During the 2020 season, the Warner House produced an on-line object-of-the-week email blast with text and images from the Brilliance Exhibit. Shown above, panels made from these objects-of-the-week were posted several at a time on the Daniel Street fence through the efforts of Warner House Director Jeffrey Hopper and Susan Kress Hamilton and Bill Hamilton at Phineas Graphic Design/Printing Solutions (one panel is reproduced on page 6). Supported by grants from The National Endowment for the Humanities and New Hampshire Humanities. Photo by Jeffrey Hopper.

**RESEARCH TIDBITS**

by Sandra Rux

Sometimes searching for historical information on one subject leads to surprising finds. Recently I was searching for information on Hunking Wentworth (1697-1784) in preparation for an exhibit at the Portsmouth Athenaeum (now scheduled for February 2021). Hunking was the second son of Lieutenant Governor John Wentworth and his wife, Sarah Hunking. Eldest son was named Benning, which was his paternal grandmother's maiden name while Hunking received his mother's maiden name. As a young man he invested in cod fishing in Canso, Nova Scotia and was referred to as "shopkeeper" in a 1729 deed from his father. Hunking is perhaps best known for his patriot activities during the American Revolution. His nephew John was the Royal Governor and most of the family sympathized with the Loyalists. Hunking was head of

Continued on Page 7

**BRILLIANCE: AN EXHIBIT**

*Early Glass in America, 1700 to 1850*

by Bob Barth

Please note that the following article was written prior to a decision to defer the full Exhibit to the 2021 season. We are indebted to the collectors who have agreed to extend their loans to the 2021 season. The exhibit was well under way and ready to open whenever an all clear was given for the 2020 season but was delayed by the Coronavirus pandemic.

Thanks to the generosity of several area collectors we have a rich variety to present in this Exhibit of early glass at the Warner House—several of local documentary interest, as well as archaeological correlation from Warner House excavations.

By the reign of James I, England had largely decimated her forests fuelling her ceramics and glass industries, and it was mandated that industry switch to coal as fuel. The concurrent settlement at Jamestown, with its abundant supplies of raw material for making glass (wood for fuel, sand and potash) made it a natural choice to establish the first Colonial manufacture. Two attempts, 1608 and 1620, met with total failure by way of incompetence, fire, disease, starvation, desertion and warfare. The intent was to make beads for trade, and bottles and window glass for England, but, apparently, no significant amount of glass was ever produced.

Supplemented by wares from Venice, Belgium, Germany and the Netherlands, the English glass industry grew dramatically in the 17th century fed by persecuted skilled workers from the Lowlands, and perhaps culminating in the perfection of leaded glass by George Ravenscroft c. 1675. Lead glass allowed for a clear, colorless product, more easily cut and engraved compared to soda glass, and, by 1700, free from the crizzling (deterioration) of Venetian glass, until then the finest tablewares available throughout the 16th and most of the 17th centuries. Up to the 1770s England supplied almost all the Colonial glass requirements and successfully thwarted most efforts at American production. Perhaps 90% of commercial glass production has always

Continued on Page 4
NOTES FROM THE MARKETING CHAIR
by Carol Seely

Hello to All Our Members and Friends of the Warner House!

We hope you are all well and keeping busy, or as busy as you want to be, during these unusual times. Here is a short update on what is happening at the Warner House both inside and outside during the past few months.

The House is closed for the season. The good news is that the Garden and Grounds are open and visitors are welcome to view them between 10 a.m. and 6 p.m. Please enter by the garden gate on Chapel Street. There are new banner panels explaining a history of the Warner House. Thank you to Judy Groppa, Jeff Hopper and Susan Kress Hamilton of Phineas Graphic Design/Printing Solutions for these.

Panels have also been placed on the fence in front of the House describing the Brilliance Glassware Exhibit, which had to be postponed. People have been stopping to read them. Bob Barth has been very busy working on the Exhibit and he has been sending out email blasts with information about the various selections of glassware represented. We thank him for all he has done for the past two years.

The Warner House Association is a recipient of a $10,000 grant from the New Hampshire Humanities Council funded by the CARES Act and the National Endowment for the Humanities. A big thank you to Jeffrey Hopper, our Director, who became aware of the availability of this grant and as soon as the application was available he downloaded it and he and Sandra Rux, our Treasurer, filed it out and applied for the grant in the amount of $10,000. Jeff and Sandra documented how this amount would be needed to make up for presumed lost revenue from admissions, need for additional interpretive signage as tours would have to be revised, masks for staff and visitors, additional cleaning and much needed improvements to our website. This is a non-matching grant and is only for operating support—no building repairs.

The application was submitted the same day it was filled out (a Friday) and on the following Wednesday, Sandra and Jeff were notified that the Warner House had been awarded $10,000. We were grant#14 so speed was meaningful. The total given out in New Hampshire was $370,200. Thank you to both Jeff Hopper and Sandra Rux for their prompt action.

The Curatorial Committee, under the direction of Judy Groppa, has also been very active. Thanks to a donation from Mary Crane, the ceilings in the small center room and the 2nd floor hall between the arch and the small room have been painted by Paul Mazgelis. Thank you very much to Board Member Mary Crane for her gift.

We would like to remind you that it is now time to renew your membership to the Warner House Association. Being closed doesn’t mean work stops and we aren’t busy. In fact, we are busier than ever. There is much more still to be done and we will have more about that in October or November. Please stop by the gardens and take time to enjoy the beautiful flowers and the work Caroline Fesquet and the members of the Portsmouth Garden Club have done. Visit our updated website at www.warnerhouse.org to donate and for more information.
In Remembrance

We recently lost two long-time members and friends of the Warner House—JESSIE KENT and EVELYN BARRETT.

JESSIE KENT died on Sunday, July 5, 2020 at the age of 92. She was the widow of Larry Kent, caretaker at the Warner House who died in 2019. Jessie also was a member of the Warner House Board and she was a strong supporter of the House. She was a familiar face at many events, often accompanying Larry.

EVELYN BARRETT died on Friday, July 10, 2020. Eve was a descendant of residents of the Warner House and served on the Board for many years. She served as Chair of the Warner House, as her mother and stepfather had before her. Eve and her mother provided the House an unbroken chain of connection to the Wendall family that was an invaluable contribution. She and her husband co-founded the Evelyn S. and K. E. Barrett Foundation for the benefit of children in need.

Both of these gracious ladies will be missed and we would like to extend condolences to both of their families.

Jeffrey Thomson was elected Chair of the Warner House Board of Governors at the Annual Meeting on January 21, 2020.

Meet The Executive Board:
Jeff Thomson

A life-long resident of Kittery, Maine, Jeff brings experience and a love of history to his role of Chair of our historic house. He has a BA in Economics, and a Master's in Public Administration. Jeff was employed as an Economist with the U.S. Dept. of Labor for 30 years. He was a member of the faculty and Chair of the History and Government Department at St. Thomas Aquinas High School for 11 years. He has also served as a member of the Kittery Town Council for 22 years.

Jeff has guided for Historic New England, the Wentworth-Gardner House, and the Warner House. He currently does historical walking tours of Portsmouth for the Discover Portsmouth Center.

Jeff is a Proprietor of the Portsmouth Athenaeum and holds memberships with the Warner House, Wentworth-Gardner, Strawberry Banke, Moffatt-Ladd, Portsmouth Historical Society, American Independence Museum, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Mount Vernon, Monticello, and Colonial Williamsburg. Jeff and his wife Coralee have three adult children, and one granddaughter.

The Warner House would like to thank the following:

BUSINESS SUPPORTERS
Anne Whitney Architect
Boston Conveyor & Automation, Inc.
Ellis Insurance Agency
Piscataqua Savings
Phineas Graphic Design/Printing Solutions

SUPPORT from GRANT & TRUSTS:
Geoffrey E. Clark & Martha Fuller Clark Fund
Rosamond Thaxter Foundation
NH Humanities
National Endowment for the Humanities

Three outdoor informational panels were installed outdoors at the Warner House—two about the families who lived there and one entitled African-Americans are Part of Our History, as part of the garden experience open to the public for the 2020 season. Photo by Jeffrey Hopper.
been comprised of bottles and window panes. Following the War of Independence a major impetus for the development of the American glass industry was the widespread need for bottles and flasks. For individual farmers, with a turbulent economy and a shortage of specie, cider, beer, ale and rum for local, Southern and West Indies trade became vital commodities, and bottles were crucial for shipment.

The Competition:
During the 17th and into the 18th centuries glass bottles largely replaced the competition, particularly German and English salt-glazed stonewares, which previously comprised the dominant containers for shipping and serving all manner of liquids: wine, beer, ale, vinegar, and even paints and turpentine. Lesser competitors were tin/lead-glazed earthenware (delftware), lead-glazed earthenwares, porcelains, woodenware, and gourds, examples of which are included in the Exhibit.

English Bottles, Decanters and Drinking Glasses:
While there were several Colonial attempts prior to 1780 to establish glasshouses, they were forbidden by England and, with few exceptions, successfully quashed. Thus, from the middle of the 17th to the fourth quarter of the 18th centuries, glass wine/utility bottles, decanters and all manner of drinking glasses, as well as some finer tablewares, were almost exclusively English in origin.

We are fortunate to have an exceptional array of these wares to show the development of design through time. To protect content the bottles are generally of dark green or amber, termed “black” when essentially opaque. They begin with the mid-17th century shaft-and-globe, and progress through onion, mallet and on to the modern cylinder by 1770. Many were sealed with owner’s name and a date, which helps considerably in determining chronology. Many of the examples in the Exhibit are sealed and several relate to Seacoast residents. Variants include a variety of shapes as hexagonal and bladder, and, most importantly, the square case, or gin bottle, originating in Holland in the mid 17th and made universally well into the 19th century. The names originate from its ability to fit most efficiently into a wooden case for shipping, and Holland’s gin was one of its more common contents. Around 1780 English wares became mixed with American, and differentiation more difficult.

Decanters were meant to display the content, rather than to protect it, and were, therefore, made of clear lead glass. We have a fine series of early examples to show their development.

Following the War of Independence American glasshouses successfully competed with Anglo-Irish cut-glass decanters by simulating the designs with pattern-molded and blown three-mold wares. Few American manufacturers had skilled glass cutters.

Drinking glasses, including wines, ales, firing, cordials, dram, champagnes, syllabubs, roemers, and on to sweetmeats and jellies show, a fascinating development of bowl shape and stem design, including baluster and the popular air and cotton twists.

This brings up a major caveat in evaluating these wares: glass, along with iron, is the most easily and perhaps frequently reproduced/faked. Popular with collectors as far back as the late 1800s, wine glasses in particular were reproduced in the 20th century in England, America, and the Continent to satisfy the antiques market. They can be very difficult to detect, and a good fake is perhaps impossible to discern. We will have a small grouping, mainly wines, that we feel are suspect, mostly by an absence of wear on the foot, or glass which fails to show the usual imperfections of early blown glass, or inconsistencies in design. The other side of the coin is that we could be wrong in calling that which is genuine a fake.

Around 1780, and obviously coinciding with Independence, American glass houses proliferate, with varying success, at a great rate, and it becomes even more difficult to differentiate English, Continental and American glass with some exceptions.

Free-blow and Pattern-Molded Glass:
In pattern-molding a gather of glass is first pressed into a small metal mold containing a tooled design. The gather is
removed from the mold and can now be blown/shaped into any form—bottle, bowl, dish, flask, tumbler—retaining the basic surface design. Many of these designs have become associated with particular glasshouses through archaeological finds or documented family pieces, such that tentative attributions of some of these wares can be made. Pattern-molding is an age-old technique, but was extensively utilized from 1780-1840 from New England to the Midwest. In addition to the design characteristics, distinctive regional differences in color and tonality may be helpful. New England glass is typically more muted, with somewhat dull olive-ambers and olive-greens predominating, while Ohio glass of the same vintage is typically more varied in color, and brilliant. Even free-blown pieces may show regionally distinctive features, as the lily-pad decoration typical of upstate New York, or the chain decoration of Thomas Cains, Boston. That said, free-blown, largely undecorated pieces are usually impossible definitively to attribute. They are sometimes referred to as “South-Jersey type”, but, in truth, might have been made by any number of glasshouses from New England to the Midwest, or on occasion, England, France, Bohemia or Germany. The reference to South Jersey is by way of one of the few somewhat successful early 18th century American endeavours by Caspar Wistar in South-west Jersey in 1739. The manufacture somehow survived until 1780 apparently by the Colonial authorities downplaying its success to England. In fact, there are very few surviving pieces attributable to Wistar to even make any comparisons, but such is the nature of early glass research. The lesson to be learned is that many attributions, including those in this exhibit, must be considered somewhat speculative.


Blown Three-Mould and Pressed (including Lacy) Glass:
Chronologically the Exhibit terminates with what was, with a few exceptions, the death knell for skilled gaffers. The skill aspect shifted to the mold-makers, as the actual formation of the objects required little to no skill or imagination, and indeed, rapidly proceeded to near complete automation in the second half of the 19th century.

Perhaps the developments at Sandwich epitomise the change. In 1827 Deming Jarvis, an extremely innovative glass-man, moved from Boston to Sandwich on Cape Cod where he perfected the technique of pressing the gather into designed molds, as well as the associated technique of producing Lacy glass. Best known for its use in the making of cup-plates, this technique involved the placing of multiple tiny shallow drill-holes in otherwise blank areas of the mold which greatly enhanced refractivity in the already highly refractive lead glass utilized in making these small plates. Once highly popular, and heavily produced from 1827 to c.1845, these plates give credence to the notion that tea was frequently drunk out of a dish, and that the oft-quoted 18th century phrase ordering “a dish of tea” had some basis in fact. Well into the 19th century tea was served in handleless Chinese Export Porcelain cups and saucers. Handleless cups would require much greater space in shipping as opposed to handleless, which could be compactly stacked. Space was the name-of-the-game when it came to shipping. The handleless cup would be too hot to comfortably handle; thus the content of the cup was poured into its matching porcelain saucer to cool. This would leave a dripping wet cup to spoil one’s table cloth, thus, the cup-plate to the rescue. A large number of these jewel-like plates are in the Exhibit demonstrating

Continued on Page 7

Early English Decanters—
Mallet and Cruciform

This is an extremely unusual grouping. It is rare to see all these varieties in one setting. All are probably English. The decanters range in height from 8¼ to 11 inches. From left to right; (1) Octagonal mallet circa 1710-20. (263) The cruciform circa 1720-35. (4) The transitional form 1750 (566) The mallet, with grooved or pinched corners. circa 1760 into the 1780s. The circa 1730-40 English balustrade wineglass with a bell bowl and folded foot, is 6½ inches tall and is shown for scale. All objects from anonymous private collections.

Wine was aged in wooden casks then shipped and stored in dark green ("black") glass bottles, which were often then used for serving. Wine from the cask frequently contained considerable sediment which could not be easily detected in black glass bottles. Spurred by the refinement of clear leaded glass by England's George Ravenscroft, transparent glass decanters became fashionable in the late 17th century. Impressions themselves and their guests, wealthier households embraced the glassware displaying their new clear decanters filled with clarified wines. The presence of string-rims and the heavy construction suggest that these vessels may also have been used to store and serve effervescent drinks. Cider, ale and champagne utilized corks that were secured in place by being tied to the string-rims. By the early 18th century two basic decanter forms had emerged—shaft-and-globe and mallet. The shaft-and-globe is extremely rare, particularly in the Colonies (we have no examples in the exhibit). Though not common, the mallet is found archaeologically. Descended in the family, a late mallet type survives at the Sayward-Wheeler House in York, Maine. Authors vary in the timeline attribution of the various shapes and we chose to use the research work of Ivor Noel Hume.1 He correlated archaeological findings with the most accurate data on the development of the mallet form from circa 1710 to circa 1760. This illustration is a decanter timeline based on Hume's work.

THE OBJECTS: The number after a description refers to the caption of the illustrated object. All the objects have some common characteristics. The common characteristics include very thick, heavy, leaded glass (probably 20-30% lead); a flared lip for ease of pouring; absence of a ground neck interior suggesting that they were never meant to have glass stoppers; molded panels and kick-ups; and small +/- 3 cm rough glass-tipped pontil scars. The earliest shape with octagonal sides is circa 1710-20 (1). The next development, circa 1720-35, was the cruciform style (2 & 3); presumably developed to increase surface area and thus rapidity of cooling when placed in ice. Object (4) circa 1750 with a less pronounced cruciform illustrates the stylistic transition occurring in the 18th century. From circa 1760 into the 1780s the shape becomes less angular and a new form develops, the mallet (5 & 6), with grooved or pinched corners. The number of string-rims on a decanter neck and their placement varies. The ring placement does not help to accurately date the pieces. Early lead glass was subject to surface degradation and several pieces demonstrate the resultant cloudiness. Several show some opalescence of the bases which results from an excess of sodium sulfate, which is reminiscent of glass gall.1


Supported with grants from

The Warner House produced a series of information panels from the Brilliance Exhibit during the 2020 season. These panels were posted a few at a time on the Daniel Street fence (shown here is panel #19).
the Portsmouth Committee of Safety at one point and a
delegate to the Continental Congress. Unlike Benning or
younger brother Mark Hunking, he lived modestly. Hunking
was devoted to the North Church, whereas most of his
siblings had become members at Queen’s Chapel.

Hunking Wentworth married three times. His first wife,
Elizabeth Wibird (1708-1731) gave birth to a daughter,
Sarah, who married John Penhallow. She had eleven children.
His second wife, also named Elizabeth (maiden name
unknown, 1710-1743), also had one daughter, Elizabeth
(1739-1793). She married Samuel Warner, brother of
Jonathan. They had three children: Daniel (1765-1806),
Elizabeth (1767-1846) and Abigail (1768-1803). Samuel
died in 1771, leaving Elizabeth a widow with three young
children. Family tradition says that Abigail lived with Jonathan
Warner and Mary Macphedris Warner at the Warner House.
Hunking’s 3rd wife, Margaret Vaughan (1709-1788), survived
him but had no children.

In his will Hunking left use of his estate to his wife Margaret
and to his daughter Elizabeth Warner, who lived with him.
This answers a question for Warner House interpretation
about where Elizabeth lived after the death of Samuel. Even
at the time of Hunking’s will in 1784, Elizabeth must have
been in ill health since although it made some provision for
Elizabeth in case she should survive widow Margaret, the
expectation seemed to be that Margaret, who was thirty years
her senior, would live longer. This is born out by a statement
by Elizabeth Warner in 1785 that she saw Thomas Ham sign
his will but was too infirm to travel to the probate office to
publicly acknowledge this.

Another surprise of interest to the Warner House is the
appointment of Jonathan Warner as the executor of Hunking
Wentworth’s estate. Hunking had appointed his first
son-in-law John Penhallow as executor. However, John
deprecated and Margaret Wentworth appointed Jonathan
Warner. The estate, after death of Margaret, was to be
divided between the children of John and Sarah Penhallow
and the children of Samuel and Elizabeth Warner. The estate
papers include extensive accounts by Jonathan Warner of
money spent to support Margaret and Elizabeth from 1784
until Margaret’s death in 1788, as well as to make repairs
to the “mansion house” located at the corner of Congress
Street and Church Lane (remnants of this building housed
Eagle Photo; Popovers is there now). The Penhallow heirs
claimed that Warner had spent too much and had benefited
from the estate. Warner rebutted by providing the detailed
accounts and recounting how he had to spend his own
money to support Margaret and Elizabeth since the estate
did not have enough income to support them unless real
estate was sold. The house was rented after the death of
Margaret, so we still do not know where Elizabeth Warner lived
between 1788 and her death in 1793. She does appear in
the 1790 census—two free women—presumably Elizabeth
and her daughter Elizabeth who did not marry Nathaniel
Sherburne until 1792. The estate was eventually divided
between the six surviving children of Sarah Wentworth
Penhallow and the children of Elizabeth Wentworth Warner.
I will also point out that Hunking Penhallow, father of Pearce
Wentworth Penhallow, who married Betsy Sherburne, grand-
daughter of Elizabeth Wentworth Warner, was one of the six
Penhallow heirs. Pearce and his heirs owned the Warner House
from late 19th century until it became a museum in 1932.

---

**Yankee Frugality, Ingenuity and Other Curiosities:**

This category includes some fascinating pieces illustrating a
“waste not, want not” mentality such as a make-do mirror
with a wonderful sea-faring history, an adzed and sawn wood
replacement window pane from Badger’s Island, and a shattered
tin-strapped, but perhaps still functional, handled mug.

The Exhibit will hopefully delight the eye of even the most casual
student. The more discerning will recognize a certain flaw common
to such endeavours: the variety is dependent on the various collectors’
interests, which may not reflect the historical incidence of objects.
For example, cut glass and historical blown-moulded flasks, though
represented in this Exhibit, do not reflect their true numbers
historically. With this caveat, we hope all might enjoy the objects,
and appreciate the several collectors who so generously lent them.
A series of informational panels about the Brilliance Exhibit were posted several at a time on the Daniel Street fence throughout the 2020 season. Supported by grants from The National Endowment for the Humanities and New Hampshire Humanities. Photo by Jeffrey Hopper.

THE WARNER HOUSE ASSOCIATION
150 Daniel Street
P.O. Box 895
Portsmouth, New Hampshire 03802-0895

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Jeffrey Thomson, Chair
Melissa Walker, Vice-Chair
Maria Barth, Secretary
Sandra Rux, Treasurer
Judy Groppa, Curatorial Chair
James Taylor, Building and Grounds Chair
Lorn Buxton, Finance Chair
Bob Barth, Governance Chair
Carol Seely, Marketing Chair and Past Chair

GOVERNORS
Robert Cook
Mary Crane
Ronan Donohue
Barbara Engelbach
Caroline Fresquet
Amanda Horrocks
Philip Kendrick
Sandy Phelps
Martha Pinello
Deborah Richards
Louise Richardson
Caroline Roy
James Smith
Curtis Springer
Robert Swan

HONORARY GOVERNOR
Richard Candee