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The widespread practice of ritually concealing shoes as apotropaic devices to protect liminal spaces such as walls, thresholds, windows, and chimneys, most often in private homes, dates to the 14th century. The practice also has roots in pre-Christian, pan-European traditions of domestic spirits and can sometimes function as a commemorative gesture to memorialize deceased loved ones. This study analyzes an early 20th-century concealed shoe deposit discovered in Long Cove, Maine and locating it within the cultural context of Long Cove’s history as a Finnish immigrant community within an approximately twenty-year period (c. 1890-1910). The study explores ways in which the Long Cove concealment shoe both fits and deviates from broader concealment patterns. Careful reconstruction of the home’s architectural history, the establishment of a chain of ownership through deed records, and the identification of significant details in the lives of the home’s inhabitants through birth, marriage, census, and death records reveal possible motivations for concealment. Since shoes were selected for concealment because they captured the imprint, both literal and metaphorical, of a specific person, probing the motivations behind individual concealments deepens our understanding of ritual concealment practices.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Only one complete poem remains. The rest of it is berries left in the bramble after a visit from midday starlings. For years I couldn't understand how this redaction moved anyone to tears. She was a dampness in the matchbook. But the world is patient. Eventually the diamond travels from the mantle to the finger of the woman you love. Eventually the light from an exploded star arrives to confirm the emperor's power. It's clear now that a very old bruise can tell us how hard someone was punched. The detective solves a murder by the help of a single hair. Archaeologists find a molar and build a face to fit.

- “The Problem with Sappho,” Charles Rafferty

1.1 Uncovering the Long Cove Shoe

On an early Maine spring evening in 2012, I heard a startled noise from upstairs where my husband had been working to dismantle a small section of wall in our home underneath the northwest eave of an unused bedroom. In the months prior, water had started to seep through from the roof, damaging the room’s old wooden paneling. He called for me to come upstairs, and when I did, I found him standing by the open cavity of the wall with a worn leather boot in his hand. At first, he told me, he had thought the shoe was attached to a body, sandwiched between the rafters and shredded bits of yellowing newspaper that approximated insulation. There was no body, thankfully, but neither were there any immediate hints as to why the shoe had been placed, seemingly deliberately, on the hemlock rafter under the eave, or who might have placed it there. The shoe was a single, left-foot, adult-sized boot, with a protrusion of split leather on the upper right inner corner suggestive of a fairly sizable bunion. The leather uppers had lost their shape and structure, and a hole about the size of a quarter had worn through where the ball of a foot had once pressed against the sole. An ink stamp on the interior heel read “B.L. Segal, Rockland,
ME,” and just above that, a company logo for “King’s Shoes, made by Arnold,” was encircled by a garland of slender leaves stitched in yellow thread.

We would later learn, thanks to a quick Internet search, that the boot appeared to be an example of a concealment shoe, which refers to the practice of depositing footwear in walls, roofs, chimneys, attics, and other spaces in homes that offered similar levels of secrecy. Such deposits, their concealers believed, could bring luck, protect the home by warding off malevolent spirits, keep the spirit of a loved one close, or act as decoys by inviting the aforementioned ill-natured spirits to attack a representation of a human in place of the living inhabitants of the home. The function of the concealed shoe changed in accordance with the intention of the concealers, the other objects it was hidden with, or the compass direction it faced. Although the practice had seemingly originated in the British Isles as early as the 1300s, it had spread throughout the globe and persisted throughout the centuries.

While these facts were readily available to us, questions abounded: How exactly did these devices function? Why and how had the practice originated? If the practice was as common as our quick Googling had suggested, why hadn’t we heard of it before? And, critically, who had once worn this particular shoe, who had hidden it, and why and when had they done so? These seemingly straightforward questions, among the first we are taught to ask when faced with any new information or situation, would prove to be the most complex. Nearly all of my initial assumptions proved incorrect: the shoe had not, it turned out, been hidden when the home was first constructed, nor had it likely been hidden by someone of British descent. We had heard from neighbors that our home was one of a series on our street that had once housed Finnish immigrants who had come to Maine’s Midcoast at the turn of the century to work in the granite quarries, but we had also heard that British immigrants, too, had lived nearby and worked in the
quarries. Perhaps, I thought at first, a British carpenter had built the home or purchased it from one of the first Finnish families who lived here. As it turned out, the house had been continuously occupied by Finnish immigrants from the time it was built through the mid-20th century, but this fact was difficult to reconcile with the lack of documented cases of concealed shoes in the Finnish tradition of ritual deposits. Unsure of how else to proceed, I turned to the deed records and began tracing the history of the house and the lives of its inhabitants. This case study is the story of the shoe in our wall, but it is also a narrative about Finnish immigration patterns, folkloric beliefs, labor rights, nativist tensions, economic hardship, the unspeakable pain of losing those closest to you, and, most of all, how quickly history can be erased and how difficult it can be to reconstruct.

1.2 Origins and Current Directions of the Study of Concealed Footwear

British footwear historian June Swann is credited not only with establishing the most comprehensive index of concealment shoes, which is housed at the Northampton Museum in Northampton, England, but also with founding the field of the study of concealed footwear.¹ Swann began working at the museum in 1950, and over the course of her first seven years there, approximately half a dozen shoes were brought to the museum for identification. Swann, in conversation with the then Head of the Boot & Shoe Department, Northampton College of Technology, John Thorton, identified a pattern: the shoes had all been found in chimneys or roofs, and as Swann notes in her 1996 article, “Concealed Shoes in Buildings,” she was “particularly puzzled” by a pair of children’s boots discovered in the thatch of a cottage roof in

Stanwick, Northamptonshire. These initial finds led Swann on a decades-long process of collecting and documenting examples of the practice, laying the foundation for much of the ongoing research today. Currently, the archive documents the locations and details of over 3,000 concealed shoes worldwide, and in 2019 work was undertaken to move the collection data online to encourage more widespread access.

Swann’s 1996 article, still widely cited in studies of concealed shoes, documents patterns and findings from the first forty years of her research on the practice. Addressing the central question of why shoes were so often chosen as objects of concealment, Swann argued that they are the “only garment we wear which retains the shape, the personality, the essence of the wearer,” a theory that would be expanded upon in later years by other researchers as well as Swann herself. Swann’s 1996 article focused primarily on documenting patterns regarding the location, age, and condition of concealed shoes, the locations of concealment sites within buildings, and other associated objects discovered with concealed shoes. Despite significant variations in all of the aforementioned categories, a few distinct patterns emerge. First, over 40% of the buildings where concealed shoes were discovered between 1950 and 1996 were what Swann characterizes as “humble cottages,” which, along with the extraordinarily worn condition of the majority of concealed shoes, points to the likely socioeconomic status of both the concealer and the wearer. The most frequent locations for the concealed shoes documented in Swann’s index were the chimney, fireplace, or hearth (26.2%), with floorboards and ceilings as the second most common hiding spot (22.86%), though Swann notes the difficulty in distinguishing between the “under floorboards” and “ceiling” categories. In a follow-up article

---

3 “Northampton Museum ‘Concealed Shoes’ Index to Go Online - BBC News.”
published in 2016, Swann reframes her findings by noting that a building’s “access points” served as the single most common location for concealment, a more general category that included chimneys, roofs, eaves, windows, doors, attics, and apexes.\(^5\)

Swann also observes a temporal pattern of concealments, with shoe instances peaking at the turn of each century starting with the 16\(^{th}\) century and continuing until the presumed conclusion of the practice in the mid-1900s, a trend she attributes to the “[obviously] dangerous and uncertain” transition from one century to the next. While Swann does not elaborate further on this observation, it underscores her sense that superstitious beliefs drove the practice. Swann later raised doubts about the turn-of-the-century pattern, pointing out that its validity was somewhat suspect due to the likely rounding of dates in attempts to date the shoes.\(^6\)

Swann revised other earlier findings as she pursued her research. Approximately 40% of the 1,550 concealed shoes documented in Swann’s 1996 article belonged to children or teenagers, a figure that would drop to 29% in Swann’s updated 2016 article, which Swann attributes to a reassessment of the indexed shoes that found 14% belonged to “unspecified adults” and 11% that belonged in the category of “families of shoes,” i.e., groupings of shoes belonging to parents and children and hidden together. Of the adult-sized shoes, 26.5% belonged to women and 21.5% to men, figures that remained unchanged in both Swann’s 1996 and 2016 articles.\(^7\)

Subsequent findings by other scholars upheld many of Swann’s early observations: the concealed shoes largely belonged to young children, teenagers, and adult women and were hidden as single shoes, rather than pairs, in the access points of buildings that were, in large part,

---


\(^{6}\) Swann, 123.

\(^{7}\) Swann, 122.
the private dwellings of the lower socioeconomic classes. At the time of their concealment, most shoes were beyond repair, many having been already resoled or otherwise repaired throughout their years of use, which Swann offers as cautionary evidence against presuming that dates of concealment closely followed the manufacturing dates of the shoes.

While Swann offers some interpretations of the reasons behind concealment, particularly in her later articles, she focuses on quantifying the ritual’s scope, patterns, and geographic range. Ralph Merrifield, whose seminal work *The Archaeology of Ritual and Magic* (1987) would later come to inform decades of scholarly work on the topic, offers some early interpretations of the practice. In a 1969 article “Folk-Lore in London Archaeology,” based on a handful of shoes he recovered, Merrifield points out a significant shift in motivation from the 16th century to the mid-17th century, a period of time spanned by these shoes: "The original idea had been positive—to bring good fortune to the building; the emphasis now was probably on the warding-off of evil, which might enter by the chimney or threshold." 8

In the ensuing years since Swann’s foundational work documenting concealed shoe location sites and details and Merrifield’s pathbreaking analysis that situated the practice within the broader context of European ritual practices and magical beliefs, scholars in the British Isles, northern Europe, the United States, and Australia have further contextualized the practice by, among other avenues of inquiry, tracing its origins, exploring its cultural and social framework, and developing criteria by which to identify ritual deposits. The bulk of this scholarship remains concentrated on the British Isles, including *Magical House Protection: The Archaeology of Counter-Witchcraft* by Brian Hoggard (2019) and *Building Magic: Ritual and Re-enchantment in"

Post-Medieval Structures by Ceri Houlbrook and Owen Davies (forthcoming in fall 2021), whose books represent some of the most recent research on the subject. The last two decades have also seen an emergence of studies examining the United States, and in particular, the eastern half of the nation.³

Three scholars, in particular, have advanced our understanding of shoe concealment in the United States. A 2003 thesis by Jessica Costello (née Geisler) documents 106 instances of concealed footwear in the United States, and M. Chris Manning’s 2012 thesis extends that work by identifying an additional 153 deposits of concealed footwear as well as numerous other deposits of cats, garments, and assorted textiles. In her comprehensive review of the literature, Manning identifies a crucial gap in the research: the few then-existing studies of concealed objects in the United States, she argued, did not sufficiently take into account the role that European folk-magic and ritual played in the American iteration of the practice.⁴ Her thesis addresses that gap by comparing U.S. concealments to those found in the British Isles and northern Europe and then analyzing how magic, folklore, and ritual may have motivated them.⁵ Her considered, systematic approach makes her work essential for any study of U.S. concealments. C. Riley Augé’s 2013 dissertation, while acknowledging the importance of broad surveys such as Manning’s, zeroes in on a specific time and place, introducing questions of “gender, age, social relations, [and] localized circumstances” in her exploration of ritual concealments in 17th-century New England and how they served to illuminate pervasive cultural fears and anxieties as well as expose the underlying dynamics of gender roles and relations.⁶

---

⁵ Manning, 31–32.
⁶ C. Riley Augé, 15.
Based on her dissertation work, Augé’s book, *The Archaeology of Magic: Gender and Domestic Protection in Seventeenth-Century New England* (2020) represents the current cutting edge of research on U.S. ritual concealments. By examining the differences in the way that men and women in colonial New England used magic to mitigate risk and cope with danger, Augé forges a new understanding of how material objects such as shoes served vital functions in establishing domestic boundaries and protecting the home and surrounding property.

1.3 Barriers to Understanding the Practice

Understanding the tradition of shoe concealment calls upon the work of archaeologists, material culturalists, folklorists, architectural historians, and historical anthropologists, given the complexity of the practice, its inconsistent documentation, and the room for misinterpretation. As architectural historian Walter Wheeler notes, reliable details regarding the origins and concealment date of a concealed shoe are rare. In his words, “the occasion and identity of the agent are typically unknown, and the relationship of the shoe to the occupants of the house is typically impossible to determine.”13 Swann further cautions that much of the information on concealment shoes is “limited…secondhand…and not helped by the finders’ assumptions that shoes are the date of the building,” which is “unlikely,” she notes, unless discovered underneath the building’s foundation.14

Further complicating matters is the lack of written evidence surrounding the practice. Indeed, as folklore archaeologist Ceri Houlbrook contends, the most significant pieces of

---

evidence are the shoes themselves.\textsuperscript{15} The paucity of other documentation may be attributed to the fact that the tradition appears to “primarily be a lower-class practice”; only 9.4\% of concealment shoes have been discovered in “manor houses and mansions.”\textsuperscript{16} Lower literacy rates among this population may therefore explain the lack of written material documenting the tradition. Swann, after decades of study charting the phenomenon, perhaps makes the most important point: the practice was not documented because it was intended to remain secretive.\textsuperscript{17} Swann argues that “the secrecy continually encountered suggests that the superstition, if disclosed, ceases to be effective.”\textsuperscript{18} This tradition of secrecy not only extends to the original concealers of the shoe but also to those who discover them. As Houlbrook puts it, among finders of concealed shoes, belief is widespread that “removing a concealed shoe is bad luck…and in this cycle of continuity, finders thus become concealers themselves.”\textsuperscript{19}

1.4 Thesis Overview, Scope, and Aims

Different scholarly methods each have their own sets of strengths and limitations. Manning’s research makes clear the value of a comprehensive and broad survey of U.S. concealments, while Augé’s work demonstrates the importance of examining the subject within a highly specific temporal, social, and regional framework. This study aims to contribute to the field by analyzing a single shoe concealment, locating it within the cultural context of a Finnish immigrant community in Midcoast Maine during an approximately twenty-year period (c. 1890-

\textsuperscript{16} Houlbrook, 104.
\textsuperscript{17} Houlbrook, 104; Swann, “Shoes Concealed in Buildings,” January 1, 1996, 67.
\textsuperscript{19} Houlbrook, “Ritual, Recycling and Recontextualization,” 110.
1910), and exploring the ways in which it both fits and deviates from broader concealment patterns.

The approach of this study forms part of its argument: in order to deepen our understanding of concealment practices, we should also attempt to understand the motivations behind specific concealments, especially as the practice of concealing shoes is founded, at least in part, on the primacy of the individual. Shoes were selected for concealment because they captured the imprint, both literal and metaphorical, of a specific person. While it is important not to overinterpret or ascribe meaning without evidence, the careful reconstruction of a building’s architectural history, the establishment of a chain of ownership through deed records, and the identification of significant details in the lives of the building’s inhabitants through birth, marriage, census, and death records can help us discern possible motivations for concealment. If enough of these types of case studies are undertaken and analyzed within the broader context that scholars like Manning and Augé provide, new and distinctive patterns may emerge. How often is there overlap between a plausible concealment range and the death of an individual in the household? How frequently do concealment shoes turn up in clusters of buildings attributable to the same carpenter? In cases of children’s concealed footwear, how old were the children in the household when the shoe concealment occurred—or were they still alive at the time of concealment? Were there clusters of shoes concealed within close proximity to each other during a period of particular turmoil, trauma, or unease? If so, what does that reveal about the preoccupations, fears, or anxieties of individuals in a particular neighborhood or town?

It is one thing to uncover an object and it is another thing entirely to surface its narrative. Without scope, there are no patterns; without focus, we lose the texture of the individuals behind
the concealments. Keeping the need to maintain the proper balance in mind, this study seeks to construct the following strands and timelines:

- The structural history of the home where the concealment was discovered;
- The chain of ownership of the home;
- The significant events in the lives of the home’s inhabitants;
- The cultural context in which the concealment occurred;
- A plausible manufacturing range for the shoe; and
- A plausible concealment range for the shoe.

This chapter has provided a brief overview of the relevant literature, the issues that it poses, and the context it provides for the discovery and analysis of the Long Cove shoe concealment. Chapter 2 examines the origins of ritual shoe concealments before exploring variations in the practice as well as global and temporal deposit patterns. Chapter 3 surveys concealment patterns in Maine before turning to the history of Long Cove village and the Finnish immigrants who worked in its quarries around the turn of the 20th century, and Chapter 4 introduces the architectural history of the home, along with a detailed analysis of the shoe itself, to help establish a plausible concealment range. That information is then layered over the family histories of the home’s inhabitants from when it was first constructed (c. 1896) to the end of the likely concealment range (c. 1910) in support of an argument that the shoe was concealed shortly after the death of Finnish paving cutter Matti Matson (1909), one of the home’s owners, by his wife, Hulda Matson, as a ritualistic grieving gesture. Lastly, evidence both for and against this argument is presented in Chapter 5, taking into account specifically Finnish concealment practices and folkloric beliefs as well as the relationship between Finnish and other families in the Long Cove neighborhood. The chapter also offers suggestions for future research that might further clarify the interpretations presented here. Chapter 6 concludes the study by returning to the potential value in recovering this kind of narrative.
CHAPTER 2: DEFINING THE CONTOURS OF RITUAL CONCEALMENT

2.1 Origins of the Practice

The tradition of shoe concealment dates to the 14th century and refers to the practice of a shoe being deliberately hidden within a building, most often a private home, as an apotropaic device, or an object that has the power to ward off evil forces, to protect “vulnerable openings” such as doorways, windows, and chimneys.\(^{20}\) Besides warding off ill fortune, this ritual stemmed from at least three other possible motivations: 1) a builders' tradition; 2) a trade-related incentive; and 3) a commemorative gesture.\(^{21}\)

Swann (1996) connects the practice to longstanding superstitions about shoes as symbols of authority (as documented in the Old Testament), fertility (as seen in the tradition of tying shoes to the vehicle of newly wed couples), and good luck (as seen in the tradition of throwing worn shoes at people, which dates to the 16th century).\(^{22}\) In an early article on the subject, Merrifield (1969) links the concealment of shoes to “the earliest building sacrifices, [which] were, of course, human,” noting that the “substitution of the part for the whole, the garment for the wearer, is acceptable practice in magic.”\(^{23}\) He later suggested that the legend of Sir John Schorne, the 13th-century English rector of North Marston, Buckinghamshire, may have provided fodder for the birth of the practice. According to legend, Schorne conjured the devil into his boot, which then acted as a “spirit trap.” This act also, as Hoggard (2019) points out, is credited with serving as the inspiration for the children’s toy, the jack-in-the-box, otherwise known in


\(^{21}\) Costello, “Tracing the Footsteps of Ritual,” 36.


France as the *diable en boîte* (the “boxed devil”). Whatever the origins, however, Sarah Randles convincingly argues that “perhaps it should be considered that the practice of deliberately concealing clothing [which] has been demonstrated over a period of seven centuries, without evident documentation” serves an example of Pierre Bourdieus concept of *habitus* in which the “behavior or belief can persist as part of the structure of a society, even when the original purpose of the practice can no longer be recalled.” Given the global distribution of concealed footwear deposits, it seems highly unlikely that a single origin story can account for the practice. It seems far more likely that the “afterlife” of this belief imbued the practice with meaning and purpose long after any origin story had been forgotten.

2.2 Variations and Iterations of Ritual Shoe Concealments

As far as can be determined, the most common function of concealed shoes in a ritual context is as an apotropaic device employed to protect the home and its inhabitants by warding off evil spirits. A number of scholars, including Houlbrook, Randles, and Augé, hypothesize that this function is connected to the placement of shoes within a building. The majority of concealments that have been discovered are located within liminal spaces such as chimneys, walls, and roofs, all places that represent thresholds and therefore physical vulnerabilities where malevolent spirits might enter. The concept of liminality, or transitional space, applies not only to locations such as these within a building but also to shoes themselves as objects that exist in between the exterior environment (i.e., the ground) and the human body. When placed in these

---

26 Randles, 117.
liminal spaces, shoes can protect a building by either preventing such supernatural forces from entering or by acting as a decoy. In the case of the latter, concealed shoes can act as a “spirit trap” as discussed in Section 2.1 by inviting evil spirits to attack the shoe, as a representation of a human, in place of the living inhabitants of the building. In the case of the former, the shoe can embody the goodness of the spirit of the shoe’s original wearer to repel such forces. In either instance, however, shoes only work as magical devices because of their association with the human form.

Shoes, in a way unique among artifacts of material culture, directly manifest the imprint of their past. The “containing vessel-nature” of shoes, as Hilary Davidson observes, allows them to “hold…something of the spirit of the original wearer, a characteristic particularly relevant if the shoe belonged to a deceased loved one.” Historical archaeologist Jessica Costello agrees, contending in “Tracing the Footsteps of Ritual,” that leather shoes “possess the unique ability to record the wearer’s form” and can therefore serve as a direct representation of the shoe’s owner. Swann points out that this distinctive ability of shoes to capture an individual’s personality has been “long claimed by cobblers mending them,” a characteristic that numerous scholars have hypothesized is central to understanding the beliefs motivating the concealment of footwear.

The ability of shoes to register their wearer’s imprint may also explain why they hold such powerful sentimental value in the aftermath of a loved one’s death. As Randles puts it, when shoes were concealed after the death of their wearers, the shoes “[acted] as a quasi-relic,

---

allowing the object to be imbued with the spirit of the dead person, endowing it with supernatural powers.”

According to Swann, during her years at the Northampton Museum, “a number of people, usually women, came to the museum to offer a deceased husband’s shoes, when they could not face either the thought of disposing of them, or even handling them.”

Because shoes “retain the trace of where the human was” in ways that other clothing and material artifacts cannot, they “hold” the space once occupied by their former wearers. That space can generate emotion, nostalgia, empathy, and connection, all of which are implied by the idiom “to put yourself in someone else’s shoes.”

Roman archaeologist Carol Van Driel-Murray was the first to offer the concept of shoes as a “signature” of a person, which is a particularly helpful way to understand not only their role in helping people to process and memorialize deaths, but also to conceptualize the common practice of tradespeople inserting shoes into the foundations, walls, roofs, and other spaces of buildings they construct. In her study of 17th-century New England, Augé notes the prevalence of “magical beliefs related to their occupations” amongst builders (and sailors) and rightfully calls for further research on this subject. Although it is widely accepted that concealed shoes played a role in builders’ traditions, it has not been systematically studied in the way that the apotropaic functions of concealed shoes have been.

---

34 Davidson, “Holding the Sole,” 91.
2.3 Global Geographic and Temporal Deposit Patterns

The majority of the shoes discovered thus far have been in England, where it is widely believed the tradition was established in the early 14th century. Concealment shoe deposits, however, have been found on every continent except Antarctica, with Europe (particularly northern Europe), Australia, Canada, and the United States seeing the largest numbers of them. European immigrants, especially those from England, brought the tradition of concealment shoes with them to North America, where the largest concentration of concealment shoes discovered to date has been in New England, primarily Massachusetts. As Manning notes, the greatest concentration of concealed footwear uncovered so far is in southeast England, which is also the region of origin for many of New England’s immigrants. Manning’s 2012 thesis documents 259 deposits of concealed footwear in the United States, 106 of which had been recorded in a 2003 thesis by Jessica Costello (née Geisler); of the 106 finds in Costello’s database, 86 had estimated dates and were used in Manning’s study to establish her observations regarding temporal patterns in concealment deposits. The practice appears to have peaked in the 19th century, gradually tapering off toward the end of the century, though Manning is careful to note the tradition was still both robust and widespread well into the 1900s.

Of the 259 U.S. deposit sites reported by Manning, the greatest concentration was found in Massachusetts, with 82 sites; other states with large deposits include New York (24), Virginia (22), Connecticut (20), Pennsylvania (18), and Maine (16). Research conducted for this thesis
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located an additional 15 deposit sites in Maine, for a total of 31 statewide. Although the Concealed Shoe Index established by Swann includes over 3,000 as of 2019, Swann and many other scholars believe the practice is likely to be far more widespread. In her 1996 article summarizing the first fifty years of her research, Swann reveals this suspicion, writing: “I suspect the Index is little guide to the extent of the practice of concealing shoes.” Of the many oddities and curiosities associated with the concealed shoe tradition, this is perhaps one of the most puzzling: why has such a seemingly widespread, global practice, spanning at least six centuries and deeply embedded in and reflective of folkloric beliefs, religion, superstition, and cosmology—in other words, some of the strongest organizing forces of human history and behavior—not attracted broader popular notice? Given the lack of evidence in the written record and the rapidly declining access to any new oral histories because the practice largely disappeared by the mid-20th century, every find represents a potentially valuable opportunity to help define—and redefine—the scope, scale, and complexity of the tradition. That is the belief, at any rate, that inspired this study of the Long Cove shoe concealment.

CHAPTER 3: GEOGRAPHIC AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE LONG COVE CONCEALMENT SHOE

3.1 Coastal Concealments: Deposit Patterns in Maine

There are 31 known sites of concealment shoe deposits in Maine with a total of 172 shoes between the sites (see Table A.1: Concealment Shoe Deposits in Maine). For purposes of this analysis, single shoes were counted as one item, pairs of shoes that were concealed within the same deposit location were counted as two items, and remnants of shoes (e.g., soles only) were counted as one item; if an estimate was provided for any given entry, the lower end of the estimate was used. Since dates were not provided for individual items within archival entries, local newspaper articles, and other similar sources the data visualized in Figure 1 below reflects the temporal distribution of the 31 concealment sites, not the individual shoes. The date ranges used in Figure 1 correspond with those used in Manning’s 2012 study for purposes of direct comparison.

![Figure 1: Temporal distribution of concealment shoes in Maine](image)

In Maine, no concealed shoes yet discovered pre-date the early 1800s and only one site, the Long Cove shoe, potentially dates to the early 20th century. Manning identified 1831-1860 as
the crest of concealed footwear deposits in the United States, and while that trend is reflected in Maine’s numbers (see Figure 1), the difference in the periods immediately preceding and following 1831-1860 is statistically insignificant (+1). Over half of the sites (17) have an unknown date of deposit, so any new evidence revealing at least a plausible concealment range for the undated sites could significantly impact the data shown in Figure 1.

While the temporal pattern of Maine’s concealed shoe deposits is difficult to establish given the large number of undated sites, the site spatial distribution, shown in Figure 2, is clearer. The sites are largely clustered along the coast, a pattern that likely reflects Maine’s European settlement history more than any inherent dynamic specific to concealment practices. There is an especially dense cluster of concealment shoes located in an approximately 30-mile radius in the Midcoast region, with deposit sites present in Nobleboro, South Thomaston, Warren, Union, Saint George, Camden, Rockland, and Belfast. It is possible that an increasing awareness of the tradition of concealment shoes, perhaps prompted by a number of articles in local Midcoast newspapers over the last few years, could be responsible for Midcoast homeowners and contractors reporting concealments that may have otherwise gone undetected, but it is also possible that the Midcoast cluster represents something more significant. Tracing the deed records and building histories of these homes could help identify plausible concealment ranges, thereby clarifying the presence (or not) of any strong temporal pattern, as well as uncover any commonalities shared amongst the sites. Pinpointing these commonalities (e.g., discovering multiple homes built by the same carpenter or identifying shared ancestry or kinship of the inhabitants in a neighborhood) could potentially illuminate the motivations behind the concealments and address the question of whether the Midcoast cluster is happenstance or truly

represents a significant pattern. For example, two of the three deposit sites in Camden are located on Union Street, which raises the question of whether the homes were constructed by the same builder and therefore potentially illustrate the “builders’ tradition” discussed in the previous chapter.

In the Downeast region, there are three notable clusters: one in Castine, where three documented concealments were found within close range of each other, and one around Mount Desert Island, represented by deposits on Great Cranberry, Great Gott Island, and Bass Harbor. The latter two sites in the Mount Desert Island area cluster were both built by the same carpenter, Martin Babbidge (b. 1836) of Swans Island. Identifying other homes built by Babbidge in and
around Mount Desert Island might uncover further examples of concealment shoes, which, like
the Camden deposits on Union Street, could raise interesting questions about the possible roots
of concealed deposits in a builders’ tradition. No comprehensive study of Maine concealed shoe
deposits has been undertaken since Manning’s 2012 thesis exploring the United States, which
noted 16 concealment sites in Maine, the sixth greatest number of any state. While outside the
scope of this particular project, a survey of Maine’s historical societies, historic preservation
organizations, and construction company records could yield valuable additional data that could
assist in establishing patterns, outliers, and concealment narratives of interest within the state.

3.2 Introduction to Long Cove, Maine: A Company Town

The setting for this case study is the village of Long Cove on the Saint George peninsula, a
neighborhood that came into existence on account of a single industry: granite quarrying.
Throughout its formative years, Long Cove was, in essence, a company town. Understanding the
history of the Long Cove granite industry is key to comprehending the social, cultural, and
economic forces that ultimately resulted in the concealment of the Long Cove shoe.

The peninsula’s granite industry began with the construction of the Maine State Prison in
Thomaston in the summer of 1823, a period that local historian Jim Skoglund describes as “an
oil rush.”46 In 1875, James M. Smith, Joseph Hume, and William Birss founded the Long Cove
Granite Company, and by 1877, the quarry employed between 60 and 100 men.47 The 1880

46 Negley K. Teeters, “Early Days of the Maine State Prison at Thomaston,” Journal of Criminal Law and
communication, conservation with author, June 6, 2021.
census reveals that most of these workers were from local families, with a handful from England, Scotland, and Canada.48

In 1879, the proprietors of the quarry won a contract to supply granite for the post office in Albany, New York, and operations were increased to fulfill what had been expected to be a year-long contract.49 Together with the demand for paving stones in cities and towns across the Northeast and Midwest, work was plentiful. In 1880 alone, the paving cutters at Long Cove cut 500,000 such stones, and one of the Booth brothers—leaders in the Maine granite industry—was responsible for selling “millions of paving blocks” for New York City streets during this period.50

The Albany Post Office contract stretched to the fall of 1881, but the fortunes of the quarry quickly declined with the completion of that contract. A number of workers left, and by October, the quarry had been attached by creditors.51 The quarry, its equipment, and the company boarding house were then purchased by the Booth Brothers Company in March 1882. A number of relatively quiet years ensued until a “good busy summer” in 1888.52 That same summer, the first Maine branch of the Paving Cutters’ Union of America was established on Vinalhaven, with local branches soon popping up in Long Cove, Tenant’s Harbor, Clark Island, Friendship, Saint George, and Waldoboro, as well as approximately half-a-dozen additional branches further

49 Falla, “The Early History of Long Cove Quarry.”
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afield, as far north as Mount Desert in Hancock County and stretching inland to North Jay, Franklin County. In total, the branches represented approximately 3,000 “thoroughly organized” members across the state, a substantial increase over the 2,000 members noted just four years earlier in the 1889 Annual Report of the Bureau of Industrial and Labor Statistics for the State of Maine. No other state had as many branches of the union in the country at the time.53 Not surprisingly, given the “migratory habits of the workman” and the large number of branches, the 1889 Annual Report found it difficult to obtain a precise count of all union members.54

The migratory habits of the workers were tied in part to what a stone cutter in the 1889 Annual Report describes as the “very trying conditions” of the industry and the ensuing frequency of strikes “owing to men refusing to go without their pay when due.”55 Other quarrymen and paving cutters quoted in the report described the frequent loss of wages due to “stormy weather or winter season,” with one man estimating upwards of 60-70 days lost per year.56 Quarrymen and paving cutters were paid by the piece, and it was not unusual for a worker to go weeks, months, or even a year without being paid cash wages. In response to the question: “How often are you paid?,” one worker responded: “For a man who has not been paid in 15 years, that question is a stunner.”57 Another man who had worked in the quarries for 17 years reflected on the opportunities he wished he could provide for his older son, at the same time acknowledging the extent to which he relied on his son’s assistance to keep the household afloat financially:

Quarrymen have, as a rule, very few of the luxuries of this life. If one has a boy, he cannot give him the opportunity he should have, the needs of the family requiring him, as soon as he is able, to assist in their support, when he should be at school. I have a boy 19 years of age working with me, and only for the assistance I receive from him I would have a hard road to travel. A man requires to be something more than human to struggle on for years and years and never have a cent come at pay day that he can call his own, but such is the case with most quarrymen.\

The quarryman quoted here would have found himself at the bottom of the socioeconomic hierarchy of the granite industry, a hierarchy established in large part on the basis of ethnicity. In contrast to the quarrymen, granite cutters possessed a much higher status in the labor force. In 1890, 70 percent of the granite cutters were American-born, and, according to that year’s Bureau of Industrial Labor Statistics Report, they enjoyed “pianos and elegant furnishings” in their homes. Granite cutters were widely recognized for their skill, and the report insisted that they were “a most useful and creditable portion of our citizenship.”\

Stone carvers, most of whom were Italian immigrants, also held skilled positions, but revealing its nativist outlook, the report disparaged the Italians as culturally insular and “here simply for what they can make.” Paving cutters, the majority of whom were immigrants, represented a “different class from the stone cutters”; however, like the stone cutters, they had union representation, an option that quarrymen did not enjoy. The Bureau conceded that, “there is as much intelligence required in the quarry as in the [cutting] shed,” but the lack of union organization made it difficult for the quarrymen to escape their lowly status.

In 1890, the Paving Cutters’ Union, in concert with the Granite Cutters’ Union, established the 9-hour workday, and for a membership fee of $2 plus monthly dues of $0.40, union members
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were eligible for a $100 funeral benefit, paid to their heirs at the time of their death, presuming they were in good standing.\textsuperscript{61} The union sought to stabilize wages and introduce pay regularity in an effort to address the sorts of concerns raised by the workers quoted in the Annual Labor Reports. The existence of the union, however, would set the stage for profound demographic shifts not only in Long Cove but across all of Knox County in the ensuing years.

One such shift was the introduction of Finnish immigrants as strikebreakers in 1894 in response to a labor dispute, which set off a wave of Finnish immigration to Maine’s Midcoast that lasted through the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Matti Matson, the Finnish paver cutter whose family is at the center of the Long Cove concealment shoe story, immigrated to the United States in 1888 and was working in the quarries by at least 1892, if not earlier. The dense concentration of branches of the Paving Cutters’ Union in the Midcoast directly translated into the region’s status as the center of Finnish immigration to Maine.

3.3 History of Long Cove Village as a Finnish Immigrant Community

An 1899 history of Finnish immigration to the United States, \textit{Suomalaiset Amerikassa} (\textit{Finns in America}) identified Rockland as the hub of Finnish immigration in the state.\textsuperscript{62} According to the author Akseli Rauanheimo, Finns first came to the region in 1892 to break the “stonemason strike.” Rauanheimo describes traveling by “electric carriage” south from Rockland past “fine bluish granite mountains” before finishing the journey to Long Cove by horse, a trip of approximately two hours.\textsuperscript{63} “Finns have lived here longer than elsewhere in Maine,” he

\textsuperscript{61} Maine Bureau of Industrial and Labor Statistics, 204.
\textsuperscript{63} Rauanheimo, 65.
observed, drawn by the “slightly better” wages for stoneworkers in Maine as compared to Massachusetts.64

Rauanheimo’s account of Long Cove in the mid-1890s is particularly valuable, as the entirety of the 1890 Maine census was destroyed by a 1921 fire. Other sources point to a slightly earlier arrival in Long Cove for at least a few Finnish workers. The Maine Bureau of Industrial and Labor Statistics annual report for 1890 found that the Booth Brothers Company employed 130 men at the Long Cove quarry that year, nearly all of whom were either American-born, English, or Scottish; only 10 Finnish immigrants existed among the paving cutters at that time.65 By 1892, the company employed 140 workers, the majority of whom were still American-born and half of whom were members of the local union branch.66

The Long Cove branch had achieved notable gains since its establishment in 1890: day wages were set at between $2.75 and $3.00 per day, and “piece men” were averaging $1.75 a day; all workers were paid on a monthly basis.67 Despite these gains, a labor strike known as “The Great Lockout of 1892” erupted. The walkout involved up to 100,000 workers and spanned the entire eastern seaboard, garnering national attention in the press.68 The workers at the Long Cove quarry participated in the “general stoppage” that occurred on May 14, and although “every effort was made to induce the men to go to work at Long Cove,” according to that year’s

64 Rauanheimo, 65.
state labor report, “very few were secured…and none of the union men returned.” The strike was especially problematic given the number of outstanding blocks required for fulfillment of a contract to supply granite for the Betz Building, sometimes referred to as Philadelphia's first skyscraper. The nationwide “Panic of 1893” and the resulting depression of 1893-1897 further disrupted national operations.

By 1894, Finnish strike breakers had been brought in, a development which local residents made clear was far from welcome. In a 2011 local newspaper article, Aune Matson Bragdon, whose father was a Finnish paving cutter at the Long Cove quarry, described how “ironic [it was] that the Finns were brought to the area to break a union strike,” given that, in her opinion, “after the arrival of the Finns and certainly in part due to them the unions became stronger than ever.” Not only did the Finnish workers ultimately contribute to the strength of the unions, they were unaware of the fact that they had been brought in as strikebreakers.

The initial role of the Finnish workers as strikebreakers translated into tensions between them and local families for at least a few years. Relations appeared to have improved by the time of the Maine Bureau of Industrial and Labor Statistics’s 1910 Annual Report, which described in glowing terms how “the Finns make excellent farmers and good neighbors, while their children, through the agency of the public school, readily accept American ways and standards.” Slightly further afield, a 1909 Boston Globe article praised the success of Maine’s Finnish immigrants due to their “hard work and frugality.” Persistent local anti-immigrant and nativist sentiment,
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however, contributed to the sense that the Finnish workers were somehow responsible for weakening the unions, a belief which continued throughout the first period of their settlement in the Midcoast area.

In addition to tensions surrounding labor relations, political and cultural differences inspired mistrust. Finns were the “first and largest foreign-language unit in the Socialist Party of America,” an affiliation that provoked nativist, xenophobic attacks. As St. George historian John Falla has noted, the establishment of a Long Cove chapter of the Finnish Socialist Federation in the neighborhood served to reinforce the distance between the immigrants and the rest of the village. The strong cultural institutions such as dance halls, lending libraries, bands, and temperance societies created by Finnish immigrants, including those in Long Cove, would have further contributed to their cultural isolation.

In contrast to the state labor bureau reports, census information about Maine’s Finnish immigrants during this period is spotty at best. As already mentioned, the 1890 census records were lost in a 1921 fire. The 1900 census records do not include documentation of the Long Cove Finnish families, a fact that Falla attributes to the presence of the language barrier that would have existed between the census taker and the Finns. Falla estimates that of the approximately 300 families who lived in Long Cove at the turn of the 20th century, 53 were from Finland. By the time of the 1910 census, however, the Long Cove Village records filled seven pages of census data, and the residents were overwhelmingly Finnish immigrants.
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In piecing together the story of the Long Cove shoe, the above context must inform any interpretation of the object: the concealment occurred within an overwhelmingly Finnish, working-class neighborhood, during a period of subsiding but likely still present tension between the Finnish and British/American-born families, and within a cultural context of extreme frugality and linguistic insularity. Together these factors offer important evidence in attempting to determine both the identity and the intended purpose of the shoe’s concealer.
CHAPTER 4: ESTABLISHING A PLAUSIBLE CONCEALMENT RANGE

4.1 Architectural History of the Home

Establishing a plausible concealment range for the shoe is essential in any attempt to determine the shoe’s concealer and specific purpose. In order to identify the shoe’s concealment range, one must first reconstruct both the architectural history of the home where the concealment was discovered and ascertain the manufacturing range of the shoe itself. As Manning notes, when the exact date of a concealment is unknown, identifying the building’s architectural history can provide an approximate date of concealment, since, in her words, “Many deposits appear to have been concealed during original construction of a building or during a period of major repair or alteration.”

In fact, Merrifield points out, the most frequent deposit sites “are normally accessible only at the time of building or structural alteration.”

In the case of the Long Cove shoe, the structural history of the home is revealed both through architectural evidence and the lives of its residents as documented in the birth, marriage, deed, death, and census records. The Booth Brothers Company, which had merged with Hurricane Island Granite in 1889 to become the Booth Brothers and Hurricane Island Company, owned several tracts of land just north of the Long Cove Quarry. In March 1896, the company sold one such tract to a Finnish immigrant from the western city of Ullava in the Länsi-Suomen Lääni region, Josef Koskela (b. 1869).

The house where the shoe was found was constructed sometime between the spring of 1896, when Koskela purchased the land from the granite company, and the winter of 1897, when Koskela and his wife Mary sold the house to
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Isaac Paakkari, another Finnish paving cutter whose prior residence was listed as “Hurricane Island/Vinalhaven” on the deed.82

The Koskelas were the first in a long line of Finnish occupants of the home. After leaving Long Cove, census records trace the family’s journey from Maine to Sand Coulee, Montana in 1900 and later to Columbia, Oregon, by which time Koskela had become a carpenter, a fact that indicates he may well have been the original builder of the home.83 This degree of geographic mobility was not unusual; as noted above, many immigrant quarry workers only stayed as long as their contracts lasted before moving on to other quarries or, as in the case of Koskela, other industries.84 The Paakkari’s occupancy of the home seems to have generated little notice in the documentary records before its sale on March 1st, 1906 to the main protagonists of the concealment shoe story, Matti Matson (b. 1861, Vassa, Finland) and his wife, Hulda (b. 1874, Teuva, Finland).85

The Matsons were Finnish immigrants to Maine who had been married for over a dozen years by the time they moved to the Long Cove property.86 Like the first owner of the home,
Josef Koskela, both Hulda and Matti were from the Länsi-Suomen Lääni region on Finland’s west coast; Vassa, Matti’s birthplace, was located about 83 kilometers north of Teuva, where Hulda was born.

Unfortunately, Matti and Hulda’s time together in their new home was short-lived. After less than three years, in January 1909, Matti Matson died of heart disease. At the time of his death, Matti’s occupation was listed as “paving cutter” and Hulda’s occupation was listed as “domestic.”

The family’s misfortune extended into the spring, when their youngest son, Swante Matson died in April of scarlet fever at just 11 months old.

There were four other surviving Matson children: their eldest daughter, Fannie (b. 1893); Hulda (b. 1895 and named for her mother); their son Walden (b. 1904); and youngest daughter Sennia (b. 1907). By July 1909, when she was 35 years old, Hulda had remarried to a younger paving cutter.
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cutter named John (Juho Viktor) Korhonen (b. 1879 in Sotkamo Parish, Oulu, Finland). In December 1909, Hulda and Matti’s eldest daughter, Fannie, married another Long Cove Finn, 26-year-old paving cutter Emil Ruuska, at the age of 16. The only known photograph of any member of this branch of the Matson family from this period (Figure 3), pictures Fannie outside the Long Cove post office.

By the time of the May 1910 census, John Korhonen was listed as the head of household, and Hulda, Walden, and Sienna Matson (the three younger surviving children of Matti and Hulda Matson) were identified as his stepchildren. Most tellingly, however, Hulda’s occupation had changed: she was no longer a “domestic” but rather the keeper of a boarding house with seven Finnish boarders. The renovation and expansion of the home may very well have taken place after Hulda’s marriage to John in July 1909, as her marriage certificate still lists her occupation as “housewife.”

The change in Hulda’s occupation is significant because it provides likely evidence of the expansion of the house from a private home to a boarding house sometime between the time of Matti Matson’s death in January 1909 and the May 1910 census. Architectural details of the house corroborate the theory that an addition was built sometime in the early 20th century: the original cedar tile roof can still be seen in the attic of the home, indicating the smaller original

90 Dale Piirainen, Personal communication, e-mail, June 29, 2021. Dale Piirainen is the president of the Finnish American Heritage Society in West Paris, Maine, who generously assisted with some of the genealogical research for the Matson and Korhonen families.
92 Fannie was identified in this photograph by Emily Morris, whose grandfather, John Morris Sr., is pictured beside her.
square footprint of the building. During this expansion, the footprint of the home roughly doubled in size, with a large first-floor living space or kitchen added to the ground floor and three new rooms, at least two of which were bedrooms, added to the second story.

Like the original house, the addition was constructed using balloon framing. The most common form of construction in the United States between the 1880s and the 1930s, balloon framing proved to be more affordable than traditional approaches to building a house. Moreover, balloon frame construction offered greater flexibility, making it easier to adapt interior spaces and add units as the needs of the occupants evolved over time.95

In the case of the Long Cove home, the addition’s balloon framing was completed using approximately 16- to 28-foot length hemlock and fir studs, possibly sourced from the surrounding woods.96 The studs are not hand-hewn, which might have indicated an earlier expansion, but milled. Evidence of hand-finishing and fitting, however, is still visible in the form of adz and chisel marks. Wallpaper uncovered on the ground floor of the expansion, shown in Figure 4, offers the possibility of further narrowing the
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timeframe of the addition if it could be dated by a historic preservationist since it appears to be the first layer on the wall of the addition where it was uncovered.

In any event, given that shoes were often concealed during periods of “construction or repair,” knowing when the addition to the house was constructed provides an important clue as to the timing of the shoe concealment.\textsuperscript{97} The structural history of this expansion also aligns with the likely manufacturing range of the shoe, as following section makes clear.

4.2 Plausible Manufacturing Range of the Shoe

In identifying both the plausible wearer and concealer of a concealment shoe, the most significant evidence may derive from the shoe itself. Unlike the majority of concealment footwear, the Long Cove shoe, shown in Figure 5, is that of an adult man. As Sarah Randles

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{long_cove_shoe.jpg}
\caption{The Long Cove shoe. The gender of the shoe can be confirmed as the company that manufactured the shoe, the Arthur Shoe Company, designed and marketed this specific style for men (see sample advertisement, Figure 8). As explained below and shown in Figure 8, this line of shoes was branded as “King Quality: The Shoe of Shoes,” and their advertising frequently included references to this line being “fit for a King” and “made for men” (See Figure 8). Photograph by author.}
\end{figure}
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notes in “Material Magic: The Deliberate Concealment of Footwear and Other Clothing,” half of the concealment shoes discovered in Britain were children’s shoes; other sources support this claim and indicate that the pattern of children’s concealment shoes existed beyond the British Isles. There appears to be enough consensus in the literature, in short, to indicate that the Long Cove concealment shoe is an outlier because it clearly belonged to an adult, and an adult male at that.

In addition to identifying the gender of the shoe, historical archaeologist Maya Veres outlines three primary categories that can assist in establishing historical facts about leather footwear: methods of construction, signs of repair, and styles and fashions. Although Veres’ research focuses on Australia, her observational methodology can prove useful regardless of country of origin. As she points out, there are over 800 methods of constructing a shoe, but they broadly fall into two categories: hand-sewn and manufactured. Of the four primary methods of manufactured construction, one known as the “stitchdown process” appears to most closely describe the construction of the Long Cove concealment shoe. According to Veres, the presence of stitched seams and “the clenched heads of lasting tacks” in the insole are the key indicators of a shoe constructed in this matter. One of the “oldest, simplest…and least expensive” methods, the stitchdown process was primarily used in the construction of “rugged boots and footwear.” Ascertaining any signs of repair, the second category in Veres’ observational methodology, is especially difficult in the case of Long Cove shoe due to its
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extreme wear—there is a hole in the center of the bottom sole, as shown in Figure 6, and the welting around the toe has come undone, dislocating the upper from the outsole.

![Figure 6: Signs of wear and repair on the Long Cove shoe. Photograph by author.](image)

Stylistically, the shoe’s rounded toe and stacked leather heel suggest it was likely manufactured before 1910, when men’s shoes “saw a revival of the pointed toe and the elongated vamp.”\(^{104}\) The “common work boot,” by definition, is less likely to reflect fashion trends, making it more difficult to identify and date such an object.\(^{105}\) Interestingly, though, while one might expect to find that a shoe from a historically working-class neighborhood of Finnish stoncutters was purchased for substance over style, the Long Cove shoe does show decorative elements in the form of small perforations on the cap-toe of the shoe and along the foxing. These features suggest that the shoe may have served multiple purposes and been worn outside of work at the quarry. The Long Cove Finns “worked hard and played hard,” according to local historian John Falla, and evenings were often spent at the community dance hall just up the road from the

\(^{104}\) Veres, 91.  
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quarry.\footnote{Falla, Personal communication, conversation with author.} The wear on the shoe may reflect both long days exposed to the elements at the quarry as well as evenings surrounded by neighbors at the dance hall.

Other identifying features of the shoe, much less ambiguous than the decorative elements, offer more certain evidence of its date of manufacture. The tag on the shoe’s topline (Figure 7) reads “B.L. Segal,” believed to be Benjamin Louis Segal (b. 1877), a Russian Jewish man who immigrated to the United States in 1894. In 1897, Segal was listed as a “peddler” on Pearl Street in nearby Rockland; in all likelihood, the shoe was produced after this year, when later references to the clothier B.L. Segal begin appearing as advertisements in the local \textit{Courier Gazette}.\footnote{“Advertisement. Summer Clothing, B.L. Segal,” \textit{Courier Gazette}, June 26, 1906, 6, Digital Maine Repository.} The earliest of these references dates to 1906, and while the possible timeframe for sale of the shoe begins in 1897 with the establishment of Segal’s Rockland storefront, a more plausible range may fall a bit later, when both Segal and the shoe’s manufacturer would have been more established in their trade.

While Segal appears to have stocked and sold the shoe, he did not manufacture it. A tag on the shoe’s heel, shown in Figure 7 above, reads “King’s Shoes, made by Arnold,” which is a reference to the North Abington, Massachusetts company Arnold Shoes, founded by Moses...
Noyes Arnold in 1865 and incorporated as a business with his sons in 1905. A 1905 advertisement for the Arnold Shoe Company (Figure 8) features a shoe that appears to share features with the Long Cove shoe, including an identical broguing pattern, similar two-tone leather panels, and same number of eyelets and lace stays.

4.3 Plausible Concealment Range

The construction method, likely date of manufacture, size, and degree of wear all suggest that the shoe belonged to an adult male who wore the shoe on a daily basis and had some connection in the early 1900s with the home where it was found. Possibilities include 1) one of the home’s male owners, all of whom were Finnish paving cutters during this time period of the home’s history; 2) a builder; and 3) far less likely, a boarder, who probably would not have had access to the specific concealment site underneath the northwest eave. While the act of hiding concealment shoes is well-established in the literature as a British builders’ tradition, the cultural context of the Long Cove concealment suggests that the builder in this case was probably not British. Given the strict frugality observed in Finnish immigrant households and the
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Figure 8: 1905 Advertisement for the Arnold Shoe Company, manufacturer of King’s Quality shoes. Photograph of original advertisement by author.
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likelihood of still-present tensions between the Finns, on the one hand, and British immigrants and American-born local families on the other, Falla believes “it [is] highly unlikely that a Finn would hire an Englishman to build his house…There was a feeling by some of the locals at the time of the quarries that, at best, the Finns were second class citizens.”\textsuperscript{109} In all likelihood, the language barrier would have also presented challenges to the hiring of an English-speaking carpenter, as census records indicate that of the home’s inhabitants, only the young Matson children spoke English.\textsuperscript{110}

Taking into account such relevant factors as likely access to the concealment site, the cultural context of the Long Cove community, evidence that dates the shoe to the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, the home’s structural history, and significant events in the lives of the home’s inhabitants during this period, one particular candidate emerges as the plausible wearer of the shoe: Matti Matson, the paving cutter who died of heart disease at age 47 in 1909, leaving behind his wife of 16 years, Hulda Matson. It seems likely, in short, that the Long Cove concealment shoe was hidden in the new eave of the home’s addition upon its expansion and transformation into a boarding house following Swante and Matti Matson’s deaths in the winter and spring of 1909 and Hulda Matson’s remarriage in July 1909. This hypothesis, however, raises contradictions and complications when explored in the larger context of Finnish concealment traditions.

\textsuperscript{109} Falla, Personal communication, conversation with author.
CHAPTER 5: THE LONG COVE CONCEALMENT SHOE: INTERPRETATIONS

5.1 Contradictions and Complications

As noted in Chapter 2, concealment shoes most often functioned as apotropaic devices to protect “vulnerable openings” in a private home, although they also functioned as representations of builders’ traditions and commemorative gestures. Given the history of home’s inhabitants and the likely concealment range of the shoe, which appears to correspond with the approximate period in which Matti Matson died, it is worth exploring the possibility that the Long Cove concealment shoe may fall into this third category of commemorative gestures. The literature on concealment shoes as commemorative gestures refers to the English tradition of hiding a shoe “upon the death of a loved one,” a practice intended to “keep the spirit of the deceased at home.” As previously observed, the leather construction of shoes, which bound themselves to their owners by molding to their feet and creating individualized “vessels” that captured the wearer’s spirit, lent itself to fulfilling this function.

When considered in the context of anthropological theories of magic that highlight the “connection [that] magic provides between two like things”—i.e. the shoe and its wearer—a fuller picture begins to emerge. The type of magic described in this theory, otherwise known as imitative magic, offers one possible avenue of interpretation of concealment practices; another such avenue is to view concealment shoes as examples of “contagious magic,” a term likely established by the Scottish ethnologist Sir James George Frazer in *The Golden Bough: A Study in Comparative Religion*, first published in 1890. Contagious magic, Frazer writes, is predicated
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112 Costello, “Tracing the Footsteps of Ritual,” 46.
114 Costello, “Tracing the Footsteps of Ritual,” 46.
“upon the notion that things which have once been conjoined must remain ever afterwards.”

“The most familiar example of Contagious Magic,” Frazer goes on to explain, “is the magical sympathy which is supposed to exist between a man and any severed portion of his person.”

Combined, these theories help to explain why shoes were so often the objects of choice in the concealment traditions of the British Isles: imitative magic allowed concealment shoes to serve as a stand-in for their wearers, and contagious magic, through its ability to “unite distant units,” offered an avenue for permanently binding the wearer and the shoe together, even after death.

It should be noted that research on Finnish concealments indicates that shoes were not commonly used objects. Since building concealments are an increasingly well-documented, geographically widespread tradition, enough material and folkloric evidence has emerged to suggest that distinctive concealment patterns exist in different countries. While the concealment traditions of the British Isles most prominently featured shoes, horse skulls, and cats, the three most common objects in the Finnish tradition were mercury, coins, and animal remains; examples of Finnish concealment shoes are rare. Sonja Hukantaival’s 2016 dissertation notes three cases of shoes in her study of Finnish ritual concealments, one of which was medieval and two of which were late modern. Of the two late modern finds, one can be directly traced to the concealment traditions of the British Isles, as the shoe was found in the attic of a manor house in Helsinki (Meilahti Manor) that was occupied by a British family during the time of its likely concealment and which had undergone a renovation in 1913. The third example of a
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118 Sonja Hukantaival, “For a Witch Cannot Cross Such a Threshold!”: Building Concealment Traditions in Finland c. 1200-1950 (University of Turku, Finland: Suomen Keskiajan Arkeologian Seura, 2016), 88.
concealment shoe in Hukantaival’s study was a small cache of three shoes discovered beneath a support beam of the attic floor of the Old Town Hall in Porvoo, located approximately 30 miles east of Helsinki on the southern coast. While Hukantaival acknowledges the theory that the concealment of personal objects such as shoes was a practice intended to foster and reflect connections between the inhabitants of a home and the house itself, she rejects the idea that the personal objects found in Finnish concealment sites are examples of this tradition.

In light of the apparent infrequency with which shoe concealment took place in Finland, it is not surprising that it was rarely practiced in Long Cove. Other types of concealment deposits, however, have been found in and around the village. A member of the local historical society has reported unearthing old coins tucked into floorboards in a number of homes in St. George, including one in Long Cove. There has been only one other example in St. George to date of a concealment shoe. It was discovered underneath the floorboards of a late 18th century home built and occupied by Keturah and Joshua Smalley, whose family genealogy can be traced to Mayflower descendants.

Interestingly, a recent oral history account suggests another kind of possible connection between Long Cove’s Finnish immigrants and rituals involving old shoes. A long-time resident of the neighborhood related a story of how, when she and her husband were struggling to establish a productive rhubarb patch, she asked one of her neighbors, an elderly Finnish woman, for advice. Shortly thereafter, the woman showed up at their home with an old leather boot and instructed them to bury it beneath the rhubarb to help the plant grow. Oddly enough, the rhubarb
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119 Hukantaival, 95.  
120 Hukantaival, 128. Other examples of Finnish concealed shoes beyond those referenced in Hukantaival’s study are discussed in the following section.  
121 Tammy Wiley, Personal communication, conservation with author, June 19, 2021; Steve Cartwright, Personal communication, e-mail, June 26, 2021.
subsequently flourished.\textsuperscript{122} There is no documentation, though, of this practice being
distinctively Finnish.

While directionality of a concealed object can sometimes offer clues as to its intended
purpose, in the case of Long Cove shoe the concealment’s direction only adds to the complexity
of its interpretation. The Long Cove shoe was deposited in the northwest corner of the house, and
while Hukantaival notes a preference for northerly-oriented concealments in Finnish folklore,
“both the folklore and the find material seem to point to an eschewing of the western direction
when placing the concealment.”\textsuperscript{123} While there is no known rationale for the bias against
westerly directions, the preference for northern concealments has clearer origins: “The Finnish
word for north, \textit{pohjoinen},” Hukantaival writes, “is connected to \textit{pohja}, which means the bottom;
the north is in fact the underworld, the abode of the dead.”\textsuperscript{124} While directionality can raise
interesting questions about how various concealments might have been intended to function, it
cannot, in this case, be used to aid in the object’s interpretation, given that it was placed at the
intersection of both the most preferred and least desirable direction.

5.2 Supporting Evidence

The above analysis suggests that if the Long Cove find is in fact an example of a Finnish
concealment shoe, it is an anomalous one. Since the cultural and linguistic insularity of the
home’s inhabitants during the plausible concealment range make it highly unlikely that someone
of British descent would have had access to the bedroom eave and given the fact that the first

\textsuperscript{122} Anne Cogger, Personal communication, conservation with author, June 6, 2021.
\textsuperscript{123} Hukantaival, \textit{For a Witch Cannot Cross Such a Threshold!}, 136.
\textsuperscript{124} Hukantaival, 136.
The non-Finnish inhabitant of the house did not take occupancy until 1954, it is worth attempting to reconcile the material facts of the concealment with the patterns documented in the literature.  

The tradition of Finnish house spirits provides an important cultural context. Folklorist Claude Lecouteux explains in his 2013 study how protective guardians of dwellings are generally acquired. As Lecouteux puts it, “The spirit is the one that lights the fire for the first time in the new house, who is the first to have arrived on the construction site and cleared it, or else the first inhabitant of the land who has died.” Lecouteux cites the research conducted by the prolific Finnish folklorist, mythologist, and poet Martti Haavio, whose voluminous works comprise much of the seminal literature on Finnish house spirits. Unfortunately, Haavio’s studies remain largely untranslated and therefore inaccessible to English-language researchers. Haavio, according to Lecouteux, stresses the centrality of beliefs in house spirits in Finland and other Scandinavian countries, especially the notion that the “first dead inhabitant can change into a house spirit.” Indeed, the idea of death as an animating force behind the establishment of a house spirit pervades Scandinavian folklore. “The theme of death,” Lecouteux writes, “is repeated so often that researchers have accepted it as one of the roots of the belief in house spirits—the other being that of the genius loci—which would even represent ‘the collective soul’ of a family and is suggestive of ancestor worship.”

More recently, in the 2019 book *Northern Archaeology and Cosmology*, archaeologists Vesa-Pekka Herva and Antti Lahelma note that household spirits “seem to bear an interesting resonance with the theme of ghosts and haunting” and they observe that “northern folklore is
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indeed rich in accounts of the dead residing in or visiting the world of the living.”

Of particular significance to the story of the Long Cove shoe, Herva and Lahelma also draw a connection between concealed objects and household spirits:

Some of the concealed artefacts—such as shoes and clothes—would seem to relate directly to the idea of an intimate, personal relationship between people and houses by making ‘parts of people’ as parts of houses…[C]oncealments thus contributed to the making of buildings into something more than just a backdrop of life.

Herva and Lahelma emphasize the extent to which such household spirits became woven into the fabric of everyday life in Scandinavian culture, emphasizing that these “household spirits were perceived, rather than merely believed, to exist.” Reports of such encounters, they point out, were offered “in a matter-of-factly fashion” into the early 20th century.

Finnish houses spirits comprise one part of what Manning calls a “pan-European tradition” of domestic deities that share similar characteristics across European countries. Common elements of this tradition include its pre-Christian origins and location within the home, near a hearth or in other threshold spaces such as the attic, roof, and walls, as well as a close association with shoes. Manning even points to a “similar association between spirits and shoes” on the Indian subcontinent, which she argues provides further evidence of “an Indo-European origin for the ritual and apotropaic use of shoes.”
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130 Herva and Lahelma, 91.
131 Herva and Lahelma, 95.
132 Manning, “Homemade Magic,” 351. While house spirits in other European traditions were often believed to prefer locations in the home close to the hearth, Haavio’s research, cited in Hukantaival’s thesis, indicated that Finnish house spirits were only “rarely found by the heath” and often preferred the ridge-beam of a home.
133 Hukantaival, *For a Witch Cannot Cross Such a Threshold!*, 133.
A 2016 case study in Finland makes clear the survival of concealment rituals well into the 20th century. Janne Ikäheimo, Tiina Kuvaja, and Tiina Äikäs, Finnish scholars from the Department of Archaeology at the University of Oulu, documented the use of a concealment shoe as part of a memorial established near the site of a public execution in 1916 just outside the town of Oulu, Finland. The three researchers viewed this specific concealment as connected to “the more widely practiced folk traditions of binding someone or something in its place, which is evident in concealed shoes found around the world.” The deposit in question was concealed at the base of a pine tree near the site where the country’s last official public execution by hanging had occurred in 1916. The man executed there, Taavetti Lukkarinen, had been convicted of high treason by the Russian authorities for his role in helping three German POWs escape from the Murmansk railroad labor camp in 1915. An archaeological excavation in 2014 unearthed a deposit containing “a deliberately fractured proximal end of a calf tibia with two shards of clear glass and an iron wire inserted into its marrow channel and a rubber shoe heel pad still preserving iron boot nails.” The tibia had been “freshly broken” just prior to its concealment and the bone marrow removed in order to insert the glass and iron wire into the tibia, indicating the intentionality of the deposit. The maker’s stamp on the bottom of the shoe’s sole, which read “Marmon,” helped archaeologists to date the deposit by identifying the period when Marmon shoe advertisements appeared in Finnish newspapers.
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135 It is worth noting that this particular case study was not discussed in Hukantaival’s thesis on Finnish concealments; however, her thesis and this article were published just a month apart in the fall of 2016.
137 The tree used in the memorial was not the one used to carry out Lukkarinen’s sentence. Those two trees were ordered cut down by Russian officials once the site started to generate significant public interest and protest (Ikäheimo et al., 318).
139 Ikäheimo, Kuvaja, and Äikäs, 320.
140 Ikäheimo, Kuvaja, and Äikäs, 321.
In their interpretation of the cache, Ikäheimo, Kuvaja, and Äikäs explain the role they believed the sole of the shoe played in memorializing the site:

Shoes have also been used to tie a spirit into a place. By burying or hiding a shoe of the deceased, the spirit would be prevented from leaving the place. This could be used in protection against ghosts or revenants in order to keep loved ones close by after their death.\(^1\)

The presence of the iron nails in the sole might have been seen as a further “way to prevent movement,” especially in light of the Finnish folklore beliefs about how the inherent proprieties of iron could stave off evil spirits.\(^2\)

The compelling case of the Taavetti Lukkarinen memorial, the rich tradition of Finnish house spirits and their association with death, especially with deceased inhabitants of a house, and the documented use of ritual shoe concealments in other European contexts to both memorialize and capture the spirit of the deceased together suggest that Hulda Matson may very well have concealed Matti Matson’s shoe as a commemorative gesture after his death. While the practice of shoe concealment may not have been widely practiced in Finnish culture, the ritual clearly existed. Swann herself cites examples of Finnish concealment shoes in her work, as does Randles.\(^3\) Even a 2016 conference paper presented by Hukantaival mentions the presence of some concealed shoes in a deposit found at the Naval Academy on Seurasaari Island in Helsinki. The paper focuses on the remains of two cats that were also interred with that deposit, however, and the shoes are mentioned only parenthetically.\(^4\)
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\(^{1}\) Ikäheimo, Kuvaja, and Äikäs, 323.

\(^{2}\) Ikäheimo, Kuvaja, and Äikäs, 323.


\(^{4}\) Hukantaival, “Same Mental Idea, Different Manifestation?,” 19.
Avenues for Future Research

In all likelihood, Finnish research on concealed shoes is in its early stages of development. Other examples of concealed shoes both in Finland and in Finnish immigrant communities abroad may well surface as the practice of ritual concealments increasingly attracts the attention of Finnish and other scholars. Given how relatively new this field of study is overall, it seems safe to assume that much work remains to be done to better understand the ritual of shoe concealment and its various iterations in different cultures.

What might a comprehensive survey reveal about how widespread the practice of concealment shoes actually was in Finland or among Finnish immigrant populations abroad? Have other concealment shoes in historically Finnish neighborhoods been discovered in the state? If so, what does their presence suggest about how Finnish immigrants interacted with, mediated, and understood their new environment?

Further research and a more collaborative, transdisciplinary approach could answer such critical questions and yield new details and theories. In the case of the Long Cove shoe, a historic preservation could help date the wallpaper found on the ground floor of the addition, a dendrochronologist could help either confirm or refute the hypothesized timeline for the addition’s construction, and a folklore archaeologist could offer insights about the ways in which artifacts of material culture reveal how traditional beliefs were adopted and translated by immigrants in new environments. These avenues of research could help not only answer the lingering questions about the specifics of the Long Cove shoe, they could also invite a deeper understanding of ritual shoe concealments more broadly.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

Whose stories are taught and told? Whose suffering is recognized? Whose dead are mourned?

- Parul Sehgal, “Fighting ‘Erasure’”

6.1 Concealment Stories

This study has argued that the discovery of an early 20th-century concealed shoe deposit in a historically Finnish immigrant community in Long Cove, Maine can be interpreted in light of other Finnish concealment rituals and the tradition of Finnish household spirits, as well as the documented use of ritual shoe concealments in other European cultures as grieving gestures to “hold” the spirit of the deceased. The story of the Long Cove concealment shoe highlights the persistent nature of folklore beliefs, the changing economy and ensuing hardship of life on the Maine coast in the late 19th and early-20th centuries, and the connections between the tradition of Finnish household spirits, ritual concealments, and deceased family members.

On a broader scale, though, this study also presents an argument for the value of analyzing discrete objects of material culture as sources uniquely positioned to reveal the social, economic, and cultural tensions and trends of a community. The ritual of shoe concealments is fundamentally a protective gesture in many of its iterations—protecting a home by repelling or trapping evil forces, protecting the memory of a loved one, or using the spirit of a deceased family member to protect the homes’ inhabitants. Protective gestures are adapted during times of stress, uncertainty, transition, or anxiety—and these kinds of external pressures then prompt a desire to protect or be protected. In this way, then, concealment shoes can reveal the preoccupations of a community or at least certain demographic dynamics within that community.
Like all stories, the story of the Long Cove concealment shoe has both a protagonist and an author. While the story of the Long Cove concealment shoe features Matti Matson as a protagonist, his wife Hulda is the story’s author. The shoe itself may have functioned as a “signature” of Matti, but the choice to conceal it, the location of its concealment, and the timing of the concealment were all specific decisions that reflected as much about the concealer as the wearer. If it was, in fact, Hulda who deliberately concealed her first husband’s shoe as a ritualistic grieving gesture, that act serves not only as an example of how immigrants translated old beliefs in new environments, it also reveals her own autonomy and agency. Caught amid a series of profound transitions—the loss of her youngest son, the death of her husband (which also meant facing unsettling financial uncertainty), and then her own remarriage—concealing the shoe may have served as a ritual of personal transformation as much as a memorialization of her husband. Hulda, from this perspective, did not simply shut down the life she created in her first marriage and submerge her identity in the new relationship with her second husband. By concealing Matti’s shoe, she maintained her connection to a key part of her past and asserted at least some degree of independence.

The Long Cove concealment shoe example underscores the important role that gender played in the adoption and adaptation of traditional beliefs and practices by immigrants in their new, transplanted environments. In particular, it suggests how immigrant women deployed material culture to carve out autonomous space for themselves. In what other ways did immigrant women access the resources of material culture and folklore to create some measure of autonomy? That question clearly deserves further exploration.

The analysis of individual objects of material culture is especially critical for the study of concealment shoes, as these objects were often intended to serve as signatures of specific
individuals. By establishing the plausible manufacturing and concealment range of a shoe and then comparing those ranges to the architectural and social history of a building, individual stories can be surfaced and sometimes recovered. These stories can only be fully illuminated against the backdrop of broader studies that contextualize and quantify concealment practices in a given region or country, but individual stories provide an important counterbalance in the effort to understand this practice. The fact that these stories often center on people otherwise left out of the historical record further speaks to the importance of this work.

6.2 The Persistence of Belief

In conducting research for this study, I visited the Finnish Heritage House just a few miles up the road from Long Cove in South Thomaston, Maine. While reading through a comprehensive, carefully constructed report on the genealogy and family histories of the “Knox County Finns,” I came across a record for Hulda Houtaula: “Married twice,” the record noted, before listing the details of Hulda’s second marriage to John Korhonen. “First husband unknown.” And there he was, unnamed on the page, a man whose record had burned with the rest of the 1890 census, whose name had been erased from the 1900 census on account of a language barrier, and who had then died just a year shy of the 1910 census that would have served as the first comprehensive listing of his family and their household: Matti Matson, the unknown first husband of Hulda Korhonen. American-born families may have also missed a chance to be recorded in the 1890 Maine census, but they showed up elsewhere, and I encountered them while looking for the Matson family: “Charles Brown [of Tenant’s Harbor] arrived home Saturday night,” a June 1906 edition of the Courier Gazette reported, just across
Details like these offer a look into even the most seemingly mundane activities of the daily life of the peninsula’s American-born residents.

There is nothing unusual about this erasure. Immigrant families of lower socio-economic status, particularly those who did not speak English, were not the focus of most turn-of-the-century documentary records. There is, however, something moving in the contrast between this lack of presence in the written world and the highly specific “signature” of a person recorded in the shoe’s leather. Whoever the shoe belonged to, he was not intended to be forgotten, despite the secrecy of the concealment. Perhaps, though, this is yet another purpose served by the practice of ritual shoe concealment: an attempt to write oneself, or a loved one, into a historical record that might otherwise leave them out entirely.
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APPENDIX A: CONCEALMENT SHOE DEPOSITS IN MAINE

The data in the following table was compiled from Manning’s 2012 thesis (which in turn was partially obtained from Costello/Geisler’s 2003 thesis, with significant work undertaken by Manning to verify and extend the data); records provided to the author by curator Rebecca Shawcross of the Northampton Museum Concealed Shoe Index in Northampton, England; the public history website, *The Concealed Revealed*, run by folklore archaeologist Ceri Houlbrook; and a search of local newspapers, magazines, and local historical societies undertaken by the author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deposit description</th>
<th>Est. date of deposit</th>
<th>Date of building</th>
<th>Nationality of inhabitants at est. time of concealment</th>
<th>Location in building</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single shoe, no description available</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>112 Broadway</td>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>04401</td>
<td>44.80614111</td>
<td>-68.76856107</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No description available. Note that this home and the Ruth Moore House were built by the same carpenter, Martin Babidge of Gotts Island</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1885</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>33 Steamboat Wharf Road</td>
<td>Bass Harbor</td>
<td>04612</td>
<td>44.23781582</td>
<td>-68.35304853</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's left boot, hobnail</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Behind closet wall</td>
<td>Private home near City Park</td>
<td>Belfast</td>
<td>04915</td>
<td>44.41557338</td>
<td>-68.9936751</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

146 Manning, “Homemade Magic.”
### Table A.1: Concealment Shoe Deposits in Maine Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 pairs of shoes</th>
<th>ca. early 1800s</th>
<th>1791</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Wall between stairway and chimney</th>
<th>Abijah Buck House, 202 N Buckfield Road, Buckfield 04220</th>
<th>44.29886317</th>
<th>-70.38811023</th>
<th>149</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various sites (3-4) of single children's shoe deposits discovered by home builder</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Camden 04843</td>
<td>44.2098</td>
<td>-69.0648</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single shoe, very worn</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4 Union S, Camden 04843</td>
<td>44.20694021</td>
<td>-69.06660237</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two adult left shoes with buckles, one cloth and one leather, possibly resoled</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Top of the stairs, under eaves</td>
<td>Union Street, Camden 04843</td>
<td>44.20542884</td>
<td>-69.06803447</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single shoe or boot with laces</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Attic walls</td>
<td>71 Pleasant Street, Castine 04421</td>
<td>44.38946585</td>
<td>-68.802737</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl's leather shoe, one pair of lace holes, oval toe, toddler size; pair of women's leather shoes, two pairs of lace holes, silk lace, oval toe</td>
<td>1806-1820s</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Crawl space, under ground floor</td>
<td>Abbott House, Maine Maritime Academy, Castine 04421</td>
<td>44.38921795</td>
<td>-68.8062773</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three shoes, no description available</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Behind plaster of central chimney</td>
<td>Perkins Street, Castine 04421</td>
<td>44.3843284</td>
<td>-68.8062121</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table A.1: Concealment Shoe Deposits in Maine Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>GPS Coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Cranberry Parsonage Cache #1: Four well-worn, single shoes (one adult male, one adult female, two different child-sized shoes). Well worn. Adult male shoe shows signs of repair. Numerous other items concealed with shoes.</td>
<td>ca. 1840 – ca. 1835</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Great Cranberry</td>
<td>177 Great Cranberry Road</td>
<td>Great Cranberry 04625 44.24406152 -68.26657101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Cranberry Parsonage Cache #2: Remnants of approximately 40 single leather shoes</td>
<td>ca. 1835</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Great Cranberry</td>
<td>177 Great Cranberry Road</td>
<td>Great Cranberry 04625 44.24406152 -68.26657101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult woman's shoe. Note that this home (which is currently the Gillis family home but once belonged to Maine author Ruth Moore) and the Trask House in Bass Harbor were built by the same carpenter, Martin Babidge of Gotts Island</td>
<td>ca. 1878</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Great Gots Island</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Great Gots Island 04653 44.20328811 -68.32644805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three single shoes: a man's, a woman's, and a small child's</td>
<td>ca. 1770s, remodeled in 1820s</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Harpswell</td>
<td>46 Wissman Point Road</td>
<td>Harpswell 04079 43.82495651 -69.90066313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobleboro Deposit #1 (Pair of woman's shoes)</td>
<td>ca. 1820-1825</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nobleboro</td>
<td>531 Upper East Pond Road</td>
<td>Nobleboro 04555 44.14593815 -69.45528464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobleboro Deposit #2 (Single boy's shoe)</td>
<td>ca. 1830-1840s</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Nobleboro</td>
<td>531 Upper East Pond Road</td>
<td>Nobleboro 04555 44.14593815 -69.45528464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three adult elastic-sided boots (one single; one pair)</th>
<th>1890-1897</th>
<th>ca. 1897</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Between studs in a cavity wall at the back of a closet</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Pittsfield</th>
<th>04967</th>
<th>44.784</th>
<th>-69.382</th>
<th>162</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single baby's shoe</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Late 1800s</td>
<td>Irish neighborhood</td>
<td>Bedroom wall</td>
<td>West End</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>04102</td>
<td>43.649</td>
<td>-70.2703</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single shoe found with an empty glasses case, book, tweezers, and small glass bottle</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Above a window in second floor bedroom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rockland</td>
<td>04841</td>
<td>44.1037</td>
<td>-69.1089</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult man's boot, Left foot. Worn sole with signs of repair. Appears to have been a dress shoe (decorative elements on toe). Tag on shoe reads: &quot;King's Quality,&quot; made by Arthur Shoe Co in North Abington, MA. Inside stamp reads &quot;B.L. Segal&quot; (clothier in Rockland, Maine)</td>
<td>ca. 1909-1910</td>
<td>ca. 1896-1897, addition ca. 1909-1910</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>Upstairs northwest cove, bedroom, in early 20th.c. addition to home</td>
<td>52 Long Cove Road</td>
<td>Saint George</td>
<td>04860</td>
<td>43.99124143</td>
<td>-69.2012752</td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One intact child's shoe, leather, very worn, and 2-3 soles of shoes with no attached uppers</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Est. late 1770s</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Underneath living room floorboards</td>
<td>36 Shipyard Road</td>
<td>Saint George</td>
<td>04860</td>
<td>43.96213904</td>
<td>-69.20127774</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult's single shoe, right foot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Built ca. 1785; addition ca. late 1950s</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Roof rafters above knee wall beam, front of the south side</td>
<td>Dublin Road</td>
<td>South Thomaston</td>
<td>04858</td>
<td>44.05317445</td>
<td>-69.10609238</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

164 Houlbrook, “Historypin | The Concealed Revealed.”
165 Cartwright, Personal communication, e-mail.
166 Manning, “Homemade Magic: Concealed Deposits in Architectural Contexts in the Eastern United States.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deposit # &amp; Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Deposition</th>
<th>Location Details</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windham Deposit #1 (Man's single open tab latchet tie shoe)</td>
<td>1820-1825</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Parson Smith House, Anderson Hill</td>
<td>South Windham</td>
<td>04062 43.71688645 -70.39247854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windham deposit #2 (Woman's single boudoir slipper, rubber sole inscribed &quot;Hayward Rubber Co., Colchester, Conn.&quot;)</td>
<td>1820-1825</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Parson Smith House, Anderson Hill</td>
<td>South Windham</td>
<td>04062 43.71688645 -70.39247854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lace-up ankle-high woman's left shoe</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1870s</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Wall opposite kitchen chimney</td>
<td>Sennebec Road</td>
<td>Union 04862 44.25171805 -69.25680632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Deposit #1 (Single shoe, no description available)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1850</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>In wall by kitchen door</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Warren 04864 44.116967 -69.253146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Deposit #2 (4 single shoes/boots, no description available) Found with plate and note: &quot;to all who inhabit this house may they have enough food for their plate and warmth for their person.&quot;</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1850</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>In kitchen ceiling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Warren 04864 44.116967 -69.253146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single boy's leather shoe</td>
<td>ca. 1845</td>
<td>pre-1836</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Under floor</td>
<td>Ely True Home</td>
<td>West Mills 04938 44.7639 -70.0162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Cache #1 (Large deposit of shoes, estimated at 50-100 pieces)</td>
<td>ca. 1860s</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Wall void adjacent to chimney</td>
<td>Old Gaol Museum, 4 Lindsay Road</td>
<td>York 03909 43.21302608 -70.61631871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

167 Manning.  
168 Manning.  
169 Lincoln, “A Sole for a Soul — Hidden Shoes Thought to Bring Good Luck.”  
171 Manning.  
172 Manning.  
173 Manning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>York Cache #2 (Woman's single leather shoe ca. 1840-1850; pair of women's shoes, black wool exterior, hand-sewn, ca. 1830)</th>
<th>ca. 1830-1850</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Wall near back (east) door</th>
<th>Peter Weare House</th>
<th>York 03909</th>
<th>43.21302608</th>
<th>-70.61631871</th>
<th>174</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Cache #3 (A man's single shoe worn on the left foot; a child's single shoe, straight; a child's single shoe worn on the left foot, a book, a woman's bonnet, a broken wine glass stem, fragments of fabric, a possible wristband)</td>
<td>1825-1860</td>
<td>ca. 1850</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Rafters of the front left south-west parlor</td>
<td>Rufus Varrell House, 438 York Street</td>
<td>York 03909</td>
<td>43.1348593</td>
<td>-70.64129593</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

174 Manning.
175 Manning.
APPENDIX B: TIMELINE OF LONG COVE HOUSE OWNERSHIP EVENTS

The data in the following table was compiled from immigration records; deeds; US census records, and marriage, death, and birth certificates. The table does not represent a complete ownership history of the home but rather focuses on the period immediately leading up to and following the plausible concealment range. This table is based on a similar framework developed by historical archaeologist Megan Springate, with two additional columns of information added to those Springate originally used to determine the plausible concealment range of a shoe recovered from the Updike Farmstead in New Jersey: 1) shoe & house history and 2) pre/post ownership events.\footnote{Megan Springate, “A Concealed Shoe Recovered at the Updike Farmstead, Princeton Township, Mercer County, New Jersey,” \textit{Newsletter of the Archaeological Society of New Jersey}, May 2011.} The timeline primarily reflects key dates in the lives of the Koskela, Paakkari, Matson, and Korhonen families, as well as that of the clothier B.L. Segal, seller of the shoe.

\begin{table}
\caption{Timeline of Long Cove House Ownership Events}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
Date & Shoe & House History & Owner & Ownership Events & Pre/Post Ownership Events \\
\hline
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (s)</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1887-1888</td>
<td><strong>HOUTAULA/MATSON:</strong> February 13th, 1874: Hulda Matson (née Houtaula) born in Teuva, Länsi-Suomen Lääni Finland.</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KOSKELA:</strong> March 18th, 1887: Left Sweden for Hull, England.</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KOSKELA:</strong> April 4th, 1887: Immigrated to the U.S., aged 18. Arrived in Boston on the ship Scythia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MATSON:</strong> 1888: Immigrated to the U.S., aged 27.</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888-1891</td>
<td><strong>KOSKELA:</strong> 1890: Josef Koskela married Mary S. Koskela, born in Finland September 1867.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KOSKELA:</strong> April 1891, Massachusetts: Eldest daughter Sima / Saima was born</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1893</td>
<td><strong>HOUTAULA/MATSON:</strong> 1892: Hulda Houtaula immigrated to the U.S., aged 18.</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MATSON:</strong> Hulda Hauta - Matti Matson married March 2nd, 1893, Maine.</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MATSON:</strong> eldest daughter Fannie Matson born 1893.</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>KOSKELA:</strong> October 1893 / 1894 in Maine: Daughter Emma born</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893-1895</td>
<td><strong>PAAKKRRI:</strong> Isaac Paakkri married Anne/Annie Antilla, April 26th, 1894, Rockland. Bride 22, occupation domestic; groom 26, occupation paving cutter. Both listed as born in Finland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

179 “Family Tree, Hulda Houtaula, 1874–1955.”
182 “Family Tree, Hulda Houtaula, 1874–1955.”
184 “Maine, U.S., Marriage Records, 1713-1922 for Fannie Matson.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1895-1896 | MATSON: March 26th, 1895: Hulda Marie Matson born (Second eldest daughter of Hulda and Matti Matson).  

1896-1897 | Likely construction of Long Cove house  

(Spring 1896 – Fall 1897) | Josef H. Koskela / Koskila and Mary S. Koskela (c. 1896 - December 14th, 1897) | KOSKELA: March 1896: Booth Bros. Co. sells the land to Joseph Koskela, the first owner and likely builder of the house.  

KOSKELA: Jan 1897 or 1896 in Maine: Lydia born  

DEED TRANSFER: December 14th, 1897: Joseph Koskela of Sand Coulee, Cascade County, Montana to Isaac Paakkri of Vinalhaven/Hurricane.  

| 1897-1898 | SEGAL: By 1897: B.L. Segal listed as peddler in Rockland at 10 Pearl Street. |  

| 1898-1899 | | Isaac Paakkri / Pookkari / Paakkan and Anne Antilla (December 14th, 1897 - March 1st, 1906) | KOSKELA: June 1899 in Montana: Swanda / William was born  

| 1899-1900 | | | KOSKELA: June 7th, 1900: Joseph Koskela listed in Sand Coulee, Montana census. 31 years old, occupation stonecutter.  

| 1900-1902 | Likely manufacturing range of shoe (1897-1908) | | KOSKELA: 1902, Oregon: Oscar was born  

| 1902-1905 | | | MATSON: 1904: Eldest son Walden/Waldo/Voldie Matson born  

---


186 “Booth Bros. and Hurricane Isle Granite Co. to Josef H. Koskela.”  

187 “Joseph Koskela to Isaac Paakkri.”  

188 “Joseph Koskela in the 1900 United States Federal Census. [Digital Image]”  

189 “Family Tree, Hulda Houtaula, 1874–1955.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1905-1906</td>
<td>By June 1906: B.L. Segal advertises in <em>Courier Gazette</em></td>
<td>“Isaac Paakkri to Matt Matson.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1907</td>
<td>Possible concealment range of shoe</td>
<td>“Family Tree, Hulda Houtaula, 1874–1955.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908-1909</td>
<td>Likely range of house addition for boarding house expansion</td>
<td>“Maine, U.S., Marriage Records, 1713-1922 for Fannie Matson.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likely concealment range of shoe</td>
<td>“Joseph Koskela in the 1910 United States Federal Census [Digital Image].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KOSKELA: 1905, Oregon: John was born</td>
<td>“Joseph Koskela in the 1910 United States Federal Census [Digital Image].”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

190 “Isaac Paakkri to Matt Matson.”
191 “Family Tree, Hulda Houtaula, 1874–1955.”
194 “Maine, U.S., Marriage Records, 1713-1922 for Holda Hontanla.”
196 “Joseph Koskela in the 1910 United States Federal Census [Digital Image].”
197 “Benjamin Louis Segal in the 1910 United States Federal Census [Digital Image].”
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Table B.2: Timeline of Long Cove House Ownership Events Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1917-1918</td>
<td>SEGAL: September 12th, 1918: Benjamin Segal registered for the draft at age 41.(^{199})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1918-1919 | DEED TRANSFER: October 2nd, 1919: Hulda Korhonen et al. to Julius and Lisi Leppanen.\(^{200}\)  
DEED TRANSFER: November 19th, 1919: William Williamson (acting as guardian for Sennia and Walden Matson) to Julius and Lisi Leppanen.\(^{201}\) (N.B. A later deed makes reference to two houses on the property, which may explain the two 1919 deeds above. The first reference to this smaller second home is noted in 1927, when the Leppanens sold the property to Matti and Kathryn Kipinen. At that time, the Leppanens maintained ownership of the second house and moved it from the site. It is possible that the two deeds above are evidence that the second house was built sometime during the Matson/Korhonen occupancy, in which case Sennia and Walden Matson likely would have maintained ownership rights to the original house, while the second smaller home was likely owned by Hulda and John Korhonen.) |

\(^{198}\) “1900 United States Federal Census, [Digital Image].”
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