Fig. 1. United States Geological Survey map, Masontown Quadrant, New Geneva and Greensboro along the Monongahela River.
Fig. 2. Map of Greensboro showing location of potteries, ca. 1870.
THE STONEWARE POTTERIES OF NEW GENEVA AND GREENSBORO, PENNSYLVANIA
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The manufacture of pottery has been part of man's technological knowledge for thousands of years. Prehistoric man in the Old World first mastered the art, but its greatest refinement is attributable to civilized man. At first, man was able to make only crude utilitarian pots out of native clays. However, as time passed and human technology progressed, man learned to remove the impurities from his clay, developed a throwing wheel to aid in shaping his vessels, invented a mill to grind the clay and mix in the proper amounts of water, found that the addition of glazes on the vessel surface made the pot impervious to liquids, discovered various ways to decorate the vessel, and so forth. Through time, trial and error, and technological advances man finally developed the pottery from which we eat and drink.

The subject of this paper is related to the nineteenth-century manufacture, in southwestern Pennsylvania, of one type of pottery—stoneware. Stoneware, or as it is more commonly known today, crockery, is a very hard-bodied pottery. It was first manufactured in Europe and Great Britain in the form of utilitarian vessels such as storage jars and jugs, or as fine table pottery or earthenware. In the United States, it was made generally only in the utilitarian forms such as: storage jars, water jugs and coolers, pitchers, canning jars, butter pots, churns, cake molds, spittoons, lift pumps, water pipes, bottles, mugs, and banks. In fact, stoneware during the nineteenth century nearly cornered the utilitarian earthenware market. Its only rival was redware which, like stoneware, was made out of local clays. The advantage enjoyed by stoneware was that it was made from a denser clay than redware and
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could be kiln-fired at a higher temperature, thus making the resulting product less porous and more suitable for food storage.

Redware was made out of the same clay that bricks were, and after it was turned on a potter’s wheel and fired, a glaze had to be applied to, at least, the interior vessel surface. If a glaze was not applied, the pot absorbed the moisture from the contents placed in it. Stoneware, though, after it was fired was nearly vitrified and needed no glaze to keep its body from acting like a sponge. Therefore, when available, stoneware was a more desirable commodity for households. Its availability, however, was inhibited by the fact that clay suitable for its manufacture was found only in certain areas. As a result, stoneware potteries were not as plentiful as redware potteries, and many of them imported their clay which they then mixed with redware clay to make it “go farther.”

It was because of the shortage of stoneware clays in most areas that the southwestern Pennsylvania potteries thrived. A short distance out of New Geneva, Fayette County, Pennsylvania, and back from the banks of the Monongahela River, there existed a fine source of stoneware clay. The result of the location of the clay banks was the development of a substantial stoneware-pottery industry at the town of New Geneva; its neighbor across the river, Greensboro, Greene County; and at several locations within twenty miles of the clay source (figure 1).

The origin of the pottery industry in the New Geneva-Greensboro area is difficult to determine since it initially was a redware industry, as in most American communities. Redware potters rarely signed or dated their work, so its identification is usually impossible. Their pottery was also generally uniform in shape from area to area, and even if a community’s potter has been documented archaeologically, a particular vessel often cannot be assigned to a specific pottery. Therefore, lacking even rudimentary archaeological data relative to the New Geneva-Greensboro potteries, other means have to be sought to attest to their origin. After examination of available sources, principally deeds and tax records, the earliest possible date for the beginning is 1806. In that year Alexander Vance purchased Greensboro town lot 22 (figure 2). While he may not have begun potting immediately at that location, which through the nineteenth century was the site of several prosperous potteries, he and his brother James were, according to Evelyn Abraham’s article, turning pottery in Greensboro in the first years of the 1800s.
The Vance brothers, who were of Scotch-Irish and Welsh parentage, had immigrated to Greensboro from Morristown, New Jersey, in about 1800. In 1805 they took in an orphan boy, Daniel Boughner, and began to teach him the art of making pottery. Unwittingly, the Vances trained the man who would undertake the initial development of the stoneware industry in the New Geneva-Greensboro area.

Boughner apparently learned the business well and gained the confidence of the Vance brothers, for in 1811 he married their sister Mary. After the marriage, he continued to turn out pottery with the brothers, but in 1819, after they moved on to Cincinnati, Ohio, he purchased lot 22 and its buildings from Alexander, and the adjacent lot 39 from Alexander and James.

Whereas the Vances had presumably turned only redware, the Boughner pottery made both redware and stoneware; by 1850 stoneware was being manufactured. It may have been turned at an earlier date, but no dated pieces are known with a pre-1850 marking. That its production was a success is fairly certain. A large quantity was sold bearing Boughner and other New Geneva-Greensboro pottery marks and motifs. The fact that the industry grew rapidly during the 1850s, 60s, and 70s further attests to the success of stoneware manufacturing in the two towns.

The Daniel Boughner pottery was sold to his son, A. V. Boughner, in 1864, although the tax records for 1859 and George Thurston's Directory of Monongahela and Youghiogheny Valleys (1859) already showed that Alexander (A.V.) and his brother William were in the pottery business (figure 3). Regardless of when they took over the firm, they continued the business until at least 1868, when they began to be recognized as merchants because of a business they had operated simultaneously for several years with the pottery operation.

Their disappearance from the pottery company was hastened likely by competition from two vigorous potteries — the Hamilton and Jones pottery and the James Hamilton pottery. The precise origins of

2 Greene Co., Deed Book 5: 167.
BUY THE BEST!

A. & W. BOUGHNER,
STONE WARE
MANUFACTURERS,
GREENSBORO', GREENE COUNTY, PA.

After many years experience with the best quality of material, confidently offer to all dealers in the article and others, an article of Stone Ware they deem unsurpassed in the United States,

JARS, MILK PANS, BUTTER POTS, JUGS, PITCHERS, CHURNs, FRUIT JARS, &c., &c.,

From one quart to thirty gallons; larger sizes if specially ordered, Orders promptly attended to at the lowest rates. Satisfaction guaranteed.

Fig. 3. Advertisement for the A. and W. Boughner pottery.

each of the firms is unclear, but both began operation about 1850. William Leet Hamilton and James Hamilton arrived at Greensboro from New Brighton, Pennsylvania, about the mid-nineteenth century, and they each established potteries. Via two purchases of land from George DeBolt, a potter in New Geneva, in 1851 and 1854, and another land purchase in 1854, James Hamilton acquired Greensboro town lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 17, 84, 85, and 86, most of which he incorporated into the making of stoneware. At nearly the same time, Leet Hamilton purchased and developed town lots 50 and 51 into a pottery.

Both of the above firms grew and prospered during much of the next fifty years. Advertisements in the 1859 Directory of Monongahela and Youghiogheny Valleys and Caldwell’s Atlas of Greene County (1876) indicate that they both were thriving and vying for business (figure 4). United States census manufacturing schedule data for 1860, 1870, and 1880 indicate that they were the largest potteries in

GREENSBORO' ADVERTISEMENTS.

EAGLE POTTERY
AND
CHEMICAL WARE MANUFACTORY,

JAMES HAMILTON, Proprietor,
COR. WALNUT AND WATER STREETS,
GREENSBORO', GREEN CO., PA.

The Proprietor of these extensive works would call the attention of Merchants and Dealers in Stone Ware to his establishment. He challenges competition from any establishment in the United States, satisfied from repeated proofs of his Ware that it is

THE BEST ARTICLE MADE IN THE COUNTRY!

It not only stands all the tests of ware generally, but such is its tenacity and elasticity, from the superior quality of clay used, that it

CAN BE FREELY USED FOR COOKING,

With the same impunity as metal utensils. The facilities of the establishment are such that Ware of the largest size can be made,

FROM 40 TO 50 GALLONS IN SIZE!

He would also call the attention of Druggists and Manufacturing Chemists, in particular, to his superior

CHEMICAL WARE,

Which is pronounced by the celebrated Pennsylvania Salt and Chemical Manufacturing Company, superior to any to be had in the country, not excepting the imported English ware. He is also the manufacturer of a superior

PATENT STONE PUMP,

Which is rapidly succeeding all other kinds; being durable, free from taste and exempt from rot.

All orders for these articles will meet prompt attention, and be filled at as low prices as at any other establishment. For a further account of his Works he refers to the statistical account of Greensboro', contained in this volume.

N. B. He also manufactures Stone Tubing for Water Pipes, which he is prepared to furnish in any quantity at 7 cents per foot.

Fig. 4. Advertisement for the James Hamilton pottery.
the immediate New Geneva-Greensboro area. The data further show that while the James Hamilton firm was the larger business in 1860 and 1870, the Hamilton and Jones firm surpassed it in profits by 1880 (figure 5). Manufacturing census data for 1890 and beyond are confidential, so the question of which company was financially more prosperous after 1880 remains moot. It is certain, however, that while each company prospered during the mid-nineteenth century, they did undergo some ownership reorganization.

James Hamilton owned his plant solely from its inception until 1866 when he sold a one-third interest of most of his land to Larry L. Crawford. The partnership lasted until Hamilton sold his remaining interest to Thomas F. Reppert and W. T. Williams in 1880. Ironically, two days after Hamilton had sold out to Reppert, he repurchased the share he had sold to Crawford fourteen years earlier. This portion he retained until his death, after which his heirs sold it to Reppert in 1881. Therefore, by 1881 Reppert owned one-third of the pottery outright and two-thirds in partnership with Williams. In 1884, Reppert bought out Williams and became the sole proprietor. That ownership lasted six years, or until 1890, when Williams purchased a one-half interest in the business. They then apparently remained equal partners until 1920, the date of the demise of the Greensboro pottery industry.5

Unlike the original James Hamilton pottery, the Hamilton and Jones, or the original Leet Hamilton pottery, had fewer owners. Leet Hamilton owned the business from its beginnings until 1866 when he sold out to Frank Hamilton, his son, and John Jones. They held lots 50 and 51 upon which the pottery buildings existed and the two lots across Diamond Street from those lots, which they had purchased in 1889, until 1893 when the firm closed after the buildings had burned.

With the exception of Johnston Little and Company which operated a pottery in Greensboro in 1870, the potteries of Hamilton, Thomas F. Reppert, Reppert and Williams, and Hamilton and Jones dominated the Greensboro pottery industry during the second half of the nineteenth century.6 However, during that period of time, those potteries were not able to dominate completely the industry in

5 Greene Co., Deed Book 21: 16; Book 28: 378, 376; Book 45: 438, 440; Book 64: 563; Greene Co., Property Roll, Greensboro Borough, 1890-1921.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capital Invested</th>
<th>Clay Used (Tons)</th>
<th>Cost of Clay</th>
<th>Salt Used (barrels)</th>
<th>Cost of Salt</th>
<th>Cobalt Oxide Used (pounds)</th>
<th>Cost of Cobalt Oxide</th>
<th>Wood Used (Cords)</th>
<th>Cost of Wood</th>
<th>Coal Used (bushels)</th>
<th>Cost of Coal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Annual Product (Dollars):** $1,275.00 per year.
southwestern Pennsylvania. Particularly the potteries in New Geneva gave them some vigorous competition, and in several instances potters that apprenticed in Greensboro operated rival firms across the river in New Geneva.

The Vance pottery had no local competition, but by the late 1840s its successor, the Boughner pottery, did. Between 1849 and 1855 Henry K. Atchison, who had been trained as a potter in the Newark, New Jersey, area, and George DeBolt, who had apprenticed at the Boughner pottery, were producing stoneware in New Geneva. Since neither of them appears to have owned land there, the location of their operation, or operations, cannot be ascertained. How long they remained is likewise clouded, but apparently it was until about 1861 at which time Atchison enlisted in the Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry. A question does exist whether they were really the first persons to produce pottery in the town. Legend gives credit to Samuel R. Dilliner as being the first person to establish a pottery, but no documentation remains to support the contention. However, since Dr. Paul R. Stewart, while president of Waynesburg College, Waynesburg, Pennsylvania, during the 1930s and 1940s, served several churches in the New Geneva-Greensboro area, collected data on the potteries, and contended it was S. R. Dilliner who started the New Geneva-pottery tradition, perhaps the legend is factual. He stated that Dilliner did so in 1854 on Ford Street, probably on lot 21 which he is recorded as purchasing in 1863.

If Dilliner was the first person to turn pottery in New Geneva, then Adolph Eberhart and Joseph G. Williams, who purchased lot 21 in 1866, were the second owners of that pottery near the banks of the Monongahela River opposite Greensboro. The question of whether Dilliner or DeBolt and Atchison ran the first pottery in New Geneva may be academic, but the manufacturing schedules of the United States census listed no potteries in New Geneva in 1850, and only Henry Atchison was listed for 1860.

Who started the potting business in New Geneva may never be known. What is clear is that the early potteries, in comparison with the industry in Greensboro, limped along. Not until the 1870s, when Joseph Dilliner, Leander B. Dilliner, and Alexander Conrad began

---

turning vessels, was the industry firmly implanted in New Geneva.

Of the three, it was Conrad who first established a pottery. In 1872 he was making stoneware at town lot 21 and the lot directly across Ford Street which was on the banks of Georges Creek (figure 6). He did not record the purchase of the lot until 1873, but a land contract, a gentlemen's agreement of sale, or a rental lease may have existed between himself and Eberhart and Williams because he paid taxes on the land in 1872.

Conrad occupied lot 21 until the property was sold to Charles W. Williams in 1882 for back taxes. Whether the business was not doing well or whether Conrad was a poor manager of money is unknown. Neither is it known whether Williams operated the pottery. (The Fayette County tax records for the period from 1883 until 1910 were
destroyed in a fire some years ago.) It is presumed that he did since his heirs sold the lot in 1889 for $1,625, better than five times what he had paid for it. The new owner, Robert T. Williams, had probably managed the pottery while Charles W. Williams had owned it.8

Robert T. Williams had begun learning the art of pottery making in 1869 at the J. Little and Co. pottery in Greensboro. When that pottery collapsed in 1870 he joined the Hamilton and Jones Company. In 1875 he began a three-year stint as a potter in Morgantown, West Virginia, a short distance to the south of Greensboro. He returned to the Hamilton and Jones plant for two years, in 1878, before moving to New Geneva to join the John P. Eberhart pottery in 1880. Then, in 1882, he became manager of the old Conrad firm, the New Geneva Pottery. Apparently, after seven years of managing that company and after the death of its owner, Charles W. Williams, he bought the business in 1889 and ran it, for a few years, in a profitable manner.

Not only did he operate a pottery on lot 21; he also purchased, in 1890, the pottery on lot 22 which had been started by Leander B. Dilliner in 1873. Dilliner had done well enough to sell out in 1880, for an 80 percent profit, to John P. and Thomas P. Eberhart. After operating the firm in partnership for one year, John P. Eberhart became its sole owner. Apparently he was unable to fulfill the original purchase agreement of 1880 as the lot was sold at a sheriff's sale in 1882 to Adolph A. Eberhart. But, from the volume of pottery marked with the John P. Eberhart name, it seems likely that he managed the pottery for Adolph Eberhart until it was sold at an undetermined time to Charles W. Williams, the same person that has already been mentioned as purchasing lot 21 in 1882. In 1887 the heirs of Charles W. Williams sold lot 22 to D. D. Sandusky, who in turn sold it in 1890 to Robert T. Williams.9 Thereafter, only one pottery operated in the community.

In competition with the Greensboro potteries, the New Geneva potteries, neither as separate companies on lots 21 and 22 respectively, nor as a combined pottery as they had been under Charles W.

Williams's ownership from the mid-1880s and Robert T. Williams's direction after 1890, were able to do extremely well. In 1896 the main portion of the pottery-making operation, that at lot 21, was sold via another sheriff's sale to Charles L. Williams, Arthur Robbins, Margaret Hamilton, and Isaac Herrington. It seems that since a number of stoneware pieces bear the C. L. Williams mark, he may have been the operator of the pottery for the next several years. But Arthur Robbins, through several land transactions, eventually obtained exclusive ownership to not only lot 21 but lot 22 as well. He continued making pottery there until his death about 1915.

The record of pottery making in New Geneva ended in that year, but a study of the industry in that town is actually incomplete if only the potteries located on lots 21 and 22 are examined. One other pottery, while not located in the town, deserves to be considered as part of the stoneware industry of the locality. In 1874 James D. Eneix began operating a pottery on land that he and Joseph E. Dilliner and Leander B. Dilliner owned in Springhill Township. The pottery was a few miles west of New Geneva and near Friendship Hill, the home of Albert Gallatin the first secretary of the treasury of the United States. Eneix apparently operated the company alone for two years before going into operating partnership with Alpheus Frankenberry in 1876. The Eneix and Frankenberry combine, as the pottery was known, ended in 1878 only two years after it began. Then, in 1879, when Leander B. Dilliner sold his one-third interest in the business to William Evans, Eneix had a new partner. That transaction probably resulted in the production of pottery marked Eneix and Evans. However, the duration of that company, or for that matter, the pottery in Springhill Township, is undeterminable because of the lack of tax records after 1882.  

Production at the New Geneva-Greensboro Potteries

The ownership and periods of operation of the New Geneva-Greensboro potteries is fairly certain, but which potteries employed the most men and produced the greatest quantity of pieces is difficult to establish. There are no known ledgers, diaries, or other documentary

---

10 Fayette Co., Sheriff's Deed Book 4: 40-42; Fayette Co., Deed Book 163: 159; Book 164: 196; Book 214: 112; Book 284: 40; Book 212: 30-31; Book 123: 228-29; Book 352: 199-200; Fayette County Register of Wills Office, Orphans Court Docket 29: 401-2; Fayette Co., Property Roll, Springhill Township, 1875-82; Franklin Ellis, ed., History of Fayette County, Pennsylvania, with Biographical Sketches of Many of Its Pioneers and Prominent Men (Philadelphia, 1882), 769.
remains from any of the firms. The documentation available for reconstructing the relative sizes of the companies is mainly from tax records and census data with a few published references for supportive evidence. Even with these data, the number of persons engaged in pottery making and the number of vessels they “turned-out” was impossible to determine for most years.

The tax records, while providing the most comprehensive estimate of numbers of people working in the potteries in any single year, were deficient in that they reflected only those persons whose primary occupation was that of a potter. Not reflected were part-time potters whose basic occupation was that of a farmer, or some other occupation. Also, not indicated were those persons who dug the clay, chopped the wood for firing the kiln, set the kiln for firing, or were considered day-laborers. In short, the tax records only listed persons who were accepted by the community as potters.

The same drawback can be specified for the census data, plus, since they were compiled only once a decade, they tended to miss those mobile potters who moved into or left the New Geneva-Greensboro area between censuses. Census records did, however, supply data that were missing due to the destroyed Fayette County tax records.

Despite the above outlined deficiencies, a fairly sizable list of potters’ names can be compiled for both New Geneva and Greensboro (figure 7). Particularly noticeable in the list is the frequency of potters with the same surname — Hamilton, Dilliner, Eneix, Atchison, and Rumble. In most cases, these people were blood relatives with father and son or brothers probably being the most common relationship—for example, Frank Hamilton was the son of William Leet Hamilton; James and W. L. Hamilton were brothers; Joseph and Leander B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Geneva Potters*</th>
<th>John P. Eberhart, 1878-79, 1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. E. Atchison, 1876-77</td>
<td>Thomas Eberhart, 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. K. Atchison, 1860</td>
<td>James D. Eneix, 1877-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Bower, 1855</td>
<td>Joseph Eneix, 1876-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Conrad, 1871-81</td>
<td>Joseph E. Eneix, 1880-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David L. (Leet) Davis, 1859-60</td>
<td>Alpheus Frankenberry, 1875-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George DeBolt, 1854-57, 1862, 1866-81</td>
<td>Jud Hayden, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James E. Dilliner, 1866</td>
<td>Joseph Gordon Shibler, 1876-77, 1879-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph E. Dilliner, 1859-65, 1867-68, 1871-74, 1876-81</td>
<td>Robert T. Williams, 1878, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leander B. Dilliner, 1869-70, 1874-79, 1881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Period from 1882-1908 is missing except for 1890 and 1900 due to lost tax records. Potters from 1890 and 1900 are from census records while potters names from other years are taken from tax records.
**Greensboro Potters**

C. E. Atchison, 1880-82
H. K. Atchison, 1874-83
James Atchison, 1872, 1874-76, 1876-78, 1881
John W. Black, 1874, 1876-77, 1880, 1882-83
A. B. Boughner, 1859-61, 1867-68, 1871
Daniel Boughner, 1816-21, 1823-41, 1843-44, 1846, 1849
William Boughner, 1859-60, 1862-63
William Buffle, 1880, 1904-8
Frank Clavenger, 1887-88
Thomas Colans, 1826
Alexander Conrad, 1859-60, 1864-69
James Core, 1877-78, 1882-83
Edward Couch, 1859
John Couch, 1890-83
Rolby Couch, 1877
William Couch, 1860, 1868-69, 1871, 1874-79, 1887
David Cox, 1867-69, 1871, 1874-76
Thomas Cox, 1860, 1867-71, 1874-76
Larry L. Crawford, 1868, 1870-71
David L. Davis, 1868-71, 1874-76
Leet Davis, 1869
Ernest Dilliner, 1881-89, 1892-1907, 1911
Leander B. Dilliner, 1886, 1888-94
Omar Dilis, 1883, 1886-93
A. B. Dunaway, 1880
Joseph Eneix, 1882-87
Herbert Fager, 1872
Joseph Frederer, 1859-61, 1864
Eli Gapin, 1829
Daniel Garrison, 1836-38
E. Green, 1887
Frank Hamilton, 1867-71, 1874-82, 1884-96
Hugh Hamilton, 1880-89, 1905-8
Isaac Hamilton, 1884
James Hamilton, Sr., 1859-61, 1863-64, 1867, 1869, 1871, 1874-79
James Hamilton, Jr., 1869, 1874, 1876-80, 1882-83
James H. Hamilton, 1877, 1880, 1884-99
Meric Hamilton, 1877, 1881, 1884-99
W. L. Hamilton, 1859-62, 1864-68, 1874-75, 1877-81, 1883-84, 1886
William Harn, 1875-76
A. J. Hayden, 1880-83, 1886-87
Isaac Herrington, 1873, 1875-83, 1885-88, 1904-8
William Herrington, 1904-6, 1908
M. C. Higgs, 1869
Noah Higgs, 1872, 1876, 1886
Josiah Ingram, 1869, 1872, 1874-81
George Johnson, 1875-76
John Jones, 1867-69, 1872, 1874-75, 1876-80, 1894-1908, 1911-16
Robert M. Jones, 1895
Joseph Keener, 1816-23
S. M. Knotts, 1882-85
Baltzer Kramer, Jr., 1868-69, 1874-77, 1880
John P. Kramer, 1874-75, 1877-78
Larry Kramer, 1877-80
George Lantz, 1877-78
James Lippell, 1869
William Mackison, 1878
A. J. Mallory, 1878
Lloyd Mallory, 1905
James Melison, 1874
H. T. Moore, 1875
William J. Moore, 1869, 1874, 1880, 1882-1903, 1911-13
James Peel, 1876, 1878
George F. Repert, 1883-85, 1887-1903
Perry Robbins, 1878
Charles Rumble, 1877, 1880-83, 1885-86
James Rumble, 1876, 1878-79
John H. Rumble, 1869-70, 1872, 1874-75, 1877-1908
Larry Rumble, 1904-8, 1911-16
William S. Rumble, 1874-76, 1878-81, 1883, 1885-88
J. G. Shible, 1874-75, 1894-97
Daniel Smith, 1867-69, 1872, 1874-87, 1889-93
John Smith, 1859-60, 1868
Norval Smith, 1876-77
Jacob Snider, 1859
Henry Stephens, 1819
James W. Thornburger, 1867-68
Charles L. Williams, 1874-75, 1885-86
Robert Williams, 1874, 1880
William Williams, 1875, 1885-86
William J. Wise, 1872
B. F. Wolverton, 1878-79
Charles A. Wolverton, 1874-78, 1880-88

Fig. 7. List of potters from New Geneva and Greensboro area, 1819-1916. Taken from Fayette County Tax Rolls.
Dilliner were brothers and their father was Samuel R. Dilliner; James Eneix was the son of Joseph Eneix; Charles E. and James Atchison were brothers and were the sons of H. K. Atchison; and A. V. Boughner was the son of Daniel Boughner. Likewise there was evidence of intermarrying between the families of potters—such as, James Eneix married one of Samuel R. Dilliner's daughters; Daniel Boughner was wed to Mary Vance, the sister of the Vance brothers; and John Jones married Mary Ann Hamilton, the daughter of William Leet Hamilton and the sister of Frank Hamilton. Note also the sometimes duplication of potters' names for the two towns. Part of the intertown mobility of the potters was the result of competition. In fact, it was probably the constant competition that caused the near or actual economic failure of several of the firms. Another factor explaining the movement of the potters from town to town was the apprentice system. Like most crafts during the nineteenth century, a person learned the art of turning stoneware while an apprentice in the company. Then, after serving an apprenticeship, he sought a bona fide job as a potter, probably at the best possible wage.

A further element portrayed in the list of potters' names is the dearth of particularly German names. No attempt has been made to determine the nationality of the names, but it is known that the Joneses were Welsh and the Atchisons were Irish. After examining the list, it is safe to say that most of the names are not of obvious German origin. This, however, should not be too surprising since the 1790 census showed that Fayette County was composed of 47% English, 19% Irish, 11% Scotch, 11% German, and 7% Welsh residents. Granted, the immigrants during the next fifty years included many Roman Catholic Germans, but the aura of the early settlers who had come to Fayette and Greene counties, principally from Maryland and Virginia, was still present during the Civil War when many men from the area served in the Confederate army. Proof of non-German influence in the New Geneva-Greensboro industry can also be seen when vessel-motif attributes are compared with stoneware from other regions of North America. The only close motif similarities come from the Richmond, Alexandria, and Strasburg, Virginia, and the Parkersburg, Petersburg, and Palatine, West Virginia, areas.

11 Ellis, 765, 766; Bates, 764-65, 771.
13 Smith, 3, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21.
Besides such information as general national origins of the potters, intertown mobility of potters, intermarriage of potters’ families, and family potting traditions, the lists of potters when classified annually by numbers instead of names represent the developmental, static, and decaying years of the industry (figure 8). The graph clearly shows that the New Geneva-Greensboro pottery tradition from the early nineteenth century to shortly after mid-century existed wholly as an industry supplying the needs of the local population. With the switch of potting medium from local red and yellow (redware) clays to greyish-white clays (stoneware), the industry began to serve an enlarged market area.

Apparently, just prior to the Civil War, production surged, although specific occupations were not listed in the Greensboro tax records for 1852-1858. Then, during the war period, production slipped, probably due to many of the potters serving in the Confederate and Union armies. At the end of the war, the industry quickly recovered, growing until shortly before the Panic of 1873. Immediately after that year, it surprisingly made a remarkable recovery. From 1874 until the late 1880s, its markets via flatboats on the slackwater navigable Monongahela River to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and then down the Ohio River to Cincinnati, Ohio, and beyond reached a peak. The death knell of their markets came as stoneware potteries in Ohio and

---

farther down the Ohio River began to supply Cincinnati and other markets with a more reasonably priced product. With the impending doom of the industry certain, the Pennsylvania potteries continued competing among themselves to be the largest in their local area as well as the largest outside distributor. But between the intra-area and outside competition, the signs of economic failure were foreboding. The old Reppert and Williams firm, under the direction of Larry Rumble and Hugh Hamilton, made a brief, feeble recovery in the early 1900s, and the Robbins firm continued feebly after 1900. Otherwise the grand pottery tradition, which had meant so much economically to the two towns, had faded into near oblivion before the turn of the century.\(^{15}\)

In addition to being reflected by the number of potters in the two towns, the production statistics for the potteries supported the same pattern of pottery development and decay (figure 9). Those statistics provide insight into the type and quantity of raw materials consumed plus some data on the amount of capital invested in the various businesses, the type of power used to operate the turning lathes, the number of throwing wheels necessary to produce a certain quantity of vessels, and the number of months per year the potteries were in production. Unfortunately, variations in the types of statistics supplied in different censuses and inconsistencies in information supplied from different townships and boroughs made it impossible to generalize too much about the industry over a period of years. However, in 1870, basic data relative to the industry could be compiled. Figure 9 shows some of the basic unit costs and profits of the five potteries in production that year. By themselves, these statistics do not make a very sig-

\[
\begin{align*}
$1.82 & \text{ per ton of clay} \\
$2.32 & \text{ per barrel of salt} \\
$0.40 & \text{ per pound of cobalt oxide} \\
$2.77 & \text{ per cord of wood} \\
$0.05 & \text{ per bushel of coal} \\
$4.23 & \text{ per barrel of slip clay} \\
$0.063 & \text{ per gallon of stoneware produced} \\
$0.089 & \text{ selling price for gallon of stoneware} \\
$0.026 & \text{ profit per gallon of stoneware}
\end{align*}
\]

Fig. 9. Cost data for raw materials and finished products for all New Geneva and Greensboro potteries, 1870.

\(^{15}\) Stewart, 1-2.
**Figure 10a: New Geneva**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>53.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>49.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>84.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 10b: Springhill Township**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>32.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>65.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>125.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>99.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 10c: Greensboro**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>39.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>31.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>33.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>28.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>70.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>63.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>66.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 10. Comparison of potters with other occupations using occupational tax evaluations as the basis for the comparison.
significant contribution to an understanding of the economics of nineteenth-century stoneware manufacturing, but in combination with data from other regions they might be quite meaningful.

Another meaningful statistic in examining the social and economic impact of the stoneware-pottery industry was the occupational tax valuation assessed each working-age male resident in Pennsylvania during the 1800s. By studying the annual tax values attached to the various occupations in the New Geneva-Greensboro area, an estimation of the monetary as well as social worth of potters in comparison to other occupations was possible. As can be seen in figure 10, the mean as well as median occupational value of potters, which likely reflected their salary, was generally equal to or slightly above that of the population as a whole. This was particularly true during those years of greatest pottery production and employment. Since during the nineteenth century income reflected status, with the exception of preachers and teachers whose status was above their income level, potting was as respectable as most occupations. In fact, most craftsmen were taxed about equally. Also, in the pottery industry, and probably in other crafts as well, when the industry did well, being a potter was a financially and socially desirable craft. But when the demand for a potter's talent diminished, the rewards of the occupation also dropped. When competition, and especially the increased distribution of the glass canning jar, destroyed the pottery industry in southwestern Pennsylvania, the financial and social rewards of the occupation collapsed and the industry disappeared. By about World War I, both New Geneva and Greensboro had lost their greatest economic assets, and slowly the towns began to decay. Today, New Geneva has disappeared except for a post office and several residences, and Greensboro, which was by far the larger of the towns originally, has fared little better. It does have, in addition to a post office, several small businesses and a population of 475. With the closing of the potteries, the towns were apparently nearly ruined economically. Slowly, like many rural towns, they have been disappearing as the folk tradition of pottery making did over a half century ago.