

OSTENSIBLY MASS PRODUCED: THE FRIENDSHIP BROOCH

Anastasia Kinigopoulo



Fig. 1. Hairwork brooch, 1785-1820
Gold, ivory, enamel, sepia ink, dissolved hair, 1 1/2 x 3/4 in. (3.18 x 1.91 cm)
Winterthur Museum Garden and Library,
Gift of Roland E. Jester in memory of Margot Jester, 1981.0101
Image courtesy Winterthur.

Gold, glass, and enamel encase the little picture, barely larger than a quarter at its longest point [fig. 1]. Inside, a woman gently lowers a wreath on two birds as they flutter on a column. A banner declaring “TO FRIENDSHIP” hangs above her. Painted with sepia on ivory, portions of the image consist of bits of macerated hair applied with gum.¹ On the back, a pin would have allowed its owner to attach the brooch to clothing, keeping near to them not only the physical expression of their affection, but also a small piece of their friend’s material body. Objects like this brooch became widely popular in the 18th century and remained so until the middle of the 1800s. The brooch was part of a

continuum of jewelry and ornamental objects in a variety of overlapping styles, including hairwork, miniature portraits on ivory, and mourning jewelry. Today, scholars and antiques dealers sometimes refer to these objects as sentimental jewelry, a term that, in its pejorative, gendered undertones, fails to capture the multifaceted connotations of these works. The volume of surviving examples speaks to these pieces’ popularity and widespread availability in late 18th century American and British society. Ostensibly mass-produced, these tokens not only allowed people’s relationships to bridge temporal and geographic divides, but also served as powerful signifiers of proper etiquette and emotions. Their emergence and use paralleled numerous changes in North Atlantic society and daily life.

Both Helen Sheumaker and Robin Jaffee Frank point out that the men and women who owned hairwork jewelry tended to be urban, white, and financially comfortable, with the means to commission custom-made objects from a professional.² The size of this consumer demographic increased rapidly during the late 18th century when the TO FRIENDSHIP pin entered the market—as did the quantity and variety of objects made to suit customer needs and tastes. Innovations at silversmith Matthew Boulton’s Soho Manufactory lead to the increased availability of the individual parts of the brooch. Boulton applied division-of-labor and factory-scale production techniques to the jewelry and metals trade, increasing the volume and variety of products he could market at varying price points. He pioneered plating techniques and, together with engineer James Watt, used steam engines to power machinery that could rapidly produce small metal ornaments such as buttons and buckles.³ Watt’s and Boulton’s inventions lowered the cost of such items and expanded their availability.⁴ These changes lead to a wide dispersal of small metal objects, which reached growing numbers of consumers eager to purchase newly affordable jewelry, hardware, and decorative trimmings.

While the casing of the brooches became more readily available, the ivory on which the image in the brooch is painted still had to be processed by hand in order to accept the water-based paint of the enclosed miniature. Certain parts of the tusk offered a better medium for this purpose than others. One instruction manual notes the best ivories are those with the least amount of grain and that overly transparent and pearly specimens were to be avoided.⁵ Ivories taken from the thinnest part of tusks appear to have been best suited for the purpose of miniature painting.⁶ Jewelers washed, sanded, ironed, and finally pasted the disks to small pieces of paper that allowed



Fig. 2. Antonio Cesare Poggi after Angelica Kauffman, R.A. (1741-1807). *Fame Decorating Shakespeare's Tomb*, 1790 (detail), Stipple engraving on paper, 14.5 x 100 cm (printed image), The British Museum, London, Gift of Lady Charlotte Schreiber

them to hold and manipulate the wafer-thin ivory without touching it. Although Boulton and Watt's innovations allowed for batch production of the metal cases that housed hairwork brooches, the labor that treated and prepared the ivory, painted the image, and affixed the hair to the ivory wafer required specialized skills that kept the price of these objects elevated.

Given the upbeat nature of the image, the purchaser of the TO FRIENDSHIP brooch may have bought it to commemorate a friendship rather than a death. Nevertheless, the line between mourning and friendship jewelry is hazy and jewelers catered to both needs with similar imagery. Angelica Kaufman's 1772 painting, *Fame Decorating Shakespeare's Grave* serves as the design source for the brooch. This image would have been widely available to jewelers about a decade after its creation, when it was reproduced as a print by numerous engravers in London [fig. 2]. Appealing to a mass audience, the image also served as a recurrent inspiration for ladies' silk embroideries—themselves often associated with mourning imagery—with surviving examples in both British and American museums [fig. 3]. Artists adapted Kaufman's original image to fit into a brooch, an embroidery, or other formats. The column and doves appear in place of the tomb, and the background fades away. Further complicating the source and meaning of the image, Frank suggests that the allegorical woman in these images may be based on Matthew Prior's poem, *Henry and Emma*, which features Emma offering marital god Hymen, a wreath of flowers and Henry's hair.



Fig. 3. Unknown artist, *Fame Decorating Shakespeare's Tomb*, 1800/15. Watercolor, ink, and chenille on silk, 22 1/2 x 18 1/2 x 1 in. (57.15 x 46.99 x 2.54 cm) Milwaukee Art Museum Gift of Mary Flagler Cary, M1969.147. Photo credit: John R. Glembin

The phrase "TO FRIENDSHIP" appeared frequently in 18th century jewelry. The extended version of the motto, "*Sacred to Friendship*," appears more commonly than the abbreviated rendition, occasionally serving as a stand-alone phrase. The images in these pieces often play on the two-doves-on-column motif. Customers clearly liked the Neoclassical woman laying a wreath on two doves, as a number of surviving examples and references to this particular motif exist. No doubt because they are especially challenging to draw correctly, miniature painters often had difficulty with modeling hands. Visual variations of the Neoclassical woman include her being replaced by a floating putti or a crown descending on two flaming hearts. The TO FRIENDSHIP brooch was but one example of the numerous variations on its themes.

Viewed on the spectrum of jewelry and adornments from the late 18th century—ranging from simple gold bands to elaborate portrait miniatures set in gold, enamel, and pearl—the TO FRIENDSHIP brooch would have been an expensive specimen. Though not nearly as sophisticated as a portrait miniature, the brooch still required a jeweler with specialized skills or sub-contractors to prepare the ivory for painting, execute the drawing, and work with hair. In the absence of these capacities, a jeweler could have purchased the individual components and assemble them—an added expense. Thus, whether imported or made in North America, this brooch would have straddled the line between batch-produced and custom-made jewelry. The account book of

Richard Vaux, a Philadelphia merchant, lists one “hair gold enamld ring” sold to William Stephenson for £2,2, more than any other single item on the order. Comparatively, “2 Enamld Gold pins” cost only a quarter of that amount.⁷ Hairwork jewelry produced in North America appears to have been similarly priced. For instance, in 1805, Godfrey Lenhart sold a “hair necklace & locket with Glass” to John Greer for £2,5. Lenhart charged George Herbach the same price for a “neckloket with Glas & hair (per Daughter)” two years later.⁸ In all three instances, these objects formed part of a larger order or extended history of transactions between supplier and client. Those able to afford hairwork jewelry could—and did—purchase other items that signaled their elevated social status, such as silverware. A person of extremely modest means would have only been able to purchase a piece of jewelry like the TO FRIENDSHIP brooch after setting aside money equal to a few weeks wages or via auction or pawn shop. Such a gift would have been a noteworthy and meaningful gesture to a potential courting partner.

In Europe and North America, this diverse range of jewelry can be considered what Jan de Vries refers to as New Luxuries: objects “capable of multiplication or of being offered in a graduated range of quality and price.”⁹

Though these objects required craftsmanship, they differed from Old Luxuries, the exquisitely wrought and crafted products commissioned by elites and royalty.¹⁰ Old Luxuries, acted as a top-down signifier of power. Available to a range of economic classes in varied forms and quantities, New Luxuries served as a means of cultural communication between consumer-participants, while simultaneously fueling economic growth. In order to afford the capital needed to purchase these objects and enter into the consumer market, de Vries argues that men and women electively began to work longer hours and to find means of generating income outside their primary occupation.¹¹

North American men and women who participated in this economy would have been able to find a jeweler via the many advertisements that appeared in newspapers, particularly in cities like New York, Philadelphia, and Charleston. It speaks to the importance of the hairwork that jewelers often featured it prominently in their advertisements, typically either at the top as one of their primary skills or as a nota bene. Henry Lupp, a New Brunswick, New Jersey jeweler, noted that, in addition to the vast assortment of serving ware and jewelry, he also offered “Hair-work laid in the neatest manner.”¹²



Fig. 4. Jeweler's sample box with hairwork, early 19th century.
Mahogany, brass, paper, silk, ivory, hair.
Winterthur, Museum Garden, and Library
Gift of Henry F. du Pont. 1959.0580.
Image courtesy Winterthur.



Fig. 5. View of a tray of samples in hairwork box, fig. 4. Image by the author.

Prominent Philadelphia jeweler Joseph Cooke included hairwork at the top of his extensive advertisements. Cooke hired numerous hairwork specialists in his manufactory, one of whom, Samuel Folwell, eventually started a vicious rivalry with Cooke.¹³ William Wightman included “Hair-Worker” in addition to his skills as a “Goldsmith, Jeweller, and Engraver” and mentions hairwork no less than four times in his advertisement, once in relation to mourning jewelry. These business owners implicitly understood that competence with bespoke hairwork, a luxurious addition to their typical merchandise and services, would have given them an advantage over their competitors.

Advertisements also allow us to better understand customers’ preferences, as jewelers marketed to these affections and desires. Hairwork references frequently evoked the themes of neatness and elegance as a measure of quality. For those with the financial and temporal concerns of having a loved one to bury, jewelers assured them that they could produce hairwork and mourning jewelry “at reasonable prices” and “with dispatch.”¹⁴ For a price, reasonable or otherwise, these men furnished the emotional and social needs of their clientele, who in turn provided them with a vigorous market.

Those who desired the jeweler to pay them a house call—surely appreciated in times of mourning—would have been served well by jewelers like Francis Rabineau, who offered to come to customers homes at no additional cost.¹⁵ Rabineau might have owned a box like the one acquired by Winterthur in 1959, once used to transport hairwork samples [fig. 4]. Joined by dovetails, with corners further reinforced by brass hardware, the utilitarian mahogany box features buckles and screws that once held a leather carrying strap. With the additional brass handle, the box offered its owner a simple and convenient means of transporting his merchandise. Opening the box,

with its lux marbled paper and red velvet lining must have been a seductive act of marketing, with an element of surprise as the sales agent unpacked each successive tray of samples. In their symmetry, the arrangement of the ivory hairwork samples echoes the presentation of dishes in elegant period dining, further emphasizing connotations of refinement [fig. 5]. Used a few decades after the close of the 18th century, the box provides a tantalizing glimpse of how objects like the TO FRIENDSHIP brooch would have been sold to customers. While secondary literature strongly

asserts that these objects were primarily produced in and consumed by urban residents, they may have also reached rural families via itinerant peddlers, who could have used boxes such as these to sell stock hairwork and cases.¹⁶

Jewelry that includes hair from this era often gets lumped into the category of mourning objects and funeralia, in part because present day Americans find the preservation of bodily material such as hair disturbing. In reality, the prevalence and ubiquity of hairwork far exceeded what was needed for solemn occasions. Although miniatures and hair lockets form a discrete material genre, they served a deeply human need to profess affection and cope with loss. In the absence of photography, such objects played a critical role in allowing people to express emotions and honor loved ones, whether living or dead. In the case of friendship jewelry, this would have been especially true among 18th century men and women with the means to spend outside of seminal events like the death of a family member.

Two reasons may account for why fewer examples of friendship jewelry appear to have survived into the 21st century: limited initial demand and loss of meaning over time. First, many men and women would not have had the financial means to memorialize a friendship with custom-made gold jewelry when parents, spouses, and children would have taken priority. By its nature, a family member’s death may have been more apt to inspire the opening of a pocketbook than generic expressions of friendship. Second, gold could be recycled for credit or cash and other jewelry. It is possible that many friendship tokens were repurposed once the living memory of an ancestor’s friend had faded. Jewelry bound by symbolic and physical ties to family would have been a less likely candidate for such treatment.

These pieces would have evolved symbolically over the course of people’s lives—as friends and family members died, but also as relationships matured. A freshly received token would have had a different meaning than

the brooch or ring that withstood decades of wear, both for the owner and for those who understood the intricacies of the symbolized bond. Beyond the constraints and expectations of etiquette or fashionable mourning, at least some of the men and women who owned these objects may have preferred to keep their sentiments to themselves.

Once received by its owner, the TO FRIENDSHIP brooch would have taken on personal and communal subtexts shaped by the quickly evolving society around it. On one hand, objects like this brooch, particularly those containing hairwork, can be seen as an evolution of the medieval Western European reliquary tradition. The critical difference, as Elizabeth Hallam and Jenny Hockey point out, is that religious institutions held relics and presented them to the public as “mediators of collective memory.” By the end of the 18th century, objects containing bodily material like hair moved into the domestic realm.¹⁷ This development paralleled the emergence of English and American genteel cultures that



Fig. 6. Mourning brooch, 1780-1810
Gold, ivory, glass, pearls, hair, 2 1/2 x 2 1/8 x 3/5 in. (6.35 x 5.4 x .95 cm)

Winterthur Museum, Library, and Gardens

Gift of Roland E. Jester in memory of Margo Jester, 1981.0132

Image by the author.

valued honorific expressions of emotions and respect, simultaneously softening and euphemizing visual representations of death.

Scholars offer a number of explanations for the changes that occurred in mourning iconography over the



Fig. 7. Reverse of brooch in figure 6.
Image by the author.

course of the 18th century. The early 18th century imagery in these objects tended to feature winged skulls, not unlike early colonial gravestones in New England. But by the Federal period and in tandem with the growth of Neoclassical taste in the United States and abroad, mourning jewelry began to include depictions of weeping women, urns, cherubs, dogs, and grieving husbands.¹⁸

According to Karen Halttunen, as communities in the later 18th century became too large for deaths to be intimately felt by the group, mourning evolved into an insular family affair rather than a shared experience. Literature of the period abounded with references to the inability of “others” and “the unfeeling crowd,” to understand the depths of a mourner’s grief. However, Halttunen’s literary evidence conflated these changes with patterns found in urban populations, when the majority of Americans continued to live in the country until the 20th century. Many communities would have retained the intimacy of mourning centered on church and neighborhood. Halttunen also noted that evolution of mourning iconography followed societal transformations that occurred as a result of the Great Awakening in the 1730s and 40s. In allowing men and women to anticipate their salvation through Christ’s passion, the religious movement changed attitudes toward death from terror to longing.¹⁹ This interpretation makes sense for some religious groups, but as Frank pointed out, Jewish families

also acquired sentimental and mourning jewelry, indicating a broad societal change beyond shifting religious values.²⁰ Citing Philippe Aries, he pointed to the softening attitudes toward children and the family as contributors to mass adoption of the new imagery and, like Haltunen, noted the greater insularity of families during this period.²¹ The growth of city centers coincided with an increase in the variety of available jewelry and the inward turn of urban families.

Small and easily concealed, jewelry served as a perfect vehicle for expressions of love and grief. Jewelers even designed some objects with concealment in mind. The Winterthur collection has a stunning example of a brooch specifically made to be hidden, in part, from view. The outside holds a lock of the deceased's hair and initials on iridescent white, framed in a thick outline of blue enamel [fig. 6]. An intricate miniature painting of a woman by a grave with the words THO' LOST TO SIGHT TO MEMORY DEAR appears on the side with the pin and clasp [fig. 7]. Frank notes that though both genders wore mourning and friendship jewelry, men were more likely to conceal it from public view than women.²²

Just as it crossed gender divides, jewelry of this sort also appeared in a spectrum of classes, from middling income to the highest strata of society. Winterthur's collection contains a pin given to Elizabeth Walcott by George and Martha Washington featuring the combined and braided hair of the couple [fig. 8]. With an inscribed date of 1797, the object preceded the death of the first president by two years and passed through the Walcott family before being gifted to the museum. John and Abigail Adams similarly exchanged friendship jewelry containing hair with Mercy Otis Warren in the early 19th century as a token of renewed friendship after a rift over Warren's biography of Adams split the Adams and Warren families apart in 1808. In less lofty circles, the edited letters of Eliza Browne find the young woman as both the giver and the recipient of hairwork friendship jewelry. In both instances, distance—and therefore time—separated her from her friends.²³ The hair would have served as the connecting physical link absent the living person.

The 1793 novel *A Hapless Orphan* offers a glimpse into emotional and symbolic resonance these objects carried in the late 18th century. Caroline, the main character, finds a miniature of handsome Clarimont in a patch of woods where she goes to read. Though a letter appears from Clarimont's fiancé Eliza requesting the return of the miniature where she found it, Caroline hesitates to follow its instructions. In this moment, Clarimont, who has been stalking her over the course of many days appears from the bushes. He offers her a locket, superficially in exchange for the miniature:

Then falling on his knees, he drew out of his pocket a locket elegantly set in gold. It



Fig. 8. Brooch with George and Martha Washington's hair, 1797 Gold, Enamel on copper, Hair, Leather, Glass, 1 5/8 x 1 1/8 in (4.13 x 3.01 cm) Winterthur Museum, Garden, and Library Gift of Mrs. Paul Hammond, 1962.0084 A Image courtesy Winterthur.

represented in hair-work, Hope, leaning upon her usual emblem, the anchor, and pointing with her other hand to a fountain, out of which two doves were drinking; on the back of it was inscribed "To friendship."²⁴

Though she finds him attractive, Caroline is aghast and ambivalent to the exchange and accompanying implications of indecency, as Clarimont confesses his affections for her in the same breath. To Caroline's horror, Eliza witnesses the interaction. The young man commits suicide a few days later and, to make matters worse, it appears he surreptitiously drew Caroline and died with her picture around his neck. Eliza, in a long-simmering fit of jealousy, begins a campaign of revenge against Caroline. The novel ends with the likelihood that she arranges Caroline's murder—a sticky "friendship" indeed. The novel demonstrates clearly the emotional stakes at play in the exchanges of objects like the TO FRIENDSHIP brooch, and the complex role they served in the inner lives of 18th century men and women.



Fig. 9. Back of the TO FRIENDSHIP Brooch
Image by the author.

Given the emotional implications of this type of jewelry, it is little wonder that many underwent repairs and alterations over the course of their life. The back of the TO FRIENDSHIP brooch reveals one such repair. Similar period objects typically feature a loop and a pin on the back, thereby allowing the owner to wear the objects either as a pendant or a pin. Instead of this construction, the brooch features a pin and latch without the pendant loop [fig. 9]. This could have been an idiosyncratic feature of this particular brooch. Yet, the jeweler who soldered the pin in place used a piece of metal that covers the entirety of the top-most back of the object, where the loop would have appeared, indicating that it was a later addition. Repairs such as this appear frequently in period jewelers account books and were not prohibitively expensive, especially compared to the upfront cost of the original object. In 1797, Godfrey Lenhart charged one of his customers a little over a shilling and a half to repair a hairwork ring—less than a tenth of its value.²⁵ The mending not only hinted at a high frequency of wear, but also on the value that the owner placed on this object.

Perhaps the repair was a caution against the possibility of losing the brooch. Whether of friendship, love, or mourning, the emotional resonance of these objects would have been especially vivid to the owners

who lost their jewelry, as many advertisements from the late 18th century testify. Owners often offered between two and five dollars—incredibly lavish rewards—for the return of missing jewelry, indicating both the advertiser's means and the emotional value of the lost jewelry. Such an event must have been deeply alarming to owners who viewed these objects as memorials. One wonders if they rushed back to where the jewelry had vanished, peering through the leaves, mud, and cobblestones, hoping that the torch caught a glint of glass or gold. That some owners were returning from the theater or the circus implies that the objects were lost after an evening of merriment. Was the objects' disappearance undiscovered until later or the next day?²⁶ Including the location where the loss took place would have also limited the probably geographic range of the tiny jewels. At least one kind person posted a "Found" advertisement, surely to the relief of the owner, if they ever saw it.²⁷

Newspapers classifieds also recorded thefts. Mrs. Mayer had over ten pieces of jewelry stolen by thieves who removed her "small Writing Desk" from her bedroom, broke it open in the garden outside her home, and ran off with, amongst other objects, two mourning rings and a miniature likeness with hairwork.²⁸ One can only imagine her sense of violation given that the hairwork and miniature portraits may have been the only representations left of friends or family members.

As they became prolific and widely available, objects like the TO FRIENDSHIP brooch tied their owners to a network of trade and technological innovation that both fed on and fueled the emergence of a new class of men and women in North America and Britain. The culture of sentiment that evolved around them remains an enduring source of intrigue for historians and material culture scholars. Curators and historians like Karen Haltunnen, Helen Schuemaker, and Robin Jaffee Frank deepen our understanding of the significances of these pieces as they circulated in late 18th century society. Though partially mass-produced, the emotional, historical, and symbolic overtones of the brooch neatly fits the definition of a fetish as described by Lambros Malafouris, in that these objects transcend the dividing lines between the signifier and signified and involve ambiguous power structures.²⁹ Indeed, in looking at the ways that sentimental jewelry in the 18th and early 19th centuries helped to shape the behavior of their owners and, at times, compelled them to action, we sense the ways in which objects like the TO FRIENDSHIP brooch acted as an "enactive signs" rather than simply a "cultural representations."³⁰ For the owners who wished to keep the memory of loved ones, adhere to etiquette, and maintain privacy in a rapidly changing country, pieces of sentimental jewelry surely would have served as steadfast friends themselves.

¹ Further analysis may reveal that the hair is flock, which would have been a cost saving—if less ethical—tactic by the hairworker.

² Helen Sheumaker, *Love Entwined: The Curious History of Hairwork in America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 1-2.

³ Matha Gandy Fales, *Jewelry in America, 1600-1900*, (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Antique Collectors Club, 1995), 149. See also, Eric Delieb, *Mathew Boulton: Master Silversmith* (New York: Clarkson N. Potter, Inc, 1971) 103-113.

⁴ In Philadelphia, jeweler Joseph Cooke attempted a similar, though less successful enterprise.

⁵ Authur Parsey, *The Art of Miniature Painting* (London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown and Green, 1831), 72.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ The Winterthur Library, Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Richard Vaux account book, Col. 695.

⁸ The Winterthur Library, Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Godfrey Lenhart account book, Doc. 1245.

⁹ Jan de Vries, *The Industrious Revolution: Consumer Behavior and the Household Economy, 1650 to the Present* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 55.

¹⁰ Ibid, 45.

¹¹ De Vries, 41-42, 113-16.

¹² *Political Intelligencer*, (New Brunswick, NJ), October 21, 1783, 4. Readex, America's Historical Newspapers.

¹³ Sheumaker, *Love Entwined*, 9-10.

¹⁴ For reasonable prices, see John Walter's advertisement in *Pennsylvania Packet*, (Philadelphia), July 20, 1784, Readex, America's Historical Newspapers. For dispatch, see James Askew's advertisement in *South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser*, (Charleston), March 21, 1785. Readex, America's Historical Newspapers.

¹⁵ *New-York Journal and Patriotic Register*, (New York, New York), December 12, 1792. Readex, America's Historical Newspapers.

¹⁶ David Jaffee "Peddlers of Progress and the Transformation of the Rural North, 1760-1860," *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 78, No. 2 (Sep., 1991), 513-16.

¹⁷ Elizabeth Hallam and Jenny Hockey, *Death, Memory, and Material Culture*, (New York: Berg, 2001) 136.

¹⁸ Matha Gandy Fales, *Jewelry in America, 1600-1900*, 25.

¹⁹ Karen Haltunnen, *Confidence Men and Painted Women: A Study of Middle-class Culture in America, 1830-1870* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 126.

²⁰ Robin Jaffee Frank, *Love and Loss: American Portrait and Mourning Miniatures* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 10.

²¹ Ibid., 121.

²² Ibid., 10.

²³ Eliza Southgate Cook Browne and Clarence Cook, eds., *A Girl's Life Eighty Years Ago: Selections from the Letters of Eliza Southgate Browne* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887) 143, 172.

²⁴ An American Lady, *The Hapless Orphan*, (Boston: Belknap and Hall, 1793), 23. Readex, America's Historical Imprints (0F2FD2E154DAA750).

²⁵ Lenhart account book.

²⁶ "Lost," *City Gazette*, (Charleston), May 15, 1797, 3. Readex, America's Historical Newspapers.

²⁷ *Daily Advertiser* (New York), July 8, 1794, 3. Readex, America's Historical Newspapers.

²⁸ "STOLEN," *South-Carolina State-Gazette*, (Charleston), July 21, 1799, 4. Readex, America's Historical Newspapers.

²⁹ Malafouris Lambros, *How Things Shape the Mind* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2013), 133-4.

³⁰ Ibid