

EXCAVATED ARTIFACTS
from the
AAPRAVASI GHAT
WORLD HERITAGE SITE



Geoffrey D. Summers


EXCAVATED ARTIFACTS

from the AAPRAVASI GHAT WORLD HERITAGE SITE

**A report submitted to the
AAPRAVASI GHAT TRUST FUND**

**by
GEOFFREY D. SUMMERS**

February 2011



Plaque commemorating the landing place of indentured immigrants.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The inspiration behind this report came from AGTF Chairperson, Vijaya Teelock. Corinne Forest, Head of technical Unit of the AGTF, provided all possible assistance.

Yann von Arnim and Diego Calaon made valuable comments on the ceramics.

The help, and particularly the patience, of Françoise Summers is deeply appreciated.

Photographs

The photographs have all been taken by the author with a Nikon D5000. High resolution images are submitted on CD. Photo numbers in the report are referred to in captions as below:

(ph 0920)

Copyright

Copyright is shared between the AGTF and the author, Geoffrey D. Summers.

INTRODUCTION

Archaeological excavations at the Aapravasi Ghat have revealed foundations and partial preserved buildings that formed elements of the 19th century Immigration Depot. In addition test trenches dug down into earlier strata have shed some light on earlier structures at the site some of which were constructed in the French Period. This study identifies a number of key classes of excavated artifacts and attempts to show ways in which study of these kinds of material evidence can illuminate aspects of the past that broadens understanding beyond the methods of archival research and historical analysis. The artifacts described and discussed help to place the Immigrant Landing Station, and indeed the island of Mauritius in a global context.

From the time of the very first human settlement on Mauritius, by the Dutch VOC at Fort Frederik Hendrik in the south of the Island, to the present day almost everything except timber and basalt building stone was imported. These imports included the most important crops grown for export, spices and sugar, as well as sheep and goat, cattle, buffalo, horses and donkeys. Pests were also imported, sometimes accidentally as with rats and sometimes deliberately as with the mongoose. The species that was to have the largest impact was, of course, human: settlers, fortune seekers, soldiers and sailors, slaves, labours, artisans, merchants and so forth- all were “imports” from incredibly diverse origins in both hemispheres of the earth. This population required and still to this day requires food very little of which has been produced in Mauritius, although the Island was more or less self-sufficient during World War Two. So far very little archaeological evidence of these imports has been revealed. In very large part this paucity is because the academic discipline of archaeology is very new in Mauritius. Yet the archaeological potential is enormous. Because Mauritian history is broadly documented and covers a relatively short span of time, and also because there was no indigenous or pre-colonial population, archaeological studies have particularly important potential in the development and testing of archaeological theory. Of much more concern here, however, is the material evidence of artifacts, that is, of manufactured objects or, more correctly, the broken and discarded fragments of objects. This emphasis on artifacts is not because environmental evidence is of less importance, the reverse may in fact be true, but is merely a reflection of what was recoverable from the excavated portions of the Aapravasi Ghat site. Limiting factors include conditions for the preservation of environmental remains, such as charcoals, waterlogged organic material and food remains, in addition to the more important factor which was the nature of the archaeological deposits. What will be seen is that the material record also shows that almost the entirety of manufactured artifacts, from building materials through glass and ceramics to iron objects and machinery was imported.

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

Archaeological strata associated with the Immigration Depot can be approximately and sometimes accurately dated on historical and archival grounds to the second half of the nineteenth century. It is of importance to understand that archaeological evidence, with very rare exceptions that are normally epigraphic in character (i.e. the digging up of inscriptions), do not provide close dating for the strata or levels in which they are found. In “Historical Archaeology”, that is when the periods under investigation are provided with a substantial textual (written) record from which detailed (if biased) history can be written, archaeology is not usually able to provide useful evidence relating to chronology. Indeed it is axiomatic in archaeology that artifacts are discarded when they have come to the end of their useful life (not at the time of their manufacture). Thus a pottery plate made in, say, 1840 could have been broken and thrown away any time thereafter, even yesterday. It could not, however, have been thrown away before it was made! Thus no archaeological strata can be older than the latest piece found within it. It could however, be younger than the oldest objects and this is often the case when, as often in urban contexts, infilling, levelling and landscaping has involved the re-deposition of considerable amounts of earth which has been garnered from elsewhere. These types of processes have been characteristic of the Aapravasi Ghat site since the first developments along the waterfront in the 18th century. The waterfront has been constantly modified and, more significantly, continually pushed forward to create a succession of waterfront buildings and quays together with slipways, docks and jetties. As the sea front was pushed forward by means of constructing quay walls and even buildings, so the empty spaces behind new walls needed to be filled to the level of the ground behind. To fill these spaces it was of course necessary to bring in soil, often by the cartload, to dump in the void between a new frontage wall and the earlier front, thereby covering part of the tidal shore. In the excavations, and especially in the sondages in Area Q, deposits of this nature have been scientifically examined so as to provide representative samples through a succession of such fills. The stratigraphy, that is the vertical relationships, provide the sequence of deposition (the order in which the layers were put down). Archival evidence provides at least approximate dates to the major phases. Study of the artifacts from these layers provides microcosmic views of material culture. It should now be obvious that many of the artifacts were older than the time when the fill in which they were found was put down – not only were they manufactured at an earlier date than the time they were discarded, but they were often redeposited in the processes of infilling. Thus much of what has been found was recovered from secondary not primary deposits.

While much of the above relates to developments at the Aapravasi Ghat site that are earlier than the construction of the Immigration Depot in 1849, the same archaeological principals apply to levels of this period too. Elements of older buildings were partially reused, as for instance the front (seaward) wall of the privies that was constructed for entirely different and as yet uncertain purpose, and frequently modified thereafter before the openings were finally remodelled to make outlets for the privies. Construction of new buildings for the “processing” of immigrants entailed more levelling of ground, the digging of foundation trenches for the foundations of new structures, the insertion of utilities and so forth. Many of these processes, including upgrading of utilities such as drainage, piped water and (later) electricity were to continue until the Depot was closed. From an archaeological perspective each of these changes reworked earlier deposits. A foundation trench is dug into earlier deposits, the excavated soil, together with the pottery fragments, sherds of glass and other artifacts, being spread around to fill in hollows and so forth, or taken off site altogether to be used as fill elsewhere. Thus the continual adaptation of areas of the site entailed a continual mixing and remixing of archaeological material. When a floor or external surface was laid it sealed earlier deposits but, as every urban dweller knows, even the laying of a “permanent”

surface does not prevent utility providers from digging new trenches through pavement and streets. It is the job of the archaeologist to recognise these complexities. This can be done horizontally, in plans that are essentially two-dimensional, or more often vertically by means of judiciously positioned sections (usually trench sides) cut through the strata and carefully recorded. It is these vertical sections that show which levels or layers were cut through when foundation trenches were dug and which accumulated against the walls of the new building. The first are of course earlier than the building, thus any artifacts that it may contain will be earlier than the building, while layers running up against walls may include levelling for floors, floors, debris accumulated on floors after abandonment and so forth. This, by the way, is why it is so essential that archaeological excavations are designed to provide sections which show the relationships between structures and layers rather than simply trenching along wall faces to reveal plans with not heed paid to stratigraphic relationships.

Finally, there is the question of relationships between the artifacts recovered from excavations at the Aapravasi Ghat and the types of activity that took place at the Landing Station. Here, it is to be admitted, evidence has not been forthcoming. It is rare for buried remains to contain artifacts preserved in situ, that is, in the positions in which they were used and therefore relate directly to activities. Obvious examples of such discoveries are destructions like that at Pompey which was buried by a volcanic eruption, or sites destroyed and burnt as a result of human conflict, but these are rare exceptions. More commonly it is possible to recover artifacts, and indeed environmental evidence from day to day garbage that may be buried in pits or accumulate in middens (piles of refuse). At the Aapravasi Ghat, however, the entire emphasis appears to have been placed on cleanliness and hygiene. Further, it was not a place where people lived, although they were temporarily accommodated, fed, and provided with facilities. Immigrant labourers would have brought little with them and what they did bring they would have kept dear and taken as they moved on. Food refuse and so on from the kitchen would have been cleaned away and taken off site for municipal disposal, not piled up in corners or thrown into open pits. Thus it would be misguided to think that the evidence of excavated artifacts could be directly related to day-to-day activities at the Station. However, what has been recovered is in many ways more illuminating. It is certainly more representative of the place that Mauritius held in the global events of the nineteenth century, and particularly the second half of that period, and is also of interest in the vignette it gives of the eighteenth century.

Notation

AGT is followed by the year, mostly 03 or 04 for 2003 and 2004, and the code C for ceramic. The number in brackets is the original photo number. Note numbers were sometime given to groups of fragments.

ARTIFACTS AND MATERIALS

Classification of archaeological artifacts is a rather subjective matter. In some cases they are divided into materials (ceramics, glass, stone) whilst in other circumstances they are treated in broad classes according to function (building materials, personal ornament and so forth). Exactly how artifacts are classified depends in very large part on the questions being asked of them, i.e. on the specific research design. This can be tempered by considerations such as storage conditions, conservation treatment, size, volumes and (rarely in historic periods) monetary value. Here, as in the majority of archaeological studies, the approach has been pragmatic. Building materials have been taken as a single category regardless of material (e.g. stone or ceramic tile and brick) while other inorganic fragments have been split according to material, mostly ceramic (pottery), glass and iron. Clay smoking pipes are an exception. Artifacts made from other inorganic materials (e.g. metals other than iron, stone) or organic (wood, leather, textile, etc) are so few that they could be treated on an individual basis. Additionally, it is normally true that ceramic and glass objects were complete in themselves. There are of course many exceptions but these are numerically so very small amongst the material culture dealt with here that they too can be dealt with individually should they occur. The same cannot however be said for the majority of other types of artefact which were composite, i.e. comprising components of different materials. An iron knife with a bone handle attached by bronze rivets for example. In such a case it is often only the more durable components that survive in the archaeological record.

This preliminary study will deal first with building materials because, their diversity notwithstanding, they are perhaps the most tangible in terms of the understanding that they provide for the Aaprasavi Ghat site regardless of the precise context of individual pieces. Next in the list come ceramics because they are the most diagnostic in terms of origin, date of manufacture and function. They thus provide much information about trade and commerce as well as about cultural preferences. Only the surface of this vast and fascinating topic can be scratched here, not only because of limitation in expertise and time but also because volume of the samples, the small size of individual pieces and the specific archaeological contexts are all limiting factors to the accuracy of conclusions. On the positive side however the material studied here demonstrates the potential for further archaeological work in Mauritius.




Figure 1. Plan of the Appravasi Ghat showing the Sectors and archaeological excavation trenches. From the Appravasi Ghat Trust archive.

BUILDING MATERIALS

Buildings are in one sense composite artifacts constructed of different materials. One way of approaching them would be to look at each element of individual buildings, but the fragments excavated at the Aapravasi Ghat do not permit such an architectural approach because they cannot document each building. Thus what follows is general and applies to standing structures as well as artifacts.

Stone

Basalt

Mauritian basalt was normally used for walls, steps and so forth, although brick was occasionally employed (see below). Basalt building stone does not form part of the AGF artifact collection. Different stone-cutting and finishing techniques together with careful documentation of masonry styles of standing and buried walls might make it possible to work out chronological changes, but such analysis is beyond the scope of this study. The bonding medium was lime mortar.

Sandstone

Sandstone flags were sometimes used for floors. Similar flagstones can be seen in Fort Adelaïde, the citadel of Port Louis, constructed between 1834 and 1840, while fragments occur amongst the miscellaneous finds.¹ This sedimentary stone is light brown in colour, and has fine beds. The origin is unclear but, like the bricks at Fort Adelaïde, it is very possibly British.

Slate

Slate was used for roofing. It is also probable that slate was used to line water tanks, soakaways and so forth, and perhaps the large example shown in Figure 2 was so employed, hence the adhering lime mortar and bitumen. The slate used at the Aapravasi Ghat was almost certainly from Wales, indicated by the large size of the fragments. No complete roofing slates have been recovered. Fragments of purple slate, seen scattered around the site, are undoubtedly from Wales. Although it is not yet possible to document from the stratigraphy, it seems highly probable from general observations that the use of Welsh roofing slate replaced earlier terracotta tiles imported from France (see below).²

¹ Sandstone flags are found in some of the large groundfloor rooms at the landward end (personal observation). For the history see Carter 1998.

² For the Welsh slate industry see conveniently with excellent pictures Sallery n.d. For slate in general see Wikipedia. Levine (1997) states: "French slates, though of good quality, are often very thin (1/16") and small (5"X9") due to a high degree of impurities in the material that ultimately becomes waste. The French Chateau style adopted these smaller slates (indeed, the cheapest of French slates) in order to increase the scale of the roofs and to insure a smooth texture and singularly neat and elegant appearance."



*Figure 2. Slate fragment with lime mortar and bitumen.
AGT 03 BM 11. (ph 0920 & 0921)*

Bitumen

Natural bitumen was used to seal flooring, particularly in the privies, and also to seal utilities. It is found still in place on floors where it would have prevented waste water seeping between flagstones, eased cleaning and thus improved hygiene. Bitumen floor covering can still be seen in Sector P, shown on Figures 3 and 4, as well as in the Gate Keepers Room in Sector T where the legs of metal furniture and other heavy items have been impressed into the surface (Figure 7).



Figure 3. Bitumen floor covering in the Sector P Washing Shed. (ph 1172)



Figure 4. Bitumen floor covering in the Sector T Gate Keepers Room with impressions made by furniture feet. (ph 1167)

Thin bitumen on slate can be seen on Figure 2 while a large lump congealed lump is shown on Figure 5.



Figure 5. Bitumen lump. AGT 03 BM 183. (ph 0916 & 0917)

Brick

The early Dutch settlers brought bricks from Holland. Examples of these small buff bricks can be seen in the museum at Fort Frederik Hendrik. In the French period smallish red bricks were produced in Mauritius for various types of fire installation, such as the bakery at Grand Port and the hot shot furnace on Ile de la Passe. Larger, standard 9 inch but often bigger, bricks for construction and flooring do not seem to have been locally produced before the second half of the 19th century at the earliest, but there is much more research to be done here. It is however clear that the clay and tempering available on Mauritius did not lend itself to ceramic production, be it for building or pottery production. The Rice Granary at Port Louis, completed in 1933, comprises a reinforced concrete frame infilled with locally made red bricks. Mauritian bricks were also used for the floor of the BRIC Warehouse, the date which has yet to be established, and at least one brick kiln is known from archival records. At the Ghat bricks were used for the partition wall architraves (and presumably door arches) in the privies and for modifications to rooms and features in Sector T. However, the bricks used for these purposes were very often, and perhaps always, recycled. This suggestion is reinforced by the variety of bricks used in the privy architraves as well as in secondary contexts in the Sector T rooms as can be seen in Figures 6 to 6.

The Mauritian sugar industry required much energy. Steam driven industrial plant was imported to meet the demands of rapidly expanding production. Industrialisation required vaulting and lining with fire-resistant materials. The result was the importation of fire bricks from England and Scotland on a very considerable scale. These same bricks were also used for domestic purposes, such as ovens, and were (and still are) recycled. In addition bricks were imported for government building, such as Fort Adelaïde and Martello Towers, and later for civilian lighthouses as well as for defences during both World Wars. Special feature bricks for specific purposes were also imported in the 20th century if not before. Many of these bricks are stamped with a brand name. Not only did the production of these industrial bricks require the right kinds of clay and temper, but large-scale production needed presses, kilns and so forth as well as fuel.



Figure 6. Yellow imported fire bricks and larger Mauritian red bricks recycled in modifications to the Sector P Privies; note also the bitumen covering basalt flagstones. (ph 1174)



Figure 7. A variety of bricks recycled in modifications to the Surgery in Sector T. (ph 1114)



Figure 8. Bricks, some recycled, in the Sector T kitchen. (ph 1120)

Red Brick, Mauritian

The complete example shown on Figure 9 measures 22.5 x 9.5 x 6.5 cm, probably intended to be a 9 by 4 inch brick. Fragments of two other similar bricks have widths of 10 cm while thickness varies by up to a centimetre. The bricks are full of inclusions sometimes greater than 1 cm in length and contain many cracks and voids created as the clay shrank during drying and firing. They were pressed in moulds, as evidenced by timber impressions on surfaces and smoothed sides.




Figure 9. Mauritian red brick, three faces. AGT 03 BM 233. (ph 892, 895)

Fire Bricks with Makers Stamps, Imported

COWEN, fire brick, yellow with black inclusions, smooth faces brand name impressed into face. Dimensions 23 x 11 x 6 cm, an English 9 inch brick made by Joseph Cowen and Company of Blaydon-on-Tyne, England from the 1820s to 1904.³ Cowen bricks are found all over Mauritius. That shown in Figure 10 is one of several that were reused in the chimney and fireplace of the kitchen in Sector T illustrated in Figure 8.

³ Gurcke 1987, 71.



Figure 10. Reused in Sector T Kitchen Chimney. (ph 1121)

Cowen fire bricks were exported round the world.⁴ Joseph Cowen junior was prominent British Member of Parliament before retiring from public life to become a newspaper editor. In his youth he was deeply interested in European revolutionary movements and smuggled documents abroad amongst consignments of bricks from the family company. He was, not surprisingly for someone whose wealth came in part from the export of fire bricks to the colonies, an imperialist.⁵



*Figure 11. AGT 03 BM 4204.
(ph 0877)*



*Figure 12. AGT 03 BM 419.
(ph 0891)*

Two imported fire bricks, both presumably 9 inch, have unidentified brand names impressed into the top surface. The brick in Figure 11 is buff in colour and friable with many inclusions including quartz grits. All surfaces are smooth. The impressed brand name, made with a metal stamp, consists of a radiate oval with border enclosing the legend in relief. The brick fragment in Figure 12 is pale yellow with black inclusions and smooth on all sides. The top surface bears the impressed brand name made with a rectangular stamp.

⁴ <http://calbricks.netfirms.com/brick.cowen.html>

⁵ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph_Cowen



Figure 13. Imported Fire Brick with Frog. AGT 03 BM 450. (ph 0901, 0903)

The imported 9 inch fire brick with a frog on the top surface shown on Figure 13 is yellow with black temper. The frog, measuring 15 x 5 x 1.5 cm, is V-shaped cross section and holds reddish mortar.



Figure 14. AGT 03 BM 422. (ph 0905)

A plain imported 9 inch fire brick is shown on Figure 14. Like the next example, this was probably machine made, although no machine marks can be seen. Similar were often reused in alterations the Aapravasi Ghat.



*Figure 15.
Machine-made
fire brick.
GT 03 BM 406.
(ph 0880, 0882,
0885)*

The machine-made brick in Figure 15 has a width of 11 cm. The faint raised circle indicates that it was pressed in a machine. The core, seen in the broken section contains many large inclusions that are typical of fire bricks.

The imported dark red air-brick in Figure 16 would have been designed for ventilation. The extant side of the piercing measures 4.20cm. The sides are very smooth, almost burnished, suggesting the use of a mechanical mould.



*Figure 16. Part of an air brick or ventilation-
brick feature brick with rectangular piercing.
AGT 03 BM 20 (ph 0859)*

Floor Tile

The largest fragment of a very few large flat floor tiles is shown on Figure 17. The extant dimension is 27 cm and it is 4.5 cm thick. The underside surface is rough while the top was scraped. Smooth sides show that the tile was made in a mould, and probably pressed. The fabric is light red in colour with some vegetal inclusions. Superficially the fabric resembles the roof tiles to be described in the following section, and it may thus be tentatively suggested that it was a product of Marseilles.



*Figure 17. Part of a large “Roman” tile.
03 BM 414. (ph 0909, 0912)*

Roof Tile

Fragments of very many terracotta roofing tiles have been recovered. It is known that some structures at the Aapravasi Ghat were provided with tiled roofs in 1857 and while it is not possible to associate any individual excavated fragment with a particular structure we can be sure that they were all of the same type. Similar tiles can be found in many places on Mauritius.⁶ They were known as Gilardoni tiles, after the brothers Joseph and Xavier Gilardoni who seem to have patented this design for tightly fitting, interlocking tiles in Marseille in either 1841 or 1851.⁷ These so-called “diamond pattern” because of the raised decorative lozenge with concave sides, were light, waterproof and windproof. They preceded the “Marseilles Tile” which became very popular in Turkey and the Eastern Mediterranean, especially amongst the Greek-speaking communities in the Aegean and Central Anatolia, as well as in India, Singapore, Australia and South America.⁸ Why the Marseilles Tile did not retain the popularity attained by the Gilardoni type is currently a matter for speculation. Both competition from Welsh slate and the relative lightness of wooden shingles (which were not so much of an option in other parts of the world where the tile dominated) might be relevant factors.

All tiles from the Aapravasi Ghat appear to have been stamped on the underside with similar, but not identical, oval stamps which invariably has Marseille, where they were made, at the bottom and the brand at the top. Not only is no stamp is fully legible, no brand name can be read. So far only pan tiles have been recognised, but a smaller number of ridge tiles are to be expected. No complete tile has been recovered and it has not been possible to establish either the length of these tiles nor exactly where the “string hole” was located. The width is 23cm, total depth 3.5 cm and the thickness 1.5 cm. The fabric is light red in colour and well levigated with no temper or inclusions. About half of all tiles are coated with a cream slip.




Figure 18. Fragment of a Gilardoni pantile, red with cream slip and incomplete stamp. 03 BM 07 (ph 0825)

⁶ AGTF 2003, 5-8.

⁷ Varman 2006, 1; Miles n.d. 6.06.2.

⁸ See Varman 2006 and Miles n.d. with references.



*Figure 19. Roof tile fragment with string hole.
03 BM 7 (ph 0852)*



*Figure 20. (a) Top of a Giladoni diamond pattern pantile, red with thin cream slip.
03 BM 130 (ph 0842)
(b) Underside with Marseilles stamp, brand illegible.
03 BM 130 (ph 0846)*



Figure 21. (a) Top of a Giladoni diamond pattern pantile, plain red with thin cream slip. 03 BM 07. (ph 0868)
(b) Underside with illegible Marseilles stamp. 03 BM 07 (ph 0873)



Figure 22. Example with the most complete stamp. 03 BM 07 (ph 0834, 0836)

Window Glass

A considerable amount of window glass has been recovered from Aapravasi Ghat. While most of this probably dates to the 20th century it is to be expected that windows were glazed from the first use as the Immigration Depot in 1849. It is likely to have been imported from Britain where cylinder sheet glass was and was used to glaze the Crystal Palace built for the Great Exhibition in 1851. All window glass is all imported up to today.

Iron

There was no manufacture of iron in Mauritius during the period of British rule. Thus all iron used for buildings, such as the supporting bands for the brick arch over the fireplace shown in Figure 8, was imported. The sugar industry did develop means of sand-casting parts for machines, as can be seen at *L'Aventure du sucre*, but this was done for expediency when repairs were needed. Iron would, however have been locally forged for door, window and shutter fittings, handrails and so forth.

CERAMICS

Ceramics, sherds of broken pottery, form the backbone of many archaeological studies. Three principle reasons underlie the importance of ceramic studies; the first is their general indestructability, the second is the worthlessness of broken pottery which has no value as scrap, while the third is the very varied kinds of information that pottery can yield – contact and trade, aesthetic taste, economy and standards of living, cultural preferences for food and drink along with preparation and consumption. In fully historic periods ceramics are perhaps less used for chronological purposes than elsewhere because they are rarely more informative than archival records, although clay smoking pipes can be particularly valuable as chronological markers when found in reliable contexts. Thus, in the undertaking of studies of ceramics from archaeological excavations, context is everything. As explained at the start of this report, the excavated contexts at Aapravasi Ghat do not lend themselves to detailed studies of spatial function, nor do they shed much light on everyday activities at the site itself. They do, however, provide a window, for the first time in Port Louis, on the material culture of the Capital. Thus it is from this broad perspective that the finds will be approached here. The most informative way to deal with this material, taking into consideration the limited time and expertise available, is to present a general and comprehensive overview. In addition, this report provides more detailed descriptions of particular fragments which are perhaps more illuminating of some specific point than the majority. Neither the quantity and size of the sherds, nor the security of archaeological contexts make a strict quantitative or statistical approach useful at the current stage of investigations.⁹ Inevitably the thrust of this report is descriptive, with comments added where apposite. While it is possible to use these numbers to track back to the original find spot, for all the reasons given above this has not been attempted in the absence of a detailed excavation report.

New, 2011, excavations in BRIC have produced a mass of material from tighter stratigraphic contexts, especially from the middle of the nineteenth century before the construction of the warehouse in 1864. The brick floor of this warehouse sealed earlier deposits. In general the pottery from the level above the Port Slip and beneath the brick floor is very similar to much of what was excavated at the Aapravasi Ghat site.

⁹ This comment on the insecurity of contexts relates to the nature of the excavated deposits. The excavations themselves were carried out with great care with excellent standards of recording being attained in the field.

Earthenware

A broad class of red earthenware is well represented. Most and perhaps all is wheel-made. The ware is not very coarse and usually has fine grit temper. The fabric pale red, often with a pale grey core. All surfaces are smoothed. Outer surfaces of closed vessels and both surfaces of open ones have a shiny varnish-like red slip, which can be dark brown verging on black in some instances. This slip is sometimes fugitive. External incised decoration includes parallel horizontal lines and continuous zigzags, rim tops are sometimes rouletted. Some pieces are partially burnished.

Shapes include a simple flat-bottomed dish (Fig. 23) large cooking pots often with seating for a lid or cover (Figs 24-28).

No jugs or jars have been identified in this red ware assemblage.

Neither the temper nor the clay appear to be of Mauritian origin. While more research is necessary, it is not impossible that these earthenware vessels were made in India and that, ultimately, they go back to a tradition of potting on parts of the coast of mainland India which goes all the way back to contacts between India and the Roman Empire in the early centuries AD.

Earthenware Catalogue




Figure 23. Shallow plain dish with iron staining, pale red with part buff. Dia 14. AGFT 03 C 94. (ph 1929, 1930)



Figure 24. Cooking pot with shallow seating for a cover; wheel made, pale red "brittle ware"; nine tool made ridges extant on the shoulder, groove and rouletting on the rim top. Dia. 22cm. AGT 03 C 152 (ph 1915, 1920)



Figure 25. Cooking pot with high rim and seating for a lid. wheel made; brownish red with grey core, hard fired and clinky; micaceous clay with sparse fine grits; thin shiny slip that gives a streaky finish, the slip has dribbled inside. Three incised grooves around shoulder somewhat distorted by irregular burnishing. Dia. 18cm.

*AGT 03 C 132g.
Ph (1907, 1912)*





Figure 26. Cooking pot; wheel made, plain light red with grey core, grit temper; groove and rouletting on rim top, shallow horizontal grooves and the top of a band of rouletting on shoulder. Four joining sherds (not mended). Dia. 18cm.

*AGT 03 C 132a-c
(ph 1924, 1968)*



*Figure 27. Sherds from a red ware cooking pot with seating for a cover; wheel made, light red, fugitive darker red slip.
AGT 04 C 147.
(ph 1978, 1977)*



*Figure 28. Selection of sherds from the shoulders of red ware cooking pots showing decorative schemes that include incised horizontal lines and running zigzags.
AGT 03 C 157.
(ph 1964)*

Porcelain

Here the term porcelain refers to "true porcelain" or "hard-paste porcelain" to distinguish it from a variety of glazed earthenwares that were developed in imitation of true porcelain. The term porcelain originally comes from the Italian word for the cowrie shell, the hardness and glossiness of which is resembled by the ceramics. Porcelain is made from kaolin, a naturally occurring type of unusually pure clay (also used for making clay smoking pipes and the main constituent of toothpaste), usually mixed with quartz and feldspars. It is fired at temperatures between 1200 and 1400 degrees Celsius at which the clay vitrifies. The resulting product is translucent with a white surface. The degree of translucence depends on the purity of the clay. Porcelain is strong, hard and impermeable, but also brittle.

Most porcelain cobalt blue painted decoration beneath a clear glaze that is essentially glass. This is termed underglaze. All of the pieces described below appear to have the paint and glaze applied directly to the dry paste before a single firing rather than to a biscuit. A few pieces have overglaze decoration which is attained by applying decoration to a piece that has already been glazed and fired, and then firing it a second time to in fact add a second layer of glaze or, sometimes, enamel.

Eighteenth and nineteenth century porcelain found in Mauritius was mostly if not entirely made in China, Japan and Europe.

Porcelain Catalogue





Figure 29. Blue on White porcelain dish, Chinese export ware. AGT 04 C 71. (ph 1984, 1982)




*Figure 30. Blue on White Chinese porcelain with mark on base.
AGT 04 C 48. (ph 2004, 2006)*



*Figure 31. Blue on White porcelain plates, Chinese export ware,
eighteenth century.
AGT 04 C 192, 159, 102, 117; 03 C 101. (ph 1996)*



*Figure 32. Blue on White Chinese porcelain with floral design.
AGT 03 C 17c, 101a, 242, 192. (ph 2014)*



*Figure 33. Blue on White porcelain plates.
AGT 03 C 223; AGT 04 C 164; AGT 03 C 246; AGT C 04 192, 164. (ph 1999)*



Figure 34. Blue on White Chinese porcelain plate rim with pagoda, eighteenth century. Degraded surface. AGT 03 C 208. (ph 1994)




Figure 35. Chinese industrial porcelain bowl base with foot ring, probably mid nineteenth century. AGT 03 C 127a. (ph 1990, 1992)



Figure 36. Chinese industrial porcelain base of bowl with foot ring, mark inside, probably mid nineteenth century. AGT 03 C 246. (ph 1988, 1986)




Figure 37. Chinese export porcelain, underglaze blue and red, probably late nineteenth century. AGT 03 C 230. (ph 1962)



Figure 38. Chinese export porcelain, block painted, first half of nineteenth century. AGT 04 C 146; 03 C 22. (ph 1954)



*Figure 39. Chinese porcelain, coral red bowl, mid nineteenth.
AGT 03 C 18.
(ph 1951)*



*Figure 40. Chinese porcelain bowl, underglaze green.
Late nineteenth or early twentieth century.
AGT 03 C 11. (ph 1946, 1947)*



*Figure 41. Chinese porcelain bowl, overglaze polychrome. Rubber stamp on base. Late nineteenth or early twentieth century.
AGT 03 C 18. (ph 1943, 1941)*



*Figure 42. Chinese porcelain bowl, overglaze polychrome with legend. Late nineteenth or early twentieth century.
AGT 03 C 43. (ph 1938, 1937)*




Figure 43. Porcelain bowl, overglaze brown exterior, fugitive interior pattern of which only gold is extant. Late nineteenth or early twentieth century. AGT 04 C 146. (ph 1935, 1932)

Salt-Glazed Stoneware

Salt-glazed stone ware was first produced in Europe in the later Middle Ages. As European trade expanded and the number of colonies grew it was commonly exported, fragments having been found in levels belonging to the Dutch period at Fort Frederik Hendrik. By the beginning of the 19th century stoneware was commonly used for ink and blacking as well as for ginger beer and other beverages being both cheap and robust. Earthenware pipes, electrical insulators and similar utility components were, and are still today, salt-glazed.¹⁰

At Aapravasi Ghat all of the salt-glazed stoneware that has been identified comes from bottles most or all of which contained ink, blacking or perhaps medicine. Thus it was invariably the content of the stoneware bottle, and not the vessel itself, that was imported. Given the huge variety of cheap Chinese industrial porcelain that was available alongside patterned European ceramics the absence of decorative salt-glazed stoneware vessels may not be surprising. At the current level of research it is not possible to say if this pattern vessel type will replicated accros Port Louis, and indeed the island as a whole.

All of the individual pieces catalogued below, which constitute the majority of diagnostic fragments, belong to the 19 or early 20th century.

Salt-Glazed Stoneware Catalogue



Figure 44. Small, cream, salt-glazed stoneware bottle, wheel made, the body wall varying in thickness. The glaze is poor, being pitted and not fully covering the lower exterior while the underside of the base is unglazed. Diameter of base 5cm. Faintly under-stamped in a vertical oval arrangement:

BRILLIANT ROULE
SANS RIVAL
PARIS

Clearly a French product, this bottle has not been closely dated, nor has its content been identified.

AGT 03 C 98b.
(ph 0927)

¹⁰ Museum of London website.



Figure 45. White salt-glazed stoneware inkbottle with raised band around neck and lip. Three joining sherds. Diameter of rim 4.5cm, extant height 23.8cm. AGT 03 C 122 & 183. (ph 0930)



Figure 46. Dark brown salt-glazed stoneware bottle, probably for ink, stamped LOVATT & LOVATT LTD. Diameter 10cm. The stamp dates manufacture to anywhere between 1913 and 1930. AGT 03 C 42. (ph 0935, 0937)



Figure 47. White salt-glazed stoneware base, probably of an inkbottle. Diameter 10cm. The oval impressed mark, the top of which is very shallow and difficult to make out, reads:

DOULTON & WATTS
LAMBETH POTTERY
LONDON

*This dates production to circa 1820 to 1854.¹¹
AGT 03 C 5. (ph 0949)*



*Figure 48. Dark brown salt-glazed stoneware bottle, unglazed near base, stamped on the exterior BOURNE DENBY in an oval cartouche within a rectangle with scrolls in the corners. Diameter 10cm. The mark of Joseph Bourne of Denby, England, manufacturer of stoneware bottles from 1809 following the discovery of a fine clay bed near Denby a few years earlier.¹² Late 19th or early 20th century.
AGT 03 C 67. (ph 0942)*



*Figure 49. Dark brown salt-glazed stoneware bottle, incomplete stamp.
AGT 03 C 139. (ph 0954)*

¹¹ Grace 2007.


¹² For a history of the Denby pottery with excellent illustrations see Denby 2009.



*Figure 50. Neck and lip of dark brown salt-glazed stoneware ink bottle.
AGT 04 C 122.
(ph 0959)*



*Figure 51. Brown salt-glazed stoneware bottleneck.
AGT 04 C 122.
(ph 0962)*



*Figure 52. (a) Very dark brown salt-glazed stoneware inkbottle (the parallel scratches are modern).
(b) Lighter brown and pale salt-glazed interior. Short neck, lip broken. Three joining sherds. Diameter of rim 4cm, extant height 12.2cm.
AGT 03 C 66. (ph 0944, 0947)*

Shell-edged Pearl Ware

Pearl Ware with moulded and scalloped shell edges, mostly feathered in blue but also in other colours, was made in huge quantities in the Potteries of North England and exported around the world. Production started in the 1780s and continued down to around 1840. In later pieces the colour was applied with a brush, which resulted in a straight band. From about 1820 more elaborate mouldings developed as demand for regular scallop-edged forms declined.¹³ Popularity fell sharply from the 1830s in response to transfer printed wares.

The few pieces from the Aapravasi Ghat excavations would all have been imported before the establishment of the Immigrant Depot and were most probably introduced with fill material.

Shell-edged Pearl Ware Catalogue



*Figure 53. Shell-edged Pearl Ware with blue paint.
English early 19th century.
AGT 03 C 159, 503, 144, 123, 340; AGT 04 959.
(ph 1022)*

¹³ Some of the summary given here it adapted from:
<http://www.bookrags.com/tandf/pearlware-tf/>



Figure 54. Later Pearl Ware with elaborate moulded patterns derived Shell-edged plates. English, made about 1820-1840.

*AGT 03 C 119, 188, 04 C 7b.
(ph 1023)*

Transfer-Printed Pottery

From the mid 1750s transfer-printing onto earthenware provided a cheap European, and especially British, alternative to imported hand-painted ceramics from China. Often called Transfer-Printed Pearl Ware because the coloured transfer was on a pearl white background. The patterned surface was over-glazed. Blue and white was the most common, but red and green are commonly found in Mauritius as, to a lesser extent, are brown, black and even purple. Huge quantities were produced, mostly in Staffordshire, for export to America and the colonies. By the 1850s the heyday was over great quantities continued to be made although the range of printed patterns decreased. In Mauritius during the second half of the 19th century, the period to which most of the pieces excavated at Aapravasi Ghat seem to belong, there are two prominent patterns, the famous “Willow Pattern” derived from what became in the West a popular Chinese legend.¹⁴

Transfer-Printed Pottery Catalogue



*Figure 55. Pearl Ware, underglaze blue transfer printed brand stamp on underside of base. [COP]ELAND & [GARRET] around LATE SPOD[E]. Late here means previously. The backmark is dated 1833-1847.¹⁵
AGT 04 C 04.
(ph 1037)*

¹⁴ For the Willow Pattern storey see: <http://www.thepotteries.org/patterns/willow.html>

¹⁵ For the backmark see: <http://www.thepotteries.org/mark/c/copeland.html>




Figure 56. Pearl Ware, underglaze green transfer printed text on inside of vessel:

*'s down h
iut his thi*

AGT 04 C 86. (ph 1006)



Figure 57. Broad rim of dish or platter, Pearl Ware, underglaze blue transfer printed, oriental, perhaps north Indian, fortified palace with water and, at right, acanthus leaf motif. Two joining sherds.

Dia. ca. 23cm.

AGT 04 C 183, 192.

(ph 0973)



Figure 58. Dish or platter, large, Pearl Ware, underglaze blue transfer print, English. The scene almost certainly the Crystal Palace, London, which was built for the Great Exhibition of 1851 where the finest products of the British Empire were displayed.

AGT 03 C 134, 154, 158. (ph. 0974)



Figure 59 (a) and (b). Rim sherds from plates and dishes, Pearl Ware underglaze blue transfer print, floral border designs. AGT 02 C 3, AGT 03 C 7, AGT 03 C 91c, AGT 03 C 134, AGT 03 C 247, AGT 04 C 71b, AGT 04 C 114. (ph 1043, 1046)




Figure 60 (a) and (b). Rim sherds from plates and dishes, Pearl Ware underglaze blue transfer print, "Willow Pattern" border design.

*AGT 03 C 7, AGT 03 C 60, AGT 03 C 153c,
AGT 04 C 47, AGT 04 C 117, AGT 04 C 127.
(ph 1026, 1028)*



Figure 61 (a) and (b). Base sherds from plates and dishes, Pearl Ware underglaze blue transfer print, "Willow Pattern".

AGT 03 C 178, AGT 03 C 188, AGT 04 C 99a,
AGT 04 C 23, AGT 04 C 132, AGT 04 C 135.

(ph 1030, 1031)



Figure 62 (a) and (b). Sherds from plates and dishes, Pearl Ware underglaze blue transfer print, "Willow Pattern".
 AGT 02 C 2, AGT 03 C 91, AGT 03 C 88,
 AGT 03 C 131, AGT 03 C 188, AGT 04 C 64.
 (ph 1034, 1035)




*Figure 63 (a) and (b). Sherds, at right from cheese platter. Pearl Ware underglaze blue transfer print.
AGT 03 C 65, AGT 04 C 95e.
(ph 1049, 1050)*



Figure 64. Sherd from serving or meat dish, Pearl Ware underglaze blue transfer print. AGT 04 C 35. (ph 1041)




Figure 65. Dish or platter, Pearl Ware, underglaze grey transfer printed, portrait of unidentified European, perhaps classical, with surrounding wreath of olive and oak. AGT 04 C 46. (ph 0982)



*Figure 66 (a) and (b). Pearl Ware, underglaze
grey and brown transfer printed sherds.
AGT 03 C 33d, AGT 03 C 234, AGT 04 C 132
(ph 1003, 1004)*



*Figure 67. Pearl Ware, underglaze grey transfer printed sherd from a closed vessel.
AGT 04 C 714 (ph 1015)*



*Figure 68 (a) and (b). Three small, Pearl Ware, underglaze grey transfer printed sherds.
AGT 02 C 28, AGT 03 C 70, AGT 03 C 101c.
(ph 0984, 0986)*



Figure 69. Cup or small bowl, Pearl Ware, underglaze red transfer printed with Chinese figure.
AGFT.
(ph 0988)




Figure 70 (a) and (b). Pearl Ware, underglaze red transfer printed sherds, the largest with floral patterns inside and out is from a bowl.
AGT 03 C 27a, AGT 03 C 47,
AGT 04 C 95h, AGT 04 C 164.
(ph 0993, 0995)



*Figure 71 (a) and (b). Pearl Ware, underglaze green transfer printed sherds, most with patterns inside and out.
AGT 03 C 12, AGT 03 C 65d, AGT 03 C 91g, AGT 03 C 246.
(ph 1009, 1011)*

Spongeware

This distinctive class of glazed earthenware was made in Scotland and England from about 1830 to 1880.¹⁶ The cream paste is not very hard and the clear glaze is often crazed. A variety of shapes, including plates, small bowls or cups and ornamental closed vessels, occur. Paint was applied with pieces of sponge on sticks, hence the name. Designs are generally floral; the small bowls have painted lines on the interior as well as the complex polychrome

¹⁶ Kelly, Kowalsky and Kowalsky 2007 (this book was not available at the time of writing).

designs on the outside. It is probable that these bowls are slightly later in date than the other examples which should belong to about the middle of the nineteenth century.

Spongeware ware is not uncommon in Mauritius, being both cheap and popular.

Spongeware Catalogue



*Figure 72. Underglaze blue on white Spongeware.
AGT 03 C 140, 151, 95, 217, 80B, 17, 95;
AGT 02 C 03; AGT 03 C 91m, 47.
(ph 1082)*



Figure 73. Underglaze purplish red on white Spongeware. AGT 04 C 193. (ph 1087)



Figure 74. Underglaze purple and blue on white Spongeware. AGT 04 C 193. (ph 1092)



Figure 75. Underglaze polychrome on white Spongeware. AGT 03 C 47, 217, 65c. (ph 1101)



*Figure 76. Underglaze polychrome on white
Spongware bowls.
AGT 04 C 89B, 114, 79, 144 48;
03 C 91, 20D; 04 C 4.
(ph 1111)*

Ironstone Lusterware

Underglaze blue, green and pink, sometimes with overglaze gilding, soup bowls, dinner plates and small bowls with painted floral designs. They belong in of the later nineteenth century. All are moulded and have foot rings on the underside. The green example has a late form of moulded shell edging.

Ironstone Lusterware Catalogue



*Figure 77. Soup bowl with blue bands.
AGT 03 C 189, 7. (ph 1089)*



*Figure 78. Soup bowl green band and
moulded shell edge.
AGT 03 C 246. (ph 1095)*



*Figure 79. Platter with pink green band and gilding.
AGT 03 C 112. (ph 1098)*



*Figure 80. Small bowls or cups with polychrome floral designs. Both examples have a simple band inside the lip.
AGT 04 C 95k, 30, 706.
(ph 1105)*

Mochaware

Earthenware in a variety of closed shapes, probably jugs, jars and perhaps tea sets, all with machine turned underglaze bands. Probably all around the middle of the nineteenth century.



*Figure 81. Mochaware sherds with machine-turned bands of various colours.
AGT 04 C 151, 130; 03 C 91d; 04 c 19, 95 (2020)*

Smoking Pipes

At the Aapravasi Ghat site and indeed in Mauritius in general, eighteenth and nineteenth century clay pipes for smoking tobacco are surprisingly uncommon. Clay tobacco pipes would usually have come from Europe, many in Mauritius being made in the Dutch town of Gouda (Fig. 1). One, however, stamped COO'EY (Fig. 2) is probably Australian made around the middle of the nineteenth century.¹⁷ Clay pipes often bear marks, usually on the base and sides of the heel of the bowl, but sometimes on the bowl itself or on the stem. Early bowls are plain but rilling around the top of the bowl (Fig. 1) soon developed. More elaborately decorated bowls generally belong the late eighteenth century down into the early twentieth (Fig. 3). Such pipes continued to be smoked if part of the stem broke, only being discarded when the stem became so short that it was unpleasantly hot to the lips.

In contrast, the Aapravasi Ghat site has produced a number of terracotta bowl stubs for hookahs or water pipes. These were presumably made in India. While none are complete, with the result that the entire form is not known. The fact that only base and lower bowl fragments are recognised is evidence that these pieces were brought to the site with other material for levelling and so forth, rather than representing smoking at the Immigrant Landing Station itself. All are of well levigated paste and quite soft fabric, covered with a glossy slip. Some have a raised band below the lip and one has a decorative spiral groove along its extant length. Internal blackening often attests to their use. Not illustrated is one unprovenanced base and two other possible fragments.

Clay Pipe Catalogue




Figure 82 (a), (b) and (c). Bowl with single line of rilling around the top. The heel is marked on either side with the coat of arms of Gouda in Holland in the form of a shield below an S for standard quality. The base of the heel sports a rampant lion denoting manufacture by Jan Prince and Son of Gouda.¹⁸ All marks are moulded. Maximum measurement 5.5cm. An exact parallel can be found at: <http://www.kleipijp.nl/> Circa 1800. AGT C 03 138. (ph 0722, 0720, 0723)

¹⁷ Brassey 1991, 29.

¹⁸ Also see Boon and Meulen. All accessed 05, 02, 2011.



Figure 83. Part of a bowl with moulded band of decoration around the bowl and rilling towards the base of the bowl. Mid or late nineteenth century.

Maximum size 2.5cm.

AGT 03 C 172.

(ph 0717)



Figure 84. Part of a bowl stamped:

COO'EY

Heel missing. Australian, nineteenth century.

Maximum size 3.5cm.

AGT 03 C 33.

(ph 8652)



Figure 85. Base, stem and party of a hookah bowl with flared base and raised bead at bottom of stem, and ridges and grooves at bottom of bowl. Four joining pieces. Wheel made, fine pale brown paste, slipped except over the central inside portion of the stem, interior of bowl burnt black. Maximum height 5.6cm, dia. of base 3.5cm. AGT 03 C 92. (ph 8819)



Figure 86. Base of hookah stem with raised band. Wheel made, pale red with sparse fine grit, shiny slip. Dia. 3.5cm. AGT 03 C 157F. (ph 1927)



Figure 87. base of hookah bowl with vertical fluting and top of stem and ridge at junction. Fine pale brownish red paste, reddish brown slip. The interior of the bowl is burnt.

AGT 03 C 36.

(ph 8635)



Figure 88. Base of hookah stem with applied band at junction with bowl. Shiny, very dark brown slip applied by dipping.

Extant height ca. 4cm.

AGT 03 C 240.

(ph 8646)



Figure 89. Hookah fragment with applied band at junction of bowl and stem. The three marks are unintentional (see the examples on Figure 00 below). Wheel made, pale red with sparse fine grit, shiny slip.

Dia. 3.5cm.

AGT 03 C 30.

(ph 8647)



Figure 90. Three stem ends from hookah bowls. The example on the left is blackened by burning on the upper portion of the interior. AGT 03 C 157 with joining fragment to that at left from 152. (ph 1974)




Figure 91. Possibly pieces of hookah bases, in any case not bowls because there is no sign of burning. The upper piece is wheel made with grooves and ridges and appears to be kicking up to a stem where broken, dia. 7cm. The lower piece could be a flask rim but is more probably a base. It is wheel made with red-black shiny slip; dia. 5cm. AGT 03 C 171. (ph 8658)

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This report documents the most useful and generally the most commonly found material from the nineteenth century together with a few pieces from both the eighteenth and the twentieth. It does not include every single piece because there seems to be little benefit in cataloguing each tiny scrap unless there is some specific purpose.

Not included in this study is the glass, with the exception of brief reference to window glass. There is a considerable quantity of black bottle glass the great majority of which comprises body sherds. Because contexts are not primary there is little obvious utility in counting and weighing it. More seriously, the metals have not been tackled. I might be of interest to look more closely at the metals from pre twentieth century contexts, but such as study would need to be done in conjunction with a program of cleaning and conservation.

The "Miscellaneous" material occupies a considerable amount of shelf space. No attempt has been made to look at this systematically. To do so would require both proper working space and considerable time. However, a more than cursory look at the bags immediately shows that almost all of this material is made up of stones that are not found at Mauritius. Much of it is coarse gravel but there are also larger stones. This is clearly ships ballast and is very clear evidence that the archaeological layers are mostly material brought in from elsewhere and not accumulations related to activities at the site itself (other than landscaping and construction).

This report makes available a broad and reasonably detailed account of the types and quantities of building materials and ceramics that were excavated at the Aapravasi Ghat site. These provide a window into the kinds of ceramics that were circulating in Port Louis in the middle decades of the nineteenth century together with a much smaller corpus from the late eighteenth. Thus an interesting and useful start has been made in the Urban Archaeology of Mauritius. It needs to be extended, as recently completed excavations at BRIC have done, so that it is more statistically reliable and with tighter contextual, and thus chronological, control. From an archaeological perspective it would be very useful to extend the corpus backwards in time to the foundation of Port Louis as the nation's capital. From the point of view of indentured labour however, this study is less specific; an inevitable result of the nature of the archaeological deposits. It will be fascinating, as archaeology develops in Mauritius, to be able to compare the material found in Port Louis with that from plantations and from villages. In addition to basic archaeological approaches to such topics as trade and economy, it would also be possible to examine aesthetics, or taste; to discern who chose to buy what as well as what was, and was not, available. It should be possible to document through time fluctuating tastes in relation to such issues as immigrant origins, gender ratios, numbers of children, and fluctuating economic circumstances at family, plantation, national and global levels. This report provides a modest start by documenting a range of what was being imported.

REFERENCES

AGFT

2003 *Aapravasi Ghat*. Past and Present. AGTF, Ministry of Arts and Culture.

Boon, P. J. <http://www.goudapipes.nl/> and <http://www.goudapipes.nl/collections/heelmarks/>
Catalogue number 246

Brassey, R.

1991 "Clay Tobacco Pipes from the Site of the Victoria Hotel Auckland, New Zealand", *Australian Historical Archaeology* 9, 27-30. Available at:
http://ashadocs.org/aha/09/09_04_Brassey.pdf

Carter, M.

1998 "The construction of Fort Adelaïde: the citadel of Mauritius", in P. la Hausse de Lalouvière, editor, *Coastal Fortifications: Fortifications Cotieres*, Heritage, Tamarin: 102-113.

Denby

2009 http://www.denby.com.au/PDF/denby_history.pdf (accessed 05 August 2010)

Grace

2007 *Graces Guide. The Best of British Engineering 1750-1960s*.
http://www.gracesguide.co.uk/wiki/Lovatt_and_Lovatt (accessed 03 August 2010)

Gurcke, K.

1987 *Bricks and Brickmaking: A Handbook for Historical Archaeology*, University of Idaho Press, Moscow.

Kelly, H. E., Kowalsky, A. A. and Kowalsky, D. E.

2007 *Spongeware 1835-1935: Makers, Marks, and Patterns*, Schiffer, Atglen, PA.

Levine, J. S.

1997 *Slate Roofs in America: A short history*. <http://www.sacredplaces.org/PSP-InfoClearingHouse/articles/Slate%20Roofs%20in%20America.htm> (accessed 28 July 2010).

Lewis, M.

n.d. *Australian Building*
<http://mileslewis.net/australian-building/>
<http://mileslewis.net/australian-building/pdf/bricks-tiles/roofing-tiles.pdf>
<http://mileslewis.net/australian-building/pdf/bricks-tiles/marseilles-tile.pdf>
(accessed 02 August 2010-08-02).

Meulen, J. van der

<http://www.goudapipes.nl/books/Meulen/digital.php>

Museum of London

http://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/ceramics/pages/subcategory.asp?subcat_id=717&subcat_name=London&page=12 (accessed 03 August 2010)

Sallery, D.

n.d. *The Slate Industry of North and Mid Wales*.
<http://www.penmorfa.com/Slate/> (accessed 28 July 2010).

Varman, R. V. J.

2006 *The Marseilles or French Pattern Tile in Australia*, Occasional paper No. 3, The Australian Society for Historical Archaeology, University of Sydney.
http://ww.ashadocs.org/occasionalpapers/OP03_Varman.pdf
(accessed 02 August 2010-08-02).

[w.ashadocs.org/occasionalpapers/OP03_Varman.pdf](http://ww.ashadocs.org/occasionalpapers/OP03_Varman.pdf)
(accessed 02 August 2010-08-02).

Wikipedia

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slate>