the same as one shown on the 1824 map in the location of Lot 56 (Figure 5.12).

Table 5.12. Artifact Counts for Phase VII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Master Context Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64 65 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>197 197 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>102 189 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>476 497 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td>76 108 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>5 6 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>857 998 357</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.13. Functional Groups Percentages for Phase VII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Group</th>
<th>Master Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64 65 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>0.2 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>58.5 69.6 57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>0.3 0.0 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>0.8 1.5 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>0.0 0.1 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>38.7 28.1 36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1.5 0.6 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>0.0 0.1 0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary and Discussion

The archaeological deposits at Lot 56 represent seven periods or phases of changes and/or occupations spanning over 100 years. However, there is evidence of prehistoric activity at the site prior to the historic period. Based on the significant presence of prehistoric lithic materials found (no diagnostics) throughout the deposits at
Lot 56, the first human occupation of the property was by prehistoric Native Americans. The subsequent historic period occupation and use of the site effectively disturbed and destroyed the deposits associated with the prehistoric Native Americans. The historic period development and occupation of Portland began in 1811, when the town was established. The first documented historic occupation of Lot 56 took place sometime between 1817 and 1824 when a structure depicted on the 1824 map was likely built (Figure 5.12). The strata associated with Phase VII represent the occupation and demolition of a domestic structure during the 1830s and 1840s. These deposits coincide with the documented occupation of Lot 56 by Nicholas E. Lanning and his family, who most likely rented the property from its owners John Burge (1817 to 1834), William Blackwell (1834), and Paul Danelli (1834-1846) all prominent land speculators in Portland (Table 5.14).

Figure 5.12. Map of the Falls Showing Portland (Flint 1824 from Thomas 1971).
Table 5.14. Chain of Title for Lot 56.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>William Lytle</td>
<td>John Burge</td>
<td>Lot 56, Square 84 Portland</td>
<td>Deed Book M:469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>Adeline Lawson (Burge)</td>
<td>William Blackwell</td>
<td>Lot 56, Square 84 Portland</td>
<td>Deed Book MM:461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>William Blackwell</td>
<td>Paul Danelli</td>
<td>Lot 56, Square 84 Portland</td>
<td>Deed Book QQ:398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Paul Danelli</td>
<td>Antone Mangin</td>
<td>Lot 56, Square 84 Portland</td>
<td>Deed Book 66:447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Antone Mangin estate</td>
<td>John P. Young</td>
<td>Lot 56, Square 84 Portland</td>
<td>Deed Book 100:445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>John P. Young</td>
<td>Anna C. Veit</td>
<td>40 ft. x 105 ft. ES 33rd St.</td>
<td>Deed Book 168:554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Anna C. Veit</td>
<td>C. Sclarenco</td>
<td>40 ft. x 105 ft. ES 33rd St.</td>
<td>Deed Book 997:300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strata and features associated with Phase VI represent the construction, occupation, and demolition of a domestic structure during the 1840s and 1850s. Structural remains, such as post holes and a robbed foundation or pier indicate that a building had been constructed on the fill layer deposited after the Lanning occupation. Subsequent strata associated with Phase VI represent the occupation and demolition of that structure. These deposits coincide with the documented occupation of Lot 56 by the Mangin family from 1846 to 1856 (Table 5.15). Documents indicate that the Mangin’s house on the property and had burned down on September 5th, 1856 (Louisville Chancery Court [LCC] case #8418). The presence of charcoal inclusions and layers within the strata and a comparatively significant percentage of burned artifacts support the documentary record of the building’s demise.

The deposits associated with Phase II were the most extensive documented at the site representing the occupation and demolition of the Veit shotgun house, a small outbuilding in the rear yard, a water cistern, and two privies from the late 1890s to the 1930s. This period included the occupation of the site by the widowed Catherine Veit and various tenants of C. Sclarenco, the subsequent owner (Table 5.15). This was followed by the demolition of houseboat shanties and grading of the area that buried the
streets, sidewalks, house foundations, etc. during the 1940s in preparation for the construction of the flood levee.

Table 5.15. Occupants at Lot 56 from City Directories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Occupant</th>
<th>Occupation/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1st Alley bet Com. &amp; Fulton</td>
<td>Frances Mangie</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1873</td>
<td>WS Fulton St.</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>House destroyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>WS Fulton St.</td>
<td>Henry Veit</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>WS Fulton St.</td>
<td>Henry Veit</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1878</td>
<td>26 33rd St.</td>
<td>Henry Veit</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>26 33rd St.</td>
<td>Katherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>26 33rd St.</td>
<td>Catherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>26 33rd St.</td>
<td>Catherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>124 33rd St.</td>
<td>Catherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>124 33rd St.</td>
<td>Catherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>124 33rd St.</td>
<td>Catherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>124 33rd St.</td>
<td>Catherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>124 33rd St.</td>
<td>Catherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>124 33rd St.</td>
<td>Catherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-1891</td>
<td>124 33rd St.</td>
<td>Kathrina Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892-1898</td>
<td>124 33rd St.</td>
<td>Catherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899-1902</td>
<td>124 33rd St.</td>
<td>Katherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>124 33rd St.</td>
<td>Katherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>124 33rd St.</td>
<td>Katherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-1906</td>
<td>124 33rd St.</td>
<td>Katherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>124 33rd St.</td>
<td>Katherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>124 33rd St.</td>
<td>Katherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Anna C. Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-1912</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Anna C. Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913-1914</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Katherine A. Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Katherine A. Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Katherine A. Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Katherine A. Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.15. Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Occupant</th>
<th>Occupation/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Katherine A. Veit</td>
<td>Widower Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Durr</td>
<td>Foreman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ollie Durr</td>
<td>Platter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Catherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fred Fields</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1921</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Catherine Veit</td>
<td>Widow Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Fred Fields</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Herman Philpot</td>
<td>Fireman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924-1925</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>William W. Kenny</td>
<td>Forman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>George D. Seelye</td>
<td>Machine hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Frank Shelton</td>
<td>Mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Bertha Shelton</td>
<td>Mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fred R. Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Elizabeth Wall</td>
<td>Widow Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Gilbert D. Wyman</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Richard E. Smothers</td>
<td>Nannie Smothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Thomas I. Smithers</td>
<td>Fireman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhetta Smithers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>910 33rd St.</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lot 53

Archaeological investigations at Lot 53 were focused on the northern portion of the lot, encompassing the southeast corner of Commercial (34\textsuperscript{th}) Street and First (Florida) Alley (Figure 4.11). The archaeological excavations at Lot 53 include 16 master contexts representing 3 strata, 7 features, and 6 strata within features (Table 5.16) (Figures 5.13 and 5.14). The features were associated with a structure that was located at the corner of Commercial (34\textsuperscript{th}) Street and First (Florida) Alley, including a builder’s trench, robbed foundation, cellar fill, a post hole, and a brick sidewalk. The strata within the cellar consisted of various deposits of coal that was underlain by a brown clay fill. The strata included a rear yard midden and a demolition overburden (Table 5.16). A Harris Matrix
analysis of the strata and features found at Lot 53 identified six phases of change to the property during its history (Figure 5.13). Each phase is discussed below.

Table 5.16. Master Contexts Identified at Lot 53.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Occup. Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mottled dark brown silt clay</td>
<td>Demolition fill</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gray brown silt clay loam</td>
<td>Occupation midden</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Brown ashy loam with brick, mortar, and charcoal</td>
<td>Robber’s trench</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Brown silt clay with mortar inclusions</td>
<td>Builder’s trench</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Brown silt clay loam with brick, mortar, and charcoal</td>
<td>Demolition layer</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Gray brown silt clay loam with mortar and brick</td>
<td>Demolition/Occupation layer</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Black cinder, coal, and ash</td>
<td>Cellar fill</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Black cinder, coal, and ash</td>
<td>Cellar fill</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Mottled brown and light brown silt clay loam</td>
<td>Occupation layer</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mottled orange brown silt clay with cinder, coal, and stone</td>
<td>Cellar fill</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Dark gray brown silt clay loam with charcoal</td>
<td>Post hole</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Black cinder, coal, and ash</td>
<td>Cellar fill</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Black cinder, coal, ash, and plaster</td>
<td>Cellar fill</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Brick pavement</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with Lot 56, Phase I at Lot 53 consisted entirely of the extensive demolition fill (M-1) that overlies the Portland Wharf site. It was deposited as a result of land grading activities associated with the construction of the flood levee during the 1940s.

Phase II

Phase II comprises M-70, a sidewalk located at the west end of the area along Commercial (34th) Street. It was constructed of brick dry laid in a herringbone pattern that was 2.18 m wide. The sidewalk was sealed by the 1940s demolition layer (M-1) (Figure 5.13). No artifacts were associated with the sidewalk, as it was only exposed and not removed. However excavations adjacent to the eastern edge of the feature show that
it overlays the Phase III master contexts, thus it is likely that the sidewalk was constructed sometime prior to M-1 demolition overburden layer. Its style of construction is consistent with sidewalks that were constructed during the early 1900s in Portland (Figure 5.15). A 1909 photo of a building located one block south of Lot 53 at the corner of Commercial and Front Streets shows the southern portion of the same sidewalk and limestone curbing, indicating that the sidewalk was likely constructed sometime during the 1890s to 1900s.

Figure 5.13. Harris Matrix Diagram for Lot 53.

**Phase III**

Phase III includes six master contexts (29, 45, 51, 52, 56, 58, and 67) which were sealed by M-1 and M-70 (Figure 5.13). Most of these represent features (M-29) or various fills within a feature (M-51, M-52, M-56, M-58, and M-67), while one (M-45) was spill over from the filling of a feature (Table 5.17). M-29 represents robbed
foundation trenches that were located at the east and western ends of the excavation area (Figure 5.14). These trenches were 75 cm wide, 70 cm deep below the stripped surface and extended beyond the north/south extent of the excavation area. The trench fill consisted of a brown ashy loam with brick and mortar inclusions. Some of the fill extended into the area between the two features, representing spill over from the filling of the trenches after the foundations had been removed (M-45). Master Context 29 contained a large amount of artifacts that were primarily assigned to the architecture functional group (Table 5.17 and 5.18). As expected, it was filled primarily with architectural debris from the demolition of the structure. Master context 45 contained a large amount of artifacts, most of which were architecture related (Table 5.17 and 5.18). Both M-29 and M-45 exhibited similar date ranges and mean dates, as the artifacts date primarily from the mid to late 1800s. The T.P.Q. date for M-29 was 1842 based exclusively on ceramics, indicating that demolition occurred sometime after that date (Table 5.19). The recovery of a single machine-made glass container base from M-29, suggests that deposition occurred during the early 1900s, however it was most likely an isolated instance of contamination from the overlying M-1 deposit (Figure 5.13).

The area in between the two robbed out trenches represents a building cellar that was filled with various coal, cinder, and clay fills (M-51, M-52, M-56, M-58, and M-67). The feature was an unlined sloping pit that was 5.55 m across. It was located closest to the western robber’s trench being adjacent to the feature and was over 4 m from the eastern robbed out trench (Figure 5.13). The cellar extended to a maximum depth of 1.1 m below the stripped surface.
Figure 5.14. Planview and Profile of Excavations at Lot 53
Table 5.17. Artifact Counts for Phase III Master Contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Master Context</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.18. Artifact Functional Group Percentages for Phase III Master Contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Group</th>
<th>Master Context</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*less than 0.1 percent
A large number of artifacts was recovered from the cellar fill, most of which originated from M-52 an extensive coal and cinder fill (Table 5.17) (Figure 5.14). Most of the artifacts from the cellar fill contexts were assigned to the kitchen and architecture functional groups, with the kitchen being the more predominant of the two (Table 5.18). Exceptions to this distribution were noted in M-56, which contained a significant amount of clothing group artifacts and M-67, which consisted primarily of miscellaneous unidentified metal fragments (Table 5.18). The master contexts associated with the cellar fill dated primarily to the late 1800s (Table 5.19). The earliest T.P.Q. date was 1890 from M-58 the earliest deposit stratigraphically. The latest T.P.Q. date for the cellar fill was M-52 with a date of 1919. These dates suggest that the cellar was filled over a period of time during the late 1800s to early 1900s.

The cellar fill master contexts (51, 52, 58, and 67), while they do contain a significant amount of architecture related artifacts, do not necessarily seem to be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Context</th>
<th>Manufacturing Date Range</th>
<th>T.P.Q. Date</th>
<th>Ceramic Date</th>
<th>Glass Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1830-1930</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td></td>
<td>1891.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1780-1860</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1820-1930</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1820-1890</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1820-1913</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1818-1930</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1855-1940</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1840-1948</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1780-1930</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1891.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1903-present</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1830-1890</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1810-1930</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1820-1913</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
primarily associated with the demolition of the structure. The cellar fill was largely comprised of coal, cinder, and domestic artifacts, such as kitchen group container glass. Most of the fills date to the 1890s and early 1900s, except for M-58 which dated between the 1870s and 1890s. This situation indicates that the old cellar may have collected trash and refuse for a period of time after the demolition of the structure. The disposal of trash and, in particular cinders, was problematic in the late 1800s to early 1900s, as trash collection was inefficient or did not accept cinders during that period. Consequently many old vaults, privies, cisterns, wells, cellars, and yards were filled with refuse and cinders (Stottman 1996; Stottman and Stahlgren 2006). It is likely that after the structure was demolished that the cellar was used as a dump over a period of time during the 1890s to 1930s.

**Phase IV**

Phase IV is comprised entirely of M-48, an occupation midden located east of and adjacent to the eastern robber’s trench (M-29). It ranged in thickness between 10 and 18 cm lying just below the overburden (M-1) (Figure 5.13). A large amount of artifacts was recovered from M-48, most of which were assigned to the architecture and kitchen functional groups (Tables 5.20 and 5.21). Most of these were window glass fragments and glass container fragments. While the percentage of architecture group artifacts was similar to contexts associated with demolition or construction episodes (such as M-29), the percentage of kitchen group artifacts was higher than those contexts. This distribution of artifacts amongst the functional groups indicates that M-48 contained
some demolition or construction related debris, but also was likely associated with the occupation of the lot.

Table 5.20. Artifact Counts for Phase IV, V, and VI Master Contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
<th>Phase V</th>
<th>Phase VI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M-48</td>
<td>M-30</td>
<td>M-57</td>
<td>M-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>998</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>184</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.21. Artifact Functional Groups for Phase IV, V, and VI Master Contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Group</th>
<th>Phase IV</th>
<th>Phase V</th>
<th>Phase VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M-48</td>
<td>M-30</td>
<td>M-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The artifact assemblage from M-48 has a date range from the early 1800s to the early 1900s and had mean dates of 1856 for ceramics and 1884 for glass (Table 5.19). The T.P.Q. date of 1870 suggests that it was deposited sometime after that date during the late nineteenth century. The stratigraphic relationship of this context with other contexts at Lot 53 indicates that it predates the robber’s trench (M-29). Together all the information suggests that M-48 was probably a late nineteenth-century occupation layer.
that contained some architectural debris from the structure or perhaps some renovations or modifications that took place sometime during the life of the building. This context represents the accumulation of trash and debris along the building during the late 1800s.

**Phase V**

Phase V comprises M-30 and M57, a builder’s trench and post hole. M-30 is a builder’s trench identified along the west side of the east robber’s trench (M-29) and represents a portion of the trench that was dug to construct the building’s foundation (Table 5.16) (Figure 5.13). Most of the artifacts recovered from M-30 were assigned to the architecture and kitchen functional groups (Table 5.20 and 5.21). The diagnostic artifacts consisted entirely of ceramics which dated primarily from the mid to late nineteenth century and exhibited a T.P.Q. date of 1830 based on the diagnostic ceramics (Table 5.19). The mean ceramic date for M-30 was 1854. Other diagnostic artifacts, such as the large amount of late machine cut nails, also indicate a construction date during the mid to late 1800s. The artifacts suggest that the foundation for the building was most likely constructed sometime during the mid to late 1800s.

M-57 is a small post hole that was identified at the western edge of the excavation area adjacent to the east side of the sidewalk (M-70) and just west of the western robber’s trench (M-29). A small amount of artifacts assigned to the kitchen, architecture, and furniture functional groups was recovered from the post hole. Ceramics were the only diagnostic artifacts recovered from the post hole, which indicates a mid to late nineteenth
century date. The post was probably used to support part of the building between the foundation and sidewalk, perhaps a stoop or stairs.

**Phase VI**

Phase VI consists of M-15 and M-54, both silt clay middens. M-15 was a 40 cm thick midden identified adjacent to the eastern side of the east robber’s trench underlying an occupation/demolition midden (M-48) (Table 5.20) (Figure 5.13). A moderate amount of artifacts was recovered from M-15, most of which were assigned to the kitchen and architecture functional groups (Table 5.21). A significant amount of furniture group artifacts also were represented. The significant presence of kitchen and furniture artifacts indicates that the deposit was primarily associated with a domestic occupation (Table 5.21). However, the presence of numerous architecture group artifacts suggests that some architectural debris perhaps associated with the construction or modification of a structure. Of the 42 architecture group artifacts recovered from M-15, most (n=36) were machine cut nail fragments or unaltered whole nails (n=1). Only five fragments of window glass were recovered from M-15. This distribution could suggest that the architectural debris was a result of a construction episode rather than a demolition, as more architectural debris and a greater variety of architecture artifacts would be expected in general. Furthermore, while some brick and mortar fragments were documented within the soil matrix, they were not noted as being extensive and were eventually non-existent at the bottom of the deposit. Diagnostic artifacts from M-15 consisted primarily of ceramics, which ranged in date from the late 1700s to the late 1800s (Table 5.19). The
mean ceramic date for this context was 1835, with a T.P.Q. date of 1830, which suggests that this deposit was created sometime after that date (Table 5.19).

M-54 was an extensive midden that extended between the east and west robber’s trench (M-29) encompassing the interior of the structure (Table 5.16) (Figure 5.14). A moderate amount of artifacts was recovered from M-54, most of which were assigned to the architecture and kitchen groups (Table 5.20). The predominance of architecture group artifacts indicates that the deposit contains a substantial amount of architectural debris. Domestic artifacts were assigned primarily to the kitchen group, but also represented a variety other groups (Table 5.21). The architecture group consisted of a variety of artifacts including significant amounts of window glass, nails, and ceramic drain pipe fragments. While it appears that M-54 was primarily an occupation deposit, the amount and variety of architecture group artifacts indicate that some demolition debris also was present. Diagnostic artifacts from M-54 consisted mainly of ceramics that exhibited a mean date of 1862 (Table 5.19). Overall the artifacts from M-54 ranged in date from the late 1700s to the early 1900s and had a T.P.Q. of 1870.

Although the contexts in Phase VI contain a substantial amount of architecture related artifacts, suggesting an association with the remains of a structure, they also included a variety of other functional groups that is likely indicative of a domestic occupation. Thus, it appears that both M-15 and M-54 represent occupation middens from the mid to late 1800s which may also be associated with the construction or demolition of a structure. Stratigraphically these contexts are the earliest identified at Lot
53 being cut by the foundation trench for the building (M-29 and M-30) and overlaid by the cellar fill (M-51, M-52, M-58, and M-67) (Figure 5.13). Thus, they predate the construction of the building and its demolition. It is likely that these middens were associated with an occupation or trash disposal that predates the building represented by M-29 and M-30. Some of the architectural debris in M-54 may be associated with the demolition of the structure, as this deposit was likely exposed underneath the structure during demolition.

**Summary and Discussion**

The deposits at Lot 53 represent six different phases or periods of time spanning nearly 100 years of history. Although some prehistoric artifacts were recovered during excavations in this area, no intact prehistoric deposits were identified. It is likely that prehistoric Native Americans inhabited the area prior to the historic development of Portland. Although Lot 53 was located along Portland’s main commercial street just one block from the busy wharf, it appears that the lot was not developed until the 1850s. The property had been bought and sold several times between 1811 and 1850, however, the first documented development of the lot did not take place until it was purchased by Paul Villier in 1855 (Table 5.22). According to tax records, Villier’s property had been improved with a structure valued at $2,000.00 by 1856.

Although the archaeological deposits located at Lot 53 were primarily associated with the occupation and demolition of this structure, there is evidence of deposits that likely predate and postdate the structure. The master contexts associated with Phase VI
most likely represent the accumulation of some trash on the lot prior to development of the lot. They also may be associated with the construction of the two-story brick building in 1855, however, they also likely accumulated artifacts from later periods, particularly M-54 which was exposed during the occupation and demolition of the structure. It appears that M-54 was disturbed by excavation to create the large pit that likely functioned as a cellar underneath the building. The lot was part of a numerous properties that Villier had purchased throughout the 1840s and 1850s along Commercial Street. It was located adjacent to a house that predated construction of the building and it is likely that the Phase VI deposits were associated with the occupation of that house and the subsequent preparation and construction of the building (Figure 5.2).

Table 5.22. Chain of Title for Lot 53.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>William Lytle</td>
<td>James Breckinridge</td>
<td>Lot 53, Square 84 Portland</td>
<td>Deed Book M:449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>James Breckinridge</td>
<td>Miami Export Co.</td>
<td>Lot 53, Square 84 Portland</td>
<td>Deed Book Y:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>M.S. Wade (Trustee)</td>
<td>John Perinet</td>
<td>Lot 53, Square 84 Portland</td>
<td>Deed Book 72:270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>John Perinet</td>
<td>Paul Villier</td>
<td>Lot 53, Square 84 Portland</td>
<td>Deed Book 92:628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Paul Villier estate</td>
<td>Antone Kahlert</td>
<td>86.5 ft. x 105 ft. E. 34th St.</td>
<td>LCC case 36520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Antone Kahlert</td>
<td>John B. Kirley</td>
<td>86.5 ft. x 105 ft. E. 34th St.</td>
<td>Deed Book 363:123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>John B. Kirley</td>
<td>Minnie Kahlert</td>
<td>86.5 ft. x 105 ft. E. 34th St.</td>
<td>Deed Book 363:124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Minnie Kahlert</td>
<td>Joseph O’Donnell</td>
<td>86.5 ft. x 105 ft. E. 34th St.</td>
<td>Deed Book 625:82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Joseph O’Donnell</td>
<td>Monogahela Coal</td>
<td>86.5 ft. x 105 ft. E. 34th St.</td>
<td>Deed Book 621:255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Phase V master contexts including a builder’s trench (M-30) for the building’s foundation and a post hole (M-57) likely associated with a stair or stoop for the building are associated with the construction of the two-story brick structure in 1855. The earliest map on which the building is depicted is the 1884 Hopkins Atlas which shows a two-story brick building at the location of the excavations (Figure 5.2). Diagnostic artifacts recovered from these contexts coincide with the construction date of the structure. The large pit under the structure was likely dug during construction or
perhaps later during the building’s life. The cellar was unlined and was a rough sloping pit, which is unusual for large buildings of this type and period. Typically these structures had a cellar lined in brick or stone underneath part of the building for storage. It is possible that the cellar could have been used for coal storage.

The Phase IV master context consisting of M-48 represents a period during the occupation and use of the structure from the 1850s to the end of the 1800s. Henry Dacquet lived in the building from 1855 to 1866 and likely operated various businesses that Villier owned (Table 5.23.). Adolph Delime lived in and operated a drug store out of the building from 1867 to 1880, after which his partner Thomas P. Taylor took over until 1883. Artifacts recovered from M-48 date to this period and exhibit the type and variety typically associated with long-term domestic refuse disposal.

Based on the master contexts from Phase III, it appears that the two-story brick building was demolished sometime in the late 1880s and early 1890s, during Taylor’s tenure at the site. These contexts include a robber’s trench fill and cellar fill. Robber’s trenches are inherently associated with the demolition of a structure, as they represent the space that was once occupied by the building foundation and was subsequently filled with demolition debris. This was the case with M-29, which contained a large amount of architecture artifacts. Artifacts recovered from the robber’s trench indicate that it was filled sometime in the late 1800s suggesting a demolition date within that period. Based on the presence of the structure on the 1884 map (Figure 5.2) and a description of the lot
that did not include any improvements or buildings that same year, the building was most likely demolished sometime in 1884.

Table 5.23. Occupants at Lot 53 from City Directories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Occupant</th>
<th>Occupation/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Commercial St. at Villier</td>
<td>Henry Dacquet</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Commercial St.</td>
<td>Henry Dacquet</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859-1860</td>
<td>9 &amp; 11 Commercial St.</td>
<td>Henry Dacquet</td>
<td>Dry Goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jean B. Bouvier</td>
<td>Porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Commercial bet Water and Front</td>
<td>Henry Dacquet</td>
<td>Salesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865-1866</td>
<td>25 Commercial St.</td>
<td>Henry Dacquet</td>
<td>Post Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868-1869</td>
<td>17 Commercial St.</td>
<td>Henry Cassel</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Killias, John</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-1875</td>
<td>19 Commercial St.</td>
<td>Adolph Delime</td>
<td>Druggist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>19 34th Street</td>
<td>Adolph Delime</td>
<td>Druggist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis A. Delime</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>19 34th Street</td>
<td>Adolph Delime</td>
<td>Druggist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>19 34th Street</td>
<td>Adolph J. Delime</td>
<td>Druggist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis Delime</td>
<td>Chair maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>19 34th Street</td>
<td>Adolph J. Delime</td>
<td>Druggist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis Delime</td>
<td>Chair maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anthony Delime</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>19 34th Street</td>
<td>Adolph Delime</td>
<td>Druggist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas P. Taylor</td>
<td>Druggist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1882</td>
<td>19 34th Street</td>
<td>Thomas P. Taylor</td>
<td>Druggist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>121 34th Street</td>
<td>Thomas P. Taylor</td>
<td>Durggist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This event coincides with the substantial decline of the Portland Wharf area, as many buildings had been damaged or destroyed by several large floods that occurred in 1883, 1884, 1898, and 1913. The successive floods of 1883 and 1884 were particularly devastating in Portland, because any rebuilding that occurred after the first was damaged shortly afterwards during the second. These floods took place at a time when Portland’s economic fortunes were in decline. These two floods most likely instigated the demise of the two-story brick building on Lot 53. Paul Villier died in 1882 and at the time of the floods, his land holdings were being managed and sold by his heirs. Lot 53, which at the time consisted of two parcels, including the two-story brick building and a one-story
frame duplex, that were sold in a Marshall’s sale in October of 1884 (Table 5.22). These parcels are listed in the tax records under Villier’s heirs until 1885, representing the previous year’s assessment. In those records, the parcel with the two-story brick house was described in the 1884 list as including improvements worth $2,000.00 and as a lot with no improvement value in 1885. Based on the tax records, the two-story brick structure was demolished sometime in 1884, which is consistent with the date of the artifacts recovered from the robbed foundation trench (M-29). Although no particular evidence of a flood episode was identified within the archaeological deposits, it is likely that the floods of 1883 and 1884 contributed to the demise of the structure.

By 1905, many lots in the area near Lot 53 were vacant and a coal storage facility had been built (Figure 5.4). Based on the fills associated with the cellar, it appears that the cellar pit was open and served as a dump for cinders and architectural and domestic trash into the early 1900s. Stratigraphically, the construction of the brick sidewalk (M-70; Phase II) took place after the initial filling of the cellar, but photographic evidence suggests that it was constructed sometime prior to 1909, thus it is likely that the cellar pit area had been filled by that time, however, it is possible that it continued to accumulate some trash afterwards into the early 1900s. As with all of the Portland Wharf area, demolition of remaining structures and grading in anticipation of the construction of the flood levee took place in the 1940s representing Phase I.
Interpretations: Reconstructing the Built and Cultural Environment

The stratigraphic analysis of the Portland Wharf landscape has provided a chronological view of the landscape’s development over time and has identified phases of change throughout that history. The archaeological deposits identified at the Portland Wharf also can be used to reconstruct the built environment that existed within those historical phases. An analysis of the features and artifacts recovered aid in developing an understanding of the structures associated with the Veit family’s occupation of Lot 56 during the late nineteenth century. To a lesser extent the structures associated with Mangin and Lanning’s occupation of Lot 56 and the commercial structure on Lot 53 can be reconstructed using the archaeological data. The following analysis will focus on these structures and their associated occupants. The reconstruction of these structures will help define the landscape that would have been a part of the resident’s daily practice.

The Veit Family Shotgun House

When Henry and Catherine Veit purchased a subdivided portion of Lot 56 in 1873, Portland was undergoing changes, as the City of Louisville had invested in some infrastructure and developers saw Portland as an opportunity for residential suburban expansion (Figure 5.2). Furthermore, the market for residential expansion was fueled by the success of Portland’s commercial district along Water and Commercial Streets over the previous 20 years. The Veit family is example of that process, as Henry built a successful shoemaking business on Water Street during that time. Veit was content to follow the model of early to mid-nineteenth century small or craft business practice of
commercial endeavors being located on the ground floor and front of a structure and the residential component being located above or behind the business. Conceptually, work and living spaces were housed in the same structures. This model began to change with burgeoning middle class development which fueled the separation of work and living spaces and suburbanization (English 1972; Wall 1985). This transformation can be seen at the Portland Wharf in the Veit family’s shotgun house. With the purchase of the lot at 124 Fulton (33rd) Street, Veit sought to separate his business life from his home life, like many Americans entering the middle class. While people in similar situations in Louisville were moving to recently developed residential subdivisions on the east, south, and west edges of the downtown central business district, the Veit family chose to build their residence one block away from Henry’s business within the Portland central business district (English 1972).

The interesting part of the Veit family’s move to their own residence is that the lot was purchased and owned by Catherine Veit, the matriarch. In the male dominated society of late nineteenth century America, it is unusual that Catherine purchased and owned the property. While women in Louisville did own property and had real estate dealings, it was most common after the woman became widowed and inherited property. Perhaps this was the case with the Veit family, as Henry died just a few years after the lot was purchased and the house built, suggesting that Catherine may have managed the family’s affairs in the last years of her husband’s life. Shortly after Catherine Veit purchased 124 Fulton Street for $560.00, she purchased a lot adjacent to the north for $41.00. Veit owned two lots totaling 80 feet of frontage along Fulton Street. By 1874, a
house had been constructed along the north edge of parcel #1. According to historic maps, the house Veit constructed was typical of houses being built on the narrow subdivision lots in Louisville at the time, the shotgun house (Figures 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5).

The shotgun house style is distinguished by its long narrow floorplan that features rooms stacked behind each other in a narrow linear pattern. It became the predominate housing type in Louisville after the Civil War, during Louisville’s initial suburban development (Preservation Alliance 1980). The use of this house type allowed developers to maximize their investments by dividing properties into more numerous and smaller lots. The size and layout of the shotgun house were well suited for these smaller lots and the increased demand for inexpensive housing after the Civil War. The smaller lots and houses allowed working class people the opportunity to own their own homes and/or rent a home rather than live in the tenements and apartments that predominated amongst the working class. Many of Louisville’s older neighborhoods, as well as Portland, still have much of their original shotgun house stock, making Louisville the city with more shotgun housing than any other city (Preservation Alliance 1980). Although there are several variations in shotgun house floorplans and a great variety of decorative embellishments and window arrangements, they generally follow the same basic design. With the addition of information from the archaeological investigations, detailed Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, and comparative examples from the surrounding neighborhood, it was possible to reconstruct the size, plan, and basic look of the Veit’s house and lot. The reconstruction of this lot is presented below.
As previously discussed, the artifacts and features associated with the Veit’s tenure at 124 Fulton Street are numerous. Features include the foundation of the house, walkways, cisterns, privies, a hearth, and post holes. A wide variety of architecture and domestic artifacts were recovered from these features and associated strata. All of these are helpful for understanding the building layout, materials used, window arrangements, the locations and functions of outbuildings, fence locations, and the spatial organization of the lot.

The Sanborn Fire Insurance maps showing the Veit shotgun house indicate that the house was 18 x 45 feet in size, one-story in height, made of wood framing, had a metal roof, and was situated along the north property line of parcel #1 (Figure 5.3). According to the maps, at various times, the yard behind the house included several small wood frame outbuildings. Sometime between 1905 and 1928 an 18 x 10 ft. addition was made to the rear of the house (Figure 5.4 and 5.5).

The presence of certain archaeological features provides more detail to the house characteristics. The identification of a hearth and chimney foundation during the archaeological investigations indicates that a fireplace was located in the center of the front half of the structure. Typically these fireplaces featured a hearth on two sides of a wall that separated two rooms. It is likely that the fireplace signifies the location of an interior wall for a front and middle room. A three room linear arrangement was typical of shotgun house plans. A small addition to the rear or enclosed rear porch was added to this plan as a kitchen. The development of kitchen appliances and indoor plumbing
during this period instigated the need to develop larger dedicated kitchen spaces in houses. The brick house foundation verifies the location and size of the house as determined from the historic maps. Furthermore, it indicates that the addition made to the rear of the house, as depicted on the historic maps, was constructed with a brick foundation that tied into the main house foundation. This foundation suggests that the rear addition was not likely an enclosed porch and was a more substantial addition to the house, as there was no evidence of typical porch supports, such as posts or piers at that location.

An analysis of architecture related artifacts, in particular nails and window glass, adds more detail to the understanding of the house. Although window glass was found in large numbers in and around the house foundation, particular concentrations were identified. The distribution of window glass across the house area indicates that concentrations were located at the front (east), the side (northeast), and the other side (middle south) portion of the foundation (Figure 5.16). Based on these results, like most shotgun houses, the Veit house likely featured windows on the front facade. Window glass concentrations also indicate that windows were likely located along the south side wall of the house. Given the high density of glass there, it likely represents more than one window. A smaller concentration of window glass on the north side of the building suggests that a window might have been located in the northeastern corner of the house. Additionally there were likely small windows in the kitchen addition.
An examination of the nails recovered from the house foundation area provides additional detail about the construction of the Veit house. A total of 2,439 nail and nail fragments was recovered from the area around the foundation most of these were machine cut (n=2,390), which date to the period that the house was built. Based on the sizes of the whole machine cut nails identified, a variety of construction elements of the house were present. It appears that nails used for roofing, siding, flooring, and framing were present, as would be expected for a wood frame structure of this type (Table 5.24). Although these nail categories are representative of general functions, they also could be associated with more specific functions as well. For instance, nails used for lathing associated with plaster walls were typically 2d to 3d in size. The presence of nails in this
size range (n=99) and of plaster within the soil matrix around the house indicates that many of the roofing category nails were most likely associated with lathing, providing evidence that the interior walls were plastered, as was common practice. Thus, the amount of roofing nails present were much less and thus, a good indication that the roof had always been metal rather than wood shake or shingled originally, as it requires fewer nails.

Table 5.24. Whole Nail Size Categories for the Veit House.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nail Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roofing (2d-5d)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siding (6d-8d)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring (9d-10d)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing (12d-80d)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>406</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Veit Outbuildings

Although much was known about the Veit shotgun house from the historic maps, the archaeological resources have provided more detail concerning the construction elements of the structure. While the maps are useful for identifying outbuildings and getting a general concept of the spatial composition and layout of the yard spaces, the archaeological remains can contribute to a more complete picture of these spaces. Urban houselots were known to contain a variety of outbuildings and structures that served the main dwelling. These buildings functioned much like their rural counterparts, which were focused on sheltering domestic and agricultural activities, however, the scale of these structures and their functions were reduced in the urban context. Urban houselots at a minimum contained a structure that housed privies. However, they often included structures for water cisterns, work sheds, storage sheds, carriage houses, stables, chicken
coops, and small tenant dwellings (Stewart-Abernathy 1986; Stottman and Stahlgren 2006). Often, multiple functions were combined into the same building in an effort to maximize the small confines of the urban lot, such as a privy, stable, and carriage house being housed within a single structure (Stottman and Granger 1993).

According to the historic maps, the Veit shotgun house contained only one outbuilding throughout its existence, a small one-story wood frame structure in the northwest corner of the lot (Figures 5.3 and 5.4). The function of this structure is not known from the maps, but it was not a stable, as would have been indicated on the Sanborn maps. Evidence of the Veit’s outbuilding was identified archaeologically in the northwest corner of the lot where denoted on the Sanborn maps. Within this area several features were identified, including a post hole, a small area of brick, and some stone rubble, all of which were probably associated with various foundation supports for the outbuilding (Figure 5.17). Thus, it appears that the outbuilding was supported by posts and possibly brick and stone piers at various points in its history.

Of the 849 historic period artifacts recovered from this area of the lot, most were assigned to the architecture (58.7 percent) and kitchen (39.2 percent) functional groups, indicating that a structure was located in the area and that it most likely had a domestic function. Other functional groups that were minimally represented included the activities, clothing, furniture, and miscellaneous groups (Table 5.3). The architecture group was comprised mainly of window glass (n=342) followed by nails (n=155). Thus, it is likely that the outbuilding did have at least one window. The nails were mainly
fragmented machine-cut types (n=127), as only four wire nails were recovered. The whole nails recovered (n=6) were likely used for siding and framing. While the nail data is limited for providing details about the structure, it does confirm that it was a wood frame building constructed during the nineteenth century, as indicated on maps.

The kitchen group was comprised of ceramic tablewares (n=97), such as nineteenth century refined ceramics including porcelain, and coarse ceramic utilitarian stonewares, redware, and yellowware (n=35). The kitchen glass was from unidentified containers, such as bottles or jars. In addition to historic period artifacts, a large number of faunal remains (n=200) also were recovered from the outbuilding area. These artifacts indicate that domestic activities took place in and around this structure, such as storage or perhaps meat processing. It is also possible that some domestic artifacts might have been disposed of in this area, during its demolition, as it is unlikely that porcelain tea and table wares would have been used or stored in the building.

Based on the features and artifacts recovered from the area, a wood frame outbuilding was located in the northwest corner of the lot, as depicted on the Sanborn maps. The presence of window glass and domestic artifacts suggests that the outbuilding served a domestic function, perhaps for storage and/or as a workspace.

The historic maps do not indicate that any other outbuildings were located on the Veit houselot. However, four privies were identified in the rear yard of the lot, each of which would have included some type of superstructure. These structures were typically small wood frame buildings to provide shelter and privacy for the privy user. Three of
the privies were located along the south lot line in the southwest corner of the lot, while the fourth was located towards the center area of the yard between the house and the outbuilding (Figure 5.17).

Figure 5.17. Plan of Architectural Features on the Veit’s Lot.
Based on the dates established for each of these features, none were contemporaneous with each other. The first privy established on the lot associated with the Veit house appears to be a square wood-lined privy (M-44) located near the southwest corner of the lot (Figure 5.17). It appears that the privy was filled rather quickly with fill deposits, but contained very little nightsoil. This situation may indicate that the vault had been cleaned-out just prior to its abandonment or that it had not been extensively used prior to abandonment (Stottman 1996).

Most of the recovered architecture group artifacts recovered from M-44 consisted of nails (n=347) and window glass (n=163), while some ceramic drain pipe fragments also were recovered. Although some of the nails could have been used in the construction of the wood lining of the privy vault, there were few in-situ nails identified within the existing wood framing and the nail assemblage represented a variety of functions including roofing, siding, and framing. The nail data indicates that the assemblage was most likely associated with a building rather than vault lining. Although not considered a high density, a significant amount of window glass was recovered from M-44, indicating that the privy superstructure could have had a window or perhaps some panes of window glass were deposited in the privy. Furthermore, a large amount of brick and stone rubble was documented within the deposits. The architecture artifact data suggest that architectural debris from a structure had been deposited in the privy at its abandonment. This structure could have been the privy superstructure. Perhaps the structure had been damaged, which necessitated its demolition, because it was common
practice to reuse or move privy superstructures to new privy vaults on a property (Stottman 1996).

It appears that M-43 represents a new privy vault and superstructure. This feature contained deposits that were typical of privy vault primary deposition, consisting of a large amount of domestic artifacts (high percentages of kitchen group artifacts), large amounts of faunal remains, and the presence of nightsoil (Stottman 1996). The diagnostic artifacts recovered indicate that the artifacts dated primarily to the late nineteenth century and were used until around the late 1880s. Unlike M-44, which was filled mostly with secondary deposition architectural debris, it appears that M-43 was filled with primary deposition.

The upper portion of M-43 was filled with M-16, possible flood deposit that sealed the primary fill deposits within the vault. It appears that M-43 was abandoned during one of the documented major floods that struck the Portland Wharf in the late nineteenth century, perhaps the flood of 1884. This particular event seems to have deposited a large amount of silt and sand over the area that was not removed during clean-up. Based on the stratigraphic profile of the Veit’s lots, the rear yard area sloped into a depression which was somewhat lower than the elevation at the front of the lot. Perhaps the flood silt collected in the rear yard represented by M-16, effectively leveling the lot and thus, forcing the abandonment of M-43. It appears that M-16 was treated as the new ground surface into which a new privy was constructed.
A third privy (M-42) was constructed around 1900 on the opposite side of the lot from the first two privies just east of the outbuilding. It was a circular brick-lined vault that also included a square brick foundation for the superstructure, perhaps indicating that it was a bit more substantial than the others. The total depth of M-42 is unknown, but it extended to a depth of 1.5 m (5 ft.) where our excavation was halted due to safety concerns. This privy appears to have been used until sometime after 1919, based on the T.P.Q. date. The upper portions of M-42 contained a large amount of brick rubble and architecture group artifacts. Overall, the artifact assemblage was dominated by domestic artifacts, such as those assigned to the kitchen group, as would be expected for the primary function of a privy (Table 5.3). However, a significant amount (39 percent) of architecture group artifacts also was recovered, consisting mainly of nails (n=540) and window glass (n=117).

The fourth privy (M-24) on the lot was constructed sometime in the early 1900s, most likely in the 1920s to replace the third. It was a circular brick-lined vault like its predecessor, but no evidence of a superstructure was identified. A backhoe was used to determine that this privy extended to a depth of 4 m (13.3 ft.).

A large brick-lined water cistern was identified in the center of the lot at the southwest corner of the house addition (Figure 5.16). Sometimes cisterns were covered with a simple shelter similar to privies, however, neither the map nor archaeological data indicates that the cistern on the lot had such a superstructure.
The historic map and archaeological data provides a better understanding of the Veit family’s shotgun house and lot. The wood frame house occupied the northeastern and middle portion of the lot, leaving the southeast middle section and corner of the lot open as side yard space. A brick walkway directly adjacent to the house and extending to its rear separated it from the yard. It appears that only two outbuildings were present on the lot at any one time, which included the wood frame outbuilding that functioned as a domestic work space and storage area, and a privy. A reconstruction of what the Veit house and lot most likely looked like ca. 1875 is presented in Figure 5.18. A fence around the lot was included as it would have been common for these types of lots at the time, although no archaeological evidence of a fence was identified.

Figure 5.18. Reconstruction of the Veit’s Buildings around 1875 (University of Cincinnati-CERHAS).
Profile of the Veit Family

According to the U.S. Census, Henry and Catherine Veit immigrated to the United States from the German area of Europe, Henry from Prussia and Catherine from Kurhessen. They settled in Portland by at least 1855. By 1860, Henry, Catherine, and their daughter Katie were living in a building on the busy Portland Wharf where Henry operated a shoemaking business and Catherine kept house. The Veit household included two more children, Louisa and Carl, in 1870. At that time, Henry had personal property worth $150.00 and real estate worth $200.00, which included the small building on Water Street where his family lived and his shop was located. Catherine purchased two lots on Fulton Street one block from Henry’s shoemaking business in 1873, as she assumed control of the family’s finances. Her taxable wealth, which included mainly real estate, never went above $500.00. Comparatively, one of the wealthiest families in Portland was that of Paul Villier, who had a taxable worth that ranged from $60,000.00 in 1858 to around $21,000.00 in 1879. Most of his wealth took the form of his vast real estate holdings in Portland and the improvements, which included substantial commercial structures, such as the St. Charles Hotel. He also owned a large farm in the southwestern part of the county.

When compared to their immediate neighbors with similar occupations, Henry Veit was at the lower end of personal wealth. A butcher was listed in the 1870 U.S. Census with a personal value of $600.00 and a neighboring shoemaker was listed with a value of $500.00. However, neither of them had any real estate. Adolph Delime, a druggist who had a store on Lot 53 one block from the Veit family, had a total worth of
nearly $3,000.00 in 1870, including real estate. Based on these comparisons the Veit family would certainly not be considered wealthy, but they were instead part of the working class built on Henry’s small shoemaking business that allowed them to own real estate and have modest personal property. So, the Veit family would be considered a modest working class family of lower socio-economic status.

By the mid-1870s, the Veit family was living in their new home on Lot 56. However, Henry died in 1878 and the family’s upward mobility came to a halt. It appears that Henry may have been sick or incapacitated for some time, as Catherine had assumed the family’s finances, including ownership of their real estate. Catherine Veit failed to keep up with her contemporaries economically and her taxable worth remained consistent at around $200.00, the value of her real estate. After her children grew and left home, Catherine Veit took in occasional boarders to supplement income until 1921.

While much of the archaeological remains identified on lot 56 were likely associated with the Veit occupation of the property, most were recovered from demolition-related contexts that cannot be separated into the various periods of the Veit occupation and most likely contains artifacts associated with the family and their various boarders and tenants, as well as the tenants of subsequent owners. However, the four privies identified on the property are likely representative of individual periods of occupation that occurred on the property. Master Contexts 43 and 44 are two privies that have deposition dates in the 1880s and likely contain artifacts associated with the Veit family’s initial occupation of the property. Thus, it appears that M-44 was the initial
privy constructed for the Veit family that was used until the early to mid-1880s. M-43 likely replaced M-44 and was used until the mid to late-1880s when it was sealed by a flood. The artifacts recovered from these two privies are exclusively associated with the Veit family, with the exception of a two-year period from 1884-1885 when the family took on George Krutzer as a boarder.

Overall, the artifact assemblage is typical of late nineteenth-century urban residences in Louisville, consisting of domestic artifacts such as a range of tablewares, storage bottles, and jars, buttons, shoe parts, food remains, and personal items (Andrews and Schatz 2011; Faberson 2010; Esarey 1992; Schatz 2014; Stottman 2000a; Stottman et al. 1991; Stottman and Granger 1993; Stottman and Watts-Roy 1995).

Although the documents indicate that the Veit family was lower working class, meaning that they did not have much personal wealth, they did own their modest property. The artifacts recovered from M-44 can provide additional information about their socio-economic status. The ceramics from M-44 indicate that a variety of ceramic types and decorations were present. Most of the ceramic types identified were whiteware, accounting for more than half of the refined ceramics (Table 5.25). During the 1880s, whiteware was declining in popularity and would have been considered old and/or inexpensive. There are examples of much older ceramic types such as a few creamware and pearlware sherds, which were most likely curated. There also was a significant amount of porcelain and white granite which would have been the most common and expensive ceramics available during the 1880s.
Table 5.25. Ceramic Types and Decorations from Master Context 44.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Type/Decoration</th>
<th>Cream-ware</th>
<th>Pearl-ware</th>
<th>Porc. Granite</th>
<th>White Granite</th>
<th>White-ware</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edge decorated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern molded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponged</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer printed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>232</strong></td>
<td><strong>401</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 96 percent of the ceramics were undecorated, which could be an indication of lower status, however, during the late nineteenth century, undecorated or minimally decorated white granite and porcelain ceramics were some of the most popular and expensive ceramics available and are not equated to the low cost undecorated whiteware common earlier in the century. A Miller ceramic economic scaling index value of 1.34 was calculated for the M-44 ceramics, which when compared to other archaeological assemblages in Kentucky is considered to be of lower socio-economic status (Table 5.26) (Stottman 2000a). The ceramics from M-44 certainly reflect the low working class socio-economic status indicated by the documents for the Veit family.

Table 5.26. Ceramic Economic Scaling for Master Context 44.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Vessels and Decoration Type</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>Miller Index (1871-1880)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, cup, undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, plate, undecorated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, saucer, undecorated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, plate, undecorated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, saucer, undecorated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ceramics recovered from M-43 are slightly different than those recovered from M-44. The ceramic types indicate the later date of the deposition in that the only refined ceramics recovered were porcelain, white granite, and whiteware (Table 5.27).
Unlike in M-44 most of the refined ceramics from M-43 were white granite, the most common ceramic of the time period. The older whiteware ceramics were still recovered in significant amounts as was the more expensive porcelains. Like M-44, most of the ceramics were undecorated (95 percent) however there was less diversity of decorative types present than M-44. Because of the predominance of white granite compared to whiteware in the assemblage, the Miller ceramic economic scaling index value for M-43 was 1.87 using the 1871-1880 values, which was higher than the value calculated for M-44 (Table 5.28). This value is more indicative of upper working class to middle class status compared to other Kentucky sites (Stottman 2000a). However, the Thomas ceramic index value using the 1890 to 1900 values was calculated at 1.12, which is like that produced for M-44, indicating that the Veit family was of lower working class status.

The refined ceramics from M-43 and M-44 indicate that the Veit family tended to have older and less expensive ceramics, but they were able to purchase some of the more expensive and popular types of the time. This situation is typical of late nineteenth-century working class families that were of lower economic capabilities, but were able to acquire some expensive items (Schatz 2014; Stottman 2000a).

Table 5.27. Ceramic Types and Decorations from Master Context 43.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Type/Decoration</th>
<th>Porc. White Granite</th>
<th>Whiteware</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern molded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer printed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>208</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.28. Ceramic Economic Scaling for Master Context 43.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Vessels and Decoration Type</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>Miller Index (1871-1880)</th>
<th>Thomas Index (1890-1900)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, saucer, undecorated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, bowl, undecorated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, cup, undecorated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, plate, undecorated</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, saucer, undecorated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, cup, undecorated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, plate, undecorated</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, saucer, undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other artifacts from these features can provide a bit more detail about the Veit family, such as those related to gender, education, children, health and hygiene, and home furnishings. Artifacts that could be associated with gender include the smoking pipes and stem, as smoking was an activity traditionally associated with men in the nineteenth century, although, some women were known to smoke. An examination of smoking pipes by feature show that most were recovered from the earlier M-44 privy, while only one came from the later M-43 privy. This pattern indicates that smoking was more predominant during the earliest period of the Veit family’s occupation of the shotgun house during the mid-1870s to mid-1880s. This suggests that smoking was associated with the period in which Henry Veit was living in the household and thus was most likely associated with him. Given that smoking paraphernalia was minimally represented in the later M-43 privy suggests that smoking was less prevalent after Henry’s death during Catherine’s tenure as head of household.

Other artifacts indicative of the family members within the Veit household include doll parts, children’s dishes, and educational dishes, which are typically associated with children. Ceramic dolls were common toys of young girls, of which the
Veit household included two. Children’s dishes typically include cups, bowls, and plates that were smaller than regular dishes or featured whimsical designs presumably used by children or used as toys. A small ceramic vessel featuring a scene of a dog chasing a rabbit was associated with the Veit household. Educational dishes include those that exhibited designs that were meant to be teaching devices, such as those that include the alphabet and numbers or morals. The example from the Veit household was a cup that featured the saying “Experience Keeps a Dear School, But Fools Will Learn in No Other” (Figure 5.19). The presence of this artifact suggests that their children’s education was important to the Veit family. In particular, the cup was meant to instill virtues of a school education. These artifacts indicate that children were present in the household during the 1870s to 1880s, which corresponds to the archival data.

An examination of these artifacts based on context shows that all of the doll parts were recovered from the earlier M-44 privy, while all of the educational and toy tablewares came from the later M-43 privy. This pattern is indicative of the aging of the children over time, as dolls were possessions when the Veit family children began occupying the shotgun house and then were given educational items as they grew older. There is some time lag in the deposition of these items as they were disposed of when these privies were abandoned. At that time, the children were older and some had left home. Although the archaeological information corresponds to the archival data, it underscores the importance of education in the household. This is further evidenced by the presence of writing board slate fragments found in both privies, a slate pencil recovered from M-44, and a glass ink bottle fragment from M-43. The presence of these
items may also indicate that some members of the household were literate. The archival data show that both Henry and Catherine Veit could read and write. In 1870, just before the shotgun house was built, the Veit household included three children age 10 or below. The oldest children age 10 and 6 were listed in the U.S. Census as attending school. The youngest at age 1 was not. By 1880, there was only one school aged child in the household, Elizabeth age 11. She was listed in the U.S. Census for that year, as attending school.

A couple of glass tableware vessels decorated with an Egyptian motif was recovered from M-43 along with several other glass tablewares decorated with starburst
pattern and/or scalloped edges (Figure 5.19). The presence of these artifacts indicates that formal glass tableware sets were used in the household at some point in the house’s initial occupation, which seems to contradict the household’s somewhat limited economic capabilities. The choice of the Egyptian motif was most likely associated with Victorian tastes that dominated during the time which favored the exotic and a fascination with the ancient world. The presence of flower pots within both privies indicates that, like most people during the period, gardening and the beautification of home interiors and exteriors were practiced during this period of the Veit family’s tenure.

The presence of a few alcoholic beverage bottles in both privies shows that such beverages were consumed. Only a few examples were found, most of which had contained liquor, while one champagne bottle was found (Figure 5.20). A number of glass medicine bottle fragments was recovered, mainly from M-43, which could indicate that some members of the Veit household suffered from ailments, as did many of their contemporaries. Most of these were unmarked local pharmacy bottles, while only one bottle from a nationally distributed patent medicine was recovered (Figure 5.20). One of the local pharmacy bottles exhibited the name of the local pharmacy from which medicine was purchased. The bottles recovered from M-43 indicate that the Veit family patronized B. Meurer’s drugstore located on Rudd Avenue just a few blocks from their house (Figure 5.20). The presence of an A.A. Winchester’s Kentucky Liniment bottle from M-43 indicates that the family used some patent medicines for general pain. However, it is clear that the Veit family preferred to procure their medicines as prescriptions from the local pharmacy. Although medicine bottles were found in both
privies, most were found in M-43, indicating that someone in the household was being treated for an ailment during the 1880s.

![Figure 5.20. Glass Bottles Associated with the Veit Household.](image)

Only M-43 produced a significant amount of faunal remains. The remains associated with food included mostly chicken, while some pork and duck also were found. The chicken remains included a wide variety of skeletal elements indicating that the Veit family acquired whole chickens during the 1880s, which could have easily been purchased at a local store or raised on their own houselot. The faunal assemblage noticeably lacked much diversity, as the only other food species identified were pig and
duck. A variety of faunal resources would have been available to the Veit family, as there was a butcher within a block of the home and wild resources, such as fish, fowl, and small mammals could have been acquired locally. They were probably raising some of their own food, as it was not unusual for small animals such as chickens and goats to be kept on urban houseslots (Stewart-Abernathy 1986). Botanical remains from both privies indicate that the Veits consumed squash, blackberry/raspberry, strawberry, mulberry, corn, grapes, and peppers throughout their occupation. All of these could be easily acquired locally or grown on site.

Overall, the archaeological data confirms what is known about the Veit family from archival resources. It does, however, indicate that the family was conscious of and participated in common customs and practices typical of upwardly mobile families such as taking tea, home beautification, gardening, and a focus on education for their children. The archaeological data also suggest that there was a preference for local goods such as local prescriptions and that they probably raised some of their own food on their small urban lot.

The Mangin House

When French immigrant Anthony Frances Mangin purchased Lot 56 in 1846, Portland was in a period of rapid growth, as the fledgling town began to see the profits of the well-established portage business around the falls and had regained its independence by seceding from Louisville. Businesses catering to the steamboat traffic grew up along the wharf and residences sprang up on the ½ acre lots William Lytle had platted 30 years
prior. Mangin was one of many French immigrants who made their way up the Mississippi and Ohio rivers from New Orleans to Portland. These immigrants were drawn to Portland by the opportunities that the growing community offered and the established Catholic Church. The Catholic Church’s strong presence and the growing French immigrant population in Portland certainly helped Anthony Mangin get established. Mangin was hired to do finishing carpentry on the interior of the newly constructed Catholic Church in 1841. Mangin was paid $400.00 for the work, which included the construction of pews, railings, confession box, altar, stairs, and to finish the gallery (Lyon 1939).

It is clear from the tax records that a house was present on Lot 56 during Mangin’s tenure at the site. The archaeological evidence shows that Mangin was living on the lot shortly after he purchased it and had constructed buildings. Intact strata associated with the occupation and demolition a house during that time was identified. Some structural features were identified in association with these strata as well, indicating that the house was most likely centered on the lot, as were most of Portland’s residential structures during the 1840s. At that time, residential lots were generally not subdivided from the original platted size and subsequently developed with houses centered on the lot. Unfortunately, there are no images of Mangin’s house or any depictions of it on maps. The only description of the house came from affidavits in the court case concerning its destruction by fire in 1856, where the house was described only as a dwelling with an adjoining dwelling.
The archaeological evidence provides some details on the house in that it was most likely a wood frame structure with some brick elements. Unfortunately, only a small portion of the building had been exposed during excavation and thus, its dimensions are not known. However, it is likely that some element of the building used a post in ground foundation system, perhaps supporting a porch or even possibly the main portion of the building itself. A remnant of a brick footer could have been associated with a chimney or perhaps a structural pier for the house. These types of foundations would have been consistent with modest houses during the early to mid-nineteenth century.

Of the 1,658 nails and nail fragments recovered from the strata associated with the Mangin House, only 134 were identifiable as to size. Most of these were roofing nails indicating that the structure had a wood shake roof (Table 5.29). A significant percentage of the whole nails were siding nails and a few were associated with flooring or framing. The relative low percentages of framing nails indicate that the structure was log or timber-framed, both construction types that utilized limited amounts of framing nails. However, given the availability of sawed timber during the 1840s and the lack of chinking stones which were prevalent with log buildings, the structure was most likely timber framed. The rather low percentage of flooring nails suggests that the Mangin house likely did not have a floor, which would have been unusual for an urban house of the period. It is possible that some of the nails classified as siding nails could have been associated with flooring or that tongue and groove flooring which requires fewer nails was used.
Based on the nails recovered, it is likely that the building was timber frame clad in siding with wood floor and shake roof, a common construction type of the period. The presence of window glass indicates that the structure had windows as expected for a house, but the densities \( n=156 \) were rather moderate suggesting that windows were limited or just not present in the area of the building excavated. Unfortunately, no features associated with outbuildings, wells, cisterns, or privies associated with the Mangin occupation have yet to be discovered and thus, I have little information on the spatial organization of the lot beyond the house. However, based on a date of 1825 calculated from the window glass thicknesses, which suggests that the windows of the associated house were made in the 1820s, it is likely that Mangin utilized an existing structure on the property in addition to building a house (See Chapter 3).

Table 5.29. Whole Nail Categories Associated with the Mangin House.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nail Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roofing (2d-5d)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siding (6d-8d)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring (9d-10d)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing (12d-80d)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the details of Mangin’s house are unknown, the archaeological and archival data have produced some valuable insights into the historical landscape of Lot 56 during Portland’s exponential growth and development as an important port on the Ohio River during the 1840s and 1850s. At this time, Lot 56 retained its original plated boundaries and a modest timber-framed house was situated in the center of the lot. A tenant house was located adjoining or near the house. The topography of Lot 56 at the
time appeared to be uneven as the west central portion of the lot was as much as 1.8 m (6 ft.) lower than grade on the eastern edge of lot at Fulton Street.

Profile of the Mangin Family

Anthony Mangin came to Portland from France with his wife, Barbara, in the mid-1830s. They had four children when Anthony purchased Lot 56, including Paul, Mary, Anne, and Nicholas, according to the census records. By 1850, they had added two more children, Victoria and Charles. It appears that Mangin had made a good life in Portland for his family, owning property and a home. By 1855, he had a taxable worth valued over $1,600, including a house at Lot 56 and a house at Lot 134 in Square 106, also in Portland based on tax lists. These records indicate that the Mangin family was solidly working class, but far below the wealthy Paul Villier who was worth over $50,000 in 1856. However, Mangin’s worth was similar to that of druggist Adolphus Delime, who had a taxable worth of $1,700 in 1863.

Anthony Mangin’s skills as a carpenter likely kept him well employed in Portland once he became established after his first job at the church. At the time Mangin lived at Lot 56, Portland was a bustling rivertown that was reaching its peak of prosperity. He was able to construct another house on his half-acre lot and purchase another lot and house that were rented to tenants for additional income. Based on this information, the Mangins quickly made a good life for themselves and were very much a part of Portland’s burgeoning prosperity.
Anthony Mangin died sometime in 1855, which greatly affected the family’s fortunes, as Lot 56 and his home were put up for sale at a Marshall’s sale to settle his estate. His wife, Barbara, was left with a tenant house on another lot after the sale of Lot 56 in 1856 and a fire destroyed its buildings. Her taxable worth was just $290 in 1858 and was $150 to $200 into the 1860s, which included the house at Lot 134 where she lived.

While no domestic features associated with the Mangin household were identified, the relatively short duration their occupation ending with a fire that destroyed the house indicates that associated strata are representative of the family and their tenants in 1856. While excavations of deposits associated with the Mangin household were limited, I can make some basic interpretations about it from the limited artifact assemblage recovered.

The ceramics recovered from the Mangin deposits, although limited, do show that their dishes were diverse in decoration and type. The Mangin household’s ceramic assemblage shows that half was decorated and half was undecorated, indicating that the family purchased moderate to high priced dishes as often as they did the lowest cost ones (Table 5.30). Furthermore, the assemblage shows that the Mangins purchased some porcelain and the newest ceramic types of the time period. There were few examples of pearlware in the assemblage, which was common prior to 1830. Most of their ceramics were whiteware, which was most prominent between 1830 and 1870. There were a few examples of white granite which was developed in the 1840s, but did not become most
popular until after the 1850s. Due to the paucity of identifiable ceramic vessels, a ceramic economic index value could not be calculated for the Mangin household. Based on the proportions of decorated ceramics, the Mangin ceramics generally indicate that the household had access to a wide variety of dishes and that they were of higher socio-economic status than their tax records might indicate.

That their ceramics seem more expensive than their economic capabilities, it is possible that the Mangin family was upwardly mobile, working their way into the middle class. These results are not surprising considering the context of the Portland at this time, which was a town rapidly growing in prosperity. During Portland’s rapid growth, there would have been a great deal of work available to Mangin, as Portland was in the midst of a building boom. The Mangin family may have been more conspicuous about their consumption of fine dinnerware, as they were quickly moving up in wealth and status, as evidenced by the purchase of a second lot and tenant house.

Table 5.30. Ceramic Types and Decorations Associated with the Mangin Family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Type/Decoration</th>
<th>Pearl-ware</th>
<th>Porcelain</th>
<th>White Granite</th>
<th>White-ware</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge decorated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine Turned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern molded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponged</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer printed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>192</strong></td>
<td><strong>209</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At this time, a variety of goods came through Portland, as most cargo moving between east and the Mississippi River had to stop at its wharf. The people in Portland would have had access to the newest styles in dishes and other goods. Other artifacts in the limited artifact assemblage associated with the Mangin household included fragments of a wine bottle, a perfume bottle (Figure 5.21), a glass bead, a stone marble, a slate pencil, a metal fork, straight pins, brass thimbles, ceramic smoking pipe stems (Figure 5.22), and jewelry. Although this assemblage is limited, it does provide some ideas about the family, some of which confirms the historical record. Some basic interpretations include the fact that there were children in the household, a woman had and used perfume, at least some in the household were literate, alcohol was consumed, a male likely smoked tobacco, and sewing took place.

Figure 5.21. A Small Glass Perfume Bottle Associated with the Mangin Household.

Of particular interest is the perfume bottle, which at the time would have been considered somewhat of a luxury item and it may have some relevance to Anthony and
Barbara Mangin’s French nativity (Figure 5.21). During this period, France was the center of perfume production and it was a product that was just becoming available to most of the American population with mass production. In mid-nineteenth century Portland, it was probably not a commonly used product and it may be reflective of a product more attune to French culture. The jewelry is also an interesting find since it is not often found in archaeological contexts. The circumstances of the house’s demise by fire may have allowed an object normally curated as an heirloom to enter the archaeological record. However, it does indicate that Barbara Mangin had and wore jewelry.

Figure 5.22. Ceramic Smoking Pipe and Stem Fragments Associated with the Mangin Household.
The Lanning House

The 1824 map shows just a few buildings in Portland, one of which was located on Lot 56 (Figure 5.12). At the time, Portland consisted of a few houses and warehouses, but it was mostly a paper town, existing primarily on a plat map created for William Lytle. Thus, most of the lots in Portland were owned by land speculators or Lytle himself. At the time the map was published, John Burge owned Lot 56 and presumably had a house constructed, although he did not live there. The property was sold after his death in 1834 to William Blackwell, who quickly sold it to Paul Danelli later that year. In the deed to Danelli, it was mentioned that a tenant named Nicholas Lanning lived on the lot. It is not clear how long Lanning had lived there or how many tenants occupied the property prior to Mangin’s purchase of the lot. It is clear that a house had been built on the lot as early as 1824, which made it one of the first houses built near the Portland Wharf.

Little is known about the house other than from the map and the limited archaeological evidence. According to the map, the Lanning house was situated in the center of the east boundary of the half-acre lot facing Fulton Street (Figure 5.12). Compared to the location of the later Veit House, Lanning’s house would have been located partly in the south side yard and on the adjacent lot to the south where limited archaeological investigations had taken place. No evidence of intact early nineteenth century deposits was identified at that location, however, some early nineteenth-century artifacts were found within deposits associated with the Veit family in that area. Intact early nineteenth-century deposits associated with the Lanning occupation were identified
in what would have been the rear yard west of house. Because no architectural features associated with the house were found in this area, deposits were likely associated with a trash midden from the Lanning house. Limited investigation of these deposits produced a small sample of artifacts that may have been associated with the house structure, including a large number of nails and window glass.

Of the 1,030 nails and nail fragments recovered from the strata associated with the Lanning house, only 102 were identifiable for size. The distribution of the nail sizes was similar to that of the Mangin house, consisting mostly of roofing nails and a significant percentage of siding nails. Small quantities of flooring and framing nails also were found (Table 5.31). Based on this limited sample of nails, the associated structure was much like the Mangin house, in that it was probably a timber framed building with wood siding and a wood shake roof. It is likely that this style of structure was typical of the early nineteenth-century buildings in Portland. A larger extant version of this type of house is the Squire Earick House (15Jf699) built around 1820 and located just three blocks to the southwest (Figures 5.12, 5.23, and 5.24). The Mangin and Lanning houses were likely built in a similar fashion. A date of 1825 was calculated from the window glass recovered from Phase VII master contexts, confirming that Lanning’s house was built sometime in the mid-1820s (See Chapter 3).

Table 5.31. Whole Nail Categories for the Lanning House.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nail Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roofing (2d-5d)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siding (6d-8d)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring (9d-10d)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing (12d-80d)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.23. The Squire Earick House Located at 34<sup>th</sup> and Rudd (Commercial and Market Streets).

Figure 5.24. Timber Framing Used at the Squire Earick House.
Profile of the Lanning Family

The 1834 deed for Lot 56 suggests that Nicholas Lanning improved the property and built a house where he lived. Thus, Lanning lived there as early as 1824. It might be considered unusual that someone would improve property that they did not own, however given that Portland was just barely a town in the 1820s, it seems reasonable that land speculators like John Burge would allow someone to occupy his property in exchange for improving the land. The 1834 deed provided some protection for Lanning as Danelli was not free of any claims to the property that Lanning may have (Deed Book QQ:398). It is not known when Lanning moved from the lot, but by the time that Mangin purchased the property from Danelli in 1846, there was no mention of Lanning or the improvements he made to the property.

There is very little information about Nicholas Lanning during the time that he was a tenant on Lot 56, as archival documents are limited for that period. However, Lanning is listed in the 1840 and 1850 U.S. Census records. In 1840, during his tenure at the site, Lanning was 39 years old and his household totaled seven people. They included a white male under the age of 5, a white male between the ages of 5 and 9, two white males between the ages of 20 and 29, a white female between the ages of 30 and 39, and a white female between 10 and 14 years old. Unfortunately, the census for 1840 provided only this basic information about the family. Based on a comparison to the 1850 census, where relationships were defined, the young boys and girl listed in 1840 were likely his children and the woman between 30 and 39 his wife. It appears that Lanning had two adult male boarders, as well.
In 1850, after his tenure at Lot 56, Lanning was listed in the census as a 49 year old chair maker who owned $600 worth of real estate. His household included his wife Matilda (age 46) and children William (age 13), Rebecca (age 7), and John (age 5). Lanning was born in New York and his wife was from Pennsylvania. Unfortunately, tax records for Portland are not available prior to the mid-1850s and thus it is difficult to determine his economic capabilities. Given his profession and the fact that he owned real estate, Lanning was likely comparable in wealth to other working class people in Portland at the time, such as Anthony Mangin.

Like the Mangin household, the archaeological deposits associated with the Lanning household were limited and thus, few ceramic vessels were identifiable and a ceramic economic index value could not be calculated. A basic analysis of the ceramic decorative types, however, can provide a sense of the family’s socio-economic status. The Lanning household’s ceramic assemblage shows that over 60 percent was decorated, indicating that they purchased moderate to high priced dishes more than they did the lowest cost dishes (Table 5.32) (Figure 5.25). Furthermore, the assemblage shows that the Lannings purchased the most common ceramic types of the time period, as well as some porcelain.

Unlike the Mangins, however, the Lanning ceramics included a significant amount of older ceramic types, such as creamware and pearlware, suggesting that perhaps they curated dishes longer or purchased dishes at an earlier time than the Mangins, which matches the 1820s to 1830s occupation that the map data suggests for establishment of
the house. These ceramics generally indicate that the household, like the Mangins, had access to a wide variety of dishes and that they were of higher socio-economic status than would be expected for a working class family renting their house.

Table 5.32. Ceramic Types and Decorations Associated with the Lanning House.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Type/Decoration</th>
<th>Cream-ware</th>
<th>Pearl-ware</th>
<th>Porcelain White</th>
<th>White Granite</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge decorated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer printed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.25. Decorated Ceramics: Mocha and Transfer Print Associated with the Lanning Household.
Other artifacts associated with the Lanning household included a small number of identified objects, such as smoking pipe fragments, metal buttons, a metal drawer pull, brass furniture tack, glass beads, glass tableware, and unidentified bottle fragments. Most of these were smoking pipe fragments, indicating that Lanning smoked tobacco, like many of his contemporaries. The presence of glass tableware, such as a dish and stemware suggests higher status, as the family was able to afford decorative glassware. A brass drawer pull with a molded flower design was a highly decorative furniture element (Figure 5.26). The glass beads indicate that personal adornment took place.

Figure 5.26. A Decorative Brass Drawer Pull, a Furniture Tack, and Early Machine-Cut Nail Associated with the Lanning Household.

The artifact assemblage associated with the Lanning household appears to be fairly typical of higher working class people of the period and compared well with the
later Mangin family. However, at the time Lanning lived at Lot 56, he did not own property and was instead renting the property where he constructed his home.

**Villier Building**

The first development of the northwest corner of Lot 53 took place when Paul Villier purchased the property in 1855. Villier became one of Portland’s most well-known residents and property owners during the mid to late 1800s and was a key player in the development of Portland’s commercial district. He bought and developed properties along Commercial (34th) Street next to his home, including the iconic St. Charles Hotel during the height of Portland’s prosperity in the 1840s and 1850s.

Villier built a two-story brick structure at the corner of Commercial (34th) Street and First (Florida) Alley in the northwest corner of Lot 53. The only map that shows this structure is the 1884 Hopkins map, which indicates that the building was made of brick with a wood frame addition to the south side (Figure 5.2). There are no other descriptions or depictions of the building.

The archaeological features identified during the archaeological investigations, including robber’s trenches, builder’s trench, and cellar, indicate that building was constructed on a brick foundation, and was situated at the street corner oriented towards Commercial (34th) Street. A large unlined cellar had been roughly dug inside of a portion of the foundation, which was not the typical form for cellars in large commercial or residential buildings of the time. This cellar appears to have been dug out underneath the
building, perhaps after construction. This type of cellar would usually only be suitable for storing coal. It is possible that, as coal became more commonly used to heat buildings during the late nineteenth century, the cellar was dug to accommodate the new fuel source.

The architecture-related artifacts recovered included a large number of nails, window glass, and metal roofing fragments. A large amount of brick rubble was identified during excavations. The roofing fragments indicate that the structure had a metal roof. The distribution of nail sizes indicates that most of the nails were assigned to the roofing category (Table 5.33). Some of these nails would have been used to attach the metal roof. These nails also could be used for plaster lathing, which would have certainly been used in a brick commercial building. The lower percentage of siding nails compared to the Lot 56 houses is not unexpected considering its brick construction, however some elements of the structure could have been sided such as the wood frame addition or a porch. The higher percentages of flooring nails compared to the Lot 56 houses indicate that the building had a wood floor as would certainly be required for a brick structure. There also was a high percentage of framing nails compared to the wood frame houses on Lot 56, which could have been associated with the wood frame addition and/or the wood frame structural elements of the building, such as the roof and floor framing. It is possible that the addition was made to the building later in the nineteenth century. If the addition did not use timber framing methods more common to the early nineteenth century, it would have required more framing nails.
Unfortunately, there are no images of Villier’s building, but based on the few descriptions and the archaeological evidence, this structure was probably much like other commercial structures that lined Commercial (34th) and Water Streets. It was certainly very different than the frame residences located one block away on Lot 56.

Table 5.33. Whole Nail Categories for the Villier Building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nail Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roofing (2d-5d)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siding (6d-8d)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring (9d-10d)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing (12d-80d)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>247</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Dacquet and Delime Families

Unlike the houses on Lot 56, Villier’s building at the northwest corner of Lot 53 was not primarily a residence, although it appears to have been partly used as one during its history. It was built as a commercial building to house various businesses that Villier had invested in or was leased to other businesses. The building’s location along Commercial (34th) Street just one block from Portland’s wharf made it a prime spot for businesses. Villier recognized the potential of the area and built several buildings along the street to take advantage of Portland’s growing prosperity at the time.

Paul Villier was a native of France like many of the early residents of Portland and he helped many other French immigrants to get started in Portland by providing room, board, and employment. This was the case with Henry Dacquet, an 18 year old native of France, who was listed in the 1850 U.S. Census as a member of Paul Villier’s
household. Dacquet worked a variety of jobs at Villier’s new building on Commercial (34th) Street from 1855 to 1867. He was a clerk for Villier, a self-employed merchant, he ran a dry goods store, and was Portland post master in 1865 and 1866. Dacquet also lived in the building with his wife Melvina and son Charles, although they were all considered part of Paul Villier’s household, according to the 1860 Census. Dacquet and his family do not appear in any local records after 1866.

In 1867, Villier leased the property to Adolph Delime, another French immigrant, for his drug store. In the lease, the property is described as containing a “two-story brick house” (Deed Book 132:501). Delime, like Dacquet, was aided by Villier when he first came to Portland, as he is also listed as part of Villier’s household in the 1850 census. He was granted a license from the town of Portland for a drug store on November 1, 1851 (Portland Town Minute Book 1851). He operated his first drug store on Water Street between Commercial (34th) and Grove (35th) Streets. In 1867, he moved his business to Villier’s building, where he also lived, although he owned Lot 60 and a house one block to the south. In 1870, his household also included his daughters Louisa (age 13), Mary (age 11), and son Anthony (age 8). Delime lived and operated his drug store in the building until 1881, when his partner Thomas P. Taylor took over the business.

In 1880, 22 year old Thomas P. Taylor began work at the drug store as Delime’s partner. At that time, he rented a room at the St. Charles Hotel across the street from the drug store. He took over the business in 1881 and moved from the hotel to a house at the corner of 3rd and Jefferson Streets in Louisville. He opened a second drug store in the
same building where he resided that same year. He operated the drug store in Villier’s building until 1883, when he closed the store and concentrated his efforts at a new store on Jefferson Street near his residence in Louisville. Paul Villier died in 1882 and his estate sold the property along with his other Commercial (34th) Street properties at a Marshall’s sale in 1884 to settle his debts. The description of the property at that time indicated that there were no buildings or improvements present, thus Villier’s building had been demolished sometime in 1884.

While Villier’s building was primarily used for commercial purposes, it also served as a residence for the business owner. It also was home to Henry Dacquet’s family and Adolph Delime’s family for most of its existence. Dacquet did not own property and had very little taxable worth, thus it is difficult to characterize his socio-economic status. Given that he operated his own business and was postmaster, he was probably like most working class people in Portland. Delime, on the other hand, did own property in addition to leasing Villier’s building for his home and business. In the 1860s, he owned Lot 60 and a small house that he likely rented out. This property, in combination with the merchandise for his drug store, gave him a taxable worth between $1,700 and $2,000. He was probably considered upper working class, like other small business owners and craftsmen in Portland. The wealthiest people in Portland were those that owned numerous lots and buildings and had multiple businesses, such as Paul Villier.

Because of the circumstances surrounding the construction, occupation, and demolition of Villier’s building and the limited nature of the archaeological excavations,
it is difficult to ascribe deposits and phases to particular households. Only the deposits associated with Phase IV represent the occupation of the structure by the Dacquet and Delime households. Some of the deposits associated with the demolition of the structure during Phase III were likely associated with the Delime household, the last family to live in the structure. Other deposits were associated with refuse disposal and grading prior to construction and refuse disposal after demolition of the building.

Although limited, the artifacts associated with the Dacquet and Delime families provide some information about their socio-economic status. The ceramics recovered from the Phase IV deposits are typical of the mid to late nineteenth century consisting primarily of whiteware and white granite types (Table 5.34). Most of these were undecorated (68 percent) unlike the early to mid-nineteenth century households at Lot 56. Because of the late nineteenth century date, the date of this assemblage is more comparable to that of the Veit family during the 1880s. The Veit family’s ceramics consisted of a distribution of white granite and whiteware types similar to Dacquet and Delime. However, they had much more undecorated ceramics than the Dacquet and Delime assemblages. Thus, this household had more decorated wares, most of which were older decorative types such as transfer prints on whiteware. It seems that the Dacquet and Delime household’s ceramics were older than those of the Veit family, but were expensive at the time of their purchase. This result is not unexpected, given that between the Dacquet and Delime families, the occupation lasted from 1855 to 1880, thus it appears that they were able to purchase some expensive ceramics, such as transfer
printed whiteware and white granite ceramics, at the time of their popularity. Although the assemblage is limited, the ceramics are consistent with an upper working class family.

Table 5.34. Ceramic Types and Decorations Associated with the Dacquet and Delime Families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Type/Decoration</th>
<th>Porcelain</th>
<th>White Granite</th>
<th>White-ware</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern molded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer printed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately, there are few other identifiable artifacts in the assemblage that can provide additional information about the occupants of the building. However, a large amount of artifacts was deposited in the cellar after the demolition of the building. Based on the dates of these artifacts, it appears that the cellar accumulated artifacts over a long period of time from 1884 to around 1900. It is impossible to determine exactly who used the cellar for refuse disposal, but it is likely that some of the materials originated from the building at the time of demolition, including building materials and any items left in the structure. Other artifacts were most likely deposited over time from neighboring houses and buildings. These might include the old St. Charles Hotel and Paul Villier’s house located directly across the street from the lot, which was used as tenements at the time, or the duplex located next door on Lot 53. It is possible that some refuse from the occupants of these structures could have been disposed of in the old cellar pit. Regardless, an examination of artifacts from the cellar could provide some general information about the people who lived in the area at this time.
The refined ceramic table and tea wares from the cellar consisted mainly of undecorated porcelain, white granite, and whiteware, as would be expected for the time period, which was comparable to the other late nineteenth-century households including the Veit and the Dacquet/Delime families (Table 5.35). However, there was more porcelain in the cellar than in the other deposits and there was more diversity in decorative types. A Miller ceramic economic scaling index value of 2.01 and a Thomas index value of 1.87 was calculated for the cellar’s ceramics, both of which were higher than those calculated for the Veit privies (Table 5.36). Since there could have been a multitude of contributors to the assemblage, it is not indicative of a single family’s status, but it does indicate that a significant amount of higher status ceramics are present, as well as older less expensive wares.

Table 5.35. Ceramic Types and Decorations from the Lot 53 Cellar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Type/Decoration</th>
<th>Porcelain</th>
<th>White Granite</th>
<th>Whiteware</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banded</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern molded</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer printed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td><strong>155</strong></td>
<td><strong>403</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the other households, it appears that some of the contributors to the cellar fill consumed alcohol, but only a few bottles were found, all of which were for liquor. On the other hand, a large number of medicine-related bottles were found in the cellar as might be expected since the building had last served as a drug store in addition to a
residence. Many of these were unmarked prescription bottles, however a large number of patent medicine bottles also were found that would have been used to treat a number of ailments, such as digestive problems and blood disease. Many of the products were marketed to women used to treat morning sickness, “female disease”, and skin imperfections.

Table 5.36. Ceramic Economic Scaling for the Lot 53 Cellar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Vessels and Decoration Type</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>Miller Index (1871-1880)</th>
<th>Thomas Index (1890-1900)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, cup, undecorated</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, plate, undecorated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, saucer, undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, bowl, undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, cup, undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, plate, undecorated</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Granite, saucer, undecorated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, cup, undecorated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, saucer, undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.87</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were artifacts associated with children, such as marbles, doll parts, game pieces, and miniature teaware. Tobacco use was common amongst the contributors, as several smoking pipes were found. The presence of numerous pencils, writing board fragments, and ink bottles indicates literacy amongst the contributors and may have been associated with the business function of the building.

Overall, the contents of the cellar were typical of lower and middle class people during the late nineteenth century and represented aspects of domestic life and perhaps the drugstore business that operated there. Little can be said about the Dacquet/Delime households from their limited artifact assemblage other than they had the types of
ceramics expected of their tenure from 1855 to 1880, which were typical of upper working class households.

**Summary**

The archaeological investigations at the Portland Wharf site were focused on two lots, one residential (Lot 56) and one commercial/residential (Lot 53) in function. The analysis and interpretation of the stratigraphy and features identified at these lots contextualized with archival data resulted in the documentation of the changes that occurred at the Portland Wharf and its chronology throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. At Lot 56, located on Fulton (33rd) Street just south of First Alley, archaeological remains associated with three residences and families were documented. Lot 56 in the town of Portland was first occupied during the 1820s by Nicholas Lanning, a tenant who lived there until the early 1830s. Limited archaeological deposits associated with his occupation were identified nearly 1.8 m (6 ft.) below the present day ground surface. At the time, Portland was only sparsely developed with buildings, although it had been founded some 15 years earlier. Lanning’s tenant house located at Lot 56 represents one of the first residential buildings in Portland. His house was most likely a small timber framed building, probably similar in construction to the Squire Earick House and other buildings of the period. Although Lanning was a tenant, artifacts associated with his tenure indicate that he was likely working class in status, perhaps emerging middle class.

Antone (Francis) Mangin, a French immigrant, purchased Lot 56 in 1846, where he lived with his family. It is known that the Mangins lived in a residence at the property
and rented out another building. The Mangin’s residence and tenant house burned in 1856 shortly after it was sold at a Sheriff’s sale to John Young. An extensive occupation and demolition layer associated with the Mangin family was identified. Artifacts and features indicate that the Mangin family was likely working to middle class in status. Their house was probably a timber framed building constructed much like the Squire Earick House, perhaps they remodeled Lanning’s house.

Young allowed the lot to sit fallow for over twenty years before he subdivided the half-acre Lot 56 and sold two small lots located in the middle the block to Henry and Catherine Veit. The Veits were German immigrants who moved from an apartment above Henry’s shoemaking shop on Water Street to a new shotgun style house they constructed. Catherine Veit lived there until the 1930s when the lot was cleared along with many other structures near the wharf. A large amount of artifacts and features associated with the Veit family were documented at the site, including the remains of the house, outbuildings, cistern, and four privies. They were likely working class in status, although Catherine’s fortunes appeared to be less after Henry’s death, but her material culture seemed to reflect the same level of status. Male-related artifacts seemed to be associated with the earlier period when Henry was still alive. The presence of educational related artifacts indicates that education was important to the family and that they sought to improve their children’s lives through education. The Veit’s houselot contained a wood frame shotgun house typical of the period situated near the street, several privies over time, and an outbuilding that likely functioned as a work or storage building.
Paul Villier’s commercial building on Lot 53 was a large two-story structure made of brick that housed several businesses and families. The Dacquet and Delime families were French immigrants who Villier had helped get established in Portland by providing a place to live and employment. These families appeared to be working to middle class, both becoming rather successful. A cellar in the building was probably added later to accommodate coal storage and later became a dump for area residents after the building’s demise.

The archaeological analysis of the Portland Wharf site has provided a chronology of the landscape over time exemplified on two lots. On Lot 56, the location of structures within the lot appears to have changed over time as it was subdivided. The style and construction type of the building also changed over time. The topography of Lot 56 changed drastically over time, as initially, it was significantly lower at the west end. This low area was as much as 6 feet lower than the east side of the lot along Futon Street, which was level with the street. It was likely a flood plain drainage or pond. This drainage was filled gradually from the 1820s up to the 1880s with debris and refuse generated from the Lanning and Mangin families and the demise of the Mangin’s buildings. The floods of 1883 and 1884 appeared to have damaged the property, as a privy was made inaccessible as the low area was significantly filled with silt and sand. With the flood silt and subsequent grading, the entire lot was level.

The Villier commercial building on Lot 53 represented the southern extent of the businesses along Water and Commercial (34th) Street. It was most likely heavily
damaged by the flood of 1884. Because of the economy at the time, Villier’s heirs did not see any profit in repairing or replacing the building and it was thus demolished and the property left vacant. It appears that the cellar of the building was at least left partially open and likely was used as a dump for local residents, perhaps for the tenants in the Old St. Charles Hotel.
CHAPTER 6: RECONSTRUCTING PORTLAND’S HISTORIC LANDSCAPE

Using the archaeological analysis and archival descriptions and images, an interpretation of the Portland Wharf landscape over time is possible. Through the analysis of these resources, the wharf’s natural, built, and cultural environments have been examined, allowing for an interpretation of the landscape at various points in time. This analysis has identified four major periods in Portland’s history that represent significant changes in the landscape including its initial development from 1811 to 1840, its rapid growth and development from 1840 to 1865, its assimilation into Louisville from 1865 to 1880, and its decline from 1880 to 1947. Each of these periods represents a landscape that is reflective of Portland’s history and the creation, modification, and erasure of its identity.

From Paper to Promise: Portland’s Early Historic Landscape (1811-1840)

The development of Portland’s historic landscape, as with most towns and cities, began with the natural landscape. The Ohio River, its falls, and man-made profit are what motivated General William Lytle to create a town on part of his forested 3,000 acre tract of land. As the only navigational impediment to market capitalism’s westward expansion on America’s inland waterways, the Falls of the Ohio River presented the conditions for the creation of several communities, the founding of which were serendipitous and/or carefully calculated.
Louisville was the first town to be established at the falls in 1778 when George Rogers Clark’s party of troops and settlers were forced to halt their journey down river from Pittsburgh at the falls. Next, the Tarascon brothers, frustrated at losing ships at the falls, decided to move their ship building business from Pittsburgh to just below the falls where they established the town of Shippingport in 1802. The founding of Portland was less serendipitous and circumstantial, instead being purely speculative.

General William Lytle was no novice at founding towns. After leaving Lexington, Kentucky in 1801, he founded three towns prior to Portland, including Williamsburg, Point Pleasant, and Fort Clinton, all in Ohio (Bell 2011). The prospect of profiting from the rapidly growing and changing riverboat trade inspired speculators all along the Ohio River to plat their own towns in hopes that steamboats would stop there and large profits could be realized. Very few of these dreams were ever materialized, as these towns only existed on paper, becoming known as “paper towns” (Bell 2011; Derry 2000; Houchens 1966; Purser and Shaver 2008; Rothschild and Wall 2014; Stottman 1998). Portland started as such a town, a dream of profits and a grid on a map. While most of these paper towns failed to be realized or live up to their founder’s hopes, Portland had geography on its side which proved to be the difference between paper and promise.

With the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, the Ohio River became the most important route for transporting people and goods west, providing an inland link between Pittsburgh and New Orleans. Between 1810 and 1811, it was estimated that nearly 1,200 flatboats,
barges, and keelboats had arrived at the falls. Most of these boats had to port in Louisville and wait for conditions that were favorable to attempt passing through the falls or travel overland to just below and continue, a fact that did not go unnoticed by land speculators (Bell 2011). By 1811, Shippingport had already become a well-established port and had grown rapidly, as the Tarascon brothers took advantage by shifting efforts from shipbuilding to serving as a port. In October of that year, the steamboat *New Orleans* arrived at Louisville from Cincinnati and then made a return trip upstream, the first boat of its kind to do so (Bell 2011; Donovan 1966). The arrival of steam powered boats changed commerce on the river, eventually allowing two-way travel between Pittsburgh and New Orleans, emphasizing Portland’s advantageous location at the base of the falls.

While Shippingport had been well established by 1811, it was located at the northern point of land protruding from Kentucky into the falls and its harbor was not large or deep (Figure 6.1). Lytle realized that land he had just purchased that same year had a larger and deeper harbor completely out of the falls and more importantly in the most favorable position if a canal were ever to be constructed bypassing the falls. Lytle speculated that his choice of location for a town at the base of the falls would prove to be most profitable and as he had done before in other places, he set out to create a town. The name Portland was chosen for his new town reflecting its preordained purpose he so desired. Although Lytle envisioned great profits from his new town, it was the construction of a canal around the falls that interested him the most. Lytle mounted the
first realistic attempt to build a canal and the sale of lots in Portland was intended to fund this effort.

Like most paper towns, Portland began as a map, its landscape planned and designed to be divided up and carved out of the wilderness for sale. It was an imagined landscape, a plan for what the town could and should be. While Portland was conceived by William Lytle, it was designed and laid out by Alexander Ralston who created this imaginary landscape. Ralston was a Scottish born surveyor who had assisted Pierre Charles L’Enfant surveying and laying out Washington, D.C. He came west into the Ohio Valley scouting land after he had been recruited by former Vice-President Aaron Burr in his conspiracy to create a new western empire. Ralston was one of only three men indicted for treason as a result of the conspiracy. He, however, escaped punishment.
and was hired by Lytle to survey the site of Portland in 1811 (Bell 2011). Ralston laid out the town in a grid pattern using the Philadelphia model, taking into consideration the impetus for the town by establishing main streets wider than normal to accommodate the heavy traffic associated with ports (Figure 6.2). He completed the job in November of 1811 and wrote to Lytle (Lytle Papers, X:40):

Dear Sir,

On Friday last we finished the plan of your Town as proposed by you. We have put a post in the corner of each square, which must be supplanted by a stone in the course of a few months. Mr. Barclay showed me a sketch of the work which he tells me he has forwarded to you which will serve to guide you in your sites &c. You will see by this plan that we have numbered the lots by beginning at or near the big black Oak and reckoning westward hence up the other side of the square &c., &c.

Would it not be well to know whether you intend any buildings between Water Street and the river – whether you intend that the whole shall be public ground or not - if public ground who will wharf it? If it should be found necessary? I would therefore suggest to you the propriety of selling to the purchaser of each water lot that ground opposite to his lot down to the waters edge. I think by this arrangement the lots would sell higher and the wharf be much more speedily improved all of which would tend to your interest: at the same time would positively forbid any buildings between the Street and the river - these thoughts you will mature and ans(wer) me by post as much (....) Is made on these points.

You requests me to (select) and lay off for myself a lot. In conformity to your wish I have made choice of lot No. 1 provided I can purchase of you lot No. 2 your price and terms of pay(ment) you will please make known to me by return of mail

yrs with respect

Alexr Ralston
Figure 6.2. Portland’s Town Plan and Enlargement 1818 (Portland Museum).
Lytle hired Joshua Barclay and Robert Todd to manage the property and act as agents. Barclay constructed a small log house and warehouse on site and Todd operated a ferry service across the river to New Albany, Indiana. By 1814, Lytle had the land, a plan, and agents at the site of Portland to begin selling lots. He took out advertisements in newspapers to announce his new town, such as this one in the *Western Courier*:

Look Here - Will be sold at public auction on the 3rd day of September ensuing, a number of half acre lots in the town of Portland, on the Ohio River, about two miles below the town of Louisville, on a credit of twelve months – the purchaser to give bond with approved security. The plan of the town of Portland – its situation upon the river immediately below all difficulties and hazards of passing the falls – its contiguity to Louisville, and its being directly on the nearest and best road from that place to Corydon and Vincennes, all conspire to promise the purchaser ample compensation for any funds he may vest in that way.

J. G. Barclay, Agent for the proprietor

N.B. There is already a large and convenient Ware-house erected, and a ferry established at the place.

The construction of a few buildings at the town was part of the marketing ploy to generate interest before lots were sold. As part of a later court case concerning the public disposition of the Portland Wharf, Joshua Barclay gave a deposition that included a description of the property just prior to the initial sale of lots:

The old town of Portland was laid off under the direction of Genl. Lytle by Alexander Ralston who was a surveyor with deponent’s assistance, and the name Portland for the town was chosen by deponent and approved of by Genl. Lytle…Deponent by Genl. Lytle’s direction built a log warehouse on the public ground, it was intended as a temporary establishment with a view to attract public attention to Portland as the loading and unloading boats below the falls was done wholly at Shippingport, this was about
1813…and after Ralston had laid off the plan of the town, the log warehouse and a small house across Water Street from it, for deponent to live in were the first houses built in Portland…the site of the town was in woods when deponent first came there…(Louisville Chancery Court [LCC] case #2979).

In 1813, Robeson De Hart indicated in a deposition that he observed no house in town except for the log warehouse, noting that Barclay was living in Shippingport at the time. He described the river bank at Portland as being in a “state of nature” in 1815, 1816, and 1817, except for the warehouse (LCC #2979). In 1818, Robert Todd described his efforts to clear land in Portland: “I am now trying to get as much wood taken off the land at Portland as I can as I think it will conduce very much to the health of the place…” (Lytle Papers, XII: 146). Lytle described the extensive timber on his 3,000 acre property that included Portland as containing quality Poplar, Oak, Beech, Hickory, and Ash trees (LP, VII:114).

Lots in Portland sold well, as speculators from Louisville and vicinity recognized the tremendous economic potential of Portland. The price of lots quickly rose over 150%, further fueling enthusiasm over the town’s investment potential. Although Lytle saw profits in the sale of lots in Portland, his plan was also tied to his desire to build a canal bypassing the falls, which was one of many attempts that had been proposed since the 1780s (Leland and Parrish 2007). The profits from fees charged to boats for safe passage past the falls eclipsed any that could be realized from selling town lots. He felt that the most logical place to build the canal was through his lands and Portland would be positioned at the end of the canal.
The success of the first sale and the desire to raise the money to build the canal prompted Lytle to enlarge the first plan for the town, which covered an area between present day 33rd and 39th Streets from the river to Portland Avenue in 1817. Lytle amended Ralston’s plan by extending the grid layout to include the land between Portland and Shippingport anchored by Portland Avenue, the main road to Louisville (Bell 2011). This final iteration of Portland, the paper town, was recorded at the Jefferson County clerk’s office in 1818 (Figure 6.2). Lytle held a second sale for the “Enlargement of Portland.”

FOR SALE - Will be offered for sale, on Monday 27th of October (1817) next, at the Union Hall Hotel, in Louisville, Kentucky:

A Number of Valuable lots in the town of PORTLAND, Situated on the Ohio river and about two miles below Louisville and a half a mile below Shippingport; at the main harbor and anchorage below the falls.

The plan is contemplated to Unite Louisville and Shippingport with Portland, in one great and general plan of a city, which appears at this time to be increasing in extent, population and opulence, more rapidly than any other west of the Alleghany Mountains; and as nature has given it ascendancy in point of locality, there is no doubt of its being in a few years a great and Commercial City.

Although the sale of lots in Portland netted Lytle over $100,000.00, nearly half of the money he anticipated would be needed to build a canal, his insistence of having sole control of the project and his refusal to take on investors doomed his canal. While there was considerable excitement from speculators about lot sales, Portland still primarily existed only on paper. Little improvement of the site was evident since the initial lot sales. However by 1819, the warehouse constructed by Barclay had been sold and
occupied, and several cabins had been built for blacksmithing and boiler making (LCC #2979).

It was not until the mid-1820s that improvements on the ground at Portland began to materialize on what had been an imagined landscape. According to the deposition of Martin Hines, in 1819 the steamboat *Fayette* was built in Portland and by 1821, John Gray and B.R. M’Ilvaine had commenced work on a new warehouse in front of Square 84 (Figure 6.2). Hines built a cabin for Gray on the property in 1822 (LCC #2979). In February of 1824, Gray and M’Ilvaine advertised their new warehouse in the *Louisville Public Advertiser*:

> THE subscribers inform the public that they are now prepared to receive, store and forward every kind of produce and merchandise; having at a great expense erected (about 300 yards below Mr. N. Berthoud’s) a commodious Warehouse, 100 feet in length and 50 in width, rising seven stories in height from the foundation, on a rock at low water mark, each story affording convenient doors for the discharge and receipt of cargoes from steam boats. Wharves have been constructed extending on each side of the building 150 feet, alongside which, and the warehouse, steam boats can lie at any stage of the river…

The ads indicate that Gray and M’Ilvaine built a wharf for their warehouse and also established a commission house. Later that year, Gray and Stewart, Steele and Co. built a large brick warehouse and an extensive wharf along the river. According to the deposition of Robeson De Hart, the wharves constructed behind the warehouses consisted of notched log cribs filled with stone and earth and they were frequently washed away by the river during the late 1820s. He described the only improvements at the Portland
Wharf in 1824 as the warehouses and five or six tenements a short distance above the warehouses (LCC #2979).

This description is consistent with the 1824 map, which shows the street grid, buildings, which were likely warehouses and residences (Figure 6.3). Other buildings are shown in various places within Portland, including the Squire Earick House along Commercial (34th) Street near Rudd and Nicholas Lanning’s house that he built along Fulton Street (33rd) on Lot 56. In November of 1824, E.M. Holden advertised in the *Louisville Public Advertiser* that he had moved to a house with gardens on Portland Avenue above the river and warehouses, where he is ready to provide accommodations to travelers and citizens:

His house shall not be inferior, in point of accommodation, to any in the state. His liquors will be of the best quality; his stables well supplied and attended by good hostlers. His sitting room will be furnished with newspapers from different part of the United States; also, a regular list of all the steam boats, plying between this and New Orleans, St. Louis, Florence, Nashville, or any other port, together with the length of their voyage, cargo, &c…

With the improvements made in Portland during the 1820s, it appears that steam boats were beginning to stop and port at the town, opening it up to a variety of goods. In April of 1826, the *Louisville Gazette* reported that J.G. Barclay and Company had just received from New Orleans and Pittsburgh “sundry Goods in addition to their stock on hand among which are: corn and grass sythes, sickles, blacksmith vices, patient coffee mills, and curry combs, glass bottles in boxes assorted, sad irons in kegs, spades and
shovels, white lead in kegs, tea kettles, wire sifters, window glass, hoes, mackerel in barrels, cod fish in boxes, raisins in boxes, pig and bar lead, fresh Ohio Flour.”

Figure 6.3. Portland on the 1824 Map of the Falls (Flint 1824 from Thomas 1971).

The 1820 U.S. census indicates that 165 people lived in Portland compared to 523 who lived in Shippingport. Nine of these were slaves and five were free blacks. A local census taken in 1823 by the Jefferson County Clerk indicated that the population of Portland was 180 compared to 440 at Shippingport and 4,563 at Louisville. The residents of Portland were probably much like Nicholas Lanning and his family, renting the property where he lived. As most of the lots in Portland were owned by land speculators, development of housing likely consisted of tenant houses built for the property owner or a situation like Lanning’s where the tenant built a house for the property owner.
Archaeological deposits associated with Lanning’s family were identified at Lot 56 and represents the first occupation of the lot in the 1820s. Based on the analysis of these deposits, the Lanning house was likely a wood timber framed building common to the period, perhaps similar to the extant Squire Earick house a few blocks to the south. Their ceramics indicate that they appeared to be upper working class in status, as they purchased and used types and styles of dishes popular during the period, including some higher status porcelain. The Lanning household was probably like most working class families in the early nineteenth century.

The deposits associated with the Lanning household were limited, as no architectural features were located, confirming that the house was likely located along Fulton Street as depicted on the 1824 map. The deposits were identified nearly 1.8 m (6 ft.) below the present day ground surface and suggest that the topography during the 1820s and 1830s was different. Although the map suggests that most of the Portland grid was laid out on a broad level flood plain, the archaeological information indicates otherwise. The map shows a steep rise between Portland Avenue and Rudd Street just below the Squire Earick House that represents the high bank or bluff line, which is still evident today (Figures 6.3 and 5.19). However, the archaeology at Lot 56 indicates that the topography of the flood plain also included some drastic elevation differences in addition to the steep river bank. It appears that Lot 56 consisted partially of a large low area or drainage in the middle and western portion of the property, whereas Fulton (33rd) Street was fairly level. It appears that refuse associated with the Lanning household was deposited in or collected in the low area during occupation (See Chapter 5).
The archaeological evidence suggests that Portland’s landscape in the 1820s was perhaps not as it appears on the 1824 map, as it seems that Lot 56 was not prepared or graded for construction. The house was situated along Fulton (33rd) Street in the middle of the eastern boundary of the lot, perhaps not for access to the street as might be expected, but because it was the only level land on the lot. This situation suggests that Portland had more of a rural feel than that of an urban town. Based on the descriptions of Portland and its wharf during the 1820s, the street grid shown on the 1824 map would have not been as evident as it is on the map, as there were no municipal improvements such as graded roads. Streets were likely worn cart and wagon paths between structures and may not have conformed to the gridded street pattern. Furthermore, the street grid for the enlargement of Portland towards Shippingport was not shown on the map. Instead that portion of the town consisted of a rural dirt road and a few scattered buildings. In 1822, Robert Todd placed an advertisement in the *Louisville Public Advertiser* to sell or rent the Robert Wallace House, which provides a good description of how the large lots of the town were used:

To Sell or Rent
A Large & Convenient House and Lot,

Now occupied by Maj. Robert Wallace, in the town of Portland, Ky. Well calculated for persons desirous of being convenient to the harbors of Portland and Shippingport, or for keeping a genteel boarding house or tavern. There is attached to the above premises Four Acres of Ground, Well enclosed with all the necessary out houses, such as Stables, Cow Houses, Corn Crib, Waggon, Shed, Ice House, Dairy, Smoke House, &c., &c.

Persons desiring of renting, will please apply to Maj. Wallace, residing near the premises, or to the subscriber on the Portland & Louisville Turnpike Road, by whom the property will be shewn, or to Charles M. Thurston or Worden Pope, Esqrs. of Louisville, or the subscriber, if to purchase.
This description of Wallace’s house and lot supports the idea that Portland at this
time had a rural feel and look. A large lot of four acres with a house and agricultural
outbuildings were more attune to a small farm than the typical cramped urban lot. While
at the time, Portland was home to over 100 residents and had several warehouses and
wharves where steamboats ported, houses were spread out on large lots with the contour
of the topography and little evidence of the street grid. In fact, much of Portland likely
had not been cleared of timber and was distinguished by clearings, a scattering of
buildings, and dirt paths. Thus, the town still did not quite look like a town. English
tourist Charles Sealsfield commented on the communities around the falls in 1825, which
reflects the busy port feel along the river and the unrestrained open spaces just beyond:

Below Louisville are the two villages of Shippingport and Portland…the latter at the distance of three miles, with fifty
inhabitants, mostly boatmen and keepers of grog shops, for the lowest classes of People. The environs of Louisville are well
cultivated, Portland and Shippingport excepted, the inhabitants of which are said to extend their notions of common property too far
(Bell 2011).

It was at this time that William Lytle had experienced financial problems. His attempts
to improve Portland reduced his cash flow, resulting in the loss of the lots, that he had not
sold or conveyed, to his brother-in-law John Rowan and the U.S. Bank. By 1824, Lytle
no longer had any control over Portland and renounced any further interest there (Bell
2011). Although he had so much hope and promise for Portland’s fortunes, he never
lived in or visited his town, leaving it to its own devices. With Lytle’s loss of control in
Portland, investors were free to revive the long held dream of building a canal around the
falls and in 1825, the Louisville and Portland Canal Company was chartered by a group
of investors.
In 1826, work began on the canal, which was placed where William Lytle had anticipated, the 2.5 mile straight line that cut off the peninsula where Shippingport was located, traversing the area between it and Portland (Figure 6.1 and 6.4). When the canal was completed in 1830, it marked a significant change to the Portland and Shippingport landscape (Johnson and Parrish 2007). Over 3,000 workers jump started Portland’s population and economy, as many remained in Portland after the construction. However, the construction of the canal permanently changed the natural landscape, turning Shippingport into an island cut off from Louisville and the head of the falls. It was the end of the town which had been the dominant community and port below the falls (Bell 2011). Shippingport’s loss was Portland’s gain, as it lay just at the canal’s entrance with its large deep harbor.

![Figure 6.4. Map of the Louisville and Portland Canal (Silliman 1828 from Thomas 1971).](image-url)
The canal was outdated before the steamboat *Uncas* made the first trip through it in 1830. At 50 feet wide, it was built to accommodate the steamboats of 1825 and in the five years it took to build the canal, steamboats had become much wider and larger, thanks in part to Portland resident Henry Shreve (Bell 2011; Johnson and Parrish 2007) (Figure 6.5). Shreve was the father of navigation on the western waters, having redesigned the steam boat to the flat bottomed, wide, triple deck type that became iconic on the Ohio, Mississippi, and Missouri rivers (Bates 2011; Donovan 1966). When the Portland Canal opened, only 1/3 of the steam boats operating on the river could use it (Bell 2011). Despite this fact, it proved to be profitable for its investors and the government. By 1843, 13,776 steamboats and 4,701 flat and keel boats had passed through the canal, generating tolls that amounted to over $1,000,000.00 (Casseday 1852). The canal greatly aided transportation through the falls, although it did not eliminate the portage business that had developed between Portland and Louisville.

The construction of the canal created the condition for rapid growth and prosperity for Portland by eliminating its competition and infusing it with new residents and money. However, the lack of a strong and well organized municipal government left Portland unable to provide the public improvements necessary for building towns and lacking political clout to advocate for its interests. Thus, Portland became inserted into a longstanding feud between Louisville and Lexington, beginning a contentious symbiotic relationship with Louisville that continues into present day.
Figure 6.5. The Louisville and Portland Canal Prior to 1870 with Shippingport in the Background (H.R. Page and Co. 1889 from Thomas 1971).

Seeking to improve and expand Portland’s status as a major port, its leaders worked along with leaders in Lexington to build a railroad between the two towns with the goal of providing Lexington with access to the Ohio River in hopes that it could better compete with Louisville. Portland could provide Lexington with river access and Portland would have access to markets in the Bluegrass. However, Portland did not have the capability or political clout to build the railroad. Lexington built the Lexington and Ohio railroad to Frankfort, but needed assurances that it could connect to Portland. In 1837, Portland was annexed by Louisville as part of a business deal that would allow the Lexington and Ohio Railroad to bypass the Louisville wharf and connect directly with Portland. Louisville built the railroad between Louisville and Portland, but did not allow it to be extended to Frankfort. The railroad became the first interurban railway in America to use steam powered engines, but merchants on Main Street in Louisville
complained about the noise and smoke produced by the engines and the short line between the two towns was converted to mule driven cars. Feeling that Louisville had broken the terms of the annexation, Portland sought de-annexation from Louisville and was once again was an independent town in 1842 (Bell 2011).

Figure 6.6. Advertisement for the Louisville and Portland Railroad in 1858 (Louisville City Directory 1858).
Promise to Prosperity: Creating Portland’s Townscape
(1840-1865)

By the late 1830s, Portland had developed beyond being a speculative paper town to becoming materialized on the landscape. With the construction of the Portland and Louisville Canal and the eminent demise of Shippingport, Portland had the geographical advantages that enabled it to start realizing the profit of the port that Lytle had anticipated at its founding. Since the arrival of the first steamboat on the Ohio River in 1811, their use on America’s waterways grew exponentially. By 1830 when the Portland canal was opened, there were 187 steamboats operating on America’s inland waters carrying nearly 30,000 tons of cargo, representing nearly half America’s cargo tonnage (Bell 2011). Portland benefited from the steamboat’s popularity on the river, as it quickly developed its wharf and was incorporated as a town in 1834, becoming a real town with over 200 residents. Portland’s growth gained the attention of its much larger neighbor Louisville, as both communities saw the importance of their relationship and the value of their mutual dependence for profiting from those who had to negotiate the Falls. The annexation of Portland by Louisville in 1837 seemed to be preordained, as William Lytle had espoused the virtues of uniting the communities at the falls in his marketing for Portland. However, entering the 1840s, Portland was once again independent and on its own to develop its town. The experience of the annexation attempt was formative in the creation of Portland as a town, community, and an identity.

By 1842, Portland had requested and was granted de-annexation from Louisville. Unlike its previous stint as a town, the community set out quickly to form a municipal
government that would manage the town’s affairs and improvements. A five person Board of Trustees was created to establish the rules, regulations, and licensing of the town. The town was funded by wharfage fees, passenger and vehicle taxes, and business licenses. However, just as the town was being reestablished, an unresolved matter dating back to Ralston’s survey for the town concerning ownership of the land along the river encompassing the wharves arose. John Rowan, William Lytle’s brother-in-law and a major investor in Portland, sued the new town over ownership of the wharf and the land between the river and Water Street (Louisville Chancery Court [LCC] case #2979). Rowan claimed that the land belonged to him, since he had acquired all of Lytle’s remaining property in Portland when the town’s founder relinquished his involvement there. By claiming the land, Rowan could restrict access to the river and collect wharf fees for his own profit, effectively cutting the town off from the river and the lucrative port industry that sustained it. According to depositions, Rowan had already constructed houses and fences that blocked access to the wharf, much to the ire of Water Street business owners and the town trustees (LCC #2979).

This court case came at a pivotal time in the development of Portland, as a thriving commercial district had developed around the wharf. Warehouses to store merchandise in transit, taverns, boiler makers, blacksmiths, and stores catering to the needs of the steamboat crews, cargo, and passengers had been built along Water Street. However, residences were still sporadically placed on the landscape behind the wharf along dirt paths. There was little infrastructure except for private wharves behind the warehouses which had to be replaced annually because of river flooding. Residents
included tenants on properties owned by absentee land owners and boatmen. With the reestablishment of the town’s independence, it was poised to become a full-fledged townscape, as it had the means to make municipal improvements. Although the court case continued for several years, the trustees were able to continue with the task of improving public land and managing the town’s affairs. Eventually, the waterfront north of Square 84 and 88 were designated public land (Figure 6.2).

In 1842, the boundaries of Portland were defined in the court case as being the same as shown on the 1818 plat including the enlargement (Figure 6.2) (LCC #2979). The population had more than tripled since 1830, as nearly 600 people lived in Portland. According to the town minute book, the trustees set to work soon after the town was reestablished, collecting fees and making improvements to the streets, which at the time were nonexistent except for Water Street. Repairs were made to Water Street to make it safe for drays and wagons. Standards for street grades and widths were set and contracts for grading the streets let. Grading the streets was a yearly expense for the trustees, as dirt streets required constant maintenance (Portland Town Minute Book [PTMB] 1842-1843). Attention to street maintenance indicates that the planned street grid was finally being realized on the landscape. As the streets were becoming established in the community, the town saw the need to name them, as few street names had been included in Lytle and Ralston’s plan for Portland (Figure 6.2) (Table 6.1).

By 1849, the trustees began to make more substantial improvements to the streets beyond grading the dirt surfaces. The sidewalk along Water Street was paved with brick.
Commercial Street from Water to Market Street was paved with gravel and stone with gutters, indicating the growing importance of this street to the town. Improvements to and the grading of the streets became costly, requiring the town and property owners along the streets that were improved to share the cost of the work. Grading work and improvements were portioned out among the property owners in each square based on the number of feet of ground they owned, while the town paid for grading the intersections (PTMB 1849).

Table 6.1. Portland Street Names in 1848 (PTMB 1848).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location*</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>West side of Square 108</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>Between Square 104 and 108</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut</td>
<td>Between Square 100 and 104</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravier</td>
<td>Between Square 96 and 100</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>Between Square 92 and 96</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove</td>
<td>Between Square 88 and 92</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Between Square 84 and 88</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>Between Square 4 and 84</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>Between Square 4 and 5</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Between Square 6 and 12</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum</td>
<td>Between Square 12 and 13</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>Between Square 13 and 21</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vine</td>
<td>Between Square 21 and 22</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Between Square 22 and 32</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock</td>
<td>Between Square 32 and 33</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal</td>
<td>Between Square 33 and 45</td>
<td>North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>North side of Squares</td>
<td>East-West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Alley</td>
<td>Bisects Northern most Squares</td>
<td>East-West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First or Front</td>
<td>Between Squares 84 and 85</td>
<td>East-West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Alley</td>
<td>Bisects Square 85</td>
<td>East-West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second or Market</td>
<td>Between Squares 85 and 86</td>
<td>East-West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Alley</td>
<td>Bisects Square 86</td>
<td>East-West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third or High</td>
<td>Between Square 86 and 87</td>
<td>East-West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Locations are in reference to the 1818 plan and key squares, but streets extend to the town limits.

Another priority of the town trustees was the improvement and maintenance of the wharf, which in 1842 only consisted of the old crib wharf behind Gray’s warehouse. Beginning in 1848, the trustees started improvements to the wharf, borrowing $5,000.00
to have it paved with stone. The town purchased Lot 4 in Square 84 for the construction of a new wharf at the foot of Commercial Street and authorized the committee to have ring bots made for the wharf (PTMB 1848). An intact section of the paved wharf and set of iron ring bots was identified during the archaeological survey investigations at the foot of Commercial Street on Lot 4 (Stottman and Prybylski 2003) (Figure 4.10).

During the 1840s, it is clear that town trustees made efforts to establish Portland’s townscape and materialize the town plan in the landscape. The streets were graded, maintained, and paved, replacing the cart and wagon paths. Some streets had to be claimed from adjacent property owners, such as Fulton Street, which had to be opened south of High Street in 1843 because Henry Allen had fenced it (PTMB 1843). This situation indicates that while the streets were laid out on a map, they did not initially translate to the landscape. As the town grew, trustees had to impose the town plan on the landscape.

While the creation of a municipal government in Portland greatly affected the fortunes and landscape of the town, other institutions were established in the 1840s. Some of the earliest residents of Portland were French immigrants, trying to escape the French Revolution and Napoleon’s empire. Many of these came to Portland from Shippingport, which had been established by the French-born Tarascon brothers (Burnett 1976). The French residents of Portland contributed to a large Catholic population, which had been holding services in the upstairs of a residence. In 1839, they petitioned the archdiocese in Bardstown for funds to build a church. In 1840, construction began on
Notre Dame du Port, later known as Our Lady Church, on Market Street between Grove and Ferry Streets. The church became a symbol of French heritage in Portland, but also served as an important institution for French immigrants and later German and Irish Catholic immigrants (Moise 1982). Two years after the construction of the church, Portland’s Catholics founded another institution in St. Benedict Academy. The school was staffed by the Loretto Sisters and was the first school in Portland, located just south of the church across Market Street (Moise 1982). Both institutions played an important role in the development of Portland’s built and cultural landscape, serving to help attract and settle new immigrants to the town.

By the end of the 1840s, Portland had made great strides in establishing its townscape. Its population was 1,114, having nearly doubled in just seven years. It had a well-maintained public wharf paved with stone and several graded streets, some of which were paved in stone. Archaeological evidence indicates that Fulton Street was paved in block stone like the wharf, while other streets, such as Commercial, Front, Grove, and Water Streets were paved in macadam with stone gutters (Stottman and Prybylski 2003).

Portland’s developing townscape is evident in an 1849 painting. Portland in the painting looks very much like a town, with a well-developed wharf and Water Street (Figure 6.7). Six steamboats are depicted crowded around the busy wharf and Water Street appears busy with people, as brick and frame buildings are neatly arranged along its south side. The wharf appears to be paved with stone and a sidewalk is visible along Water Street. Beyond Water Street, brick and frame houses are spaced throughout the
landscape along with the spire of Notre Dame du Port. Residential development appears to have been confined to the area between Gravier (37th) and Fulton (33rd) Street, as areas to the west were depicted as farmland with a lone farmhouse. The street grid has not been fully delineated on the landscape in the painting, as it appears that east/west streets did not extend west beyond Gravier Street nor east beyond Fulton Street towards the canal. Water Street turned into a dirt country road along the river past Gravier Street. However the streets within the developed area appear to resemble the street grid plan. The canal can be seen east of the developed area across undeveloped land, demarcated by a pair of steamboat stacks protruding above the landscape. The water frontage of the Portland enlargement was developed with a few buildings, but for the most part the enlargement was undeveloped. The remnants of Shippingport can be seen in the background as a steamboat heads upstream.

![Figure 6.7. 1849 Landscape Painting Showing Portland (New Albany-Floyd County, Indiana Public Library).](image-url)
The painting depicts Portland as a swath of development in contrast to the primarily rural setting around it, reflecting the process of establishing the townscape seen in the actions of the town trustees. Lot 56 exemplifies this process, as the tenant house occupied by Nicholas Lanning and his family during the 1820s and 1830s is remodeled by Anthony Mangin and an additional house is built in 1846. Mangin’s story is common to Portland during this period, a French immigrant drawn to the town by its large Catholic and French population. His contract to do finish carpentry in the newly constructed Notre Dame du Port church helped him own property and become established in the community. He built a home on his half-acre lot that he purchased from Town Trustee president Paul Danelli, where he and his family lived along with his tenants.

Based on the archaeological investigations at Lot 56, at least part of Mangin’s houses or outbuildings was situated towards the middle of the lot within or near a low depression or drainage. Archaeological deposits associated with the Mangin family were identified nearly 1.8 m (6 ft.) below the present day surface. Anthony Mangin probably built a modest timber framed house common to the period in addition to the preexisting house. Artifacts recovered indicate that the Mangin household was upper working class, as they benefited from Portland’s quick rise in prosperity. They were able to purchase the most popular dishes and teawares of the time, some of which were expensive types. Mrs. Mangin had some luxury items such as jewelry and perfume (See Chapter 5).

The Mangin family marked a change in the residential make up of Portland since its early development. The prosperity that Portland was experiencing made it not only
attractive to land speculators to use for rental property or development opportunity, but also to those looking to become established and make a life there. People with a skill or trade were attracted by the opportunity for work in the growing town. Immigrants like Anthony Mangin had the opportunity to employ his carpentry skills, own property, and establish a good life for his family as a resident of the town. To supplement his investment in the property and Portland, Mangin rented part of his large lot to tenants. At that time, Fulton Street was just being graded and maintained to become an obvious part of the landscape, as Lot 56 likely sloped from the street grade to the low area on the lot. Like most of the residential lots in Portland at the time, Lot 56 probably had a more open and rural look than the typical compact urban lot in larger towns.

As the year 1850 approached, Portland had successfully been established on the landscape as a town, with its townscape featuring a distinct wharf and commercial district, some semblance of a street grid, a residential area, and public institutions. The work and cooperation of town trustees and property owners was extensive, as a thriving and functional town took shape on the landscape. This effort was immense and perhaps overwhelming for volunteer civic leaders. Perhaps, the job of running a town was too much, as the trustees begin efforts to seek annexation by Louisville again in late 1851. The board of the trustees was authorized to negotiate with Louisville for annexation in January of 1852 (PTMB 1852). The poll to determine annexation was held on January nineteenth. The results were “96 for annexation and 2 against it. Whereupon the report of the committee in regard the Poll Book was received and adopted. Resolved that the Clerk be authorized to present to Jas. Speed, the Mayor of the City of Louisville, the Poll
Book with the reception of this Board” (PTMB 1852). Once again Portland became part of Louisville, with the conditions that the city provide a public school and maintain the cemetery in perpetuity.

Although Portland was no longer an independent municipality, this fact did not change the view of Portland as an entity separate from the City of Louisville. During the 1850s, it seemed that Louisville was content to benefit from the fees and taxes collected at the Portland Wharf and performing its fiduciary duty, while Portland kept its separate identity. At this time, little change, as a result of the annexation, was noticeable in the Portland landscape, as the community continued on its trajectory established in the 1840s. Maps of Louisville during the 1850s still show Portland as a separate area with its platted street grid, as the area between it and the western reaches of Louisville’s neighborhoods was largely undeveloped. Thus, Portland was still somewhat separated from Louisville spatially by farmland, forest, and unrealized street grids (Figure 6.8).

Portland continued to grow as if it was an independent town in the 1850s, as Water Street and the wharf expanded along the river and the commercial district extended down Commercial Street. An 1853 sketch of the Portland waterfront labeled “Portland KY taken from Sand Island” shows a bustling wharf with a crowd of steamboats and a line of large commercial buildings rising over the riverbank (Figure 6.9). This image of Portland shows that it has a well-defined townscape and identifies it as a specific independent place, not as Louisville.
Figure 6.8. Map of Louisville and Environs (Casseday 1852).
Construction of new buildings and houses continue during this period, as a wide variety of businesses and industries were developed. The City of Louisville continued what Portland’s town trustees started by improving infrastructure, such as street grading and paving, expanding the paved wharf, constructing drainage sewers, and enforcing ordinances to clean up nuisances. In 1856, an ordinance was passed to build a “Market-house in the Town of Portland” on Market between Grove and Commercial Streets (Louisville Daily Courier May 31, 1856). An ordinance passed in October of 1855 by the Louisville General Council ordered Farmer Dewes, the owner of Lot 55 in Square 84, the lot just to the west of Lot 56, and Joseph Tunstall, agent for Lot 49 in Square 88, to remove the ponds on their properties by filling them up so that they do not collect standing water (See Figure 6.2). The penalty for failure to comply was that the city
would contract to have the nuisance removed at the owner’s expense (*Louisville Daily Courier* 1855).

This order indicates that these particular lots were undeveloped at the time and that low lying areas were common in the area, some of which collected water and became ponds. Thus, the archaeological findings on Lot 56 could reflect the nature of the lots in the south half of Squares 84 and 88 as having a varied topography. The order suggests that lots in this area were sparsely developed at the time, but that development likely increased, as the ponds had become a nuisance to neighbors. It also represents actions that the City of Louisville took to alter the landscape from the natural topography. The archaeological evidence at Lot 56 does not indicate that the low lying area there collected water, became a nuisance, or was filled at the time, as structures associated with the Mangin family were located there. Perhaps the Mangins had complained about the condition of their neighbor’s lot.

The actions of the city to clean-up lots and establish and maintain the streets seem to indicate that there was a great deal of residential development just beyond the Water Street commercial district. Portland’s population increased dramatically during the 1840s and 1850s and thus it could be inferred that intense residential development took place simultaneously. However, the archaeological evidence from Lot 56 suggests otherwise. With intense urban residential development, one would expect to see the large lots laid out for sale, subdivided for resale and development to maximize the profits of land speculators. However, it appears that Portland’s large lots remained relatively intact, as
they were left undeveloped or developed with a building or multiple buildings by the same owner. This was the case with Lot 56, which remained intact when Anthony Mangin purchased it for his home. Based on the location of his buildings, it appears that Mangin had no intention of subdividing the large lot. After Mangin’s death, his house burned down in 1856 shortly after it had been sold at a Marshall’s Sale to Louisville businessman James Young.

The archaeological deposits indicate that after the fire, the remains of the burned structure were dumped in the low area of the lot and covered. The lot was not leveled, graded or redeveloped. Instead of rebuilding houses on the lot for tenants or subdividing it for sale, Young elected to leave the lot undeveloped throughout the remainder of the 1850s and the 1860s.

Young was a successful and wealthy businessman who had developed businesses and properties along Louisville’s riverfront. Thus, it is unusual that he chose not to rebuild or subdivide Lot 56. Portland was a thriving community with a quickly expanding population. Lot 56 was in a prime location to take advantage of Portland’s substantial growth. It is not clear why Young felt like he could get a better return on his investment later, rather than taking advantage of the market that Portland offered. It can only be speculated that perhaps the market for residential lots was not good or that Lot 56 in particular had little potential at the time. This situation suggests that residential development in Portland at this time was sporadic and spreading rather than intensifying in density. Thus, it appears that residential lots along and near Portland Avenue and in
other parts of the grid saw more development, placing more emphasis and importance on the road between Louisville and Portland. This road, which became Portland Avenue upon entering Portland, was important to the economic well-being of both Portland and Louisville and helped spur the later development of residences and businesses along this street at the southern edge of the community.

In the mid-1850s, some of Portland’s early investors and land speculators began to cash in on their investments by developing their properties. Other developers arrived in Portland during the formative years of the town’s development in the late 1830s and early 1840s. One such developer was Paul Villier, widely considered one of Portland’s wealthiest and most important citizens. Villier was a native of France, arriving in New York by 1843 and quickly making his way to Portland. He acquired several lots along Commercial Street and single handedly made the street true to its name with his aggressive and bold developments. He owned and developed Lot 53 on the east side of Commercial Street, where he built a large frame house. In 1855, he built a two-story brick commercial building on the lot at the southeast corner of Commercial Street and First Alley, which would contain several of the businesses that Henry Dacquet operated for him in the 1850s. The remains of these buildings and artifacts associated with Dacquet were identified during archaeological investigations at the site (See Chapter 5). This building represented the expansion of Portland’s commercial district from Water Street south into the sparsely developed residential section, connecting the wharf with the Catholic institutions along Market (Second) Street. From the building, Dacquet operated a dry goods store and post office.
Across the street from Dacquet’s store, Villier built the St. Charles Hotel, his most ambitious building and business, in 1856 (Figure 6.10). Prior to its construction, accommodations for the many travelers arriving in Portland daily were available at various small taverns and inns located throughout the community or at hotels within the commercial buildings on Water Street. Portland lacked a signature hotel, like those in larger towns and cities. For example, Louisville boasted several grand luxury hotels such as the Galt House and The Louisville Hotel, which were housed in iconic masonry buildings. A hotel of that magnitude in Portland would be seen as a symbol of the community’s importance and prosperity. An article describing the St. Charles Hotel in the *Louisville Daily Courier* in May of 1856 provides a good account of Portland’s status and landscape at the time:

A Hotel in Portland It has often been to us a source of wonderment that the neighboring town of Portland – now incorporated as part and parcel of our own city – had not first class hotel for the accommodation of the great throng of passengers daily arriving at that place. That such an establishment would be profitable to the proprietors, and highly convenient to the traveling public, can admit of no doubt. Every day throughout the year, there are a large number of steamboat arrivals, crowded with travelers, many arriving in the night time, who in order to reach this city, must submit to many inconveniences. This pressing demand for hotel accommodations in Portland is now about being satisfied. Mr. Paul Villier, a wealthy and public spirited citizen has erected a very fine and commodious building admirably adapted for a house of public entertainment. It is situated on Commercial Street, within a few steps of the steamboat landing, and yet sufficiently removed from the bustle of the wharf to be quiet and secluded.

This Hotel, the St. Charles, is now about completed, and will soon be in readiness for occupancy. It is a beautiful specimen of architecture—five stories in height, and embracing some sixty spacious, well ventilated and convenient rooms. The parlors are
large and handsome—the dining room is a perfect model and the sleeping apartments snug, airy and light. We do not know of a public house combining greater advantage of location and construction than this. Mr. Villier has spared no pains to render it unexceptionable. Adjoining the hotel structure, are very large and handsome grounds, properly ornamented with shade and fruit trees, flowers, shrubbery and other embellishments for the gratification of the taste and the luxurious enjoyment of the body. So that the visitor while convenient to the whirl of business, can find a petite paradise of rural sweets, by stepping from his room.

The basement of the St. Charles consists of several large, dry and light rooms, adapted to various hotel purposes. In the yard there is a fine well and force pump—furnished by Thos. Williams & Co., of this city—that can, with the labor of four men, throw streams of water all over the premises, thus preventing any danger from conflagration. The view from the observatory upon the top of the hotel is of exceeding beauty. A most charming landscape—a perfect panorama of variegated scenes, spreads out before the eye. The Knobs of Indiana and busy little city of New Albany in their shadows—the falls and islands of the Ohio—the green woods in the rear of Portland—and the church spires of Louisville—can all be embraced with one sweep of the vision. It is the purpose of Mr. Villier to rent the establishment to a good landlord on the most reasonable terms. His main object in erecting it, has been to increase the trade and importance of Portland. That portion of our city needs such a hotel. Its busy commerce—its large boarding school for young ladies, and the future promise of growth, all testify to the importance of this improvement. We trust that the energy and public spirit of Mr. Villier, may meet with due reward, and that Portland may soon boast of a first class hotel in the St. Charles.

Archaeological excavations at the site of the St. Charles Hotel have identified the foundations and basement of this large structure, as well as artifacts hinting at its first class status, such as decorative tiles and expensive dishes (Stottman and Prybylski 2003). The St. Charles was an important addition to Portland’s developing townscape, an indication of its status as a place just as important as other major river towns like
Louisville and Cincinnati. It was certainly an iconic building for its sheer size and opulence compared to the surrounding commercial buildings and frame houses. Based on the newspaper description it is clear that the building stuck out amongst its neighbors and the undeveloped land that still surrounded Portland.
While the St. Charles represented Portland’s commercial district, another important building anchored the east end of Portland Avenue. Completed in 1852, the massive U.S. Marine Hospital was a fixture on Portland’s landscape, serving the multitudes of boatmen that worked on the river (Jefferson County Board of Health 1999; Stottman 2008). It was a large three story brick structure that featured innovative design for its ventilation and privy system (Stottman 2008). The establishment of the hospital at the east end of Portland and improvements in the Louisville and Portland Road helped to spur development along Portland’s main road between its wharf and Louisville.

In addition to Paul Villier’s development of a grand hotel and dry goods store along Commercial Street, Portland had a wide range of businesses that catered to the steamboat market. Businesses such as taverns, saloons, coffee houses, barbers, and hotels catered to passengers passing the time before departure downstream or through the canal or falls. A number of businesses were aimed at the steamboat industry, providing services and supplies for the companies and crew, such as a boarding house, boat stores, blacksmiths, sheet metal worker, wagon maker, provisions dealer, wine and liquor distributor, brewers, and, coal merchant. There also were a number of bakers, butchers, game and poultry stores, shoe makers, grocers, dry goods stores, druggists, doctors, tailors, and lumber dealers. Interestingly, there were five confectioners in Portland according to the 1858 City Directory. Nearly all of these businesses were located on Water or Commercial Street. The 1861 city directory showed an increase in the number and diversity of goods and services available in Portland. Industries included a brickyard, blacking manufacturer, chemical works, a cooper, cork manufacturer, fanning
mill manufacturer, a pottery, and wheelbarrow maker. There were a number of businesses that catered to higher status clients, including a fancy grocery, watch and jewelry maker, fancy goods and toys, clothing store, furniture store, and tobacconist. Other businesses catered to the large number of livestock that were being transported by steamboat each day, such as feed stores and four stockyards. In the 1861 city directory there were many more businesses located on Portland Avenue than in the 1858 edition, indicating that lots were being developed and a secondary commercial district created along the southern boundary of Portland along the road to Louisville.

Certainly by 1860, Portland’s status as a port on the busy Ohio River afforded its residents and travelers all of the goods and services available in much larger towns and cities. Portland featured an impressive townscape with a thriving wharf and riverfront business district, a first class hotel, institutions such as churches and schools, industries, a secondary business district, and the expansion of its realized street grid and residential area. Clearly, Portland had flourished with its annexation to Louisville, as it continued on its trajectory of building a distinctive townscape. Although it had been annexed just eight years prior, there was little evidence of its status visible on the landscape and Portland had the look and perception of an independent town.

A testament to Portland’s perceived independence was the fact that separate city directories were published for Portland and Louisville in 1857. Later, Portland was published as a separate section within the Louisville directory and eventually assimilated in the Louisville directory, reflecting the process of Portland’s assimilation into
Louisville. Portland’s sense of independence was evident in an 1856 editorial in the *Louisville Daily Courier* responding to the 1855 Bloody Monday Riots in Louisville. The Know Nothing political party and a rival newspaper editor to the *Courier* had whipped up a nativity furor that prompted riots against immigrants and Catholics and left German and Irish owned businesses in flames and as many as twelve immigrants dead. Prior to the riots, Mayor James S. Speed had been ousted by the majority Know Nothing party during an illegal election (Yater 1987):

> Although our city, like all political cormorants, and which much of the annexative spirit characteristic of the national government, has swallowed up the corporation formerly so widely known as the TOWN OF PORTLAND, that place has lost none of its identity. At the last city election, it was the only portion of Louisville that repudiated the dictation of Know-Nothingism and voted the independent reform ticket. For that good act alone, we feel inclined to canonize all Portlanders. They and their residence however, deserve mention on many other accounts. Just now it is the scene of very great business activity. Yesterday there were nine first class steamers at the wharf loading and discharging more freight than all the boats that land at Cincinnati in a week’s time could carry. Among other steamers departing was the regular packet *Northerner*, loaded with emigrants for the far West—the founders of new States in the occident; while the *High Flyer* from St. Louis brought over one hundred passengers, who entirely filled two trains of cars in the Louisville and Portland Railroad. The streets of Portland are now being thoroughly cleaned, and when the Avenue shall have been bouldered, it will be one of the most important sections of our city (*Louisville Daily Courier*, April 15, 1856).

Portland was a center of anti-Know Nothing sentiment and a democratic stronghold, as an advertisement in the October 1, 1856 *Louisville Daily Courier* promoted a Democratic and anti-Know Nothing club in Portland. Perhaps because of its strong anti-Know Nothing sentiment, a large number of German and Irish immigrants moved to Portland.
after the riots, adding to its already established French and Catholic population. Portland was already a destination for many immigrants, as German immigrants escaping the break-up of the Prussian empire and the Irish fleeing the potato famine were drawn to Portland due in part to its strong Catholic infrastructure and the economic opportunities (Watrous 1977). Many of these settled in the Enlargement of Portland area between Fulton Street and the canal to Portland Avenue (Figure 6.2). Paul Villier took several recent French, German, and Irish immigrants into his household in 1850, a common practice that helped recent immigrants become established, as was the case with Henry Dacquet and Adolph Delime, who went on to have their own businesses (See Chapter 5).

At the close of the 1850s, Portland thrived after annexation reaching new heights of economic prosperity and development due to its association with the steamboat industry. However, in 1859 an event occurred that was destined to change Portland’s fortunes and its landscape. The first train became operational for the newly completed rail line of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad (L&N). The railroad was charted in 1855 to diversify Louisville’s transportation modes and economy (Yater 1987). Although railroads had been built between Louisville, Frankfort, and Lexington in the previous decade, this form of transportation had yet to challenge the steamboat for shipping dominance. These rail lines had been built to connect inland cities and towns to ports on the Ohio River to take advantage of steamboat transportation. However, with the establishment of the L&N railroad to other major cities, such as Cincinnati, Nashville, and Chicago, this form of transportation was poised to compete with the steamboat.
During this time, improvements were being made to the canal to make it more functional and able to accommodate more types of boats. It was widened to 65 feet and a new branch canal and new locks, known as the Scowden Locks, were completed in 1865. The new branch canal cut through the Enlargement of Portland section of the community which had yet to be fully developed. Thus, the canal exited much closer to Portland’s wharf and significantly improved river traffic (Johnson and Parrish 2007).

At the beginning of the 1860s and the Civil War, Portland was able to maintain the perception of independence and developed a distinctive townscape that reinforced it. This perception of Portland’s independence grew stronger in the context of secession associated with the Civil War, sometimes enabled by the city of Louisville. City leaders in Louisville seemed to be content with this perception of Portland, doing its municipal duties and benefiting from the relationship.

Having already developed the reputation for being independent, Portland residents willingly took on that identity. Just before the outbreak of the Civil War, a group of Portlanders gathered at Duckwall’s Tavern and created a parody of the Southern Secessionist movement that was published in the December 16, 1860 edition of the *Louisville Democrat*. Citing Portland’s independent spirit, the satirical article suggested that Portland secede from the Union despite what Louisville might do and made outrageous demands and resolutions, such as keeping the fees and taxes, taking control of the lower canal, taking half ownership of Louisville’s public buildings, seizing all public property, and stating that they did not care if Shippingport joined them or not. This new
Portland was to be called the Confederacy of Portland and would be “perfectly independent of all nations of the world.” Clearly the article was written in jest, poking fun at the South and at Portland’s independent spirit. In fact, Duckwall’s Tavern was known as the home of pro-Union sentiment in Portland. While this satire was well understood by the residents of Louisville and Portland in 1860, it would be misinterpreted by some residents much later in time (See Chapter 8).

The outbreak of war greatly affected commerce on the Ohio River, as steamboats were commandeered by the Union Army, Confederate saboteurs burned boats, and the all-important canal was under constant threat (Johnson and Parrish 2007). Union gunboats patrolled the river to protect the canal and a home guard was formed in Shippingport to protect Union boats that frequently became stranded in the falls. Although Portland, like Louisville, had both Confederate and Union sympathies it had the reputation of having a secessionist sentiment (Johnson and Parrish 2007). Both communities, however, tended to favor whichever side was more profitable, which in most cases was the Union. Other than a few near Confederate attacks on Louisville, Portland escaped the war without incident. The only incident during this time occurred at the close of the war in Portland, when seventeen steamboats loaded with Union troops being sent east to support the final efforts to capture Lee’s army awaited passage through the canal at Portland. Drunken soldiers went on a rampage through Portland, robbing residents and businesses, including Adolph Delime’s drug store. The soldiers shot and killed Edward Burke, the proprietor of a whiskey shop (Daily Union Press, January 23, 1865; Johnson and Parrish 2007).
It appears that Portland’s exponential growth in the two decades prior had slowed a bit during the war, but it still maintained its level of prosperity and importance. The 1865 map showing Louisville and its defenses shows a slightly expanded version of Portland’s original street grid with street names. It also showed that Louisville’s western street grid had expanded towards Portland and met up with the east end of Portland Avenue where it is apparent that some development had taken place around the Marine Hospital, narrowing the amount of undeveloped land that separated the two communities (Figure 6.11). This development is evident in the addition of new streets in that portion of Portland and west Louisville. For example in 1865, the Louisville Chancery Court ordered the opening and establishment of Lytle Street between Portland Avenue and Bank Street (Louisville City Code Book 1884:159). The same had been done in 1860, with the establishment of Rowan Street. These actions are an indication that Portland was expanding south and west of the original street grid during the 1860s.

Figure 6.11. 1865 Map of Louisville and Its Defenses Showing Portland (Phillips 1865 from Thomas 1971).
Portland and Louisville had endured the Civil War intact and unscathed, unlike many major cities in the South. With its river and rail transportation networks intact and its burgeoning industries, Louisville was poised to become a major manufacturing center during Reconstruction. During the late 1860s through the 1870s, Louisville saw significant growth and expansion. This was accompanied by new development patterns and housing that prioritized smaller lots and houses aimed at the growing working class (Yater 1987). The large lots in the city center were divided into smaller lots, and farmland around the city was platted into narrow long lots on which shotgun houses were built (Preservation Alliance 1980; Yater 1987).

The archaeological investigations of the Veit House on Lot 56 exemplify this development pattern and housing type (See Chapter 5). After the Mangin house burned down in 1856, James Young cleared the lot and left it undeveloped throughout the remainder of the 1850s and through the 1860s. By early 1870s, Young had subdivided Lot 56 into six small narrow lots facing Fulton Street as was typically done in the new additions and subdivisions of Louisville. Catherine Veit purchased two of the center lots and a shotgun house was constructed on one of them. The foundations and artifacts identified during the excavations there indicate that it was a wood frame structure with a central brick chimney and that it was home to the working class Veit family (See Chapter 5). Although they built a shotgun house, which was designed for narrow lots, the Veits left their adjoining lot undeveloped and used it as yard space. With both lots, they could
have constructed a larger home, yet they chose to build a traditional working class house that was common to other immigrants and working class throughout Louisville.

The archaeology on the Veit’s lot also indicates that they did not grade or modify the topography of the lot which sloped to the west into a low area or drainage where they built their privies. Unlike Louisville, where lots were filled and graded, the Veits built a new style house on a small lot in the way that was traditionally done in Portland.

By the mid-1870s the western edges of Louisville’s suburban developments had reached Portland, nearly eliminating the spatial separation that had distinguished the two communities. In 1874, the Commercial newspaper remarked: “A few years ago Portland was considered a good way from Louisville,” which was no longer the case, as seen on the 1876 map of Louisville (Figure 6.12). This map shows the western additions of Louisville meeting the eastern edge of Portland’s original street grid and the Marine Hospital. The area just south of Portland Avenue at the Marine Hospital showed a great deal of development. This situation indicates that at that time, Portland’s eastern boundary was not clearly defined.

The map shows Portland’s street grid with the street names that had been established by the old Town of Portland in the 1840s. However, as Louisville’s suburban expansion began to consume Portland, city leaders were not content to leave the old Town of Portland as it was. The city took steps to more fully assimilate Portland, as
many of its streets were renamed to more reflect Louisville’s system of naming streets (See Chapter 7).

Street name changes were not the only thing that changed in Portland during the 1870s improvements at the canal drastically changed the community. With the opening of the Scowden locks, other improvements, and the ceding of control to the federal government, more steamboats used the canal and they had less wait times to get through it. Thus, fewer boats moored in Portland and used the portage system. By 1879, only nine steamboats used Portland’s wharf the entire year. Louisville’s wharf also saw
reduced activity, as wharfage fees collected by the city went from $40,000.00 annually to just $17,000.00 in 1879. Throughout the 1870s, the federal government reduced the canal tolls and by the end of the decade the canal was free of tolls (Johnson and Parrish 2007). Louisville’s grip on shipping on the Ohio River came to an end, as the steamboat industry was no longer as profitable as it once was. Thus, Louisville was no longer content to collect Portland’s wharf fees and leave it alone.

If the canal was not enough to kill Louisville and Portland’s control of commerce on the river, the first railroad bridge to cross the Ohio River in Louisville was completed in 1870. Now the railroad connected more cities and quickly competed with the steamboats for transporting goods, significantly cutting into their business. Portland no longer had the industry that precipitated its birth and gave it so much prosperity. As Louisville’s western neighborhoods began to surround Portland, it was difficult to recognize the town of Portland, as it became the Portland Neighborhood of Louisville.

The Decline of The Portland Wharf (1880-1945)

Although Portland’s wharf was dying and the steamboat’s grip on transportation was over, the Portland Neighborhood was not dead. In the early 1880s, Portland thrived as a neighborhood, as residences and industry continued to develop around Portland Avenue. Old grand mansions lined the avenue, while nearby undeveloped land was carved into long narrow lots for working class shotgun houses. Although some lots near the wharf were subdivided and developed with shotgun houses, most of the development took place elsewhere and many lots lay undeveloped.
This pattern of development is evident on the 1884 map, which shows building and lot details as well as the street grid (Figure 6.13). The map clearly shows intensive development of lots and houses around Portland Avenue. However, aside from a few lots and the Robert Wallace subdivision in the old Square 96, many of the lots in the wharf area were void of buildings. Lot 56 had been subdivided and contained five shotgun houses including the Veit’s. Evidence of these buildings was identified during the archaeological survey project (See Chapter 4). Lot 55 adjacent to the west had never been improved and only August Reynauld’s house in the middle of the block and Paul Villier’s buildings on Lot 53 at its west end represented improvements. The grand brick buildings of Water and Commercial Streets still existed and housed businesses, including the St. Charles Hotel and Aldoph Delime’s drugstore which had moved from Water Street to Villier’s building on Commercial Street. Although Paul Villier still owned his property in Portland, he had moved to a large estate and farm in the southwestern part of the county by 1879. While the businesses around the wharf catered less to steamboats, there were more residents in Portland who were patronizing them.

An 1883 birdseye view map of the area further demonstrates the development pattern in Portland (Figure 6.14 and 6.15). The expansion of Louisville can be seen on the east with well-established street grids, small lots, and tightly packed houses extending along Portland Avenue. The old Portland street grid is distinct in the western portion of the map, with its large lots and sparsely developed residences. The scene at the wharf is quite different in 1883 than it was twenty years earlier, as steamboats pass by the empty Portland Wharf. This image of Portland shows it as less distinctive on the landscape, but still retaining some recognizable elements of the town.
While the changing development patterns and encroaching Louisville subdivisions made Portland more inconspicuous at this time, there was still a semblance of a town near the wharf. Unfortunately, it would not be the loss of the steamboat industry that would doom the wharf, it was nature. In the years of Portland’s existence, there have been floods, but most were minor and not enough to dissuade opportunities to profit from the river. A massive flood in 1832 that severely damaged Shippingport, happened before Portland had fully developed and thus was not embedded into the community’s collective memory. However, the 1880s would prove to be devastating to the wharf area.
The first flood of the decade hit in 1882 and by all accounts was not considered to be major event compared to the 1832 flood. However, it did inundate buildings along the wharf with six feet of water. That flood was only the beginning, as major floods struck again in 1883 and 1884, devastating portions of Portland and the remnants of
Shippingport (Johnson and Parrish 2007). A substantial amount of damage was reported in Lower Portland, the area north of Market Street (Rudd Avenue) (Figure 6.16). On February 13, 1883 the *Louisville Commercial* reported:

All along the river front people were driven from their homes and forced to seek shelter on higher ground...The loss of property was not great at a later hour yesterday evening, but the probabilities were that $50,000 or $60,000 would be swept away before morning, and at least 200 families would be turned adrift. A reporter for the *Commercial* was down in Portland yesterday evening, and the scene presented on the levee front was truly pitiful. The whole of the lower part of the suburb seems to be flooded or about to be flooded. The people were moving out of their little houses and trying to save as much as they could. In some places the water was up to the second story; in others it only covered the ground floor. It is thought that at least 500 families in Portland will be thrown out of house and home.

Figure 6.16. Gravier (37th) Street and Market Street (Rudd Avenue) during the 1884 Flood (Filson Club from Thomas 1971).
During these floods, houses were loosened from their foundations or washed away downstream. Furniture and merchandise on the ground floor of houses and stores were ruined and a thick layer of sand and silt was deposited over the landscape.

The archaeological deposits at both Lot 56 and Villier’s building at Lot 53 show two different responses to the floods of 1883 and 1884 (See Chapter 5). The brick building built by Paul Villier in 1855 and which housed Adolph Delime and T.P. Taylor’s drugstore in the 1880s was demolished sometime between 1883 and 1884. After taking over the business from Delime, Taylor moved his business to higher ground on Rudd Avenue in 1883 before later moving his entire operation to Louisville. Reports indicate that flood waters were extensive in the area where the building was located and it is likely that it was severely damaged. Given the change in Portland’s economic fortunes and Villier’s death in 1882, it may not have been worth reinvesting in the building.

The archaeological deposits associated with the Veit shotgun house at Lot 56 showed evidence of these floods in the stratigraphy. The floodwaters had deposited a layer of silt and sand over the low lying area in the rear yard, destroying a privy. As a result, Catherine Veit filled in the low area in the rear of the yard and created a level grade on her lot on which she repaired the house and built a new privy and outbuildings. As all she owned was invested in her real estate, she had little economic choice but to stay. Clearly the floods of 1883 and 1884 had a profound effect on the Portland Wharf landscape, as many property owners were in the same position as Villier and Veit, making the choice to reinvest or not.
Adding insult to the Portland Wharf’s economic situation, the Kentucky and Indiana railroad bridge was constructed at Fulton (33rd) Street across the Ohio River in 1886 (Figure 6.17). The goods and passengers that used to stop at Portland’s wharf on steamboats, now passed-by on rail cars. The bridge and accompanying railroad was physically imposing on the landscape, cutting through the middle of Portland. The bridge and its later iteration would become a landmark in its own right and was the first to allow vehicles in addition to trains to cross the river, effectively ending ferry service to New Albany. It took away yet another reason to go to the Portland Wharf.

Figure 6.17. Construction of the K and I Bridge in 1886, Fulton (33rd) Street is at Left (Filson Club from Thomas 1971).
Floods continued to wreak havoc on the remaining buildings along the Portland Wharf into the new century, striking in 1898 and 1913. A photograph of Bott’s Tavern at the corner of Commercial (34th) Street and Front (Missouri) Street shows the flood of 1913 with a portion of the St. Charles Hotel under water (Figure 6.18). A newspaper article described the Portland Wharf in 1918:

Out at Thirty-fourth and Water streets, just below the K & I bridge, the traveler may push aside the dead weeds and tangled willows and find the cobblestones of a dock built more than half a century ago...And up from the dock is the old St. Charles Hotel, a gaunt, tattered, three-story building with stenciled walls and ancient carved woodwork hinting at glories of a generation that took life with a little leisurely luxury and a good deal of pleasure. But the fine old ballroom of the St. Charles, where young belles of Portland and the swains of prosperous river days mingled with the adventurous traveler and aristocrat, is a ruin so complete and mocking as to fall short of the dignity of pathos. Clustered with rags and filth from vagrants who have given vandalism in payment for shelter there, the old tavern to-day serves only as an occasional rendezvous for a furtive group of crapshooters and bootleggers (*The Courier-Journal*, December 29, 1918).

A further indictment of conditions at the Portland Wharf is evident in the archaeological deposits associated with the cellar of the Viller building which had been demolished around 1884. It appears that the cellar or a large depression was left open after the demolition and it was gradually filled with domestic trash from neighboring properties from the 1890s to 1910s. It served as a garbage dump, as did many vacant lots (See Chapter 5).
By 1928, very few buildings remained on Water Street and those that did were a few shotgun houses that had replaced the earlier commercial buildings. The iconic St. Charles Hotel had been demolished and was gone. The Portland Wharf was almost void of its original buildings. In 1933, yet another floor hit the area. A photo in The Courier-Journal shows the shotgun houses on Lot 56, including the Veit house partially under water with a houseboat shanty (Figure 6.19). By 1940, all that was left in the blocks around the wharf were houseboat shanties, as most of the original buildings were gone, including the Veit shotgun house and others on Lot 56. By this time, Portland’s main residential development and commercial district had become concentrated along Portland Avenue on higher ground.
After the 1920s, the abandoned land in the Portland Wharf became home to “river people,” the transient poor who lived in houses called shanties. Some of these buildings were actual boats propped up on piers next to the river or were houses that had been converted into boats that were haphazardly placed on the landscape. In the 1930s, the old Portland Wharf was known as “Shantyboat Town” \((\text{Louisville Herald Post, February 19, 1935})\). The people were Portlanders, having moved from place to place in the neighborhood before moving into their shanty, the early twentieth century equivalent of a mobile home \((\text{The Courier-Journal, June 20, 1948})\). The area had become blighted and in 1935, the Portland Civic Club initiated a program to remove the blight, by uncovering the streets and wharf and restoring reminders of grander days \((\text{Louisville Herald Post, February 19, 1935})\). Just two short years after initiating the project, the river reclaimed them during the flood of 1937, the largest and most devastating on the Ohio in recorded
history. This flood that inundated much of Louisville and was a national disaster, minimally affected the Portland Wharf section of Portland, as it had little left to take.

Prompted by the enormity of the 1937 flood, local and federal officials developed a plan to protect Louisville from future floods. The plan included the construction of a series of floodwalls and levees stretching from bluffs at the northeastern corner of Louisville to southwestern Jefferson County. After one more major flood occurred in 1945, construction of the floodwall and levees began in 1946. It was built in sections with the last being completed during the early 1980s in Southwest Jefferson County.

Construction of the Portland levee required the grading of the land north of its location between Front (Missouri) Street and Market Street (Rudd Avenue), effectively removing any last remnants of structures left on the landscape (Figure 6.20). The course of the levee took a noticeable jog around the Our Lady Church to spare this important landmark. The work revealed remnants of the old landscape, such as foundations, artifacts, wells, and cisterns, causing some difficulty for the project (The Courier-Journal, October 19, 1947). The large amount of soil needed to build the earth and stone levee came from borrow pits in the wharf area and Shippingport (The Courier-Journal, July 18, 1947).
Figure 6.20. The Portland Wharf in 1947 after Construction of the Levee (Courier Journal 1947).
The Modern Portland Wharf Landscape (1947-Present)

When the flood levee was completed in 1947, the Portland Wharf had been erased from the landscape and the remaining Portland Neighborhood cut off from its birthplace. The wharf and associated businesses and residences were gone, the large pits dug to provide soil for the levee had been filled with sand and the area was graded. All that was left was a level field of grass. In the 1960s, Interstate 64 was constructed atop of the levee, further impeding access to former wharf. The land lay fallow and largely unused for 40 years, providing little indication of its former function upon the landscape. The City of Louisville maintained the land mainly as open field with some sparse trees, but it was primarily a buffer between the river and the Portland Neighborhood. Residents would frequently visit the land to fish in the river or play in the fields.

By the late 1980s, the City of Louisville stopped mowing the grass and maintaining the fields. Trees grew throughout the wharf area and by the late-1990s, it was heavily wooded in most areas. The lack of maintenance and the tree cover changed the use of the area, as it became a place where more nefarious activities took place. Criminal activity and teenage mischief was commonplace and it became ingrained in the experiences and lore of teenage life. The City of Louisville built a portion of the new riverwalk trail through the wharf in the 1990s, which provided better access to the former wharf area and brought more people to the area. However, at the end of the twentieth century the Portland Wharf landscape was still heavily wooded and had a poor reputation. It became an informal dirt bike and ATV course and a place for hidden activities, while the occasional jogger or cyclist passed through on the way to somewhere else. The
Portland Wharf looked more like the wilderness it was prior to the town of Portland’s founding in 1811.

Although there was no indication of the town that began at the Portland Wharf on the landscape, Portland’s former glory had not been forgotten by all of its residents. Portland had become one of Louisville’s poorest communities by the 1970s. These economic conditions spurred residents to examine Portland’s more prosperous history when it had a thriving wharf. With the establishment of the Portland Museum in 1974, interest in Portland’s past rose amongst its residents. It quickly became an institution dedicated to Portland’s rich history and facilitated efforts to reconnect its residents with that history. The former wharf was seen as place to tell the community’s story and changes to its landscape are seen as an important part of revitalizing Portland, which is discussed in Chapter 9.
CHAPTER 7:
PAST IDENTITY AT THE PORTLAND WHARF

Through archaeological and archival data, I have reconstructed Portland Wharf’s historic landscape and documented the substantial changes that have occurred over time. How did this landscape and these changes reflect and affect identity in Portland? In this chapter, I will use the archival record to develop a context of identities that might have historically existed within the Portland community, such as socio-economic status and ethnicity, focusing specifically on Portland’s historical identity of independence. I will examine households at the Portland Wharf with those of similar backgrounds and time in other neighborhoods of Louisville to identify archaeological correlates of ethnic identity. Then, I will compare Portland’s historic landscape development to that of Louisville to examine the relationship between the two communities and the landscape’s role in creating, maintaining, and erasing Portland’s independent identity. Finally, I will examine the construction of privies as a material manifestation of practices reflective of an independent identity that can be affected by the landscape and discuss the process of identity and its relationship to the landscape.

Archaeologists explain the differences in material culture between people, as distinctive to a particular group and as a form of identity. This is most readily seen when we compare between groups. For the historic period, we are not restricted to just the archaeological record, we can examine a multitude of identities by using the documentary record. Thus, researchers have used known characteristics such as ethnicity, race, class,
gender, religion, etc. to look for material markers or correlates of those characteristics which are considered identity. These markers tend to represent the overt expressions of culture as forms of self-identification, the things that people use to identify themselves. However, most of what we consider to be identity is how we as researchers use the differences or similarities we see in material culture to identify groups, which may or may not be conscious expressions of culture. Thus, we compare our data to create the contrast needed to see material expressions of the identities.

The concept of identity that relates cultural material or distinct practices to documented cultural characteristics tends to be simplistic, essentializing identity into stereotypes such as, drinking amongst the Irish and Catholics or opium use by the Chinese immigrants. While such correlations between material objects and patterns to documented identities have been well established, we have learned that they are highly contextual and often do not account for or recognize the complexity of multiple identities. If identity can be a construct of our own making through our process of research to interpret material patterns, then we can also examine more latent and unconscious expressions of identity, as well as unconscious motivations for more overt expressions. If reflections of identity are differences or similarities amongst groups of people when contrasted with each other, then we can examine the process by which these differences or similarities occur and their relationship to multiple forms and concepts of identity. In order to examine the process of identity, researchers have to unravel the multiple identities of individuals and their communities to understand their constituent parts and their relationships.
Ethnic and Class Identity at the Falls

Since the first Euro-American’s settled the Falls of the Ohio during the late eighteenth century, it was a place that drew immigrants of many ethnicities, as they saw great economic promise there. Although the initial settlers were largely multi-generational Americans from the East Coast and their slaves, it quickly became a destination for foreign immigrants as well. For the many ethnic groups forging a life at the Falls of the Ohio, the negotiation of the quickly developing economy and finding their place within socio-economic strata was very much an important part of life. Thus, ethnic and socio-economic identities were likely to be seen and manifested archaeologically.

Studying the history of Portland, there are a number of possible cultural identities that could be overtly deployed and latently expressed by residents. Some of these are the obvious ethnic and class identities seen in most of America’s cities. During the early and mid-nineteenth century a large number of French immigrants gave Portland a decidedly French feel, as it would not have been uncommon to hear French spoken as much as English. The concentration of French in Portland was only second to Shippingport in the falls area during the early to mid-nineteenth century. Thus, French ethnicity is an identity that was likely evident in early Portland residents, such as the Mangin, Dacquet, Delime, and Villier families. How much, if any of this identity, was overtly visible to their neighbors or to archaeologists? Unlike earlier time periods, many of the people during the historic period did not make goods for their own use that might reflect identity. They lived in a consumer based economy where their identity could be expressed in their
consumption decisions, but was unlikely to be reflected in the everyday objects made elsewhere. Perhaps the buildings Anthony Mangin built for his family, the way they prepared meals, or dressed reflected some of their French heritage. Perhaps they bought items reflective of their heritage.

An examination of the artifacts recovered from the archaeological deposits associated with the Mangin occupation failed to locate what would be considered markers of French ethnicity. There were no overt ethnic markers such as French porcelain, wine bottles, or symbols that one might expect. That is not to say that the Mangin family did not possess such items, it is just that they are not reflected in the archaeological record. Furthermore, expressions of ethnicity in the cultural material are likely to be more nuanced than overt, such as a particular pattern of ceramic vessels, glass bottle types, or faunal remains that could partly be reflective of ethnicity.

In order to examine the process of identity through time, we need to establish the role of ethnic identity in the past, as well as in the present. In order to put the apparent lack of ethnic identity being manifested materially into context, we need to examine ethnic identity in other communities as well. Thus far in this examination, I have failed to locate material markers of French identity for French immigrants within heavily French Portland.

This also was the case in Shippingport (15Jf702), where excavation of an early nineteenth century cellar at the John Colmesnil house did not included any overt ethnic
markers (Andrews et al. 2010). Colmesnil came to Shippingport after unrest in French Haiti forced many of the French elite from the island. He was related to John Tarascon’s wife, one of the founders of Shippingport. The Tarascon brothers actively recruited French exiles to move to Shippingport, which gave early Shippingport a strong French presence. However, the material culture of Colmesnil’s household did not reflect any overt expressions of that identity. Instead, the artifact assemblage included mainly English made goods such as ceramic and glass tablewares that dominated the American market (Andrews et al. 2010). An English style gunflint was among the artifacts, although French style gunflints were readily available. In fact, there was no shortage of French goods making their way to Shippingport, as newspapers reported the arrival of such goods at Shippingport from New Orleans on a regular basis. Researchers found that wealth and class were more important identities to display for the Colmesnil family at the time. The societal wealth and class of these early residents of the fledgling town of Shippingport were equal to those in the much larger Louisville (Andrews et al. 2010).

A similar situation was found with other ethnicities at the Portland Wharf, such as the Veit family, who by the mid-1800s had come to Portland along with many other German and Irish immigrants. Although a large amount of artifacts related to this family has been recovered, no ethnic identity markers were present. No objects made in Germany or specific to Germanic culture were found. Their material culture looked much like that of other working to middle class families. For example, excavations at the Louisville Convention Center site (15Jf646) in downtown Louisville investigated the
household of Ludwig Wunsch, who would have been a contemporary of Henry Veit (Stottman 2000a).

Like Veit, Ludwig Wunsch emigrated from Germany in the 1840s and started his own business. He along with his bothers started a brush making business in Louisville’s commercial district on Market Street. Ludwig and his family lived in the same building as the business from 1870 to 1888, at which point they moved into a house on the outskirts of town. Wunsch’s business did well, as he had a taxable income of over $1,000.00 in 1863. By 1873, he earned over $14,000.00 which was far more than the economic capabilities of the Veit family at this time. The Veit and Wunsch families had a similar background in that they were both German immigrants running their own businesses in the central business district of a river town. The only difference was their wealth and the fact that one was in Louisville and one was in Portland. The artifacts recovered from the Wunsch’s household, like those from Veit, contained no obvious markers of German ethnicity, but instead looked like the materials from any other burgeoning middle class family (Stottman 2000a). Ethnic identity seemed to be of minimal importance materially to the Veit and Wunsch families, as class and status identities were primary in their consumer choices.

Contrary to these findings, several households in the Russell Neighborhood of Louisville during the late nineteenth to early twentieth century exhibited some ethnic markers (Stottman and Watts-Roy1995). The McDermott household (15Jf604) and the Schildger and Schneider households (15Jf606) included examples of ethnic markers
within their material culture. The Russell Neighborhood is located just west of Louisville’s central business district and represented one of the first suburban expansions of the city in the mid-nineteenth century. It was diverse in ethnicity, race, class, and status, all of which were segregated by street and time. Wealthy Anglo-Saxon Protestants lived in the large houses that lined Jefferson Street. Middle class German and Irish Americans lived in more modest homes on adjacent streets. Poor and working class Irish immigrants and African-Americans lived in shotgun houses and cottages that lined the alleys behind the upper and middle class homes.

Catherine McDermott was an Irish-American catholic and a widow of a successful physician. She and her son Thomas lived in a two-story brick house that was located on the edge of the wealthier portions of Jefferson Street from 1855 to 1888 (Stottman and Watts-Roy 1995). The McDermotts were considered upper middle class, with Catherine having 15,000 dollars of real property and 1,000 dollars of personal property, in 1870. Her artifacts were typical of a solidly middle class household exhibiting a wide diversity of table and tea wares, which reflected her status appropriately. However, one compelling artifact was associated with her household, a ceramic tobacco jar decorated with molded images of Jesus, the Virgin Mary, and clovers, all which could represent her Catholic and Irish background.

Another example of ethnic markers was identified during excavations at the Conrad Schildger and Peter Schneider pharmacy in the Russell Neighborhood. Both druggists were middle class German Americans who lived and worked in the building;
Schildger from 1880 to 1895 and Schneider from 1895 to 1940. In addition to the large amount of bottles and pharmacy equipment recovered from the privy, several artifacts reflective of their German heritage were found, such as several vessels from a porcelain tea set made in Germany and a candlestick holder that depicted a scene of the Rhine River in Germany (Figure 7.1). These items were likely reminders of their homeland and perhaps showed a preference for the kind of teaware available back in Germany. These objects were likely expressions of their German heritage.

These two examples clearly show that material manifestations of ethnic identity did exist within the material culture of some Louisville households. So why were no ethnic markers associated with the households at the Portland Wharf, at Shippingport, or the Wunsch family in Louisville? I think the answer to this question is ethnicity’s relationship to other forms of identity and context. Aside from the possibility that ethnic markers did not enter the archaeological record, it appears that within the context of America’s developing socio-economic classes that class identity was more important to conspicuously display than ethnic identity. In some cases, it is possible that some ethnicities may have perhaps tried to suppress their identities during their assimilation into American culture. Perhaps ethnic identities were important to display or materialize in particular contexts where the distinction of differing ethnic groups was important and required deployment; however it seems that assimilating into American culture by emphasizing class was more important.
Figure 7.1. German Porcelain Cup from Schneider’s Privy.

Given the limitations of investigating identity through ethnic markers, some researchers have begun to reveal the process of identity by examining broader patterning and changes in material culture over time and through transnational comparisons. For example, Stephen Brighton’s dissertation research (2005) of mid-nineteenth century Irish identity in New York and New Jersey, relied on comparisons of material culture between Irish tenements in New York City and Patterson, New Jersey with pre-famine landless laborer’s cabins in Ireland. He found that there was a gradual assimilation of new immigrants into an American identity reflected in material culture. New arrivals tended to favor certain ceramic forms and food that were familiar, like those found at cabin sites in Ireland. However, over time their material culture became more reflective of overall American consumer habits, as immigrant Irish households looked much like other American working class households materially. Through his approach, he was able to identify the process of identity in the increasing consumer choice of ethnically neutral
artifacts, placing the process of identity within the actions of people and not wholly manifested in the objects themselves.

Brighton did also find overt ethnic markers within the material culture of his New York and New Jersey sites. He found objects that were symbolic of strong ties to the political struggles that took place in Ireland by Irish Americans. Artifacts that indicated support for political movements in Ireland, such as smoking pipes with political slogans and reminders of Gaelic history, were recovered. The presence of these objects demonstrated that Irish Americans maintained ties with Ireland and were deeply sympathetic to the socio-political struggles there. At the same time their material culture shows widespread adoption of American consumption, laying the groundwork for developing Irish American identity (Brighton 2005). Brighton’s study also demonstrates the situational and contextual nature of ethnic markers, in that specific events or movements can instigate expressions of ethnicity in material culture or consumption. In this case, the ethnic markers are more readily tied to specific reasons that motivate deployment of ethnic identity related to socio-political struggle in Ireland than a more general pattern of keeping mementos of their homeland within their material culture.

Locally we have not seen overt ties to such events as immigrants in the Ohio Valley may have been further removed and disconnected from socio-political events in their homelands, as connections were made through mementos or not expressed materially at all. Furthermore, there were local events and movements that could have affected overt displays of ethnicity, such as the Nativist Movements and the Bloody
Monday Riots of the 1850s in Louisville (Yater 1987). Many immigrants may have been compelled to mute their ethnicity by the swell of anti-immigrant and Catholic sentiments expressed by Nativists and the No Nothing Party at the time. The presence of and display of ethnic markers appears to be contextual to time, place, and events.

Although these studies indicate that identity reflected in material culture can be tied overtly to the specific cultural characteristics of individuals or small groups, in most cases material culture reflects and actively creates and modifies much broader and latent concepts of identity. Archaeologists have to better understand the contexts and situations of our material patterns and their associated households, as well as the actions and practices of people.

Based on these comparisons, ethnic identity does not seem to be expressed materially among the households studied at the Portland Wharf. Although French immigrants have a substantial presence at the Portland Wharf during its early history, French identity was not expressed materially through artifacts recovered at the households studied. Other ethnicities did not seem to be expressed materially as well, such as at the Veit household. The material culture at the Portland Wharf households was very much like households at sites in Shippingport and Louisville, except that two households in Louisville’s Russell Neighborhood exhibited ethnic markers.

These comparisons suggest that perhaps other identities such as class were more important to deploy than ethnic identities. However, in order to examine the process of
identity in the Portland Wharf landscape, we need to examine an identity that is specific to Portland in contrast to its surrounding communities. As demonstrated with ethnicity, identity is situational and contextual, thus a historically documented identity specific to the Portland context could be manifested in the Portland Wharf landscape and materially by its residents. As mentioned previously, there was little difference in the material culture of the Portland Wharf households compared to those in other communities in the area. However, one thing that historically defined Portland from many of its surrounding communities was the strength of its independent attitude.

Portland’s Independent Identity

Like most communities that formed around the Falls of the Ohio, Portland started as an autonomous town and its identity, as such, is defined by its relationship to the much larger community of Louisville. As previously discussed, Portland’s relationship with Louisville was one of mutual benefit and antagonism. This relationship included competition as two rival ports on the Ohio River, mutual benefit in the portage industry around the falls, failed and successful annexations of Portland by Louisville, the retention of Portland’s independence after annexation, and its eventual assimilation into Louisville. Portland’s independent identity during the nineteenth century has been well-documented through contemporary accounts, as both Portlanders and Louisvillians saw Portland as a community separate from Louisville even when it was within its political jurisdiction (See Chapter 6).
Portland’s independent identity was conceived when the town was established as a “paper town.” Like many speculative towns established along the Ohio River during the early nineteenth century, a wealthy landowner sought profits by creating the next great port for the tons of cargo and people that traversed this important waterway. What began as a speculative venture eventually became a town. Portland historically was independent politically, economically, culturally, and spatially from the other falls communities, which contributed to an independent identity. This identity was accentuated with the annexation by Louisville which resulted in Portland’s secession, taking an indelible place in its history. This act of defiance against Louisville became a part of Portland’s independent heritage, not only distinguishing it from Louisville, but also defining an attitude of independence amongst its citizens. Although Portland was politically independent for only about 30 years, for many years after, its successful annexation in 1852, it was perceived by many of Louisville’s residents and media to be an independent community because it was still physically, spatially, and culturally separated or different than Louisville (See Chapter 6). This identity is seen in the landscape and conversely affected by the landscape.

**Developing Landscape Identity**

When comparing the landscapes of two communities such as Louisville and Portland, we must consider that it is really a comparison between a city and a town. Although both are considered urban, there are inherent problems when comparing a cityscape and a townscape. This comparison does not take place on equal terms, as each community exists in different stages of development and differences may be merely an
issue of time (Rothschild and Wall 2014). However, such a comparison is relevant when the two communities have a relationship and they are tied to each other. Thus, comparisons go well beyond simple city vs. town dichotomy, as each community affects the other, providing numerous points of contrast from which to examine identity. Within this context, differences between Louisville and Portland rooted in stages of development or time are relevant to examining identity. Cities and towns have elements that are the same and different. Residents experience the cityscape or townscape in different ways, which when exposed through comparison can reveal identity (Tolbert 1999). In this section, I will examine each of these communities from the perspective of a resident experiencing the landscape and how that landscape changes experience which can then change, maintain, or modify identity. More specifically I will examine changes in Portland’s landscape that erases one identity and normalizes another.

Most towns and cities in America developed in a similar way, beginning as a street grid carved into the wilderness or farmland. Initially houses and businesses are developed with the natural topography and as they grow and the best land is occupied, the topography is modified to suit more dense development. Although townscapes and cityscapes can be distinctive, no one town or city is unique in the way that it developed over time. The process of development in itself is not a form of identity unless contrasted with a community at a different stage of development or the development process erases a landscape that has particular meaning or identity for a community. Such was the case between Portland and Louisville in which the communities developed at different times and scales. When these two processes at different stages of development come in
contact, the process for one or both can be altered. As the people who live in these communities experience landscapes that have been altered, the identities that are supported by that landscape can change and become normalized in the new landscape.

Based on historical and archaeological data, Portland and Louisville initially developed in a way similar to most towns. When they were carved out of the Kentucky wilderness, other than land clearing, there was little modification of the topography. The towns largely existed as a street grid drawn on paper with imaginary lot lines traversing an existing landscape that may or may not have been conducive to development. These towns did not start with a cleared and level blank slate. Topographical features such as streams, hills, swales, drainages, lakes, and ponds were not altered until development pressures or safety demanded it. Thus, the best or most profitable land was developed first. As the lots initially laid-out in Portland and Louisville were large, some exhibited varying topography. Thus, half of the lot may have had land suitable for development, while the other half did not. The best portions of the lot were developed first, often with the lot owner’s home on the best ground. As the large lots were subdivided and subsequently developed with homes and businesses, the areas with poorer topography were developed last because significant land modification, such as filling in ponds, swamps, and swales or leveling out rises was required (Gums and Shorter 2000).

The stratigraphic analysis of Lot 56 at the Portland Wharf documented such a process (See Chapter 5). The east side of the lot along Fulton (33rd) Street was the highest land, being level with the street, while the west side of the lot sloped into a low
drainage. The lot directly to the west contained a pond, indicating that this part of the block was low land that was not conducive to extensive development without filling. The development of buildings on the lot took place along the east side close to Fulton (33rd) Street. Over time the natural topography was filled and leveled.

A similar development pattern has been documented in Louisville. Historic maps indicate that initial development of town lots conformed to the topography. A significant natural feature of Louisville’s early landscape was Beargrass Creek which flowed parallel to the river and emptied into the river at Third Street in the heart of the wharf (Figure 7.2). The creek essentially restricted the town from a good portion of riverfront property. By the late 1850s, the creek had been diverted into the river further upstream from the town and the old creek bed gradually filled. Numerous ponds were known to have been located across Louisville, which like the old Beargrass Creek bed became open sewers and the source of disease. These ponds also were filled throughout the nineteenth century, which not only eliminated unsanitary conditions but opened up more land for development (Figure 7.3).

Many of the ponds that dotted the Louisville landscape were created by prehistoric peoples who had built mounds on the landscape hundreds of years before Euro-Americans visited the Falls. The mounds themselves provided an obstacle to development, as an entire lot might be occupied by one large mound. Some of the earliest houses built in Louisville were constructed upon existing prehistoric mounds (Bader 2003a). Not only could the mounds have been considered obstacles to development, but their presence also conflicted with narratives of Manifest Destiny and
its assumptions of a pristine and unused landscape. Modifying the landscape by removing mounds to fill in unsanitary ponds also erased physical reminders of monumental Native architecture (Gums and Shorter 2000).

Figure 7.2. Beargrass Creek Entering the Ohio River at Louisville’s Wharf in 1856 (Comettant 1866 from Thomas 1971).

This development pattern was documented archaeologically as well at the Scholar House site (15Jf767) in Old Louisville (Andrews and Schatz 2011). Initial development of the lots in this suburb of Louisville during the 1860s took place with the construction of the lot owner’s house on the highest and best land, while a low drainage traversed a large portion of the property. Subdivision of the lot and subsequent development extended along the high ground around the drainage which eventually became an open sewer as development intensified. By the 1880s, all of the lot had been developed except for the drainage, which was subsequently filled and developed with houses by the mid-1890s (Andrews and Schatz 2011).
Although maps indicate that Louisville’s early development and subsequent suburban development appears to conform to the natural topography rather than impose upon it, early descriptions of the town make note of its artificial appearance against its wilderness context. In reference to several early descriptions of Louisville, Kramer (1986) states “In spite of their differences, these remarks suggest certain common motifs. Whether positive or negative in their attitude toward the city, these descriptions underscore its artificiality as opposed to the natural character of its wilderness setting” (p.432). These references indicate that Louisville’s townscape in the 1830s to 1850s was a dominating feature of the area’s landscape and gave Louisville the appearance and feel of an urban city imposed on the landscape.
Based on these examples, clearly both Portland and Louisville experienced similar development patterns, as they occupied similar topography on the Ohio River floodplain. However, the early and intense development in Louisville created a cityscape that was far different than the townscape in Portland, as the two communities were at different stages of development (Figure 7.4). When these two processes come into contact within the context of Louisville’s annexation of Portland and subsequent assimilation, they can expose the changing, modification, and erasure of identity.

By 1870, the result of Portland’s development process was a townscape centered at the Portland Wharf, with large brick commercial buildings along Water Street and Commercial (34th) Street. Residences were more sparsely situated on the landscape compared to their commercial counterparts. Lots were not overly subdivided and intensely developed with buildings, as there were still many large lots with only one house. The topography of the landscape was still relatively intact, as some lots included ponds, drainages, swales, or the high river bank. A few blocks from the Portland Wharf were farms, as streets transitioned into rural dirt roads or ended at a farm. Landmarks on the landscape included a broad stone paved wharf, the imposing St. Charles hotel, Cedar Grove Academy, and Our Lady Church. At this time, Portland was much like a small town, not unlike those seen in rural areas (Figures 6.7 and 7.5) (See Chapter 6). Although the wharf and Commercial (34th) Street would have been reminiscent of Louisville’s wharf on a much smaller scale, as one experienced Portland, it would have looked and felt very different. Thus, the Portland townscape helped maintain Portland’s independent identity even nearly 20 years after it was annexed by Louisville.
Figure 7.4. Louisville’s Cityscape in 1855 (Palmatary 1855 from Thomas 1971).

Figure 7.5. A Digital Reconstruction of the Portland Townscape from the Corner of Fulton (33rd) and Water Street in 1884 (University of Cincinnati-CERHAS).
The Portland townscape embodied its independent identity through its contrast with Louisville. As Portlanders experienced the townscape on a daily basis, it became a part of their routines or their practices. The things they did on a daily basis took place within this townscape, which framed their daily lives and interacted with them. It became a part of the Portlander’s habitus, providing reference points, a space, and a place for their practices. In turn, the practices of Portlanders imbued the townscape with meaning and the narratives of its residents. Thus, on a daily basis as the residents of Portland traveled through their townscape, they unconsciously took in the sights, smells, and noises which cued their memory, identifying Portland as the context for their practices. For residents, this townscape felt like and was home. The cues of this townscape imparted a sense of independence that was deployed into consciousness when that identity was threatened or made visible through contrast. What makes Portland’s landscape and townscape a part of Portland’s independent identity?

Portland’s independent identity becomes visible in the townscape through contrast with Louisville. Portland’s townscape was different than Louisville’s in several obvious ways. The size and scale of the two communities was quite different, as Portland was much smaller. Portland spent most of its existence on the periphery of Louisville within a rural setting. Beyond the few blocks around the wharf and Portland Avenue, there were farms. Even up into the early 1900s, there were many farms within a few blocks of the wharf. Its large sparsely developed lots that conformed to the natural topography contributed to the small rural town appearance of the Portland townscape. The contrast between the bustling wharf and impressive buildings on Water Street with the pastoral...
residences and farms just a couple of blocks away was most certainly evident. Portland would have clearly looked and felt different than Louisville.

Although this distinctiveness was largely the product of the different developmental context of the two communities, a comparison between the two at a particular time can better expose Portland’s independent identity. Portland from annexation to 1870 did not look or feel like a neighborhood of Louisville; it was more like a small town and its residents would have experienced the townscape, as such. It had a distinctive commercial district, center of economy in the wharf, and institutions such as an iconic church and hotel, which defined its townscape. Thus, this townscape played a role in the maintenance of Portland’s independent identity during that period.

Portland’s independent identity can also be seen in the redundancy of its landscape as well. The fact that Portland had its own wharf and economy were major factors in displaying its independence. As a neighborhood of Louisville, Portland’s wharf was a redundant feature of the landscape. Louisville had a wharf and bustling shipping industry just miles from Portland and its other neighborhoods did not have nor need a wharf. Unlike these neighborhoods, which were dependent on Louisville for their economic vitality, Portland and its wharf were independent and self-sufficient. In actuality, Portland’s wharf was essential to the portage industry, but from a landscape perspective it was not needed. If Portland was considered simply a neighborhood of Louisville, Portland’s wharf and commercial district were redundant features of the landscape. By retaining and utilizing the wharf and commercial district after annexation,
Portland residents were able to maintain a large degree of independence because it was not dependent on Louisville’s wharf and businesses like so many other neighborhoods.

Although a contextual examination of Portland’s historical townscape can make the case that it was partly a product of and reinforcing of an independent identity, this same landscape could be interpreted in many other ways within a variety of contexts. Thus, the point is not to find identity in the landscape, but is instead to expose the process of identity creation, maintenance, and modification and the landscape’s role in that process. In order to examine the process of identity, we must see how the landscape affects and reflects the actions of the people who live and travel in it. Through the archaeological and archival record, we can examine changes in the landscape over time and these changes can be related to changes in Portland’s independent identity.

**What’s in a Name: Portland’s Streetscape**

Perhaps nothing is more emblematic of the inextricable relationship between Portland and Louisville and the process of assimilation upon the landscape than its streetscape. Through archival and archaeological records, the changes in Portland’s streetscape have been documented through time (See Chapter 6). These changes can be examined for their effect on the landscape and Portland’s identity. The focus in this section is on the streets and their role in the daily experiences of Portlanders. The lay-out and design of the street grid, the size and construction of the streets, sidewalks, and street names will be considered.
A comparison of the streetscapes of Portland and Louisville provides particular contrast to see differences that are indicative of Portland’s independent identity and Louisville’s attempts to normalize its own identity in Portland. In particular, I will examine the changes that occurred to Portland’s streetscape during the late nineteenth century as Louisville began to assert more control in the community. The inherent tension between the two communities overtly and subconsciously is more evident as Portland’s independent identity became threatened, when Louisville began to assimilate a declining Portland. The contrast between the two communities and this tension will make Portland’s independent identity visible in the landscape, especially the streetscape.

The nature of the portage industry and the spatial distance between the two communities made their connection by road an essential component of their economic prosperity. Furthermore, the streets in each community, although in many ways like those in any other American town, were distinctive and were a product and representative of identity.

Since Portland was founded, roads have been as important to river traffic as the river itself. The portage around the Falls of the Ohio was an overland route that was dependent on sufficient roads to transport goods back to the river. The Portland and Louisville Turnpike had connected the two communities since Portland was established in 1811, even being depicted on the earliest maps of the area prior to Portland’s establishment (Figure 7.6). Originally, it was merely a dirt path cut through the woods and as Portland began to develop as a town and the portage industry began to thrive, it
became a more formal dirt road. As traffic increased, the quality of the road lessened and many attempts were made to improve it with various pavements including wood planks and macadam. As important as the road was, it became the source of much tension between Louisville and Portland, as those who had to portage around the falls became increasingly unhappy with its condition. Attempts to improve the overland portage included the construction of a railroad and calls to improve the roads. *The Louisville Daily Courier* described the condition of the road between Portland and Louisville (now Portland Avenue) and how it could be improved in its April 19th 1855 edition:

The *quasi* road is thickly studded with vehicles of all description from early dawn to midnight. Horses are stalled, wheels are broken, shafts are snapped, springs give way and oaths are sworn from one end of the road to the other…This road is of the greatest importance to the city, by it a part of the access of strangers and travelers is had; the travel over it exceeds in amount that of any road near the city; it is in fact, the great artery which supplies our commercial heart; and yet there is not a more miserable apology for a road to be found leading to any country village in the State. Why then, should not this new council signalize the inauguration of its reign by building at once a substantial boulder road, and make suitable provisions for keeping it in repair! Macademized and plank roads have both been tried, and both have signally failed.

Despite the need for investment in the Portland and Louisville road, no substantial improvements were made. By the 1880s, the road was still paved with wood planks. However, other roads in Portland and Louisville were being improved at this time. Although there may have been some disagreement between the two communities about the responsibility of maintaining the road prior to annexation, clearly after 1852, the city of Louisville should have improved and maintained the road. While the road connecting
the two communities may have existed in a municipal no man’s land, each community
did develop their own distinctive streets within their established grids.

![Figure 7.6. Map of the Falls of the Ohio Showing Road from Louisville in ca. 1788 (Imlay 1793).](image)

When Portland was laid out by Alexander Ralston based on the Philadelphia plan, it looked like many other communities consisting of a grid of streets and lots. Portland’s grid was rather generic, lacking a distinctive town central square for public buildings common to most other iterations of the plan (Tolbert 1999). However, Portland was not founded as a rural farming community like many of those that utilized the plan (Tolbert
Instead, it was intended to be an urban port town purely focused on the river and the portage industry and it was designed as such. Portland’s streets were laid out with the portage industry in mind, as the streets leading to wharf and main cross streets were 99 feet wide in order to accommodate the turning radius of the hackney cabs, wagons, and dray carts that served the boats at the wharf (Bell 2011). Where the main streets met the wharf they were made even broader, as Fulton (33rd) Street was 190 feet wide, Commercial (34th) Street 284 feet, and Ferry (36th) Street 296 feet (Portland Town Minute Book [PTMB] 1841-1843). Apparently the increase in river traffic during the 1840s required the widening of the roads at the wharf.

The condition of Portland’s town streets during that time also was a major concern for the town. Prior to the 1850s, the streets of Portland were merely packed and rutted dirt which roughly outlined some of the town’s grid system. By the late 1840s, the town took on the task of paving and maintaining its streets. Most of the town’s efforts were focused on paving the wharf and Water Street, its most economically important street. However, the town did maintain and improve other streets (See Chapter 6).

Although Portland’s streets seemed to be distinctive to its particular function as a port, like the town plan, the street names were largely generic. Although street names like High, Market, Water, and Commercial can be found in just about any American town or city, these names did have specific relevance to Portland or were meant to memorialize or symbolize its identity as a bustling port. Water Street’s distinction is clearly related to its location closest to the river, like its counterpart in Louisville and other river towns.
However, the name is closely associated with a major element of Portland’s identity and its connection to the river. Commercial Street was perhaps the most important street in Portland, as it was the designated economic heart of the town, where commercial development was allowed to spill over from Water Street into the residential area to form a perpendicular commercial corridor to Water Street. Ferry Street was the way to and the location of the ferry to New Albany, Indiana, an important part of the town throughout the nineteenth century. Fulton Street, is perhaps the most symbolic street name in Portland, as it was meant to memorialize and honor Robert Fulton the inventor of the steamboat that would realize the town’s fortunes after Fulton’s steamboat *New Orleans* made the first steam powered trip down the Ohio River in 1811. Streets like Grove, Front, and High were directly related to their location and natural elements of the town, such as the high bank of the river and the prominent grove of cedar trees. Other streets took on names common to most towns, such as those named after tree species and numbers (Figure 7.7). While on the surface, Portland’s street names seem generic, however they were imbued with meaning that was emblematic of Portland’s economic and maritime identity.

When Louisville was laid out in 1779 by Gen. George Rogers Clark and William Pope, it also was based on the Philadelphia plan that was the model for nearly all American cities. They established Louisville’s Main Street on the second or high bank of the River, leaving all the land between it and the river as public land for a wharf. They also left a row of half lots across the southern extent of the city as public land that was intended to become public commons. A town square or center was established for public
buildings (Figure 7.8). Although this was the plan for Louisville, it never became realized as planned. The city had to sell most of its common lots set aside according to the plan, in order to pay John Campbell, who in partnership with a British sympathizer had laid claim to the site of Louisville in 1774. While his partner had forfeited all his lands because of his allegiance to the British, Campbell sided with the Americans and was a true patriot and expected to be compensated for his share of the land. Thus, only the court house square, a cemetery, the public wharf remained public land after 1784 (Bell 2011).

Although they were both based on the Philadelphia plan, Louisville’s layout was different than Portland’s. There also were differences noted in the streets. Although Clark and Pope realized the importance of access to the river for economic purposes, in 1779 the needs of the portage industry were not as evident as they were in 1811. Thus,
Louisville’s streets were laid out in a typical size of 60 feet for most streets and 90 feet for Main Street narrower than Portland’s key commercial streets.

Furthermore, the original streets were named using sequential numbers for the north/south streets to the west, names of important people for north/south streets to the east, and Main, Market, and Jefferson Streets for the east/west cross streets. Jefferson Street had significance, as Virginia Governor Thomas Jefferson was instrumental in helping Louisville gain its city charter from Virginia prior to Kentucky’s statehood. With subsequent additions to the city plat, other typical street names were employed such as Green, Chestnut, and Walnut. Names associated with presidents, such as Adams and Washington also were used. However, people important to Louisville’s early history also were honored with street names, such as Floyd and Preston, both early landowners.

As the City of Louisville grew rapidly and had already become a major city by the time Portland began to see its major growth, it made a priority of paving city roads to
promote better drainage, long thought to be an important sanitary practice. The city utilized a variety of pavement types to replace the miles of dirt roads that traversed the city, which would become stagnate mud pits in wet weather (Louisville Municipal Reports 1860-1900). Being a larger town and having more resources than Portland, Louisville employed a variety of techniques to pave the streets during the nineteenth century.

The most common paving type used during the early nineteenth century was called the plank road, which consisted of lining the street with wooden planks or logs to provide traction and stability. However, this type of paving was rough and associated with high maintenance costs. Many of the important rural roads or turnpikes in the area, including the Portland and Louisville turnpike, were paved with planks (Mullins 1994).

The most durable, but expensive, hard paving was block stone, as it was used to pave both streets and Portland’s wharf. Block stone was used on Louisville’s most heavily used roads, mainly those that connected to its wharf and in the main business district. Archaeological evidence indicates that Fulton Street was the only street in Portland paved in block stone. More cost effective types of paving included boulder and macadam paving. Boulder paving was merely a foundation of large rounded stones laid on a bed of earth, which provided a durable surface, but a bumpy ride (Mullins 1994).

Macadam paving was developed by John Louden MacAdam, in early nineteenth century England. There are varying descriptions of this type of pavement, but it
generally consists of a compact bed of earth with a foundation of large broken stones finished with fine crushed gravel (Mullins 1994). Macadamized roads were often sloped from the center to provide better drainage into stone gutters along the sides of the road. According to the Portland Town Minutes and archaeological investigations, most of streets directly around the Portland Wharf were Macadam with stone gutters. Mcadam pavement also was frequently used on Louisville’s streets, but later replaced by stone block or brick. In the twentieth century, the crushed gravel surface layer was bonded with tar, a paving type now called asphalt.

Brick also was used for paving streets, which provided a surface much more durable than macadam and less expensive than stone blocks. However, brick that could handle the weight of and punishment of vehicular traffic was not developed until the 1870s using clays that could be fired at low temperatures and by using the stiff mud process (Hockensmith 1996; Gurke 1987). However, problems with water absorption limited their popularity with road builders. Once brick makers learned that adding shale to the clay vitrified the brick and solved the water absorption problem, bricks became a viable paving material. By the 1890s, brick was favored as a paving material for roads (Hockensmith 1996). Brick was the pavement of choice for the City of Louisville during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century and subsequently many of Portland’s streets beyond the wharf were paved in brick by the city.

At this time, it is not known when a concerted effort was made by the City of Louisville to pave the streets in Portland, but it is known that the city began to invest in
the infrastructure of Portland shortly after annexation. The public wharf at Portland was paved with stone in 1853. One of the first sewers in Louisville was built under Grove (35th) Street to aid drainage in the wharf area. In general, archaeological evidence shows that little was done to improve the streets in the wharf area after the town’s annexation, as the pavement and grading done prior to annexation was still in use during the 1880s (Figure 6.13, macadam streets shown in blue). Thus, other than maintenance, the streets around the Portland Wharf were much like they were when Portland was an independent town, being a physical remnant of its independent status. While the streets remained largely unchanged after annexation, as the wharf declined, Louisville invested in Portland’s streets located along its new economic corridor, Portland Avenue (Louisville and Portland Turnpike) by paving them in brick as it did other neighborhoods. The street paving of Portland reflects the shift of Portland’s economic center from the wharf to Portland Avenue further to the south and away from the town’s wharf. This shift was facilitated by Louisville’s disinterest in the wharf during the late nineteenth century and its investment in the area along Portland Avenue.

Other changes to the Portland Wharf’s landscape also were facilitated by the City of Louisville. For example, Louisville made a concerted effort to assimilate Portland’s street grid with Louisville’s by renaming streets to fit Louisville’s naming system and to eliminate duplicate street names. The names of many streets in Portland today have little resemblance to the original names prior to assimilation by Louisville. With Portland as an autonomous town, it had its own system of streets that bore names that were relevant to the city’s identity. For nearly twenty years after Louisville annexed Portland, there
was little attempt to assimilate Portland. Although politically Portland was part of Louisville, the perception was and its landscape indicated that it was independent. By the 1870s, Louisville began to change that landscape and perception. This assimilation was evident when Louisville began to change the names of Portland’s streets in 1875 (Louisville City Code Book 1884). Streets like Commercial, Front, Fulton, Ferry, Gravier, and Grove were change to numerical street names following Louisville’s pattern of using numbers for north/south streets and names that did not conflict with established streets in Louisville (Table 7.1) (Figure 7.7). Streets named after states, such as Missouri, Mississippi, and Florida replaced named east/west streets in the Portland Wharf area. Only Water Street was left unchanged, since it matched Louisville’s Water Street, which also ran along the river.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Street Name</th>
<th>New Street Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street</td>
<td>38th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Street</td>
<td>34th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Street</td>
<td>36th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Alley</td>
<td>Florida Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front or First Street</td>
<td>Missouri Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton Street</td>
<td>33rd Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravier Street</td>
<td>37th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Street</td>
<td>35th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High or Third</td>
<td>Marine Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock Street</td>
<td>26th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market or Second Street</td>
<td>Rudd Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Street</td>
<td>39th Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The renaming of Portland’s streets represents one of the more obvious attempts at assimilation by the City of Louisville through the modification of the Portland landscape. It is not likely that Louisville intended to neutralize Portland’s identity, but the action was more a result of a need to bring the former town into the fabric of municipal politics and functions, as the two communities were no longer distinctive by spatial separation at the
time (See Chapter 6). As the two communities assimilated geographically on the landscape, Portland’s growth shifted from its wharf to Portland Avenue, its main link to Louisville. As such, much of what is considered the heart of Portland today was developed after annexation during the late nineteenth century and thus, most of its streets were laid-out and named by the City of Louisville. At this time, Louisville continued its practice of naming north/south streets numerically, but named some east/west streets after figures important to Portland’s history, such as Lytle and Rowan Streets. Other existing street names that did not conflict with Louisville’s naming system remained unchanged, such as Portland Avenue and Bank Street.

Although it does not appear that Louisville was malicious in its attempt to assimilate Portland’s streetscape, the changes did have an effect on its identity and how it was manifested on the landscape. Elements of Portland’s landscape that helped materialize its independent identity had been erased or changed. The importance of the streetscape to the creation and maintenance of identity in Portland cannot be underestimated. Whether obvious or subtle, conscious or subconscious, these elements of the Portland Wharf played a role in the everyday experiences and memories of Portlanders that made their community distinctive.

This perception changed as the physical and spatial separation between the two communities disappeared and Portland’s wharf was no longer economically viable. Changes in the Portland landscape normalized the community’s new status as a Louisville neighborhood and erased much of its independent perception.
Change in Portland’s Landscape

Historical accounts of Portland noted its economic, political, and geographical independence even after annexation. It was physically separated from Louisville, it had its own thriving economy, and it acted in its own interest with little input from Louisville’s city leaders, often contrary to sentiments in Louisville. However, independence can also be seen in the actions of people in the landscape as reactions to changes in the landscape. What did changes to the landscape do to Portland’s independent identity? To examine this question, we must understand changes to the landscape within the context of Portland’s independence and when it became assimilated into Louisville economically.

In 1870, little had changed in Portland’s landscape since the 1850s when the City of Louisville annexed the town. Portland still had a thriving economy, some lots were being subdivided into smaller lots and occupied with shotgun houses that created a more urban feel amongst the once rural town. Although politically a part of Louisville, Portland bore little resemblance to its much larger neighbor. Louisville did little to exert its authority, as it was business as usual in Portland. People in Louisville, maps, city directories, census takers, and many others saw Portland as an independent town that was spatially and culturally different than Louisville. The landscape bore evidence of this and facilitated it.

In the late 1870s when Louisville made efforts to assimilate Portland, we can see changes in the way development occurred with respects to the topography, which
changed the way Portlanders experienced the landscape. This was a period of great change in Portland which was manifested in the landscape. The Portland Wharf was in decline, as the portage industry waned and multiple floods ravaged the commercial heart of the town. Simultaneously, Louisville’s western suburbs had encroached upon the eastern edges of Portland, spurring economic development along Portland Avenue. The community was no longer physically separated from Louisville and the city began to treat it like other neighborhoods. What Portlanders saw and experienced on a daily basis on the landscape was different than what they experienced just 10 years earlier.

With the opening of a wider and more functional Portland and Louisville Canal that was under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and free of use fees by the end of 1870, things began to change. The portage industry began to suffer immediately, as fewer boats landed at the wharf and there was less work for the people who moved goods throughout the portage system. The Portland Wharf generated fewer fees for the City of Louisville and its western suburbs had come into contact with the southern and eastern fringes of Portland along Portland Avenue. By the mid-1870s, Louisville had changed the names of many of Portland’s streets and increased enforcement of its laws. By 1883, the new street names had been incorporated into new maps, which show that Portland still retained much of its townscape, although few boats landed at its wharf and businesses were closing on Water and Commercial Streets (Figure 6.15).

After 1884, a series of natural disasters had drastically changed Portland’s landscape. Many buildings were damaged or destroyed during several flooding events.
Because of the combination of the flood damage, economic decline, and Louisville asserting more control, Portland Wharf was never the same. With little economic incentive left at the wharf, many buildings were not rebuilt after the flood, while others were repaired but repurposed. Residential structures were typically rebuilt or repaired, as most did not have much of a choice as their wealth was tied to their property, such as the Veit family (See Chapter 6). Many commercial buildings on the other hand were not replaced or repaired, as the return on the investment was too little given the wharf’s economic decline. This was the case with Taylor’s drug store which replaced Delime’s drug store in the building owned by Paul Villier. Villier had died just prior to the floods and his heirs were not interested in repairing the building afterwards. Taylor moved his drug store a couple of blocks south on Commercial (34th) Street at Market (Rudd) Street. Some buildings, such as the St. Charles hotel, were repaired, but not to their former glory. The St. Charles was no longer viable as a hotel due to the lack of boats landing at the wharf. Thus, it was converted into a low-rent tenement (Figure 7.9.).

The Portland Wharf’s townscape after the mid-1880s looked drastically different than the one that began the decade. Many of the large commercial buildings that defined Portland’s thriving commercial district at the wharf were gone, while others became tenements or dwellings. Residential yards and empty lots were filled and leveled, as evidenced by the Veit’s yard (See Chapter 5). By 1892, a landscape that once looked like a town, now looked like one of Louisville’s other neighborhoods, with level lots. The wharf’s commercial district along Water Street was now populated with houses and corner stores just like other neighborhoods in Louisville. The only sign of its past
townscape was the imposing St. Charles Hotel building, which was a deteriorating tenement, much like those seen in Louisville’s older commercial and residential areas.

Figure 7.9. 1892 Sanborn Map of the Portland Wharf Area between 33rd and 35th Streets.
Within 20 years, the Portland Wharf’s landscape had been transformed and looked very much like a neighborhood landscape one would see in Louisville. This landscape communicated very little about Portland’s independent identity and thus, it was not one that would have helped Portlanders maintain that identity. Instead this new landscape would have helped normalize another identity, thus erasing the previous identity. With the events that precipitated the dramatic change to Portland’s landscape, Louisville’s newly asserted authority influenced the resulting landscape and thus was at least partly a product of the practices common to Louisville, reinforcing the way things were done there. Portlanders would have no longer experienced Portland’s townscape, which had been decimated, but instead experienced Portland’s neighborhood landscape which encouraged them to accept the reality of Portland’s status as a neighborhood of Louisville.

With the decline of the Portland Wharf, the development of a new commercial district along Portland Avenue, and the continued residential expansion of Louisville, Portland as a neighborhood grew and expanded largely away from the river, the source of the devastating floods. Lots were subdivided, ground was leveled, roads were paved, and many shotgun houses were built. Portland became a place where many of Louisville’s working class and immigrant populations were able to buy their own property and houses. There was now a seamless transition from Louisville’s west end to Portland, as there were few cues of Portland’s previous iteration as a separate town.
Thus, Portland’s landscape changed drastically between 1870 and 1900, from one that reflected its independent identity to one that reinforced Louisville’s authority and Portland’s place as a neighborhood. Although it is clear that the landscape changed and elements of Portland’s independent identity were no longer evident, we really can’t see the effect these landscapes had on the people who lived there. We can document the changes to the political and economic landscape through the archival record. We can even see changes to the landscape on the maps, with regards to the spatial separation between Louisville and Portland and the changes to the street names that were imposed. However, what are the material consequences of this change in landscape to Portland’s independent identity?

Privy to Past Identity

While it is difficult to see Portland’s independent identity manifested in individual artifacts, through archaeology we can see evidence of Portland’s independence in the actions of its residents. The material evidence of actions that were counter to or in violation of Louisville’s ordinances could be considered an expression of Portland’s actual and perceived political independence from Louisville. Although most municipal ordinances are unlikely to have archaeological correlates, ordinances governing the construction and maintenance of privies have been examined in comparison to the archaeological remains to demonstrate compliance or lack thereof to regulations (Stottman 1996, 2000b).
Research of privy construction in neighborhoods that were within and outside of the jurisdiction of Louisville has shown both compliance and violation of Louisville’s ordinances governing the construction of privies, thus demonstrating the action of compliance with a law or regulation. Compliance or noncompliance to a regulation could be motivated by a number of factors, such as misguided perceptions of sanitation or socio-economic conditions (Stottman 1996). However, the act of compliance could also be indicative of expressions of assimilation or independence when there has been a change in jurisdictional authority, such as the annexation of the formerly independent Portland to the City of Louisville. Thus, we could consider non-compliance with ordinances to be an expression of resistance and compliance a result of assimilation. The examination of privy construction at the Veit houselot during the period that major changes occurred in the landscape shows gradual compliance with Louisville’s privy construction ordinance, corresponding to the transformation of Portland’s landscape during the same period. Thus, changes in privy construction could be a result of changes in resident’s independent attitudes which were partially maintained in the landscape. It is possible that privy construction represents a material manifestation of the process of identity change that took place in the landscape through the actions of people.

In 1853, one year after Louisville successfully annexed Portland, the City of Louisville passed its first ordinance regulating the construction and maintenance of privies.
No privy shall be built without a vault at least twelve nor more than thirty feet deep, and walled with hard brick; nor shall any part of the contents of any privy-vault be removed except by its being taken out of The City, or into the current of the river, in the night-time. Each privy shall be kept in proper condition at all times, and from the first of April till the last of October shall be well sprinkled with lime at least twice in each month. Any owner or occupant of premises, on which any of the above regulations shall not be complied with, shall be fined ten dollars for each offense. - *Ordinance 59 approved Nov. 5, 1853* [Louisville City Codes Book 1884:289].

The motivations behind the creation of the ordinance and the misguided perceptions of sanitation that informed it have been extensively discussed (Stottman 1996; 2000b). It is, however, the act of compliance that is of interest here. A comparison of specifications from privies excavated at archaeological sites in and around Louisville shows various levels of compliance and liberties taken with the ordinance. This comparison demonstrates a clear trend of compliance for residents that lived under the ordinance and non-compliance for those that did not. In some cases, the conversion of non-compliant privies to be in compliance has been identified (Stottman 2000b; 2015). The act of compliance with the privy ordinance has previously been linked to perceptions of sanitation and jurisdiction. However, we can also examine the acts of compliance or lack thereof to be a measure of jurisdictional control or even acts of defiance.

An examination of the privies identified at the Portland Wharf site with regards to Louisville’s privy ordinance indicates whether the Veit family complied with the ordinance or not. A privy was considered to be in compliance with the ordinance if its depth measured between 3.7 m (12 ft.) and 9.1 m (30 ft.), it was constructed with brick, and was built during the enactment of the ordinance post 1853. A total of five privies
was identified at the Portland Wharf site, all of which were located on Lot 56. Only three of these were fully excavated and have a known total depth. All of these were constructed at a time when Portland was within the jurisdiction of Louisville and during the enactment of the privy ordinance. Two privies (M-43 and M-44) were out of compliance with the ordinance, while M-24 was in compliance (Table 7.2). M-44 was the most out of compliance of the privies, as it did not meet any of the specifications in the ordinance, being constructed of wood to only a depth of 2.0 m (6.5 ft.) (Figure 7.10). M-43 was partially compliant having been constructed of brick, but fell far short of the 3.7 m (12 ft.) depth requirement (Figure 7.11). M-24 was constructed of brick and also just met the depth requirement at just over 4.0 m (13 ft.) (Table 7.2).

Figure 7.10. Master Context 44, a Wood Lined Privy at Lot 56.
Table 7.2. Privy Depths and Construction at Lot 56.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
<td>4.1 m (13.3 ft.)</td>
<td>Brick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ca. 1880s</td>
<td>1.3 m (4.4 ft.)</td>
<td>Brick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Ca. 1873</td>
<td>2.0 m (6.5 ft.)</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these privies were constructed at different times, indicating varying levels of compliance through time. There could be numerous motivations behind the construction of these privies that determined their compliance with the ordinance. It is possible that the construction of privies was dependent on those that were hired to build them and their own preferences, work ethic, or attitude towards the law. However, each of these three privies was associated with the same family at different times, which
provides a constant in their comparison. If the property owner had any control over the construction of the privies, there would be little variation in the privies due to owner preference.

Regardless of the possible factors, these privies were within the jurisdiction of the City of Louisville and variation of compliance is directly related to the municipality’s ability to regulate privy construction according to its ordinance and the privy builder’s respect for it. Thus, non-compliant privies are a product of weaker enforcement or a lack of respect for enforcement by property owners, while compliant privies are indicative of stronger enforcement and an acknowledgement of the ordinance’s jurisdiction. Given the context of Portland’s liminal status within Louisville’s jurisdiction during the late nineteenth century, the variation of compliance during this period could be an indication of Portland’s transition from independent town to Louisville neighborhood and of Louisville’s increased efforts to assimilate Portland.

While non-compliance with Louisville’s privy ordinance may not be a conscious act of defiance for Portlanders, it could be a material manifestation of an independent identity that was largely unconscious and a part of their habitus (Bourdieu 1990). It was just the way they had always constructed their privies. However, the variation in these privies also points to a change in this practice, as privies gradually became more compliant over time. This trend is consistent with the documentary history in that it seems that the City of Louisville was content to leave Portland to itself in the early decades of annexation. It appears that this trend is exhibited in privy construction at the Veit houselot, as well. The privy, constructed at the time the Veit house was built in
1873, did not conform to the privy ordinance that had been in place within the jurisdiction of Louisville for twenty years. It is likely that the Veits constructed their privy like most Portlanders always had and indicates that Louisville’s hands off attitude towards Portland included lax enforcement of some ordinances, such as the privy ordinance.

By the 1880s, the Veit family had constructed a new privy on their property, which was partially compliant. It is not clear why the first privy was abandoned, however, it is clear that it had not been filled to capacity, so it was unlikely that it was due to overfilling. Perhaps the Veits were forced to construct a new privy because their old one was out of compliance. However, the replacement was not completely compliant. While it was walled in brick per requirement, it was much too shallow. An explanation for this situation could be that the brick lining gave the appearance of compliance, but was not. It would have been easier to disguise the lack of depth in the privy rather than the lack of brick. It is possible that this second privy represents a more conscious effort to usurp the enforcement of the privy ordinance. At this time, the documentary evidence indicates that Louisville began to make efforts to assimilate the Portland community into the fold of Louisville culture.

Without the economic engine that was the Portland Wharf, Portland was well on its way to becoming just another neighborhood in Louisville, losing the impetus for its independence. The second Veit privy could be a material manifestation of this context, as the Veits demonstrated some semblance of compliance, but maintained some of their
independence by usurping the ordinance, perhaps making these expressions of identity more conscious. If this was the case, then defiance may have become conscious, but was still was not overtly visible and thus becomes a personal materialization of defiance.

By the early 1900s, Portland had become fully assimilated into Louisville, as the Portland Wharf landscape showed little evidence of its independent past. This trend is evident in the Veit privy of this time (M-24), which was fully compliant with Louisville’s privy ordinance, and could be an indication of Portland’s complete assimilation into Louisville. This situation reflects the state of the Portland Wharf’s landscape, which bore little resemblance to the bustling independent town evident just 50 years prior.

So, were the actions of the Veit family and the decisions made regarding the construction of their privies a sign of identity? If we think of practices and unconscious actions as being representative of identity, then certainly they can. In this case, while there may have been an element of defiance to Louisville’s authority in these decisions, it is likely that the context in which privies were constructed became part of the Veit’s *habitus* or just the way that they built privies. This in itself is not visible as identity until the practice is compared to privy construction examined in other neighborhoods. While non-compliance to Louisville’s privy ordinance may be an indication of Portland’s independent identity, it is not unique to Portland. When compared to other neighborhoods in Louisville, we can see compliance and non-compliance in other contexts.
For this comparison, the lining material and total depth was examined for privies excavated in communities that were originally part of Louisville or eventually annexed by the city. Thus, to determine whether privies complied with the specifications of privy construction in the ordinance or not, their context, as related to construction date of the privy and when it was under the jurisdiction of the city, had to be determined. Special attention was paid to privies that were in use during the transition to the ordinance’s jurisdiction and how they reflect willingness to comply with the ordinance.

The privies examined for this study (n=55) were excavated in different areas and at various sites in Louisville, including Highland Park (n=13), Russell (n=7), Parkland (n=1), Shippingport (n=3), Convention Center (n=4), Lewis Pottery (n=1), Old Louisville (n=10), Pearl and Lafayette Avenue (n=2), Federal Court House (n=1), Muhammad Ali Center (n=1), Portland Marine Hospital (n=2), Cathedral of the Assumption (n=2), and East Market Street (n=6) (Table 7.3). Privies were determined to be in compliance with the ordinance if they met the material and depth requirements and the privy was constructed post 1853 and within the Louisville city limits. The date of construction for the privies was determined by using a combination of factors including the date of its contents, coincidence with changes in households, and relationship to other privies on the same lot. The depth of privies was measured from what was believed to be the original ground surface at the time of construction. In some cases the total depth of privies was not determined due to safety concerns, however they were relevant to the study because a determination had been made as to whether they were less than or greater than the 3.7 m (12 ft.) threshold established in the privy ordinance.
Table 7.3. Privies Found in Other Louisville Neighborhoods and Districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Site/Privy</th>
<th>Lining</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Construction Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highland Park Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td>15Jf608</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>2.3 m (7.5 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established as a town in 1892, south of Louisville.</td>
<td>15Jf609a</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>3.1 m (10.2 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexed in 1922 (Stottman and Granger 1993)</td>
<td>15Jf609b</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>2.2 m (7.3 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf611</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>1.2 m (3.8 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf613a</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>1.9 m (6.3 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf613b</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>3.4 m (11.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf614</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>1.6 m (5.1 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf615</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>2.5 m (7.8 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf618a</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>2.2 m (7.2 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf618b</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>2.1 m (7.1 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf620a</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>2.0 m (6.8 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf620b</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>2.7 m (8.8 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf623</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>2.0 m (6.5 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russell Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td>15Jf604a</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>5.0 m (16.5 ft.)</td>
<td>1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of residential area</td>
<td>15Jf604b</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>5.6 m (18.5 ft.)</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed between 1830-1870</td>
<td>15Jf606</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>6.7 m (22.0 ft.)</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated into the city in 1828 (Stottman and Watts-Roy 1995)</td>
<td>15Jf624a</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>3.7m (12.0 ft.)</td>
<td>1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf624b</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>6.7 m (22.0 ft.)</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf624c</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>6.1 m (20.0 ft.)</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf624d</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>5.8 m (19.0 ft.)</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shippingport</strong></td>
<td>15Jf702-F101</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Ca. 1820s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established as a town in 1806, northwest of Louisville.</td>
<td>15Jf702-F493</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>2.4 m (8.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexed in 1852 (Andrews et al. 2010)</td>
<td>15Jf702-F511</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>2.4 m (8.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convention Center</strong></td>
<td>15Jf646-F1</td>
<td>Wood/Brick</td>
<td>4.6 m (15.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of Louisville’s core</td>
<td>15Jf646-F10</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>4.0 m (13.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed in 1810 (Stottman 2000a)</td>
<td>15Jf646-F11</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>4.9 m (16.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf646-F14</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>4.0 m (13.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parkland</strong></td>
<td>15Jf572</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>3.7 m (12.1 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established as at town in 1874, southwest of Louisville Annexed in 1894 (Stottman et al. 1991)</td>
<td>15Jf658</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.2 m (4.1 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1820s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lewis Pottery</strong></td>
<td>15Jf767-F1</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>6.1 m (20.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1890s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of residential area</td>
<td>15Jf767-F29</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>2.1 m (7.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1890s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed in 1820s Incorporated into the city in 1828 (Westmont 2012)</td>
<td>15Jf767-F30</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>4.3 m (14.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1890s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf767-F45</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>2.7 m (9.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1890s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf767-F46</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>4.9 m (16.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf767-F49</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>5.5 m (18.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf767-F51</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>6.1 m (20.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf767-F55</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>6.1 m (20.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf767-F56</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>5.5 m (18.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf767-F95</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>4.3 m (14.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Louisville</strong></td>
<td>15Jf767-F1</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>6.1 m (20.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1890s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban development 1860s-1890s</td>
<td>15Jf767-F29</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>2.1 m (7.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1890s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexed in 1868 (Andrews and Schatz 2011)</td>
<td>15Jf767-F30</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>4.3 m (14.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1890s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf767-F45</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>2.7 m (9.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1890s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf767-F46</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>4.9 m (16.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf767-F49</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>5.5 m (18.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf767-F51</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>6.1 m (20.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf767-F55</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>6.1 m (20.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf767-F56</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>5.5 m (18.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15Jf767-F95</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>4.3 m (14.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.3. Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Site/Privy</th>
<th>Lining</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Construction Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muhammad Ali Center</strong></td>
<td>15J697</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>4.6 m (15 ft.)</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Louisville core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed 1780-1810 (Bader 2003b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Market Street</td>
<td>15J793-F1</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>3.7+ m (12+ ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1860s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of residential area</td>
<td>15J793-F2</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>3.7+ m (12+ ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1860s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed 1820s-1850s</td>
<td>15J793-F3</td>
<td>Wood/Brick</td>
<td>3.7+ m (12+ ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition to city plat around 1800</td>
<td>15J793-F4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>.79 m (2.6 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1830s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stottman 2015)</td>
<td>15J793-F5</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>1.9 m (6.2 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1840s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15J793-F7</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>1.3 m (4.2 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1840s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl and Lafayette Ave.</td>
<td>15J717</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>1.7 m (5.5 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1870s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of residential area</td>
<td>15J718</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>1.6 m (5.2 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed 1840s-1880s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated into the city in 1823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Faberson 2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Court House</td>
<td>15J778</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>1.2 m (4.0 ft.)</td>
<td>Ca. 1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of residential area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed 1830s-1870s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated into the city in 1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Faberson 2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Marine Hospital</td>
<td>15J727 north</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>1.0 m (3.4 ft.)</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexed in 1852</td>
<td>15J727 south</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>1.4 m (4.75 ft.)</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1845-1852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stottman 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral of the Assumption</td>
<td>Structure 1</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Louisville core</td>
<td>Structure 3</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>1.8 m (6.0 ft.)</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed in the early 1800s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mansberger 1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 27 privies were considered to be under the jurisdiction of the ordinance, of which 24 complied with the ordinance (89 percent). The three non-compliant privies were located in Old Louisville at the Scholar House site (n=2) and in East Downtown at Pearl and Lafayette Avenues (n=1). The Old Louisville privies were built in the 1890s around 25 years after the area came into the jurisdiction of the ordinance and failed the depth requirement, being 2.1 m (7 ft.) and 2.7 m (9 ft.) deep respectively. The East Downtown (Pearl and Lafayette Ave.) privy was built in the 1870s and also failed the depth requirement, being only 1.9 m (5.5 ft.) deep.
A total of 28 privies was determined to be non-compliant with the ordinance. Ten of these were constructed, used, and abandoned outside of the jurisdiction of the ordinance. These privies suggest that property owners abandoned the privies and built new ones prior to the enactment of the ordinance. Thirteen of the non-compliant privies were considered to be transitional in that they were constructed just before or near the time that the ordinance was enacted or the community, in which they were located, became part of the city.

Five of the privies investigated in Highland Park were constructed in the 1920s, which falls within the time period that the community was annexed by Louisville in 1922. It is likely that some of these privies were constructed after annexation, however none were compliant with the ordinance. It is likely that some lag in compliance occurred when communities came into the ordinance’s jurisdiction. The fact that none of the privies examined in Highland Park complied with the ordinance indicates that a considerable amount of lag occurred, as some of these privies were used into the 1940s. Privies in Highland Park were either not replaced or new privies were built out of compliance.

Other non-compliant privies appear to have been constructed just before ordinance jurisdiction, but continued to be used well past the date of jurisdictional control before they were replaced by compliant privies. This was the case for privies at the Convention Center site (n=1), in Shippingport (n=2), Pearl and Lafayette Ave. (n=1), Portland Marine Hospital (n=2), and in Old Louisville at the Scholar House site (n=1). It
appears that these privies had been constructed just prior to the enactment of the
ordinance or city annexation, but continued to be used at least 10 years beyond the
jurisdiction date, before being replaced by a compliant privy or abandoned at the demise
of the associated dwelling.

These examples suggest that compliance with the ordinance in areas where
jurisdiction was imposed on a community later or the privy ordinance was enacted within
the city limits took place rather slowly, however there were exceptions. They included
two privies identified at the Convention Center site (15Jf646) and in the East Market area
at the Haymarket site (15Jf793). These privies show evidence that a wood-lined privy,
rather than being abandoned and replaced was converted to be compliant with the
ordinance. In these examples, a brick-lined privy was built inside of a deep wood-lined
privy (Figure 7.12). These privies indicate that these particular property owners were
quick to bring their privies into compliance with the new ordinance.

Overall, of the privies examined that were under the jurisdiction of the privy
construction ordinance, either by being within the city limits or built after the ordinance
was enacted, most complied with the ordinance. Of the privies excavated that were not
under the jurisdiction of the ordinance, either because they were outside of the city limits
or pre-dated the enactment of the ordinance, none complied with the ordinance.
Communities that were originally founded as independent towns prior to annexation,
such as Highland Park and Shippingport, in general had more non-compliant privies and
exhibited a considerable amount of lag before compliance. In general, non-compliant
privies that were constructed prior to the enactment of the ordinance continued to be used for many years under the regulation. However, there is evidence that some privies were quickly converted to become compliant or were replaced with compliant privies, especially in areas already within the city limits at the time the ordinance was enacted.

Figure 7.12. A Wood Lined Privy Converted to Brick at the Convention Center Site.
Like the Veit’s privies there were examples from other Louisville privies that were non-compliant with the ordinance although under its jurisdiction (Old Louisville and East Downtown areas). Although there seems to be a disregard of the privy ordinance like that seen at the Veit’s houselot, the context of the associated communities was different than Portland.

During the 1890s, Old Louisville was at the southern edge of the city and was still developing. Thus, the area may have had some liminal status with the city, and perhaps enforcement of regulations was lax due to this status. Or perhaps, it was owner preference, as the builder of the houses associated with the non-compliant privies also built privies that were compliant at the same time. The compliant privies did straddle lots lines, suggesting that perhaps they were shared by multiple lots, while the non-compliant privies were not shared (Andrews and Schatz 2011). It could be that the privy construction ordinance did not enter into reason when these homes were developed in the 1890s and it has more to do with individual preference. Thus, the act of privy construction and disregard for the privy ordinance may not be an act of defiance or a representation of identity in this case.

The East Downtown area (Pearl and Lafayette Ave.) was one of the earliest expansions of the city’s core in the early 1800s and was incorporated into the city limits by 1823. By the time the privy construction ordinance was enacted, this area had been part of the city for nearly 30 years. There are few reasons as to why a non-compliant privy would be built other than personal preference or ignorance of the ordinance by the
builder. Again, given this context, it is unlikely that the disregard of the ordinance stemmed from an independent identity, but could possibly be some form of individual defiance.

The context of the Portland Neighborhood was much different. When this chronology is interpreted within the context of Portland’s independent identity, a case can be made that privy construction at the Veit houselot is a reflection of that independent identity. At the time that the Veits constructed their house, Louisville made moves to assimilate the former town into its suburban fold. Whereas the city had been very hands off when it came to Portland’s perceived identity, it was becoming much more hands on in its control of the community. Thus, Portland’s independent identity was being threatened, which was evident in its landscape (discussed further in Chapter 8). Within this context, the Veits constructed their privy.

The non-compliance of the Veit’s first and second privies could be reflective of the assimilation process that Portland was undergoing at the time and an individual act of defiance by the Veits. Ironically, the second privy was destroyed by the very floods that forever changed the Portland Wharf’s landscape, the last physical vestiges of its townscape and independence.

The Veit’s third privy was constructed around 1900 within a completely different landscape than its two predecessors. The Portland Wharf was nearly abandoned, as steamboats had not disembarked there consistently for nearly 15 years and many of its
buildings had been destroyed by floods and not rebuilt. This landscape was a far cry from the overtly autonomous thriving commercial center it was 50 years prior. Thus, this privy was compliant with the privy construction ordinance, as there was little motivation to defy it.

This example demonstrates that when contrasted against other community contexts, compliance with the privy construction ordinance can be an action that is a form of identity representative of Portland’s independent identity. This identity while initially unconscious may have become more conscious as a latent act of defiance when Portland’s independent identity was threatened. The Veits eventual compliance with the ordinance coincides with drastic changes to the Portland Wharf landscape, which deemphasized Portland’s independent identity and normalized Louisville’s assimilation of the community, as a neighborhood.

**Summary and Discussion: The Process of Identity and the Landscape**

This examination of identity in the Portland Wharf landscape has demonstrated that Portland’s independent identity can be seen in the landscape when contrasted with that of Louisville. Although not entirely unique to Portland, the stage of development of the Portland landscape for nearly 20 years after annexation when compared to Louisville’s landscape development, exposed differences that helped create and maintain Portland’s independent identity. The small town-feel of Portland’s townscape, with a bustling wharf and commercial district surrounded by a sparsely developed residential area that followed the natural topography, was a contrast to Louisville’s cityscape with its
extensive commercial district and level lots tightly developed with residences and corner stores. The look and feel of Portland’s townscape, the geographical separation from Louisville, along with the redundancy of its own wharf and economy, signified its independence. These elements of Portland’s landscape helped to create a place by defining its space and providing meaning to its residents (Tuan 1977).

Ordinary things such as street names and pavement, the large residential lots that were sparsely developed on the natural topography, the nearby farms, and steamboats lined up at the wharf contributed to making Portland a meaningful place to its residents. Portlanders formed an attachment to this place, much like a homeland. Although there were landmarks that anchored meaning in Portland as a place, such as the St. Charles Hotel and Our Lady Church, the ordinary also triggered memories that attached residents to this place as a homeland. According to Tuan “Attachment of a deep though subconscious sort may come simply with familiarity and ease, with the assurance of nurture and security, with the memory of sounds and smells, of communal activities and homely pleasures accumulated over time” (1977:159). Thus, as residents experience this place as part of their daily practices, their perspectives were certainly different based on their contexts. This place had different meanings for different people. Elements of the landscape, such as the large commercial structures and luxurious St. Charles Hotel certainly helped to reinforce the social and economic hierarchies that were present in Portland as they were elsewhere.
Just as any city, town, or neighborhood, the way a place looks and feels to those that experience it helps to define it. Those who lived and worked in Portland on a daily basis took cues from the landscape which defined this place as Portland. The practices they performed further imbued the place with memories and meaning, be that work, play, living, or traveling. As visible as the landscape is, it is mundane even in its landmarks to those that experience it on a daily basis. The landscape becomes a part of accumulated history and experiences that constitute one’s *habitus* and thus largely exists subconsciously interacting with daily practices.

Michel de Certeau’s (1984) concept of spatial practice through the example of walking in the city, exposes the process by which the landscape can affect the process of identity, creation, maintenance, and erasure. Spatial practices such as walking within a city provide experiences for people that are departures or detours from the functional structures of the landscape that are often designed to reinforce and communicate a variety of concepts, such as power. Spatial practices provide agency to the pedestrian within this landscape, challenging these concepts that were overtly or subconsciously used to define a place, such as a city. While the landscape can define a place, spatial practice provides the theoretical means to examine how people define place within the landscape. Thus, we can examine the Portland Wharf landscape in relation to how people transcended the overt landscape to define a place that was independent. The agency of people in the landscape can help expose the process by which the independent identity of Portland was defined from that landscape and how changes to the landscape, during Louisville’s assimilation of Portland, erased but did not kill that identity. I would argue that through
the normalizing qualities of the landscape the overt functional structural aspects of the landscape are always changing and shifting and for that matter the personal detours produced from agency can, in themselves, become parts of or be adopted by or incorporated in the overt. Thus, the landscape is not a mere container designed by the architects of power to impose their message, although it certainly embodies elements of this concept. The landscape does not just do the bidding of a master, it has many contributors, users, and agents. They all can affect the landscape as much as they are affected by it, through a dialectical relationship, which is largely unconscious. Like most concepts, we can’t see and understand the entirety of this relationship, but only parts or components that could act independently or together. Thus, we can only really study it through the specific contexts and relationships that comprise the landscape.

The example of identity and landscape at the Portland Wharf demonstrates the process of identity. By focusing on but one aspect of identity in Portland within the context of the changing historic landscape, we can expose some of the process of how identity works. The Portland Wharf landscape and the many people who interacted with it, is much more complicated than will be discussed here. However, through this one example, we can expose the process by which identity and landscape interact, a process that may be at work with regards to the countless other aspects of identity and landscape that could be seen. Thus, we can essentialize neither identity nor the landscape. We are instead trying to uncover the processes by which they relate and interact, which may be applicable to a myriad of other identities.
The search for overt markers of ethnic identity at Lot 56 failed to produce any material manifestations of French or German heritage, as might be expected at documented immigrant households. An examination of households at other sites in the Louisville area also failed to produce artifacts related to ethnicity, except for two cases in the Russell Neighborhood. This result is not unexpected given the complicated nature of ethnic relations during the nineteenth century and it is not clear how important or advantageous deploying such identities was. In the context of nineteenth-century urban America, immigrants were more likely to want to fit in rather than distinguish themselves and that is what the artifacts from most households investigated archaeologically in Louisville indicate. Possibly a much more nuanced comparison of artifact assemblages between households of differing ethnicities could tease out some differences in artifact patterns that could be related to ethnicity, as well as a variety of other identities. It appears that the motives for consumer choice were minimally related to ethnicity, but instead largely driven by actual and desired socio-economic status.

If we take the concept of identity being produced from one’s *habitus*, as described in Chapter 2, then identity is not inherent in objects, but instead inherent in practices that use objects and are influenced by the *habitus* which are largely unconscious. For example, how Creoles in New Orleans use and manage their urban spaces is as much representative of identity as any ethnically imbued artifact (Dawdy 2000). This particular form of identity was not visible until archaeologists created contrast through the contextualization of the archaeological data. Thus, identity that is unconscious within practices is something that is not visible until we look for it and make it visible.
We can conclude that in order to make such identities visible, we must create the contrast necessary, as discussed in Chapter 2. If we conceive of the landscape as a dialectical relationship that is both affected by and affects the people who experience it and their daily practices, then creating contrasts between landscapes could make identity visible. The concept of landscape, as diachronic and dialectical described in Chapter 2, allows us to examine its normalizing qualities as related to identity. As demonstrated above, a concept like ethnic identities, which are more likely to be expressed at a smaller scale, are not likely to be readily seen in the material landscape. However identities, such as independence, which is defined in a variety of ways and scales by its residents, can be seen in the landscape and in the actions and practices cued from the landscape.

A comparison between Portland’s landscape development and Louisville’s landscape created the contrast necessary to see the independent identity that Portlanders created during the years after its annexation to Louisville. Portland had an attitude of an independent entity even under the political jurisdiction of Louisville, which was evident in the perceptions of the community both from its residents and those outside the community, as Louisville did little to change Portland and allowed it to function as it did when it was independent. The Portland independent identity was certainly not latent, in the sense that it was recognized as a place separate from Louisville for nearly 20 years after annexation. For both Portland and Louisville, it was not so much an intended distinction, it was more a situation of business as usual after annexation, as neither community was motivated to change anything. Thus, their landscapes were different when compared. For nearly 20 years the physical separation of the communities, the way
they developed and the resulting townscape and cityscape helped to maintain Portland’s independent identity.

This landscape was not entirely a designed functional structure meant to communicate what its designers intended (Rothschild and Wall 2014). Although the plan for Portland and some of its buildings were certainly intended to communicate some message of prosperity and power, the Portland landscape was partly a product of the spatial practices of its people (de Certeau 1984). By 1870, Portland had been created by a strong economy, a weak political structure, and the many individual decisions its residents made on a daily basis. Because we can see contrast between the landscapes of the two communities, it suggests that Portland’s landscape was a product of an independent identity, which helped to maintain that identity (Tuan 1977). In order to better understand this relationship we needed to examine change in the landscape. The changes made to Portland’s landscape beginning in the mid-1870s helped expose the process of identity and its relationship to the landscape.

Documented changes in Portland’s landscape demonstrated the normalizing quality of the landscape as events conspired to change Portland’s independent identity. As the spatial separation between Portland and Louisville and Portland’s economy disappeared, there was an overt effort to assimilate Portland into the folds of Louisville’s neighborhoods. Part of this effort was done by renaming many of the streets in Portland. Though not likely an attempt to destroy Portland’s independent identity, this action by Louisville began a series of events that certainly threatened it. Names are an important
part of the landscape, as they help define and give meaning to place (Basso 1996; Tuan 1977). They also were part of the designed landscape and were part of the message Portland’s founder wanted to send about the vitality and economic promise of this venture (de Certeau 1984). “In the spaces brutally lit by an alien reason, proper names carve out pockets of hidden and familiar meanings. They “make sense”; in other words, they are the impetus of movements, like vocations and calls that turn or divert an itinerary by giving it a meaning (or a direction) (sens) that was previously unforeseen” (de Certeau 1984:104). Although street names are meant to structure and guide “These names create a nowhere in places; they change them into passages” (de Certeau 1984:104). Although their intended message may have been lost or hidden, the street names in Portland became in a sense a passage to nowhere and elements of an independent identity. For when Louisville changed the names their relationship to spatial practices and Portland’s identity changed, as they no longer had meaning to the residents. Thus, the change had a structural function in the designed landscape, communicating a message from its architect, the City of Louisville.

Although the intent of street renaming in Portland was not likely to threaten Portland’s identity, it likely had a normalizing or pedagogical effect on the community (Orser 2006; Schien 2003). These new names held no meaning for the residents of Portland, as they were not relevant to Portland’s identity and instead were related to Louisville’s practices and thus, its identity. In this case, proper names are a product of “alien reason” as they did not relate to the people of Portland, but instead would have been perfectly in tune with the spatial practices of Louisvillians (de Certeau 1984).
These names replaced Portland’s meanings with Louisville’s and thus normalized a Louisville identity. As we will see in Chapter 8, this was not the last time that street name changes would threaten Portland’s identity.

While street names alone do not change identity, the change of Portland’s street names in 1875 was an important event in that it signified a change in Louisville’s attitude towards Portland. It was no longer a hands-off approach and there was the desire to assert more control and connect it to the larger city. Through the landscape we can see the transformation of Portland’s identity from independence, a place separate from Louisville, to a neighborhood very much a part of Louisville. Although the examination of changes to the Portland landscape over time and its contrast with Louisville exposes Portland’s independent identity and even suggests that it has a role in the process of identity, we can still ask the question of did these changes affect the daily practices and perceptions of Portland’s independent identity? Furthermore, did changes in the landscape erase the old identity and normalize a new identity that privileged assimilation with Louisville? It is reasonable to suggest that with the loss of Portland’s townscape which represented Portland’s independent identity that the integrity of that identity would suffer.

As broad and pervasive as Portland’s independent identity was, it is difficult to materialize this identity, much less to demonstrate its erasure and replacement. Although Portland’s independence was evident in contemporary accounts and reflected in the landscape when contrasted with another landscape, there were no particular artifacts
recovered from the archaeological investigations that symbolized Portland’s independence. Just as with ethnic identity, there were no markers of independent identity. There was no overt movement of independence materialized in the objects of Portland’s residents. However artifacts and other archaeological materials can demonstrate the process of identity and its relationship to the landscape through their use in the practices of its residents.

The examination of privy construction at the Veit houselot demonstrated changes that mirrored changes in the landscape. Furthermore privy construction could be directly related to expressions of independent identity, as it was not a structure meant for display, but was a result of actions and decisions made by the property owner and privy builder. The compliance with ordinances in Louisville that governed privy construction can be interpreted as a product of an independent identity or assimilation. The Veit’s privies mirrored the assimilation process and the changes in the Portland landscape, as privies became more compliant with Louisville’s privy construction ordinance over time. Thus, non-compliance with the ordinance could have been an act of defiance and symbol of Portland’s independent identity and eventual compliance evidence of assimilation.

Through these examples we can see that unconscious identity is exposed when a researcher creates the necessary contrast to make it visible. An independent identity is visible in the landscape of Portland Wharf when contrasted with Louisville’s landscape. The landscape helped create and maintain this identity, as evident in the actions and practices of the people who experienced it. The landscape also helped erase Portland’s
independent identity and normalize a new one representative of Louisville’s authority. While it is possible to declare Portland’s independent identity dead after 1900, the landscape did not kill it. It is true that the landscape no longer maintained or reinforced Portland’s independent identity as it was, but memory of that identity continued to exist amongst Portland’s residents through narratives or stories about places. Thus, identity never really dies, but takes on another form, residing in the history of a place, waiting to be deployed again when the situation and context calls. The landscape will again play an important role in the maintenance of that identity. The story of Portland’s independence is not over, as it has been called upon again to help define the place that is Portland and the landscape is an important element of the deployment of this identity.
CHAPTER 8: PRESENT IDENTITY IN PORTLAND

The analysis of the archaeological deposits at the Portland Wharf has helped reconstruct the historic landscape and exposed the process of identity creation, maintenance, and modification through the landscape. However, I am not studying an extinct community, as Portland and its people are still here and we can look to the present day community to examine identity and its relationship to the past and landscape. In order to better understand present perspectives on the community, its history, and identity, I conducted an ethnographic study (See Chapter 3). The information collected was used to help understand the process of identity creation, maintenance, and erasure among current residents and how that process taps history and heritage for the deployment of present day identities. Although the study does not represent a fully engaged ethnographic examination of Portland, it does provide some insight into a narrowly focused topic, allowing me to examine continuity in the process of identity in Portland over time and its relationship to the Portland Wharf landscape.

The ethnographic study primarily consists of interviews, however information about identity and related current events are supplemented with newspaper articles from the Louisville Courier Journal and the local neighborhood paper the Portland Anchor, as well as participant observation of local neighborhood gatherings, such as community meetings and festivals (See Chapter 3). I will first examine the question of what current and former residents of Portland know about the community’s history, particularly its nineteenth-century history when it was an independent and prosperous river town. I will
examine how historical knowledge is learned and how it relates to academic versions of history. Next, I will examine what residents think about Portland’s identity and their perceptions about Portland. I also will examine the role that heritage plays in these identities and perceptions, as well as the relationship between the City of Louisville and Portland.

**Know Much About History?**

If the idea that the past is very much a part of the Portland identity, particularly its independent identity, then one could make the assumption that Portland residents know about Portland’s history. Of course the actual facts of history are often elusive to even professional researchers, and we can question as to whether they really matter in the present. However, an examination of what Portland residents know about their history can say much about the motivations and process by which history becomes heritage and identity. Thus, in order to see how history is used and modified in the process of identity creation and maintenance, I will compare the historical knowledge of Portland’s residents and former residents to the history that is produced by professional historians, archaeologists, and academics. The purpose of this study is not question the accuracy of resident’s and former resident’s historical knowledge, but instead to understand how it has evolved and is used in the present. By examining why there are differences between the two perspectives of history, I create the contrast needed to expose the process by which history is related to identity.
During the interviews it was clear that some residents did not know much about the general nineteenth-century history of the community, such as when and how it was founded, major events that took place, or about its autonomy and prosperity or at least did not say much about it. Nearly 46 percent of the interviewees indicated that they knew some history about Portland. About 30 percent indicated that they knew a lot about Portland’s history, while 25 percent admitted that they knew very little. Most responses about what they know of Portland’s history were either very broad in the sense that “it is old and very historic” or focused on specific family history. All of the interviewees knew that Portland was historic, but discussion of Portland’s history in the nineteenth century, and about its founding and prosperous riverboat economy was limited. Of those that indicated they knew about Portland’s general history, it often conflicted with academic versions of history. Of the 25 people interviewed, Portland’s riverboat history was mentioned only three times during the interviews and its status as an independent town mentioned only twice.

The history most often mentioned by interviewees consisted of some basic events in Portland’s history, which was often conflated with other events. For example, it was mentioned 11 times in interviews that Portland is Louisville’s oldest neighborhood and that the City of Louisville started in Portland, which are facts that I hear repeated often in the neighborhood. Given the historical context presented earlier in this dissertation, it is clear that neither of these statements are accurate based on academic versions of Portland’s history. It is clear from the historical record that Louisville was founded and well-established before Portland was founded. Also, Portland did not become a
neighborhood of Louisville until after it was annexed in 1852. By that time, Louisville had several distinct neighborhoods. Clearly there is no evidence to support this history, but it is presented by some residents of Portland with a determined certainty that it is not questioned by other residents. The point is not that this history is inaccurate, it is rather to understand how it originated and for what purpose it serves.

A closer examination of the interviews with regards to this history reveals some possible origins and that it is rooted in some substantiated historical facts. For example, the idea that Louisville started in Portland appears to be based on the original settlement of Louisville in 1778. One resident said “I don’t know how many young people know about the history down here. Being the first fort in Louisville, that was a big deal. All of the goods came here first and then were shipped to Louisville. So, it started here” (Interview #22). When Louisville was founded, a small group of settlers accompanying General George Rogers Clark’s troops on the way to the Illinois country, occupied some crude cabins and stockades on Corn Island at the Falls of the Ohio. This settlement signified the official founding of Louisville on May 24, 1778. By the fall of the same year the construction of a more substantial fort on the Kentucky shore near the intersection of today’s Twelfth and Rowan Streets had been completed and became known as “Fort on Shore” (Yater 1987). It was replaced by the heavily fortified Fort Nelson located upstream around today’s 7th and Main Streets in 1781 (Figure 8.1). Fort Nelson became the center of what would become the city of Louisville and from which its street grid was platted. Thus, Fort on Shore’s role in the founding of Louisville often gets overshadowed by the Corn Island settlement story and was largely forgotten.
Fort on Shore does play a significant role in the establishment Louisville and does represent the first Euro-American settlement on the Kentucky shore at the falls. It appears that Portland’s residents have adopted Fort on Shore as a part of their history, given its location in or near what is today known as Portland. The narrative concerning the location of Fort on Shore is that it was located in Portland. However, this fact contradicts traditional and contemporary perceptions of Portland’s boundaries. Traditionally, Portland was “Portland Proper”, extending from 33rd to 37th Streets east/west and only later including the area along Portland Avenue further east. When asked to define Portland’s boundaries, most (76 percent) of the interviewees defined boundaries that would not have included Fort on Shore. Sixty percent indicated that the eastern boundary of Portland was west of 15th Street (Figure 8.2). Only 12 percent of the
interviewees defined an eastern boundary that would have included Fort on Shore. Thus, the contradiction is that Portlanders seem adamant that Fort on Shore was in Portland, yet most define neighborhood boundaries that would not include the location of the fort.

Regardless of the geographical perceptions that Portlanders have regarding the location of Fort on Shore, Portland had not been conceived of as any sort of entity when Fort on Shore was built and occupied. Thus, Portland has no historical connection to the fort other than as a geographical location. The adoption of Fort on Shore by Portlanders serves several purposes in the construction of the present day Portland identity. One way is that it is emblematic of Portland’s relationship with the City of Louisville. According to the interviews, many Portlanders (56 percent) have the perception that there is a poor, weak, or strained relationship with the City or that it has forgotten or neglected Portland. In addition to Portland, these comments also were often applied to other surrounding neighborhoods collectively known as the West End. A former resident described the West End and Portland with regards to their relationship with Louisville in this way:

…there is a great divide between the West End and Louisville, which I think was intentional. They drew a line at 9th Street during Urban Renewal and created a DMZ….The City at some point decided that they were going to put their problems down there. It was easy because the river is on three sides, all you had to do was control that one side and you could keep those problems over there and that was 9th Street (Interview #12).

The neighborhoods west of 9th Street took the brunt of Urban Renewal, in particular 9th Street itself. As part of Urban Renewal, 9th Street was turned from an urban street into a four lane divided connector road to access Interstate 64 (Figure 8.2). Several
blocks on either side of the street were cleared and replaced with expansive parking lots, housing projects, and open space, creating a swath in the urban fabric that divides downtown from the West End neighborhoods. The creation of the new 9th Street was the source of differing perceptions of Portland’s eastern boundary. Four of the interviewees, who indicated they defined the eastern boundary as 15th Street, recognized that most maps show the boundary at 9th Street, thus creating some confusion about what Portland’s eastern boundary is. However, there is the perception amongst Portlanders that anything west of 9th Street is forgotten or neglected by the City, much like the role of Fort on Shore in the history of Louisville’s founding. In this way Portlanders can relate to one of the more obscure aspects of Louisville’s founding and claim it as their own.

The adoption of Fort on Shore as part of Portland’s history provides a place to anchor Portland’s history. The creation of the new 9th Street seems to have expanded Portland’s physical area in the eyes of the City, allowing Portland to claim the place where Fort on Shore was located, although most Portlanders would not consider it in the neighborhood. The adoption of Fort on Shore has allowed Portland to claim a piece of Louisville’s founding and thus elevating its status with the City. This history legitimizes Portland as an integral part of Louisville and as a place that cannot be ignored, for it is where Louisville began. To turn its back on Portland is to ignore its own history.
Figure 8.2. The Location of The Portland Neighborhood, Fort on Shore, and Corn Island.
The contradictory history told by some of the interviewees that Portland is Louisville’s oldest neighborhood likely originates from aspects of Portland’s documented history, as its independence and prosperity became conflated. It is clear to Portlanders that their neighborhood is very old. This idea is accentuated by the abundance of historic residential structures and continuity of its residents generationally. The claim to be Louisville’s first neighborhood seems to work in conjunction with the claim that Louisville started in Portland, as they are often mentioned together in discussion of Portland’s general history. So, not only is it important that Portland claim a piece of Louisville’s founding, but there also seems to be a need to distinguish Portland from Louisville’s other neighborhoods. Its age and historical importance is one way that the distinction is made through this deployed history.

This history seems to be particularly used to distinguish Portland from the West End and the eastern suburbs, in particular historic eastern neighborhoods, such as the Highlands and Old Louisville. Although many interviewees specifically discussed Portland in comparison to Louisville’s other neighborhoods (n=18), they made those distinctions in different ways. For eleven interviewees, Portland’s history was never mentioned as a way to distinguish Portland from the neighboring West End or Shawnee. Interviewees tend to conflate the history of these areas with Portland’s, acknowledging that they are also old, although the case could easily be made that Portland’s history was more distinct. Instead, Portland’s distinction from the West End is usually based on race, economic status, crime, and cultural differences, such as style, pride, and attitude, all of which were mentioned by interviewees as distinctions. As much as Portlanders seem to
want to defend their boundary with the West End, they also identify with it through the way in which both communities are treated by the City of Louisville. Those that discussed the 9th Street dividing line, Portland and the West End were discussed together in the same way.

However when it comes to distinguishing Portland from the neighborhoods that do not share its boundary, history is deployed, in addition to economic and cultural differences. This was particularly the case with the East End, which was mentioned by seven interviewees. The economic and cultural differences between the communities predominate, for example there are references to Louisville’s wealthier eastern neighborhoods and suburbs as “uppity” and other choice synonyms. One interviewee said: “The expressway took our house. I was about 15 years old. I was very traumatized by the fact I was forced to move away from Portland…all of my friends, school, everything and then I moved to the East End. To me those were uppity people you know. It was a very frightening experience, moving to the East End” (Interview #1). However there also seems to be a need to further distinguish the affluent East End and the historic Old Louisville area with the historical fact that Portland was Louisville’s first and oldest neighborhood. Interviewees said “It is the oldest part of Louisville, not the East End not the South End.” (Interview #25) and “You look at Old Louisville we were old when that started.” (Interview #12). Thus, history seems to be deployed as part of larger narrative that distinguishes Portland from Louisville’s wealthier neighborhoods and to legitimize its importance among Louisville’s neighborhoods.
The contradiction of this history’s focus on Portland, the neighborhood, is curious in that deployment of Portland’s independent history would likely be more distinctive and accentuate its importance. A conflation of the importance and history of the community, when it was independent and its most recent status as neighborhood, is the resulting narrative. The creation of this history hints at the relationship of the landscape to the process of identity creation and maintenance, as this history was born in the present at a time when the landscape of Portland’s independent past had been erased and supplanted by the landscape of Portland, the neighborhood. The loss of Portland’s independent landscape is evident in other more nuanced comments from interviewees concerning its history. Portland’s status as an independent town and its annexation and secession were not prominent in the interviews. Of the five interviewees that mentioned at least one of these aspects of Portland’s history, all had conducted research in association with projects at the Portland Museum or on their own and one was a professional historian. Other than the professional historian, the accounts of this history were either very general or contained elements contrary to academic versions of Portland’s history.

One of the interviewees described Portland’s annexation and secession as such:

The City, I honestly think they forgot where it all began. When we were at archives we decided that the City and Portland, the town merged and annexed over some tax or something and the City said we will send the militia out, but we said “screw you we are outa here” but they needed us because we had all of the shipping. We had to keep the cemetery and the public school…and it finally came back together, but we had all of the trade and the City didn’t (Interview #15).
Another discussed Portland’s secession this way:

The people in Portland are separate. They seceded from the United States in 1863 and we have never really come back to the City. It’s true. I mean the people that have been down here that long, not that a person has survived that long, but the families, we still have that feeling…Well we seceded from the United States before the Civil War because we own the canal. Portland owned the canal and we could tax everything that went through it. So, they knew that they could independently have revenue that came through there and they could control things and that is the attitude that people in Portland still have (Interview #1).

These perceptions of Portland’s independence were discussed in the context of a description of Portlanders’ attitude and where it comes from. However they demonstrate some interesting aspects of the Portland identity and its relationship with history and landscape.

As with previously discussed aspects of Portland’s deployed history, there are several inaccuracies compared to more academic versions of these events in Portland’s history, however, they are rooted in and conflated with documented fragments of history. These perceptions indicate interviewees had basic knowledge of some events in Portland’s history, such as that Portland was an independent prosperous town, it was annexed, and it subsequently seceded over some disagreement. However, the details of these events do not match documented history, likely being modified to suit present needs and fit modern narratives. Both versions stated by the interviewees mention taxes prominently, which may have actually played a role, but only a minor one if it did. According to academic versions of Portland’s history, certainly the City of Louisville had its eyes on reaping the benefit of collecting the wharf fees at both ends of the falls when it
annexed Portland, but it was not a forcible action intended to collect taxes from Portland’s citizens, according to documented history. It was a mutually beneficial agreement when conceived. The City failed to honor the conditions of annexation, leading to Portland’s secession, which certainly created some resentment and animosity between the two communities, but never precipitated calls for the militia. These events certainly did not take place between Portland and the United States nor did it happen during the 1860s. The Portland Canal was owned by a private company from its inception until it was taken over by the Federal Government around 1870. Portland, as a town, never collected fees from the canal and when it was federalized the fees that had been charged by the company were abolished. With regards to this perception of Portland’s secession, it appears that the actual event of annexation was transposed over Southern secession from the United States in 1860 and conflated. Both examples appear to be meant to emphasize Portland’s independence, prosperity, and anti-government sentiment. As such these perceptions would resonate with anti-tax, anti-government, and Civil War revisionist sentiments that predominate among segments of present day society. Thus, these versions of Portland’s history have been modified to demonstrate a historical connection to Portlanders’ independent and stand up attitude.

In this case, the Portland independent identity seems to have been kept alive through these historical nuggets created by people who have sought to research Portland’s past. Other interviewees did not mention Portland’s independence. This situation may demonstrate the importance of having an identity anchored in the landscape through a place. Without the Portland Wharf landscape, the physical reminders and the
place where Portland’s independence could be remembered are limited and do little to promote remembering and promoting this identity. Thus, how current and former residents of Portland learn their history is important to the content and use of that history.

According to the interviews, Portlanders learn about history in a variety of ways. The way mentioned the most by interviewees was through talking to family and others (n=12), which explains why much of what they discussed about history focused on family history and general events that occurred within one or two generations. Other ways that the interviewees learned about their history included research (n=7), the Portland Museum (n=5), and books or newspapers (n=4). People who used these sources of history tended to have more knowledge of Portland’s nineteenth-century history or at least understood the basics of Portland’s history with regards to riverboats and trade. However, with little of Portland’s nineteenth-century landscape evident, there are few material cues on the landscape to help people remember that period of Portland’s history. The current landscape reflects the post-assimilation period when the Portland Wharf had all but disappeared, representing Portland as a twentieth-century neighborhood. The interviews indicate that there is a disconnect between Portland’s nineteenth-century history and its modern population, as would be expected because of the degradation of information over time. However, some of that history does survive in modified forms and through individuals interested in that history. This situation does not mean that history is not important. Pieces of that history or general history are deployed in present times to help differentiate Portland from other neighborhoods and to claim part of Louisville’s history. Also, family history and the history of more recent pasts within
several generations are important and seem to help define Portlanders. However, I can say that Portlanders are not as cognizant of academic versions of Portland’s history, as I thought they would be. As to what effect history has on present day Portland identity, I need to examine what are the present day perceptions of identity.

The Portland Identity

When I asked interviewees a direct question about Portland’s identity, I got a variety of answers. However, identity permeates all of these interviews in that people clearly understand what it means to be from Portland. On the surface, the perceptions of Portland’s identity are not much different than other economically challenged communities, but the history of Portland distinguishes it from many communities of similar socioeconomic level. What I have learned about Portland’s identity is that is varied, but some common themes run through those identities.

I have classified the responses to my direct questions concerning identity and heritage into seven categories based on responses I received, including attitude (n=2), pride (n=3), white (n=1), independent (n=2), tight knit community (n=5), working class (n=4), and Irish and German heritage (n=7). None of these identity categories particularly dominates perceptions of the Portland identity, but they are telling of the constituent parts of its identity, which is fleshed out and explained in the individual comments made. For example, two of the interviewees recognized that people in Portland think its identity is Irish but that they did not. An African-American woman stated that “They consider it to be Irish…people who have lived here and always lived
here” (Interview #4). Thus, ethnic identities were frequently discussed within the interviews, mainly associated with the Irish and Germans, with occasional mentions of the French and Italians. All of these ethnicities, along with African-Americans, have a long history in Portland, which was known to have been culturally diverse throughout its history.

The Irish and German ethnicities tended to dominate the discussions in the interviews. These two groups of immigrants became more prominent in Portland toward the end of the nineteenth century, as they did in other parts of Louisville. So, to be of Irish or German heritage was not necessarily an indication you were from Portland (Figure 8.3). There is no doubt that many lived in Portland, but it was not until the early to mid-twentieth century that these groups became more prominent if not notorious for gang activity. One former resident described this activity:

There were German and Irish, there were some Italian, not many mostly German and Irish and they didn’t really get along that well, as the stories go. They lived in pockets in different areas and they were very protective of their area. How much of that was actually true and how much was false, I don’t really know. As far back as I can remember there were gangs; there was the Blue cart gang and the Portland gang, Market St. gang (Interview #14).

This colorful more recent history of the Irish and Germans tends to resonate with Portland’s identity today.
However, most of the interviewees discussed particular traits of the people, as being most reflective of the Portland identity, which includes the categories of attitude, pride, and tight knit community, which together were mentioned 10 times. Words such as hardworking, neighborly, outspoken, and proud were often used to describe Portland’s identity within these categories. For example: “I think it is that people in Portland tend to be outspoken and friendlier. Outspoken a lot...It is almost like we are a different breed. If you meet people from Portland and how they are, we are just there, here we are, this is us and if you don’t like it that is your problem” (Interview #15). Another interviewee described Portlanders as “Hardworking, loyal, down to earth, take care of their own, and neighborly. If someone’s grass needed to be cut you would cut that. If
someone didn’t do it, you would pitch in” (Interview #18). These are traits that one might associate with a small town or just about any small community. In fact, just as many of the interviewees (n=4) thought that Portland was like a small town, as there were who actually knew that it was once an independent town (n=4). These traits are not exclusive to Portland, as they can be found in many other neighborhoods. I have the same perception of my neighborhood. Although some of the interviewees acknowledged that other neighborhoods had similar traits, three stated specifically that Portland was unique and that people in other neighborhoods, particularly people in the East End, would not be as neighborly as those in Portland. The overall sentiment amongst the interviewees, even those relatively new to the neighborhood, was that the people took care of each other and that it was a close knit community. That is why people live in Portland and what defines them. The interviews indicate that Portland is a close knit community because people want to be there and that their families have lived there for generations. It is a community with a long and proud history. Perhaps a resident sums up Portland best:

You have other neighborhoods, they were formed from Portland. Portland was here first and we kept our own identity and you can see how the generations have lived here and other neighborhoods don’t. They don’t, they move in and then move out, you don’t have that in Portland, they stay. I don’t think you have that history in other neighborhoods like you do in Portland. You might have some people that live in their neighborhood for 20 years, but you have to understand we have people who have lived in Portland for 50 or 60 years. My uncle’s brother died when he was 101 and he can remember when the K and I bridge was built. You still have the old people who live down there that are 80 and 90 and their kids and their grandkids still live there. There has to be something that are making people stay and it is not because they can’t afford it, some of them can’t they just don’t want to leave (Interview #15).
Although direct questions about Portland’s identity provide some insight into how Portlanders identify themselves or at least provide some sense of how they would like to be seen, it also is important to reveal identities that may be unconscious. What I mean by this is that, while some identities are deployed, residents may not be entirely aware of the identities and their purpose. For example, the claim that Louisville started in Portland. As previously discussed, this statement is inaccurate according to academic history. However, the statement appears to have the basis in an actual historic event, which has been modified and used to provide legitimacy to Portland’s history as equal to and integral to Louisville’s. The people who use this statement are not likely conscious of its origins and purpose. They deploy it when they feel forgotten or neglected by the City in order to remind it of Portland’s integral role in its very existence. Even then residents may not be aware of the intent of its deployment. The statement becomes a part of their narrative and subsequently their identity when it is threatened by the City of Louisville. This narrative will become materialized in the landscape if a park proposed for the site of Fort on Shore is built. This park is envisioned as an extension of the highly successful Waterfront Park in downtown that will aid efforts to help revitalize Portland (Shafer 2014). The connection of the site to Louisville’s founding and its materialization on the landscape will likely modify the claim depending on whatever interpretation of the past is presented and embolden an identity based in Portland’s claim to Louisville’s founding.

Thus, to see Portland’s identity, we have to view it in the context of contrast or conflict, which is often played out in the landscape. For example, several current issues in the neighborhood that have instigated the deployment of particular identities were
discussed in the interviews, including Section 8 housing (n=11), West End encroachment (n=5), the renaming of 22\textsuperscript{nd} Street (n=4), and the conversion of one-way streets to two-way streets (n=2). These were all issues that have caused controversy in the neighborhood and created the conflict or contrast needed to view deployed identities, many of which have relevance to past identities.

A major issue in Portland that was discussed in or underlay many of the interviews has been Section 8 housing and the displacement of people during Hope VI projects in other parts of Louisville. The HOPE VI program replaces barrack style public housing units with mixed income housing, which invariably displaces many residents from the projects. Of the interviewees that mentioned this issue, most referenced changes that have taken place in the neighborhood over the last six to 10 years which they feel threaten Portland’s culture. The concerns expressed in these interviews had racial overtones. Because of the low cost of housing in Portland and the increase of multifamily housing over single family housing, many people displaced from public housing projects have moved into the Portland Neighborhood. Furthermore, for the same reasons, the neighborhood has seen an increase in the development of Section 8 housing, scattered site housing, and Habitat for Humanity homes. Along with the influx of people attracted to low rents and subsidized housing, many people in the neighborhood have seen an increase in crime and an overall lack of typical Portland behavior, as well as a noticeable change in the neighborhood’s demography.
According to the interviews, 76 percent of the interviewees felt that people outside of Portland had a negative perception of the neighborhood. They think that people outside the neighborhood view it as high crime, low class, poor, rough, or dangerous (Figure 8.4). Although some of the interviewees acknowledged that the perception that it was rough was deserved because of the many gangs and fights in Portland during the mid-twentieth century, 74 percent attributed the perceptions of crime, drugs, and dangerous to recent changes largely caused by the influx of people living in subsidized housing or had been displaced from the projects. Racial overtones were evident throughout responses concerning this issue. When I examined the responses about outside perceptions by race, all three African-American interviewees saw things differently. Each interviewee had a different perception. One thought that people that they knew outside of the neighborhood believed there were no African-Americans in Portland. Another knew people outside of the neighborhood who thought it was trashy and not well kept. The final African-American interviewee indicated that she knew people outside of the neighborhood who thought that it was “redneck and racist.” These results demonstrate change is and has been happening in the neighborhood and it is due to the influx of new residents into the neighborhood. Statistics indicate that the neighborhood is changing, at least racially. Between 2006 and 2011, the percentage of African Americans has increased nearly eight percent and the percentage of whites has decreased by around seven percent (Network Center for Community Change 2015).
Residents and former residents of the neighborhood who have strong generational ties tend to think that the new residents do not represent what Portland was about, such as hardworking and neighborly. Some of the interviewees had the perception that the new residents did not have jobs, receive government assistance, and did not respect the neighborhood. One interviewee exemplified this feeling:

I think it’s due to the peoples got stuff given to them. They come from the projects and they get brand new homes built for them. They feel like they are invincible and untouchable and they could do that because this ain’t their hometown, they don’t give a crap what happens to the next person next door for the simple fact that they got a free government home, given a check, and can sell drugs and etc. I feel that’s got a lot to do with it (Interview #2).
There are clearly some people who have racialized the changes that have occurred in the neighborhood recently. They find it easy to create a racial dichotomy because the faces of those new residents are black, which phenotypically contrasts so greatly with the white perception of Portland. It is easy to blame problems on the new people who don’t know and respect the traditions and identity of the neighborhood and they look different. Some residents also see the changes occurring in the neighborhood but understand the issues to be more complex than can be essentialized into race, as exemplified by this response:

The issue that exploded about ten years ago is in-fill housing, Section 8 housing which are code words about black people moving into the neighborhood got confused with other issues, criminals were not everyone who were moving in or all in that housing, but there was a spike in criminal activity and it was harder to deal with because people did not know them (Interview #23).

An African-American interviewee who is new to the neighborhood and lives in a Habitat for Humanity house had a different perspective about moving into the neighborhood (Figure 8.5). She certainly does not seem to fit the perception that some people have of these new residents. She moved from the West End to Portland for the opportunity to own her own home through the Habitat for Humanity program and did so with some trepidation. She initially wanted to turn down the offer because of what she had heard about the negative perceptions of the neighborhood, but she did not want to pass up the opportunity to own a house. She is a single mother who has a good job that she has had for more than 10 years and she takes great pride in her new house. She even goes so far as to complain that her neighbors do not do a good job of keeping up with their property and allow trash to build up.
Figure 8.5. A New Habitat for Humanity House Next to a Historic Shotgun House.

They are really good people, some of them are not so good, but some of them are really good and I really like living here now for the most part. It is just sometimes I don’t. It is just…the properties down here for one and I am still cleaning up this street the block. I am not just use to that, you know I don’t care if I came from the West End and I am not just use to seeing junk and garbage (Interview #10).

When I told her that some people in the neighborhood lumped people like her with the Section 8 and scattered housing site people she was really confused. She did not see herself as part of that. This is what she said about those people:
Clarksdale you know they had to send them somewhere, which is where they were building the extra housing, some of that is okay, it depends on the tenant on the person that is moving in. I don’t mind it at all as long as they conduct themselves, they take care of their property you know even though they don’t own it you can still take care of it (Interview #10).

Although the issue of change in the neighborhood is more complex than people think, it is clear from the interviews that a prevailing sentiment is that the influx of new residents is the catalyst for that change and it has been difficult for some to deal with it. I think that the changes seen in the neighborhood have been going on longer than people think and the change has caused many residents and former residents, because of their generational ties, to become nostalgic about the way things were in the past. Nostalgia seems to be a sentiment that underlies much of what these generational residents think about Portland’s identity and the inevitable changes that are occurring. The new residents just do not seem to be as tight knit, neighborly, and respectful as people in the past. However, these changes have become racialized, which has allowed some people to create a dichotomy that simplifies the issue and vilifies based on race. This dichotomy is manifested on the landscape along the physical, cultural, and racial boundaries that demarcates Portland from the West End. The changes that Portlanders have seen in their neighborhood are seen by many as the encroachment of the West End into Portland. When responding to the question about the boundaries of Portland, one interviewee stated:

15th St. to 30th Market to the River. There have been a lot of news accounts on T.V. and radio of things in the West End and they call it Portland, but it is not. Portland has changed a lot in the last 15 years, it used to be predominantly white and the Urban Renewal, where they are tearing down the projects you know welfare and all of that, the blacks it is
probably almost over fifty percent black now. I read that here in the paper. Because it was cheap housing people who were moving out the projects were moving this way (Interview #21).

It is the contrast and the conflict, created by the influx of new residents and the perceived encroachment of the West End across well-established boundaries in a racialized landscape, that instigates the deployment of new and old identities to defend against a perceived threat to Portland’s identity. These identities are perhaps no more visible than at the Portland Festival. The Portland Festival started in 1974 as the Portland Family Reunion, an event held annually the first weekend of June to welcome back former residents and for families to reunite with their former community and raise money for local charities (Cengel 2006). Although many Portlanders have left the neighborhood for other communities in Louisville and around the nation, former residents that gave interviews, all demonstrated a strong attachment to the Portland neighborhood. Events like the festival were opportunities for former residents to reconnect with the place they loved. When the festival started, it was held on a rather isolated part of Rudd Avenue near the floodwall and had a family cookout and block party atmosphere that was diverse. However, the event has grown over the years and was moved to the more visible Portland Avenue and Northwestern Parkway. The event in more recent years has featured bands, beer tents, a parade, a midway, and games (Cengel 2006). It has since become known as just the Portland Festival. Although the festival has been an inclusive event for Portland’s diverse residents, it also has become ground zero for the deployment of identities meant to combat the changes seen in Portland from West End encroachment, as attendees, musical acts, and merchandise vendors reflected the push back against interlopers.
In recent years, the Portland Festival had acquired a reputation for being a redneck drunk fest, as beer and country or southern rock music is all that many people saw or remembered about the event. Although these tendencies seen at the festival during the late 2000s, could be attributable to overtly excluding a particular segment of the population, this was not the intent of the festival organizers. The racial overtones seen at the festival may have resulted in the exclusion of more recent African-American Portland residents, but it also is likely due in part to the dominance of other recent immigrants to the neighborhood from Eastern Kentucky and other parts of Appalachia. One of the interviewees responding to the question about outside perceptions of the neighborhood stated:

I think the perception is that it is a bunch of losers. I think the last 30 years has been the presence of hillbillies and Southern Rock, mullets and teasing those folks. And frankly they have a tough time adjusting to city life. That is why I think more recent impressions are so negative. I think a lot of that is outside people. Portland people know who is who (Interview #12).

This interviewee clearly felt that the presence of some of these people in the neighborhood has attracted others like them from outside of the neighborhood to events like the Portland Festival. Regardless of the origins and the intent of the sentiment visible at the festival, it had the effect of being exclusionary. This sentiment was evident to one of the interviewees in response to my questions about the Portland identity:

I would say there are folks who think they represent the Portland identity, but there are a number of voices they don’t represent and probably are not aware of. Like for example at the Portland Festival, which is the Portland Family Reunion Festival I think is the official name. I always thought it
interesting when I go there given the number of African-American residents in the neighborhood now that there are not many African Americans present. This last year was more so than in the past, but I think that is only a segment of the population that comes out for that (Interview #6).

A common vehicle for identity deployment in modern times, the t-shirt, materialized this sentiment ranging from blatant messages to more latent iconography. During my visit to the 2010 Portland Festival, there was no shortage of t-shirts being sold by vendors proclaiming “Portland is not the West End” (Figure 8.6). The official festival t-shirt was much more subtle in its message. The design featured many maritime symbols, such as anchors, rope, and a ship’s wheel, which Portland has frequently used to reflect its heritage as an important port. The design also included a *fleur di lies*, the symbol of Louisville, perhaps an acknowledgment of Portland’s connection to the City or a nod to its French heritage. Additionally, green clovers are visible on the design materializing the common perception that Portland was predominately Irish. As innocuous as these symbols are, their presence on t-shirts conveys a message of what and more importantly who Portland is, and it does not reflect or include its more recent residents.

One of the residents I interviewed was very involved with the organization of the festival and recognized the increasing negative perception of the event which detracts from its intent and purpose: “I want my grandchildren to live here and that is why I work and do what I do with the Portland Festival, it raises money for the community. The Festival people think it is just a big drunken party, but they don’t know everything about it. I explain it is not just a party, we raise money for a lot of groups.” (Interview #18). Since then, festival organizers have taken steps to dispel that perception by returning the
focus of the festival back to family, as there are now beer free zones and more diverse musical acts. However, the changes that occurred at the festival during the late 2000s represent the materialization of the sentiments that had been brewing in the neighborhood at that time concerning the influx of new residents displaced from the projects or living in subsidized housing, many of whom were African-American. This issue came to a head in late 2006 over a street name change which helped facilitate the deployment of identities meant to defend Portland from interlopers.

Figure 8.6. T-shirts for Sale at the Portland Festival in 2010.
In December of 2006, Louisville Metro Council proposed to rename 22nd Street to honor Dr. Martin Luther King. Since King’s death in 1968, there had been no significant honor for the slain civil-rights leader in Louisville and city leaders intended to rectify the situation by renaming a section of 22nd Street that runs through the West End and Portland (Shafer 2006a). This street was chosen to honor King, because he had led a march down the street and his brother had preached at one of several African-American churches along the street. Furthermore, the street passes through the West End, a predominately African-American area. However, city leaders failed to recognize that a portion of 22nd Street also runs through the heart of Portland and their proposal offended Portlanders in several ways and instigated a call to defend the neighborhood (Figure 8.7).
The proposed renaming of 22nd Street ignited a firestorm in Portland among residents whose patience ran out when it came to the changing demographics of the neighborhood and the City’s neglect of the neighborhood. The feelings culminated at a meeting held by several council members with residents of Portland to discuss the change. Around 140 people crowded into Nelligan Hall on Portland Avenue (Figure 8.3) to voice their displeasure with Metro Council and the idea of renaming one of their streets (Shafer 2006b). According to media reports, most of those who attended the meeting, 90 percent of whom were white, opposed the renaming. Comments from the residents reflected the underlying racial dichotomy that had been brewing in the neighborhood and the City’s tendency to either ignore Portland or push unwanted policies on them. One attendee at the meeting said “Dr. King did a lot of great things. However, he is not part of our community. This is about our identity.” Another resident suggested that those that supported the proposal were “troublemakers who knew this would cause a problem.” (Shafer 2006b). According to a newspaper article, many attendees “expressed concerns that the new street name might be confusing and would detract from Portland’s Irish and German heritage.”(Shafer 2006b). The meeting was contentious, as Portland residents confronted Metro Council members over the proposed renaming (Figure 8.8).
The consequences of this meeting were numerous and lasting for the residents of Portland and the perceptions of the neighborhood. For several weeks afterwards, the neighborhood and its residents were bashed in the editorial pages of the newspaper, leading to or confirming perceptions of Portland as white and racist. The damage that this issue caused to the neighborhood’s image was clearly concerning to many residents who did not oppose the renaming and to neighborhood leaders. My visit to a Portland NOW (neighborhood association) meeting revealed that many residents were upset with the way the neighborhood was being portrayed by the media and the neighborhood board discussed at length, strategies for combating the developing narrative about their neighborhood. An article in the neighborhood newspaper attempted to repair some of the damage by explaining Portland’s opposition to the renaming proposal and some of the underlying issues that it exposed.
A major roadway in Portland is 22nd Street…A few months ago a member of the Metro City Council suggested that 22nd Street be renamed to Martin Luther King Blvd. The suggestion was meant to honor a great leader however, the Metro City Council failed to ask Portland how they felt about that decision. Portland was concerned because we were not included on any discussions about our community…Now the issue has been dropped and the city council does not want to rename the street at all. When the citizens of Portland stood up and said “Wait a minute let’s talk about this.” We were all condemned to be racist. The people of Portland know the sting of prejudice and racism first hand because we are treated unfairly every day because of who we are and where we come from. People from all over Louisville look down their noses at us. The rich call us “Portland Trash” and say that we live in “Poor Land.” We might not drive the fancy car and have the big house of the most affluent neighborhoods. What we do have is a rich heritage dating back hundreds of years…We are hard-working people who do not have a voice in issues that face us. We are not all racist. Portland does not have anyone speaking up for us. (Portland Anchor, July 2007).

Eventually, the plan to rename 22nd Street was dropped and instead a portion of Interstate 65 that runs through downtown was named after Dr. King. However, the events surrounding this issue created a great deal of conflict and contrast which exposed identities in Portland and their deployment. The issue was mentioned several times in my interviews, representing a variety of perspectives, which mirrored the newspaper article. Many of these supported renaming 22nd Street, and interviewees “didn’t think it was a big deal.” An examination of the 22nd Street renaming controversy is an opportunity to see how identities are deployed, where they originate, and how the landscape can normalize them. It is interesting that my discussion of identity has come back to street names, as a significant change made to Portland’s landscape in the 1870s, which helped assimilate the community into the City of Louisville, has now become a bastion of Portland’s identity.
Summary and Discussion

This examination of identity in Portland has revealed that Portlanders see themselves as a working class and tight knit community that take care of its own. They are loyal, friendly, and neighborly, but they stand up for themselves and exhibit a great deal of pride in their neighborhood and its people. They see themselves as a diverse neighborhood, but one that is predominantly white that has a strong Irish and German heritage. They recognize that their neighborhood is historic and many of its families have lived there for generations. Certainly Portlanders are not the only people who see themselves in this way. There are residents in many of Louisville’s neighborhoods that see themselves in a similar way. These descriptions could just as easily be attributable to the residents of Butchertown, Irish Hill, or Germantown. However, Portland’s identities become more distinguishable when contrasted through conflict and threats to Portland’s culture and heritage and how its residents construct and deploy identities.

When tensions with the City government arise, Portlanders reach into their past to deploy an identity that substantiates its legitimacy as a unique neighborhood and makes evident its integral role in the establishment and prosperity of Louisville. Although many liberties are taken with the facts that comprise this identity, it establishes the Portland Neighborhood as important to the rest of the Louisville community when it is being neglected or bullied by the City government. This identity harkens back to Portland’s independent status of the nineteenth century, which underlies it but rarely references that past directly. This identity was built on layers of historical facts passed down and retold over generations and interpreted at the Portland Museum, in local media, and by local
historians and researchers. The ambiguity of this identity’s origin to Portlanders and the way local history is disseminated make, what is consciously deployed, also unconscious. For example, people will state that Portland is the oldest neighborhood and is where Louisville started when they are displeased with their treatment by the City, but they tend to have little understanding of where and how that identity was constructed. It was not until recently that the practice of deploying its nineteenth-century heritage had a place amongst the landscape. While it lived in neighborhood narratives, it was not anchored to a place or any tangible entity. With the revival of the Fort on Shore history and its claim by Portland, there is now a place with which that identity can be associated. And if plans for a park at that location are enacted, it can be materialized on the landscape.

Based on the interviews, the physical boundaries of the Portland Neighborhood figured prominently in its relationship with the City and adjacent communities. These boundaries were largely defined according to certain streets and the river, representing an unmarked physical boundary which had significant cultural implications. These boundaries represent some tension with the City over what is included within the Portland Neighborhood. In contrast, city government considers Portland to be anything west of 9th Street and north of Market Street. It was clear from the interviews that Portland residents have a different view of these boundaries, as 15th Street was the most often mentioned eastern boundary. This discrepancy demonstrates to residents that the City does not care about their perspective and frequently violates their perception of Portland’s boundaries by conflating it with other neighborhoods. Although there were many perspectives on what the boundaries of the neighborhood were, throughout the
interviews it was clear that they were distinct, for example one side of a street could be Portland and the other not. There are few if any signs that demarcate the boundaries of the Portland Neighborhood, but residents are all too aware of what Portland is and what is not. These boundaries have become very important in recent years, as Portland has erected cultural barriers along them to fend off threats to Portland’s identity from the influx of new residents and conflation with the West End. These boundaries and barriers have created a racialized landscape that defines Portland as white and the surrounding West End neighborhoods as black. The displacement of people from housing projects throughout the city, because of Hope VI projects and the increase in subsidized housing within the neighborhood, has brought a large number of new residents into Portland, mostly African Americans. These new residents are seen as the cause of negative perceptions that people outside of the neighborhood have of Portland, as there has been a rise in crime and they have not adopted the established identity. They are seen as jobless, not neighborly, and disrespectful.

With the establishment of these boundaries and the perceived threats to their identity, when the City proposed to rename 22nd Street, identities were deployed to combat the City’s disrespect and the encroachment of the West End across its boundaries. This encroachment was seen as a threat to Portland’s Irish and German heritage, as the change in the racial landscape could normalize a new non-white identity. Renaming 22nd Street would have been a change to Portland’s landscape that could potentially threaten Portland’s identity, by replacing it with another identity that represents the West End, African-Americans, and the City’s authority. Thus, the name 22nd Street became a part of
Portland’s identity in order to prevent the City from using another street name to normalize another identity. The Portland Festival can be seen in a similar light, as changes in the festival from its origins to exclude a segment of residents and accentuate another by catering to a particular group of people and with t-shirts.

The 22nd Street controversy provides some continuity in the use of street names and landscape to change Portland’s identity and then normalize it. The process of identity is visible in this diachronic perspective, as street name changes in the 1870s helped assimilate an independent Portland with Louisville and normalize Louisville’s way of naming streets. This change to the landscape essentially helped erase evidence of Portland’s independence and normalized Portland’s status as a neighborhood of Louisville. Along with the removal of the Portland Wharf landscape, the establishment of a new landscape along Portland Avenue helped facilitate the landscape and identity of Portland today. So much so, that Portlanders fight for the 22nd Street name, a product of that normalized landscape out of fear that the new name would normalize another identity. In this case, the changes to the landscape during the late nineteenth to early twentieth century normalized the landscape Portlanders cherish today as being important to their identity, which is exemplified by an article on Portland’s Streets in the Portland Anchor newspaper. Although the article discussed Portland’s status as an independent town with its own street names, there was little mention of streets in the wharf area. Only Water Street and Rudd Avenue were mentioned. Most of the article was focused on streets within the landscape that had been established along Portland Avenue and
Northwestern Parkway, including 22nd Street. The article tied Portland’s identity to these streets.

Many of these streets are held in great respect by Portlanders of today, although their names have been changed. The street that I grew up on, Lytle Street, was once Todd Street but to Portlanders of today, it is Lytle…Lytle Street between 15th and 17th, like so many other streets in Portland was an Irish community that knew and cared for its own…So the streets of Portland have had many names, but the North-South Streets have usually had numbers. Twenty-Second Street started life as 10th Cross Street. Although progress traditionally means change, it seems apropos that this tradition continues (Batliner 2007).

This article demonstrates the effectiveness at which street names imposed on Portland by the City of Louisville can under certain circumstances become, as much a part of Portland’s identity as, the Portland Wharf. Residents continue to see the streets as a manifestation of their identity, willing to fight to prevent them from being changed. Not only are the names being threatened, but how they operate as well. Two interviews mentioned a proposal by the City to turn some of Portland’s one-way streets back to two-way. Many of Portland’s streets were made one-way in the late twentieth century by the City to help facilitate traffic flow through Portland. City officials have recently touted that two-way streets are good for businesses and safer for residents. This proposal met with a great deal of opposition from residents, who are generally not trusting of any City proposal and again saw its streets as a part of its identity.

The tensions with the City and the threat to Portland’s identity precipitated the construction of a racialized cultural boundary around Portland that was materialized in the landscape through its streets abet a landscape that was historically a product of the
City. History and heritage play an important role in this process. History is deployed to remind the City about Portland’s legitimacy and relevancy. Irish and German ethnic identities are deployed when Portland’s racialized landscape is threatened from West End encroachment.

This examination of identity was not meant to portray Portlanders in any particular way. Certainly some of these identities and landscape have been racialized within the context of the examples examined. While clearly there are some racist tendencies among some of Portland’s residents, they should not characterize the neighborhood, as has been done in some media reports. Most the people interviewed exhibited no racist tendencies. The purpose here is to use the contrast and conflict that racialization has precipitated to examine the process by which identity is created, modified, erased, and materialized in the landscape.

It is clear from this examination of identity in Portland that a multitude of identities can be seen and the process by which they are created and deployed is complicated. However, it has also exposed the process of identity creation and modification and its relationship to history and heritage. The contrast created by the tension between residents of Portland and the city government demonstrates that there is a remnant of Portland’s independent identity that has been revived through the establishment of the Portland Museum, but has not been anchored in the landscape. Tensions between Portland residents and the influx and encroachment of the West End facilitated the deployment of several identities, some of which have become racialized.
Some identities are tied to misconceptions of history, while others have been normalized by the present day landscape which was developed from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century. The fight to save numbered streets that were imposed on the community during the nineteenth century is a prime example how previous identities were neutralized and new ones normalized in the landscape. Many of these identities are conscious to residents as they have been deployed for a purpose. However, residents were unaware of the origin of these identities and their basis was largely unconscious. For example, there has been a revival of Portland’s independent identity with the establishment of the Portland Museum in the 1970s, which underlies many identities within the subconscious. Clearly present day identities were influenced by more recent events and histories than those of the nineteenth century. Identities based on Portland’s nineteenth-century history were not anchored in the landscape and thus, this history has largely been forgotten or misconceived.
CHAPTER 9:
REMAKING THE PORTLAND WHARF

A Landscape of Clearance

When the flood protection levee was completed in 1947, the Portland Wharf became a landscape of clearance (Smith and Gazin-Schwartz 2008). The remnants of the wharf and the remaining buildings were leveled, the residents of the houseboat shanties that lived there were evicted, and the land was graded. What once had been the heart of a bustling town had become cleared of any evidence of that town (Figure 9.1). Portland’s landscape had been recreated as a neighborhood of Louisville and shifted to Portland Avenue, as the Portland Wharf’s landscape was cleared of the physical signs of its past. Amy Gazin-Schwartz (2008) describes three ways landscapes become cleared: abandonment, avoidance, and expulsion. The Portland Wharf was cleared through all three types. It was largely abandoned after successive floods destroyed much of the built environment and economic decline made reconstruction unprofitable. The people who reinhabited the landscape after abandonment and the few industries remaining were forcibly evicted in advance of the construction of the levee. Once the landscape had been cleared it was avoided due to regulations preventing construction at the site.

The clearance process and the resulting landscape effectively erased any evidence of Portland’s independent identity from the wharf. The cleared landscape promoted forgetting Portland’s independent identity and began to normalize a Portland identity that was cut off from the place and river where it was born. “Clearance of landscapes is about rupturing the sense of belonging, home, identity, and meaning; it is about the politics of
remembering and the politics of forgetting…” (Smith 2008:23). After clearance, the Portland Wharf landscape consisted of open fields and trees, which was occasionally used as passive space or for impromptu baseball games and to fish from the riverbank. The perspective of the landscape above the ground normalized forgetting what it once was. However, the evidence of the previous landscape lay just below the surface in the form of archaeological deposits, demonstrating that the landscape was not completely cleared, only that the visible landscape was cleared. The archaeological remnants of the previous landscape when made visible can reanimate the cleared landscape, suggesting that what happens after a landscape is cleared is just as important as how and why it was cleared in the first place.

Figure 9.1. Land Grading Activities at the Portland Wharf During Construction of the Floodwall in 1947 (Courtesy of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers).
The study of cleared landscapes has been focused on how and why landscapes were emptied, with particular attention to the economic, environmental, and socio-political causes (Gazin-Schwartz 2008). The process by which Portland Wharf’s landscape was cleared was a long one, taking nearly 50 years to be finalized. This process demonstrated how identity can be created, maintained, and erased. However, it is equally important to understand how cleared landscapes are used after they are cleared. The repopulation, reuse, and reanimation of a landscape provides a bridge between the process of identity in past landscapes and present landscapes. I think that the process of identity formation in a cleared landscape is more exposed to examination, as I can see the process in action and even participate. Gazin-Schwartz (2008) described the importance of how people respond to landscape clearance and the locus of decision making as variables in the land clearance process. I think these variables are just as important, if not more so in the reuse of a cleared landscape. The same questions apply to the reuse of a cleared landscape; why is it being reused, what is the response to reuse, and where is the locus of decision making for its reuse? The Portland Wharf landscape demonstrates this process well and the process of landscape reuse provides us with a view of identity formation.

In order to understand the reuse of the Portland Wharf landscape today, we have to examine the impetus for reusing it, which has much to do with the consequences of the landscape that replaced it. By the late 1940s, as the clearance of the Portland Wharf was being completed with the construction of the flood levee, a new landscape had normalized Portland’s identity as a neighborhood of Louisville. However, this new
identity did not completely erase Portland’s other identities. These identities, including
its independent identity, latently resided in the neighborhood’s history. A history that
had few cues in the landscape, but one that would be reused in a remade landscape as
heritage.

The Revival of Portland’s Independent Identity

The revival of Portland’s Independent identity began in the late 1950s and early
1960s, as post World War II suburban development began to take its toll on Louisville’s
inner city neighborhoods. Some of Louisville’s first residential neighborhoods that
extended west from the central core saw a mass exodus of its upper and middle class base
and an influx of low income residents (Yater 1987). With this transformation that was
taking place in most of America’s older cities at the time, housing and property values
plummeted and neighborhood demographics changed. In Louisville, the draw of the
suburbs was strong, but the development of Rubbertown, a large chemical manufacturing
district in the West End, is what drove many residents to the suburbs. As neighborhoods
in the West End became devalued and marginalized, they took on a new perception.
These neighborhoods became predominantly poor and African American.

Portland ironically also experienced this inner city decline. This neighborhood
which started as a town that seemed quite distant from Louisville was at this time
considered inner city. However, Portland’s population remained fairly stable during this
change, as most of its residents had been well established in the neighborhood since the
end of the nineteenth century with the residential expansion around Portland Avenue that
occurred at that time. Several generations of Portlanders had lived in the neighborhood since then and had developed a close knit community. However, the Portland neighborhood began to lose its base population, experience declining home values, and an influx of low income families from Appalachia (Abell 2009). The result of this process was that Louisville’s west end became predominantly African American, while Portland had maintained its racial make-up of around 20 percent African American, the same distribution as Louisville as a whole. During a time of much racial tension, the demographics of Louisville’s western neighborhoods took on a racial perspective. West Louisville had clearly become predominantly African-American, being nearly 90 percent African American (Watrous 1977). Meanwhile, Portland was seen as a white enclave surrounded by African-American neighborhoods. This perception and the clear racial distinction along the geographical boundaries of the neighborhoods created a threat to the Portland Neighborhood and its identity.

With the contrast of the surrounding neighborhoods, Portland took on a new identity that was created and maintained by the landscape developed in the 1880s. By the 1960s, Portland was different than the other neighborhoods around it and its residents began to deploy various identities to further distinguish themselves and to confront the threat to its identity posed by racial influx, property devaluation, loss of population base, and urban renewal (See Chapter 8). In particular, the community reached into its past to deploy identities that would further distinguish it from its neighbors.
To help defend the neighborhood’s identity, residents revived its independent identity, which resided in the stories and history of the community. Given the landscape of the time, which emphasized the racial and economic differences of Portland compared to its surrounding neighbors, the revival of the community’s past as an independent town could be used to further accentuate differences. This independent identity also draws upon Portland’s historic tension with the City of Louisville, as the perception was that city leaders ignored and neglected the neighborhood leading to its degradation. The deployment of this identity was not only a reminder of Portland’s independent roots, but also provided a historical basis for new animosity towards the city. As with most economically depressed communities, residents of Portland and the West End felt neglected by the larger city government, which became the target of their angst. Portland’s historic antagonistic relationship with Louisville helped provide historical legitimization of this renewed attitude.

The most visible distinguishing aspect of Portland in the 1960s and 1970s was the stark racial differences with its surrounding neighbors. Although Portland had been home to a variety of ethnicities, including African Americans, from its initial development, it contrasted with the nearly all African-American neighborhoods that surrounded the community and had the perception of being a white enclave. Residents sought to embrace this racial difference by deploying an ethnic identity based on Irish ancestry. At this time Portland had the perception of being a historically white and Irish neighborhood. With the desire to distinguish their neighborhood from those surrounding it, residents became interested in defining neighborhood boundaries, spatially what
Portland is and does and does not include. There were a variety of perceptions about these boundaries, some of which were frequently contested (see Chapter 8).

In 1978, Portland sought to materialize its independent identity and history through the establishment of the Portland Museum (Figure 9.2). It was founded by elementary school teachers to be an educational resource and to collect, preserve, exhibit, interpret, and enhance Portland’s culture and heritage. The museum became a place where Portland’s story could be told. A few years after the museum was founded, residents became interested in more than just telling Portland’s story, but also reanimating the place where it was born, the Portland Wharf. Although the landscape at the wharf bore no resemblance to its more prosperous past, residents and the museum sought to tie their stories to a real place where what could only be depicted in diorama exhibits actually happened. They recognized that remains of the former landscape were likely present beneath the current landscape. Inspired by the idea that Portland the independent town could be buried just over the levee, school children dreamed up the idea of turning the unused land into an archaeology and heritage park in the early 1980s (Portland Museum 2003).

At this time, archaeology was becoming a part of the plan to restore the Portland Wharf landscape, as residents wanted a material connection to their independent identity. However, in order to generate interest in the idea of archaeology at the wharf, residents called upon archaeologists to locate resources at the wharf and demonstrate their importance. At the time, archaeology in Kentucky was thought by most people to be focused on prehistoric Native Americans, as historical archaeology was just getting
established. In 1982, the University of Louisville conducted test excavations that demonstrated that intact remains of the wharf and surrounding community were present. The Portland Museum asked Marley Brown, a noted historical archaeologist at Colonial Williamsburg, to assess the potential of the Portland Wharf for public archaeology. Dr. Brown wrote a letter stating that the site was well preserved, had considerable research potential, and could have an effective public program (Brown 1985). His letter essentially certified that the Portland Wharf was an important archaeological site worthy of interpretation. It represents the impetus for all future excavations at the site and legitimized the dream of building an archaeology and heritage park at the wharf.

Figure 9.2. The Portland Museum.
Some attempts were made to physically alter the landscape at the Portland Wharf and reconnect Portland with the river. In the 1990s, a portion of the Riverwalk trail system was built by the City of Louisville at the site. The Riverwalk initiative was designed to reconnect people to the river all along Louisville’s waterfront. A trail system was to extend along the river from downtown’s Waterfront Park to Shawnee Park in the West Louisville neighborhoods, which would promote exercise and recreation along the river. The city Public Works department built a portion of the trail through the old Portland Wharf area. With assistance from the Portland Museum some interpretation of Portland’s history was incorporated into the project. The asphalt path began at 31st Street and the levee, extending along the top of the levee before descending towards the river at 33rd Street. The path was designed to follow the old street grid to symbolically mimic the historic streets, thus it extended down the what would have been 33rd (Fulton) Street, then made a left turn on what would have been Florida Street (First Alley) and then a right turn on 34th (Commercial) Street at which point it became a trail that meandered amongst the cottonwood trees along the river west towards Shawnee Park (Figure 9.3). Embedded within the asphalt pavement were markers that referenced the wharf’s history, including markers on the descent from the levee showing the high water marks of various floods and random lists of businesses that had once occupied Water Street. The trail was supposed to provide some symbolic sense of what used to be on the landscape when the Portland Wharf was a thriving river community. This effort represents the first attempt to reclaim the Portland Wharf and reconnect it with the Portland Neighborhood.
It is within the context of the materialization of the Portland independent identity at the Portland Museum, the Portland Wharf, and the deployment of ethnic identity to distinguish the neighborhood, that identity in the present is derived. Thus, Portland’s independent identity in the present is about remembering what was forgotten and creating public memories about Portland’s independent past. The place where Portland’s independence was most evident was the Portland Wharf. It was the place where the events of an independent Portland took place. The area encompassed within Portland Wharf Park was the location where the steamboats landed, unloaded and loaded cargo, and embarked and disembarked thousands of passengers. It was the commercial, economic, and cultural center of Portland. The remembrance and commemoration of this
past became the heritage of Portlanders that was integral to the revival of the Portland’s independent identity and the place where it happened is important to that process (Till 2005). However, in order for the Portland Wharf, the place that embodies Portland’s independent identity, to facilitate a public memory of that identity, that landscape needs to be reanimated or interpreted to help convey that narrative and create heritage (Casey 2004; Valdez del Alamo and Pendergast 2000; Shackel 2001). In other words, the Portland Wharf landscape needs to be changed in order to revive, recreate, and maintain Portland’s independent identity. How that landscape is changed is just as important as the resulting product.

The process by which the landscape is reanimated lends a sense of authenticity and legitimacy to the heritage it reinforces. Thus, the Portland Wharf just can’t be designated a park and then populated with interpretive signs and facsimiles of the former built environment; these things need to be connected to real evidence, ruins, and objects from the past (Valdez del Alamo and Pendergast 2000). The archaeological remains present at the Portland Wharf serves the role of providing process and authenticity to the reanimation of the Portland Wharf landscape. An expert can designate a place as important. “Scientists thus appear to have a certain power; they can create a place by pointing their official fingers at one body of water rather than another” (Tuan 1977:162). Such is the case when Marley Brown, a noted historical archaeologist, determined that the archaeological resources at the Portland Wharf were significant and important. Thus, archaeologists become the purveyors of an authorized discourse that places them within the process of identity creation (Smith 2006). This situation presents the archaeologist
with the opportunity to create activist goals in addition to their research goals, as well as have a role in how the results and products of their research are used. With this in mind, archaeologists could take the perspective of activist and help reclaim landscapes that create, modify, or maintain identities and could benefit communities (Potter 1999; Atalay et al. 2014; Stottman 2010).

A Plan to Remake The Portland Wharf

In 2000, nearly 20 years after the idea of creating a history park at the Portland Wharf was proposed, the City of Louisville funded the development of a plan for the park. The idea was to create a landscape at the old wharf site that would inform and engage visitors about the history of Portland. The plan, which would become the Portland Wharf Park master plan, was a product of a two-year collaboration of residents, neighborhood groups, the Portland Museum, Louisville Metro Parks, professional park designers, and various other technical advisors and advisory committees. This planning process is how I became involved in research at the Portland Wharf Park, as I served on one of the technical advisory committees. This process included public meetings and design charrettes to solicit ideas and feedback from neighborhood residents about the goals, elements, and interpretive focus of the park.

The result of the planning process was a 93-page report that detailed background information on the history, topography, river hydrology, and existing conditions; the results of the public meetings, workshops, and design charrettes; interpretive potential; and a plan (Rhodeside & Harwell 2002). Visions for the park that were considered most
important, as a result of the process, included the use of the archaeological resources, re-establishing a connection to the river, increasing public access to the river, developing educational programming, protecting natural areas, linking the park to others in Louisville, redesigning streetscapes in the neighborhood outside the park, encouraging reinvestment in surrounding areas, and creating a unique historical destination. Major elements of the plan included the development of trails through the natural preserves in the western portion of the park, creating an opening in the levee for access, developing an archaeology park with interpretive history and public archaeological programming, a visitor’s center, and a market corridor connecting the park to the neighborhood. The master plan, if implemented would significantly alter the existing Portland Wharf landscape to one that would emphasize the plan’s heritage narrative. Of particular interest to my study of identity in the landscape is the use of archaeology and history to tell Portland’s history.

A major component of the master plan is the telling of Portland’s history legitimized and authenticated through archaeology. Portland’s nineteenth-century story, when it was a town with a bustling wharf and businesses, is the focus of this effort. The famous people who lived in or passed through town, the industries, the underground-railroad connection, and Portland’s bitter battle with Louisville over the railroad are interpretive foci (Rowland Design 2008). The master plan called for the reconstruction of one or two buildings discovered by archaeological work, uncovering historic street pavement, and active ongoing archaeological research to connect real objects from the wharf to the interpretation (Figure 9.4) (Rhodeside & Harwell 2002). Later iterations of
the plan scrapped the building reconstructions, but instead focused on the use of original or replica streetscape elements, such as pavement and foundation outlines of buildings (Figure 9.5). However, a constant since the idea of the park was born has been the use of public archaeology as a participatory activity that would allow visitors to physically engage with the history of Portland.

Figure 9.4. Archaeology at Portland Wharf Park as Envisioned by the Master Plan (Rhodeside and Harwell 2002).

Figure 9.5. A Rendering of Portland Wharf Park from the Master Plan (Rhodeside and Harwell 2002).
The master plan demonstrates that the Portland Wharf Park is to be a carefully designed landscape that is intended to articulate a particular message and narrative within clearly defined goals. This landscape has a purpose that is largely aimed at reinforcing Portland’s independent and historic identities and creating new identities relevant to current issues. However, the trials and tribulations of implementing the plan have actually worked to reinforce current attitudes and identities in the neighborhood.

**Portland Wharf Made a Park**

There is no doubt that the Portland Wharf master plan is ambitious and expensive. The reopening of the flood levee alone would cost several million dollars even if the agencies that manage the flood protection system would allow it to happen (PDR Engineers 2002). Thus, the chances that the entire ambitious plan could be implemented were fairly remote. However, the creation of Portland Wharf Park that implements some goals and elements of the master plan were well within the realm of possibility. In 1999, before the master plan was completed, the Portland Wharf was officially designated a park by the City of Louisville. However, there was little fanfare or celebration. The designation as a park was a mere formality that took place between two agencies of city government. The 55 acres of excess land that had been cleared for the construction of the levee had been under the control of the Public Works department was transferred to Metro Parks and officially became Portland Wharf Park, one of the largest additions to the parks system in 20 years.
Although the Portland Wharf had been made a park, it did not look much like one and very little changed initially other than the erection of a sign with the park name. At this time, the park was overgrown with scrub trees and young forest. The river walk trail descended into the forest and did little to indicate its designation as a park (Figure 9.6). It looked more like surplus property at this time, than it did just 20 years previous during the first archaeological investigations. The designation of the Portland Wharf as a park did little to change the landscape and indicate its independent and prosperous past.

In 2002, with the completion of the master plan report, Metro Parks began an effort to implement the plan. Since archaeology was a major focus of the master plan, Metro Parks initiated a complete archaeological survey of the park to locate and assess the archaeological potential and designate areas of significant archaeological deposits. The results of the survey identified five areas within the park as having intact archaeological deposits and it was recommended that they should be the focus of archaeological research (See Chapter 4). As a result of the archaeological survey, Metro Parks had a better handle on the location and nature of the archaeological deposits within the park and thus could move forward with master plan implementation.

Given the state of the park in 2002, Metro Parks wanted to find a way to make the land look more like a park. However, there was little funding for implementation of the master plan and immediate visible results in the park were needed to assure residents that development was moving forward. Thus, Metro Parks initiated the Ghost Streets project in 2003. Given that the construction of the river walk trail through the park did not
provide enough of a physical indication of the previous cultural landscape, the Ghost Streets project was intended to help better define the old street grid and clear some of the forest to develop a more park-like landscape. Thus, the forest was cleared from the original street right of ways to restore the original street grid pattern. In the block between 33rd and 34th Streets, which was designated an important archaeological area, the entire block was cleared of most trees except for a few older trees (Figure 9.7). Additionally a large borrow pit was filled and leveled. The street boundaries in this area were demarcated with large stone blocks salvaged from the old locks in the canal. This work created a large open grass field with a few trees that would provide opportunities for passive and active park usage as well as allow easier access to the archaeological resources for public programming. The Ghost Streets project literally carved the old Portland Wharf street grid into the forest landscape, imposing some sense that it was once a town. It represents the most drastic change to the Portland Wharf landscape since the levee was constructed and it was one that was intended to communicate a physical clue to Portland’s independent past.

In 2005 and 2006, Metro Parks funded additional archaeological work to determine the extent and significance of the intact deposits, develop research goals, and design and test public archaeology programming. The results of that work, much of which is presented in this dissertation, determined that extensive archaeological deposits extending nearly 1.8 m (6 ft.) deep and dating to the early nineteenth century are present at the Portland Wharf site. Thus, the Portland Wharf Park site, also known as Portland Proper, was in 2006, listed on the National Register for Historic Places.
Also during 2005 and 2006 projects, a number of public archaeology programs were designed and tested, including participatory excavations, tours, and interpretive signage. The results of the public programming test determined that a number of strategies could be implemented as part of park programming. However it also identified
several obstacles to programming, such as poor access to the site, lack of amenities, poor security, and the threat of flooding to ongoing excavations (Stottman 2014).

In addition to conducting archaeological research and public programming, a park usage survey was conducted to assess how many people visited the park and what activities they did there (Appendix E). During the 44-day period that the archaeological project took place, a total of 1,542 people visited the park. Most of these people (66 percent) visited while cycling, walking, or running on the trail. In these instances the park itself was not a destination, but visitors were merely passing through using the trail. However, the public archaeology programming conducted during that time drew nearly 400 people, representing 25 percent of the total visitors. In some cases, people using the trail stopped to participate in some of the public archaeology programming. Of the destination activities at the park, public archaeology drew the most participants. Other destination activities were minimally represented and included picnicking and fishing.

From the park usage survey, it can be concluded that public archaeology and the site’s history has the potential to attract people to the park and help it become a destination (Figure 9.8). In order to further understand archaeology’s and the park’s role in the development of Portland’s heritage, an exit survey of those that participated in public archaeology programming was conducted (Appendix C and D). Of the people that participated in the public archaeology program, most (60.8 percent) participated in the tour of the archaeological site, while 31.7 percent participated in the dig program. A small percentage (7.5 percent) of people only participated in a self-guided tour, featuring
interpretive signage. Most (87.2 percent) of those that participated in the test programs were interested in participating in future archaeology programs at the park.

Figure 9.8. Public Archaeology at the Portland Wharf.

The exit surveys also indicate that the public archaeology programs had the ability to draw people into the neighborhood and/or expose a wide variety of people to the Portland area. Of the 134 people who completed exit surveys, most (79.2 percent) were neither residents nor former residents of Portland. They represented 46 different zip codes, six states, and eight counties in Kentucky. Most (80 percent) of the people were from the Louisville area or Southern Indiana, as they hailed from 21 different Louisville neighborhoods or suburban cities. These results indicate that a diversity of people, many of whom (54.5 percent) were from the wealthier eastern Louisville or the eastern suburbs
and were unlikely to visit Portland as a destination otherwise. The exit surveys demonstrated that a variety of people were being exposed to the neighborhood and its history through the programs.

The majority (97.8 percent) of those that participated felt that the programs increased their knowledge of Portland’s history and 82 percent indicated that the programs affected their perception of the neighborhood. None of the participants thought that the programs affected their perception of the neighborhood in a negative way, as nearly 80 percent thought it was positive. Of the people asked about their impression of Portland prior to participating in the program, 39.6 percent stated positive, 25 percent negatively, and 35.4 percent were neutral. Participants, when elaborating on how their perception changed, indicated that they were not aware that Portland had a rich history or how important the community was. For example, one respondent said “I was unaware of the wharf.” Other comments included “I realized that this area was much more active and prosperous than I realized”; “I’ve worked in the area for over 30 years and had not learned much of the pre-I-64 history”; “Where the actual town was, I’ve biked through here and never knew”; and “As a native of Louisville, my perception of Portland was negative (crime and poverty), through this project I now see Portland, as rich in history and presently a strong working class community of families.” The exit surveys seem to indicate that the public archaeology programs had increase knowledge of Portland’s history and positively affected participant’s perception of Portland.

Although it is clear that the park’s public archaeology programs affected the knowledge and perceptions of people from outside of the Portland neighborhood, the exit
surveys also indicated that residents and former residents also gained more knowledge and/or their perceptions were affected. Most of these (88.5 percent) also reported that the programs affected their perception of the neighborhood. Comments from residents and former residents included: “It is very educational and helps me learn about my heritage”; “Learned that where I played in the 60s was actually buildings at one time”; and “Portland was once a very important and useful community.”

The exit surveys conducted during the public archaeology testing programs clearly demonstrate that active heritage programming at Portland Wharf Park could greatly affect perceptions of the Portland Neighborhood, increase knowledge of its history, and expose that history to a variety of people who resided outside of the neighborhood. However, the archaeology programming was conducted for just a limited time and has no permanent presence at the park. Thus, unless a permanent and regular public programming is instituted, as indicated in the park master plan, it has little lasting impact on Portland’s identity and people’s perceptions.

Although people were excited to see something happening at the park, they realized that more is needed and this sentiment was apparent in the comments and suggestions of those that took exit surveys. There were many comments about the lack of amenities, the poor condition of the park, and limited access to the park. For example, a sample of the comments included: “It should be more accessible and more inviting”; “Landscaping is always nice!”; “…it should be treated as an actual park instead of a glorified pasture.”; “Keep it mowed and landscaped so it looks like a park.”; “Keep the
grass mowed, set up grills, possibly a small shelter, and soccer goals”; “Perhaps a shelter and more permanent restrooms are in order”; and “Parking and restaurant to bring people down here and enjoy and learn about our great city and neighborhood.”

Furthermore, there were comments about the overall need for some physical elements of landscape, such as interpretive signage, historic street signs, exposed foundations, reconstructions, or facsimiles of the historic landscape on display. Some comments included: “Make permanent exhibits of the excavations such as sections of the streets or interesting foundations.”; “Maybe a memorial statue, fountain, or street signs for the original streets”; “I am looking forward to seeing historic buildings rebuilt or foundations laid out, would love to see a model of what the city looked like in the 1800s”; and “Permanent markers, maps, etc.” The participants in the public archaeology programs recognized the impermanence of the activities and clearly thought that some permanence was needed on the landscape.

Although people were happy to see activities taking place in the park, they did so with some trepidation. A resident remarked “Being from Portland, I am glad to see that things are moving along” while another said “There needs to be more funding to finish excavations, the dock on the river, and the total project.” As part of the guided tours and the temporary signage that we installed at the park, we informed the participants about the master plan for the park and the need to fund the initiative. Although this information was not the focus of our presentations, it clearly resonated with the participants through their comments. Given the rather poor condition of the park, it was easy for even the
non-residents to see the need for follow through from the City. There were many comments about funding and the master plan, such as “Provide project funding in order to continue to help community outreach and education” and “We would love to see the master plan executed.” Unfortunately, the impermanence of the public archaeology projects conducted could do more harm than good for the residents of Portland. Without some real material changes to the landscape, the archaeology project could be seen as just another temporary program that the City occasionally does to make it look like something is happening at the park. Residents could see the lack of follow through as another example of the City abandoning and neglecting them.

The usage and public archaeology exit surveys clearly demonstrate the potential that the Portland Wharf Park has for being an important heritage site for the Portland Neighborhood. They also exposed the importance of the condition and materiality of the landscape for creating permanence for the history being told there. Although the programs really seem to resonate with and expose Portland’s heritage to many people who lived outside of Portland, the surveys provided some insight into the residents and former residents who participated. The surveys in addition to the interviews conducted suggested that some of the residents and former residents have poor knowledge of the facts about their community’s history and of its independent past. The lack of understanding about Portland’s nineteenth century history and its independence demonstrates the relationship between heritage and identity to the landscape and tells us about the effectiveness of the efforts to create and revive heritage and identity.
It is clear from the interviews (Chapter 8) that efforts initiated in the late 1970s to promote culture and heritage through the Portland Museum have made an impact amongst residents. Nearly all of the interviewees had heard of the museum or had been there at least once. Some recognized the museum as the main source of their knowledge of Portland’s history and noted that this institution was a point of pride for the neighborhood. Current and former residents indicated that Portland was unique in that it was the only neighborhood in Louisville that had its own dedicated museum. Louisville as a whole does not have such a museum. However, many of those interviewed seem to have a rather limited knowledge of Portland’s early history and its independent status or if they did, there were misperceptions about it. Those that demonstrated extensive and accurate knowledge of these was a professional historian or a few who had conducted their own extensive research. It is clear from the interviews that elements of Portland’s early history and independence had been used in the deployment of recent identities, but had been conflated with various other histories or events (See Chapter 8). This situation demonstrates that remembering this history and identity through the Portland Museum or generational narratives was limited. The removal of the landscape where that history took place, greatly affected how it is remembered and subsequently used and deployed.

As has been demonstrated in this dissertation, the landscape is essential to the permanence of heritage and identity. It is clear that the identities and history most remembered and used by Portlanders were derived from more recent history that took place during the twentieth century and materialized in the landscape that was established in the late 1800s. Elements of this landscape, such as numbered streets, like 22nd Street
and the neighborhood boundaries that extend far beyond the original town of Portland, have become a part of Portland’s identity. Thus, the fragments of Portland’s history from the nineteenth century that are not materialized in the landscape are misperceived or misunderstood if they are remembered at all. Although Portland’s independent identity had been revived in more recent times to help distinguish it from other neighborhoods and combat City government, the history of this independence is often lacking, as the identity resides latently in the Portland pride or attitude. Although efforts to revive Portland’s independent identity through the Portland Museum or cultural events like the Portland Festival have helped recreate an independent sentiment, residents are largely unconscious of its origin and history limiting its ability to benefit the community. Thus, it is essential that the Portland independent identity be anchored and memorialized in the landscape. The recreation of the Portland Wharf landscape can provide a place of remembrance and authenticity that will allow Portlanders to convert their history into heritage and revive its independent identity.

The creation of Portland Wharf Park has the potential to have a lasting effect on the interpretation of Portland’s history and its use in the creation, modification, and erasure of identity. The interpretation presented, the activities performed, the visuals, and the feel at the park will be concretized. But, the process of its creation and use becomes subject to the politics and power struggles of the present. Who decides what the park looks like and what will be interpreted? Was the process inclusive? Does it represent Portland? The creation of this landscape will undoubtedly have an effect on how Portlanders learn about and understand their history, as well as defining Portland’s
identity. It may be a bit naïve to place so much importance on the Portland Wharf Park landscape, but it does have the potential to be very important in the creation and deployment of Portland’s identity. Everyone involved in the creation of Portland Wharf Park has a responsibility to the consequences that could result. Thus, it would be disingenuous to pretend that this park could be created without consequences, because there will be consequences, good and bad. Those involved must think about the potential consequences and even guide them. Thus, it is easy for planners, City officials, neighborhood leaders, and even archaeologists to create this park and let things happen as they may, without any recognition of the landscape’s power and ability to instigate change. The responsible thing to do is to recognize, anticipate, and control consequences. We must create a process that collaborates with a community and places responsibility for the consequences on everyone. Furthermore, such a process provides an opportunity to use the power of the park to help the community. As such, archaeologists within this process have the opportunity to be activists and advocate for the community.

**Activist Archaeologists at The Portland Wharf Park**

Over the last fifteen years there has much momentum in the development of activist approaches to the practice of archaeology, which seek to bring archaeologists into the issues of the present and benefit the communities in which we work (Atalay et al. 2014; Derry and Malloy 2003; Little 2002; Little and Shackel 2007; Little and Zimmerman 2010; McGuire 2008; Sabloff 2008; Stottman 2010). Building on the work of archaeologists that wanted to create a more self-reflexive and critical archaeology in
the 1980s, significant discussions and debates have taken place to examine the role of archaeological research and practice in the politics of present day communities. These discussions have moved beyond questions of “Should we delve into issues of contemporary society” to “How do we do it effectively and ethically?” (Atalay et al. 2014; Stottman 2010). As of yet, an activist archaeology that encompasses its iterations in all forms of archaeology has not been fully defined.

Activism is difficult to define within the varied landscape and contexts of archaeology and will inevitably have different goals and challenges depending on where and with whom it is practiced (Atalay et al. 2014; Ferguson 2014). For example, advocacy within a contemporary historic period American community is far different than in a contemporary Native American community, whereas advocacy is welcomed and encouraged in one and often seen as oppressive in the other (Ferguson 2014; Stottman 2014). Although discussions continue, many archaeologists agree that at least sometimes activism has a place in archaeology and that we should use archaeology in a transformative way (Atalay et al. 2014).

It is not my aim to have a debate or discussion of activist and transformative archaeology here, as I and others have extensively written on the subject (Atalay et al. 2014; Derry and Malloy 2003; Little 2002; Little and Shackel 2007; Little and Zimmerman 2010; McGuire 2008; Sabloff 2008; Stottman 2010). However, it is important to discuss and define activism in relation to the archaeology conducted at the Portland Wharf, as I have used it as a case study for activist archaeology (Prybylski and
Activism is particularly relevant to the archaeology that has been conducted at the park and my role in the plans to create the Portland Wharf Park landscape. Activism for me is the recognition that there are present day consequences to archaeological work and that we should use the products and process of archaeology to collaboratively benefit the communities in which we work. I argue that the practice of an activist archaeology is based in public archaeology and applied anthropology (Stottman 2010).

In the case of the Portland Wharf Park project, I have taken an activist approach from the very beginning when I was first asked to participate in the park planning process as a member of the technical subcommittee. I was invited by the community to participate in the park planning process because of my expertise. I was seen as someone who could help them realize their dream of using the archaeological resources at Portland Wharf to benefit their community. I am what could be similar to an “expert witness” (Ferguson 2014). Archaeologists often serve the role of expert, being called upon to use their education, training, and experience to answer questions about a variety of archaeological, heritage preservation, and cultural issues. Ferguson notes: “Ideally, the service of an expert witness is grounded in objectivity and scholarship that is explicitly not advocacy, and is not bias toward finding only the results that a client desires” (2014:247). Thus, we are needed for our expertise which may conflict with our desire to be advocates for a community. Although Ferguson is referring specifically to the times that we may actually be called to serve as a witness in legal proceedings, I would argue that when we are called upon for our expertise in other contexts, it can cause similar
predicaments. Such a case is my initial role with the Portland Wharf Park planning process. I was being invited to provide technical expertise, however I recognized the challenges that the community faced and their desire to use archaeology for their purposes. Thus, I was invited not only to provide technical advice, but also to help the community to use the archaeological resources for their benefit. I was being asked to be an advocate for the community through my expertise. So, I had to step outside of my training in objectivity, and advise with the aim to use archaeology for a particular purpose. However, there are complications and consequences to this idea. I was faced with questions about how do I know what the community wants? How can I represent their needs and wants? And what are the consequences of my advocacy? Will my actions function as intended and will there be unintended consequences?

The process of creating Portland Wharf Park was intended to be collaborative from the master planning to the implementation. The community participated in most aspects of the process. Public meetings, design charrettes, interviews, surveys were all used during the master planning process by the design consultants to gather input from the community. But, ultimately the task of designing and creating the vision and plan falls to the professional architects, designers, planners, and archaeologists with their expertise. The community has to trust that we can take their input and create a park that will represent and benefit them. The result will undoubtedly represent most of the community, but it also will disenfranchise others. My role as objective expert may occasionally clash with my role to serve the community. What I learn from the archaeological record may not be consistent with the heritage and identities the
community wants to portray. Some members of the community may not see value in the archaeology and work against it and the messages intended from the landscape created at the park. Thus, there is a struggle between our role as expert and our desire to be an advocate and do what is right for the community. What the experts create at the Portland Wharf will have an effect on the community. The narratives that are presented and the story that is told and inscribed on the landscape puts us in a position that allows us to be advocates but also take a position of power and create what Laurajane Smith (2006) calls an “authorized discourse.” Because of our position as experts, our discourse can be seen as carrying more weight and authority. The narrative presented at the Portland Wharf Park is a discourse authorized by the experts in the name of the community.

I recognize that the landscape that we create and its reanimation through public programming will have an effect on the community’s perception of its history and heritage, as well as foster the creation and modification of identity. This park will reinforce some existing identities and erase others. It will normalize the identities that are created at the risk of neutralizing identities that the existing landscape has fostered over the last 100 years. It is hoped that what is interpreted at the Portland Wharf Park will help create identities that will benefit the community, but I also recognize that it could just as well reinforce or foster others that will not.

Although the park master plan represents the broad conceptual idea for what the park can be, the interpretive plan details what narrative will be presented at the park and represents an aspect of the master plan that can easily become reality. This narrative and
its accompanying landscape will have the most immediate and lasting impact on the Portland Identity. The interpretive plan was developed by a committee of professionals and park planning consultants drawing from the results of the master planning public input process. The interpretive plan committee included representatives from the Portland Museum, several neighborhood representatives, and me. The consulting team included an architect and designers. This team was tasked by Louisville Metro Parks to create themes that would be interpreted in the park and design the physical landscape, such as signage, hardscape, vegetation, trails, and entrances that could be realistically implemented given budget realities.

The budget for Portland Wharf Park is a discussion unto itself, reflecting the saga of the Portland people and the politics of Louisville City government. When the Portland Wharf master planning process was initiated in 1999, the City of Louisville was an entity separate from the Jefferson County government. The mayor took on Portland Wharf as one of his pet projects and allocated money for the master planning process and earmarked over $300,000.00 for implementation. The actual cost to enact the master plan fully would be in the millions (PDR Engineers 2002). Despite the budget discrepancies, the Portland Wharf project had a rather sizable amount of money designated for its creation and the full support of the mayor and his administration. However, the project over the next 15 years would become somewhat of a political football and its funding constantly threatened. When the City of Louisville and Jefferson County governments merged in 2003, the fortunes of Portland Wharf Park became ambiguous. The new Metro government mayor had no interest in the park and Metro Parks had no mandate to create
it. The funding earmarked for the park was reallocated and converted to other types of funds that made it difficult to use for park projects. However, the Portland Museum, neighborhood leaders, and some dedicated Metro Parks staff fought to keep the process going and create and implement an interpretive plan.

The basis of the interpretive plan was to make Portland Wharf Park look like a park, give a sense of the location’s former iteration as a town, and tell Portland’s nineteenth-century history. A key to the project was reestablishing the street grid within the forested current landscape. Thus, the interpretive plan built on the Ghost Streets Project, which had created cleared and mowed strips along the original streets in and around the wharf. This particular project had created an imprint of the original grid system of the town and cleared the dense vegetation from the area with the most intact archaeological deposits. The idea of the interpretive plan was to build on that landscape and introduce other defining features of the streets and former built environment and provide interpretation (Rowland Design 2008). Thus, the physical landscape will convey the sense that a town was located there, which will be accomplished by further defining the street grid with vegetation variations of mowed grass and plantings that distinguish it from the surrounding forest and clearing. These areas will convey the width of the streets, one of the character defining elements of Portland’s early streets (Figure 9.9). Markers signifying street names used in the original town will be placed at street corners.
Figure 9.9. A Proposed Interpretive Node at Portland Wharf Park (Rowland Design 2008).

A series of 15 interpretive nodes will be developed along the entrance trail and at street intersections, representing individual historical themes. Each node will incorporate sections of pavement reminiscent of paving types used historically at the town, as well as gutters and sidewalks. The pavement defines each interpretive node, which also features interpretive signage for the theme designated for that location. Nodes also will include some streetscape elements such as benches and curbing to further convey a sense of the former streets. Physical reminders of the built environment also will be incorporated, providing a sense of how the area was developed, including uncovered or recreated building foundations within the cleared area. One interpretive node, the intersection of Commercial Street and First Alley, will be the location of the outdoor classroom and
pavilion, which will provide some amenities for the park and be the focus of interpretations and educational activities. The plan also addresses a main entrance for the park at the Riverwalk trail head, directing people down the path into the park and providing additional interpretive opportunities (Rowland Design 2008).

A major aspect of this plan is the interpretive nodes which will tell Portland’s story through signage that features text and images (Rowland Design 2008). The interpretive themes include interpretations of historical events or people, descriptions of the historic landscape, the locations and histories of important landmarks, discussion of important people, and a description of the process by which we know this history through archaeology (Table 9.1). The information presented at these nodes, which is reinforced materially in the landscape and legitimized through archaeology will tie into some existing identities in the neighborhood and will contradict others. However, with the focus on Portland’s nineteenth century history and its landscape, the park interpretation also will enlighten residents to forgotten history that will foster the creation of new identities, the modification of others, and the revival of past identities. In particular the rematerialization of the nineteenth century landscape and the interpretive focus on Portland as a town will help anchor Portland’s independent identity and facilitate the community’s public memory.
Table 9.1. Proposed Interpretive Nodes from the Historic Interpretive Plan (Rowland Designs 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Time and the River: Portland at the Crossroads of America</td>
<td>Located at the park entrance, this node provides an overview of the area’s history and of the Park’s development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rudd Avenue</td>
<td>Located where the trail passes present day Rudd Ave. allowing visitors a look at an existing street before descending into the park where street facsimiles are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>K&amp;I Bridge</td>
<td>Located at the top of the levee next to the bridge, this node provides a discussion of rail transportation’s role in Louisville and Portland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The River was not Always a Friend</td>
<td>Located at the top of the levee, this node provides information about the floods that struck Portland and provides a sweeping view of the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Famous People and Unsung Heroes</td>
<td>Located at the intersection of Commercial St. and First Alley, this node will be the interpretive focus of the pavilion with stories of famous and everyday people and points out the location of the Saint Charles hotel, a once iconic building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>How Do We Know?</td>
<td>Located at Fulton St. and First Alley in the area where most of the archaeological work has been conducted. It will explain how archaeology has helped us learn about Portland’s history. It will also reference public programming and foundations that have been uncovered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Never the Same River</td>
<td>Located at the end of Fulton St. at the river. It will focus on how the river has changed the landscape over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A Town Takes Root</td>
<td>Located at Commercial St. and Water St., this node will provide descriptions of the town in the nineteenth Century, with a focus on businesses and commerce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A Bustling Wharf</td>
<td>Located at Commercial St and the River, this node will focus on Portland’s role in river transportation and how that system worked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Iron Horse</td>
<td>Located at Grove St. and Water St., this node will discuss the railroad’s role in Portland and of the tenuous relationship between Louisville and Portland over the railroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Landing</td>
<td>Located at Ferry St. and Water St., this node will focus on the history of the ferry service that was based at the location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Crossing to Freedom</td>
<td>Located at the intersection of Gravier St. and Water St., this node will focus on Portland’s African-American history and its role on the underground railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Living off the Land</td>
<td>Located at the intersection of Gravier St. and First Alley, this node discusses live on the outskirts of town and its farms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Portland Spirits</td>
<td>Located at the intersection of Ferry St. and First Alley, this node tells the story of Portland’s distilleries in the nineteenth century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Our Great Western Garden</td>
<td>Located at the intersection of Grove St. and First Alley, this node focuses on the natural environment and Portland’s ties to James Audubon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interpretive nodes that discuss Portland’s history of flooding and the stories of its community spirit during the disasters will tie to the identity of a close knit community that was mentioned so often during interviews (see Chapter 8). The 1937 and
1945 floods were often noted as an example of Portland’s neighborly spirit, as the community pulled together and helped each other through the disasters. This identity will be materialized in the park landscape through several interpretive nodes. The interpretive nodes focused on rail and river transportation will discuss the symbiotic and contentious relationship between Portland and Louisville, which will feed into contemporary tensions between the neighborhood and city government. These nodes could help further perpetuate and anchor more recently deployed identities intended to legitimize Portland, such as the oldest Louisville neighborhood and Fort on Shore histories (see Chapter 8).

The node dedicated to distilleries in Portland is partially informed by archaeological research, which identified the foundations of the late nineteenth century Rugby Distillery. It also taps into the current bourbon tourism boom, as Portland can also lay claim to a piece of bourbon’s heritage just as Louisville, Bardstown, and Frankfort have recently done.

The interpretive node dedicated to Portland’s African-American community and the Underground Railroad could directly challenge some of the more racially motivated identities that have been deployed recently. The defense of the neighborhood against the influx of government assisted housing and encroachment of the West End have been heavily racialized, as white identities associated with Irish and German heritage have been deployed (See Chapter 8). The “Crossing to Freedom” node challenges those identities by depicting Portland as a historically diverse community and one that helped undermine the institution of slavery on the Underground Railroad, although many Portland residents owned slaves and many slaves were rented out by their owners to work...
at the wharf. The materialization of this information into the park landscape could
neutralize those white identities and anchor an identity of diversity that could be
normalized through the landscape.

Finally, the interpretive node dedicated to archaeology and the process by which
the information presented at the park was collected is an important addition to the
interpretation. It is rather unusual at museum interpretive sites that the process by which
we learned about history is given equal weight compared to the historical interpretations
that result. However, its inclusion can serve several purposes. One purpose is to pay
homage to and highlight the archaeological resources present in the park. These
resources have been an impetus for the creation of the park from the beginning and
deeded as important by experts. Another purpose is that it helps legitimizes the
information presented at the park. This node indicates that the information presented has
real and tangible correlates buried beneath the park and that the information is a product
of an objective scientific process. It also conveys the idea that there is more that can be
learned and that the public can be a part of that process through public archaeology.

Although the park landscape and interpretation will certainly affect the residents
of Portland and the process of identity creation, they also could benefit the community by
telling its story to those that visit from outside of the neighborhood and by encouraging
outsiders to visit the neighborhood. My initial concept of activist archaeology in Portland
was that archaeology was a way to get people to visit Portland. I felt that if people could
just experience the community like I did, they would look beyond the stigmas and
stereotypes, just as I did. I felt the challenge was that many outsiders who had a negative
perception of Portland had never actually been there or experienced it. I thought that archaeology could bring people to Portland and change perceptions, as it has helped to do for the Southwest Jefferson County community through the archaeology programs at Riverside, the Farnsley-Moremen Landing (Stahlgren and Stottman 2007). Heritage tourism was seen as an activist way that archaeology could be used to change or help Portland’s fortunes (Prybylski and Stottman 2010). Archaeology at the Portland Wharf can certainly do that as demonstrated in the exit surveys conducted during the public programming tests.

Public archaeology program testing demonstrated that not only are the products of archaeological research important to the interpretation of the park, but the process is important for bringing people into the neighborhood. The focus on the process of archaeology rather than just the product defines my concept of the practice of an activist archaeology. Admittedly the information that archaeologists produce is a relatively weak tool for activist endeavors (McGuire 2008; Stottman 2010). I argue that public archaeology and the public’s participation in the process of archaeology has a much greater impact on communities and activist goals (Stottman 2010).

I see the process of archaeology as a way to draw people to Portland Wharf Park to become exposed to Portland’s culture and history and begin the process that changes the way outsiders perceive the neighborhood. However, the process of archaeology is also important to the residents of Portland. The process of archaeology connects people to the history they make. It is a way to give them some ownership of the facts of history.
and have a role in the authorized discourse. The products of archaeology, while they can benefit a community, also create a power dynamic that places the archaeologist above the community through the control of information. Although we can’t control how people use the information we produce, we control the process by which we produce it, a process which legitimizes that information. Participation in the process of knowledge production through public archaeology democratizes information produced from archaeology. Thus, the practice of an activist archaeology, I believe is rooted in public archaeology, as it gives a community access to the production of knowledge, not just products that facilitate the use of knowledge. If we want to use archaeology to benefit communities then we have to be collaborative and give up some of our control of it and open archaeology for communities to experience.

The development of Portland Wharf Park has been a collaborative process, as the community conceived of the park, invited the experts, and participated in the design process. However, the collection and interpretation of information and decisions concerning what information will be presented in the park has largely been left to the experts with input from a few community members. The decisions regarding the archaeology have been left to me, as the community has trusted me as an expert to manage and interpret their archaeological resources. Thus, the archaeological process at the park is not a collaborative one, as far as developing research questions is concerned. I have used public archaeology to open up the archaeological process to the community and the public at large. Although I still control the information, public programs have
and will provide the community an opportunity to participate in the archaeological process and to take ownership of their archaeological resources.

The Portland Wharf Park project is an example of an activist archaeology project, demonstrating that archaeology can be used to benefit a community. However at this point in the project it is mainly potential. Despite all of the planning, little has been done to create the park as envisioned by the community and there is currently no ability to implement the plans. There is no political or financial will on the part of the city government to build the park. The last two mayors have not been interested in championing the park, as it is still seen as a former mayor’s project. The money initially earmarked for the park has largely been appropriated or moved around within various city departments and projects. Despite the efforts of some dedicated city employees, the development of Portland Wharf Park has been deemed a low priority by Metro Parks. As evident in the interviews and exit surveys it is a major struggle just to maintain mowed street grid created during the Ghost Streets project. To add insult to injury, the riverwalk trail which provides the only access to the park and its main source of visitors to the park has endured damage from flooding, prompting the closing of the section of the trail that passes through the park. The trail currently has been detoured away from the park, leaving it with only a one-way entrance, meaning that it is now a destination only park (Figure 9.10). It is a park that has no amenities, no interpretation, and nothing that makes it a destination. Although the trail is slated to be repaired and reopened in the park, it has sat untouched for the last several years.
Despite all of the planning and effort to create a park that will help change a community, the landscape has changed little and all that we have to show for it is potential. Because the landscape has not changed, the park now has the potential to have a negative impact on the community, as it can now be seen as more broken promises by the City, facilitating more tensions and further emboldening existing identities. All of the work and collaboration invested in the creation of Portland Wharf Park does little to tell Portland’s story, bring people into the neighborhood, change their perceptions, or foster the creation of new or revival of old identities without being anchored in the Portland Wharf landscape. As seen throughout this dissertation, the landscape plays an important
role in the process of identity creation, maintenance, and modification. When the
Portland Wharf’s nineteenth-century landscape was erased, much of Portland’s
independent and prosperous history was forgotten and is largely absent from its heritage.
Although institutions like the Portland Museum and Marine Hospital have tried to revive
Portland’s independent identity, without its materialization on the landscape, this identity
will continue to reside latently within identities built on historical misperceptions, hastily
deployed to combat racialized changes in the neighborhood.

In the spirit of a true Portlander, I find myself not only advocating for the
neighborhood through my work as an archaeologist, but also as a citizen encouraging
support for the park plan and exposing city leaders and potential investors to Portland and
the park. Being an activist is not just about using your expertise to help a community, it
is about transcending our role as expert and being a part of the community. If I have
learned anything from my work in Portland is that the people are resilient and they will
find a way to make their dream of creating Portland Wharf Park a reality. I have no
doubt that archaeology will be a part of that.
CHAPTER 10:
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study of identity and landscape at the Portland Wharf, I used archaeological data collected from two lots to examine changes to the landscape over the history of Portland. Although these lots represent just a fraction of lots in Portland, an intensive examination of their archaeological deposits has allowed me to interpret changes to the landscape and examine its relationship to identity through the three families who lived on Lot 56 and the businessmen that occupied the commercial building on Lot 53. Investigation of these two lots led to a better understanding of the Portland Wharf’s nineteenth-century history and the changes that occurred on the landscape over time. I also used archaeological and archival data to examine identity in the past and its relationship to changes in the landscape. Ethnographic data was used to understand identity in the present and how it relates to history, heritage, and the landscape. Then I discussed how the proposed Portland Wharf Park will reclaim the Portland Wharf’s nineteenth-century landscape and affect change in the Portland community.

The archaeological excavations conducted at Lot 56 provided substantial information about the development of the Portland Wharf’s physical landscape. An analysis of the stratigraphy and features identified during the excavations was a key to understanding landscape changes at Lot 56. The use of the Harris Matrix, modified to include functional and temporal information derived from artifacts, proved to be an important tool in understanding landscape changes over time. This analysis identified three distinct occupations at the lot beginning in the 1820s, when Nicholas Lanning
rented the property from an absentee landowner. Based on the significant presence of architecture-related artifacts in deposits related to Lanning, a structure was present on the lot, most likely a house where Lanning lived, confirming its identification on the 1824 map.

An analysis of the nails recovered indicates that this structure was most likely a timber framed building, like others of the time period in Portland, such as the Squire Earick House. Other artifacts such as fragments of ceramic dishes, buttons, glass bottles, glass tablewares, smoking pipes, and beads indicate that the Lanning family had lived there for an extended time and that they were like many upwardly mobile lower working class people at the time. Lanning was in his early twenties when he rented Lot 56 and was likely just starting out with his wife and young family. He built the house on the property he rented, as it was common for tenants to improve lots owned by land speculators. At that time, there were just a few buildings in Portland, as most lots were owned by speculators who did not improve their properties. Lanning moved to the sparsely populated town of Portland and built a house on property he did not own. He eventually flourished, just as Portland did, eventually purchasing his own property, making a living as a chairmaker and attaining some political stature in the town.

It is not clear how long Lanning lived on Lot 56, but he was no longer there when Anthony Mangin purchased Lot 56 in 1846. Mangin was a carpenter, who had immigrated with his wife to Portland from France. He found work doing finish carpentry for the newly constructed Catholic Church and was able to make enough money to
purchase Lot 56. Deposits associated with Mangin included a large amount of architectural and domestic artifacts from his home and a tenant house known to have been located on the lot. An analysis of the nails recovered indicates that these structures probably used timber frame construction like other houses in Portland at the time. Based on the date of the window glass found, it is likely that Mangin remodeled Lanning’s house either for a tenant house or his own and then built another house on Lot 56. Because some architectural features were associated with the Mangin occupation, it appears that Mangin built a structure towards the west side of the lot behind the existing house that faced the street.

Mangin was able to find ample work in Portland, as it was growing quickly at the time and his skills would have been in demand. As with Lanning, Mangin was upwardly mobile with regards to status. Less than ten years after purchasing Lot 56, he and his family had become well established in Portland. He owned multiple lots and tenant houses and had a respectable taxable wealth. The ceramic dish fragments found indicate that he was able to purchase the most popular decorated dishes of the time and his wife had some luxury items, such as perfume and jewelry. Other artifacts found, such as fragments of smoking pipes, marbles, pencils, thimbles, and straight pins were indicative of the domestic nature of the houselot, as expected.

One of the strata associated with Mangin showed evidence of burning and contained a significant amount of burned artifacts, suggesting that buildings burned sometime during Mangin’s occupation, confirming documentation that Mangin’s
buildings burned down in 1856. That the Lanning and Mangin deposits were identified nearly 1.8 m (6 ft.) below the ground surface indicated that a depression or ravine existed along the west side of Lot 56 and was much lower in elevation than the east side along the street. Debris from the burned houses and its contents were deposited into this low area.

John Young, a wealthy land speculator from Louisville, had bought Lot 56 at a Marshall’s sale after Mangin’s death in 1855. This was one of many lots that Young owned in Louisville and Portland which were used for rental. However, Mangin’s widow refused to leave her house and the buyout offers from Young, after which the buildings mysteriously burned down. As a result, Young received no return on his investment. He allowed the property to lay fallow for nearly 20 years before subdividing it and selling a couple of lots to Catherine and Henry Veit in 1873. An immigrant from Germany, Henry Veit worked as a shoemaker on Portland’s busy wharf during the 1850s in the same building where he lived. Henry Veit kept his shoe shop on Water Street and moved his family to a separate home he had constructed on his newly acquired lots. After Henry’s death in 1878, Catherine became a female head of the household maintaining her home through the economic decline of the wharf and multiple devastating floods.

The features and artifacts associated with the Veit’s occupation of the property indicate that they built a frame shotgun house with a brick foundation. This house was like many being built in Louisville and Portland by the working class at the time. Based
on the analysis of the nails, window glass, and associated features, I was able to reconstruct the structure and look of the Veit’s house and lot. The lot included a modest shotgun house situated near the street, a cistern at the rear corner of the house, a small shed outbuilding, and privy at the rear of the lot. A ceramic economic scaling analysis of artifacts from two of the privies, used from 1873 to 1884, shows that the ceramic price index values were rather low, reflecting the documented working class status of the family. Although the Veits were able to purchase some of the popular dishes of the late nineteenth century, the family’s upwardly mobile trajectory seemed to stop when Henry died, as Catherine Veit was only able to maintain her status rather than increase it.

Evidence of the 1883 and 1884 floods that devastated much of Portland was found at the rear of Veit’s houselot, as much of the rear low area and privy had been filled and sealed by flood silt. The house and shed appeared to have survived the floods and at this time and the low area at the rear was filled, making the lot level. New privies were built and used throughout the rest of the house’s existence until it was demolished in the 1930s.

The commercial building on Lot 53 represents the growth and prosperity of Portland and its dependence on the wharf and associated economy. Paul Villier, a French immigrant, amassed a fortune by owning land in Portland, becoming one of its wealthiest citizens by 1850. He increased his wealth by developing commercial properties on his land located just off of the wharf, such as the iconic St. Charles Hotel and the building located on Lot 53.
Architectural features identified at Lot 53 confirmed that a large brick building had been constructed there in the 1850s. A large unlined cellar had been dug underneath the building, perhaps for coal storage. Based on the large number of domestic artifacts recovered from deposits associated with the occupation of the building, it appears that Henry Dacquet and Adolph DeLime lived in the building, as well as operated their businesses there. Villier helped many of his countrymen immigrate to Portland by providing lodging and a job at one of his many commercial endeavors. Henry Dacquet started as a clerk in the store that occupied the building and lived in quarters above. He became a merchant and operated a dry goods store. Villier also helped Adolf Delime get established in Portland when he emigrated from France. Delime operated a drug store in the building followed for brief time by his assistant T.P. Taylor, who went on to found Louisville’s most well-known drugstore chain. This building on Lot 53 represents the history of Portland’s economic fortunes, as businesses supporting and catering to the wharf and the thousands of people that passed through every year were numerous at the time.

Based on dates of the artifacts associated with the demolition of the building and historic documents, Villier’s building was demolished sometime around 1884, possibly due to damage incurred during successive floods around that time. Due to Portland’s declining economic fortunes and Villier’s death several years prior, it appears that his heirs did not think that rebuilding after the floods was a profitable investment.
According to the deposits and artifacts identified within the cellar underneath the building, it appears that it was left open after demolition, as it collected various deposits of cinders and trash. Based on the dates of the artifacts in the cellar fill, the cellar was used as trash dump during the 1890s and early 1900s by residents that remained in the area after the floods, including residents living at the old St. Charles hotel, a tenement at the time. A ceramic economic scaling index analysis of the ceramics from the cellar produced a higher price index value than that calculated for the Veits and one that was suggestive of middle class status. It is likely that the cellar accumulated trash from a number of households at a time when many residents were leaving the area to escape the floods and economic decline that hit Portland. Some the items deposited in the cellar could have been from these residents, as they cleaned out their houses when they moved and invariably threw out items they could not or did not want to take with them. The presence of these artifacts is a further indication of the area’s decline and depopulation.

The wealth of archaeological and archival information analyzed and synthesized during this research has provided a better understanding of the Portland Wharf’s nineteenth century landscape and the changes to it over the last 200 years. In particular, the archaeological evidence not only helped confirm information from the archival record, but also was integral for understanding the topographic changes to the landscape, the process of land development, details of the built environment, profiles of the people who lived there, and their response to major events, such as fires and floods.
This research has revealed Portland’s past and its largely forgotten wharf landscape. The late nineteenth century was a pivotal period of the Portland Wharf landscape and Portland’s identity. Portland’s annexation and subsequent secession by and from Louisville in the late 1830s set the independent attitude for the small fledgling town. The economic prosperity and rapid growth that followed during the 1840s materialized that attitude in the landscape, as a distinctive townscape was developed. Although there were likely many identities deployed by individuals and groups in the bustling river town, particularly ethnic differences, this specific identity was not overtly visible in the archaeological record and did not seem to relate to the broader landscape. It is likely that ethnic identities as well as a myriad of other identities were deployed by Portland’s historic residents, as they are by its current residents. These identities may not have been materialized in the archaeological record or perhaps it will require more nuance research questions and comparisons to make them visible.

Portland’s independent identity is well-documented in the archival record during the nineteenth century and represents a broader community identity that is visible in the landscape when contrasted with Louisville’s landscape. Portland, during the nineteenth century, was physically separated and distant from Louisville. It had a distinctive townscape, and developed differently, all of which distinguishes it from Louisville and can be seen as exemplifying an independent identity. This example demonstrates that the more mundane aspects of a community can become visible to us as identity when they are compared to another community. Otherwise, Portland’s townscape and development will be seen as much like many towns during the nineteenth century and only unique in
the consciousness of those that experienced it in the minutia of the built and natural environments.

It is clear that Portland fostered an independent attitude and identity, which was largely unconscious or latent amongst its residents. Perhaps this broad identity was even mundane, so as to produce little overt expression. However, distinctions that are visible in the landscape when compared to other communities become expressions of identity. This identity continued even after Portland was successfully annexed, as people in Louisville acknowledged that the community was independent. Although Portland was politically no longer an independent town, the landscape did not change immediately as a result the annexation and thus, it reinforced Portland’s continued independent identity. This example demonstrates the relationship of the landscape to the maintenance of identity, as the residents of Portland saw few changes that challenged that identity. The Portland landscape would have looked and felt the same to the residents, as it did prior to annexation. Louisville was content to leave Portland as it was and profit from its wharf.

The 1870s was a time of significant change in Portland, as events conspired to change its landscape and Louisville asserted more authority in the community. With its economy in decline and the distance between Portland and the western edges of Louisville closed, the city was no longer content with the status quo and made efforts to assimilate the former town. The landscape was altered during this period, as street names were changed, the wharf was in decline, and much of the townscape was decimated by floods. By the 1890s, the Portland Wharf landscape no longer resembled the independent
town that had inhabited it previously. The changes in the landscape facilitated change in the community’s identity, as the landscape no longer helped maintain its independent identity. Thus, demonstrating that without a material anchor in the landscape, the independent identity could not be maintained.

Furthermore, the economic heart of Portland was moved from the wharf to Portland Avenue reflecting a landscape that was created in the image of Louisville’s other neighborhoods, as the Portland Wharf’s townscape disappeared and the landscape changed. This new landscape neutralized Portland’s independent identity and normalized a new identity of Portland as a neighborhood of Louisville. Without an anchor in the landscape, Portland’s independent identity was forgotten. This example demonstrates the normalizing quality of the landscape, its ability to affect change, and its importance for anchoring public memory.

These expressions become more evident when Portland’s independent identity became threatened during the late nineteenth century. As the landscape changed, so too did the residents’ independent identity. For 20 years after annexation, Portland still had the look and feel of an independent town, which translated to people’s perception of the community both inside and out. This identity was materialized in the way the Veit family constructed their privy when they built their shotgun house in 1873. Although they were under the jurisdiction of Louisville’s ordinances, including those governing privy construction, their privy was out of compliance, unlike those in Louisville which tended to be in compliance. It is not likely that the construction of an out of compliance privy
represents an overt display of independence, but instead is probably a result of the common practices of Portlanders and the lack of enforcement by Louisville. The Veits just built their privy the way they normally did. However, they abandoned their privy before it was full and built a partially compliant privy around 1880. This action can be interpreted to be an indication of Louisville’s asserting its authority in Portland, which corresponded with changes to the landscape through street name changes. The fact that the privy was not fully compliant could represent a more overt act of defiance, in that the privy looked compliant, but was not. It could represent some resistance on the part of individual residents to Louisville’s authority. After the devastating floods of 1883 and 1884, the partially compliant privy was destroyed and sealed beneath flood silt along with much of the Portland Wharf’s townscape and its independent identity. A fully compliant privy was constructed on the Veit’s lot afterwards, which signified consent to Louisville’s assimilation of Portland. Without evidence of Portland’s independence left materialized in the landscape and the dire condition of the Portland Wharf area, there was little motivation for deploying an independent identity. Thus, the chronology and construction of the Veit family’s privies mirrors the transformation of Portland’s landscape from an independent town to a neighborhood of Louisville.

The examination of the Portland Wharf landscape and its independent identity over time through the archival and archaeological records, clearly demonstrates the relationship of the landscape and identity. However, the aim of this dissertation was not to confirm what is largely known. It is the aim of this dissertation to illustrate that identity can be latent or unconscious to people and become visible in their practices and
actions. The landscape is a product of these actions and practices and it also influences them as a part of the process of identity creation, maintenance, and modification. The Portland Wharf landscape demonstrates this process as the townscape was developed in the context of independence and autonomy, while a new landscape, created in the context of Portland as one of Louisville’s neighborhoods, replaced and normalized a new neighborhood identity. The clearance of one landscape and the creation of another neutralized old identities and normalized new ones. Without the landscape, public memory had no anchor and as such, identities deployed in the present are loosely based on the past and can only go as far as the landscape allows. Thus, landscape and identity are really about the present and how the past or at least perceptions of it are used in the present.

Although archaeologists have been primarily focused on overt conscious expressions of identity in the objects that they find, the process of identity can be seen in the archaeological record as largely unconscious actions and practices that are made visible by researchers in the present. Most identity in the past is visible in the comparisons and contrasts that we make in the present, the same process that people use when they deploy overt expressions of identity. Whether it is those that deploy an identity or researchers, we create the conditions for making distinction, as identity becomes visible at the boundaries where there is contrast. In Portland, this contrast often takes place in the landscape, past and present. The townscape, development process, street paving, or street names do not become expressions of Portland’s identity until they
are compared to other communities within specific contexts. We can see this process at work in the present day deployment of identities by residents of Portland.

Through interviews and surveys, I have been able to examine the process of identity present day and how the past is used in the deployment of identity. Boundaries in the landscape facilitate the deployment of identities to create contrast, thus making identities visible. The threat to Portland’s current identity, as a distinct neighborhood, comes from the influx of new residents displaced from the redevelopment of Louisville’s housing projects, subsidized housing, and the encroachment of predominantly African-American West End communities. There is the perception from some existing residents that these new residents do not have the same affinity for Portland by not privileging the neighborly values that define the community presently. These new residents threaten Portland’s identity of being multigenerational, a close knit community, and in some cases, white. In the face of this threat, Portlanders have deployed a number of identities and strategies to distinguish themselves and establish boundaries.

The past is used in the creation of identities to help distinguish the Portland Neighborhood from surrounding communities and Louisville. However, history with no place in the landscape can be elusive and forgotten to public memory. Instead, the past is used to legitimize the community’s existence, as it clings to the current landscape, one that had neutralized its independent identity and normalized assimilation long ago, as a representation of its distinctiveness. For example, on the surface, the deployment of statements about Louisville’s founding in Portland and being Louisville’s oldest
neighborhood could be viewed as a lack of historical knowledge by current residents. Neither of these statements is accurate in the academic sense, however, they do expose the process of identity creation and its relationship to the landscape.

These statements are derived from a nugget of historical fact that has been manipulated for a specific purpose in the present. Portlanders deploy these statements as a way to distinguish their neighborhood from the other neighborhoods in Louisville and to legitimize its importance to Louisville. Clearly Louisville was not founded in or started in Portland. Louisville was established on Corn Island in 1778 over thirty years before Portland. However, Portland through some manipulation of its boundaries has claimed a little known and largely forgotten aspect of Louisville’s history for its own. The settlement of Louisville moved from Corn Island to the Kentucky shore a few months later where Fort on Shore was established near present day 12th Street. This fact of Louisville’s first establishment on the Kentucky shore is overshadowed by its initial founding on Corn Island and the construction of Fort Nelson by 1781 at the present site of downtown Louisville. However, present day Portlanders have claimed Fort on Shore, as their own, because the City of Louisville now considers 12th Street to be within Portland, although most Portlanders do not. The fluidity of Portland’s eastern boundary has been the source of some contention, as the City government had imposed its boundary as west of 9th Street, thus conflating Portland with other West End neighborhoods. However, Portlanders have recently used this boundary to co-opt the Fort on Shore history and the claim that Louisville started in Portland.
The statement that Portland is Louisville’s oldest neighborhood seems to be rooted in the fact that Portland was established in 1811, before Louisville’s neighborhoods had been developed. However, Portland was not founded as a neighborhood; it was an independent town. It did not become a neighborhood of Louisville until the second annexation in 1852, after several other neighborhoods had been established. So, the statement of Portland being Louisville’s oldest neighborhood is rooted in its independent past, but embraces its neighborhood status. Portland, as a neighborhood, was largely created in the late nineteenth century during its assimilation by Louisville through the gradual clearance of the Portland Wharf townscape and the creation of a new neighborhood landscape along Portland Avenue. In this example, there is the recognition that Portland is older than Louisville’s other neighborhoods, but Portland’s identity is associated with its status as a neighborhood not as an independent town, as that is what the landscape communicates.

This history is used in the present to create an identity centered on Portland’s antiquity and legitimacy as an integral part of Louisville, and as a distinctive neighborhood. So, the deployment of this identity and of these seemingly inaccurate statements is an example of how identity is created and its relationship to the past and the landscape. The people of Portland certainly deploy overt identities presently to help distinguish their community from its neighbors. The “Portland is not the West End” t-shirts, statements of its Irish ancestry, and Irish iconography are all conscious attempts to distinguish Portland from its predominantly African-American neighbors. However, when researchers start to create contrast between landscapes and communities, we can
expose latent or unconscious aspects of identity in the landscape and in the historical claims of residents. In order for these histories to be effectively used in the present for identity creation and maintenance they need to be anchored in the landscape.

The Fort on Shore history will be inscribed into the landscape if a park planned for the site is built and the history told there. Portland’s neighborhood identity is etched in the present day landscape along Portland Avenue and the boundaries that have been created. The resistance that Portland residents have to changing the existing landscape is a symbol of their neighborhood identity. This resistance to change is exemplified in the fight to keep 22nd Street from being renamed in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, in order to preserve “traditional” Portland street names. Thus, it demonstrates the important role of the landscape in the process of identity creation, maintenance, and modification.

Although Portland’s independent identity had largely been neutralized and supplanted by its neighborhood identity, it still lived in the community’s history and attitude. It had been lost to public memory and was cleared from the Portland Wharf landscape, but the neighborhood still exhibited distinctiveness that harkened back to its independent past. The independent identity had been kept alive in part through an effort to revive this historic identity amidst the economic challenges, racial influx, existing population loss, and property devaluation. The founding of the Portland Museum in the late 1970s and the idea of a park at the old Portland Wharf began the revival of Portland’s independent identity. The museum was a place where Portland’s history and story could be told and a physical place to serve as the center of heritage and culture for the
community. However, early in the process of reviving Portland’s independent identity, it was realized that the Portland Wharf landscape had to be remade to anchor that identity.

The place where the old Portland townscape had once reinforced Portland’s identity was integral to the revival of that identity. The place where the events of that independent past happened and the buried remnants of that landscape exist will provide an authenticity to that history and the opportunity for a materialized version of that identity. Thus, a park dedicated to the history of Portland the independent town was conceived and represents the conscious use of the landscape to create and maintain identity. Archaeology plays an important role in the creation of the park and in the maintenance of identity. The development of Portland Wharf Park demonstrates that not only does archaeological information contribute to the process of identity in the present, but so does the act of archaeology. Archaeologists can move from being passive participants in the process of heritage and identity creation to become activists that use archaeological information and its process as a means to advocate for and benefit the communities in which they work.

The reanimation of the Portland Wharf landscape, that communicates the history of a prosperous and independent Portland, could create positive community identity and change the negative perceptions that outsiders have. Thus, a community effort to create the Portland Wharf Park was represented in the development of a park master plan. Efforts had been made to reintroduce the former landscape of the Portland Wharf into its current landscape, such as history themed markers in the river walk trail and the etching
of the street grid into the forested landscape. However, the implementation of the park master plan would create a memorialized landscape of what Portland used to be and its independent identity. Aside from building a memorial to old Portland, archaeology was seen not only as a way to gather information to interpret this landscape, but also as a means to connect people to it. The archaeological remains buried at the Portland Wharf represent real tangible remnants of that past and the act of recovering those remains is also a very powerful tool to create identity.

Public archaeology is a way to engage the public in the process of archaeology and help the Portland community to realize its goals. Test programs conducted at the park indicated that people had a positive response to archaeology in the park. These programs demonstrated that archaeology has the ability to draw people to the park, especially people from outside of the neighborhood. When residents and non-residents participated in the programs, their knowledge of Portland’s history was increased and their perception of the community improved. This study demonstrated that if we think about archaeology in an activist way and understand that archaeologists have a role and responsibility to the present, that we could affect the communities in which we work. However, the business of activism is messy and there are consequences to our involvement in the Portland community. The interpretation of this landscape could disenfranchise segments of the population who don’t agree with our discourse or even normalize identities that are contrary to the neighborhood identity represented in the current neighborhood landscape.
Although I was invited to this community to help them use archaeology for their benefit, I still have the role as an expert and thus an authorized discourse that is perhaps privileged above others. Thus, public archaeology is important to our activist efforts, in that it democratizes archaeology. It is not good enough that archaeologists take up the cause of the communities in which we work. We can be activists with the products of our research, but we really are not activists just by marching side by side with the community for their cause. We really cannot know or even relate to the struggles and issues of that community because we don’t experience their community like they do. In the end, we still control the archaeology and the discourse. In order to more collaboratively benefit or advocate for a community, archaeologists have to give up some of their control and open archaeology to the community. Public archaeology can do that, as it allows the community to participate in the process of archaeology and gives them ownership of the information we recover, or in other words, their history. My experience at the Portland Wharf and the activist perspective that I have taken is an example of that. There will be no end to the activism at the Portland Wharf, as it is a lifelong commitment that we make when we do this kind of work.

Although we have a plan to create a new Portland Wharf landscape, it has yet to be realized and delays can be detrimental to the neighborhood, reinforcing the animosity between Portland and city government and its neighbors. The lack of action towards implementing the master plan, in a way, legitimizes the current Portland Wharf landscape as a symbol of the City’s inaction and neglect of the Portland Neighborhood. Despite all of the collaborative good intentions of the activist agenda to change Portland’s identity
and fortunes by changing the Portland Wharf landscape, they could easily turn to the opposite direction. Thus, the fate of the Portland Wharf Park project is dependent on political will and forces outside of the control of the archaeologist and, to a large degree, the community. It is a message to us that we can be as collaborative as possible, but still be somewhat powerless to further our activist agenda. I don’t know what is going to happen with the Portland Wharf Park project. I don’t know if that landscape will ever change the way we envisioned or benefit the community the way we intended. But, the process of identity will continue with or without the park and the community will continue to create, recreate, and deploy identities rooted in their past to for purposes in the present. It is a matter of how those identities will be anchored in public memory and for what purpose they serve.

It is not my intention with this research to uncover a process of identity that is applicable to all contexts. Given my theoretical perspectives, there is no universal way in which identity works. Through this research, I set out to expose and understand how identity is created, maintained, and modified in the Portland community and its relationship to the landscape, specifically through the Portland Wharf landscape. Even so, the historical processes at work on the two lots at the Portland Wharf I examined may not be representative of other lots at the wharf or to Portland more broadly. However, through this research I have exposed the process of identity and its relationship to history and the landscape at least in this specific example. Thus, my results and understanding of identity might not be able to be replicated in other communities. However, the perspective I have taken and the questions that I have asked can be applied elsewhere.
Identity is complex; there are many identities that have been and are deployed on a daily basis by many different people for many different reasons. Due to the situational and contextual dependency of identity, it is impossible to corral everything that is identity into one process. This research is about pushing our concept of identity and how it works further beyond identity, seen as only a conscious display inherently materialized in objects. I build on the work of those many archaeologists who see identity as a dynamic and diachronic process that can be seen through unconscious practices. In order to expose and understand this process, I had to find identities that transcended the history of Portland and that have relevancy today. I needed to use a vehicle that has a strong relationship to the process of identity to provide the contrast needed to make it visible. In this case, the landscape was that vehicle, being a major influence on how identities are created, maintained, and modified. I was able to see the process of identity through its relationship with landscape over time from the establishment of Portland as a paper town to our present day use of the landscape in an activist way. It is my hope that this research honors those whose perspectives and research I have used and is yet another stepping stone for those in the future.
REFERENCES CITED

Abell, Stephen
2009 The Portland Revitalization Movement of the 1970s. Unpublished student paper on file at the University of Louisville Archives, Louisville.

Andrews, Susan C., Kimberly D. Simpson, and Savannah L. Darr

Andrews, Susan C. and David W. Schatz
2011 Reading the City: Urban Archaeology of the Family Scholar’s House Site (15Jf767) in Old Louisville, Kentucky. CRM Report No. 2010-02x, AMEC Earth and Environmental, Louisville.

Anschuetz, Kurt F., Richard H. Wilshusen, and Cherie L. Scheick

Area Vibes

Ashmore, Wendy and A. Bernard Knapp (editors)

Atalay, Sonya, Lee Rains Clauss, Randall McGuire, and John R. Welch (editors)
2014 Transforming Archaeology: Activists Practices and Prospects. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

Bader, Anne T.

Ball, Donald B.


Barth, Fredrik

Basso, Keith H.

Bates, Alan L.

Batliner, Doris

Baumann, Timothy, Andrew Hurley, and Lori Allen

Bell, Rick

Bernard, H. Russell
2006  *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* Alta Mira Press, Lanham, MD.

Bender, Barbara

Bourdieu, Pierre


Brighton, Stephen A.

Brown, Marley R.

Burnett, Robert A.

Casey, Edward S.

Casella, Eleanor Conlin and Chris Fowler

Casseday, Ben
1852 *The History of Louisville from Its Earliest Settlement Till the Year 1852*. Hull and Brothers, Louisville.

Cengel, Katya
2006 Portland street festival isn’t just a family affair these days. *Courier-Journal*, June 4, 2006.

Chambers, Erve

Clarke, William F.
Cohen, Allison E.

Comettant, Oscar

Conkey, M. W.

Cosgrove, Dennis E.

Courier Journal, the

Cressey, Pamela J., and John F. Stephens

de Certeau, Michel

Delle, James A.

Derry, Linda

Derry, Linda and Maureen Malloy (editors)

DiBlasi, Philip J.
Donovan, Frank

English Judith Hart

Esarey, Mark E.

Faberson, Tonya A.


Ferguson, T.J.

Flint, J.
1824  *Map of the Falls of the Ohio.*  E.G. Gridley, Cincinnati, OH.

Freda, Barbara
1996  *Greetings from Portland...A Brief History of a Once-Bustling River Town.*  Business First, Louisville.

Gazin-Schwartz, Amy
Genheimer, Robert A.  

Groover, Mark D.  

Gums, Bonnie L. and George W. Shorter  

Gurke, Karl  

Handwerker, W. Penn  
2001 *Quick Ethnography*. Alta Mira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

Harris, Edward C.  

Hockensmith, Charles P.  

Hodder, Ian and Craig Cessford  

Hopkins, C.M.  

Houchens, Mariam S.  

Imlay, Gilbert  
1793 *A Topographical Description of the Western Territory of North America*. J. Debrett, London.
Ingold, Tim  

Jackson, John Brinkerhoff  
1980  *The Necessity for Ruins and Other Topics*. University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst.

Jefferson County Board of Health  

John Milner and Associates  

Johnson, Leland R. and Charles F. Parrish  

Johnson, Nuala C.  

Jones, Siân  

Joyce, Rosemary A.  

Karem, Kenny  

Kealhofer, Lisa  

Kedia, Satish and John van Willigen (editors)  

Kleber, John (editor)  
Kramer, Carl E.  

Lefebvre, Henri  

Leone, Mark P.  

Leone, Mark P. and Parker B. Potter Jr.  

Lewis, Peirce F.  

Lightfoot, Kent G., Antoniette Martinez, and Ann M. Schiff  

Little, Barbara J. (editor)  

Little, Barbara J. and Paul A. Shackel  
2014 *Archaeology, Heritage, and Civic Engagement: Working toward the Public Good*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

Little, Barbara J. and Paul A. Shackel (editors)  
2007 *Archaeology as a Tool of Civic Engagement*. Altamira Press, Lanham, MD.

Little, Barbara J. and Larry J. Zimmerman  
Louisville Abstract and Loan Association
1876  *Index Map of the City of Louisville, KY.*  Louisville Abstract and Loan Association, Louisville, Kentucky.

Louisville City Code Book
1884  *Louisville City Code Book.*  Available at the University of Louisville Archives, Louisville.

Louisville City Directories
1832-1950  *Louisville City Directories.*  Available at the University of Louisville Archives, Louisville.

Louisville Municipal Reports
1860-1900  The City of Louisville Annual Municipal Reports.  Available at the University of Louisville Archives, Louisville.

Louisville/Jefferson County Information Consortium

Low, Setha M.

Lucas, Gavin

Lyon, Rev. John A.
1939  *Church of Our Lady: Centenary of the Parish 1839-1939.*  Archdiocese of Louisville, Louisville.

Lytle Papers

McGuire, Randall H.

Mansberger, Floyd
Matthews, Christopher N.  

Miller, George L.  


Miller, Henry  

Mitchell, Don  
1996  *The Lie of the Land: Migrant Workers and the California Landscape.* University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Moir, Randall W.  

Moise, Leicester R.  

Mrozowski, Stephen A.  


Mullins, Paul R.  

Mullins, R. L.  
Munro-Leighton, Judy and Bill Munro-Leighton

1979b The Falls, A Stopping Place, A Starting Point. Portland Museum, Louisville.

Murray, Tim, and Penny Cook

Neary, Donna M

Nelson, Robert S. and Margaret Olin (editors)

Network Center for Community Change

Noël Hume, Ivor

Nora, Pierre

Orser, Charles E. Jr.


Owens, Dalford

Page, H.R. and Co.

Palmatary, J.T.
1855 Lithograph of Louisville. J.T. Palmatary, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Pauketat, Timothy R.

PDR Engineers

Pelto, Pertti J.
2013 *Applied Ethnography: Guidelines for Field Research.* Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

Phillips, Kendall R.

Phillips, Robert G.

Pool, Christopher A. and Lisa Cliggett

Portland Museum
1981 *The Tarascon Mill.* Portland Museum, Louisville


Portland Trustees Minute Book
1842-1852 Minutes of the Town of Portland’s Trustees. On file at the University of Louisville Archives, Louisville, KY.

Potter, Parker B. Jr.

Preservation Alliance

Price, Patricia
2004 *Dry Place: Landscapes of Belonging and Exclusion.* University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
Preucel, Robert W.
2000 Making Pueblo Communities: Architectural Discourse at Kotyiti, New Mexico.

Prybylski, Matthew E. and M. Jay Stottman
2010 Reconnecting Community: Archaeology and Activism at the Portland Wharf. 

Purser, Margaret, and Noelle Shaver

Rhodeside and Harwell
2002 Portland Wharf Park Master Plan. Rhodeside and Harwell Inc. for Metro Louisville Parks, Louisville.

Rivers, Sara J.

Rodman, Margaret

Roenke, Karl G.

Rothschild, Nan A. and Diana diZerega Wall

Rowland Design Inc.

Sabloff, Jeremy A.
2008 Archaeology Matters: Action Archaeology in the Modern World. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, CA.
Sandweiss, Eric

Schatz, David W.

Schensul, Stephen L., Jean J. Schensul, and Margaret D. LeCompte
1999  Essential Ethnographic Methods: Observations, Interviews, and Questionnaires. Ethnographer’s Toolkit No. 2. Alta Mira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

Scrimshaw, Susan C.M. and Elena Hurtado

Shackel, Paul A.


Shafer, Sheldon S.


Silliman, Benjamin
Smith, Adam

Smith, Angèle

Smith, Angèle and Amy Gazin-Schwartz (editors)
2008 *Landscapes of Clearance: Archaeological and Anthropological Perspectives.* Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

Smith, Laurajane

Schein, Richard H.

Solari, Elaine-Maryse

Soja, Edward W.

South, Stanley

Stahlgren, Lori C. and M. Jay Stottman

Stewart-Abernathy, Leslie C.
Stone, Tammy

Stottman, M. Jay (editor)
2010 *Archaeologists as Activists: Can Archaeologists Change the World?* The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Stottman, M. Jay


Stottman, M. Jay, Anne T. Bader, and Joseph E. Granger
Stottman, M. Jay, and Joseph E. Granger

Stottman, M. Jay, and Charles D. Hockensmith

Stottman, M. Jay, and Charles D. Hockensmith

Stottman, M. Jay; Karen Hudson; Gwynn Henderson; Cheryl Bersaglia; W. Stephen McBride
1997 *The 4-H Cultural Heritage Project: Excavation of the Neal-Rice Site (15Ni44).* Kentucky Archaeological Survey, Lexington.

Stottman, M. Jay and Matthew E. Prybylski

Stottman, M. Jay and Lori C. Stahlgren
2006 *Archaeological Investigations at the Center Street Site (15Wa116) and the Seventh Street Site (15Wa117) Bowling Green, Kentucky (Item No. 3-310.00).* KAS Report #110, Kentucky Archaeological Survey, Lexington.

Stottman, M. Jay, and Jeffrey L. Watts-Roy

Thomas, Frederick

Thomas, J.

Thomas, Samuel W. (editor)
Till, Karen E.


Tilly, Christopher
1994 *A Phenomenology of Landscape*. Berg Publishers, Providence, RI.

Tolbert, Lisa C.

Tuan, Yi-Fu
1977 *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Upton, Dell


van Willigen, John
1986 *Applied Anthropology: An Introduction*. Bergin and Garvey, South Hadley, MA.

van Willigen, John, Barbara Rylko-Bauer, and Ann McElroy

Valdez del Alamo, Elizabeth Valdez and Carol Stamatis Pedergast
Voss, Barbara L.  
2000 Colonial Sex: Archaeology, Structured Space, and Sexuality in Alta 
California’s Spanish Colonial Missions. In *Archaeologies of Sexuality*, edited 

Wagner, Mark J.  
1992 Phase III Archaeological Investigations at the James L. Brown Farmstead 
(15He683) Green Coal Company Permit 851-0006, Henderson County, 
Resources Group, Carbondale, Illinois.

Wall, Dianna DiZarega.  
1985 The Separation of the Home and Workplace in Early Nineteenth-Century New 

1999 Examining Gender, Class, and Ethnicity in 19th Century New York City. 

Watrous, Gary  
1977 *Louisville Survey West*. Preservation Alliance of Louisville and Jefferson 
County, Louisville.

Weissberg, Liliane  
1999 Introduction. In *Cultural Memory and the Construction of Identity*, edited by 
Dan Ben-Amos and Liliane Weissberg, pp. 7-26. Wayne State University 
Press, Detroit, MI.

Westmont, V. Camille  
2012 *Rising to Meet the American Queensware Challenge: A Stratigraphic Analysis 
of the Lewis Pottery Site*. Senior Honors Thesis, Department of Anthropology, 
University of Kentucky, Lexington.

Wylie, Alison  
1993 Invented Lands/Discovered Pasts: The Westward Expansion of Myth and 

1999 Why Should Historical Archaeologists Study Capitalism? The Logic of 
Question and Answer and the Challenge of Systems Analysis. In *Historical 
Archaeologies of Capitalism*, edited by Mark P. Leone and Parker B. Potter, Jr., 

Yater, George  
1987 *Two Hundred Years at the Falls of the Ohio: A History of Louisville and 
Young, Amy L.
1991  *Nailing Down the Pattern in Historical Archaeology*. Master’s Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.


Zierden, Martha
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW KEY

Interview #1: white male age 65, resident 31 years and white female age 57, resident 31 years
Interview #2: white male age 35, resident
Interview #3: white male age 59, resident
Interview #4: black female age 38, resident 38 years
Interview #5: Hispanic female age 23, resident 16 years
Interview #6: white male age 35, resident 3 years
Interview #7: white female age 74, resident
Interview #8: white female age 49, resident 46 years
Interview #9: black female age 46, resident 16 years
Interview #10: black female age 47, resident 5 years
Interview #11: blank
Interview #12: white male age 63, former resident, lived there seven years as child
Interview #13: white male age 72, former resident, lived there seven years as child
Interview #14: white male age 66, former resident, lived there until after High School
Interview #15: white female age 59, resident 57 years
Interview #16: white male age 71, resident 4 years
Interview #17: white male age 54, resident 16 years
Interview #18: white female age 50, resident 50 years
Interview #19: white male age 51, resident 51 years
Interview #20: white male age 67, resident 67 years
Interview #21: white male age 66, resident 66 years
Interview #22: white male age 54, resident 32 years
Interview #23: white female age 59, resident 33 years
Interview #24: white female age 47, resident 41 years
Interview #25: white male age 49, resident 49 years

Interview #1 included two people who represent two interviews.

Interview #11 was not used because there were multiple people present and participating in the interview and it was not structured by the interview questions and thus is not consistent with the other interviews.
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Basic Information Questions:

What is your name?
What is your address?
What is your age?
How long have you lived in the neighborhood?
Where have you lived other than Portland and how long?

Topic Specific Questions:

What do you know about the history of Portland?
How did you learn about the history of Portland?
What do you consider to be Portland’s heritage?
What defines what it is to be from Portland?
How is history and heritage important to Portland’s identity?
How would you characterize Portland’s relationship with the City of Louisville?
What role does history play in that relationship?
What do you think people outside of Portland think about the neighborhood?
What do you think people who live outside of Portland should know about the neighborhood?
Have you heard of the Portland Wharf Park and the archaeology project there? What do you think their impact to the community can or will be?
What is your impression of the Portland Museum, the U.S. Marine Hospital or any other historic sites in the neighborhood?
APPENDIX C: PORTLAND WHARF PARK PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY PROGRAM EXIT SURVEY 2005

1. What is your zip code ________________?

2. Check one of the following:
   Resident of Portland ____  Former resident of Portland ____  N/A____

3. Which category best describes your age?
   __Under 8   __ 9-18   __ 19-25   __ 26-35   __ 36-49    __50 & up

4. What archaeology programs did you participate in?  __Dig   __Guided Tour   __Self Tour

5. Rate the quality and amount of information presented to you through signs or guide.
   ___ poor   ___ average    ___ excellent

6. How much time did you spend at the site?
   __less than 1 hr.  __1-2 hr.  __2-4 hrs.  __more than 4 hrs.

7. Has the archaeology program increased your knowledge of Portland’s History ___Yes ___No

8. Has the archaeology program affected your perception of the Portland Neighborhood?  ___Yes ___No  How has it affected your perception?

9. Do you have a better understanding of archaeology, including the process and ethics, by participating in the archaeology program?  ___Yes ___No

10. Would you be interested in participating in archaeology programs at Portland Wharf Park in the future?  ___Yes ___No

11. What type of program would you be interested in?
    ___Archaeology and Portland Tour  ___ Day Camp for Kids    ___ Family Dig

12. How much would you pay per person to participate in each of these programs?
    Tour (dig site, Portland Museum, Marine Hospital) $______
    Day Camp for Kids, 3 days 9 am-4 pm $______
    Family Dig, 1 day 9 am-4 pm $______

Comments or Suggestions:
APPENDIX D: PORTLAND WHARF PARK PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY
PROGRAM EXIT SURVEY 2006

1. What is your zip code ________________?

2. Check one of the following:
   ____ Resident of Portland    ____ Former resident of Portland    ____ N/A

3. Which category best describes your age?
   ___ Under 8   ___ 9-18   ___ 19-25   ___ 26-35   ___ 36-49   ___ 50 & up

4. How much did you know about the history of Portland prior to participating in the archaeology program?
   ___ Nothing    ___ Some    ___ a lot

5. Rate your impression of the Portland Neighborhood prior to participating in the archaeology program.
   ___ Positive    ___ Negative    ___ Neither

6. Has the archaeology program increased your knowledge of Portland’s History ____Yes ____No

7. Has the archaeology program affected your perception of the Portland Neighborhood?
   ____Yes ____No

8. How has it affected your perception? ____ Positively    ____ Negatively    ____ N/A

9. Rate the condition of Portland Wharf Park. ____ Excellent ___ Average ___ Poor

10. Do you think that investment in Portland Wharf Park and heritage programs, such as archaeology digs, would benefit more than just the residents of Portland?
    ____ Yes ____ No

11. What suggestions or ideas do you have for improving Portland Wharf Park?
## APPENDIX E: PORTLAND WHARF PARK USAGE TALLY SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Teens</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/Running</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology Program</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Activities</td>
<td>______ATV</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_____Facilities</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td></td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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