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This volume developed from a colloquium held at the New York State Museum on October 24, 1997 titled "Nineteenth-Century Domestic Archaeology in New York State." The goal of that colloquium was to determine what we know, do not know, and want to know about nineteenth-century domestic archaeology in New York State. The colloquium was organized in response to a growing concern among some archaeologists and cultural resource managers in New York State agencies for better data planning and management of that particular category of archaeological site, which appears to be ubiquitous. There was also a need to determine whether the perception of ubiquity was correct, and if so, to determine what kinds of research were being done with the existing databases of such sites. To those ends, colloquium participants included not only archaeologists who presented papers on recent research on nineteenth-century domestic archaeology, but also personnel from federal, state, and local agencies charged with managing cultural resources who described their agencies' concerns and policies regarding these sites. To those ends, colloquium participants included not only archaeologists who presented papers on recent research on nineteenth-century domestic archaeology, but also personnel from federal, state, and local agencies charged with managing cultural resources who described their agencies' concerns and policies regarding these sites. The presentations were followed by an open discussion that included both participants and audience. The colloquium was quite successful in meeting its goals, and resulted in the conclusion that despite their seeming ubiquity, we really do not know very much about nineteenth-century domestic sites in New York State. A list of colloquium participants and paper titles is presented at the end of this preface.

This volume contains updated and revised versions of papers presented at the colloquium (by Affleck, Fisher, Kuhn and Little, Peña, Sopko, Versaggi, and Wurst et al.), as well as other papers that have been added to round out the presentation of recent research and ideas (by Huey, LoRusso, Pendery and Griswold, Pickands, and Raemsch and Bouchard). The volume has also been expanded to include early twentieth-century domestic archaeology (by Kuhn and Little, Pickands). As we enter the twenty-first century, early twentieth-century sites will become increasingly important as that period of time appears more and more distant.

I have eschewed writing a traditional introductory chapter because the first four chapters serve as an excellent introduction to the subject of domestic site archaeology of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in New York State. Kuhn and Little in Chapter 1 and Wurst, Armstrong and Kellar in Chapter 2 provide important data-based overviews of the current condition of domestic archaeology in New York State. They show that the perception that "We have thousands of these!" is, at best, overstated. In Chapters 3 and 4, Huey and Peña discuss the possible directions of and the need for research on this category of site. While both authors concentrate on farmsteads, their discussions and ideas can easily be extended to other subcategories of domestic sites. Both concur that there is a need for the development of clearly defined research designs that include not only hypotheses but also methods for obtaining the data necessary to test those hypotheses.

The second part of the volume comprises four chapters that deal with specific aspects of domestic sites. In Chapter 5, Versaggi builds a strong case for the ability of domestic-site sheet middens to yield
important information on the lives of site inhabitants. In Chapter 6, Fisher discusses how the landscapes of domestic sites can be viewed as artifacts that supply information on how changes in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century socio-economic conditions affected the domestic sphere. In Chapter 7, Pendery and Griswold demonstrate the importance of archaeology for reconstructing the effects of socio-religious factors on domestic architecture. Finally, in Chapter 8, Raemsch and Bouchard show how information from small family cemeteries can provide important information on how socio-economic changes affected attitudes toward death and dying and how health, disease, and death affected domestic life.

The third and final part of the volume provides case studies of specific sites and groups of sites that use various lines of evidence to reconstruct the domestic lives of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century New Yorkers. In Chapter 9, Rafferty summarizes the results of one of the first and relatively intensive nineteenth-century farmstead site excavations in the southern tier of New York State. In Chapter 10, Sopko summarizes the results of archaeological investigations to date at three farmsteads in eastern New York. By contrast, in Chapter 11, Affleck summarizes the results of archaeological investigations at a series of related farmsteads at Fort Drum in upstate New York. Rafferty, Sopko, and Affleck are able to show how larger socio-economic trends during the nineteenth century affected the domestic lives of these New York farmers. In Chapter 12, LoRusso summarizes the results of excavations of an early freed black domestic site on Long Island. LoRusso reminds us of a poorly remembered history of slave ownership and manumission in New York State, and demonstrates how archaeology can be used to tell the story of a little-known and -understood class of New Yorkers: recently freed slaves. Finally, in Chapter 13, Pickands summarizes investigations to date on the first twentieth-century domestic sites in New York determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Archaeological excavations at a short-lived boarding house in the western Adirondacks that rented rooms to loggers and others employed in logging and related industries, have the potential to increase our knowledge and understanding of another poorly understood class of New Yorkers: early twentieth-century transient industrial workers.

There are gaps in the volume's coverage. For example, no chapters deal with urban domestic sites, western New York is not represented, and there is no discussion of the potential for shaft features to yield information on the domestic sphere. However, the volume does demonstrate the potential of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century domestic archaeology to shed light on the lives of New Yorkers during a time of rapid change that set the stage for later developments in twentieth-century New York and thus in our own lives. But, as the volume also demonstrates, the key word is potential. Until much more intensive archaeological investigation is done on this category of site, and until we can better understand the temporal and spatial variations that existed in domestic life, we will be unable to develop archaeological explanations for that time of rapid change. Such explanations would require planning on the nature and scale of archaeological investigations themselves—planning that will at least be informed by the colloquium and this volume.

Of particular note is that all of the chapters in this volume are derived or benefit from projects carried out in compliance with federal and state historic preservation laws and regulations. As pointed out in the first four chapters, the growth of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century domestic archaeology is the direct result of compliance archaeology. The New York State Museum’s Cultural Resource Survey Program (CRSP) has been a major contributor to that growth, mainly through an interagency agreement between the New York State’s Education Department and Department of Transportation. The chapters by LoRusso, Pickands, Rafferty, and Sopko are all based on projects sponsored by the Department of Transportation, and the two primary case studies used by Versaggi to illustrate the usefulness of sheet middens are projects sponsored by the Department of Transportation. What this demonstrates is not only the importance of compliance archaeology in generating archaeological data to assist client agencies and industries meet their compliance needs, but also that compliance archaeology can define new areas of archaeological research and contribute substantially to the growth of that research.
I wish to thank all of the colloquium participants and contributors to this volume. Without their hard work and timeliness, neither the colloquium nor this bulletin would have become a reality. I especially want to acknowledge the assistance of Chuck Fisher, who helped me solicit and edit a number of the chapters, made useful suggestions on the volume’s organization, and encouraged me to complete it. I also wish to thank the two peer reviewers who provided many useful suggestions on the contents and presentation of each chapter. Finally I want to thank my colleagues in the Museum’s Cultural Resource Survey Program and in SUNY Binghamton’s Public Archeology Facility who have helped me understand the potential importance of research on nineteenth- and early twentieth-century domestic sites.

John P. Hart
August 1999
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Serious interest in nineteenth-century and, more recently, twentieth-century domestic archaeological sites is a relatively recent phenomenon occurring primarily within the last fifteen to twenty years. It is a research theme spawned largely from cultural resource management (CRM) archaeology in the United States, and CRM programs continue to be the principal source for context development, field work and data collection, analysis, synthesis, and publication. Expanding the focus of historical archaeology to include these relatively recent domestic sites should be considered one of the many contributions that CRM has made to the discipline of archaeology.

Domestic archaeological sites of this time period include the remains of residential occupations such as house foundations and associated privy, midden, and sheet refuse deposits. This property type includes urban residential sites, rural village and hamlet occupations, and rural farmsteads. In addition to house sites, farmsteads can include the archaeological remains of a variety of barns, related outbuildings, and agrarian landscape features and patterns. Farmsteads, therefore, are not strictly residential; they also contain specific work sites. Because work can always take place in domestic settings, our categorization is not one of "work vs. home," but rather one in which domestic sites are categorized as places where people lived relatively permanently. In contrast, other types of sites of the last two centuries include industrial, commercial, and military sites. Industrial and commercial sites in the northeastern United States include mills, forges, factories, iron works, glass works, foundries, mines, gas manufacturing plants, tanneries, potteries, taverns, hotels, smithies, liveries, fishing camps, fish hatcheries, and shops. Military sites can include battlefields, redoubts, batteries, forts, campsites, and cantonments. Cemeteries, shipwrecks, and cultural landscapes are also common, but are specialized property types that have been excluded from this study. Nineteenth- and twentieth-century domestic archaeological components may be associated with all kinds of sites, including military and industrial sites. Some military sites, for example, include long-term domestic components, as do many industrial sites, particularly those of early or small-scale manufacturing. However, for our purposes, and given the universe of properties listed in the National Register, we find it useful to distinguish between the general categories of domestic, military, and industrial.

A review of the research issues pertinent to domestic sites in general would entail a review of the bulk of historical archaeology, since domestic sites of one form or another are involved in most of the field's research domains. The study of race, ethnicity, class and status, gender, health, subsistence, cultural contact, conflict and accommodation, and consumption of material goods all involve domestic components. Historical ethnography is one of the major goals of historical archaeology (Deagan 1982; Little 1994), and many ethnographic questions are addressed in the context of house lots, neighborhoods, villages, towns, and cities—in short, domestic sites of various scales. Rather than attempt to outline research issues for all recent domestic sites, we have emphasized rural sites and...
focused on the single issue of consumption, since that is a topic common to all domestic assemblages.

This chapter presents a discussion of the evaluation of significance of nineteenth- and twentieth-century domestic archaeological sites. The review and compliance program of the New York State Historic Preservation Office is offered as an illustration of current trends and practices concerning the evaluation of these types of sites. Archaeological site listings on the National Register of Historic Places for New York State are presented so that the treatment of these domestic archaeological sites in different program areas can be compared. Sites listed in the National Register of Historic Places for states in the Northeast provide a context and comparison for the New York data. In this paper the Northeast is defined, somewhat arbitrarily, as consisting of New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine.

The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, is a list of the nation’s historic resources worthy of preservation. The NRHP has evolved as states and the federal government have refined and developed the listing process over the last three decades. During the first fifteen or so years of the NRHP, there was little written guidance from the National Park Service. Because the program is housed in state historic preservation offices, each state’s approach and priorities are somewhat different. Priorities for listing archaeological properties vary greatly from state to state. Judging from the nominations to the NRHP, it appears that the evolving requirements of CRM have influenced the expected level of documentation. As archaeologists came to terms with CRM as a source of data that required research designs, the NRHP programs in state and national offices increased their standards accordingly, so that explicit research designs and thorough site descriptions are currently the norm.

In New York State, the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation serves as both the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and administers the federal and state historic preservation programs. These programs include the National Register of Historic Places program and the Section 106 review and compliance program as mandated by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA); the State Register of Historic Places program and the Section 14.09 review and compliance program as mandated by the State Historic Preservation Act of 1980 (SHPA); and a local assistance program involving the review of Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) in accordance with the State Environmental Quality Review Act of 1977 (SEQRA).

Properties nominated for the State and National Registers of Historic Places are evaluated in accordance with the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. These criteria are also employed for making Determinations of Eligibility (DOEs) for Section 106, Section 14.09, or SEQRA reviews. Criterion D is employed most often for the evaluation of archaeological sites. On average, project reviews lead to approximately forty archaeological site DOEs per year in New York.

**Historical Archaeology and Recent Domestic Sites**

Over the past twenty years, the burgeoning field of CRM has challenged archaeologists to develop coherent research designs for resources they had previously overlooked. Nineteenth- and twentieth-century domestic sites are not unique in this respect. Hardesty (1988, 1990), for example, has highlighted this situation by discussing the historical archaeology of mining as a microcosm of the problem of responsibly addressing little known resources. He cautions against the creation of trivial questions that are not connected to clearly identified research strategies. Most archaeologists would agree with his insistence on a coherent framework that links historic context, research focus and strategies, and key research questions with the specifics of the archaeological record.

Hardesty also offers the concept of the “feature system” in the mining industry, by which he emphasizes the need to understand the whole system in order to understand the smaller, and often seemingly insignificant, pieces of it. This “feature system” can serve as a useful analogy in discussing domestic sites as well. Domestic sites are pieces of a whole system that includes industrial sites and other labor locations, military installations, institutions such as churches and schools, commercial
sites and districts, and transportation networks. Looking at domestic sites as if they could stand alone diminishes their research value because the connections that could be made within local and regional settlement systems are overlooked.

As recently as 1986, Noble (1986:36) could reasonably write that the investigation of late historic occupations was “still in its formative stages, with basic research themes not yet fully developed or articulated in any formal sense.” Majewski and O’Brien (1987) make a similar point about the poorly developed methods for analyzing nineteenth-century ceramics.

A symposium on assessing the archaeological significance of historic sites was held at the annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology in 1987. In their introduction to the published version of that symposium, Lees and Noble (1990:10) assert that the “National Register criteria, as almost everyone agrees, are woefully inadequate for providing a workable definition of site significance.” They promote the idea of context, which has actually long been essential to the National Register evaluation process (NPS 1985), as key to assessing site significance. The major problems they identify—subjective, biased, and inconsistent approaches to historic sites in survey, evaluation, and treatment—have not disappeared. The body of data, however, has grown enormously, as have the number of important research questions and intelligent research designs for addressing the information potential of recent historic sites. The number of states that do not deign to even record twentieth-century sites during surveys has dropped, although such recording is still not universal.

Smith (1990:52) describes the problems historical archaeologists face in persuading land managers that certain site types are significant. There is usually little problem in showing the importance of military European exploration sites. But, [it is the mundane site, which has no direct connection to such [famous] persons, places, or events, that consistently seems to become the point of argument. It is with these mundane sites that archaeologists are faced with their greatest intellectual challenge in justifying to others the scientific value. And yet it is the “series of farmsteads and rural town sites that demonstrate the diachronic and synchronic evolution and development of rural America” (Scott 1990:52). The “mundane site” is just what needs to be considered in the evaluation of the complex “feature system” of American life in the nineteenth and twentieth century.

In describing the approach taken at Fort Leonard Wood in Missouri, Smith (1994:96) refers to the management challenge of the “ubiquitous homesteads of American farmer or rancher,” and comments,

But to neglect them because they are so prevalent or so much less exotic is to neglect a major portion of the cultural history of this nation. As late as 1920 one in three Americans lived on farms. For most Americans, our cultural roots are tied to the world of the family farm.

Smith develops a regional context through a combined cultural, historical, and landscape approach. The context assists in identifying sites that best represent the range and variety of cultural history. The most difficult part Smith found in devising such a context was the integration of the historic context with the archaeological remains. Smith used site types as the key. In developing the context for the Fort Leonard Wood settler community, Smith identified different types of settlers with purposes ranging from subsistence to cash cropping and characterized associated sites according to their archaeological visibility, signature, and sensitivity. Some sites, such as those of early squatters, have very low visibility, low signatures (that is, they are difficult to identify), and very high sensitivity because they are extremely rare and can provide important information. Others, such as twentieth-century tenant sites, have high visibility, easily identified signatures, and low sensitivity. It would be important to examine some, but by no means all, of this latter type of site. Even a damaged site could be worthwhile for addressing research questions if it represents a less-common type. The approach taken could be used as a model for approaching the evaluation and management of common site types.

In an article entitled, “We’ve Got Thousands of These! What Makes an Historic Farmstead Significant?,” Wilson (1990) suggests the establishment of regional contexts based on extensive local history. His example is from very well-documented
Surry County, New Hampshire. He uses population and agricultural productivity statistics, occupation patterns, and occupation spans of households to screen the kinds of sites he believes will offer the best research results from archaeology. He advocates archaeological excavation only for those sites with "analytic clarity" provided by single occupation of one household fewer than twenty years, or by a single family for up to sixty years. In the particular context he developed, Wilson asserts that more than 85% of the identified farmsteads cannot address certain kinds of research questions because occupation by many households over a longer period of time has blurred the potential of the assemblages. However, as Cabak and Inkrot (1997:194) point out, there are many ways to evaluate what determines a site's information potential. They contrast Wilson's approach with that of the Wisconsin SHPO, which judges that long-term, single-occupation farmsteads are the most important sites for studying rural lifeways.

Researchers working on domestic sites in many contexts face common questions about the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Such questions include consumer behavior and modernization. Issues of race relations and the economic strategies of African-Americans after the Civil War have been recently examined in the rural South (e.g., Orser 1990) and in urban areas in the mid-Atlantic (e.g., Mullins 1996). Issues of gender definition in the Victorian era have been addressed at middle-class domestic sites in New York City (Wall 1994), at brothel sites in Washington, D.C. (Seifert 1994), and for the domestic reform movement (Spencer-Wood 1996). Issues of workers' responses on the domestic front to the sweeping changes of the factory system have been investigated in both northern and southern settings in Lowell, Massachusetts (Beaudry and Mrozowski 1989) and in Harpers Ferry, West Virginia (Shackel 1996).

Archaeology has turned out to be a uniquely useful research tool for investigating consumer behavior in detail (Klein 1991; LeeDecker 1994). It is often assumed that documentary data provide more fine-grained information about the past than archaeological data. Certainly the chronological control offered by documents is usually far more precise. In researching consumer behavior, however, archaeological information provides household data that refine the community level of information provided by newspaper advertisements, merchant daybooks, and commercial documents. Documentary evidence, with very few exceptions, cannot reveal what consumer goods and other items a household actually used.

The household is a primary unit of analysis because it serves as the unit of economic consumption and production. Depending on the scale of both documentary and archaeological data available, the neighborhood may also serve the analysis of consumer behavior (LeeDecker 1994). To arrive at any meaningful conclusions, it is important to correlate archaeological deposits with the household or group which deposited them. Whether the identification is by name with a rich family history, or more coarsely grained by class and ethnic group, the archaeological deposits must have some broader historical context to address questions of consumer behavior.

Some researchers propose a modified version of modernization theory as useful for interpreting the archaeology of the recent past. For example, Cabak and Inkrot (1997:17) write,

the modernization model . . . possesses the potential to provide insight into the interpretive interface between regional development, the adoption of new technology and crop regimes, the organization of class structure and gender roles at the community and household levels, and the general way that material culture change has transpired over the last 100 years in rural settings.

Massive culture change has characterized the twentieth century. One of the places to examine those changes, particularly the social change from folk to modern, is twentieth-century rural sites.

Historical archaeologists have studied Southern plantations almost since the formation of the discipline. In the introduction to a volume on the historical archaeology of southern farms and plantations, Orser (1990) proposes to push the discipline forward. He emphasizes that the contributors demonstrate that significant issues in the agricultural history of the South can be directly addressed by archaeology. Such issues include racism, symbolism, social relations, and cultural persistence. The archaeology of farms and plantations, as well
as of slavery, seems to have gotten much more attention in the South than in other regions in the United States. There may now be enough comparative data to begin to ask questions about regional differences in slavery and racism, farm capitalization, mechanization, and rural household consumption (see, e.g., Fitts 1996).

Writing about the major cultural and social changes in a southern Piedmont farm during the twentieth century, Stine (1990:37) affirms that objects provide “a unifying perspective for exploring the transformation of social and economic structures of daily life.” In the same volume, Friedlander (1990:109) directly addresses the value of historical archaeology while dismissing the trivial questions that sometimes caricature the discipline: “It is already well known that the rich lived better than the poor. What is less well known is how everyday objects confirmed and reinforced relative positions and brought faraway decisions home to ordinary people.”

Grettler et al. (1996) examine a series of three marginal farms occupied from 1765-1822, 1850-1889 and 1822-1937 in Kent County, Delaware. Their general research issues are taken from the Delaware State Plan. These issues concern (1) agricultural tenancy in central Delaware; (2) the social and economic changes of urbanization, industrialization, and development of a powerful, volatile nationwide economy in the nineteenth century; and (3) the role of agriculture in an increasingly volatile economy. The 22-acre Moore-Taylor farm, occupied from 1822 to 1937, changed hands twenty-four times. The farm never appeared on an agricultural census because it never produced more than $100. It was constructed during a period of prosperity when strong regional markets encouraged farm tenancy, and it was later abandoned during the Depression. Trash disposal patterns showed major life-way changes after the mid-nineteenth century with off-site disposal of trash. Five sequential wells provided household-associated occupations from the last two tenants. Within those sealed contexts is evidence of a major shift in consumption patterns between the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, from self-sufficiency to a consumer culture (Grettler et al. 1996:220ff).

Traditional expectations about material culture and status, particularly that high status translates into more or more expensive household goods, are not always met. In their study in South Carolina, Cabak and Inkrot found that even though wealthier households may spend more on services such as domestic help and gasoline, most households in a community may spend similar amounts on consumer goods. “Although very few households could afford to mechanize their farmsteads or modernize their homes, most people, regardless of tenure class, had access to inexpensive consumer goods, such as soda pop, that were being produced by the nation’s expanding factories” (Cabak and Inkrot 1997:190). Indeed, with the mass production of consumer goods, the analysis of consumer choice presents a difficult challenge for the archaeologist who must try to decode subtle variations in the material record (Little 1997; see Stewart-Abernathy 1986).

Access to national, regional, and local markets can be revealed by household assemblages. One of the challenges faced by archaeologists researching nineteenth- and twentieth-century sites is the analysis of material culture. The proliferation of ceramic companies and the similarity and longevity of ubiquitous “whitewares” and “ironstones” make certain familiar analytic techniques questionable (see Majewski and O’Brien 1987). The dating tool of Mean Ceramic Dating (MCD), for example, was invented for ceramic wares of the eighteenth century. The economic scaling tool invented by Miller (1980, 1991) offers cost comparisons for English ceramics purchased in the nineteenth century. No indices have been created for American-made ceramics.

Historical archaeologists often use a straightforward but misleading correlation between status and the cost of goods. LeeDecker (1994:348) writes, “A weakness of many archaeological studies of consumer behavior is the preoccupation with socio-economic status and inattention to characteristics of the individual households and other factors that influence consumer behavior.” Such factors include household composition, life cycle, and income strategy (see Henry 1987). The cost of ceramics is a minor part of a household budget. Ceramics are important for archaeological interpretation because they are ubiquitous in the record, are datable, and can often be assigned to specific households. But ceramics are not a clear indicator of socio-economic status, which should be derived from other data (Grettler et al. 1996:207; Cabak and Inkrot 1997).
Catts and Custer (1990:266) find that "there are no simple correlations between patterned variability in ceramic assemblages and socio-economic status, site function, layout, ethnicity, or cultural geographic context." They explored the Thomas Williams site in New Castle County, Delaware. The most archaeologically visible occupation was that of an African-American laborer and his family who bought the property in 1887 and lived there until 1922. This site and the few other comparative sites demonstrate that there was a great variety in the assemblages of rural blacks who, in spite of poor representation in the documentary record, participated fully in the consumer culture. Cabak and Inkrot (1997) also find that ethnicity is a poor indicator of material culture choices (see LoRusso, this volume). Mullins (1996) finds that African-Americans explicitly used their purchasing power as a strategy to confront the racism that attempted to exclude them from American social and economic life.

Many recent studies demonstrate the importance of studying many kinds of evidence—both material and documentary—to interpret our past. Architectural and archaeological information together, for example, provide a much more relevant assessment of material life, and each is essential for fully interpreting the other (e.g., Cabak and Inkrot 1997; Catts and Custer 1990; Grettler et al. 1996; Orser 1988). There is a growing realization that archaeology provides an essential component to studies of the material past. The contribution of CRM archaeology counters the grudging argument made in many state offices and federal agencies that archaeology of the recent past is important only in limited situations where documentary data are not available. On the contrary, archaeology contributes important information in many more situations than just poorly documented ones. An archaeology of only the poor or particular racial or ethnic groups, for example, would have no comparative perspective within American society and could not contribute to the holistic understanding of the "feature systems" of American life.

**Context Development for Recent Domestic Sites in New York State**

In New York, one of the first major forays into the arena of nineteenth-century domestic archaeology involved the CRM program implemented in response to the Army's expansion at the Fort Drum Military Reservation from 1985 to 1991 (Affleck, this volume). Fort Drum is a 107,000-acre Army installation located in Jefferson County, northern New York state. The CRM program completed for the Army, the New York SHPO, and the National Park Service included the identification, evaluation, protection, registration, and in some cases mitigation of nineteenth-century hamlets and farmsteads within the reservation. By the completion of the project, 145 historic sites had been subjected to some level of archaeological testing and evaluation.

The Fort Drum CRM program included the preparation of a detailed historic archaeological context which focused on agriculture, the development of regional settlement patterns, intra-site organization of farmstead facilities, site transformation processes, aspects of consumer behavior, market networks, and continuity and change over time. The historic context was then employed to develop appropriate research questions and integrity requirements that could be the basis for site evaluations. Upon completion of the Phase I and II investigations, the historic contexts and the archaeological results provided the basis for determinations of eligibility.

The Army's preferred treatment strategy for archaeological sites was protection and preservation in situ through site avoidance. While three nineteenth-century domestic sites were ultimately the subject of Phase III data recovery excavations (Affleck, this volume), the culmination of the project was primarily the nomination and listing of four historic archaeological districts to the National Register of Historic Places. The Alpina, LeRaysville, Lewisburg, and Sterlingville archaeological districts include the archaeological remains of four nineteenth-century hamlets. The districts range in size from 17.8 to 66.1 acres and include the archaeological remains of eight to twenty-eight domestic dwelling sites in addition to individual mill, tavern, hotel, blacksmith shop, foundry, store, school, and church sites. The four archaeological districts were listed on the National Register in 1995, along with a fifth nomination for an individual grist mill site. (For additional information on the Fort Drum project, consult Louis Berger & Associates Task Order 17, 1992.)
The important emphasis that the Fort Drum project placed on context development for nineteenth-century domestic sites was a critical step in the evaluation of these sites. In two respects, nineteenth-century domestic sites are categorically different from other types of archaeological sites to which the National Register Criteria apply. First, there has been so much substantive interest and research in prehistoric sites, in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century sites, and even in nineteenth-century industrial, commercial, and military sites, that a contextual understanding already largely exists for these property types. In comparison, the development of appropriate contexts for evaluating nineteenth-century domestic sites is under-represented. Second, the evaluation of most other site types is made with an understanding of their rarity, which is an important aspect supporting their significance. In contrast, nineteenth-century domestic sites are common, even plentiful, in New York. Determining significance for site types that are ubiquitous can be a difficult assessment, particularly if a fully articulated context has not been developed. The context developed for nineteenth-century domestic sites at Fort Drum provided a full understanding of the significance and research potential of these sites that would not have been otherwise possible.

The effort at Fort Drum in northern New York also made it clear that context development for other regions of the state would be necessary. There may be some unique occasions when an individual domestic site associated with an important person or event might meet the National Register Criteria at the state or national level of significance; however, the majority of these sites will likely only be eligible for the Register at the local level. Therefore, local or regional contexts are necessary to adequately evaluate nineteenth-century domestic sites. While the context developed for Fort Drum aids the evaluation of nineteenth-century domestic sites in northern New York, it is not always applicable to sites in other regions of the state.

The recognition of this problem led the New York SHPO to fund the development of a context study for the Genesee Valley in 1989. The study has since been embellished into a full-length monograph entitled "The Development of Nineteenth-Century Agricultural Practices and Their Manifestations in Farmsteads in the Genesee River Valley" (Bodner 1990). This context statement serves as an important tool for the evaluation of nineteenth-century domestic archaeological sites in the Genesee Valley, most of which are farmstead-related.

Lack of funding has prevented the development of other local and regional contexts for the evaluation of nineteenth-century domestic archaeological sites in New York. But the contexts developed for Fort Drum and the Genesee Valley serve as important models for the level of effort that is needed in order to adequately address this site type. In the absence of appropriate local or regional contexts, project-specific context statements are necessary to appropriately evaluate nineteenth-century domestic sites on a case-by-case basis. In day-to-day practice, most DOEs for the New York review and compliance program are made in this way.

SITE EVALUATIONS IN NEW YORK STATE

The New York SHPO evaluates approximately 300 to 400 archaeological survey reports each year in its review and compliance program. DOEs for sites identified by survey efforts have been systematically recorded in a computerized statewide inventory of historic properties since 1991. During the period 1991 through 1997, the SHPO determined that 310 archaeological sites met the National Register Criteria as a result of project review and compliance evaluations. As is shown in Figure 1.1, 64.2% of these determinations were for prehistoric sites and 35.8% were for historic sites. (Again, cemeteries and shipwrecks have not been included in this summary presentation).

A division of the eligibility determinations for historic sites is presented in Figure 1.2. Historic sites are divided by time period and by property type. Sites that span more than one time period are categorized based upon their earliest occupation. Domestic sites include both rural and urban residential habitations as well as farmsteads. Under the category "Industrial" we have included industrial, commercial, and other types of non-domestic sites, while the category "Military" includes battlefields, forts, and other types of military-related sites.

As is shown in Figure 1.2, nineteenth-century domestic sites account for close to 50% of the historic sites which have received DOEs. In part, this
reflects the fact that these sites occur with high frequency across New York and are the most commonly encountered type of historic site within the review and compliance program. Also, the growing recognition that these sites can be used to address important historical and archaeological research questions and have the ability to yield information important to our understanding of the past has contributed to the increasing attention accorded them during project reviews.

DOEs for nineteenth-century domestic sites in New York have focused on a variety of pertinent research questions. Early nineteenth-century sites reflect the earliest period of settlement in some parts of northern and western New York. These sites have the potential to yield important information concerning settlement period migration patterns, population demography, subsistence farming, and localized patterns of resource exploitation and market access. Research questions for later nineteenth-century domestic sites have focused on a variety of issues including the expansion of market capitalism, social status and economic inequality in both rural and urban contexts, and nineteenth-century gender roles, to name a few.

The frequency of DOEs for nineteenth-century domestic sites is an indication that the research potential of this type of site has become widely accepted within the discipline (cf. Peña, this volume; Wurst, this volume). Recently the New York SHPO has also begun to explore the potential significance of more recent twentieth-century archaeological sites (Figure 1.2). Twentieth-century sites that have received DOEs include the archaeological remains of training trenches at Camp Upton on Long Island, used to train recruits in the art of trench warfare during World War I. Of greater relevance to this paper is the DOE prepared for two domestic sites discretely dated to the 1910-1927 occupation period of boarding houses and residences used to board itinerant loggers during the heyday of the logging era in the western Adirondack mountains (Pickands 1997, this volume). Archaeological investigations at the sites produced a large and diverse artifact assemblage indicating that the sites have the potential to yield information relevant to the study of the lifeways of this community's largely transient working population. The logging era is an important but relatively undocumented chapter in the history of the Adirondack region. As we enter the twenty-first century, archaeologists are now beginning to consider the potential significance of twentieth-century domestic archaeological sites.

In the vast majority of cases, sites determined eligible for the National Register are successfully protected and preserved through project avoidance measures. Nevertheless, the destruction of a number of nineteenth-century domestic sites has been mitigated through data recovery excavations (see e.g., LoRusso, this volume; Rafferty, this volume). As just one example, the CRM program for the 375-mile-long Iroquois Pipeline, which traversed New York State and Connecticut from the St. Lawrence River to Long Island Sound, included data recovery mitigation of historic archaeological components at five different sites. All five sites included nineteenth-century domestic occupations.

The Phase III data recovery excavations at the Iroquois Pipeline project sites have produced important results which have added significantly to our understanding of nineteenth-century lifeways in New York. Some of the more important and unique research themes that archaeological work on these sites addressed included the role of native fauna in nineteenth-century consumption practices, the correlation of trash disposal patterns with ethnic traditions of occupation, the persistence of ethnic architectural construction techniques over time, and landscape archaeology as a means of reconstructing land modification practices at rural farmsteads.

These types of data recovery results are providing an important means of assessing the degree to which this site type can satisfactorily address hypothesized research questions. In addition, the growing body of data recovery results can be used to assess redundancy in the information acquired from these sites. Given the plethora of nineteenth-century domestic sites on the modern landscape, information redundancy is an issue that must be examined and considered as part of the site evaluation process.

**The National Register of Historic Places**

The NRHP office of the National Park Service processes approximately 1,500 nominations per
Figure 1.1. New York State Historic Preservation Office Determinations of Eligibility (DOE's) for Review and Compliance Projects, 1991 through 1997: all archaeological sites. (Cemeteries and shipwrecks are not included in the data presented in Figures 1.1 through 1.6.)

Figure 1.2. New York State Historic Preservation Office Determinations of Eligibility (DOEs) for Review And Compliance Projects, 1991 through 1997: historic archaeological sites.
year. Figures are not available for an average number of archaeological properties, but the percentage of properties listed under Criterion D for their information potential is about 7% of the approximately 70,000 listed properties (more than 80% are buildings). Not all of these, however, are archaeological properties. Massachusetts, for example, has a multiple property context for the state's "first buildings." Under that context, the buildings themselves are considered significant for their "above-ground archaeological potential." The likelihood that significant below-ground archaeological resources are also present on the properties is acknowledged, but is not a focus of the nominations.

The New York SHPO completes approximately 100 National Register nominations each year. The overwhelming majority of these nominations are for historic buildings, as is true nationally. Nevertheless, in New York state 100 National Register nominations have been completed for archaeological sites or archaeological districts. As is shown in Figure 1.3, 62% of these are for historic archaeological properties, and 38% are for prehistoric sites. Contact period Native American archaeological sites are included in the prehistoric category, so the historic category reflects only Euro-American sites. A division of the National Register nominations for historic sites is presented in Figure 1.4.

It should be noted that Figures 1.3 and 1.4 include only those nominations that are principally archaeological in theme. They do not include, for example, districts of historic buildings that may include an individual archaeological site, or a historic estate that may have contributing archaeological properties in association with the built resources. In New York, whenever a nomination is in process of completion an effort is made to include archaeological resources that may exist on the property as contributing components to the nomination. Therefore there are more archaeological sites on the National Register in New York than are included in Figures 1.3 and 1.4. We have only included nominations that are principally archaeological in nature in Figures 1.3 and 1.4 because these numbers are probably the best reflection of archaeology-driven interest in the National Register program. Figures 1.3 and 1.4 also do not include the many cemeteries and shipwrecks that are listed in the National Register, because these property types were not included in this review.

A second point that must be emphasized is that the figures represent numbers of National Register nominations rather than individual sites. They include nominations for both individual sites and archaeological districts that may contain numerous sites. Individual nominations and districts were weighted equally because each represents a single sponsor's interest in registering a specific piece of property, regardless of whether that property includes one or numerous sites. In most cases, even for historic archaeological districts, most of the sites in the district represent a single property type, such as a complex of industrial ruins, a military area with batteries, redoubts, or defensive works, or an archaeological village with multiple domestic sites.

With these caveats in mind, it is of interest to compare the tables and note the differences. As Figure 1.3 indicates, historic sites have received greater attention than prehistoric sites in New York's National Register program. There are a number of reasons for this.

First, as indicated in Figure 1.4, there are a large number of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century military sites on the Register in New York. In the early years of the National Historic Landmark (NHL) and National Register of Historic Places programs, there was a strong emphasis on designating the many important battlefields, fort sites, and cantonments which played such an important role in the formation of the country. In New York State, French and Indian War and Revolutionary War sites are very common; many were designated NHLs and added to the National Register when that program was created. As illustrated in Figure 1.2, as a result of this effort few previously unknown or unevaluated military sites remain to be encountered by the review and compliance program.

Second, appropriately or not, the Register has tended to focus on visual, above-ground resources. Buildings and structures dominate the list, and even among archaeological properties visible resources such as industrial sites—which often have above-ground ruins—predominate. In contrast, prehistoric sites and less-visible historic sites such as domestic sites tend to be under-represented. As Figure 1.4 indicates, nineteenth-century domestic
Figure 1.3. New York State archaeological site National Register nominations, 1966 through 1997: all archaeological nominations.

Figure 1.4. New York State archaeological site National Register nominations, 1966 through 1997: historic archaeological nominations.
sites are disturbingly under-represented on the National Register of Historic Places in New York, especially in comparison to the level of attention this type of site is receiving in the review and compliance program (Figure 1.2).

This differential is greater when the nature of the six New York nominations for nineteenth-century domestic properties are considered (Figure 1.4). Two of these nominations are for properties associated with free black communities, and the African-American theme is the principal focus of these listings rather than any significance they may embody as domestic sites. The other four all derive from a single project, the Fort Drum initiative. Also, all six of these nominations are historic archaeological district nominations. In actuality, the number of individual nominations for single, nineteenth-century domestic sites listed on the National Register for New York is zero. In contrast, most DOEs for nineteenth-century domestic sites (Figure 1.2) are for individual sites.

The number of National Register of Historic Places listings under Criterion D for the northeastern states (including Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont) is summarized in Figure 1.5. Data were derived from the National Register Information System (NRIS) database compiled and maintained by the National Park Service. This count should be understood as rough and does not exactly equate with the number of archaeological nominations because other types of resources, including buildings, can be listed under Criterion D. Additionally, the nature of the database, which was begun in the mid-1980s by checking older nominations, does not always allow a precise understanding of the integration of archaeological and other values. Due to variations in states' nomination practices, many properties that could clearly meet Criterion D for their archaeological information potential are nominated and listed only for their significance under other criteria. Nevertheless, Figure 1.5 provides a very general basis of comparison between the states.

Figure 1.6 categorizes the National Register nominations for historical archaeological properties (non-Native American) in the northeastern states other than New York. Comparing Figure 1.6 with Figure 1.4, the other northeastern states have not listed as many military properties for their archaeological values as New York; however, in most other respects the distributions of nominated sites are relatively similar. Like New York, nineteenth-century domestic sites are relatively under-represented on the Register for the Northeast, probably for many of the same reasons. State offices have pursued varying priorities for nominating properties and in some of the states nineteenth-century domestic sites are not represented at all on the Register. Rhode Island (4) and Connecticut (3) account for seven of the nine nineteenth-century domestic sites listed on the Register from the northeastern states.

The National Register Criteria for evaluation and supporting National Park Service bulletins and guidelines establish a valuable framework for completing site evaluations. Yet these criteria and guidelines are, by necessity, general in nature and broad in their interpretation. More than thirty years into the National Register program, the reality is that the National Register has itself become a tool that is useful when making eligibility determinations. What has been listed on the Register in the past becomes a baseline against which unevaluated properties are continually measured. Properties that are listed, therefore, provide a precedent for eligibility.

As new kinds and types of properties are identified and their significance recognized, it is important that examples of these property types be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Property types whose significance has only become widely recognized in recent years include nineteenth- and twentieth-century domestic sites. Other examples, such as twentieth-century roadside architecture or Cold War-era military resources, could also be given. An important step in promoting recognition of the true significance of these types of resources is to list examples on the National Register. Listings bear the endorsement of the independent State Review Board for Historic Preservation and the Keeper of the National Register in Washington, D.C. National Register listing is a status that is widely recognized by the public as a true indication of significance.
FIGURE 1.5. Northeastern states: properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion D for information potential, and number of historic archaeological properties (as of 1/97).

FIGURE 1.6. Historic archaeological nominations for the northeastern states combined, excluding New York (as of 1/97).
CONCLUSION

An assessment of the New York SHPO's programmatic treatment of nineteenth- and twentieth-century domestic archaeological sites generates the following conclusions and recommendations:

1. Local or regional contexts are necessary to satisfactorily evaluate the significance and research potential of nineteenth- and twentieth-century domestic archaeological sites. While we have good context statements for some areas of northern and western New York, contexts for other regions of the state are needed.

2. DOEs and data recovery results must continue to be synthesized and incorporated into the evolving site evaluation process for nineteenth- and twentieth-century domestic sites. This expanding database will provide the ongoing measure of site research potential and significance, as well as form the basis for evaluating site rarity and information redundancy.

3. Examples of nineteenth- and twentieth-century domestic sites need to be nominated and listed on the National Register of Historic Places to serve as examples and models of what constitutes a significant site for this property type, and as a means to begin educating a broader constituency about how the archaeology of recent domestic sites can contribute to our understanding of the past.
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Chapter 2

Between Fact and Fantasy: Assessing our Knowledge of Domestic Sites

LouAnn Wurst, Douglas V. Armstrong, and Elizabeth Kellar

In 1990, John Wilson published an article in *Historical Archaeology* titled “We’ve Got Thousands of These!” While Wilson was referring specifically to rural farmsteads, this opinion can easily be applied more broadly to domestic sites in general. This statement mirrors a common sentiment voiced to and by some federal land managers, State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs), and Cultural Resource Management (CRM) contractors (Wilson 1990:23). The implicit assumption is that since we have so many domestic sites, and since we already know so much about them, it becomes hard to justify more work on them (but see Kuhn and Little, this volume). In essence, the onerous task of appraising significance falls to the researcher to argue for new and creative ways to look at these sites.

The goal of this paper is to assess the reality of these ideas about what is common and what is unique—what we refer to as the “fantasy” of archaeological work. Research performed as part of the Syracuse University Intermodal Systems Transportation Enhancement Act (ISTEA) project allows a systematic look at the hidden database in New York, the gray literature that is not readily available to most researchers, but which constitutes most of the work on regional historical archaeology. In essence, these data provide the means to assess what we actually know and don’t know about domestic archaeological sites in New York.

In this paper, the SHPO site files form the basis of assessing what we know about domestic sites in central New York. Interesting contrasts emerge when these data are compared to the historic period properties included in New York State Museum site files and on the National Register of Historic Places, local landmark lists for the cities of Syracuse and Ithaca, and the New York State Historic Marker Program listings. Each of these listings has varying objectives and inherent biases; yet when viewed as a whole, we gain insights into how domestic sites are perceived both by archaeologists and the public.

Comparisons of these differing data sources indicate that contrary to our archaeological fantasy, domestic sites in both town and countryside have been virtually overlooked. Our analysis indicates that such sites are generally more highly valued by the public, as evidenced by local landmark listings. We also demonstrate that in the past decade archaeologists have begun to pay more attention to
these sites. However, our data also suggest that archaeologists have a great deal of work ahead of them in terms of recognizing the diversity inherent in the misleadingly unified classification of "domestic."

**THE SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY ISTEA PROJECT**

The Syracuse University ISTEA project entailed the creation of a unified regional archaeological Site File (prehistoric and historic periods) and Geographic Information System for Department of Transportation (DOT) Region 3 in central New York state (Figure 2.1). The project has compiled a detailed list of sites for each county within Region 3 and synthesized site information to create a comprehensive database of archaeological resources. The project is sponsored by the Central New York Regional Office of the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (NYSOPRHP), which has recognized the importance of this research for regional preservation planning. Our project provides a pilot study for detailed cultural resource planning applicable more broadly to New York State as a whole.

The boundaries of DOT’s Region 3 and this project include Tompkins, Cortland, Seneca, Cayuga, Onondaga and Oswego Counties (Figure 2.1). This region has been selected for several reasons. Most important is that as the subject of a pilot study, Region 3 bisects numerous natural environmental and historic developmental zones in New York State. Natural environmental areas within this region include the Great Lakes lowlands and the glaciated Alleghany Plateau. Specific resource areas can be defined as the Great Lakes, the Finger Lakes, riverine systems based on the Oneida, Seneca, Oswego and Tioghiouga Rivers, Cicerio Swamp, and numerous smaller tributary waterways and wetlands. These rivers and lakes provided natural transportation corridors which affected the historic settlement of central New York state.

Region 3 includes areas of early French settlement and historic or contact period Onondaga and Oneida occupation. Region 3 is also bisected by several early east–west-oriented turnpikes, including the Genesee Turnpike, the North Branch of the Seneca Turnpike, the Hamilton and Skaneateles Road, and the Cortland-Ithaca Road (Faigle 1943; Miller 1979). Land use and settlement patterns in this region were influenced by the Erie, Oswego, and Ithaca Canals which supplanted the earlier turnpikes and led to a dramatic increase in population, industry, and urbanization in inland areas in proximity to these canals (Miller 1979; Taylor 1951). Railroads and New York’s interstate highway system later consolidated the effects of these previous transportation systems.

In addition to transportation developments, Region 3 also contains a cross-section of different historic period land use. DOT Region 3 comprises most of the area originally set aside to remunerate Revolutionary War soldiers, known as the New Military Tract (Schein 1993). Most of this land was surveyed at the same time and divided into lots using a consistent process, providing a comparable baseline for settlement. Even so, Region 3 includes a wide diversity of historic land use such as the regional urban/industrial areas of Syracuse and Ithaca, the smaller urban/industrial areas of Cortland, Seneca Falls, and Auburn, and numerous villages and unincorporated hamlets, as well as areas which focused on rural agricultural production. Most of these historic contexts are not exclusive to Region 3, and general findings from this project may be applicable throughout upstate New York. Given the richness and potential for settlement, expectations should be high for a diverse archaeological database in Region 3 across the dimensions of site occupation, context, and function.

SHPO site data were recorded based on existing information. Site record forms for each of the counties within the region were utilized for initial data recording of available information regarding the details of the sites. The survey report files were consulted to complete any missing, ambiguous, or incomplete information. On the basis of our review of these two sources, we recorded the following information for each site: site identifier, site location (county, town, village or city, quad map), geological zone, present land use assessment, property type, site function, temporal/cultural affiliation and date range, level of site treatment, types of features identified, classes of cultural materials recovered, name and organization of the investigator, bibliographic references, and notation of the material repository.

In conjunction with this information, the database was geared toward evaluating how the poten-
tial significance of a site was assessed. The Syracuse researchers collected information presented in reports that included a statement on the research themes and historic contexts developed in terms of the research potential of a particular site; what the perceived interpretive context of the site was; what National Register criteria were invoked in arguments of significance; and how reports linked the site and research potential to the cultural history of New York State. Explicit discussion of this essential aspect of archaeological research was curiously absent in many cases.

Although the SHPO site files were the primary source of information, other databases, including those of the New York State Museum (NYSM), National Register of Historic Places, Syracuse and Ithaca Landmarks, and the New York State Education Department’s Historic Marker Program, were utilized for comparative purposes. Each of these sources has differing goals and objectives in recording historic resources. The NYSM Systematic Archaeological Site File was created in 1980, updating an earlier version developed in 1955. The initial file was developed in an effort to record prehistoric sites. In 1996, historic period Euro-American sites were added from cultural resource management studies performed by the NYSM Cultural Resource Survey Program. Because of the nature of these projects, the historic period sites included in the NYSM site file are also listed in the SHPO site file. Information from the NYSM site file was adjusted only for the purpose of assigning site functions that were consistent with the classification that we used for the other data sources.

Consistent site functions were also added to the National Register database obtained from the National Register Information System. The criteria for nomination to the National Register specifies that properties have historic significance and integrity in association with historic events or important persons, are distinctive in design or physical characteristics, or have the ability to provide important information about history. Most of the properties listed on the National Register in DOT Region 3 have been evaluated on the basis of architectural integrity.

The Syracuse Landmarks file, maintained by the Syracuse Landmarks Preservation Board, was compiled from various historic resource surveys conducted in the city, and also included local and national historic districts. The Ithaca Landmarks’ data were provided by the Tompkins County Division of Assessment. This database mainly represents buildings within local or national districts. Both Landmarks’ databases were expanded to include site function. Information on historic markers was obtained from a survey performed in 1994. The marker program, begun in the 1920s, was intended to mark sites of historic significance in the Colonial, Revolutionary or State Formative period. Marker location and text were supplemented with the classification of site function and time period based on the actual text of the marker.

In some respects, each of these databases is merely a “list” of properties and/or sites in the region. The value of this disparate information lies in our ability to use these different sources to evaluate how historic properties are recognized and managed by different agencies with differing concerns and objectives. These sources provide the means to assess the representativeness of the domestic sites included in the SHPO site files.

**DOMESTIC SITES**

The SHPO site files contain a total of 631 archaeological sites for the six-county region. Of these, 52% are historic sites. It should not take much reflection to realize that this cannot reflect actual site density. Since Euro-American settlement had a much more dramatic impact on the landscape than Native American occupation, we would expect there to be many more historic period sites. This percentage appears even smaller considering the expectations of diversity in the regional context at the start of this project. Perhaps we should wonder why any prehistoric remains are more likely to be listed, while some more rigorous criteria seem to hold for historic materials resulting in their lower-than-expected incidence in the site file listings. We would all agree that a small lithic scatter represents a site, but a small scatter of historic artifacts, in the absence of features, may not actually be labeled a site.

Assessing the function of historic sites has been unexpectedly difficult. In this regard, it is important to note that the historic site forms used by SHPO do not include any space to list site function. In some cases this information was available.
from the site name, such as the “Brigden Blacksmith Shop Site” or the “Turtle Island Tile Factory Site.” In other cases, the site was named after the present landowner, which gives little clues as to the nature of the site. Often, returning to the original report did not help elucidate the site’s function. Obviously we cannot always know the function of a site, but the high incidence of unknown site function may be related to the general lack of explicit discussion of significance for historic sites.

Even given the above, we were able to categorize site function for 82% of the historic sites. We devised the general categories of site function from the National Register function listings, and then adjusted the classification for both terminology and specific aspects of known historic functions. Certain general site functions appear obvious, such as “Religious” (churches, rectories), “Education” (schools, academies), “Transportation” (canal locks, depots, roads), and “Military” ( arsenals, blockhouses, forts). “Industrial” was used to categorize all enterprises relating to production and maintenance of commercial goods. This category included a wide range of industrial-type sites, such as mills, factories, quarries, etc., which were distinguished in a secondary field entitled “Specific Site Class.” The “Agricultural” category was used solely to incorporate a farm’s related activities of domestic and production aspects. The secondary field of “Specific Site Class” provided the distinction between these two aspects (barn, outbuilding, farmstead). A distinction was also made to clearly delineate service from commercial activities. Sites related to “Service” activities included hotels, taverns, shops, and boardinghouses. Residential and domestic sites, the focus of this paper, were consolidated into a category labeled as “Dwelling.” Many site descriptions merely noted domestic trash, refuse, or sheet middens associated with domestic structures. Other categories were created (“Cemetery,” “Leisure,” and “Euro Village”) to account for other aspects of historic significance.

It must be noted that in reality these site functions are not always discrete or independent of each other. If the available site information noted multiple activities, these were reflected in how the site function was recorded (“Service/Dwelling,” etc.). Such designations tended to be rare; more commonly, no site function could be assigned due to a lack of information, and the site’s function was designated as “Unknown.”

Based on this classification scheme, the breakdown of historic site function for the SHPO data shows some interesting surprises. Of the 328 sites, the largest percentage (26%) is represented by dwellings, followed closely by industrial sites at 25%. Sites with an unknown function rank third at 18%. Agricultural sites comprise 9%, while transportation-related sites rank fifth at 7% of all historic sites. Other site functions with a low incidence are grouped into education, service, military, religious, and leisure categories.

To address issues of domestic sites, we combined the site functions of dwelling and agriculture, except in cases where only barns or farm outbuildings were included in the specific site function. This brought us to a grand total of only 107 domestic sites for the six-county region. The distribution of these sites is not uniform across the area. The breakdown of the number and percentage of domestic sites related to all historic sites is shown in Table 2.1. For comparative purposes, the number and percentage of all historic sites are also shown. The number of domestic sites per county ranges from zero to forty-six. Several counties obviously have a much larger representation of domestic sites than others, making it impossible to deal with variability across the area. This variation is undoubtedly related to the number of compliance surveys conducted in these areas based on economic development and infrastructural improvements. But even given this, Onondaga, the county with the largest number of domestic sites, has only recorded forty-six sites. Given the economic, political, and social diversity of this large county, the relative dearth of recorded domestic sites becomes even more startling.

Examining the distribution of domestic sites in terms of rural or urban contexts also reveals an interesting pattern. Of the 107 domestic sites, 70% were located in towns (or townships), 26% in incorporated villages, and 4% in cities. In New York State, towns represent the largest geographic areas, and these numbers indicate a largely rural bias in the site file data. Although the low number of domestic sites identified in cities may seem strange to our colleagues from New York City, this pattern represents a real lacuna in the comparative data for upstate contexts.
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Table 2.1. Domestic Sites by County as Listed in the SHPO Files.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Historic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswego</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The paucity of information on domestic sites in this region is also highlighted by an examination of the type of investigation. Of the 107 domestic sites, 30% are known only through historical documentation; 2% through surface finds; 50% through Shovel Test Pit (STP) excavation; and only 18% through a combination of STPs and larger excavation units. The totals are startling: for all 107 domestic sites, only 1,031 STPs have been dug and only thirty square meters of surface area have been excavated. These figures average to nine STPs and only .3 m² per site. To put it bluntly, it is hard to understand how we think we know anything about these sites with this level of investigation.

While the preceding analysis provides an opportunity to reflect on the state of domestic sites and certainly adds a dash of cold water to our perception of them, we do not want to convey an impression of only gloom. There is good evidence from the site files that our treatment of domestic sites is improving. Table 2.2 shows the number of STPs and excavation units for domestic sites broken down by decade. This table shows an increase in recent attention to domestic sites. The 1970s had the largest number of total sites reported for any decade, although a relatively low number of historic sites, while the 1980s showed a decrease in the number of both historic and domestic sites. Interestingly, during the 1990s over twice as many domestic sites were listed, while the number of all historic sites increased only slightly.

Attention also needs to be paid, however to the level of investigation by decade. Table 2.2 illustrates that while in the 1990s historic sites in total

Table 2.2. Level of Investigation by Decade for Domestic, Historic, and Total Sites Listed in the SHPO Files.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic Sites</th>
<th>Historic Sites</th>
<th>Total Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STPs</td>
<td>m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
had an increase in the number of STPs, there was a corresponding and dramatic decrease in square meters excavated. The same trend can be seen in the level of investigation of domestic sites, which exhibit a dramatic increase in the number of STPs but only a minor decrease in the area excavated. While these figures indicate an improvement in the treatment of domestic sites in the last decade, we cannot help but wonder what effect the emphasis on STPs will have in lieu of excavated units. We seem to be taking these sites more seriously, but as yet there is little evidence that we have learned much about them.

DOMESTIC SITES IN PERSPECTIVE

The preceding discussion clearly dispels the archaeological fantasy of “We’ve got thousands of these!” While few domestic sites are listed in the SHPO files, the importance of these sites to the public should not be underestimated. Additionally, the fact that few are listed is not representative of the totality of this site class across the landscape of central New York. In order to illustrate these points, we will provide comparative information from other databases generated for the ISTEA project, as well as offer an analysis of historic period atlases.

The SHPO site files are not the only source of historic resources in this region. Our research has also collected data from the NYSM site files, the National Register of Historic Places, local landmark listings from Ithaca and Syracuse, and Historic Marker listings. These records indicate that domestic properties are more highly valued as important historic resources. Although these files do not, with the exception of the NYSM site files, emphasize the archaeological importance of these types of sites, the public recognition of related resources is more prominent in all of these sources. Table 2.3 presents the percentage of domestic sites for each data source in comparison to the SHPO file data. The NYSM data, although appearing to be uncharacteristically high in comparison to SHPO, actually reflects what we believe to be the product of recent attention to domestic sites. The Museum only began to systematically record historic sites in 1996; thus the total number of historic sites is low for this database, yet high in terms of domestic focus.

While Table 2.3 shows that the National Register has a higher percentage of domestic sites than the SHPO site files, the percentages for the two local landmark databases are most interesting. Both Syracuse and Ithaca have chosen to highlight the domestic context in their landmark designations. At 86% and 79%, these are the only databases which have a significant proportion of domestic sites. Unfortunately, the reason these properties have been listed as landmarks are not that they are domestic per se, but that they are architecturally significant based on style or association with important people in the history of the region, state, or nation. Yet even with this caveat in mind, the preponderance of domestic sites on these lists indicates the importance of the domestic context in public sentiment.

We used the Beers 1874 atlases in order to evaluate the relative presence of domestic sites across the “real” landscape of nineteenth-century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Domestic (%)</th>
<th>Industrial (%)</th>
<th>Service (%)</th>
<th>Religious (%)</th>
<th>Education (%)</th>
<th>Transportation (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSM</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKERS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITHACA</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYRACUSE</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2,275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3. Percentages of Major Functional Classes.
centrally New York. Obviously, care must be taken when evaluating the historic atlas sources (Daniels 1987; Herman 1987; Seasholes 1988). Even so, examination of the historic maps provides an independent measure of the relative frequency of different site classes. A 10% random sample was selected individually from the populations of towns, cities and villages within the six-county region. Our sample thus consisted of one city, three villages, and five towns. Each structure on the maps in the sample was classified in terms of the same functional categories utilized for the site files and other historic property databases. These atlases typically label service and industrial properties as such, while domestic sites are inferred by the proper name of the owner. But this process runs the risk of obscuring multi-functional properties which were prevalent during the nineteenth century. For example, a property labeled as store, tavern, or hotel (functionally listed as "service") may also have housed the proprietor and his family, as well as clerks or other workers, making the domestic function as valid as the service designation. On the other hand, many small manufactories or other aspects of domestic production may be obscured by the sole designation of "domestic." This is certainly true with agricultural properties, which by their very nature combine production and domestic activities.

Even given these limitations, the atlases indicate a greater presence of domestic sites across the landscape than are reflected in the site files. Table 2.4 summarizes the number and percentage of domestic sites within each of the sample units. The percentage of domestic sites ranges from 75% to 94%, and 89% of all structures shown on the atlases are domestic. This value is comparable to the percentage of domestic structures recorded for the Syracuse and Ithaca Landmarks, and shows that domestic contexts are a more important part of the actual landscape than our archaeological site files would indicate.

In some cases, the lower percentages are a result of unlabeled structures which could not be assigned a function. In addition, the variation in percentages of domestic sites for towns, cities, and villages seems to indicate a wide diversity within these geographic categories. Given the expectations for diversity across Region 3, we should not be surprised that different communities would have a mix of these functional categories. Understanding this diversity should be a crucial aspect of historical archaeological studies in New York, but to date few examples exist of context statements for central New York State. The variation evident from the historic atlases indicates that the economic, social, political, and geographic contexts within which domestic sites existed are crucial to understanding the diversity of domestic site types that we have so far discussed as a single, unified category.

**DOMESTIC SITES IN CONTEXT**

The contemporary world of archaeology—both theoretical and methodological, compliance and academic—is permeated with the issue of context. Historic context has been referred to as the “cornerstone of historic preservation planning” (Ames et al. 1989:20); historic context and research themes provide an essential framework for evaluating historic resources, in terms of defining site types and evaluating their diversity (De Cunzo and Catts 1990; National Park Service 1994; McManamon 1990). At this time, New York State does not have a systematized state plan, historic context statement, or explicit articulation of research themes (Kuhn and Little, this volume). While efforts are underway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulton(C)</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert(T)</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanibal(T)</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings(T)</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga(T)</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skaneateles(T)</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga(V)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid(V)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,438</td>
<td>3,859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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for the creation of a unified plan for managing and evaluating cultural resources in New York State, it is not clear when this plan will be operational. At present, as discussed by Kuhn and Little, arguments of significance for cultural resources are provided by each individual researcher based on his or her own understanding of the time period in question. This becomes a significant issue, since many researchers are not trained in historical archaeology but must deal with these sites out of necessity (Lees and Noble 1990:11; see Rafferty, this volume). These arguments are, in turn, evaluated by the SHPO without a coherent statement or plan, creating a situation where each individual site is evaluated in isolation. This situation will not change until we have an explicit statement detailing the data potential and research strategies that could be carried out for different types of historic and prehistoric sites.

With this situation in mind, the final stage of the Syracuse University ISTEA proposal entailed synthesizing the site file and GIS information as a preliminary step to developing research themes and contexts for the implementation of a cultural resource management plan for prehistoric and historic resources in Region 3. Our original goal was to begin this task by examining the types and functions of prehistoric and historic sites that have actually been identified for the region, and evaluating the research strategy, design, and corresponding designations of the potential historical and cultural significance for each site. We argued that it made more sense to utilize the accumulated site file data in developing research contexts and themes rather than to use the approach common in other states, which is to develop these themes and contexts in isolation from the archaeology that has actually been performed.

Given the general nature of the site file data described above, it should come as no surprise that this latter approach has been of little use for domestic sites. Only a small fraction of the research potential statements collected from the original site reports contained explicit research questions that could be used to build research contexts. As such, these few statements can be integrated into a contextual framework, but are not sufficient to create a framework on their own. However, these research statements do provide the means of assessing our archaeological "fantasies" in regards to domestic sites.

Analyzing the qualitative attributes of research assessment and data potential has been a challenging endeavor, since many of the original reports contained no explicit statements of research potential. Recommendations for no additional work on these sites include such statements as "The late date of the site and lack of distinct artifact clustering prevent analysis" (TM 50); "Site will not be impacted by construction" (TM 51); "Limited because of disturbed context" (SE 58); "Site examination showed that there were no stratified remains" (ON 3); "Limited research potential because of documentary gaps and compromised site integrity" (ON 128); and the vague "No potential for additional data beyond Stage 1" (NI 57). Obviously the archaeological context of a site places restrictions on its research potential. At one time or another, many of us may have become interested in the research potential of a site, only to discover that those issues could not be approached with the disturbed or missing archaeological deposits "in the ground." Four of the site reports recommended additional research to assess the site's eligibility, while ten were deemed eligible due to intact features and material-bearing deposits.

The research themes developed to deal with individual sites varied widely, although the sample of sites discussed in this way is very small. Many of these statements relied on vague ideas and research issues, such as the investigation of construction techniques, lifestyle, domestic living patterns, consumer choice, or food ways. Based on the site file data on hand in 1997 when our findings were presented at the Domestic Archaeology Colloquium at the New York State Museum, research statements for only two of the domestic sites in this six-county region entailed some sort of comparison. One included the following statement: "The site has the potential to yield knowledge of farmstead development, particularly the living conditions of farm laborers as opposed to farm owners" (CA 20). This statement implies both a social and a temporal comparison. The other site whose potential involved a comparison utilized the material culture of rural craftsmen compared with the unskilled laborers who boarded there.

In February 1998, we updated our site file data to include sites reported for the previous year. We were surprised to discover that, in addition to the two sites previously recorded, twelve of the
new site files contained statements that detailed a comparative or regional developmental context for the site in question. Of these twelve statements, two explicitly emphasized differences in socio-economic status, while in two others this comparison was implicit. Other comparisons included comparing an agricultural domestic site with other service and non-farm domestic sites; comparing a farmstead with a tenant-occupied site; more generically, comparing the site to others to study consumer behavior and class; and a comparison focusing on the structured patterning of the community as a cultural landscape.

Several research statements emphasized regional development. Two sites had the potential to study the impact of the Erie Canal on rural life, while four others were noted as having been occupied when the community they were located in was experiencing a “period of active growth” or was “established as a crossroads community.” The unstated is that the social or economic development of the region or community has a direct relationship to the experience of those living in dwellings in the area.

While the increased attention to comparative and regional contexts is certainly encouraging, it should not overshadow the fact that domestic sites described in this way account for only 13% of the domestic sites recorded in the SHPO site files. In both academic and a compliance environment saturated with the idea of context, it is revealing that the only sites whose potential was based on a larger context were those compliance projects that were either large or diverse enough to contain an internal context. We can see the same pattern in the case studies reported in this volume. It is only when the boundaries of our project areas are large enough—who we have to confront the variability of life in the past—that we utilize this context in site potential statements.

Many authors have suggested that the key issues in evaluating site significance are context and site frequency. McManamon argues that “the frequency of an archaeological property type is an important aspect in the consideration of the significance of individual archaeological properties” (1990:15). Hardesty has suggested that “a sample of all site types containing each category of uninterpreted or middle range information . . . should be preserved” (1995:5). While we can all agree with these premises, there is a real problem with evaluating site type redundancy based on the archaeological fantasy of what we know. Two examples from the site files highlight this situation. One site was described as follows:

The site is a foundation of a simple farmhouse of the mid 19th century. Such sites are not unique and exist in large quantities . . . The settler cannot be associated with any historic event. This site did not represent initial settlement, and the long time span of occupation does not provide dating that would make the cultural material analysis more valuable. (ON 32)

A similar site was evaluated thus:

As a farmstead alone, this site is not unique; when viewed in relation to the tenant house site, it is unusual and interesting. This site has the potential to contribute to our understanding of rural agrarian management and labor relations as manifest in material culture—housing, personal property and food ways. (CA 20)

These examples highlight the importance of context in evaluating site significance. No single site existed in isolation; no single site can be evaluated in this way. Any examination of rural contexts highlights diversity based on agricultural and industrial production strategies; proximity to transportation and market systems; the class, gender, or household composition of a dwelling’s occupants; and transformations in capitalist production through time, to name only a few.

The diversity within our assumed monolithic domestic site type must be factored in before we can acknowledge the potential redundancy of a domestic site. As frustrating as the site files may be, they do show that researchers have begun to recognize that “research” and “domestic sites” go together. However, merely positing the general questions of diet and food ways or consumer choice is not sufficient. We have to reconnect our domestic sites to their social and economic contexts before we can assess the conditions under which consumer choice or diets vary. For instance, what are the differences in consumer choice between a “middling” farmer and the tenant he hired to work his farm? Or the differences between a middle-class
urban household with four daughters compared to a working-class family with the same household structure? An unsettling example of the biased expectations for domestic sites and our ability to study them was an assessment that stated, in essence, that since a limited ceramic assemblage was recovered, the site had a limited or low data potential to address problems regarding consumer choice (ON 136). The absence of ceramic consumer goods may be clear evidence of consumer behavior as much as a rich and diverse assemblage; we need to recognize this.

CONCLUSION

As discussed by Kuhn and Little, domestic sites have been and continue to be important aspects of historic resource inventories conducted at both the local and national level. Our summary of the site file data shows a surprising deficit in the recording and attention paid to domestic sites in central New York. A review of the Historic Marker program, Syracuse and Ithaca Landmarks files, and the National Register clearly indicates that these properties are important in the public domain. It is only within the past decade that archaeologists have begun to understand that these sites can also inform past social and economic contexts. Likewise we have also learned that without an understanding of social and economic contexts, we limit our ability to assess the significance of domestic sites.

The site file data, in conjunction with the case studies presented in this volume, indicate that domestic sites are not, nor should we consider them, a unified site type. From the Five Points in New York City to farmers in Oneida County, domestic sites exhibit an incredible amount of diversity. Given the small sample of domestic sites listed across a large area of the state, it is clear that it is far too early in the game to begin to exclude sites based on notions of redundancy, especially since we do not even have a clear idea of the nature of the diversity relating to these sites. The stark reality is that we know very little about domestic sites in New York. The argument that "We've got thousands of these"; is based on the fantasy of the supposed number of sites that exist across the landscape rather than on the reality of what is recorded in our site files.
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NOTES

1 References to contract reports in this section are done according to the SHPO report file system.
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Farmstead and other domestic sites from the nineteenth century constitute the type of archaeological resource perhaps most frequently discovered during cultural resource surveys in New York State. During the past twenty-five years of archaeological survey work in the state, probably thousands of these sites have been discovered, archaeologically tested, and otherwise documented, sampled, and inventoried (cf. Kuhn and Little, this volume; Wurst et al., this volume). To the extent that data have been consistently collected from nineteenth-century sites, a tremendous opportunity now exists to apply some of those data to current research questions and issues in the history of nineteenth-century agriculture and rural life. In addition, it is time to develop a framework of research questions to give purpose and focus to this work so that data collected in the future can be used in meaningful and productive ways (see Peña, this volume).

Archaeology offers a way of examining historical questions and of testing conclusions and hypotheses that have been based solely on the historical record. During the past five years, historians have produced a large number of books and articles in which the history of nineteenth-century agriculture in New York State has been closely reexamined. Important issues and questions have been addressed, and the work of these historians has produced a multitude of conclusions that can serve archaeologists as hypotheses for archaeological testing. Archaeological resources can produce data independent of the historical record, and the analysis of these data by archaeologists may support many hypotheses while altering or refining others. At the same time, historians have become increasingly anthropological in their methodology and theory (see, for example, Ross 1993:30–31; Darnton 1984:xiii, 3–7, 259–263; Isaac 1982:322–326, 346–347). Many historians have also begun to use demographic and other forms of statistical and quantitative analysis to identify patterns of behavior and change in the past (see, for example, Vinovskis 1979; Flinn 1981:1–2; Henretta 1993:211–212; Carr and Walsh 1993). “In the late twentieth century, socio-economic, gender, and cultural concerns have moved to center stage of historical analysis that political and constitutional affairs once occupied alone,” and modern historians have increasingly recognized the importance of “studies over the last decade on the consumer revolution in the Anglo-American world” (Lawson 1993:222–223). Although many archaeologists still are fearful of being classified as “handmaidens to history,” this fear represents a narrow and parochial view of these disciplines. The issue is an old one that is no longer pertinent.

Historians have devoted special attention in recent years to research questions related to diverse issues such as rural ecology and environment and the market orientation of farmers in the nineteenth century. For example, Lee A. Craig (1993) has correlated farm production with family size in the mid-nineteenth century. To explain why families in the Midwest and on the frontier had more children than families in the Northeast, he concluded that the cost of raising children in the Northeast, after subtracting their labor value, was more expen-
sive for parents overall than for parents west of the Appalachians. In effect, Craig suggests that farmers were far more market-oriented than other “new social historians” might admit (Summerhill 1995a). This level of historical research and analysis, producing hypotheses that might be tested with archaeological data, demonstrates once again why it is important that the archaeology of nineteenth-century New York State farmsteads not be conducted without reference to work in other states and regions for comparative studies.

The archaeological evidence of wealth and economic status at nineteenth-century farmstead sites, systematically analyzed and compared with data from other sites and regions, could also be used to examine hypotheses presented by Sally A. McMurry (1995, 1997:xiii) based on a study of Oneida County, New York, beginning in the 1820s. As the opening of the Erie Canal brought wheat farmers into hopeless competition with Midwestern grain farmers, the Oneida County farmers increasingly turned to dairy farming. McMurry observes that “both the number and the size of spring houses, for example, increased dramatically.” Cheese became a particularly important cash crop, and the economic power of women within the family grew since dairying had been a traditional activity of farm women. As cheese production moved from the home to the factory, women sought more active roles in the community, and by the 1880s rural New York farm families embraced many values, such as temperance, of the urban middle class. As Thomas Summerhill notes, “Their experiences aligned them far more with the bourgeoisie than with the laboring classes,” thus offering “a compelling answer to the question of why Northeastern farmers seemed to reject so wholeheartedly the radicalism of Populists in the South and West and why the capitalist transformation appeared so smooth in New York” (Summerhill 1995b). Most archaeologists are vigilant when interpreting the archaeological evidence of children and women in nineteenth-century sites, but it is perhaps also important to consider the presence or absence of objects, for example, such as wine or liquor bottle fragments at a site as evidence (or lack of evidence) of influence from the Temperance Movement.

Farmhouses developed “more efficient, specialized work and leisure spaces,” and, in New England, “ell additions incorporated highly organized labor patterns and often housed technological innovations such as water systems. Spaces for formal, family, and work purposes grew more distinct” (McMurry 1997:viii–x). During the first half of the nineteenth century, the new cycle of farmhouse construction in Delaware included merging kitchens into the house proper. In contrast, kitchens in New England were moved away from the main body of the house into ells. The reasons for this regional divergence remain unknown. Whether this divergence is a function of the longer persistence of slavery in Delaware, climatic differences, or other local vernacular traditions might be revealed by the extent to which there is archaeological evidence that New Englanders brought this pattern into New York (McMurry 1997:viii–x).

There is also much information to be gained by the study of pollen evidence in sealed soil samples from sites. The pollen from dated contexts, properly retrieved, can provide information available nowhere else about changes in the environment during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, while faunal remains may reveal the extent to which wild game such as deer and passenger pigeons continued to be available. An article by Alan Taylor (1995) has provided a sequel to the process of agro-ecological transformation for colonial New England that was developed by William Cronon and Carolyn Merchant. Taylor analyzes the process of environmental change as New England settlers expanded into New York, particularly in the region around Otsego Lake. He concludes that the newcomers classified the plants and animals they encountered as to whether they could be exploited for profit, whether they should be destroyed, or whether they were inconsequential. The enormous flocks of passenger pigeons suffered mass destruction in the nineteenth century, but while foxes, wolves, panthers, and bears were also exterminated, squirrels and chipmunks proliferated and attacked grain crops. Finally, Taylor notes, it was the clearing of land that allowed the more tenacious weeds that had followed the settlers from Europe to New England to flourish (Taylor 1995:269, 271–272, 274–275, 30
With archaeological data, it should be possible to refine these hypotheses. Martin Bruegel (1996) has documented the precarious existence of farmers in the late eighteenth century even in the older settled areas of the mid-Hudson Valley (Bruegel 1996). Most farmers had to struggle to become self-sufficient; survival and a decent subsistence took precedence over profit and economic gain. Barter between families was common (Bruegel 1996:265-268).

Progressive farm developers of the period such as John Jay, with a farm at Bedford, New York, also found that their improvements continued with painful slowness. When Jay contracted with brick-makers in 1787, part of their payment consisted of 100,000 of the bricks. It was not until much later, in the nineteenth century, that the needs of a rapidly growing population in New York City created a market for surplus dairy products, poultry, and groceries other than grain, all produced on the farm at Bedford. Changes and improvements at the Jay farm clearly reflect this shift (Waite et al. 1972:18, 29; Feister and Sopko 1996:61, 63).

James A. Henretta (1991:218, 225, 229) dates the American transition from subsistence household production to a full-fledged market capitalism, particularly in the mid-Atlantic colonies, to the period between 1770 and 1800. In an important article published in 1978, Henretta persuasively challenged the assumption that colonial farmers were aggressively entrepreneurial. The desire for profits “yielded to geographic realities,” and it was “cultural constraints [that] circumscribed the extent of involvement in the market economy.” Among colonial farmers “the maximizing of profit was less important to these producers than the meeting of household needs and the maintaining of established social relationships within the community.” The emergence of capitalist individualism was inhibited until, through cultural change, there was a change in the “web of social relationships and cultural expectations that inhibited the free play of market forces.” The resulting changes, however, “brought greater prosperity to those farmers whose geographic locations and values were conducive to market activity.” Significantly, in noting how the high cost of inland transport was one factor that inhibited the expansion of northern wheat production, Henretta documents the low cost of shipping a bushel of wheat on the Hudson River from Albany to New York City in 1769. In comparison, the cost of shipping wheat or grain the same distance on the Delaware River or overland to Philadelphia was between four and five times greater in proportion to the selling price (Henretta 1993:215–219, 221–222, 226–227, 233).

As early as 1946, Neil A. McNall determined that western New York farmers in the Genesee Valley, because of the opening of the Erie Canal and improved transportation and technology, used increased wheat production to turn from a self-sufficient economy to commercial farming. Finally, McNall notes, it was not until the 1850s in the Genesee Valley that “an unhappy combination of external competition from the cheaper new lands of the prairie states, and internal enervation, chiefly from the ravages of soil depletion and the midge, forced the abdication of King Wheat” (McNall 1946:426–431, 443). A significant new book for historical archaeologists in New York State, however, is The Agricultural Transition in New York State: Markets and Migration in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America by Donald H. Parkerson (1995). Based on a careful study of census and tax records and farm account books, Parkerson has defined a different period when farmers switched from subsistence to market production. The question of when this occurred has, according to Summerhill (1997:86) “proven to be an enduring problem for historians.” Parkerson concluded that within the period 1855 to 1865 there occurred a decisive shift toward surplus production by farmers throughout New York State. In 1855, nearly 45% of New York farmers failed to grow sufficient food to meet their subsistence needs, supplementing their yields with hunting, fishing, and the harvest of forest products. By 1865, two-thirds of all New York farmers produced a market surplus. Moreover, Parkerson believes that farmers in the backcountry after 1840, prompted by the consumer culture of an increasingly industrialized America, were able to order inexpensive manufactured goods and available luxury items by increasing their cash crop production (Summerhill 1997).

It should be possible for archaeologists to test such hypotheses using not only the evidence of faunal remains at farmstead sites but also other evidence, including ceramics. Material evidence may also confirm the economic differences between
those surplus market farmers interested in expanding commercial production (who, Parkerson argues, moved to areas such as the Erie Canal corridor) and those subsistence farmers who gravitated toward marginal regions such as the Adirondacks (Summerhill 1997). Tracing the migratory patterns of farm families should be an important element in the analysis and interpretation of their representative artifact assemblages. In any case, as Richard L. Bushman (1991:252-253) has observed, “along with the transition to improved farming practices, marked by opening land and continuous cropping, came the adoption of rural consumerism.” This consumerism was manifested in the increased number of furnishings and level of domestic comfort that “were as much a part of the American agricultural revolution as rotation systems and improved fences. . . . The smoothing, softening, and decorating of the farmhouse can be seen as a rural rejoinder to the aspersions of boorishness, vulgarity, and coarseness that haunted the nineteenth-century American farmer.” Sally McMurry (1997:vii-viii) has also traced the role of nineteenth-century agricultural journals, as well as itinerant peddlars and portrait painters, in spreading the many innovations that constituted a “transition between the old culture and the new” with the result that “progressive” farmers served as cultural mediators.

In addition to pollen and faunal analyses, there are many other techniques available to archaeologists to begin testing some of the hypotheses that have been proposed by historians to explain both environmental and economic changes. Glass containers marked with company names and locations are commonly found at nineteenth-century sites, and they provide information on trade networks and connections with distant places as sources of merchandise (Schuyler 1977:10-16). As ceramic data from nineteenth-century sites are analyzed, it will also be important for these data to be reported consistently, with reference to total sherd counts by type as well as to minimum numbers of vessels by type and decoration. Quantitative data on ceramic sherds may be useful in studies on ethnicity and status (Huey 1994), while Miller’s ceramic index values can be calculated and are specifically designed to provide information on economic status at sites dating between 1780 and 1860 (Klein 1991:81; Manson and Snyder 1996; Miller 1980; Miller 1991). Another tool that may prove useful is Paul A. Shackel’s formula to determine the amount of variety represented by plate rim sherds recovered from a site, as an index of standardization and segmentation in worldview (Potter 1994:150–153).

The challenge to utilize data from nineteenth-century sites so it can provide meaningful interpretation or reinterpretation of nineteenth-century history is increasingly under discussion. On October 24, 1997, the New York State Museum sponsored a one-day colloquium on nineteenth-century domestic site archaeology in New York State, and on October 17, 1997, at the Annual Meeting of the Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology, Terry Klein, George Miller, Mark Shaffer, Mary Beaudry, and Wade Catts presented a workshop on “The Archaeology of Nineteenth-Century Farmsteads.” The dialogue was continued on October 17, 1998, at the subsequent Annual Meeting of the Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology with a session of papers organized by Terry Klein and Sherene Baugher on nineteenth-century farms and farmsteads. Historical archaeologists in states other than New York have already begun to address some of the historical issues and questions raised and discussed by historians relating to market production versus subsistence farming (Bedell et al. 1994:49–50). A method for extending the use of Miller’s ceramic index values to late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century sites has also been developed (Manson and Snyder 1996), and it is possible that the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries will yet prove to be a most interesting and significant period for archaeological research.

The Progressive Era, lasting roughly from 1890 to 1930, was a period which brought fundamental changes in almost every aspect of daily life. It was a watershed between the past and the present. For New Yorkers exactly one century later, there is much about this era that should be studied. By the end of the 1880s, there was a growing sense that life could be greatly improved not only through technology but also through reforms. Life in 1650 was in many ways much more similar to life in 1875 than life in 1875 was similar to life in 1915. Inclusive within the Progressive Era was World War I, an idealistic “war to end all wars.” But within the Progressive Era, an almost countless number
of inventions and improvements would transform daily life: the electric light, the telephone, radio, moving pictures, the automobile, the airplane, the phonograph, the X-ray, smokeless gunpowder, dynamite, bottle caps, wire nails, pasteurized milk, celluloid, concrete, vitamins, and many more. The Progressive Era also brought with it strong movements in favor of reforms, including consumer protection, prohibition, women’s suffrage, and fair labor laws. Frank Lloyd Wright overturned conventional architectural styles, while skyscrapers forever changed the Manhattan skyline as New York City rapidly expanded and swept away many archaeological sites in the path of development. Negative aspects of the period also included the prejudices and anti-Catholicism of organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan.

Indeed, it was not until the Progressive Era and later that historians of the time finally began to recognize that in the Middle Colonies, unlike New England and the South, “colonies like New York represented, in germinal form, the very nation that had come into existence by the late nineteenth century.” Frederick Jackson Turner, in particular, directed the attention of historians to the “middle region” of the Atlantic coast which, he noted, was a composite typical of the modern United States of 1892, with resemblances closest to the men of the frontier (Klein 1974:12-14). Unfortunately, until recent years the work of many other historians is largely descriptive and fails to raise significant questions or propose testable hypotheses. Ulysses Prentiss Hedrick, who wrote the landmark A History of Agriculture in the State of New York published in 1933 by the New York State Agricultural Society, stated flatly that “this is not a history of agriculture as an economic activity” (Hedrick 1933:v). As early as 1946, however, David M. Ellis had already declared of New York State agricultural history that “the transition from a predominantly self-sufficient economy to one primarily dependent on the market was to effect changes fully as far-reaching if not as spectacular as those accompanying the Industrial Revolution” (Ellis 1967:viii). Immediately following the Progressive Era, the contrasts of the Depression in the 1930s offer additional opportunities to study major cultural change. Many farmers suffered hardship and poverty. Linda G. Ford has noted how, on small family farms with no hired help, gender distinctions in work quickly broke down (Ford 1994:378, 396).

A framework of research questions and goals is needed for each region of New York State so that data from nineteenth-century sites can be used to produce meaningful new information and insights. Every site is different, and no site is truly redundant. It is fortunate that so many nineteenth-century sites exist, because the larger and more nearly total the sample size, the stronger the research results will be. As every artifact at a single site is a clue in reconstructing a larger picture, so every nineteenth-century site is a clue in better understanding a very complex period in history. A searchable database is needed, listing all nineteenth-century sites that have been found, and it should include a variety of attributes for each site in addition to location and approximate date range. With these data, archaeologists have both the opportunity and the responsibility to produce meaningful research results.
Perhaps what is needed is a permanent task force of historians and archaeologists to utilize archaeological data that have been and are being generated and to reexamine historical interpretations of the nineteenth century. Clearly it is time to sharpen the focus of archaeological research goals in relation to nineteenth-century sites.
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Chapter 4

Prospects For the Archaeology of Nineteenth-Century Farmsteads in New York State

Elizabeth S. Peña

The field of historical archaeology has seen a considerable amount of recent interest in the archaeology of farmsteads. While this is no doubt linked to the related scholarly work in landscape archaeology (Yamin and Metheny 1996), attention to farmscapes can be specifically attributed to the plethora of nineteenth-century farmstead sites that continue to become subjects of cultural resource management (CRM) projects in New York State and across the Northeast. Pipelines, cable installations, and road construction all have an impact on linear stretches of landscape; many of these corridors follow roadways that were lined with farms in the nineteenth century. While many of these farm structures remain standing today, the farm landscapes have often been altered by the subdivision of farm fields, significant structural alterations, and adjacent development. Farmsteads that are no longer extant can often be located on nineteenth-century maps, and it is these map-documented structures (MDSs) that become the foci of archaeological investigation. For a number of reasons, some of the archaeological work that has been conducted on farmstead sites has proved somewhat unsatisfying. Some of these problems are related to the exigencies of CRM work; that is, the severely circumscribed project areas, the limited time allotted, regulations and restrictions of clients and review agencies and, of course, budgetary constraints. While archaeological fieldwork conducted under the academic aegis is also subject to external controls, including those enacted by granting agencies and university timetables, these projects tend to enjoy readier access to a wider range of specialists and scholars. Student theses also make significant contributions, allowing for more in-depth investigation.

The study of rural life is important because it represents most Americans' way of life in the nineteenth century. Because farm life was generally inclusive in terms of ethnicity, gender, and age, its study can provide information on many topics of current interest in historical archaeology. As the twenty-first century approaches, there is a growing conceptualization of the nineteenth century as a foreign, distant place. As an essential part of the continuum representing the process of cultural change, many aspects of nineteenth-century rural life need to be better understood. Farmstead studies provide the mechanism for the investigation of the construction of rural domestic life in the nineteenth century.

The term “farmstead” refers not only to the farmhouse, but includes outbuildings of all kinds, as well as landscape features such as fields, stone walls, fences, and roadways. The spatial relationships between these structures and features is an important element of the farmstead concept. The farmstead, which can be considered an integrated unit of rural production, represents “a tangible record of the means by which people have adapted to environmental, social, economic, and technological change through time” (Bodner 1990:76). While country life has often been characterized as eternal and unchanging, particularly in contrast to the fast pace of urban life, Adams' (1990) definition of farm country as the “rural frontier” better captures the sense of the rural environment as one in
which change and adaptation were key. Change, variety, and instability were as characteristic of rural landscapes as they currently are of cities, and the interplay between tradition and innovation can be seen in the farmyard layout (Beaudry 1995). Many of these changes were technological, which naturally caused alterations in the other subsystems of culture. The impetus for some of these innovations, however, was ideological, arising from new philosophies about farming. Whatever the origin of change, it was manifested in the farmstead by the construction of new outbuildings, additions to the farmhouse, new fences, changes in trash disposal methods, adoption of new or different items of material culture, and alterations in the landscape. All of these changes have the potential of becoming part of the archaeological record. As DeCunzo (1996:12) states, “material culture, events, people, and their beliefs and actions have meaning only in their multi-component, cultural, systematic contexts. Moreover, each context incorporates many scales, from minutes to millennia, from the individual to the global. Recovering the past can proceed only from constructing and reconstructing this multitude of contexts.” Only an understanding of regional or local agricultural practices will lead to insights into rural life. For example, Garrison (1996:370) describes the careful husbandry of grain-fed cattle (“fatt cattle”) in Massachusetts’ Connecticut River Valley and the regimented 2:00 p.m. feeding, noting, “The elite cattlemen learned work discipline before the coming of industrial production in the 1820s further reshaped the region’s landscape.” This insight is possible because of the establishment of a detailed contextual background for this valley. With the knowledge of how these farmers lived, researchers can offer more specific and meaningful interpretations of the archaeological record.

Too often, archaeological reports lack the detail necessary to give meaning to the archaeological record. Rather than despairing of the sparse, plow-zone nature of the archaeological remains, we need to reconsider the investigation of nineteenth-century farms, perhaps refocusing our research questions in terms of contextual studies and finding ways to deal with the archaeological record as we encounter it. In examining this issue, three principal questions stand out:

1. What are the research issues pertaining to nineteenth-century farmsteads?
2. How should sites be selected for archaeological investigation?
3. What is the nature of the archaeological evidence and how can it be analyzed?

**WHAT ARE THE RESEARCH ISSUES PERTAINING TO NINETEENTH-CENTURY FARMSTEADS?**

One important and multi-faceted research topic relates to the “myth of self-sufficiency” and the study of the shift from self-sufficiency to dependence on the market economy, from farmers producing food for their own use to cash cropping. Innovations in food technology changed farming practices as new methods of packaging and storing foods, such as canning, became popular (Rotman and Nassaney 1997:58). Closely linked to this change is the effect of newly established transportation networks, since the nineteenth century saw the growth of the canal system, followed shortly thereafter by railways. Transportation is especially important in upstate New York, where many areas remained largely unsettled by Euro-Americans until the opening of the Erie Canal in 1825 and the railroad systems that followed.

Also part of this process is the transformation of cottage industries to larger-scale rural industries, frequently with a concomitant shift in gender. This, in turn, raises the interesting conundrum of women who, having ceded their roles in cottage or home industries (such as dairying) to men, lost status and power with the diminution of their overt economic roles (Rotman and Nassaney 1997:53). Though some women worked for wages in cheese factories (Gibb et al. 1990:19), they no longer controlled the means of production. Yentsch (1991) has analyzed utilitarian redware to examine the shift in dairying from the women’s sphere to a more industrialized, male-oriented production process. Huey (this volume) notes that as cheese production moved from the home to the factory, women sought more active roles in the community. Such changes in women’s roles, as evidenced in the rise of the “cult of domesticity” and the increasing significance placed on motherhood, could have direct archaeological correlates, as house plans and spatial
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organization changed to accommodate these new ideas (McMurry 1997:87-134). The role of women and gender relations on farm sites are topics that are difficult to discern archaeologically, but could be better understood through the establishment of a historical and cultural context.

Other changes in the family are also important, as dynamism is part of the developmental cycle of the domestic group. The focus on the household allows for study of the role of individuals in the “constitution and reproduction of family and family identity” (Beaudry 1995:19), enabling the researcher to use the “active voice” in moving from studying artifacts to studying human agency (Beaudry 1996:477-478). Tenants, lodgers, and children would all increase household size. Children leaving for the city might be replaced in number by tenant workers, but the composition of the household would have been altered significantly. The nature of household life would also be affected by whether those tenants were relatives or neighbors or immigrant laborers. The position of a farm’s occupants on the “agricultural ladder” affected the choices made by the household in terms of farming practices, landscape alterations, and consumption choices (Mascia 1996:149).

Rural life was characterized by a number of different developments, including the progressive farming movement. Agricultural journals proliferated and were widely read, with significant cultural consequences: “Culture, after all, is a series of communicative acts, and differences in the mode of communication are often as important as differences in the mode of production, for they involve developments in the storing, analysis, and creation of human knowledge, as well as the relationships between the individuals involved” (Goody 1977:37). The agricultural journals of the nineteenth century represented a new mode of communication for the rural community, with far-reaching effects. As McMurry noted in her social analysis of nineteenth-century farmhouses, “Within this spreading network—facilitated by innovations in transportation, publishing, and even corrective eyewear—was disseminated all manner of information, from abstract ideas to artifacts. Peddlers and itinerant portrait painters became mediators in this process of transition between the old culture and the new. Country peddlers, for example, contributed to a new ‘social organization of knowledge’ within which rural people gained exposure to ideas and objects that had originated far outside their immediate experience—both physically and psychically” (McMurry 1997:vii–viii). The progressive farming movement had a significant impact on nineteenth-century farmsteads, and the evidence of this impact can be examined archaeologically (Mascia 1996). One important research issue concerns the extent to which the tenets of progressive farming were carried out in reality, as opposed to how many of the movement’s ideals remained on the pages of agricultural journals.

Religious movements may also have influenced nineteenth-century farmsteads. Various rural areas were swept by social and religious movements such as the anti-Masonic revivalism that swept west along the Erie Canal, known as the “Burned-Over District” for the vehemence with which it traveled. In reaction against the revival movements that focused on individual conversion, or “moral suasion,” the 1840s saw movements emphasizing the family unit and the Christian household. These ideas were quickly adopted by housing reformers, who conceived of the house as a church. Housing reform was furthered by the Temperance and Abolition Movements, with their emphasis on the inherent possibilities of “elevating influences” to be found in properly designed houses (Clark 1988:540–541). A farm family known to have been adherents of the Abolition Movement may have arranged their farmstead in particular ways, perhaps demonstrating differences in housing or feeding tenants and laborers from other farms, or even participating in the Underground Railroad. A recent archaeological investigation of a farmstead in Delaware correlated evidence in tax records that assessed the tenant houses as worth more than the main farmhouse to the Methodist practices of the farm family, notwithstanding the fact that the farmer had committed the very un-Methodist act of killing his neighbor (Scholl 1997).

To some extent, farmsteads can be contrasted with urban households, whether “urban farmsteads” (Stewart-Abernathy 1986) or city row houses (Wall 1994). Farm families tended to grow within networks of kinship, while new members of urban households were often unrelated boarders (Ryan 1981:230). However, similarities between urban and
rural lifeways are often overlooked. For example, the notion that farm families did not experience the disjunction between the workplace and the home is contested by McMurry's (1997) detailed analysis of changing farmhouse designs. The mid-1850s saw the beginning of a trend to construct laborers’ quarters that stood apart from the farm family's home, a trend which was also related to the influx of non-kin immigrant tenants. As McMurry comments, “This tendency toward privacy in the progressive farm family was part of a broader trend in nineteenth-century America (especially among the middle classes) toward separating the nuclear family from the work world” (McMurry 1997:107; also see Wall 1994). This movement is linked to the separation of children’s spaces, including nurseries, playrooms, and individual bedrooms, perhaps related to new views about childhood (McMurry 1997:182-183) and the elaboration of motherhood and domesticity.

 HOW SHOULD SITES BE SELECTED FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION? 

Wilson raised many relevant issues in his 1990 article, advocating the creation of a “data package” which would place historic farmsteads in national, regional, and local contexts in order to assess significance and generate archaeological hypotheses (Wilson 1990:24). While he discusses many important points, Wilson concludes that archaeological field investigation should focus on single-occupation farmsteads because of their “analytical clarity” (Wilson 1990:30). Given the realities of the archaeological database and the important relevant research issues, conducting archaeological investigations only on single-occupation farmsteads is not an appropriate methodology. Regarding multi-household occupations, Wilson notes that such sites often include both good and bad features, and require subsurface testing to assess significance (Wilson 1990:30-31).

In a cultural resource management study, there might be a long list of nineteenth-century farmsteads within a given study area, derived from a cursory study of historical maps and documents and perhaps a windshield-type survey. Often a distinction is made between standing structures and map-documented structures, or MDSs. This boundary is artificial in that standing structures are positioned on archaeological sites, a point which seems more obvious after the structure itself is razed. These site types, with both extant and demolished structures, should be considered as a whole. All sites should receive initial subsurface testing to address the presence or absence of archaeological materials. Even sites that seem unpromising can contribute valuable information. For example, the Shaeffer Farm in Armstrong County, Pennsylvania (northeast of Pittsburgh) was not shown on any historic maps (which sounds a cautionary note for the lists of potential sites often relied upon in CRM). It would have been considered a low-probability area in terms of topography, having a 19% slope. As the researchers (Bedell, Petraglia, and Plummer 1994:31) note, “The discovery of this significant site in such an unpromising location underscores the importance of including surface reconnaissance and testing low-probability areas in all survey designs.”

Too often, criteria for investigation reflect wishful thinking rather than reality. In the best of all possible worlds, we could set criteria that would include: the presence of intact, datable features; either a simple single-component site or a well-stratified, multi-component one; examples of different farm types in both function and time period; a complete documentary record; and perhaps even informants for oral histories. The reality, however, is that intact, datable features are very much the exception rather than the rule, and nineteenth-century farms are often contained within the plow zone. Criteria need to be kept loose, and situationally altered. Following initial subsurface testing (Phase I), artifact-bearing sites should proceed to the next phase (Phase II). Absence of features should not prevent further inquiry, as the principal feature of a nineteenth-century farmstead might be an ill-defined one, such as a midden or the remains of some earth-moving or landscaping effort. Sites that exhibit any definable features or any apparent regularity in artifact distribution should be candidates for Phase III work. This archaeological work is, of course, tied to documentary research. Mascia (1996:154) has outlined five document groups for research, in addition to the use of oral histories if available:

1. Primary government and legal documents (vital records, census, tax or probate records, maps)
2. Family or farm documents (diaries, accounts, letters)
3. Newspapers or journals
4. Photographs
5. Secondary documents (agricultural, town, or family histories)

WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE AND HOW CAN IT BE ANALYZED?

It is a fact that the archaeological evidence on nineteenth-century farm sites is often somewhat ephemeral. Artifact analysis is of particular importance because the nature of the evidence is often limited to plow-zone artifact scatters, features and structural remains having been obliterated by development or declared off-limits due to the constraints of CRM project boundaries. When features are not found, analysis and interpretation must rest on broadcast sheet refuse, which often appears to have been subjected to considerable foot traffic and other post-depositional processes. It is important to regard these post-depositional events as processes rather than disturbances, since they can be considered part of the landscaping activities at the site (Beaudry 1986:39). The distribution and composition of middens can be analyzed with computer mapping programs, despite mixing and overlapping of midden areas; King and Miller were able to identify and date three phases of deposition at the seventeenth-to-eighteenth-century van Sweringen site in St. Mary's City, Maryland, allowing for in-depth analysis and interpretation (King and Miller 1987:42).

A frequent goal of analysis in nineteenth-century farmstead archaeology is the determination of status and ethnicity, using artifacts such as ceramics and glass as well as architectural features. Many nineteenth-century farmers were immigrants, and the extent to which they practiced “Old Country” agricultural techniques or maintained such foodways is important is understanding acculturation. While the study of ceramic and table glass artifacts, as well as faunal and floral analyses, provides a window into food preparation and consumption practices in the past, Scott’s detailed study of contemporary cookbooks illustrates the need for more nuanced interpretations: “Simply put, the data from these cookbooks call into question some of our long-held, albeit often tacit, assumptions about the functions of various ceramic and glass vessels we excavate” (Scott 1997:135). Scott found that the same item could have been used for drinking, measuring, or serving foods. Unfashionable or chipped vessels could have been used for food preparation rather than for serving, extending their use life. Undecorated whiteware pieces may have been purchased specifically for kitchen use rather than for any particular affinity for whiteness and its symbolic purity (Stottman 1996) or because of the cultural position of white ceramics in the structural mediation between the natural and the artificial (Deetz 1988:222–224). By the Victorian era, white, mass-produced ceramics were valued for their perfection and sameness, reflecting contemporary cultural mores (personal communication, Lois Feister 1998). Standardized tableware emphasized commonly held values on both urban and rural sites: “As the social meaning of home life and family dinner was rapidly changing, the standardization of these dishes was important, so that their message came through loud and clear” (Wall 1994:147).

Analysis usually includes an assessment of market involvement through examination of imported bottles and butchered bone, and an evaluation of wealth/status by categorizing ceramics according to Miller’s (1991) economic scale. Since ceramics are the most commonly found artifacts, it is tempting to base interpretations on ceramics statistics. It is important to remember, however, that statistical analysis of ceramics may not be the most appropriate means for analyzing status, “for it fails to account for the economic and symbolic use of the landscape as a means of social production and reproduction” (Beaudry 1986:40). Changes on the farm itself, through the addition of outbuildings, the reorganization of farmyard spaces, or other means, often would have taken precedence over the purchase of material possessions such as ceramics (Mascia 1996:155–156).

While the presence of imported pharmaceutical bottles and bone which was butchered off-site suggest some involvement in the market economy, we must consider the bias against discovering self-sufficiency; that is, the material culture correlates of self-sufficiency might be less likely to be recovered archaeologically. For example, a home remedy might have been kept in a ceramic jar which, in the archaeological context, bears no sign of this specialized use. This stands in contrast to a
bottle with a pharmaceutical lip, embossed with the name of a local druggist or a regional or national company.

Too many studies conclude that given the "mixed" nature of the deposits, no further analysis can be undertaken. More intensive and careful analysis of sheet middens would help define activity areas, as demonstrated by King and Miller (1987). Soil chemical analysis has the potential for delineating different areas of the farmyard. Adding to our understanding would be the use of some elements commonly used in prehistoric analysis: characterization of soil types, physiography, and micro-environments. While some of these techniques might be difficult to implement given the limitations commonly imposed by CRM archaeology, an examination of soil surveys or a consultation with a soil specialist is often part of standard Phase II work; a focused effort with these same sources might yield interesting and helpful results.

Getting the information gained from these projects out of the "gray literature" and into the professional community has been problematic. While many archaeologists working in CRM have succeeded in enriching the field with their contributions to professional journals, too few archaeologists follow their example. Writing for professional journals might involve the alteration of an existing CRM report or the specialized study of a particular aspect of the project. Whether the costs for writing an article can become part of the project budget, or whether they must be borne by the CRM firms, is unclear; once the CRM report is written, creating an article based on the report is not necessarily a time-consuming process, and making this information available to the larger archaeological community is essential to the development of the field.

CONCLUSION

Because of the abundance of nineteenth-century farmsteads under archaeological investigation across New York State, it is important to develop methods and techniques for excavating and interpreting them. Too often, these sites prove frustrating because the material evidence consists of broadcast refuse in the plow zone and because site-specific documentary sources are often lacking. By following the lead of other scholars, this research can become more relevant to important research issues, both historical and anthropological. With a close reading of documentary sources, both primary and secondary, and with careful attention to plow-zone scatters, meaningful information can be gleaned from these ubiquitous sites, and interpretations can be created that contribute to and alter our understanding of rural life in the past.
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Chapter 5

Decoding the Message In the Midden: What Can Nineteenth-Century Sheet Refuse Tell Us?

Nina M. Versaggi

Historic domestic sites comprise many complex elements, the most basic of which are structures, below-ground features, and yard refuse. A common element found on these sites is the latter, which frequently accumulates into what is termed sheet midden. Sheet midden mostly describes episodes of secondary refuse resulting from daily discard behavior (Wilson 1994:43-45; Wurst 1997:27-29). However, areas of primary deposition, occurring from discard during specific activities in the yard, are sometimes included under this heading (Bulgrin 1994:75). When archaeological investigations encompass a whole historic house lot, the potential for encountering all three of these basic elements is high. However, not all house lots contain below-ground features, such as privies, wells, and cisterns. Some rural domestic sites had no privies at all, and water was hauled from a creek rather than raised from a well or cistern. Structures may have consisted of foundation-less cabins, or plank buildings with dirt floors. Even when shaft features are present, they do not always contain cultural deposits that are associated with the occupation of the property. However, many historic households disposed of trash on their house lot and sheet middens are common.

These points provide an interesting reality check: for many historic sites, sheet midden, not structural and shaft features, will be the primary evidence encountered from past human activities. This is particularly striking when one considers how many investigations occur within linear project areas (e.g., highway reconstructions, gas pipelines, transmission lines) where only a portion of a house lot is sampled. Because sheet middens are aggregate features, there are conceptual differences in the behaviors that produced them when compared to behaviors contributing to the material culture in vault features and pits. The complex nature of these features requires careful analysis of their integrity and potential before they can be used for research. The purpose of this chapter is to argue that many sheet middens have high analytical potential as information-rich features that are the direct results of human behavior. While rural sites are the subject of much of this chapter, sheet middens are equally important to the interpretation of urban sites. This chapter also outlines ways to address the inherent variation in these features and their research potential. By analytically isolating...
and defining several attributes of sheet middens, researchers can start to assess the behaviors that generated these assemblages and make appropriate links to larger research topics in historical archaeology.

**DOMESTIC REFUSE SCATTERS**

The importance of household refuse was established early in historical archaeology with studies on the cultural formation processes affecting refuse deposits (Schiffer 1977), variations in discard behaviors (Rathje and McCarthy 1977), and classification and pattern recognition of yard refuse (South 1977). However, the interpretive potential of sheet midden deposits often is ignored, and reliance on structural and below-ground features dominates historic analysis. A possible explanation for this lack of perceived potential rests with the fact that methods of analysis and interpretation of artifacts discarded as secondary deposits within house lots have not progressed much beyond the pioneering work of Stanley South (Wilson 1994). There have been numerous critiques and refinements of this early work, most occurring within a framework of the processual/post-processual debate. These critiques and refinements have resulted in useful modifications, alternatives, and cautionary notes about inherent biases in the method (Deetz 1983; Little 1994; Majewski and O'Brien 1987; Orser 1989). However, sheet middens have not been specifically discussed (Wilson 1994). Because of their aggregate formation processes and spatially dispersed nature, it is generally much more difficult to isolate, characterize, and analyze yard deposits than it is to do the same for more defined shaft and pit features.

The fact remains that sheet midden results from intentional behavior related to the disposal of refuse. Within the realm of prehistoric archaeology, artifact scatters are accepted as a source of information on community organization, refuse disposal patterns, technology, and household activities. It is puzzling why historical archaeology attaches less research significance to artifact scatters on historic sites and relies more on structural and shaft features to interpret everyday behavior. While it is clear that structural and refuse features have high data potential in both fields and are major contributors to research questions, they are not the only activities that humans performed to transform a domestic landscape. The behaviors that produce deliberate end products, such as the creation of an above-ground structure or the sinking of a below-ground feature, inform us more about unique events such as land modification and massive disposal but not as much about everyday life. A relatively mundane event, such as daily trash disposal, does not usually receive the same degree of research attention unless it occurred in a discrete shaft or pit. As anthropologically-trained archaeologists, a good part of our research mission is to learn about the everyday aspects of cultures, and sheet midden is an essential part of this. It should not be construed from this argument that sheet middens are more important than structural features. Instead, it is argued that all modifications to a domestic landscape need to be assessed as important analytical components of a behavioral and ideological system. There are research areas where each component makes a unique contribution. Likewise, there are situations when a combination of these data shed the most light on both understanding the unwritten past and enhancing the written record of the past.

However, the question remains: how does one address the variability and interpretive power of these aggregate features? LeeDecker (1994) has extensively discussed discard behavior and how it relates to interpretive contexts in historical archaeology. However, he focuses almost exclusively on shaft features and analytical techniques for the contents of these features. It can be argued that many of the analytical methods he outlines for defining the formation processes, and therefore the analytical potential, of shaft features also can be applied to sheet midden deposits. For instance, the pedological characteristics of the deposits, stratigraphic evidence and sequence of dates, artifact properties, patterns of cross-mends, and a characterization of the quantity and type of artifacts present, are all variables that can be measured, for artifact scatters as well as for shaft features (LeeDecker 1994:356).

Wilson (1994) thoroughly addresses secondary refuse deposits and methods for assessing the variation inherent in these deposits, as well as ways to link the data to contemporary research issues. He
strongly states that “the full potential of refuse deposits has not yet been exploited” and cites others, such as Hayden and Cannon (1983:125) who also support this argument (Wilson 1994:42). Wilson (1994:43–46) offers ways to measure the variation present in “secondary refuse aggregates” such as diversity of artifacts present, location of discard in relation to the house lot, and functional characterizations of the artifacts present in the deposits. He also proposes socio-economic and demographic research topics, such as wealth and status, household size and composition, ethnicity, and displays of status, that can be related to the patterns of variation identified (1994:52–62). Other researchers (Carillo 1977; McCarthy et al. 1996; Ward and McCarthy 1994; Wurst 1991, 1993, 1994) have demonstrated that these concepts can be successfully applied to interpretations of the content of sheet middens. However, before theoretical concepts can be applied and discussed, the variation inherent in sheet middens and their potential for interpretation needs to be defined, using variables that can be measured and evaluated for their research power.

Attributes of Sheet Middens

Studies conducted at the Public Archaeology Facility (PAF) at State University of New York at Binghamton since 1990 have focused on the intrinsic attributes of sheet refuse that contribute to their varying research value. These include, but are not limited to, spatial, temporal, compositional, and contextual. It is clear that these attributes interpenetrate to form a complex matrix of interdependency that requires care in analysis and interpretation. Above all, context is a major differentiating attribute that structures much of the interpretational potential of sheet middens. However, for the sake of clarity, this paper separates and discusses each attribute individually.

Spatial

Spatial attributes such as density and dispersion characterize the physical clustering or spatial evenness of an artifact scatter. Wilson (1994:44) distinguishes between dispersed, low-density artifact scatters that he refers to as “sheet trash,” and localized, high-density deposits termed “secondary refuse aggregates.” PAF uses measures of the number of artifacts per unit of analysis (e.g., shovel test pits or 1 m² excavation unit) to define high-, moderate-, and low-density areas within general sheet midden deposits. Computer mapping programs, such as Surfer and AutoSketch, illustrate these density patterns using isopleth or chloropleth mapping techniques. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) programs, such as ArcInfo and IDRISI, provide another means to visually display and measure density data. These types of physical characteristics are related to disposal history (particularly sanitation practices), function of the secondary refuse, use of space on the house lot, and class, as well as ideology (e.g., class or ethnic perceptions of sanitary hygiene). In addition, spatial attributes have methodological importance and allow investigators to focus on parts of the midden that produce the types of data that can be linked to research questions.

Hays et al. (1995:18–26) show how defining the spatial character of a sheet midden aids in both research on use of space within a house lot and topics relating to status, wealth, and class. Their field investigations of the nineteenth-century Whittemore site in Broome County, New York produced varied sheet middens around a standing house, barn, and privy. A grid of 42 shovel test pits (STPs) spaced 5 meters apart produced over 300 artifacts. Contour (isopleth) mapping identified discrete patterning in the sheet midden. Using functional classes of artifacts (e.g., food-related, food, architectural, etc.) analysts found non-overlapping spatial clusters of food-related artifacts (table/tea wares and food preparation/storage items) and food remains. These patterns suggested a varied use of space on the property for refuse disposal during the early to mid-nineteenth century (Hays et al. 1995:26). Several factors could have contributed to this spatial variation in the use of space for refuse disposal. Hygienic concerns may have forced disposal of food remains far from the dwelling to keep odors and rodents away. Isolated spatial clusters of sheet midden could have related to temporally distinct episodes of disposal associated with the household. And ideological factors could have structured the occupants’ perception of how disposal of “waste” should be conducted. Since the site context showed that the occupants constituted members
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of the social and economic elite in this rural community, the midden assemblage demonstrated the potential to address these spatial factors, as well as suggested research into consumer choice, allocation of resources for the purchase of status objects, and food preferences for the household. The spatial patterning also provided researchers with a way to focus subsequent investigations on those parts of the midden with the highest likelihood to yield quality research data.

Within a linear project area in Ontario County, New York, Hohman and Weiskotten (1996) examined a series of historic sites within an early nineteenth-century frontier community consisting of crossroads hamlets with dispersed farmsteads around them. Using counts of artifact types per unit, they divided the units into high, medium, and low frequencies. Chloropleth maps showed how each sheet midden varied spatially according to its domestic, food, and architectural assemblages. This information allowed an assessment of how refuse disposal differed among the various households in the sample and provided a comparison between the elite pioneer “first settlers” in the hamlets and later settlers who occupied the dispersed farmsteads on the periphery of these settlement clusters.

**Temporal**

Temporal attributes are a critical aspect for evaluating the potential of sheet middens. Since middens accumulate over time as a result of daily disposal of refuse, the potential is present for vertical as well as horizontal differences in deposition. To discern vertical patterning requires a stratigraphically controlled excavation strategy, such as 5 cm levels in unplowed contexts to help determine microstratigraphy and build culturally meaningful layers within the midden. Due to the mostly slow rates of natural soil accretion during the relatively short historic period (100 to 200 years in most areas), defining natural soil horizon breaks is not expected unless deposition has occurred within an actively flooded area (Cremeens 1998; Hohman 1998). However, land modifications on historic house lots have produced culturally redeposited soils, since properties are landscaped and new foundations are dug (Fisher, this volume; Sopko, this volume). Therefore the potential is present for stratified middens as a result of these cultural transformations. Much more likely are horizontal differences marking changes in the location of secondary refuse areas through time.

Horizontal differences in the deposition of sheet refuse at different points in time have been demonstrated at the Porter site in Chenango County, New York (Figure 5.1) (Levandowski and Versaggi 1995; Rafferty 1998, this volume). Documentary evidence showed that the site had been occupied by a single family for at least sixty years (c. 1830–1890). Remote sensing, using ground-penetrating radar along a one-meter grid, failed to produce any cultural anomalies (Rafferty 1998:20). Archaeologists relied on the sheet midden to address the research objectives of the project. Preliminary investigations indicated that the mean manufacturing dates for the ceramic assemblage differed by yard area on the parcel (Levandowski and Versaggi 1995:31–35; Rafferty 1998:6–7, this volume). Later investigations (see Figure 9.3) supported this pattern with the early to mid-nineteenth-century deposits occurring in the front, side, and back yard near the door to the structure, and the late nineteenth- to early twentieth-century deposits occurring deeper into the back yard of the property and in a side yard further removed from the door area (Rafferty 1998:51). This integrity of the temporal variable allowed researchers to conduct household comparisons along the research dimensions of use of space, consumer behavior/household production, and rural social/gender relations (Rafferty 1998:79–84).

Spatial variation in the age of deposits was also used by Bulgrin (1994) in his analysis of the lives of rural women in the nineteenth century. The archaeology of the Dische farmstead in Orange County, New York yielded sheet midden and primary refuse areas near a summer kitchen; mean ceramic manufacturing dates differed between the front and back yards. The resulting patterns showed that before 1820–30, similar levels of discard occurred in both areas of the house lot. After 1830–40, the more sheltered back yard experienced an increase in discard while the front yard declined in usage for activity refuse and trash disposal (Bulgrin 1994:83–89). Bulgrin interprets this patterning as the intentional movement through time of activity areas and associated refuse to less visible
areas of the house lot (1994:94). He ties this temporal variation in the use of space to influences from the ideological “Cult of Domesticity” which discouraged the involvement of women of high moral values in manual labor (Cott 1977; Kraditor 1968; Margolis 1984; Ryan 1981).

Sometimes the presence or absence of sheet refuse during certain time periods and in specific contexts is notable. As Larkin (1988:130) has pointed out, disposal of refuse in sheet mounds was more or less the norm until the first decades of the nineteenth century, when “rural households gradually took up the city and village custom of dumping their refuse in well-defined pits instead of scattering it broadcast.” While accepting this pattern as a “norm” may be an oversimplification of individual choice in disposal patterns, variation in the location of well-defined sheet mounds through time or in similar contexts constitutes a deviation from an expected pattern and can be discussed in different contexts.

For instance, the presence of later sheet mounds can be used to discuss issues of class, as Wurst (1993, 1994) did for the Upper Lisle tannery workers in Broome County, New York. During the middle to late nineteenth century, dense sheet midden blanketed the yard areas of worker housing, while the occupants of the adjacent, contemporaneously-occupied tannery owner’s house disposed of refuse in a large vaulted privy rather than as yard scatter. In a rural community where power and control were evident in many forms, including the placement of the owner’s house on a rise overlooking the worker’s housing, refuse disposal constituted an avenue for exercising resistance to those values. Therefore, at a time when yard refuse should have been minimal, the workers’ house lot produced a dense sheet midden, hence an “unclean, unsightly” yard within view of the owners as well as others within this small hamlet (Wurst 1993, 1994).

An equally interesting example of class differences is from the Binghamton Mall project, an urban investigation in Broome County, New York (Wurst and Versaggi 1993). Within this city block, the elite Mather household, secure in their status and social standing, discarded rich sheet midden in the back of their house lot during the mid-nineteenth century when common views of “moral” behavior dictated a clean, well-cared for property. Around the corner from the Mathers, the contemporary middle-class household occupying the Stower property, possibly striving for social recognition and standing in this neighborhood, concealed trash in pits in their back yard, thus demonstrating their commitment to the moral values of the elite.

In addition to the ideological concepts of emulation and resistance as explanations for refuse disposal patterns, health and hygiene were also important factors affecting yard refuse in the nineteenth century. As Anderson has noted (1993:1-2), health and hygiene became major concerns in urban centers in the late nineteenth century as urbanization and industrialization produced high risks of pollution and disease. By the turn of the century, many municipalities enacted ordinances requiring the regular removal of refuse from urban properties, thus making an impact on the presence of sheet midden in all but the least visible sections of house lots. However, many of the urban poor lived in crowded, multi-family dwellings and the density of refuse generated on these properties was much greater than for middle- and upper-class neighborhoods (McGuire 1991:13). Prior to the organization of municipal garbage collection, most of the urban poor probably could not afford private refuse removal, thereby producing a greater potential for dense yard refuse, pollution, and disease than in other neighborhoods.

While sanitation reform measures gained popularity in crowded urban areas, rural areas experienced a different ideological concern related to health and hygiene. Wurst (1993:193) has shown that there were numerous published examples in the mid-nineteenth century that drew the distinction between “success/cleanliness and failure/slovenliness, both personal and around the farmstead.” The implication is that a clean farm was a successful farm, and thus a tidy yard was both sanitary and a badge of achievement. The presence or absence of dense sheet midden in these regional and temporal contexts provides avenues for interpretation using these ideological and sanitation factors.

Midden Composition
Midden composition has the potential to provide data to address complex research issues in archae-
ology and anthropology. Since middens constitute the everyday trash of households, they harbor data linked to many household consumption and production research issues (LeeDecker 1994; Wurst and Versaggi 1993). Most sheet middens accumulate from primary refuse discarded from specific activities performed on a house lot. Midden content, as well as its location on the lot, enhances interpretations of space organization and modes of household consumption and production (Bulgrin 1994; Rafferty 1998, this volume; Wilson 1994). Various analytical strategies for historic material culture provide a hierarchical system for measuring compositional attributes that can be tailored to the specific data contained in each midden. At the most basic level, middens can be characterized with regard to function, using artifact groupings similar to those proposed by South (1977). A modified version of South’s functional groupings has been used at the Public Archaeology Facility (PAF) to provide a general starting point for classifying historic artifacts and to maintain a baseline of comparability among sites. While South’s system has been critiqued as being gender-biased by encouraging stereotypic and devalued characterizations of women’s activities during the historic period (Spencer-Wood 1996; Wurst 1996), these criticisms result from how the classification is used and interpreted. With relevant contexts, many of these biases are neutralized. PAF uses general categories, such as food-related (Group 1), food (Group 2), architectural (Group 3), hygiene/medicinal (Group 4), and a variety of other categories (Groups 5–11). These groups allow clusters within a midden to be characterized for later focus, analysis, and contextualization. They also permit preliminary interpretations of the richness of the midden (e.g., if several less-common categories are present). Richness can even be characterized and evaluated relative to the sample size of the assemblage using diversity indices and Monte Carlo simulations that control for sample size biases, such as in Kintigh (1992).

If enough artifacts are present in the midden, analysis of the minimum number of vessels in the assemblage is possible. The process of assigning individual ceramic or glass pieces to specific vessels provides a conservative estimate of the minimum number of individual vessels that exist within the midden. The process is conservative because it potentially underestimates the true number of vessels, since several sherds with the same characteristics are lumped under one vessel number, where they could have represented many more vessels but lack the defining characteristics to make that assignment. Once a vessel inventory is derived for a midden, a more accurate assessment of the temporal span of the deposition is possible and potential components can be separated.

Other strategies for analyzing the composition of a midden can include an inventory of decoration diversity, assignment of vessels to types (e.g., tableware, teaware, food preparation/storage, and others as appropriate), and forms (e.g., plate, cup, saucer, teacup, teapot, pitcher, etc.). The application of Miller’s Common Creamware (CC) baseline indices (Miller 1980, 1991) to vessel types and forms is a logical next step in such an analysis, although some researchers caution about the limited applicability of these indices (Brighton 1996; Klein and LeeDecker 1991; LeeDecker et al. 1987; Levin 1985; Wurst 1996). These researchers show that the price of nineteenth-century ceramics may not be that strongly linked to how consumers selected the products they bought. Availability, access to goods, household composition and goals, and class/status strongly influenced ceramic purchases, and the researchers argue that indices alone are insufficient to characterize all of the social complexities that influenced and determined the purchase of durable goods. These cautions are important reminders that a variety of other concepts affect the interpretation of sheet midden composition. With this in mind, a compositional enumeration allows linkages with research topics that address consumer choice, household production and consumption, class, and status within the social history and economic paradigms of historical archaeology (Spencer-Wood 1984, 1987; Wall 1991, 1994).

For example, Wurst identified and interpreted class differences within one urban property during the Binghamton Mall project described above (Wurst and Versaggi 1993). Sheet midden that accumulated in the back yard of the Mather house showed distinctive spatial variation in composition. Historic maps indicated that a secondary building, probably a stable or carriage house, existed behind the main Mather residence. Since this secondary building was assigned an address, it
likely housed servants in second-story rooms. Excavations revealed differences between the composition of the concentrated organic midden associated with this secondary building and the general yard midden (Wurst and Versaggi 1993:182–189). For instance, the stable midden contained ceramic vessels that were mostly plain; the general yard midden produced numerous vessels, most of which (80%) were highly decorated. The general midden yielded very few vessels used in food preparation and storage, while 30% of the stable midden vessels were assigned this function. The general midden contained a diverse array of faunal remains including beef, pig, lamb, and some chicken; the stable midden had mostly chicken remains, more than three times of what was represented in the rest of the yard. The stable midden also yielded 92% of all the liquor bottles on the entire city block investigated, as well as the largest concentration of smoking pipes and stems clustered around the stable. Wurst interpreted these differences along class lines: the stable midden represented the “household” refuse of the serving classes on the Mather property. Living quarters separate from the main house allowed the owners more privacy and less visibility of serving-class activities than would be if servants lived in the main house. The general midden also reflected not only the status of the Mathers but also their household composition. In the mid-nineteenth century, the Mather family included several daughters of marriageable age. Within the elite classes of early Binghamton, as well as in other urban centers (Wall 1991, 1994), socializing and displays of status were acceptable means of “viewing” potential marriage partners, and this ideology is reflected in the highly decorated teawares and tablewares present in the midden.

Context

There are at least two major dimensions to assessing the attribute of context. The first is site-specific, and the second is comparative (inter-site). When defining the site-specific context, a combination of documentary research, location, and compositional attributes produces the characterization. At a fundamental level, contexts can include urban and rural, residential and industrial, landowner and tenant, as well as population clusters such as crossroads hamlets and dispersed farmsteads. Cross-cutting these contexts are more complex contextual dimensions, such as class, ethnicity, race, and status. Expectations must be tailored to each site-specific context. For instance, one would not expect the domestic assemblage for farmsteads to be the same as for urban house lots. Likewise, one cannot expect that all farm contexts will be identical. Such an assumption ignores the fact that the countryside was a rich mosaic of landholders and tenants, widows and single-gender households, artisans and laborers, and wealthy and middle-class farmers (Rafferty 1998; Wurst 1995). Add to that mosaic the presence of rural industrialists who resided in the country but who may or may not have farmed (Wurst 1993), and the result is a multitude of expectations for the composition and research potential of sheet refuse.

To assume that all sheet middens can be interpreted as identical requires the added assumption that the people who created them were also identical. Since archaeologists know that this is a false assumption, acknowledging the variation and addressing it can provide significant avenues for research. This rich mosaic translates into productive opportunities to model dimensions of human variability and decision-making. Issues of class, gender, consumer preferences, and individual or household ideology are reflected in the material culture deposited as everyday refuse on a domestic site. Thus, as shown previously, even the absence of sheet middens in some contexts can be important evidence not only for different household approaches to sanitation and hygiene, but also ideological factors related to context.

Comparative contexts are essential for interpreting a specific sheet midden. In an ideal research situation, having an extensive database on sheet middens from numerous tenant farms, middle-class farmsteads, or urban elite house lots provides variables to compare against each new site. A large sample of sites with a similar context yields a baseline characterization of the artifacts from that sample as well as cases that deviate from the norm. As in all statistical analyses, sometimes the deviations are more informative than the average cases, and searching for the explanations for these outliers can yield innovative and unique interpretations of the behaviors that created those sites. However, without a comparative database, interpretation is limited to a single site or a group of sites that may not share the same context. The opportunity for sampling biases is great in these situations—it can-
not be determined with confidence if the case being studied is average or unique. Lack of a comparative context does not mean that interpretations of single sites have limited utility; many of the examples presented previously demonstrate that this is not the case. Rather, interpretations from a single site applied to a wider class of sites would benefit the most from comparative samples. Creating these comparative contexts has been an ongoing process and it will take time to assemble an adequate sample of various site contexts for reliable assessment. Researchers can strive to create these comparative databases and share them widely.

Recent research at the Ramsay site (Figure 5.1), conducted by the Public Archaeology Facility at Binghamton University provides a case study outlining the process we use to define the attributes of sheet refuse. This example also offers a comparative database against which to compare other sites with sheet midden. The comparative database includes examples from mixed contexts (e.g., urban, rural, middle class, upper class, landowner, farm laborer), but offers a starting point for collecting the types of comparative information that assist in interpretation.

**THE RAMSAY SITE MIDDEN**

In 1997, a PAF Phase I reconnaissance survey (Kastl and Ravage 1997), performed as part of the statewide highway contract with the New York State Education Department, identified an intriguing sheet midden in Dutchess County, New York (Figure 5.2). A dense artifact scatter was found within a narrow project area at the base of a slope leading up to a vernacular, federal-era house. Fifteen round shovel test pits (STPs) produced 181 artifacts (twelve per STP) within a 300 m² area. Most of the artifacts were food-related ceramics, of which 30% were diagnostic. In addition, varying diagnostics within STP levels suggested the potential for temporal stratification of the midden. A subsequent Phase II site examination (Kastl et al. 1997) placed eleven, 1 x 1 m units across the site (Figure 5.3). These excavations produced over 3,000 artifacts, the majority of which were ceramics and glass. The results mirrored and enhanced the potential found during reconnaissance. Using the attributes described above, researchers assessed the data/research potential of the Ramsay midden in relation to the National Register criteria for eligibility. The following discussion of the Ramsay midden outlines the process PAF uses for evaluating the research potential of sheet middens.

**Midden Evaluation**

Analysis of the spatial variability of the sheet midden indicated that the deposits did not represent one uniform cluster of artifacts on the site. Rather, there was a general east-west division, representing at least two major artifact clusters associated with different temporal episodes of deposition. A subsequent geomorphological assessment (Cremeens 1998) provided a plausible explanation for these temporal and spatial differences. Analysis showed that a combination of landscaping and filling of a small water channel contributed to the differences in the temporal range of the artifacts, both vertically and horizontally across the site. Earlier deposition (pre-1830) occurred within the dry channel that was later filled. Deposition that post-dated this fill clustered on the top of the filled-in feature and on the channel's bank.

Documentary research showed that the house was built sometime between 1790 and 1800 by Jacob and Rebeckah Overacker. Jacob died in 1814; his widow remained in the house with her unmarried children until her death in 1853. At this time, her daughter Peggy and married son Martin retained ownership of the house until Peggy's death in 1866. Martin was the sole owner until 1880, when the property passed to Martin's daughter and her husband. Almost 70% of the manufacture end dates for vessels occur before 1850. Fifteen percent of the datable vessels had manufacture end dates prior to 1795. It is likely that these goods were brought to the newly built house by the first female head of household, Rebeckah. Therefore the temporal attribute, as measured by the documentary record of household succession and by the chronology from diagnostic vessels, suggests that most of the midden assemblage is associated with Rebeckah Overacker's household prior to 1853 (Kastl et al. 1997).

For the Ramsay site, there is incredible stability in the female heads of household, with the same family lineage of women residing in the household for most of its history. In this case, stability is reflected in the gradual accumulation of...
broken and discarded items into the sheet midden over a c. fifty-year period. At Ramsay, the sheet refuse had great potential to inform researchers about the succession of females in the household, as well as about their choices and allocation of household resources to the purchase of durable goods. In fact, the curated items (those with end dates prior to 1795) probably constituted the dowry pieces from Rebeckah. Wheeler (1996) studied the contribution of female lineages to household refuse. While Wheeler's research used shaft features with major cleaning episodes to illustrate her points, her ideas can be applied more generally to the accumulation of refuse in sheet middens. Wheeler proposed that with the formation of new households or with the changing of the female head of household, there is a corresponding increase in massive cleaning and removal of items associated with the departing group. Important to this discussion is the point that women bring dowry items, mostly durable movable pieces, into their new households. When they leave these households, or during regular use and discard, their dowry items find their way into middens along with everyday refuse, or into shaft features if a massive cleaning occurs.

This argument is interesting in light of the fact that very few of the artifacts in the midden are associated with the later periods of occupation (post-1850). This suggests some form of shift in the behaviors associated with refuse disposal. One
explanation may include a change in the attitudes towards sanitation on the house lot, with disposal occurring in less-visible areas of the property, such as privies or trash pits. With the death of the family's matriarch for more than fifty years, Martin's wife, and not his sister Peggy (who resided with Rebeckah) could have become the female head of household in 1853. A different set of beliefs regarding sanitation on the house lot might be attributed to this shift in household decision-making. Alternatively, the midden may have accumulated from massive cleaning after Rebeckah's death. While it is likely that Rebeckah's material goods passed to her daughter, Peggy only lived another thirteen years. A massive disposal of these "curated" pieces could have occurred anytime during or after this period.

Midden evaluation continued, using functional, vessel, and faunal analyses. Using a modification of South's methodology for characterizing site function, the Ramsay artifacts were attributed to functional groups to allow a general categorization of the midden and a starting point for subsequent analysis. As is shown in Table 5.1, 21% of the midden artifacts were assigned to the food-related group (Group 1), while 28% were food
remains (Group 2). Only 11% of the assemblage was architectural in nature (Group 3). Analysts assigned 35% of the midden artifacts to Group 0, which means no obvious function could be discerned. A breakdown of this category showed that 81% of this group was ceramics, most of which could have had a food-related function but were too small to make this differentiation. Therefore, the midden was characterized as having the kinds of artifacts associated with high research potential, such as those that can be linked to social and economic research questions.

The Ramsay artifacts were then divided into individual vessels. This process found that the site included fragments from a minimum of 219 individual ceramic and glass vessels. The vessels were assigned to functional types to refine the midden characterization. Researchers could assign 153 of the 219 vessels (70%) to types. Tablewares and teawares accounted for 42% of the vessel assemblage; food preparation/storage accounted for another 18%, and bottle glass accounted for 10%. The tablewares and teawares were mostly decorated—well over half of the ceramics had some form of decoration. This indicated a midden characterized by the types of decorated tablewares and teawares that could be either analyzed for relative cost using Miller’s indices or interpreted along the lines of class and status.

Vessel form was also identified for the ceramic assemblage, although form information is generally limited for the small fragments generally found in sheet refuse deposits. For the Ramsay site, only a small percentage of vessels could be typed by form. Only six forms are represented: plate, teacup, teapot, mug, footed bowl, and spittoon. Among the curated pieces were also common forms, mostly plates, mugs, and some bowls. The effects of trampling and the elements may also limit the identification of unusual or unique vessel types. It is possible that a higher sampling fraction would have increased this assemblage of vessel forms. It has long been accepted in prehistoric archaeology that the larger the total number of artifacts, the greater the chances of finding more artifact types and increasing diversity (Kintigh 1982). Increased sampling of a site will undoubtedly increase the total number of artifacts. However, will that increase the number of forms? The question that always remains is, how much sampling is enough to obtain a representative sample of the site and its defining attributes? This has been approached by McManamon (1981, 1994) and Knapp (1997) for prehistoric sites, but has not been attempted for midden deposits on historic sites. At present, we must assume that the sampling percentage at Ramsay was sufficient for obtaining a representative sample of vessel forms, and that the

### Table 5.1. The Ramsay Midden Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute: Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatial: Site Size (m²)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m² Excavated</td>
<td>11 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Artifacts</td>
<td>3024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts per m² Exc.</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal: Years Occupied</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composition:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified (Group 0)</td>
<td>35%a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-Related (Group 1)</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food (Group 2)</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural (Group 3)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Groups 4–11)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Ceramic Vessels</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Glass Vessels</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels/Years Occupied</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Vessel Types</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Prep/Storage</td>
<td>18%b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table/Teawares</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Vessel Forms</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels w/form</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Faunal</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal per m² Exc.</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a percent of total artifacts (3,024)
b percent of total vessels (219)
low number of vessels that could be assigned a form is attributable to cultural and natural factors. However, the issue of adequate sampling in historical archaeology begs for further consideration beyond this paper.

Deriving relative value for vessels in an assemblage is somewhat dependent on vessel form, if Miller's indices are used (Miller 1980, 1991). However, as Wurst (1993) has shown for the Mather site, Hohman (1997) for the Carpenter site, and Rafferty (1998, this volume) for the Porter site, there are also ways to derive relative value for those assemblages lacking a large number of forms, using the relative cost of decorative types in the assessment. As mentioned previously, these indices should be used with caution, since there are variables other than cost, (such as class and status) that influence the presence of durable goods in a household.

The Ramsay midden also produced a rich faunal assemblage consisting of 179 pieces of bone, of which 60% could be identified with regard to species. Five species were represented, and butchering marks were evident on some pieces. They included cow, pig, sheep/goat, deer, and chicken. The rest were either general mammal, Artiodactyl, or unidentifiable. Pig remains accounted for 26% of the faunal assemblage, and cow accounted for 17%.

A contextual evaluation of the Ramsay site showed that the land was part of an early farmstead established within the Beekman Patent (1697). The owners of this land grant, the Beekman, Pawling, and Livingston families, mostly leased their land to tenant farmers. The remainder of the land was sold to individuals as large farm lots; the Ramsay parcel was one of these. By 1785, the lands surrounding the site resembled a patchwork of tenancies and owner-occupied farms (Kastl et al. 1997:6). It was within this diverse setting that the Overackers bought land and built a house between 1790 and 1800. The site represents a successful mid-sized farm (c. 160 acres), occupied by a pioneer family, who became prominent in the agricultural history of the town and local affairs. The farm was always peripheral to hamlets and major population centers; however, an early road system connected this hinterland to the emerging city of Poughkeepsie and to the Hudson River.

Comparative Contexts
PAF has been assembling contexts from in-house files against which sites such as Ramsay can be compared. These examples include many of the cases discussed previously in the "Attributes of Sheet Middens" section. They include the Porter site (Rafferty 1999, this volume), the Mather and Stower sites (Wurst and Versaggi 1993), and the Keith site, a small holding in Chenango County, New York occupied by a family of lower-class farmers who sold their labor to other farms (O'Donovan and Weiskotten 1999). All of these represent Phase III data recoveries, while the Ramsay data presented here is from a site examination. Because of this difference in level of investigation, archaeologists excavated fewer units at Ramsay than at the data recovery sites (an average of 39.5 m² for the data recoveries, versus 11 m² for Ramsay). While it is recognized that this difference in sampling could significantly bias the results of the comparison, it actually highlights the richness of the Ramsay midden, which produced as much or more diversity than the rest of the comparative cases.

A numerical summary of midden attributes is presented in Table 5.2. While such a statistical characterization of the attributes discussed cannot tell the whole story of each site, the data provide some interesting points for comparison and interpretation. Different types of comparisons are possible. For instance, the rural sites can be compared: two were occupied by individuals who owned their land, and one was occupied by poor farmers who sold their labor to others. The figures for artifacts per m² show that Ramsay and Porter have similar densities of artifacts in the midden different than the small farm at Keith. This could mean that different attitudes towards refuse disposal created this difference, or that the lower-class farmers did not have the same amount of disposable income to invest in durable goods. This latter explanation seems plausible, since the numbers for Keith are almost identical to those for the urban tenants at Stower.

All three rural sites have comparable numbers of vessels in their midden assemblages. However, when the number of vessels is standardized to neutralize the varying sample sizes by using the number of vessels per m², a very different pattern emerges. The Ramsay site assemblage far outnumbers the other rural sites, as well as all the other sites in the comparative sample. This could be interpreted in a variety of ways. For instance, the Ramsay site is earlier than the other sites in the
Table 5.2. Numerical Attributes from Comparative Midden Contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatial: Site Size (m²)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m² Excavated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(% of Site)</td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Artifacts</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td>10,903</td>
<td>12,108</td>
<td>4,457</td>
<td>7,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts per m² Excavated</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal: Years Occupied</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition: % Food-Related</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Food</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Architectural</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Vessels</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels per m² Excavated</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels/Years Occupied</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Vessel Types</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Food Prep/Storage</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Table/Teawares</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Vessel Forms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Vessels w/Form</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Faunal</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal per m² Excavated</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context:</td>
<td>rural landowner elite</td>
<td>rural landowner middle cl.</td>
<td>urban landowner elite</td>
<td>urban renter middle cl.</td>
<td>rural lower cl. farm labor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sample (as early as 1800 versus 1830–50 for the other sites). However, one would expect a reverse pattern to result, since a variety of new vessel types and decorations became available with the transfer-printed whitewares around 1830. Also, Ramsay is somewhat remote from population centers, and functioned at a time period when the transport of durable goods was still a challenge for those living in the “country.” However, it was noted earlier that the changes in female heads of household could have resulted in a massive cleaning of “old” goods, which could have made their way into the midden.
In light of the very high number of vessels per excavated area for Ramsay, this explanation seems more plausible. Again, a caution is in order: the small size of the comparative sample allows opportunities for sampling bias. It is possible that Ramsay is the norm and the others are the outliers in a larger population of test cases. For now, it appears that a distinctive deviation from the norm is evident in this compositional variable; this may be related to a unique situation in this particular household. This one variable also influences many of the remaining compositional attributes that relate to vessels (e.g., number of vessel types, forms, and the percentage of vessels with identifiable forms).

The faunal category provides another avenue for comparison. While the number of faunal remains contained in the Ramsay midden compares favorably with the number from Keith but is much less than Porter, the data standardized for excavated area show a different pattern. Ramsay far outpaces the other two rural examples. While the Ramsay figures are very close to those of the other elite property owner, they are much lower than the middle-class renters on the Stower property. There could be cultural as well as natural factors operating in these examples. Since the Stower refuse was deposited in trash pits, fragile bone would be subject to less trampling and scavenging than in general yard scatters. This would have encouraged better preservation, thus producing a higher recovery rate than for the general yard middens. While it is possible that the Stower occupants could have been buying more meat and poultry than the rest of the households in the sample, this would require a closer look at the inventory of fauna in the assemblage. Over 60% of the Stower assemblage consisted of cow. This far outpaces the figure for Mather (46%) and Ramsay (31%). For whatever reason, cow comprised a dominant component of the diet for the renters at Stower.

Table 5.2 suggests a few observations among sites using the other classifications under context as well. A comparison of Porter (middle-class landowning farmers) with Keith (lower-class farm laborers), both in the same town and county, shows some stark differences clearly related to the class of these households. Not only does density differ significantly, but food-related and food remains are much lower at the tenant farm. While the number of vessels is relatively the same, there are fewer types and forms at Keith, suggesting a more diverse assemblage of wares for the middle-class household. This is an expected result for a farm laborer-landowner comparison. By adding more sites to comparative tables, the opportunities for observing and interpreting patterns is greatly enhanced.

**Conclusions**

This discussion shows that there are indeed “messages in the midden,” although questions still remain. Decoding these messages is an ongoing process of data collection, assessment, and evaluation. For instance, sampling levels for sheet middens are a major concern. Are we sampling these artifact scatters sufficiently to derive a representative sample of the artifacts present? What types of spatial sampling (random, uniform, judgmental) are the most efficient and effective ways of deriving the targeted data from each midden? Can we more explicitly construct midden “types” that should be sampled with different techniques? At what point is there sufficient potential present to justify the time needed to decode the “message in the midden?” What other attributes and variables should we be evaluating? It appears from the comparative interpretations presented above that there are multiple levels to each comparison, depending on the contextual attributes for each site. It is also clear that regional and temporal factors influence the composition of each midden, since access to goods and availability of new products can differ significantly by region and through time. These influences can be teased out of the documentary and artifact data to assist in the formulation of regional models that use transportation and market networks of the nineteenth century.

One thing is certain: in sheet refuse there is both intriguing diversity and uniformity that can yield important data for interpreting behavior. Continuing to build comparative contexts for sheet middens is a necessity. As we build these contexts and link the data to research questions, models will emerge that will help interpret both the midden and the message.
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Chapter 6
ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE RURAL LANDSCAPE
Charles L. Fisher

The nineteenth century was marked by rapid population growth, social mobility, urbanization, industrialization, and numerous social reform movements. The focus of research on urbanization as a source of the dynamics of this process has created a false image of a static rural society. Many of our contemporary notions of rural life as traditional, moral, egalitarian, and self-sufficient maintain the illusion. The rural transformation to agricultural capitalism in the nineteenth century changed the way of life for the majority of the population, since early America was a rural society in which only one in twenty people lived in communities with a population over 2,500 in 1790 (Larkin 1988).

The archaeological documentation of landscape alterations at rural sites has provided new material evidence of the change in social relations that occurred during this period. While the general outline of this transformation is known, many of the details of this process and its effect on individuals and communities in different locations remain unknown. Although the analysis of historical records has provided a great deal of the information presented in the following examples, archaeological research was critical to the new interpretation of existing documents. Archaeological investigations provided chronological controls on events, discovered new material evidence, and focused research on specific problems.

Landscape as an Artifact

Archaeologists consider artifacts to be more than just material objects—they embody the social conditions under which they were made (Marx 1967:180). Material objects are made to do something; at the same time, material things are expressions of human ideas. Once created, material culture and the ideas about it become part of the structure of social relations. The cultural landscape is a material object that provides and organizes the social space in which individuals and groups interact.

In this way, landscapes of domestic sites of the nineteenth century may be considered as products of the existing social structure and political ideology. Landscapes were constructed to be seen and to communicate ideas about the social world. Through the organization of social space and the communication of ideas about social relationships, they were the means by which social divisions were sustained, reproduced, and modified. For example, Shackel and Little (1994:98) have noted that

Figure 6.1. Location of John Ellison’s House.
landscape studies have become an increasingly important focus of attention in historical archaeology. Since the 1980s, archaeologists have realized that landscape is very much an artifact. The landscape features serve as more than ornaments attached to the great houses...; they are also expressions of Baroque and Renaissance ideals, expressions of emulation, assertions of power over the natural environment, and sometimes vehicles used to display control and reinforce hierarchy.

In contrast, just over ten years ago an archaeologist complained that "there has been little concern for recording information about the space that surrounds the remains of buildings and comprises part of the house lot or farmstead (e.g., yards, fields, and pastures). In general, this space has been treated as a backdrop rather than as an artifact" (Rubertone 1986:127).

Although landscape studies in archaeology developed from the desire to reconstruct and interpret the grounds surrounding the historic homes of the rich and powerful, archaeologists have been interested in the interpretation of the broader cultural landscape, including the homes and workplaces of people not included among the elite.

**THE AGE OF REVOLUTION**

Historians, sociologists, and anthropologists have referred to the social and economic changes of the nineteenth century as the "Industrial Revolution," "Modernization," "The Age of Reform," "The Age of Improvement," and the "Great Transformation." All of these terms refer to the results of the emergence of the industrial-capitalist market economy. Since the late 1970s, scholarship in this area has focused on rural American society, following Marx's belief that the basis of the transformation to capitalism depended on the destruction of agrarian peasants and the creation of a free labor force (Wood 1994:44). Increased agricultural production was necessary for capitalist market expansion since it allowed more people to enter the factory labor pool and provided a home market for manufactured goods. From this perspective, the transition from feudalism to capitalism occurred in the countryside.

The historical research on this topic may be summarized in terms of two schools of thought about the nature of early American communities. A group of liberal historians has described early New England society as capitalist from the initial settlement. The original inhabitants have been described by these historians as eager to acquire land, participate in markets, and make money (Hartz 1955; Leamon 1972; Rothenberg 1981). Another group of anthropologically oriented historians has described early New England communities as pre-modern, pre-capitalist, and peasant-like (Clark 1988; Henretta 1978; Merrill 1977). From this perspective, it was not the lack of markets that limited agricultural productivity but the lack of interest in participation in marketing. Production was primarily for family and local consumption, or for use rather than for profit (Bruegel 1996). This does not exclude market participation or imply self-sufficiency as Bushman (1998) has recently explained.

An analysis of price convergence, farm wages, and agricultural productivity by Winifred Rothenberg (1992) has demonstrated a more efficient use and organization of farm labor in the post-Revolutionary War period. At least one of the leading historians of the anthropological approach appears to agree with these results, that a "...new system of economic behavior, values, and institutions occurred at the beginning of the nineteenth century" (Henretta in Wood 1994:48). The similarity of prices and wages over larger regions during this period, however, does not tell us who was actually involved in the buying and selling. The variations of participation in, and rejection of, this new economy remains a subject of research.

The transformation to this new system of behavior, values, and institutions led Emerson to refer to the period from 1800 to 1860 as the "Age of Revolution," despite the passing of almost twenty years since the end of the Revolutionary War (Gross 1988). During this period farmers stopped producing their own food, tools, and clothing and instead provided specialized products for urban markets, which resulted in new social arrangements of agricultural capitalism.

During the period of transition, farmers and their families straddled two worlds: that of almost self-sufficient, or independent, household producers, and that of producers and consumers for urban markets, or market producers (Bushman 1998; Gross 1988). These roles involved different social
relations which occurred at the same time during this period of change. Paid labor became more important and shared labor was reduced during this period. Spatial arrangements for working and living changed along with the social relations of production.

**ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE TRANSITION**

Archaeological evidence of the cultural change that occurred may be observed at specific sites in the spatial characteristics of developing capitalism. Variation among sites may be expected, since American culture was never homogeneous. We cannot assume that everyone accepted this change, or that some aspects were absent in traditions that resisted this change.

This transformation may be observed in several ways. Archaeologists and historians have investigated the spread of specific architectural styles and mass-produced goods (Larkin 1988; Miller et al. 1992; Riordon and Adams 1985), the separation of home and work (Wall 1994), the increased specialization and commercialization of activities and their associated location (Hubka 1984; McMurry 1988), and the standardization of behavior (Beaudry and Mrozowski 1989; Shackel 1996). These issues may be explored within the context of the historic landscape.

The reform of the domestic landscape during the nineteenth century was a part of the larger transformation. Colonial households were centers of production, and the surrounding yards reflected their use as a workplace. Ground surfaces adjacent to homes were largely devoid of vegetation from human and animal traffic and were cluttered with trash. An Englishman traveling in Long Island in 1818 referred to the “out-of-door slovenliness bits of wood, timber, boards, chips, lying about, here and there, and pigs tramping about in a sort of confusion” (Corbett in Larkin 1988:127, 128). In 1830, John Fowler remarked that “to the English taste there is a great want of neatness observable” in respect to the farmhouses of the Hudson Valley (Fowler 1982:41).

Archaeological evidence, in the form of plow scars, indicates that fields frequently began right at the farmhouse doorstep. The proximity of houses to roads prevented the creation of yards that later separated the private home from the public road. Trash was discarded from doors or windows onto the surface without concern for the yard’s appearance, but to the advantage of the dogs, chickens, and pigs. The absence of sanitary waste disposal practices indicates that health problems were common. The lack of archaeological documentation of privies prior to the 1840s outside of urban areas, public buildings, and the estates of wealthy landowners reveals a lack of concern for both waste removal and privacy among the majority of Americans.

The creation and construction of enclosed front yards marks a different conception of the home and its surroundings. A farm journal in 1829 recommended that “In front of the house there should be sufficient room for a convenient yard, which should be made perfectly level and smooth, and enclosed with a suitable fence” (Hubka 1984:73). The landscape improvements advocated by farm journals in the early nineteenth century involved a change in aesthetics from a utilitarian to a more decorative yard (Bullion 1988; Hubka 1984). J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur described his rural neighborhood in the late eighteenth century as “very deficient in gardens, for we have neither taste nor time” (Stone 1986:314). According to Jenkins, “before the Civil War very few Americans had lawns ... Around the buildings there [was] beaten dirt rather than grass” (1994:2). Front lawns were the subject of foreign visitors’ remarks around “the mid-nineteenth century as a strange element in the American landscape” (Jenkins 1994:3). These new ideas involved the imposition of order, neatness, economy, standardization of behavior, and separation of the public and private spheres of life. The acceptance of this new domestic landscape correlates with the increased reliance on commercial exchange, while those engaged in traditional household production appear to have resisted the new landscape.

The new concept of property relations resulted in the different treatment of animals in rural areas. The “free-ranging” of animals in the Colonial period, which was a consistent source of conflict among neighbors, was replaced by the fencing-in of livestock. People were no longer required to construct protective fences for their gardens and crops, but rather contain livestock within fenced areas (Jackson 1969).
John Ellison's House

The transition to the new domestic landscape was not a smooth change, but rather one of enormous social tension and conflict. In the first decade of the nineteenth century, John Ellison was the subject of a controversy that is revealed in a letter written to support turnpike legislation (Nicoll 1806). John Nicoll, one of the directors of the New Windsor and Blooming Grove Turnpike, wrote to his Assemblyman, Robert Burnet, in support of changes in a bill before the New York state legislature. The letter refers to a petition submitted by the stockholders of the New Windsor & Blooming Grove Turnpike that requested action on a proposed bill to end "the breaching of roads round the [toll houses] for instance John Ellison has caused a road round the gate near his house." Vandals were damaging the new turnpike, "breaking Mile Stones, digging up the road, tearing up the Bridges." and Ellison's "tools are so active that it is almost impossible to keep a plank on the Bridge near his house."

John Ellison was not a community trouble-maker or social outcast, but one of the leading citizens of the town of New Windsor in the years prior to the Revolutionary War. He inhabited the elegant stone Georgian house that was quarters for several Continental Army officers during the war (Figures 6.1 and 6.2). Ironically, he was frequently elected Supervisor of Roads for the town in the years before the Revolutionary War (Ruttenber 1911). The Goshen Road was built in reference to Ellison's father's "newly" constructed flour mill in 1741, and his house was constructed adjacent to this road "near his mill" in 1754 (Gibbons 1977; Lear 1983; Schneider 1972).

Ellison's house was similar to many other large houses constructed in the Hudson Valley during the middle of the eighteenth century. As a result of the enormous profits obtained through the wheat trade, their kin-based merchant enterprise consisted of family-operated farms, mills, stores, and sloops, as well as wharves on both the Hudson River and the Great Dock at New York City.
Thomas Ellison contracted with William Bull in 1754 to build "a stone house of forty-four feet long and thirty-five feet wide two stories high above the cellars" (Gibbons 1977:3). The construction of this house announced Ellison's expectations of political, economic, and social leadership in the community.

By 1798, a number of buildings were recorded in the vicinity of Ellison's house and mill in preparation for the proposed Federal Property Tax, which did not become law. These buildings included a cooper's shop, a grain house, storehouse, cider mill, stable, smoke house, fowl house, barns, hay house, and a new house used for public worship. The separation and specialization of activities in specific places across the landscape is reflected in this list of buildings (Anonymous 1798).

**Archaeological Survey**

Archaeological excavations were conducted to evaluate the house and mill, the power system for the mill, and to locate evidence of the colonial road in front of the house. In contrast to historical documentation, the archaeological record indicated that substantial alterations to the mill were made at the end of the eighteenth century, along with the construction of a new dam and underground raceway (Figure 6.3). An important result of these excavations was discovery of a number of alterations to the domestic landscape.

Test excavations around the house revealed that the ground surface was extensively modified in the early nineteenth century. Of twenty-three excavation units placed around the house, eighteenth-century ground surfaces remained in only three units (Moody n.d.). The majority of these tests showed a soil layer with both eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century artifacts, along with some prehistoric objects, as the deepest cultural deposit resting upon the natural soils (Figure 6.4). Usually archaeologists will consider this a mixed context of little archaeological research potential. In this case, however, the mixed stratum was interpreted as an artifact that resulted from domestic yard reform.

The creation of cleared lawns at Ellison's house involved both the front and back yards by the mid-nineteenth century. This was necessary due to the construction of the house adjacent to the colonial road on the south side and the later construction of the disputed turnpike to the north of the house. By 1857, an illustration in Wilson's Newburgh Gazette showed the house from the turnpike (Figure 6.5). Although this was the rear of the house, there was a cleared lawn-like appearance, probably grazed down by fenced-in domestic animals. The town of New Windsor passed a fence law in 1794 which required fences four feet high to keep animals inside. The extensive work areas were identified archaeologically. These included barns and sheds which were present to the east, visible in the 1850 drawing of the site by Lossing (1855), and another complex of nineteenth-century service structures located to the south in the vicinity of the mill (Figure 6.6).

Excavations in the colonial road on the south side of the house provided additional evidence of the impact of domestic yard reform (Fisher 1990). The eighteenth-century house apparently was considered too close to the road by later occupants, and an attempt was made to formalize the boundary between the public road and private yard. The initial cobbled, dirt road was covered with various layers of gravel and coal clinkers. A stone edging was located along the north side of the road directly in front of the house, creating a level, raised yard clearly distinct from the graveled road.

By the second half of the nineteenth century, large yard trees and grass lawns were present and the road took on a private appearance, with only one lane. The south half of the road was abandoned and a topsoil was created over the road, evident in the archaeological section drawing across the road (Figure 6.7). The eighteenth-century road, approximately eighteen feet wide, was reduced in width to about ten feet. Later in the nineteenth century, a turning circle was added to the road in front of the house. This is evident on a map from 1896 and in the earliest photographs of the site (Figure 6.8).

On the west side of the house, several landscape features were constructed to increase the level yard around the house. A stone retaining wall that enlarged the front yard was constructed on the sloping bank to Silver Stream requiring deeper soil deposits to the east of the wall (Figure 6.9). This wall was located east of the east side of Test L17-75. A stone retaining wall was discovered on the west side of the smoke house, on the north side of the house (Figure 6.10). This enlarged the work area around this building, probably accommodating...
Figure 6.3. Detail of archaeological excavation plan at John Ellison's house, Knox's Headquarters State Historic Site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATA</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Brown sandy loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Yellow brown silty clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Yellow brown clay with silt mottling of prehistoric, 18th and early 19th century artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Hard packed yellow brown clay mottled with brown silty clay, natural soil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Figure 6.4.** Archaeological section drawing of Test L9-75, east wall.
Figure 6.5. Drawing of north side of Ellison’s house from Wilson’s Newburgh Gazette 1857.

Figure 6.6. Ellison’s house viewed from the Turnpike Road on the north side (Lossing 1855).
**Figure 6.7.** Archaeological section drawing across the Colonial Road on the east side of Ellison's house.
those tasks that were previously conducted in the dooryard.

The extensive construction, alterations, and land-moving that was observed archaeologically raised additional questions concerning these activities. Ellison built a new structure in 1791 on the west bank of Silver Stream and alongside the colonial road. This was intended as a store and Methodist meeting house (Ruttenber 1911). Clearly the domestic yard reform was related to Ellison’s economic and social interests.

The landscape alterations were accomplished with slave labor. In 1800 Ellison owned eighteen slaves, three times the number he held in 1790 (Federal Census 1790, 1800). By 1810 the period of rebuilding was over, and Ellison decreased his number of slaves to seven (Federal Census 1810). Ellison freed six of his slaves in 1801, but only one was a newborn, as required by the 1799 Gradual Emancipation Act. According to this law, he did not have to free his adult slaves. This suggests that his action was the result of a change in his personal beliefs rather than the new law. He freed slaves rather than sell them, and he freed adults as well as newborns.

The freeing of his slaves followed his support of Methodism and the construction of the store and meeting house. This building appears to have united Ellison’s new economic and social interests, while the Methodist discipline is generally regarded as the religious choice of the new capitalists. The Methodist emphasis on personal salvation through hard work, temperance, and systematic study was compatible with the work discipline advocated by industrialists (Thompson 1964).

Ellison’s personal relationship with the leading American Methodist, Reverend Francis Asbury, may have influenced the former’s position during the American Revolution (Asbury 1821). Asbury was a pacifist who advocated neutrality during the conflict (Higgenbotham 1983; Pointer 1988). Ellison, probably due to business interests in British-controlled New York City and rebel-controlled New Windsor, was a “reluctant” revolutionary who maintained an image of neutrality during the war.
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**Figure 6.9.** Archaeological section drawing of Test L17-75, east wall.

**Table: Strata Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATA</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Dark brown sandy loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Cinder and ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Brown sandy loam with charcoal, gravel, and yellow clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Cinder and ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Brown sand with pebbles and coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Brown silty clay with pebbles, ash, and coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Coal and Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Brown clay loam with coal and cement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Brown clay loam mottled with yellow brown clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Brown clay loam with whiteware sherds, and wire nails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Brown silty clay with rocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Yellow brown clay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The physical alterations observed at this site and the new ideologies evident in his support of Methodism and the freeing of his slaves were part of the larger transformation in the rural landscape. Ellison's struggle against the new capitalists over the location of the turnpike is an example of social conflicts that occurred in rural areas during the early nineteenth century. John Ellison's acceptance of the new economy and landscape reform at the very beginning of the nineteenth century were part of his attempt to retain his privileged economic, social, and political position that was altered by new relations of capitalism.

**Variations in the Transformations**

The details of the process of transformation at John Ellison's house have been presented as one example. Other case studies have indicated a wide variety in the material evidence of domestic landscape
reform and the time of its appearance. Ellison's position within a merchant family business, as well as his physical location on the Hudson River, may be important factors in the specifics of the transformation observed at this site.

In contrast, the David DeFreest house was part of a tenant farm on the Van Rensselaer patroonship, in the modern town of North Greenbush in Rensselaer County. The house was initially constructed in the 1760s alongside a small stream. Refuse from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries has been found widely distributed around this house during a limited archaeological survey (Fisher and Hartgen 1982). The excavation of a cellar hole for an addition to this house in the 1840s resulted in the transformation of the landscape, probably completed by the 1860s. A level front yard was created and two to three feet of fill was deposited on the creek side of the house, including a wedge of river cobbles that extended the yard. This fill created a level terrace to the rear of the house, where formerly a steep slope to the stream was present. The buried topsoil contained artifacts that were manufactured in the middle to late eighteenth century, including slip-trailed red earthenware, Wheildon-type creamware, blue-painted tin-glazed earthenware, and blue-painted pearlware. The most recently manufactured ceramics were transfer-printed blue and mulberry pearlware. The fill may be dated by the most recent ceramics present, which included transfer-printed light blue and mulberry pearlware.

In the process of creating a level yard around the house, the exterior cellar entrance was covered. Creating this new landscape was associated with substantial changes to the house. Domestic landscape reform in this case involved moving large amounts of soil without the aid of slaves or wage laborers.

Variation is evident in the acceptance of landscape reform, even by successful industrialists. Davis (1998) reported a house cellar and domestic artifacts immediately adjacent to NY Route 29 in the town of Milton in Saratoga County. This house was built in the 1840s in the front yard of a larger, Federal Period house. The larger house was the home and farm of the owner of the nearby paper mill, Chauncey Kilmer. The house alongside the road was the residence of workers on both Kilmer's farm and paper mill, and may have functioned additionally as a storage cellar for the farm and mill. Kilmer moved into a modern Italianate-style house by the 1850s that was located between the mill and farm. This house was set back from the road and further distanced by a tree-lined approach.

His move coincided with a change in the organization of his mill. In the early portion of the nineteenth century the mill was operated seasonally, without a permanent labor force. The mill was a part of his diversified business that emphasized the farm. Both the construction of worker housing and artifact concentrations along the road in the front of the house evidence little concern for the ideal of domestic yard reform. By the time he built a new house, however, his business was structured by different ideas of specialization and production that were reflected in the landscape.

At the White Farm in the Town of North Castle in Westchester County, Sopko (1996, this volume) reported the different distributions of refuse during different periods of site occupation. The site dates from the 1780s to 1915, and historical and archaeological investigation defined three periods of occupation. The first period, 1780 to 1827, was associated with initial settlement and development of agriculture on the sixty-eight acre farm. This was not subsistence or self-sufficient agriculture, but involved the production of farm goods by an extended nuclear family with the aid of domestic servants and farm laborers. The nearby urban market was the outlet for surplus production. During the period between 1830 and 1882, which marks the initial market agriculture at this site was transformed to commercial agriculture. This change included a shift from the extended family to the nuclear family, increased use of wage labor, specialization of crops, diversification of farm products, and use of mechanical farm equipment.

Archaeological evidence of this transformation at the site included a change in the spatial organization of the farm and house. The size of the house increased and a special-function addition was added. A second house was constructed to shelter the farm laborers, and a barn was built.

Material items from the late eighteenth century were discarded as sheet refuse in the vicinity of the house, even in the front yard, on the south side of the building. After 1830, which marks the
beginning of commercial agriculture at this site, no cultural material was discarded in the front yard. Refuse disposal shifted to the rear yards of both houses. Other aspects of domestic landscape reform were observed at this site.

Some nineteenth-century sites evidence resistance to domestic yard reform. In an innovative study of rural tannery workers in Upper Lisle, Broome County, Lou Ann Wurst observed that the nineteenth-century "workers were using a casual, broad scale, refuse disposal practice" (1994:156). A larger number of archaeological tests at the workers' area contained artifacts, and more artifacts were recovered in tests associated with the work areas of the site, in comparison to the owner's house lot. "The yard area, littered with broken ceramics, glass, and bone was undoubtedly unsightly" (Wurst 1994:159). Domestic landscape reform was not an objective of the tannery workers.

SUMMARY

Archaeology has contributed to the investigation of the rural transformation that occurred in the nineteenth century. This process resulted in the present cultural landscape of agricultural capitalism. Investigations of consumer goods, new architectural forms, separation of home and work, trends of specialization and commercialism, sanitary conditions, and numerous other issues in this process have been studied by archaeologists. The large degree of variation present during this period between locations and among ethnic and religious groups, as well as class distinctions, means that a great deal of investigation and analysis remains.

Domestic yard reform as an aspect of this transformation may be observed archaeologically in numerous ways. Roadside surveys have located structural remains adjacent to roads; these remains represent different ideas about public and private spaces. Artifact distributions indicate disposal patterns that need definition in order to provide access to the occupants' ideas about their relationship to their environment. A particular problem evident in the literature has been the identification of "disturbed soils" or "fill" in the front yards of many nineteenth-century domestic sites. In the context of the nineteenth-century landscape, this fill is an artifact that represents domestic yard reform.
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Nineteenth-century domestic archaeological sites in National Park units in upstate New York are widely diverse and nationally significant. Three sites associated with American presidents have received archaeological attention, including the Home of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in Hyde Park; Lindenwald, Martin Van Buren National Historic Site in Kinderhook (Capozzi 1991; Fiero 1983; Gallagher 1984; Mahlstedt 1979; Simon 1982a, 1982b); and the Theodore Roosevelt Inaugural National Historic Site in Buffalo (which also includes part of the Buffalo Barracks). Other types of residential sites which have been sampled include the Vanderbilt Mansion National Historic Site in Hyde Park and the nineteenth-century houselots of Rome, New York, exposed during the excavation of Fort Stanwix (Hanson and Hsu 1975).

Women's Rights National Historic Park, located in the towns of Seneca Falls and Waterloo, contains archaeological resources of national significance which differ in nature from those listed above. This park commemorates women's struggle for equal rights and includes the Wesleyan Methodist Chapel (the site of the first Women's Rights Convention in 1848), the Elizabeth Cady Stanton home, and the M'Clintock House where the Declaration of Sentiments was written. Authorized in 1980, this park has benefited from the fully-matured field of historical archaeology. Most of its sites have received some form of archaeological survey or data recovery.

The M'Clintock House is a ca. 1835 brick building located at 14 East William Street in Waterloo (Figures 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3). Limited archaeological testing was completed on the north side of the house in 1990 by Thomas Schley, and a Historic Structure Report was completed for the house in 1993 by Barbara Yocum, both of the National Park Service. Yocum's report suggests that two successive wings had been attached to the south side of the house, the most recent of which burned and was demolished in 1955 (Yocum 1993:138). The Archaeology Branch of the Northeast Cultural Resources Center of Lowell, Massachusetts was engaged by the Park to explore the evidence for the south wing and to evaluate other areas of the site. An archaeological survey was conducted in 1996 and an intensive survey of the south wing area was completed in 1997. This paper reviews the goals, methods, and results of the 1997 project.
Figure 7.2. Locator map for the M'Clintock House.
Figure 7.3. The M'Clintock houselot.
The story of the M’Clintock House begins with the arrival of a young Quaker, Richard P. Hunt, in Waterloo in 1821. Hunt established a dry goods store on the corner of Main and Virginia Streets. Hunt made shrewd real estate investments and soon acquired a farm on the east side of town. He constructed a three-story commercial block which he extended over the years, and acquired properties to the north on William Street (Becker 1949:184). He invested in the Waterloo Woolen Manufacturing Company where he became managing partner. He also participated in local government and in the management of local institutions such as the Waterloo Academy (Becker 1949:151; Weber 1985:115).

Hunt’s activities must be viewed in the wider context of the Quaker community of Waterloo. Hunt and each of his four successive wives embraced the liberal Hicksite branch of Quakerism. This branch resulted from a Quaker schism into Orthodox and Hicksite groups during the “Great Schism” of 1827. The Hicksites contested Quaker reliance on the Bible and the Society’s Elders rather than on the “inner light.” The dictates of their consciences compelled them to reform society in various areas. Their leader, Elias Hicks, was an abolitionist, but the Hicksites were actively involved in the numerous reform movements of the day including temperance, prison reform, and women’s rights, in addition to abolitionism. The Junius Monthly Meeting of the Farmington Quarterly Meeting, of which the Hunts and M’Clintocks were members, adopted the Hicksite position.

**The M’Clintocks**

Thomas M’Clintock was a Hicksite Quaker minister from Philadelphia who moved to Waterloo with his wife, son, and four daughters in 1835. Thomas’s sister Sarah apparently arrived around the same time, and in 1837 she married Richard Hunt. Thomas M’Clintock initially purchased a drugstore on the corner of Main and Virginia Streets and later rented both a house and a store from Hunt, the house on the south side of William Street and the store opposite, in the Sentner Block (Becker 1950).

Thomas M’Clintock advocated a progressive stance which exceeded even that of the liberal Junius Meeting. One issue concerned opening their meetings to abolitionist speakers. The refusal of Farmington Monthly Meeting Quakers to do this prompted an exodus of 200 sympathizers who formed their own meeting of the Congregational or Progressive Quakers. This group embraced all who promoted righteousness regardless of sex, creed, or color. These views were articulated in the “Basis of Religious Association” written by Thomas M’Clintock (Weber 1985:122–123).

Jane Hunt, Richard’s third wife, was a catalyst for the organization of the Seneca Falls Women’s Rights Convention by reuniting Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott, who had originally met at the World Anti-Slavery Convention in London in 1840. Mott, her sister Martha Wright, Jane Hunt, and Mary Ann M’Clintock were all Progressive Quakers. At a meeting at the Hunt residence on July 13, 1848, Stanton expressed her discontent with her position as a woman and resolved with these four Quaker women to hold a convention to discuss the “social, civil, and religious condition and rights of women” later in the month (Becker 1949:151,152,155). The convention was to be held at the Wesleyan Methodist Chapel of Seneca Falls, built by a radical reform branch of Seneca Falls Methodists formed in 1843. The group reconvened later in the month in the M’Clintock house parlor to write their declaration and resolutions. The Declaration of Independence of 1776 served as a model for the document, known as the Declaration of Sentiments. The M’Clintock family rallied support for the convention and four of them—Thomas and Mary Ann and their two eldest daughters, Mary and Elizabeth—signed the declaration. Some of the M’Clintocks attended the second Women’s Rights Convention in Rochester three weeks later, and they continued their involvement in the Abolitionist and Women’s Rights Movements. The 1850 census lists a seventeen-year-old black girl and an eight-year-old mulatto child in residence with the M’Clintocks, possibly escaped slaves being protected by the family.

Richard Hunt died in 1856, and in that same year the M’Clintocks returned to Philadelphia for unknown reasons. There, Thomas died in 1875 at the age of 75, and Mary Ann died in 1884 at the age of 84 (Weber 1985:147).
**The M'Clintock House Lot and House**

The M'Clintock houselot at 14 East William Street was originally part of Lot 24 of Waterloo, New York, a portion of Military Lot Number 4 in Romulus, land granted to Revolutionary War veteran John McKinstry. This undeveloped land was transferred between different owners and speculators until 1832, when Richard P. Hunt bought the remainder of Lot 24, a 99-foot by 160-foot parcel, for $1,000. Based on map information, it appears that Hunt built the house later to be known as the M'Clintock House sometime between 1833 and 1836. Historic maps indicate that at least one wing was added on the south side sometime before 1855, which was damaged by fire in 1955 and removed.

Richard Hunt’s executors sold the M'Clintock house and lot in 1875 to members of the Waterloo Baptist Church. The M'Clintock house was then used as a parsonage. The following year a Sunday school and lecture hall were built next to the house. In 1899 an addition was made to the front of the church building. Both church and lecture hall structures were removed by the National Park Service after it acquired the property in 1985.

The M'Clintock house is a two-and-a-half-story brick building with full cellar. Its prominent Greek Revival feature consists of the front entrance with flanking Doric columns. The interior was modified during the period it was used by the Waterloo Baptist Church, but research by Barbara Yocum permits a reconstruction of the interior first-floor plan. Traces were found of an original south wing of probable wood frame construction. This wing was apparently replaced by a more substantial structure sometime before 1855.

M'Clintock period outbuildings included a barn or stable built on the southeast corner of the lot. During the period of the Waterloo Baptist Church, a stable was constructed on the southwest corner of the lot, replaced by a garage in the early twentieth century. A local informant remembered the presence of at least one privy on the south lot line around the period of World War I. Sources of water, a cistern and a well, were found closer to the house.

**Archaeological Research Design**

The research design for archaeological investigation of the M'Clintock house lot addressed two objectives. The first focused on providing architectural evidence to historical architects for the missing south wings. The Women’s Rights National Historic Park felt that sufficient architectural and archaeological evidence existed to support a reconstruction of the ca. 1836–1855 south wing. Additionally, it was believed that evidence for the earliest, original south wing might be preserved as well.

The second area of research focused on the activities of the M'Clintocks themselves. Was there a Quaker mode of consumption that could be distinguished from that of non-Quakers? Was there any archaeological evidence of their involvement in mid-nineteenth-century social reform movements? Was there any material evidence for the involvement of the M'Clintocks in the Underground Railroad?

The question of the archaeological visibility of American Quakers has been discussed periodically in historical archaeology. In his study of the Mott Farm site in Portsmouth, Rhode Island (1640–1800), Marley Brown noted that “in many domains of daily life, there is no reason to assume that Friends behaved differently than anyone else. As a result, it is unlikely that the Motts’ cultural identity as Quakers can be read directly out of the archaeological record” (Brown 1987:274). Brown also notes that Quakers were admonished to show evidence of moderation in their household furnishings and “simplicity” in their clothing. Based on archaeological investigations in downtown Philadelphia, John Cotter, Daniel Roberts, and Michael Parrington observed that “the rather mundane collection of ceramics found at Front and Dock streets attests that the earliest Quakers adhered to a simple lifestyle—possibly because of their middle-class values, but possibly also out of necessity . . .” (Cotter et al. 1992:448). However, the lifestyles of Quakers who later prospered in Philadelphia’s bustling business environment displayed considerable ostentation. Those who were drawn towards prosperity and converted to Anglicanism were known as the “wet Quakers.” What would constitute either moderation or ostentation in material
lifestyle in nineteenth-century Waterloo is a matter of speculation because of the absence of comparative archaeological data. Application of George Miller's ceramic price indexing system to ceramics from ca. 1835-1850 deposits would possibly provide a clue to the relative level of household expenditures on consumer goods. However, Klein (1991:87) argues against the value of using ceramics in studying consumer behavior of different social and economic groups. Also, Brown's caveat against a one-to-one correlation between material culture and Quaker values must be heeded.

Nineteenth-century American social reform was wide-ranging and diverse, and so are its archaeological sites. The most dramatic examples of social reform were the various secular and non-secular intentional communities which attempted to reform society by example. Of these, only the non-secular groups such as the Shakers have received much sustained archaeological attention. Susanne Spencer-Wood has discussed the archaeological potential of domestic reform movement sites at the institutional level, but excavated examples are few (Spencer-Wood 1987). At the level of a social reformer's individual household, Paul Grebinger and Corrine Guntzel identified some archaeological issues for the Elizabeth Cady Stanton house site in Seneca Falls. In her book, *Eighty Years and More*, Elizabeth Stanton castigates the usual nineteenth-century practice of discarding rubbish out the back door (Stanton 1971). Grebinger and Guntzel were interested in exploring Stanton's own practices, and found some discarded ceramics dating to her occupation of the site. They were generally frustrated with their inability to identify "deposits of material culture that bear her mark" (Grebinger and Guntzel n.d.:7).

Even with growing public interest in Underground Railroad sites, few archaeological sites of this type have been systematically investigated (NPS 1995, 1998). For this reason, little is known of the architectural characteristics of these types of sites. Architecturally, historical documentation suggests that they may contain discrete accommodations separate from the main living quarters, especially after passage of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850. The room above Richard Hunt's carriage house just off the Seneca Turnpike is an example of this type of architectural element (Becker 1949:156). Possibly the M'Clintock carriage house or rooms within the addition may have been used in a similar fashion. Artifactual manifestations of fugitive slaves might include personal possessions or ornaments of non-New England origin.

In summary, the main objective of this project was to identify the location and architectural characteristics of the vanished south wings of the M'Clintock house. The investigation was informed by the documentation of the M'Clintocks (1) as Hicksite Quakers, (2) as proponents of women's rights, and (3) as abolitionists. The extent to which these activities could be investigated archaeologically depended in large part on the actual level of archaeological resource preservation.

**OBJECTIVES AND METHODS**

The following objectives were established for the 1997 excavations: (1) expose the footprint and document the dimensions of the wings; (2) identify, sample, and date features associated with the additions, such as builders' trenches; (3) relate the architectural sequences to the development of the immediate landscape; (4) identify and sample preserved yard surfaces that pre-dated the additions.

A metric grid was established over the site. A post-1955 deposit was cleared to expose the surface of the south wing foundation, and a 50 cm-wide trench was excavated in sections to expose the north-to-south profile through the structure (Figure 7.4). Other 2.0 x 0.5 m trenches were excavated to expose areas in both the interior and exterior of the wing (Figures 7.5 and 7.6).

**SITE STRATIGRAPHY AND FEATURES**

**Stratigraphy**

Stratum 1 was a mixture of both root mat and a brown silty soil (Figures 7.4–7.6). Artifact analysis indicated that Stratum 1 contained artifacts dating primarily from the post-1955 period. Stratum 1A was composed almost entirely of coal ash and was found on the southern exterior of the footprint, as was Stratum 1B, a mottled brown fill layer. The 1955 fire which destroyed the wing seems to have been responsible for the creation of Stratum 2, which contained varying amounts of wood, char-
Figure 7.4. Plan of excavations, M'Clintock House south wing.
Figure 7.5. Profile through south wing.
Figure 7.6. Profile through cistern (Feature 10).
coal, brick, glass, mortar, slate, and nail fragments. Stratum 3, a sand fill layer, lay below Stratum 2 and was found in units S23 E3, S23 E4, S23 E5, and S23 E6. Relatively few artifacts were found in it, with the exception of many small slate fragments. Stratum 3A, more appropriately described as a lens, contained decaying mortar and brown loam, and was encountered in S23 E4. This thin lens of material was only apparent in this one unit. A mottled clay layer, Stratum 4, lay below Stratum 3 and Stratum 3A. It was redeposited in its present location and packed in around Feature 1. It appeared in units S23 E3, S23 E4, S23 E5, S23 E6, S20 E6, S21 E6, and S25 E4, and could be seen in the south and east profiles of the 4 x 3 m unit opened up to expose the cistern. It contained several complete, or nearly complete, artifacts as well as some early ceramics (late eighteenth-early nineteenth century). Stratum 4 had been deposited on Stratum 4A, the original ground surface. Stratum 4A, a brown silty clayish soil, contained many artifacts, and its deposition and accumulation predate the construction of the wing addition. Stratum 5, a glacially deposited sand layer, lay directly below Stratum 4A. It appeared in units S23 E3, S23 E4, S23 E5, S23 E6, S20 E6, S21 E6, and S25 E4. Hard-packed sterile clay was encountered below Stratum 5.

A total of sixteen features were uncovered in and around the footprint, summarized in Table 7.1.

Architectural Features

The 1997 excavations answered several questions concerning the south wing and introduced other questions. The exterior dimensions of the building were approximately 14 ft by 24 ft, with the western edge of the foundation (Feature 1) set in from the western wall of the house approximately one foot. The eastern wall was constructed of limestone, while the western wall utilized rounded fieldstones. The south wall of the wing was constructed of the smallest stones. Poorly-preserved brick features were found on the southeast and southwest corners of the wing.

The foundation walls had been built without the use of an installation trench. Instead, the stone foundation of Feature 1 had been constructed on the existing ground surface (Stratum 4a) and then a fill deposit (Stratum 4) had been packed in around the interior and exterior of the walls. This type of construction may have been a response to the difficulty in excavating the dense clay subsoil. The builders probably acquired the fill of Stratum 4 from some as yet unknown source and packed it around the wall. Hunt is known to have built many houses in the immediate vicinity, and perhaps this fill was from one of his various construction projects. The south wing, then, must have had only a crawl space below the floor. Features 7, 8, and 9 were modern disturbances from the construction and demolition of a fire escape after the south wing burned in the 1950s.

Feature 12 may represent the location of a hearth or stove. The feature consisted of carefully fitted masonry just interior of the second addition's south wall. Some stones showed evidence of burning.

Archaeology provided further documentation for the presence of a doorway on the eastern side of the south wing near the south corner (Figure 7.4). The absence of flagstones in S23 E7 and S24 E7 provides evidence that there had been some type of stairway out of the addition that led to a well (Feature 5). The slate apron of the well rested considerably above Stratum 4, and so it appears to be contemporary with or slightly later than the Feature 1 addition, although the well itself may pre-date Feature 1. There was evidence of repairs made to the apron over time. One informant described a two-handled pump that sat over the well in the early twentieth century. More recently, the well was capped by a cement plug.

The water cistern, Feature 10, predates the second wing addition, Feature 1. The cistern may be contemporary with the first wing addition, which left no archaeological traces. The cistern consisted of a conical excavation into the clay subsoil with parapeted sides. It had a roof consisting of wooden joists covered with planks, based on the imprints of these elements in the plaster. A space existed between this roof and the floor of the second wing, which probably contained a trap door to provide access to the cistern. The lowest fill deposit within Feature 10, Stratum 3, contained abundant evidence of seeds and nuts and other small objects, including a pencil, many of which had gnaw marks. It appears that rodents had access to the roof of the cistern, and their collections dropped into the water on occasion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Stratigraphic Position</th>
<th>Relative Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>S18 E2, S19 E2, S20 E2, S21 E2, S22 E2, S23 E2, S24 E2–E6, S25 E2–E6, S23 E6, S22 E6, S21 E6, S20 E6, S19 E6, S18 E6</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Below Str. 1 Above Str. 4A</td>
<td>Wing Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shallow depression</td>
<td>S23 E3–E6</td>
<td>Str. 4A</td>
<td>Below Str. 4A Above Str. 5</td>
<td>Pre-Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Slate pavers</td>
<td>S23 E7–10 S24 E7–10</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Below Str. 1</td>
<td>Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Linear stain</td>
<td>S23 E10</td>
<td>Unexcavated</td>
<td>Below Str. 1</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Slate well cover</td>
<td>S23 E8–E9</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Below nothing</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bedding</td>
<td>S23 E10</td>
<td>Mottled soil with clay and gravel</td>
<td>Below Feat. 3 Above Str. 4A</td>
<td>Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>S19 E3</td>
<td>Construction/destruction debris</td>
<td>Below Str. 1 Above Feat. 9</td>
<td>Post-Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>S20 E3</td>
<td>Coal ash</td>
<td>Below Str. 1 Above Str. 4</td>
<td>Post-Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cement footing</td>
<td>S19 E3</td>
<td>Cement</td>
<td>Below Feat. 7 Above Feat. 10</td>
<td>Post-Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cistern</td>
<td>S18 E2–4 S19 E2–4 S20 E2–4</td>
<td>Pargeted lining</td>
<td>Below Feat. 1 Above Str. 4A</td>
<td>Pre-Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pit/trench</td>
<td>S21 E6</td>
<td>Str. 4A</td>
<td>Above Str. 5</td>
<td>Pre-Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fireplace foundation</td>
<td>S24 E2–6</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Below Str. 2 Above Str. 4</td>
<td>Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Trench</td>
<td>S19 E2, S20 E2</td>
<td>Mottled fill</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Stone collapse</td>
<td>S19 E3, S20 E3</td>
<td>Stone and loam</td>
<td>Below Feat. 1 Above Feat. 10 Str. 2</td>
<td>Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cistern overflow drain pipe</td>
<td>S18 E2, S19 E2</td>
<td>Glazed redware</td>
<td>Contemp with Feat. 10</td>
<td>Pre-Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Trench for Feat. 16</td>
<td>S18 E2, S19 E2</td>
<td>Mottled clay</td>
<td>Below Str. 4 Above Str. 4A</td>
<td>Pre-Wing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After the demolition of the first wing, the foundation of the second wing, Feature 10, was extended over the west side of the cistern. It was not until 1895 that the cistern was filled, when the trustees for the Waterloo Baptist Church declared the cistern to be “unfit to use.” The artifacts from Feature 10, Strata 1 and 2 are consistent with a later 1890s date.

Only one deposit at the site of the south wing, Stratum 4a, contained artifacts dating to the M’Clintock occupation. This contained a range of creamwares, pearlwares, and white wares as would be expected in a middle-class urban site in the Northeast for the period ca. 1835–1850. There were numerous examples of transfer-printed wares as well as undecorated wares, but the assemblage lacked the austerity that characterizes some institutional sites of that period. Non-ceramic artifacts were unremarkable save for an impressive assemblage of toothbrushes, including one turned example in ivory. Paul Shackel has documented the prevalence of toothbrushes in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Annapolis, Maryland sites, to support his argument for increasing concern for personal discipline during that period (Shackel 1993:42-49).

**INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS**

The M’Clintock House archaeological project was successful in obtaining architectural evidence about the missing south wings of the M’Clintock House. The earliest wing was probably contemporary with the construction of the house (Figure 7.7). It measured about 8 ft by 12 ft and covered a subterranean, pargeted water cistern. Sometime during the mid-nineteenth century, probably before 1856, the first south wing was replaced by a two-story wing, about 14 ft by 24 ft in size (Figure 7.8). The original (ca. 1835) cistern was accessible beneath the lower floor and remained in use until 1895. A paved apron was constructed for a well due east of the south wing. The south end of the wing floor was fortified with masonry, possibly to support the weight of a cast iron stove.

This architectural evidence, more than the artifactual evidence, speaks to the long-term occupation of the house by a reform-minded family. In a manuscript copy of a speech on “Home Life” discussed at length by Corinne Guntzel (1982), Elizabeth Cady Stanton declared:

> If the wife must do her own work, make the sunny side of the house into a large airy kitchen, and dining room and put the parlor sitting room and library all into one for family use. Those who can afford the room should have two kitchens, one for washing and ironing. (Stanton n.d.)

The Stantons, the M’Clintocks, and the Hunts had a shared interest in social reform in general and in promoting women’s rights in particular. While Elizabeth Cady Stanton was the most articulate member of this group in documenting her sentiments about improving the working conditions of women, we know by their actions that the M’Clintocks and Hunts shared these values. It is equally probable that they discussed and shared Stanton’s feelings about how this could be partially accomplished by constructing well-lit and well-ventilated kitchens and laundries. The M’Clintock House south wing may be an expression of group solidarity around this idea that the working conditions of women should be improved.

The first south wing (ca. 1835) accommodated the water cistern and probably little more. The second wing was built sometime during the M’Clintock occupation, between 1836 and 1856. It conforms to the “large airy kitchen” on the sunny side of the house model advocated by Stanton. However, this may have been the second type of kitchen used for washing and ironing better known to us as a laundry. It had direct access to the cistern as a source of water for washing and to the back yard for drying laundry. A laundry set apart in a separate wing would reduce the disruption of household routines caused during washing day. A first-floor laundry separate from the kitchen was a feature of the design of larger country houses published in 1850 by Newburgh native Andrew Jackson Downing (Downing 1969:318).

Another common feature of upper-middle-class houses around this time was the placement of servants’ bedrooms above a kitchen or laundry wing (Vaux 1970:158, 188, 294). The second floor of the second south wing was known to have contained a bedroom long after the M’Clintocks left Waterloo. Whether this bedroom existed during...
Figure 7.7. Location of the vanished ca. 1835 wing.

Figure 7.8. Location of the vanished post-1836 wing.
the M'Clintock occupation can only be conjectured. If indeed it was originally built to contain a bedroom, it may have provided space for either servants or fugitive slaves. The 1850 census list includes six family members and three non-family members in residence. The second floor of the wing probably contained sleeping quarters for the non-family members.

The occupation of the house by the M'Clintock family marks a period of growing discontent with the inflexibility of the Greek Revival house form (Clark 1986:17). There was a new awareness and urgency to find architectural solutions to changing domestic needs. Typically the need was not just for more space, but for increasingly specialized use of space, especially as determined by the activities of women. Advice manuals, magazine articles, and other forms of literature articulate this in the 1830s, 1840s, and 1850s, echoing Downing's architectural designs. Kitchens are more fully articulated and spacious to accommodate labor-saving devices, and laundries are often sited to be closer to sources of water and yard areas for the drying of clothes. Innovative designs for kitchens were promoted by Catharine E. Beecher and her sister, Harriet Beecher Stowe, in their 1869 publication The American Women's Home. The rebuilding of the M'Clintock House wing after 1835 may have anticipated these later attempts at domestic reform. Ultimately it was the realization that these separate domestic accommodations further isolated and alienated women which led to the creation of communal kitchens and laundries in the planning of Associationist and other utopian communities in the Northeast (Hayden 1981; Spencer-Wood 1987).

In summary, nineteenth-century sites such as the M'Clintock House site remind us of the importance of the physical environment, especially the domestic environment, to nineteenth-century social reformers. By recommending how the organization of domestic space could be altered to improve working conditions for women, Elizabeth Cady Stanton clearly understood through her own experience how behavior and environment are linked. The archaeology of domestic sites in New York State such as the Stanton and M'Clintock Houses may contribute to a better understanding of social and domestic reform both in the nineteenth century and in our own times.
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A unique source of data contributing to interpretations of the domestic realm of historical populations is the information provided by family cemeteries. While historic cemeteries are ordinarily inaccessible for archaeological study, opportunities allowing for the study of old cemeteries and their contents have arisen in recent years. Excavation, removal, and reinterment of historic graves has become more frequent and is often required due to erosion, inadvertent discovery of unmarked graves, and development. Particularly since the 1980s, extensive studies of historic grave sites ranging from almshouses and military sites to church burial grounds and family cemeteries have been completed. Through the analysis of grave forms, coffin styles, personal items, and human skeletal remains, these studies have been successful in documenting the various and often diverse socio-cultural, economic, and physical environments of past communities. Family cemeteries and their contents in particular offer a unique opportunity for studying the life and death experiences of a family and their surrounding community, information normally not found in the written record.

This study involves the investigation and analysis of a nineteenth-century family cemetery from the Town of Sharon, Schoharie County, New York (Figure 8.1). The study developed from a Phase I cultural resource management survey of the Henry Lehman farm, a nearly 200-acre property acquired by Wal-Mart in early 1994 as the site of a more than one million sq.-ft. warehouse and transportation site (HAA, Inc. 1994a). As part of Section 106 compliance, Hartgen Archeological Associates, Inc. (HAA, Inc.) was retained to provide cultural resource services for the project, including the removal of the Henry Lehman family cemetery located on the property (HAA, Inc. 1994a, 1994b, 1994c, 1994d). The study combined census, deed, and other historical records; gravestone data; archaeological data including the remains of the coffins and coffin hardware; osteological data from the remains of ten individuals buried in the cemetery; and comparative data from other early cemeteries in order to provide a context for interpreting the domestic and social life of the Lehmans, a nineteenth-century farming family residing in rural upstate New York.
HENRY LEHMAN AND HIS FAMILY

The Setting
The 140-acre Henry Lehman farm lies north of U.S. Route 20, which was built in 1802 and was known as the Great Western Turnpike (Figures 8.2 and 8.3). Henry Lehman’s land rises from the south along U.S. Route 20 to the crest of a glacial ridge about 1,000 feet from the highway. Lehman’s 1820s two-story, Federal-style house stands about halfway up the ridge, taking advantage of both the sunny southern exposure and the protection afforded by the top of the hill. The Lehmans placed the family cemetery on the crest of the ridge, a site with a full view of the farm chilled on cold days by unrelenting winds from the north and west.

Beginnings
Census records, deeds, grave markers, and other documents provided the information to reconstruct much of the Lehman family history. Johan Ehrhardt Lehman II (1734-1837), Henry Lehman’s father, emigrated to the United States and settled in Palatine, a German farming community about ten miles north of Sharon Springs. Henry, the third of four sons, was born in 1791. Early in the nineteenth century the family moved to Sharon Springs. Henry’s three brothers, Peter, John Edward, and Benjamin (the youngest), married and settled on contiguous farms about a mile northeast of Henry’s farm. In the 1820s, Henry married a young childless widow named Anna Kling who was known throughout her life as Nancy. Henry and Nancy had three sons and five daughters. There is no record of the oldest son, Peter, after the 1825 state census. The second son, Josiah, left Sharon and settled in Galesburg, Illinois. He died before 1865. Henry Jr., the youngest son, stayed on and worked the farm with his parents. He married a local woman named Catharine Hiller. All of Henry and Nancy’s daughters married locally; only one of their husbands lived more than about five miles away, and one lived close enough to have been a laborer on the Lehman farm. The Lehman women’s husbands were laborers, farmers, and carpenters (Beers 1866; Federal Census 1860).

Henry’s Heyday and Family Troubles
In 1860, Henry Sr. and his three brothers all had property valued between $7,000 and $10,000. The Lehmans were among the best-off townsmen, had the largest farms in Sharon Springs, and could be considered upper middle class. All four brothers had roughly comparable assets of livestock and farm products, buildings, land, and personal belongings (Federal Census 1860). In January 1859 Henry and Nancy’s oldest daughter Maria Ann Horning, died. Henry Jr. took ill and died on June 11. In February of 1860, Henry’s next oldest daughter, Catharine (who had married the farmer Seth Swift), died at the age of forty. In March, Henry’s wife Nancy died. Among those who died, Nancy, Henry Jr., and Catharine Lehman Swift were all buried in the family cemetery. While Henry Jr.’s original marble headstone is now in the Slate Hill Cemetery, it is believed that he was originally buried in the family cemetery, since the cemetery at Slate Hill was not established until 1866, seven years after his death. On April 1, 1861, Henry and Nancy’s youngest daughter Eliza Hitchman died; she was buried in the Leesville cemetery.

About 1861, Henry Sr. at age seventy, married his son’s widow Catharine, who was about thirty-eight years old at the time. By 1862, Catharine gave birth to a son named Seward. Whatever joy Seward might have brought into his parents’ lives was short-lived. DeWitt, Catharine’s oldest son, enlisted in the Union Army in 1862, contracted typhoid fever, and died in Baltimore in October (Hogan 1985). In addition to the spate of deaths that plagued the family beginning in the late 1850s, Henry’s marriage to his daughter-in-law did not gain the approval of two of his daughters. He became estranged from them and cut them out of his will. In a new will, he left his land to his son Seward, giving his second wife, Catharine, lifetime use of the farm (Schoharie County Surrogate Court Records 1864). Already an old man in failing health, Henry contracted typhoid fever and died on November 24, 1864 (New York State Census 1865). Despite his obvious concern for the welfare of his son Seward, Henry still willed money to each of his other grandchildren, except for the children of Magdalena and Sophia, the daughters who had fallen out of favor.

Perseverance and Decline
After Henry’s death in 1864, his second wife Catharine ran the farm with her young son Seward and the children from her first marriage to Henry Jr.
Figure 8.2. Location of the Henry Lehman Family Cemetery in the Town of Sharon, Schoharie County, New York (NYS-DOT 1977 Sharon Springs and 1974 Sprout Brook 7.5’ Topographic Quadrangles).
By 1865, the farm was more prosperous than when Henry Sr. was alive. The largest crop in 1864 and 1865 was hops, but there were also substantial amounts of potatoes and buckwheat—enough, in fact, to sell. Catharine and the children harvested hay, picked apples, and produced maple sugar and molasses. The family kept chickens, horses, sheep, cows, and pigs. Three hundred pounds of pork were processed and a hundred pounds of butter was churned (New York State Census 1865). Obviously much effort was expended in providing for the family and growing crops for market. A family of ten could have readily consumed all of the meat from two or three pigs; the butter production amounted to about two pounds a week. Ninety pounds of wool from the sheep was sheared, carded, spun into yarn, and woven into flannel blankets which the Lehmans sold.

Catharine Hiller Lehman died May 2, 1869, and given that she still resided on the farm and her two husbands were buried there, she was most likely buried in the family cemetery. Subsequently her son Alfred, eighteen at the time, became the head of the household. Seward sold the farm in 1886 and the Lehmans largely disappeared from the Sharon Springs community.

**The Henry Lehman Family Cemetery, Lost and Found**

The Henry Lehman family cemetery was located through a combination of documentary research, information provided by Mr. Kenyon Parsons, the owner of the Lehman farm until it was sold to Wal-Mart in 1994, and archaeological field work undertaken as part of the cultural resource studies completed by HAA, Inc. The possibility that a “lost” cemetery existed on the Lehman farm was first realized when an 1860 deed mentioning a thirty-by-fifty-foot burial ground was located. The deed did not specify the cemetery’s location, other than that it was probably on the western half of the farm; however, no surface evidence of the cemetery was identified.
Mr. Parsons indicated that there had been an overgrown cemetery on the ridge northwest of the house; however, his grandmother had told him she did not think anyone was buried "up there," meaning that the graves had been moved. This was the first indication that some of the graves might not be intact. In the 1970s, the Parsons family had cleared the vegetation, moved the gravestones to the base of an apple tree near Henry Lehman's old house, removed the old stone wall and hedgerow that bordered the north side of the cemetery, and integrated the cemetery into the surrounding farm field. Mr. Parsons was thus able to discern the approximate location of the burial plot by sighting along the remains of the old hedgerow. In April 1994, HAA, Inc. conducted a Phase I archaeological field reconnaissance to locate the cemetery. The work was accomplished by stripping the plow zone and examining the subsoil for the outlines of grave shafts. Altogether, eleven or twelve grave shafts arranged in three rows were identified (Figure 8.4).

In order to remove and relocate the cemetery, a data retrieval plan was formulated and approved by the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation. The plan called for hand-excavating the burials and performing a non-destructive physical anthropological examination of the human remains. Additional historic research was employed to place the cemetery in local and regional perspective. Human remains, personal goods, coffin remains, and other items were excavated, mapped, and removed. At the completion of the study, both the human and artificial remains were reinterred a few miles from the family cemetery at the Slate Hill Cemetery where Henry Lehman Jr. and his wife Catharine Hiller are now buried.

The data retrieval identified a total of fifteen graves arranged in three rows, with five adult graves in the west row, one adult and one infant in the middle row, and two adults and six children in the east row (Figure 8.5). Unexpectedly, five adult graves were empty: Graves 9, 10, and 13 in the west row, Grave 7 in the middle row, and Grave 1 in the east row. The graves were probably moved as a result of Henry Lehman Sr.'s second marriage to his daughter-in-law, Catharine Hiller, and his falling-out with two daughters. The fifteen people buried in the Henry Lehman family cemetery probably belonged to at least four nuclear families: Henry Sr. and Nancy Lehman (Graves 11 and 12), Henry Jr. and Catharine Hiller (Graves 9 and 10), Catharine Lehman and Seth Swift (Graves 1, 2, 3, and 4), and Magdalena Ann Lehman and Charles Anthony (Graves 5, 6, 14, and 15).

The archaeological study revealed previously unknown information regarding the manner in which the Lehman family individuals were treated at death and about who remained in the cemetery following the family's troubles. An analysis of the archaeological data provides insight regarding the family's mortuary practices, customs that would have occurred within the limitations imposed by their economic status, local cultural traditions, and accepted methods of dealing with death. The following sections describe the cemetery's organization and various components of the burials, including the outer boxes, coffins, coffin hardware, and burial clothing.

**Cemetery Organization**

Based upon the grave markers found both at the family cemetery and at the nearby Slate Hill and Leesville cemeteries, the first interments occurred in the Henry Lehman family cemetery between 1840 and 1844 when Elizabeth Anthony, or possibly a younger sibling named Almira, was buried there. The last documented grave is probably that of Catharine Hiller Lehman, who died in 1869. The cemetery was used for at least twenty-five years and possibly longer, since it is likely that some of the empty or unmarked graves were created before or after these dates. The following discussion summarizes information regarding who was buried in the family cemetery, as well as the probable candidates for the five empty adult graves and the four unidentified infant and child graves.

**The Family of Henry Sr. and Nancy**

The only identified adult burials in the cemetery are those of Henry Lehman Sr. (Grave 11), his wife Nancy (Grave 12), and their daughter Catharine Lehman Swift (Grave 2). Henry and Nancy were interred in the westernmost of the three rows in the cemetery, Nancy in 1860 and Henry in 1864. Space for one grave was left between them; whether intentionally or not is a matter of conjecture.

---

The Henry Lehman Family Cemetery: A Unique Contribution to Nineteenth-Century Domestic Archaeology
Nancy is known to have borne eight children, four of whom are accounted for either in this cemetery (Catharine Lehman Swift) or other nearby cemeteries (Henry Jr., Eliza Hitchman, and Sophia Best). One child (Josiah) moved to Illinois. Among Henry and Nancy’s children for whom there are no documented graves are daughter Maria Ann Horning (died 1859); Peter, who disappeared from the records after 1825; and Magdalena Ann, the wife of Charles Anthony. Daughter Maria Ann remained in the neighborhood, but neither her grave nor that of her husband, George Horning.
are accounted for in the public cemeteries. They may have been buried in their own family cemetery on the Horning farm south of U.S. Route 20. Peter and Magdalena Ann are also unaccounted for in local cemeteries.

The Family of Henry Jr. and Catharine Hiller
As discussed above, Henry Lehman Jr. and Catharine Hiller Lehman were undoubtedly once buried in the family cemetery, probably in Graves 9 and 10 in the west row, two of the empty graves.
It is not known when their graves were moved, but the original marble gravestones now stand in Slate Hill Cemetery along with the headstone of their son DeWitt, who died in an Army hospital in Baltimore in 1862. DeWitt was not listed in the compendium of the deaths of Schoharie County officers and men who died in the Civil War, but according to this record virtually all of the military men who died during the war were buried at the place where death occurred (Hogan 1985). Although commemorated with a grave marker at Slate Hill, it is more likely that DeWitt is buried in a military cemetery near Baltimore rather than in the Slate Hill Cemetery. This also means that he was never buried in the family cemetery on the farm. The only other known grave of a member of the Henry Jr. and Catharine Hiller Lehman family is that of son John F. Lehman (1857-1913), who is buried in the Leesville cemetery.

The Family of Magdalena and Charles Anthony
The earliest dated graves in the cemetery are the Anthony children, all in the east row. Here are Elethea and Elizabeth Anthony, either of whom may occupy Graves 14 and 15, and Clarissa Anthony (Grave 6). These children died in 1844, 1847, and 1854, respectively. The grouping of Grave 5 (A. Anthony) with the other Anthony children and the use of brass tacks on the coffin are other threads tying this child to the Anthony family. While a child with a name beginning with A. is not listed in the Anthony family in any of the state or federal censuses, when asked in the 1865 state census how many children she had borne, Magdalena Ann stated the number was eleven. A. Anthony in Grave 5, who died in 1840 or 1841, makes eleven.

Research did not reveal the location of Magdalena Lehman and Charles Anthony’s graves in any of the local cemeteries, and their deaths were not reported in local records; both disappeared from the census after 1865. It is possible that they moved from the area sometime following the deaths of the four children buried in the family cemetery.

The Family of Catharine Lehman and Seth Swift
The southern half of the cemetery’s east row contains four burials, all presumed to be members of the family of Catharine Lehman and Seth Swift. Seth Swift, who died in 1894, is buried in the Leesville cemetery, as evidenced by a twentieth-century granite grave marker bearing his, Catharine’s, and son Douw’s names. Although Catharine’s name is engraved on that headstone, a marble headstone remained at the family cemetery, and an engraved nameplate identifying Catharine and bearing the date of her death was affixed to the lid of the coffin in Grave 2.

Unnamed infants less than about two months of age and interred in nearly identical coffins were found in Graves 3 and 4. The only substantial difference in the manner of burial in Graves 3 and 4 was the use of an outer box with Grave 3. Given their proximity to Ms. Swift’s grave, and given that the Anthony children are all accounted for, the infants in these two graves are likely Swift children. The most likely candidate for Grave 1 is Douw Swift, Catharine Swift’s fifth son who died in 1878. How Douw Swift’s grave came to be disinterred is conjectural, but the twentieth-century grave marker at the Leesville cemetery suggests that he was moved there at a later time.

Summary
Based upon the number of empty graves and available information, it is not possible to entirely reconstruct the Henry Lehman family cemetery in a convincing manner that accounts for what is already known about the family. It is possible to speak in probabilities about who might have been buried in the empty graves, but without their grave markers, or coffins with engraved nameplates and human remains that resemble people known from the historic record, the occupants of Graves 1, 7, 9, 10, and 13 will never be known for certain.

As discussed above, the two most likely candidates for Graves 9 and 10 are Henry Lehman Jr. and Catharine Hiller Lehman, now interred at the Slate Hill Cemetery. Given that Henry Jr. died seven years before Slate Hill was established, it appears that his remains were moved to that cemetery at a later time. Catharine may have been moved from the family cemetery at the same time. Douw Swift, perhaps originally buried in Grave 1, may have been moved to the Leesville cemetery in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century; however, the records of the Sharon Cemetery Association do not have this level of detail. No prospective candidates have been identified for two of the empty
graves (Graves 7 and 13) or for the infant buried in Grave 8.

COFFIN STYLES, HARDWARE, AND CONTENTS

An analysis of coffin styles, hardware, and personal items provides an opportunity to decipher information regarding the general preferences and availability of materials to the Lehman family during the time of the cemetery’s use, as well as to identify similarities and differences in burial type and elaboration for each of the family members.

Outer Boxes

Outer boxes, made to hold a coffin, were identified in seven of the fifteen Lehman family cemetery graves (Table 8.1). Outer boxes were constructed of plank or board boxes joined with nails or screws. In the twentieth century, outer boxes were replaced by sealed concrete vaults used to hold and protect the casket. Whether an outer box was used in the Lehman cemetery graves was varied with the particular nuclear family more than age, gender, or status. Nonetheless, neither of the caskets of the adult women, Catharine Lehman Swift and Nancy Lehman, who died within one month of each other, were placed in an outer box. For the other six adult or adult/adolescent graves, four removed prior to the archaeological study included outer boxes, and Henry Lehman Sr., who died in 1864, had a rough box. It is unknown whether the sixth adult grave (Grave 1) contained an outer box. Among the seven infants and children, two (Graves 3 and 5) had outer boxes. Grave 5 dates to 1840 and Grave 3, a Swift infant, probably dates between the 1840s and 1860, the year that Catharine Lehman Swift died.

Coffin Hardware

Coffin or outer box hardware was recovered from all the graves. The amount, type, and elaboration of coffin hardware increased as mortuary practices proliferated, but also reflected the age and status of individuals. In numbers and types, coffin and outer box hardware ranged from cut-iron nails alone to elaborate handles, white metal nail caps and screw covers, and nameplates all designed specifically and exclusively for mortuary use. In the middle range were coffins with hardware such as white metal bail handles that could have been used in cabinetmaking as readily as for coffins. Virtually every coffin had common nineteenth-century joining hardware such as plain cut-iron nails or wood screws. Other hardware was divided between simple and elaborate funerary for each grave. The hardware discussion begins with the occupied graves and ends with the empty graves.

Graves with Human Remains. As expected for nineteenth-century New York, the coffin lengths listed in Table 8.2 reveal the use of English system measurements in feet. The Lehman cemetery coffins were made in four basic shapes: rectangles, hexagons, octagons, and trapezoids, and there was variety among coffins in the same group. For instance, for the five hexagonal coffins, only the infants' coffins from Graves 3 and 4 have the same proportions. Dimensionally, these two coffins are identical, but they exhibited substantial differences in the level of ornamentation. The coffin in Grave 3 had four small plain white metal coffin handles, cut nails and wood screws with white metal screw-slot buttons for ornamentation, and lining and round-headed tacks to hold it in place; whereas the coffin in Grave 4 was devoid of ornamentation altogether and was joined with twenty-eight cut-iron nails.

Among the other three hexagonal coffins, Grave 2 (Catharine Lehman Swift) and Grave 12 (Nancy Lehman) both date from 1860; the two women died less than a month apart (February 16 and March 11, respectively). Even so, coffin shapes and details are quite different: Catharine Lehman Swift's coffin had a two-piece lid while Nancy Lehman’s blue-gray painted coffin had a one-piece lid. Both coffins included inscribed plates, although the plates were different in both shape and metallurgy; the only other exterior ornamentation on the coffins was white metal slotted buttons on lid screws and tacks used to cover the cut-nail holes, and bail coffin handles (Figures 8.6 and 8.7). Both coffins had angled foot rests. There were also fragments of lining in Catharine Lehman Swift's coffin, identified as cotton lawn or muslin and woven braid with gold thread. The only textiles found in Nancy Lehman’s coffin were the remains of the clothing in which she was buried. The lining and the foot brace in Catharine Lehman Swift's coffin suggest that it might have been made commercially, while the unusual outline and simple mode of manufacture of Nancy Lehman’s coffin suggest manufacture by a local carpenter or cabinetmaker.
Table 8.1. Summary of Graves by Nuclear Family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grave No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year of Death</th>
<th>Age at Death</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Outer Box</th>
<th>Coffin Shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAST ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Douw Swift?</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Catharine Lehman Swift</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hexagonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6-12 mos.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hexagonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0-9 mos.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hexagonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTER ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Adolescent or Adult</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6-12 mos.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rectangular?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Henry Lehman Jr. or Catharine Hiller (?)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Adolescent or Adult</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Henry Lehman Jr. or Catharine Hiller (?)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Adolescent or Adult</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Henry Lehman Sr.</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Octangular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nancy Lehman</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hexagonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Adolescent or Adult</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Grave 15 hexagonal coffin (Elethea or Elizabeth Anthony) had plain butt hinges on the two-piece lid, and the forty-eight brass tacks forming the initials “E.A.” (Figure 8.8) demonstrate that it was made by a local carpenter, probably the child’s father, Charles Anthony. The similar use of thirty-five brass tacks in the “A.A.” coffin (Grave 5) suggests that Charles Anthony perhaps made that coffin too. Both children died in the 1840s.

There were two octagonal coffins in the cemetery, Grave 11 (Henry Lehman Sr.) and Grave 5 (the child, A. Anthony). The Grave 5 coffin hardware
Table 8.2. Coffin and Outer Box Hardware from the Henry Lehman Family Cemetery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grave</th>
<th>Coffin</th>
<th>Elaborateness of Coffin Hardwareᵃ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Length (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>hexagon</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>hexagon</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>hexagon</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>octagon</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>rectangle</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>rectangle</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>octagon</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>hexagon</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>trapezoid</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>hexagon</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ᵃPlain hardware consists of handmade, cut, and wire nails, iron woodscrews, and plain brass or iron plate hinges that could be used for purposes other than coffin construction. Examples of simple funerary hardware include white metal screw caps and matching tacks, lining and brass tacks, and plain white metal and brass bail handles with mounting plates of the type that would be suitable as chest handles. The inventory of elaborate funerary hardware includes stamped tin beading, escutcheons, and tacks in the shape of diamonds and stars; caplifters and thumbscrews with escutcheons; and outsized, highly ornate, cast metal coffin handles. Ornate coffin hardware would look out of place if used anywhere else than on a coffin. Coffin plates are components of both simple and elaborate funerary hardware.

was restricted to fourteen cut-iron nails, thirty-five plain rounded brass upholstery tacks forming the initials “A.A.”, one white metal lining tack, and two plain plate metal coffin hinges. The Grave 5 coffin was probably locally made, again by the child’s carpenter father. It is interesting to note that among the three coffins that are likely to have been made by Mr. Anthony (Graves 5, 6, and 15), all were different shapes, but all were similar in that they had two-piece lids with simple butt hinges that folded downward toward the coffin foot for viewing.

The hardware of Henry Lehman Sr.’s coffin in Grave 11 was the most elaborate. There were six large ornate white metal coffin handles (Figure 8.9). The lid also bore a rather plain oval coffin plate. There was a wide band of stamped tin beading inset from the edge of the coffin lid, and diamond star tacks were used to cover the nails that held the coffin together (Figure 8.10). General hardware included two wood screws and cut-iron nails from the outer box and nails from the inner box. The complex construction of Henry Lehman Sr.’s cof-
Figure 8.6. Coffin hardware and personal items from Grave 2, Catharine Lehman Swift. The coffin plate is silver-plated Britannia metal (tin, antimony, and copper). The coffin handle is white metal. One four-hole milk glass button and one five-hole bone button, hairpins, and straight pins.

Figure 8.7. White metal coffin handles and white metal screws and screw/nail tacks from the coffin of Nancy Lehman (Grave 12). This hardware is similar to that from Grave 2.

Figure 8.8. Pine coffin lid with brass tacks forming the initials of Elethea or Elizabeth Anthony (Grave 15).
Figure 8.9. Elaborate white metal coffin handles and stamped tin nail/screw covers from the coffin of Henry Lehman Sr. (Grave 11).

Figure 8.10. Stamped tin beading and nail/screw covers from the coffin of Henry Lehman Sr. (Grave 11).
The variety of hardware used to decorate the coffin suggests it was manufactured commercially.

There were two rectangular children's coffins in the cemetery. The one in Grave 6 held the remains of Clarissa Anthony who died in May 1854. The coffin had simple funerary hardware consisting of four bail handles and two white metal butt hinges. Fasteners included eleven wood screws with white metal heads and screwdriver slots with quadruple filigree. While no match was found in mid-nineteenth-century hardware catalogs, similar-appearing hardware with triple filigree is shown in the 1869 Sargent & Co. hardware catalog. The second rectangular casket, containing the unidentified infant burial in Grave 8, was the smallest in the cemetery. Only plain hardware (four cut-iron nails) was recovered from this tiny rectangular coffin.

Empty Graves. All five empty graves contained at least some hardware from the outer boxes or decorative hardware from the coffins. Single cut-iron nails,probably from outer boxes, were retrieved from Grave 1 (Douw Swift?) and Grave 7 (unknown). The absence of other hardware indicates that both the coffins and outer boxes were still in good condition at the time of exhumation, and that removal probably occurred within a few decades of interment. Cut-iron nails were retrieved from both Graves 9 and 10, most likely the graves of Henry Lehman Jr. and Catharine Hiller, his wife. At the time of excavation, most of the nails were still in place at the bottom of the grave shaft, where they marked the margins of the outer boxes. Also, the decorative hardware from the two coffins consisted of diamond-shaped tacks similar to ones represented in the 1865 Russell and Erwin Manufacturing Company hardware catalog, but each grave had a different type. Some diamond tacks were still attached to coffin wood in both graves, evidence that both the outer boxes and coffins were already decomposed at the time of exhumation. It is clear that the graves were moved many decades after they were interred. One wood screw and forty-nine cut iron nails were retrieved from the empty Grave 13, an unknown adult. About half of the nails were retrieved from the perimeter of the bottom of the outer box.

Personal Items and Clothing
The bodies in the ten occupied graves in the Henry Lehman cemetery were buried without jewelry or personal goods of any kind other than hairpins from Grave 2 (Catharine Lehman Swift). The bodies buried in these nineteenth-century graves were dressed or shrouded with cloth made from silk, cotton, and wool. As natural fibers, the textiles were subject to the same decay that reduced the bodies with which they were buried. Except for Henry Lehman Sr.'s silk-lined wool suit in Grave 11, scant evidence was found in the other graves for either clothing or coffin linings. Non-textile clothing remains consisted of buttons and other clothing fasteners.

One metal button was obtained from the shaft of empty Grave 1, and was probably not associated with the burial. Evidence for clothing in Grave 2 (Catharine Lehman Swift) consisted of one milk glass four-hole button and one bone five-hole button. The milk glass button was found overlying the outside edge of the right hip. The bone button was recovered from the grave fill. The buttons may have closed a nightgown or shift. There were also four straight pins that may have been used to secure a burial shroud. The three hairpins were found behind the skull. Coffin lining materials included felted wool, wool braid with gold thread, and cotton muslin.

Straight pins were the only clothing fasteners found in Graves 3, 4, and 14, the possible Swift and Anthony infants. The pins were probably used to secure a burial shroud or small blanket around the children. One four-hole milk glass button and a bone bead were retrieved from Grave 6 (Clarissa Anthony). No personal items, pins, or textiles were retrieved from Graves 5 and 15 (Anthony family) or Grave 8 (unknown).

Mention has already been made of the suit found in Henry Lehman Sr.'s Grave 11. This garment was a wool black or navy double-breasted suit. The trouser waistband and legs, as well as jacket lapels, sleeves, and cuffs, survived along with part of the silk lining. Five large, hollow, fabric-covered, metal buttons were preserved along with a smaller cloth-covered button that closed the pants' waist. The absence of shirt buttons suggests that a cravat, a popular nineteenth-century burial garment, may have been used instead. The inventory of clothing remains in Nancy Lehman's grave (Grave 12) consisted of three brass hooks and eyes (two with fabric attached), one bone button, and one four-hole milk glass button. Mrs.
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Lehman appears to have been buried in a dress or skirt and blouse.

**Summary**

The data regarding coffin style, hardware, and personal items provide previously unknown information about the general preferences and availability of materials to the Lehman family. The form and style of burial for each of the individuals in the cemetery varied to some extent, and the use of simple or elaborate hardware appeared dependent upon the date of interment as well as the age of the individual.

The early burials in the cemetery, dating between 1840 and 1854, were all children's burials characterized by simple elaboration. Burials post-1854 were all adult burials. Two adult graves, those of Nancy Lehman and Catharine Lehman Swift who died the same year (1860), are characterized by simple elaboration; the remainder of adult graves with coffin remains, Henry Sr. (d. 1864) and the probable graves of Henry Jr. (d. 1859) and Catharine Hiller (d. 1869) are in the elaborate category. Due to the lack of comparative information within the cemetery, it is not certain whether the lack of elaboration of the early burials and increased elaboration in later burials is tied to the dates of interment or to the age of the deceased. In the sections below, the Henry Lehman family cemetery is placed within the broader context of nineteenth-century mortuary practices in order to gain a better understanding of the behaviors expressed by the Lehman family. The immediate section below explores the Lehmans' physical environment, demographic characteristics, and possible causes of death.

**Human Remains**

The study of human remains from the Henry Lehman family cemetery provides an opportunity for identifying aspects of the Lehman's physical and social environment and their impact on the health and mortality of the family. The sample of ten burials is small; nonetheless, a comprehensive biographical study of the cemetery was feasible due to information available from historical documents and grave markers, as well as from comparative data from other nineteenth-century cemeteries. The purpose of the osteological study of the ten individuals was to extract relevant biological information, including age at death, sex, cause of death, and patterns of disease and trauma. The study confirmed, to some degree, the known ages of individuals buried in the cemetery, and also confirmed that the remains from three adult graves represented two females and one male. In addition, the study provided previously unknown information regarding the ages of several children buried in the cemetery and the general level of health of this nineteenth-century farming family.

**Demographic Profile of the Henry Lehman Family**

Demographic statements regarding the Lehman family are possible when the osteological data are interpreted within an appropriate historical and environmental context. Table 8.3 lists the members of the family buried in the cemetery, along with known age, skeletal age, personal identity (known or assumed), and date of death.

Due to its small size, little can be said about the male/female ratio of the group. Of the three adults, Henry Sr. was the sole male present in the cemetery. Based on census records and grave mark-
Table 8.3. Demographics of the Henry Lehman Family Cemetery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Known</td>
<td>Assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADULTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Henry Lehman Sr. (d.1864)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nancy Kling Lehman (d.1860)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Catharine Lehman Swift (d.1860)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHILDREN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Swift infant (d.?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Swift infant (d.?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A. Anthony (d.?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clarissa Anthony (d.1854)</td>
<td>4.5 years</td>
<td>4–5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Unidentified infant (d.?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Elethea (d.1847) or Elizabeth (d.1844) Anthony</td>
<td>1.5 years</td>
<td>&gt; 6 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Elethea (d.1847) or Elizabeth (d.1844) Anthony</td>
<td>1.5 years</td>
<td>1.5–2.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNKNOWN (coffins removed from cemetery)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 7, 9, 10, 13</td>
<td>adolescents or adults (based on grave shaft size)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ers, it is possible that the four deceased Anthony children were females. Regarding ages at death for other Lehman family members, we know that at least four of Henry Sr.’s eight children (three daughters and one son) died by the age of forty-one. Two others are known to have lived at least to the age of forty-two, and one is known to have lived to at least fourteen. Henry’s daughter-in-law and second wife Catharine Hiller Lehman died in her late forties. At least four grandchildren died between the ages of seventeen and twenty-eight years. Thus, while Henry and his first wife Nancy lived into their seventies, at least half of their children and a significant number of their grandchildren did not survive past their early forties, and many did not survive past infancy, childhood, or the teen years.

In summary, what today we would consider as early death was common in the Lehman family. The compilation of assorted data suggests that mortality within the Lehman family was characterized by high infant, childhood, and young adult death. This pattern is not unusual in the context of nineteenth-century rural America.

The Health of the Henry Lehman Family

The discussion of general levels of health and disease in the Lehman family is limited to the more
common pathologies noted in the sample, with reference to a few specific pathologies (Tables 8.4 and 8.5). While it is not possible to identify for certain the causes of death for members of the Lehman family strictly from osteological data, some conjectures can be made regarding general levels of health and disease based on the observed skeletal pathologies. This data can be combined with information on general patterns of health and disease in the nineteenth century to provide interpretations of potential health threats to the family, as well as possible causes of death.
TABLE 8.4. Dental Observations of the Henry Lehman Family Cemetery Remains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial No.</th>
<th>Identity (Known or Assumed)</th>
<th>Caries</th>
<th>Calculus</th>
<th>Attrition</th>
<th>Periodontitis</th>
<th>Enamel hypoplasia</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Henry Lehman Sr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandibular tooth wear indicating habitual pipe smoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nancy Kling Lehman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— No dental remains present in burial —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Catharine Lehman Swift</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full maxillary resorption (no upper teeth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Swift infant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dentition consisted of four partially developed tooth crowns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Swift infant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One partial tooth crown present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A. Anthony</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clarissa Anthony</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Unidentified infant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dentition consisted of four partially developed tooth crowns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Elethea or Elizabeth Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— No dental remains present in burial —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Elethea or Elizabeth Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial No.</td>
<td>Identity (Known or Assumed)</td>
<td>Infection (Periostitis)</td>
<td>Arthritis</td>
<td>Neoplastic (benign) tumor</td>
<td>Osteoporosis</td>
<td>Cribra orbitalia</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Henry Lehman Sr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trachoma (eye disease)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nancy Kling Lehman</td>
<td>n/o</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Catharine Lehman Swift</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ear infection (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Swift infant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Swift infant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A. Anthony</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>n/o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clarissa Anthony</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Unidentified infant</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>n/o</td>
<td>Agenesis of lower limbs (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Elethea or Elizabeth Anthony</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Elethea or Elizabeth Anthony</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>n/o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† n/o = not observable
**Adult Health.** A specific cause of death is known for only one individual buried in the cemetery: Henry Lehman Sr., who is recorded to have died from typhoid fever in 1864. No skeletal evidence of this disease was apparent; however, other pathologies that supply information regarding Mr. Lehman's overall level of health were identified. Causes of death for the adult women are not known; however, other information regarding their health is inherent in their skeletal remains. In general, three main types of skeletal pathology were prevalent in the adult sample: periodontal disease, arthritis, and infection.

Dental disease was evident in the teeth of two adults. Henry Lehman Sr. and Catharine Lehman Swift both exhibited advanced periodontal disease, a disease of the mouth that in advanced stages involves tooth loss. Periodontitis normally results from poor oral hygiene, and specifically results from irritation associated with plaque buildup, attrition, and untreated cavities, which all predispose an individual to abscesses and tooth loss. Both Henry Sr. and Catharine Swift exhibited signs of periodontitis, indicating poor oral health that was likely a result of their lifestyle. While dental problems increase with age, they are also correlated with dietary habits. Gritty diets, such as those including coarsely processed grains, tend to increase occlusal wear, while cavity formation and dental plaque is intensified by a diet high in carbohydrates, such as that consumed by farmers. Considering these factors, the degree of periodontitis noted in these two adults is not surprising.

A second disease common to adults in the sample is osteoarthritis, or degenerative joint disease, which is a chronic, progressive condition related to both physical activity and advanced age. All three adults exhibited some arthritic changes, with Henry Sr. and Nancy Lehman, both in their seventies, exhibiting more prominent levels of osteoarthritis. Henry Lehman exhibited severe arthritis of the neck, including ankylosing (fusion) of cervical vertebrae; moderate arthritis of the mid-spine; and minimal but noticeable arthritic activity in his hand and foot bones. This patterning is expected of a hard-working farmer, an occupation involving repetitive heavy manual labor and consequent stress to the joints. While most of Nancy Lehman’s joint surfaces were poorly preserved, early stages of arthritis were noted in the arm, hand, and foot joints. She may have suffered from advanced stages of the disease in some of her joints, but this could not be documented due to the poor condition of her remains. Catharine Lehman Swift exhibited minimal arthritic development in her arm, hand, and foot bones, but less arthritic involvement is expected for Ms. Swift, given that she was three decades younger than her parents at death.

Henry Sr. and Nancy Lehman exhibited discernible signs of sinus infection, Mr. Lehman’s evidenced by lesions and a small bony tumor in his maxillary sinus, and Mrs. Lehman’s by a small tumor in her frontal sinus. The infectious lesions noted in Henry Lehman’s sinuses signify upper respiratory tract or other infection, allergy, or exposure to poor ventilation or air pollution (Roberts and Manchester 1995:131). Given that Mr. Lehman suffered from typhoid fever, it is possible that the sinus infection resulted from associated bronchitis, often a symptom of the fever (LeBaron and Taylor 1993:257). Additional evidence of infection in Mr. Lehman included slight but active lesions on several ribs. The ultimate cause of benign tumors in both individuals cannot be determined with certainty, as tumors result from a number of causes, some of which are indiscernible. Sinus tumors, however, are likely related to chronic upper respiratory tract infection and/or poor ventilation in a smoky environment. Based on his tooth wear patterning, we know that Mr. Lehman was a heavy pipe smoker, and the Lehman household may have been quite smoky, a result of cooking and heating with wood. One can imagine that Mr. Lehman’s condition near the time of death, namely a serious infection with respiratory complications, was exacerbated by his smoking habit and other immediate environmental conditions including a smoky atmosphere and perhaps the drafty winter weather during which he passed away.

Henry Lehman also exhibited possible evidence of an eye disease known as trachoma, indicated by the presence of a lesion in the roof of his right eye orbit. The lesion is strikingly similar to that identified by Webb (1990) as the osseous marker of the disease, which results from the infection of the upper eyelid conjunctiva, and is known to cause blindness (Aufderheide and Rodriguez-Martin 1998:251). This is a very unusual condition to locate.
osteologically, and most cases have been identified in Old World populations. Research has not identified whether the condition may be related to viral or other infections prevalent throughout the nineteenth century.

Osteological signs of infection were absent in the remains of Catharine Lehman Swift, with the exception of a possible ear infection. Her overall skeletal health appeared relatively good, with the exception of the periodontitis; however, it is clear that Catharine Lehman Swift died prematurely.

Nancy Lehman’s overall health is difficult to assess, since the portions of her remains that accumulate pathological information were poorly preserved. As noted, she did have a sinus tumor and arthritis; however, neither are likely to create problems serious enough to precipitate death. One additional age-related (and nutrition-related) disease noted from Mrs. Lehman’s remains is osteoporosis, evidenced by the typical thinning of the parietal bones. As an aside, given that the two women died within a month of each other, it is possible they had both contracted and died from a common infectious disease. Although this cannot be determined with certainty, it is quite likely, given that infectious diseases were rampant in the United States throughout at least the third quarter of the nineteenth century.

Infant and Child Health. The overall health of children, infants in particular, is considered by demographers to reflect the conditions of life surrounding the child. Infant mortality is used as a means of assessing sanitary conditions within the child’s, and thus the family or community’s, surrounding environment (Herring et al. 1991). The skeletons of children reflect evidence of chronic indicators of physiological stress, and post-neonatal mortality in particular (deaths occurring between twenty-eight days and the first year) is a good indicator of an infant’s environment, including nutrition, exposure to infectious disease, and living conditions (Herring et al. 1991:56).

In general, infant and child health in the Lehman family is assumed to have been poor given the high mortality experienced by the Lehman grandchildren, particularly during the post-neonatal ages. One sign of chronic stress noted in one of the longer-living grandchildren, Clarissa Anthony, is the condition known as enamel hypoplasia. The defect involves the structure of the tooth enamel, where horizontal lines on the teeth represent episodes of stress induced by metabolic insults (Aufderheide and Rodriguez-Martin 1998:405). The presence of several striations in Clarissa Anthony’s teeth indicates she was subject to several periods of acute infection and/or malnutrition throughout her short life of four and a half years; she probably succumbed to one final infection at that age.

Of the six other children, four were identified as succumbing to various infections, evidenced by cribra orbitalia (pitting in the eye orbits) and/or periostitis, a generalized bony response to infection. Two other children’s remains were too poorly preserved to identify evidence of these conditions. Similar to enamel defects, cribra orbitalia is an indicator of infection or malnutrition, and is often attributed to iron deficiency anemia (Roberts and Manchester 1995:165–171; Stuart-Macadam 1987). The high rate of the condition among the Lehman grandchildren and their early deaths suggest they probably suffered from the combined effects of infection and malnutrition. The unsanitary living conditions and unvaried diet typical of nineteenth-century rural America was a significant contributor to poor infant and childhood health, and it is not surprising that the life span was short for so many.

An additional physical anomaly of note was identified in the apparent physical condition of the unidentified Lehman grandchild buried in Grave 8. The infant, aged between six and twelve months, was buried on his or her back, with the arms folded across the rib cage (Figure 8.11). Three nails were present around the edge of the burial, suggesting burial within a coffin. The upper skeleton, with the exception of the cranium, was very well preserved, but only portions of the pelvic bones and no lower limb bones were present. Normally the absence of remains indicates poor preservation or disturbance within the burial; however, no disturbance or soil texture differences were apparent in the lower portion of the grave. The cause of the missing remains must be interpreted with caution; however, it is possible that the infant was born with a condition known as agenesis (congenital absence) of the leg bones. Agenesis of the limb bones is a relatively rare condition, but many known cases of the malformation have been recorded, although none have been described archaeo-
logically (Aufderheide and Rodriguez-Martin 1998:71). The outline of the grave allows space for the lower legs, but only if the legs were flexed, an unusual position. It is obvious that some care was taken in placing the infant in the grave due to the position of the arms; thus the lower body probably would have been intentionally placed in a normal extended position similar to two other children whose burial positions could be determined. Because this is an archaeological case, and there is no known record regarding the health of this infant, it cannot be determined with certainty whether this infant did suffer from agenesis; therefore, the physical condition of the child remains an enigma.

While specific causes of death can not be identified for the Lehman children, the infectious lesions in their skeletons suggest they succumbed to infection. High mortality among the children suggests the environmental conditions surrounding them were unhealthy. Whether the illnesses contracted by these children occurred independently of their overall level of health or were related to malnutritional factors is indeterminable. However, several diseases were common to children throughout the nineteenth century, and many infectious diseases were associated with overall poor health, which in turn resulted from unsanitary living conditions. Well into the nineteenth century, infectious disease was most prevalent in children. For example, scarlet fever, an acute infectious disease, was the leading cause of childhood death from the early nineteenth century to about 1875 (Hardy 1993:992). The disease is transmitted through intimate contact and contaminated milk, and was rampant in the winter months.

Unsanitary conditions, a poor and unvaried diet (particularly the weanling diet which was often diluted with contaminated water), a shortage of informed doctors, and the use of home remedies created an ideal environment for the development of other maladies such as the diarrheal diseases common in the 1800s. The summer months were considered a high-risk time for children, as diarrheal disease was particularly deadly during the heat of summer and times of drought (Herring et al. 1991:66). Diarrheal disease, coupled with scarlet fever in winter months, was enough to endanger children's health year-round. In addition to these maladies, regular epidemics of measles and smallpox were common during the last century (Kunitz 1993:331), and numerous outbreaks of cholera occurred in North America in 1832, 1854 (the year Clarissa Anthony died), 1866, 1887, and several later years (Speck 1993:646-647). Unfortunately, specific data regarding outbreaks of infectious disease in central New York are not available, so associating the Lehman deaths with specific outbreaks is not possible.

**The Henry Lehman Family**

**Health in Historical Context**

The information collected from the human remains of the Henry Lehman family and consequent interpretations regarding family health are comparable to other historic skeletal samples described in the literature (see Bellantoni et al. 1997; Herring et al. 1991; Pfeiffer et al. 1989; Saunders and Lazenby 1991). The data from the Lehman and other historic cemeteries reveal similar patterns of overall health and disease, and reflect the unfortunate environmental circumstances of the time: unsanitary living conditions, a diet lacking in variety, high risk of infectious disease, and deficient medical care. These conditions directly influenced rates of disease and mortality throughout eighteenth- and nineteenth-century America. While specific causes of death of Henry Lehman family members cannot be determined with certainty based on their osteological remains, the information provided by the physical anthropology study provides insight into the general health and lifestyle of the family over a period of twenty years. The osteological data, combined with historical and comparative data, suggest that the family was commonly exposed to infection that would have contributed to high rates of infant, child, and young adult mortality. Suspected poor living conditions within the household(s) are based on Henry Lehman's death from typhoid fever, the frequent death of children, and signs of infection recorded in the remains of many family members.

The health of the Lehman family in general, as reflected in the health of those occupying the family cemetery, is considered representative of health within the larger community. The nineteenth century was a time of general ill health, pestilence, and high mortality, primarily due to lack of knowledge regarding correlations between disease contraction and spread and such factors as water
contamination and poor quality diets (especially for children). As noted by Higgs, during the nineteenth century communities allocated too few resources to maintaining their health (Higgs 1977:194) and the health of their children, and this was intensified by the presence of pestilence throughout the period. In general, it appears that even though members of the Henry Lehman family were some of the wealthier farmers in the area, they experienced health distresses typical in early-to mid-nineteenth century communities.

**The Henry Lehman Family Cemetery in Perspective**

A general examination of nineteenth-century burial practices and late eighteenth- to nineteenth-century cemeteries places the Henry Lehman family cemetery within its historical context, allowing the cemetery to be interpreted within the broad socio-economic and sociological patterns of life and death of the time.

The Evolution of Colonial and American Mortuary Practices

In the nineteenth century, prior to the development of sophisticated mortuary practices delivered by professionals outside the home, most people dealt with death within the home and within the framework of the nuclear or extended family. Doing so required a balance between the need for relatively rapid interment and the desire to provide suitable eternal accommodations for the remains of a dear and respected relative or friend. This occurred within the limitations imposed by the family's economic status as well as local or ethnic cultural traditions and customs that dictated appropriate ways of disposing of the dead.

American colonial burial customs evolved from European practices, especially those of the British Isles. Customs at the time mandated intimate family involvement both as part of the death ritual and subsequently with the disposition of the remains. When a family member or close friend was near death, one or more relatives and friends kept watch or sat with the dying person. The observance continued even after the person was dead, partly to show respect and partly to look for signs of life (Earle 1896:296, 297, in O'Dell 1990:25).

The women of the family, sometimes assisted by an unrelated woman of the community, prepared the body for burial. The body was washed and laid out, a burial shroud was sewn, and the body was placed within it. Shrouds were simple robes that often had sleeves. Although usually left open for viewing, there was often sufficient material left at the top to cover the face at the time of burial. Straight pins closed the shroud when it was time to bury the body. Children were sometimes buried in a nightshirt or shift, garments that in their simplicity had more than a superficial resemblance to a shroud. Men and women could also be buried in their best clothes or better everyday clothes (O'Dell 1990:25). While the women of the family were responsible for preparing the body for burial, the male relatives excavated the grave. Men were also responsible for the construction of the coffin or arranging for one to be built if they had no skills for doing so (Earle 1896:296, 297, in O'Dell 1990:24).

Although there were some antecedents in the eighteenth century, complex burial practices and rituals proliferated among people of even modest means about the middle of the nineteenth century. The change was partly due to the improving economic position of many Americans because of gains in productivity and better transportation, which in turn had resulted from the Industrial Revolution. Balanced against an improving economic situation for most people, was the absence of commensurate advancements in either individual or public health. Typhoid fever, diphtheria, tuberculosis, and cholera were regular if not annual visitors to most communities, and these and other diseases accounted for many deaths. To this were added manmade disasters such as the Civil War, which reinforced the apparent randomness of death and people's inability to ward it off. Cold and drafty living conditions, poor diet, and the lack of pediatric care resulted in the deaths of nearly half of all infants and children. By mid-century, people had the time to mourn a lost child, spouse, sibling, or parent, but medical practice had not yet advanced to the point where lives were extended.

The complex mortuary traditions that proliferated in the nineteenth century have been referred to as the manifestations of the "cult of memory," the "beautification of death," and as part of an effort to "domesticate heaven" (Pike and Armstrong 1980).
Examples of practices that evolved during the period include:

1. Elaborate stone grave markers memorializing the deceased. The markers often incorporated sentimental life-size sculpture such as sleeping infants or pets, empty cribs, angels, lambs, and the like; monumental shapes such as temples and obelisks were also employed.

2. The development of factory-produced, ornately decorated coffins referred to by the more esthetically pleasing term "casket."

3. Manufactured burial garments for men, women, and children that mimicked the best-quality clothing, but were open at the back so that they could easily be fitted to the body.

4. The development of "rural" cemeteries to inter deceased urban dwellers. The cemeteries incorporated elaborate landscaping and plantings and were popularized for weekend urban recreation.

5. Professionalization of undertaking, including services such as removing the deceased from the place of death to a funeral home, embalming and preparing the body, providing burial clothing and dressing the deceased, arranging for funeral home, church, and graveside memorial services, transportation to the cemetery, and burial.

6. The transformation of the act of burying the dead from a simple private affair conducted by the family and a few close friends to an elaborate social gathering involving a wake and public viewing of the deceased, a funeral procession, church and graveside memorial services officiated by a minister, and catered luncheons following the memorial services.

The social obligations involved with a complex public funeral made mourning and the outpouring of emotion unfashionable. The intensity of the funeral activities also tended to obscure the fact that someone had passed away.

The extent to which the Lehman family participated in some of the mortuary activities described above can be deciphered through an analysis of the data retrieved from the archaeological study, as well as by comparisons between the family cemetery and other historic cemeteries in the northeastern United States.

Comparisons with Other Cemeteries

The cemeteries chosen for comparison with the Henry Lehman family cemetery include the almshouse cemetery at Uxbridge in Massachusetts, the emigrant American Harvie family burying ground in North Dumfries Township, Ontario, and the Walton Cemetery in Griswold, Connecticut. The Walton cemetery is the earliest and is discussed first.

The Walton Family Cemetery. The Walton family cemetery in Griswold, Connecticut belonged to the Nathaniel Walton family, which migrated from the vicinity of Boston in 1690 (Bellantoni et al. 1997). The cemetery plot was purchased by the family in 1757, and presumably the earliest burials date from that time. Another unknown family subsequently used the cemetery plot for a few years after the Waltons left the area in the early nineteenth century. The cemetery, rediscovered and excavated in the early 1990s, contained twenty-eight graves, most of which were marked by stone slabs retrieved from the neighboring fields. Each grave contained wooden coffins, twelve of which were hexagonal and eleven of which were rectangular in outline. The shapes of five coffins could not be discerned. Nine of the twelve hexagonal coffins and all of the unknown-shape coffins contained the remains of adults. All eleven rectangular coffins contained children. There was no evidence of outer boxes, although two coffins were set within fieldstone or unmortared brick and fieldstone crypts. Both coffins also bore the initials and age at death outlined in brass tacks on the coffin lid, and were the only coffins with any decoration. The only items found within the coffins other than the human remains were brass and silver straight pins in eleven graves (Bellantoni et al. 1997).

The Walton family cemetery dates from the period before elaborate mortuary practices evolved, but the plainness of coffins and grave markers also probably reflects the family's relatively meager economic circumstances that eventually culminated in their abandonment of the farm. The use of straight pins evidences the persistence of burial shrouds, the traditional burial garment of the dead in the eighteenth century. Interred before the advent of the "beautification of death" movement, there was little or no effort expended by the families to deny death by fostering an image of a "sleeping" family member rather than a corpse.
The Harvie Family Burying Ground. The Harvie family cemetery is a pioneer burying ground in Waterloo, Ontario. In 1817, the Scots Presbyterian Harvies emigrated from Caledonia, New York, to a settlement of scattered wilderness houses located twenty miles west of Lake Ontario. The family cemetery, excavated in 1988, contained the remains of fifteen people ranging in age from newborn to ninety-eight years. There were nine adults and six sub-adults, the children ranging in age from newborn to six years. Grave markers bore death dates ranging from 1825 to 1894 (Saunders and Lazenby 1991).

Coffin shape was discernible in ten graves containing eight hexagonal coffins and two rectangular coffins. Outer boxes were not included within the graves. Early coffins were devoid of decorative hardware; coffins post-dating 1850 included decorative hardware such as slot-headed white metal-capped screws and tacks, coffin plates, ornate white metal coffin handles, "caplifters" (special handles used to raise the coffin lid), decorative tin strips on the lid, and thumbscrews and thumbscrew studs. The ornamentation applied to post-1850 coffins was related to both age and status. Less decoration or decorations made from cheaper materials were used in the coffins of children and an unrelated field hand (Woodley 1991:41-49).

Personal items and clothing-related goods among graves predating 1850 were few: silver straight pins with round heads and one agate button. The graves of two older men buried in the latter half of the nineteenth century had the most evidence of burial garments. The grave of the hired hand contained white porcelain, bone, and fabric-covered steel buttons. The porcelain buttons suggest the man was buried in a shirt, while the fabric-covered steel buttons were likely from a suit coat or jacket. The bone buttons may have fastened his trousers. With an unidentified sixty-year-old man were three metal buttons covered with black cloth, evidence of a jacket. In addition, three tin medallions were found along the midline of the body (Woodley 1991:47).

The Harvie family's rapid adoption of ornate and elaborate mortuary hardware in the 1860s is attributed at least in part to the hiatus in burials between 1848 and 1860, a time when mortuary “fashion” was rapidly evolving (Woodley 1991:47-48). During the same period, the availability in rural areas of hardware manufactured specifically for the funeral trade also improved as a result of the developing transportation system and increasing popularity of the “beautification of death” movement. The authors conclude that the “continued elaboration of burials and coffins through time (as) reflect(ing) changing attitudes towards death. Rather than facing death, the ornate coffins seem to hide or disguise death” (Woodley 1991:48).

The Uxbridge Almshouse Burial Ground. The Uxbridge almshouse burial ground is located in the borough of Uxbridge, Worcester County, Massachusetts. Located on “poor farm” property, the cemetery was used to bury the town’s paupers from the early 1830s until 1872, when the property was sold. The cemetery included twenty-four adults and seven children. About half of the graves were marked with crude blocks of quarried granite or natural schist, granite, or gneiss stones obtained from neighboring farmlands. There was one engraved headstone, and most graves probably originally had both head and foot stones (Elia and Wesolowsky 1991).

The Uxbridge burial containers were hexagonal wooden coffins except for two rectangular coffins, one a child’s, the other an adult woman’s. Apparently there were no outer boxes, and none of the coffins were fitted with handles. Hinges found in two-thirds of the graves indicated a high proportion of two or even three-part coffin lids. Hinges were both simple and ornate styles commonly found in mid-nineteenth century hardware catalogs, such as those made by the Russell and Erwin Manufacturing Company (Elia and Wesolowsky 1991).

With regard to burial garments, some paupers were interred in their everyday clothes and some in shrouds. Burial textiles included a few fragments of cotton textile from six graves, identified as a child’s blanket in one case, a cravat in another, and a possible coffin lining in a third. Clothing fasteners included buttons made of mother-of-pearl, porcelain, bone, and metal, indicating that the dead were interred in shirts, blouses, high-collared dresses, trousers and, in some instances, undergarments (Elia and Wesolowsky 1991).
The plain or modestly decorated coffins commissioned and paid for by the Uxbridge borough government reveal that the town sought relatively inexpensive containers for the paupers’ bodies. Nonetheless, the dead were interred in a respectful if simple manner in a designated burial ground on the poor farm property. The use of glass viewing plates on two coffins reveals that the frugal borough government was not immune from the influence of evolving practices. Even though grave markers were simple field or quarried stone in all instances except one, virtually all graves were probably originally marked at both head and foot (Elia and Wesolowsky 1991).

**DISCUSSION**

Three aspects of mortuary practice gleaned from the archaeological and historical records of these four cemeteries are tallied in Table 8.6. These aspects are the division of coffin hardware among plain, simple and elaborate categories; the types of burial garments as evidenced by straight pins and clothing fasteners; and the types of grave markers.

**Coffin Hardware**

The ability or willingness of families such as the Waltons, Harvies, and Lehmans, or the Uxbridge town officials to retain familiar practices or adopt new styles is exhibited in the numbers of coffins adorned with funerary rather than common hardware, and the elaborateness of the funerary hardware employed. How rapidly new styles were adopted by the Walton, Harvie, and Lehman families can be discerned by the dates of the various cemeteries and the absence or degree of ornamentation of the coffins within. At the Walton cemetery, the oldest of the four burying grounds, twenty-four coffins were assembled with plain hardware. Only four coffins had simple funerary hardware consisting of white metal-capped wood screws and matching wood tacks. There were no coffins with elaborate hardware.

The Uxbridge burying ground (c. 1830-1872) had no coffins with elaborate hardware, although 24 of 31 graves had some type of simple funerary hardware such as white metal screw caps and tacks and viewing windows. Elia and Wesolowsky (1991:281) suggest that this type of mortuary hardware was inexpensive and had little impact on the overall price of a coffin, even for a pauper.

At the Henry Lehman family cemetery (c. 1840-1870), three infant coffins had plain hardware. Of the six coffins with simple mortuary hardware, two were adults (Catharine Lehman Swift and Nancy Lehman) and four were children. Henry Lehman, Henry Jr., and Catharine Hiller Lehman were buried in coffins with elaborate funerary hardware. The use of simple or elaborate hardware for coffins in the Lehman cemetery was tied to the date of interment as well as to an individual’s age.

This trend was repeated in the Harvie cemetery in Ontario where burials fell into only two of the hardware groups: plain and elaborate. The absence of transitional simple mortuary hardware may reflect a hiatus in burials between 1848 and 1860; however, this cemetery reflects how rapidly tastes in coffins evolved at mid-century. Within a span of twelve years the family adopted elaborate funerary styles to the exclusion of the plain hardware of half a generation earlier.

**Burial Garments**

How the three families and the keepers of the poor in Uxbridge chose to dress bodies for interment evolved more subtly than choices in coffin hardware. In the c. 1757-1830 Walton family cemetery, no evidence of clothing was preserved in any of the twenty-eight burials; shroud pins were found in two burials. The absence of pins from the remaining twenty-six graves could mean that those bodies were interred in shrouds that were completely sewn and did not require pins, a practice common in earlier times. For the other three cemeteries (Harvie, Uxbridge, and Lehman), virtually equal numbers of graves had shroud pins and clothing fasteners. Furthermore, in all four cemeteries there was at least one burial that contained both (Table 8.6). As suggested for the Walton cemetery, when the dates of the burials are taken into account, there is a distinct tendency for burials with pins to occur in early interments and clothing alone in later ones. For the Lehman cemetery, shroud pins were obtained from three infant/child graves, all interred during the 1840s and 1850s. Four graves dating from 1860 and before had shroud pins, while three graves dated 1854 and later had only clothing fasteners. Active at mid-century, the Lehman cemetery...
TABLE 8.6. Coffin Hardware, Evidence for Burial Garments, and Grave Markers from Four Cemeteries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Category</th>
<th>Walton (c.1757–&lt;1830)</th>
<th>Uxbridge Poor Farm (c.1830–1872)</th>
<th>Lehman (c.1840–1870)</th>
<th>Harvie (1825–1894)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coffin Hardware:</td>
<td>24P/ 4SF/ 0EF</td>
<td>8P/ 24SF/ 0EF</td>
<td>3P/ 6SF/ 3EF</td>
<td>9P/ 0SF/ 6EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Plain (P)</td>
<td>2/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>5/ 4/ 1</td>
<td>3/ 3/ 1</td>
<td>2/ 2/ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Simple Funerary (SF)</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Elaborate Funerary (EF)</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burials with:</td>
<td>2/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>5/ 4/ 1</td>
<td>3/ 3/ 1</td>
<td>2/ 2/ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shroud Pins</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing Fasteners</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave Markers:</td>
<td>X/ X/ X</td>
<td>X/ X/ X</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ X/ X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified or Unmodified Local Stone, Not Inscribed</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscribed Local Sandstone or Non-local Marble</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-local Commercial Granite</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
<td>0/ 0/ 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aFor the purpose of this paper, plain hardware consists of handmade, cut, and wire nails, iron wood screws, and plain brass or iron plate hinges that could be used for purposes other than coffin construction. Examples of simple funerary hardware include white metal screw caps and matching tacks, lining and brass tacks, and plain white metal and brass bail handles with mounting plates of the type that would be suitable as chest handles. The inventory of elaborate funerary hardware includes stamped tin beading, escutcheons, and tacks in the shape of diamonds and stars; caplifters and thumbscrews with escutcheons; and outsized, highly ornate, cast metal coffin handles. Ornate coffin hardware would look out of place if used anywhere else than on a coffin. Viewing windows and coffin plates are components of both simple and elaborate funerary hardware.

represents a transition point when a family might choose to use a burial shroud, nightshirt/shift, clothing, or a combination of shroud and clothing.

Grave Markers.
While other aspects of mortuary practice such as the elaborateness of coffins evolved rapidly at the middle of the nineteenth century, grave marker styles do not appear to have kept pace, at least not for the Lehmans. Grave markers from the cemetery date from 1844 (Elizabeth Anthony) to 1869 (Catharine Hiller Lehman). All nine grave markers that originally stood in the family cemetery (six recovered at the cemetery and three moved to Slate Hill Cemetery) were non-local marble fashioned by skilled artisans, demonstrating that the family was wealthy enough to participate in a market economy.

At Uxbridge, all graves but one were marked with fieldstone or quarried granite slabs. The only different headstone was that of a black woman who died in 1859 and whose grave was marked by an inscribed limestone headstone (Elia and Wesolowsky 1991:24, 27). Details of the markers from the Harvie cemetery are not discussed in the report (Saunders and Lazenby 1991), although a variety of styles and materials was pictured in one photograph.

The evolution of grave markers in the nineteenth century paralleled other aspects of changing mortuary practices. The adoption of new materials and styles mirrored the development of the American industrial economy, the country’s improving transportation network, and the evolution of technology. Both the Walton and Uxbridge
cemeteries have grave markers made of local materials, mostly fieldstone and quarry slabs. That some of the Uxbridge markers are granite quarry slabs indicates that a granite works operated nearby. A hard igneous rock, granite is difficult to cut, while limestone, sandstone, and marble are soft enough to shape easily with hand tools and soft iron saws. It was only after mid-century when powerful industrial cutting equipment driven by steam was employed that granite grave markers become competitively priced. The stone's hardness resisted erosion and made it suitable as an "eternal" memorial that engendered a sense of solemnity and reserve that appealed to the Victorians.

**Perspective**

The Walton, Harvie, Uxbridge, and Lehman cemeteries are examples of late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century northeast North American rural burying grounds. As such, they were on the trailing edge of cultural change, located in places where evolving styles took time to diffuse from the urban centers where they originated. The rate of diffusion depended on several factors including the state of development of the transportation network and the ability of individual households to participate in the market economy due to improving economic circumstances. As prosperous mid-nineteenth-century farmers, both the Harvies and the Lehmans could take part in the movement. As poorer people earlier in the century, the Waltons predated "the wave." Among popular mortuary goods that the Harvies and the Lehmans acquired were grave markers made from high-quality, non-local stone carved by artisans, and hardware designed specifically for coffins and available from distant manufacturers.

In some ways, the three family cemeteries and the poor farm burying ground belong to the age of pre-mortuary elaboration, especially the Walton family cemetery and the Uxbridge almshouse cemetery. For the later poorhouse burying ground interments, even modest pauper's coffins had simple ornamentation. The Harvies adapted to changing mortuary practices, abandoning traditional modes of burial and rapidly assimilating concepts such as decorating coffins with elaborate hardware and dressing the deceased in his or her own clothing. To a modest extent, the Lehmans kept pace with changing styles in coffin hardware. Had the Lehmans continued to use their cemetery into the 1880s and 1890s, their conservative marble grave markers might have been supplanted by elaborate carved granite stones.

As the nineteenth century progressed the families discussed here adopted within their means more elaborate mortuary practices that diverged in important ways from the rituals of previous times. The new funerary rituals were aimed at divorcing death from life, in contradistinction to the preceding view that saw death as an integral part of life. Dichotomies separating the two world-views included dressing the body in the garment of the living rather than covering the body with a simple shroud that fortified the idea that the individual was dead, disguising death by placing the body in an ornate casket rather than recognizing the passing of the individual by using a plain wood coffin, and memorializing the dead with elaborately sculpted grave markers of exotic "permanent" materials in place of unmodified locally available "natural" materials.

**Summary and Conclusions**

Similar to most eastern North Americans during the nineteenth century, the Lehmans existed in a milieu of constant change resulting from a rapidly developing industrial economy, transportation network, and social movements. They responded to the new forces shaping America by participating in both the consumer economy and social changes reflecting evolving attitudes toward death. Prior to the "beautification of death" movement, Americans related to death as an integral part of life. As is demonstrated by the large number of children interred in the Lehman family cemetery, as well as the early death of many of the Lehman adults, death was a common occurrence in most families. Before the "beautification of death" movement, people conducted most burial activities themselves with little help from outside the nuclear or extended family, other than arranging for the construction of a coffin. Bodies were fitted with shrouds, garments designed specifically for the dead. As mortuary practices evolved in the last half of the nineteenth century, caring for the dead became more complex and culminated with the wholesale
professionism of the industry. The Lehman cemetery marks an early point along this continuum where funerary practices were still relatively simple. Only the later graves show the family beginning to commit to the "beautification of death" movement. A comparison of the Lehman cemetery with others dating from earlier and later times in the Northeast demonstrates how widespread the movement was and how people everywhere participated within the economic limitations of their households.

The Lehmans were well-off but frugal people who suffered from many of the diseases common in nineteenth-century America. The osteological study provided previously unrecorded information regarding the general level of health of the Lehman family. While specific causes of death for the family members could not be identified, the study still provided insight into the lifestyle patterns of the family and surrounding community. The family suffered the devastation of high infant and child mortality, premature adult death, and various signs of infection, all of which were typical of the time period. While some adult diseases, such as arthritis and dental disease, were activity- and age-related, others, primarily infectious diseases, were correlated with the Lehmans' immediate environmental conditions. The poor health and early death of the children, and Henry Lehman's death from typhoid fever, point to unhealthy living conditions within the Lehman household and surrounding community. These conditions were common in both rural and urban communities, indicating that most people everywhere suffered from the same intractable diseases that often had plagued their forebears even as their own lives improved.

The study of the Henry Lehman family cemetery demonstrates the value of a synergistic approach to learning about a specific burying ground and the domestic characteristics of the associated family. The written historical record was essential for obtaining general information about the family, such as birth and death dates and general patterns of their lives, but shed little light on specific features of the Lehmans' social and physical environment. The archaeological and physical anthropology studies provided important information concerning the behaviors and preferences of the Lehman family, most of which were directed by and associated with the larger nineteenth-century community.
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The Porter site is both typical and unique. By typical I mean that as a nineteenth-century rural farmstead site located alongside a modern roadway, and discovered, researched, and excavated under the aegis of cultural resource management archaeology, Porter belongs to a class of sites which is becoming the most frequently encountered in publicly funded archaeology (Kuhn and Little, this volume; Peña, this volume; Wurst, this volume). While nineteenth-century rural domestic sites such as Porter have become so numerous that some have voiced the opinion that to excavate any more of them would be redundant, I also characterize the site as unique for several reasons. Porter, one in a broadly similar category of sites, is a unique example since it existed in its own historic and cultural contexts. Additionally, the degree of excavation and the size of the site’s artifact sample, as well as the depth of data analysis undertaken after excavation (compare to Wurst, this volume), make it unique.

While archaeologists know of countless sites in New York State like Porter, we don’t know many of them thoroughly. Those sites which have been extensively excavated either come from states far enough removed from New York that their differing historical and cultural contexts make them poor comparative cases, or have had data presented only in the “gray literature” of CRM reports. The Public Archaeology Facility’s (PAF) principal investigator, Nina Versaggi, and myself made the decision early on to treat the Porter site as a “test bed” to demonstrate what can be contributed through an intensive excavation and analysis of a nineteenth-century rural domestic site.

The Porter site is located in the Town of Coventry in Chenango County, New York (Figure 9.1). It is situated at the base of a hill overlooking a small creek (Figure 9.2). The site was first identified during a Phase I shovel test survey along both sides of N.Y. 235 undertaken by PAF prior to New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) construction in the area, and coincided with an exposed nineteenth-century foundation (Levendowski and Loren 1995). Historic maps for the area revealed that the structure in question was the home of one L. Porter in the late nineteenth century.

A Phase II site examination was conducted in September 1995, consisting of a 5m interval grid of shovel test pits, and of eight 1x1m test units. Results of the site examination indicated that (1) the
site covered an area of approximately 500 m\(^2\), (2) the site was characterized by a broad sheet midden of mid- to late nineteenth-century artifacts, and (3) there was no evidence of disturbance within the site boundaries. It was believed at the time that the site had the potential to contribute greatly to the ongoing research program within PAF regarding the social history of rural New York, and a more extensive Phase III data recovery excavation was recommended (Levendowski and Versaggi 1995; Rafferty 1996).

### Research Design and Documentary Evidence

The research design for the interpretation of the Porter site centered around four general issues: (1) nineteenth-century rural social dynamics, (2) changes in farming practices and strategies, (3) household production, and (4) consumer behavior. These research topics are drawn from PAF’s research program for rural nineteenth-century sites developed by Nina Versaggi and LouAnn Wurst.

### Rural Social Relations and the Agrarian Myth

Most historical studies of rural America have contrasted rural with urban society. Rural life is often characterized as simple, unvarying, and agricultural, and is seen in this perspective as passive, unprogressive, and associated with the past. Urban society has been viewed as complex, hierarchical, and industrial, and thereby active and progressive (Burns 1989; Johnstone 1938; Marx 1964). LouAnn Wurst (1993, 1994) notes that since rural society is viewed as undifferentiated, it is implicitly seen as classless. The widespread ownership of land in rural areas strengthened this view (Barron 1984). The perception has come to be known by critics as the “Agrarian Myth.” Wurst’s (1993, 1994) research in upstate New York portrays a more dynamic view of rural society, consisting of wealthy landowners, well-to-do farmers, and the owners of rural industries, as well as migrant farmers and rural industrial laborers. Rural society was not only class-based, but transcended simplistic conceptions of stratified societies.

Keeping this view of rural society in mind, an examination of documentary evidence for the Porter site provided a social context from which subsequent interpretations were framed. Census information was most helpful in this regard. The 1850 Federal census lists Lorren Porter as head of household, then age fifty. Also in residence were Lorren’s wife Eliza, age forty-four, and four children: Charles (fifteen), Lucy (eleven), Sarah (nine), and Edward (seven). Lorren’s personal assets are listed at $2,000 on the 1850 census, twice the average for the area. The 1855 New York State census includes Lorren Porter at age fifty-six, along with Esther (age twenty-two, not listed in 1850), Charles Porter (age twenty), Lucy (age sixteen), Sarah (fourteen), and Henry E. (age twelve, presumably listed as Edward in 1850). Lorren is noted as widowed, so Eliza must have passed away between 1850 and 1855. The 1860 federal census includes Lorren Porter at age fifty-six, along with Esther (age twenty-two, not listed in 1850), Charles Porter (age twenty), Lucy (age sixteen), Sarah (fourteen), and Edward (age seventeen). The next available census was the 1875 New York State census, which lists Lorren Porter at seventy-five years of age living with his son Charles and his daughter Sarah. The next document pertaining to the Porter Site is a deed dated 1885, recording the sale by Lorren of the property containing the site to his eldest son Charles. This is the last document listing Lorren B. Porter, and he presumably died soon thereafter.

Agricultural schedules for the 1850, 1855, 1860 and 1875 censuses (Tables 9.1–9.3) give a picture of...
Table 9.1. Census Agricultural Schedule Entries of Farm Value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Improved Acres</th>
<th>Unimproved Acres</th>
<th>Farm Value</th>
<th>Machinery</th>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Slaughtered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$348</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td></td>
<td>$97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>$166</td>
<td>$1,717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.2. Census Agricultural Schedule Entries for Stock.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Horses (n)</th>
<th>Cows (n)</th>
<th>Oxen (n)</th>
<th>Cattle (n)</th>
<th>Sheep (n)</th>
<th>Pigs (n)</th>
<th>Cheese (n)</th>
<th>Butter (lb)</th>
<th>Wool (lb)</th>
<th>Eggs ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>900</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.3. Census Agricultural Schedule Entries for Crops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Wheat</th>
<th>Buckwheat</th>
<th>Corn</th>
<th>Oats</th>
<th>Potato</th>
<th>Peas</th>
<th>Apples</th>
<th>Cider (bbls)</th>
<th>Hay (tons)</th>
<th>Maple Sugar (lbs)</th>
<th>Molasses (gal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>80 lb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>200 lb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crop amount values are in bushels unless otherwise noted.

The Porter farm economy. The entries for farm value (Table 9.1) clearly indicate a steady increase in the size and worth of the farm. While it does not appear that Lorren B. Porter was a wealthy man, he definitely seemed to be doing well economically during the late nineteenth century, with his personal holdings and assets appreciating steadily. Comparison to other farms in the Coventry area during those years show that the value of the Porter farm tends to exceed that of his neighbors, in some cases by nearly twice as much.

The entries for stock (Table 9.2) indicate a diverse collection of animals, with numerous milk cows, showing an emphasis on dairying. Other
stock, including horses, oxen, beef cattle, sheep, and pigs, presumably served as draft animals and sources of supplemental income. The single entry for eggs sold indicates that chickens were kept as well. Few farmers could afford to raise only dairy cows for milk, butter, or cheese, and a mixed approach was more common (McMurry 1995:2).

The crop entries (Table 9.3) support the picture of a diverse farming strategy. Some wheat and a fair amount of buckwheat were produced, but also corn, oats and potatoes, probably fodder for the dairy. Also, entries for apples and maple sugar, as well as for some peas, cider, and molasses, indicate that some crop flexibility was maintained to supplement production and income as circumstances warranted.

When first encountered in the census and deed documents, the Porter family seems to exemplify the “middling farmers” postulated by the Agrarian Myth to be the dominant social category in the countryside. With time, however, we see a different picture, as the Porter farm greatly expanded the family’s holdings to become one of the most successful family dairy operations in the area.

Other critiques of the Agrarian Myth have focused on its lack of attention to internal social contradictions. Much of rural farming depended on female labor, especially in the dairy regions of the Northeast (McMurry 1995). Despite this dependence on female labor, “women’s work” tended to be devalued. Osterud (1991) noted a dynamic situation of male—female interaction as women manipulated their personal relations and labor to maintain a relationship of mutuality with men. McMurry notes how women’s attempts to acquire education and a life outside of the family farm had an impact on the dairy industry in upstate New York by undercutting the traditional source of dairy labor (McMurry 1995). These dynamic views of rural gender relations contradict perceptions of men and women inhabiting “separate spheres” (Wall 1994).

Documents provide insights on the role of female labor at the Porter site. Censuses indicate that the available labor force consisted of Lorren himself, his wife Eliza, his three daughters Esther, Lucy, and Sarah, and his two sons Charles and Henry. Eliza died sometime between 1850 and 1855. While Lorren, Charles, and Henry would probably have been responsible for the maintenance of the property and major crops, the agricultural schedules show that a significant portion of the farm’s output was outside these traditionally male responsibilities, including the dairy, chicken, maple sugar, and molasses or apple cider production, which would most likely have involved the labor of the Porter women.

The Agrarian Myth has also been criticized as imposing a false dichotomy between “rural” and “urban” as separate entities. A more relational model sees the two as interdependent, linked by social and economic ties. Barron states that “[f]armers . . . were at once tied to national markets and also entwined in a face-to-face local life that remained central” (Barron 1984:136). Any fruitful analysis of a rural context has to take into account the effect of the interaction with urban society and broad economic forces. The research issues concerning nineteenth-century farming, household production, and consumer behavior involve the relationship between rural society and wider social and economic scales.

**Nineteenth-Century Farming**

The nineteenth century saw profound changes in the lives of New York farmers, as technological innovations sparked a shift toward industrial farming. This undercut the family-based rural farmers who had dominated agriculture until the mid-nineteenth century. Construction of the canal system and railroads made it easier and more profitable for farmers to get their products to urban markets (Barron 1984:3), but also resulted in a shift of agricultural production away from New York State. The growth of urban industrial production with wage-paying jobs stimulated a migration from rural areas to urban centers (Gibb 1994); many took the opportunity to escape from the routine of the family farm, while others remained to carry on the farming tradition. Some farmers were adversely affected by shifting markets, while others actually saw an improvement in their economic situation (McMurry 1995). All were forced to make choices in order to adapt to changing circumstances, and these choices can be analyzed from their material consequences and from documentary evidence.

Documentary evidence shows us some of the choices made by the Porters to cope in a changing world. The variation in the types of stock and crops
raised provided flexibility in their economic activity that would have given them an advantage over more specialized farming operations. The focus on stock requiring less capital investment than dairy cows, such as pigs and sheep, as well as on a variety of crops and processed products, contributed to the growth of the farm in the face of increasingly difficult economic circumstances. Moreover, the results of the Porter site analysis show material aspects of the choices made by the Porters that are not perceptible in the documentary record alone.

**Production and Consumption**

Non-agricultural household production and consumer behavior are closely related, one being the reciprocal of the other. Household production refers to productive activity based at the household level rather than at a farm or industrial level. Research regarding household production has tended to focus on urban contexts. However, this work is insightful in that it highlights the role of women as the primary laborers in household production. Most household production tasks have traditionally been undertaken by women, either within a family or communally (Osterud 1991:194). To this list we can add activities associated with dairying and varied farm production, which we see in evidence in the Porter documents. While household production was transformed during the late nineteenth century, its repetitive and devalued character remained constant (Strasser 1982).

Consumer behavior issues reflect the other side of the economic coin. The latter half of the nineteenth century saw the expansion of capitalist markets into the rural countryside. The expansion of consumerism had been an ongoing and growing phenomenon in America since the late eighteenth century (Martin 1996; McKendrick et al. 1982), and increased markedly during the period of the Porter site’s occupation. The growing availability of consumer goods via catalogues was key in this transition. Even the poorest tenant farmers had access to a variety of manufactured items. The increase in the availability of consumer goods directly contributed to a transformation in the social relations of consumption in rural America as luxuries became necessities; one’s standing in a community was measured by possessions as well as by who one was (Walker 1995). The Porter site provides an ideal case study to examine how changes in the availability of material goods affected the consumption choices of a single family.

Household production and consumer choice issues can be approached via material culture associated with each phenomenon. Changes in the value, design, and variety of table and tea wares can inform the consumption of material culture in household subsistence as well as in social display. Similar changes in utilitarian ceramics or glassware, as well as the nature of the faunal assemblage at the site, can provide information on the nature of production at the household level and possibly on changes taking place, since what was previously produced internally could now be purchased from external sources.

**The Porter Site Excavation**

Figure 9.3 depicts the location of all testing at the Porter site, as well as the location of the foundation and other structural features within the site area. All testing was confined to seven excavation clusters, A through G. Excavation was undertaken primarily in 1x1m units. In all, thirty square meters were excavated, a 6% sample of the site area and an intensive excavation in comparison to other excavations on rural nineteenth-century domestic sites in New York (Wurst, this volume). During excavation, one large feature was identified: an external wall attached to the foundation.

A historic sheet midden comprised of ceramics, glass, animal remains, personal artifacts, and architectural debris covered the site. The areas of highest artifact density lay to the southeast of the foundation, in association with the external wall; this presumably was the rear yard area (based on the location of the cellar stairs and the foundation’s orientation to the roadway), so a high artifact density is not unexpected. Stratigraphy across the entire site was quite shallow, with most units encountering sterile subsoils within 50 cm. Following the completion of the excavation, NYSDOT construction went ahead.

**Analysis of the Porter Site Assemblage**

The Porter site was one of the most intensive data recoveries performed on a nineteenth-century domestic site by PAF. Intensive excavation does
littie good in the absence of equally intensive analysis. But the scope of the excavation and analysis actually posed a problem for us as researchers, since we had few case studies from New York to turn to for comparison, forcing us to treat Porter for the most part as a single example.

Analysis began at the cataloguing stage. The PAF cataloguing system organizes historic assemblages in terms of artifact function. The system is based on South's (1976) artifact classification, adapted to include material culture types common to the nineteenth century and organized by functional groups. Each artifact was classified by its function (kitchen, architectural, personal, smoking, etc.), as well as specific type (nail, bottle, food preparation, etc.). Information on ceramic decoration and form was also recorded where appropriate. Where possible, time ranges for the manufacture of these artifacts were assigned.

The South classification system has been criticized as devaluing female contributions to an assemblage (Spencer-Wood 1996:400–401). Specifically, the characterization of artifacts as “domestic” or “kitchen-related” has often carried the implicit stereotype that these were exclusively female concerns, but were subordinate to other, presumably male-dominated social arenas. PAF researchers use a modified South system of classification primarily for organizational facility in order to maintain comparability among data sets within our historical research program. PAF is aware of these issues and implements this system with the possible shortcomings of the technique in mind. I feel that attention to both documentary records relating to the gender composition of the household and to the female contributions at the Porter site assemblage mitigates possible biases of the classification system.

Artifacts grouped as unaffiliated are too eroded or fragmented to be classified functionally, or else belong in more than one functional group (the vast majority of unaffiliated artifacts in the Porter assemblage was classified due to fragmentation, not because of ambiguities in the classification system). Food-related artifacts are primarily the remains of ceramic and glass vessels associated with the preparation, serving, or storage of food. Food remains are any material, such as bone or shell, which was presumably the remains of meals (no vegetal material was recovered during excavation). Architectural artifacts are items associated with a building, such as nails, bricks, or window glass. Hygienic or medicinal artifacts include medicine bottles or other items which had some form of medical function. Furnishing or clothing-related artifacts are the remains of household furniture or personal apparel. Personal, amusement, or cosmetic artifacts include toys, combs or brushes, and other objects associated with personal enjoyment or grooming. Lighting-related artifacts consist primarily of lamp chimney or globe fragments, or the remains of lamp burners. Tools or arms include all farm implements, weapons, or ammunition. Smoking artifacts consist generally of kaolin smoking pipe fragments. Miscellaneous modern artifacts include all items of post-World War II origin, such as plastic. Transportation or mechanical artifacts include all items associated with wagons, carts, cars, or other farm machinery. Finally, manufacturing or production-related artifacts include any objects associated with rural industry or farm production.

The first step in analyzing the data from the Porter site was to formulate a chronology for the

---

Figure 9.3. Porter Site Excavation Plan.
site. We knew from historical documents that the Porter family had occupied the site from the 1840s to the 1880s. This is a fairly narrow range of history, and a period that saw some major transformations in rural society. While we had a reasonably clear indication of the range of the Porters’ occupation, it remained to be seen if we could find more precise chronological information within this span. Since our research program focused on change over time, it was our hope that we would be able to identify distinct periods of the site’s occupation based on material culture. This would usually be accomplished through stratigraphic analysis. With Porter however, the deposits were so shallow that we had little in the way of stratigraphy with which to conduct such an analysis. Test units averaged 22 cm of artifact-bearing soil, and the artifact-bearing stratum showed no internal differentiation. The only possible solution was to seek chronological variation across the site area horizontally in the hope that areas of artifact deposition changed over time within the site boundaries. This investigation of “horizontal stratigraphy” was quite successful, and provided the chronological variation we needed for the research questions at hand.

Diagnostic mean ceramic dates were calculated by unit for each excavation cluster. The vessel-derived dates are given in Table 9.4 for each excavation cluster. It was impossible to refine the vessel dates any closer due to sample size, but this gave the spatial variation in mean dates that we were seeking. Deposits on the site appeared to date to three general periods, and got progressively younger as one moved south and east. Clusters A, D, E, and G date to the mid-nineteenth century. Cluster C contains slightly later deposits and dates from the mid- through the late nineteenth century. Finally, Clusters B and F contain relatively recent deposits which date from the late nineteenth through the early twentieth centuries. This spatial/temporal patterning formed the basis for the examination of transformations in the use of material culture at the Porter Site over time. It should be noted that a mean ceramic date range for a given excavation cluster does not mean that every artifact within that area corresponds to that date range; rather, it relates to a general chronological affiliation, although some mixture within that range is inevitable.

The Porter assemblage was both dense and fairly diverse, with all major functional types represented. We recovered 10,903 artifacts, with an average of 295 artifacts per square meter. Artifact concentrations existed both in overall artifact density and in the frequency of specific artifact types. The site was intact and free of modern disturbance; only three artifacts of clearly modern origin were recovered, in spite of the site’s proximity to a modern roadway.

Cluster A, southwest of the foundation, contained a moderate concentration of artifacts (2,299), which were grouped primarily as unaffiliated, food-related, food remains, and architectural. Unaffiliated artifacts consisted mostly of undifferentiated ceramics. This cluster also had the highest concentration of food remains of any excavation cluster, and a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th># Vessels</th>
<th>Mean Date</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Mid-Nineteenth Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Mid-Nineteenth Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Mid-Nineteenth Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Mid-Nineteenth Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Mid-Late Nineteenth Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Late Nineteenth–Early Twentieth Centuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Late Nineteenth–Early Twentieth Centuries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
very high proportion of food-related artifacts (primarily ceramics) as well; vessel glass was present only in very low concentrations. Architectural artifacts were present in moderate concentration, most in the form of nails and window glass. Other functional groups were either absent or present in very small quantities. Overall, Cluster A seems to indicate a mid-nineteenth-century sheet midden deposit, most likely a result of trash disposal at the rear of the structure.

Cluster B, south of the foundation and containing the external foundation/wall, had the highest concentration of artifacts at the site (4,952), nearly half of the total assemblage. The amount and proportion of unaffiliated artifacts (2,907) was higher for this area than for any other, accounting for nearly 60% of the cluster and over a quarter of the total assemblage, consisting mostly of undifferentiated ceramics and undifferentiated bottle glass. Food-related artifacts and food remains were present in moderate amounts, and architectural artifacts were numerous. Other groups, while present in low amounts, were more prevalent in Cluster B than any other excavation cluster, with the notable exceptions of smoking-related artifacts and manufacturing/production artifacts, which were entirely absent. Overall, the Cluster B assemblage appears to represent a concentration of late-nineteenth-century artifacts associated with some form of external structure overlying the earlier, mid-nineteenth-century sheet midden.

Cluster C, located at the southern margin of the site, showed a comparatively low concentration, with only 1,140 artifacts. The area had a fairly low density of food-related ceramic sherds (371), and a fairly high density of architectural artifacts, especially in the eastern section of the cluster. Overall, the assemblage appears to represent a portion of the mid-nineteenth-century sheet midden that covers much of the southern portion of the site, with a slight concentration of architectural material, probably resulting from the removal of the structure.

Cluster D represented a low density of material on the southwestern margin of the site, with the entire cluster assemblage totaling only 600 artifacts; over half of the assemblage was unaffiliated. The cluster had a relatively high proportion of food-related artifacts, which accounted for one quarter of the cluster, second only to Cluster A. Architectural artifacts were present in relatively low (16.5%) amounts, among the lowest value for architectural artifact concentration, which is not surprising given the distance from the foundation. The overall composition of the cluster indicates a low-density sheet midden area on the site periphery.

West of the foundation, Cluster E also contained comparatively few artifacts. Distribution analysis shows that this area, in what would have been a side yard area, is in the lowest area of artifact concentration for all types with the exception of architectural artifacts, presumably due to the cluster's proximity to the foundation. It appears that the western side yard area was outside of the primary zone of deposition at the site, with the assemblage largely consisting of architectural artifacts from the removal of the building.

Cluster F was a high-density area to the east of the foundation and adjacent to the northern part of the external wall feature. These artifacts consisted primarily of unaffiliated artifacts (54%), architectural artifacts, food-related artifacts, and lighting-related artifacts. Food-related and architectural artifacts were present in comparatively low concentrations in comparison to the other clusters. Lighting-related artifacts, consisting of 165 fragments of lamp glass, showed the greatest amount and proportion of such artifacts on the site. The cluster assemblage appears to represent a moderate-density late nineteenth-century sheet midden, contemporaneous with Cluster B to the south.

North of the foundation, Cluster G was a low-density zone dominated by architectural artifacts. Other artifact groups were present in nominal amounts or were altogether absent. The high proportion of architectural artifacts was probably associated with the construction of the Porter house, one test unit being directly adjacent to the foundation. It is possible that the northern periphery of the sheet midden was disturbed by the removal of the structure.

To summarize the Porter site assemblage: while all functional groups were represented, the assemblage consisted primarily of unaffiliated, food-related, or architectural artifacts; these groups account for over 89% of the total assemblage for the site (9,683 artifacts). A significant number of food remains were also recovered, consisting of 618 pieces of bone, keratin, and shell. The assemblage from all excavation clusters indicates a generally
domestic assemblage, along with material related to the building itself. When compared between clusters, temporal patterns appear, since there is a marked increase in the amount and diversity of artifact types in the later contexts, Cluster B especially. This shows an increase in the variety and availability of material culture towards the turn of the century in rural areas. If the mid-nineteenth-century contexts (A, D, E, and G) are counted along with the mid- to late-nineteenth-century context (Cluster C), there is a comparable area of excavation allowing a general comparison between early and late periods of occupation. Clusters A, C, D, E, and G, with mid- through late-nineteenth-century ceramic mean dates, have a total excavation area of 22 square meters, while Clusters B and F, with late-nineteenth to early twentieth-century dates, cover only 15 square meters. However, the later contexts have over twice the number of artifacts and a much greater variety of artifact types represented. Finally, much more of the later material falls outside of the functional group typology, and is included in the unaffiliated category, further evidence of the increase in the diversity of material culture towards the turn of the century.

The remainder of the analysis focused on the vessel assemblage that comprised so much of the material culture from the site. All ceramic and glass fragments were analyzed to determine a minimum number of individual (MNI) vessels represented in the assemblage. A minimum of 351 vessels was identified; 279 were ceramic vessels, and 72 were glass. Table 9.5 provides a general breakdown of the ceramic assemblage. Most of the vessels fell either into the combined table/teaware or the food preparation and storage categories. These two types account for 234 vessels or 84%. These two groups are detailed in Tables 9.6 to 9.9. The household/decorative vessels consisted of eight flowerpots (six redware, one stoneware, one earthenware) and a redware flowerpot dish. The toilet-related vessel was an undecorated ironstone wash basin. Finally, the undifferentiated ceramic vessels consisted of common creamware (one plain, one molded), five earthenware (with finger swirl decoration), four ironstone (one plain, two molded, one transfer print), three porcelain (one decal, two molded), two semi-porcelain (one plain, one glazed), one plain whiteware, and one yellowware with Rockingham slip. All of these were too fragmented to derive useful information regarding form or function.

Table 9.6 shows the ceramic vessel assemblage by functional type and material for each excavation cluster and time period. Some interesting patterns are evident. The first pattern identified is simply the temporal progression of material types as a function of technical developments in the ceramic industry. Mid-nineteenth-century contexts are dominated by redware vessels for food preparation and storage, while the late nineteenth-century contexts are dominated by stoneware and yellowware vessels within the food preparation/storage types. Table/teaware-type vessels generally consist of whiteware, with some pearlware and common creamware, early in the site's occupation, while later contexts consist primarily of ironstone.

A second pattern is the proportion of functional vessel types. The most prevalent types are table/teaware and food preparation/storage. Teaware vessels vary in proportion between clusters, but consistently dominate the vessel assemblage. Food preparation and storage types, however, are consistently present in lower proportion. Furthermore, there is a slight decrease over time in the proportion of food preparation and serving types present, from 21.5% for the mid-nineteenth century to only 13.5% for the late nineteenth to early twentieth century. Since food preparation and storage types are generally utilitarian wares involving household productive activities, this trend indicates that these productive activities decreased in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doll China</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Prep./Store</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household/Dec.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table/Teaware</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Mid-Nineteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doll China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep / Store.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household / Dec.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table / Teaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiff. Ceramic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.6. Vessel Type and Material by Cluster and Time Period.
frequency over time, or that their function was taken over by non-ceramic vessels, typically glass.

Table 9.7 lists the table/teaware-type vessel assemblage by both material and decoration for each cluster and time period. In addition to the general trends in material types already discussed, there is some patterning in the type and amount of decoration on table/teaware vessels. Undecorated forms comprise only 19.2% (twenty vessels) of the table/teaware vessels for the mid-nineteenth century contexts. This proportion increases to 40% (ten vessels) for mid- to late nineteenth-century contexts and 43% (twenty-two vessels) for late-nineteenth to early twentieth-century contexts. At the same time, highly decorated transfer printed or painted vessels comprise 65.4% (sixty-eight vessels) of the mid-nineteenth century assemblage, 48% (twelve vessels) of the mid- to late nineteenth-century assemblage, and 29.4% (fifteen vessels) of the late-nineteenth to early twentieth-century assemblage. The remainder (31%) of the decorated forms in the late nineteenth- to early twentieth-century assemblage consists either of less-ornate edge decorations or inexpensive decal decorations; less-decorated vessels comprise only 25% of the table/teaware vessels from the mid-nineteenth-century assemblages. In short, there is a trend over time toward a less-decorated, and therefore less expensive, vessel assemblage. This is presumably due in part to increases in the mass production of cheaper, easily produced ceramics towards the turn of the century. It is also likely that the decrease in vessel value over time may relate to changes in the Porters’ economic circumstances and their interaction with the national markets.

Table 9.8 summarizes the forms in the table/teaware. The majority of vessels in the table/teaware type were unidentifiable with regard to form for several excavation clusters. The most prevalent form was the plate, which comprised about one-third of the table/teaware ceramic assemblage, followed by saucers, then cups. Plates, while varying in proportion between clusters within each time period, do not seem to greatly increase or decrease in proportion over time. There is a slight increase in the proportion of saucers, accompanied, however, by a decrease in the proportion of cups. Since these two forms would be expected to co- vary due to functional association, it is likely that any actual changes in proportion are masked by the large quantity of unidentified forms. Table 9.9 shows that the form data for food preparation and storage ceramic vessels are less informative, with nearly 85% of the assemblage being unidentifiable with regard to form. This information further highlights the low percentage of food preparation/storage vessels in comparison to table/teaware vessels.

The range of forms present in the vessel assemblage, even allowing for the unidentifiable forms, is surprising. At a minimum it shows that, for the early periods of the site, the vessel assemblage value is comparatively high, while the form diversity is quite low. This may have implications for the purchase patterns of the Porter family, with ceramic purchasing choices being governed more by functional needs than by social factors.

Table 9.10 presents the glass vessel assemblage. The percentages are given for total vessels rather than within the glass vessel assemblage only (as was done for ceramics) in order to trace the varying prominence of glass vessels over time. The glass vessel information shows increasing quantity and variety of glass vessels over time, especially for bottles. The late nineteenth- to early twentieth-century contexts have twice the number of vessel types represented and have greater quantities of glass vessels; more importantly, glass vessels make up a much greater percentage of the vessel assemblage than for mid- through late nineteenth-century assemblages. This preponderance of glass vessel types in later time periods is due to the much greater availability of glass vessels at the turn of the century as advances in technology, such as molding and machine manufacturing, facilitated the manufacture of cheap, uniform glass vessels.

While the quantitative patterns can be explained as simply due to technological developments, the variety of vessels provides information on the types of activities undertaken at the Porter site. The most prevalent glass vessel type, bottles, is evidence of the consumption of marketed products. Vessel types associated with in-home production, however, are almost entirely lacking. Household production of food products in the form of canning was greatly facilitated towards the turn of the century by the manufacture of sealable glass canning jars (Creswick 1987). While small numbers of such vessels are present in the glass vessel assemblage (thirteen vessels, or 20% of glass ves-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Decoration</th>
<th>Mid-Nineteenth</th>
<th>Mid-Lt. Nineteenth</th>
<th>Lt. Nineteenth-Early Twentieth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. Cream.</td>
<td>Molded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molded Edge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poly Painted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>Banded Edge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaded Rim</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gilt Banded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scalloped Edge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poly Painted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearware</td>
<td>Feather Edge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mono Painted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Blue Trans.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poly Painted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shell Edge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Decal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Porcelain</td>
<td>Banded Edge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>Beaded Rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flow Transfer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mono Painted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Blue Trans.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poly Painted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shell Edge</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sponge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9.8. Tableware/Teaware Vessel Form by Cluster and Time Period.

| Material       | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z | Total |
| Mid-Nineteenth |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Mid-Lt. Nineteenth |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Lt. Nineteenth–Early Twentieth |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Material       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Bowl           | 1 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 10.5 | 1 | 3.1 | 4 |
| Butter Pat     | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 10.5 | 1 | 3.1 | 2 |
| Child’s Mug    | 1 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 10.5 | 1 | 3.1 | 1 |
| Cup            | 11 | 17.7 | 5 | 26.3 | 2 | 13.3 | 1 | 12.5 | 4 | 16.0 | 2 | 10.5 | 2 | 6.3 | 27 |
| Footed Bowl    | 21 | 33.9 | 6 | 31.6 | 2 | 13.3 | 2 | 25.0 | 5 | 20.0 | 3 | 15.8 | 11 | 34.4 | 50 |
| Plate          | 12 | 19.4 | 6 | 31.6 | 2 | 13.3 | 2 | 25.0 | 5 | 20.0 | 3 | 15.8 | 11 | 34.4 | 50 |
| Saucer         | 16 | 25.8 | 6 | 31.6 | 11 | 73.3 | 5 | 62.5 | 5 | 20.0 | 6 | 31.6 | 8 | 25.0 | 57 |
| Total          | 62 | 100 | 19 | 100 | 15 | 100 | 8 | 100 | 25 | 100 | 19 | 100 | 32 | 100 | 180 |

### Table 9.9. Food Prep/Storage Vessel Form by Cluster and Time Period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Mid-Nineteenth</th>
<th>Mid-Lt. Nineteenth</th>
<th>Lt. Nineteenth–Early Twentieth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crock</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crock Lid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footed Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixing Bowl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pie Plate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(sels), any significant amount of canning would have resulted in a much greater jar assemblage than is present at the Porter site. Also, glass food preparation vessels, such as bowls, are entirely absent. In short, the glass vessel assemblage supports the interpretation of the ceramic assemblage, and indicates a high degree of consumption and a minimal degree of household production.
Table 9.10. Glass Vessel Assemblage by Cluster and Time Period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Mid-Nineteenth</th>
<th>Mid-Lt. Nineteenth</th>
<th>Lt. Nineteenth-Early Twentieth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle—Ink</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle—Liquor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle—Medicine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle—Unident.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit Jar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jelly Jar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamp Globe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Glass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table/Teaware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiff. Glass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparative Analysis

As discussed in the introduction, our analysis of the Porter site was limited by a lack of comparative sites of similar age and context, from which comparable data had been collected. Only five such cases were available: the Keith Site, a small tenant farm near the Porter Site in Chenango County; the Burghardt Tannery site in Upper Lisle, Chenango County, with contexts for the tannery owner’s house as well as worker housing (Wurst 1993); and two urban households: middle-class renters on the Stower property, and the middle-class Mather household, both from the Binghamton Mall site in Binghamton, Broome County (Wurst and Versaggi 1993). Wurst and Versaggi (1993:168) interpret the Stower property as occupied by “white collar” workers such as clerks. The Mather property was the home of a Binghamton merchant, Richard Mather, and his family.

The types of decoration present in earlier periods are interesting in comparison with other contemporary historic sites. When possible, the preferred method of cost comparison among ceramic assemblages uses Miller’s CC index values (Miller 1980, 1991). In this case, small average sherd size made the derivation of specific CC index values for the assemblage difficult. It was possible, however, to do a qualitative comparison of decoration types and proportions between sites. Table 9.11 lists relative proportions of vessel decorations in descending relative value. Highly decorated transfer prints and painted decorations are generally the most expensive types; dipped, annular wares and edged or molded wares are comparatively less expensive, and undecorated wares are least expensive.

The Porter assemblage is most similar in terms of value to the Mather property of the Binghamton Mall site. The Mather property was an urban household context with a very high artifact densi-
Table 9.11. Comparison of Decoration Type Percentages Between Sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration</th>
<th>Porter, Mid-Lt. Nineteenth Century</th>
<th>Keith Tenant Farm</th>
<th>Burghardt Tannery Owners</th>
<th>Burghardt Tannery Workers</th>
<th>Stower Property Bing. Mall</th>
<th>Mather Property Bing. Mall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undec.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ty (a minimum of 379 ceramic vessels). The Mather property is contemporaneous with the mid-nineteenth-century context at the Porter site. Given these comparative proportions, Table 9.11 indicates that the mid-nineteenth-century context at the Porter site has a relatively higher proportion of expensive transfer-printed vessel types (49%) than most of the sites with the exception of Mather. Therefore, the mid-nineteenth-century vessel assemblage at Porter was unusually expensive for a site of this type (rural, middle-class landowners), even in comparison to rural elite groups such as the Burghardts (43%) or an urban middle-class household such as Stower (33%). In contrast, the Keith vessel assemblage produced only 32% transfer-printed wares, which closely matched the assemblage at Stower (33%) and the Burghardt tannery workers (38%).

The slight difference between the percentages at Porter and Mather may be related to physical access to goods, with Mather having more ease of access due to the Chenango Canal and major turnpikes passing through Binghamton. Since the occupants of the Stower property would have had the same physical access to markets, the contrast between Stower and Mather is more marked. Wurst and Versaggi (1993:167) attribute the large and expensive Mather assemblage to their elite status in the community, as well as to the composition of their household and the entertainment obligations that would have accompanied these two factors.

The physical access to markets also would have been identical for Porter and Keith, making their differences in ceramic assemblage value equally significant. While the difference in status (middle-class landowner versus tenant) could easily account for this disparity, differences in how they handled disposable wealth could also be a factor. Lorren Porter's household was accumulating disposable wealth during the nineteenth century, and his personal wealth also increased steadily. In contrast, the records show that the occupants of the Keith site attempted to purchase their property at least once during the nineteenth century, but were not successful. It is possible that these tenants were accumulating cash for the purchase of land and were not using it as disposable wealth for the purchase of durable expensive goods, as seems to have been the case at the Porter site.

Table 9.12 shows a comparison of the relative proportion of ceramic types and provides a general indication of the emphasis on production activities within the Porter household. The Mather household produced the largest percentage of table/teawares and the lowest percentage of food preparation and storage vessels. The Porter site was a distant second for table/teawares, but had the largest percentage of food preparation and storage vessels. The disparity indicates a near-total lack of in-home production for Mather, which is not sur-
Table 9.12. Comparison of Ceramic Types by Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Tableware/Teaware %</th>
<th>Food Preparation/Storage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porter Mid-Late Nineteenth Century</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Tenant Farm</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stower Property</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mather Property</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

prising for an urban, middle-class merchant’s household. This can be compared against the evidence for at least a low level of household production for the Porter site during the nineteenth century, and even lower levels for both Keith and Stower. Porter fared much better than either Keith or Stower in the amount of table/teawares, which indicates a greater emphasis on purchasing wares that were more expensive than average, as well as the greater importance of using potential status items for meals and entertaining.

Data on ceramic forms (cup, bowl, plate, etc.) were only available for Porter and Keith. Each of these sites was about the same size (500 m2 for Porter and 450 m2 for Keith), and were sampled similarly during data recovery (6% and 7%, respectively). Excavations produced a similar number of vessels (279 for Porter and 234 for Keith), providing a good comparative context. When the number and types of forms are examined, significant differences result. Table 9.13 shows a greater diversity of forms for Porter than for Keith. Plates, cups, and saucers dominate the vessel assemblage, indicating a high likelihood that at least some of the vessels were purchased in sets, though not in highly diverse collections. Keith, on the other hand, is dominated by plates and bowls. The large occurrence of bowls at the site offers the potential that less-expensive soups and stews were more frequent meals at Keith than at Porter. Since both households had equal physical access to markets, the differences observed are related to household decisions on the allocation of resources to durable goods. The tenant household would not have had as much disposable wealth for the purchase of non-functional table/teawares as the Porters.

Interpretations and Conclusions

Our conclusions regarding the Porter site follow the basic research issues that were outlined previously. Documentary evidence, functional artifact analysis, and spatial patterns on-site were integrated to provide an assessment of the basic activities that took place. Interpretations addressed the basic issues of consumer behavior and household production, changes in nineteenth-century farming practices, and rural social relations, specifically those based on class and gender.

Table 9.13. Comparison of Ceramic Forms by Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Forms</th>
<th>Mid–Late Nineteenth Century Porter # (%)</th>
<th>Keith # (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>11 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter pat</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s mug</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>23 (27)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footed Bowl</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>36 (42)</td>
<td>29 (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>23 (27)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86 (100)</td>
<td>45 (99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Vessels</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The census agricultural schedules clearly show that the Porter site was part of a dairy farm for most of its existence. Entries relating to stock and acreage place the Porter farm among many moderate to large dairy operations that dotted the landscape of central New York State during the mid- to late nineteenth century, dates immediately prior to and during the downturn of the New York dairy (McMurry 1995). While the documentation demands that the site be interpreted within a larger context of rural dairy production, little direct evidence of this production was found in the artifact assemblage. Excavations were limited to the area around the house foundation which did not include any outbuildings. The artifact assemblage at Porter thus reflects domestic, household-level activities. The array of ceramic vessels recovered on the site is almost entirely food-related, with very few that could be interpreted as farm production-related. There is very little in the way of farm-related machinery. When unaffiliated, food-related, and architectural artifacts are accounted for, the remainder of the artifact assemblage consists of the miscellaneous personal belongings of the Porter family members.

The domestic nature of the assemblage is not surprising given the scope of excavations. On most dairy farms, the day-to-day work of the farmer would have taken place away from the domicile, in separate structures such as a milking barn. Any such structure would most likely have been located to the north or east of the house, outside of the NYSDOT right of way that determined the scope of excavations. The only likely farm-related activities that might have taken place at or near the home would have been activities peripheral to the dairy operation. The Porter site functioned as a domestic household with its own sphere of domestic activities, located within a larger dairy farm context.

The artifact assemblage consists of a relatively shallow sheet midden across the site. This indicates that refuse disposal at the site was broadcast in nature, but accumulated into denser midden deposits. There are two concentrations within this general sheet midden which can be interpreted as preferred dumping areas. The first of these is located generally south and southwest of the rear cellar stairs of the structure, in the vicinity of excavation clusters A and C, and dates primarily to the mid-nineteenth century. The vast majority of food-related material (especially ceramics) and food remains was recovered from this area. The second concentration was located in Cluster B and was associated with the exterior addition. This area dates to the end of the site’s occupation during the late nineteenth to early twentieth century. The Cluster B concentration consisted primarily of architectural material, with food-related material as well, including the majority of the vessel glass. The relatively high percentages of bottle glass indicate that the addition was probably built as some form of storage area, and perhaps also served as a kitchen in later periods. The necessity for additional external storage could be the result of an increase in the purchasing of commercial food products.

There are some indications of a change in the use of domestic space at the site over time in terms of disposal habits. Relatively little in the way of food remains or food-related material characterizes the later nineteenth- and early twentieth-century contexts, while this material appears to have been rather freely disposed of in the rear yard during the mid-nineteenth century. It is possible that the disposal of food-related and food remains refuse took place outside of the core site area towards the turn of the century, possibly in a privy or refuse pit. If such features were present, as the patterning of refuse in the sheet midden may indicate, then they were located outside of the NYSDOT project area.

Interpretations of consumption at the site were based primarily on the archaeological remains, while research on household production incorporated both documentary and archaeological data. The consumption of material goods is influenced by two interrelated factors. The first of these is the supply of the material goods in question. Supply is determined by the technological ability to produce the goods in significant amounts, as well as by the ability to get the material goods to the consumer. As such, the supply of material goods is inversely proportional to the ease of transportation to the consumer; material which might be easily available in urban areas near the manufacturer might be in short supply in rural areas if transportation networks are not highly developed (Mui and Mui 1989).

The second factor is the demand for the material goods on the part of the consumer. While supply can be seen as closely related to technological and economic variables, the demand for material
goods is closely related to social variables. These social factors are most commonly modeled by the increase in a consumer mentality at certain periods of history, with the most commonly cited "consumer revolution" occurring in the late nineteenth through the early twentieth century (Shammas 1990). This period saw expansions in transportation as well as the advent of department stores and catalog sales, both of which radically increased the availability of consumables. While the tendency has been to view this consumptive transformation as tied to urban middle-class society, with rural, agrarian populations focusing more on household production (Brady 1972), current reinterpretations of consumer behavior question this assumption. Walker (1995) notes that the availability of material goods through catalog purchases bred a "consumer culture" in rural areas, since previously unattainable items became viewed as necessities; rural social position was determined by what one owned, the same as for the urban middle class. In a similar vein, Shammas (1990) notes that the spread of consumerism during the latter half of the nineteenth century "... occurred among a broad spectrum of people ..." (Shammas 1990:299) of both urban and rural context and various economic means. "Paradoxically, the individual who drank tea in a teacup, wore a printed cotton gown, and put linen on the bed could be the same person who ingested too few calories to work all day and lived in a one-room house" (Shammas 1990:299).

The place that the Porter site occupies in this debate can be elucidated by comparing the economic context of the Porters and their household composition against material evidence for both consumption and household production. The census agricultural schedule entries for farm value indicate that the Porter farm was a thriving family-based dairy concern during the mid- to late nineteenth century. Increases in economic means and productive capacity took place during the escalation of local transportation capacity, with the construction of the Chenango Canal and railroads. In short, the Porter family's ability to consume in terms of material supply and economic means, as well as its ability to be self-sufficient in terms of productive capacity, both increased over time. These capacities were not complementary, however, but reciprocal. Focusing on consumption would have entailed turning farm activities towards the production of material for market sale, while focusing on household production would have reduced the marketable output of the farm in the absence of a large household of productive individuals, which is not indicated by the censuses. The material evidence seems to point to the former strategy.

The comparison of differing periods at the Porter site points to an increase in the amount and diversity of artifacts over time. The late nineteenth- through early twentieth-century contexts at the site clearly contain proportionally more artifact types than the earlier mid-nineteenth-century contexts. The amount of unaffiliated artifacts increases over time, further supporting the assessment of increased diversity. Many of the types represented in later periods were factory-manufactured ceramic, glass, and metal artifacts. The types of artifacts represented in later time periods of the site, especially manufactured glass bottles, indicate the consumption of prepared grocery goods through local market sources.

A comparison of the Porter site ceramic assemblage with contemporaneous sites further indicates the Porter's integral relation with urban-based markets. The ceramic assemblage contains relatively highly decorated and relatively expensive table and teawares. This pattern is most similar to the urban middle-class merchant family assemblage from the Mather site in downtown Binghamton. This indicates that the Porter family's ability to consume was on par with the urban middle class, and in fact exceeds other urban middle-class households. While this comparison is not exhaustive, it does show that the Porter family was not a self-sufficient entity but was linked to the expanding economic web in New York, both productively through the manufacture of dairy products and consumptively through the purchase of ceramics and foodstuffs.

While the overall artifact assemblage does indicate that the Porter family was "buying into" the capitalist market-based consumer culture, the ceramic vessel analysis also indicates that the situation was somewhat more complex. Ceramics are often used as indicators of consumption patterns, since they are indicators of assemblage value. Furthermore, ceramic purchasing choices have been interpreted as having social implications. Specifically, the purchasing of expensive matched ceramic sets has been linked to the construction of an urban
middle-class ideology in which ceramic assemblages functioned as social display items as much if not more so than as functional food-related artifacts (Spencer Wood 1984, 1987). The range of decorations for the earlier periods at Porter, with an unusually high proportion of expensive, highly decorated forms, might seem to indicate that the Porters were focusing on a displayable array of finely decorated ceramics. However, the low diversity of forms represented does not support an interpretation of the Porter family adopting the urban, middle-class ideology Spencer-Wood proposes. Also, the amount of decoration and perceived value of the ceramic assemblage drops precipitously in the later periods. The large proportion of plate forms throughout the site assemblage probably indicates that the vessel assemblage was primarily functional in nature. However, an equal number of teacups and saucers suggests the purchase of sets, which in turn suggests the possible social importance of these vessels within the household. While the overall artifact assemblage does indicate that the Porters were taking advantage of the wide array of consumer goods that were increasingly available at the time and possibly using them within middle-class social settings, they were probably not fully adopting the ideological trappings of the urban middle-class consumer culture.

The information relating to household production correlates well with data pertaining to consumption. There is comparatively little in the way of evidence for household-level productive activity at the Porter site. Food preparation and storage-type ceramic vessels are quite rare throughout the site's occupation, and there is no indication that glass vessels compensated for the lack of production-related ceramics. The vessel assemblage supports a strategy of purchasing prepared products to fulfill subsistence needs. There is documentary evidence and limited artifact evidence for the production of farm products in addition to the central dairy operation. However, the general lack of material evidence for these productive activities at the household level indicates that this production was external to the domestic operation of the Porter site, and focused more on a cash crop for market sale rather than on agricultural subsistence. While some of the material absent in the assemblage, such as faunal material, may be due to differential preservation, the majority of the consumption-related artifacts in question is made from durable material and could be expected to be recovered.

While the artifact assemblage at the Porter site is reflective of a domestic context separated spatially from the productive context of the Porter farm, the fact that the dairy operation provided the economic means for the Porter household cannot be ignored. The only direct evidence we have for the operation of the farm itself is the limited information provided in the census agricultural schedules. However, some interesting correlations can be made from this information. First of all, while there is little doubt that the basic focus of the Porter farm was dairy, the overall impression given by the agricultural schedules is one of diversification rather than a narrow specialization on dairy. Furthermore, this diversification appears to vary over time. Dairy production appears to continuously expand based on butter production, herd size, silage production and farm acreage. Other farm products appear to vary in production, between censuses.

What these patterns in the productive activities of the Porter farm likely indicate is changing productive strategies over time in reaction to market demand, as well as taking advantage of natural fluctuations in agricultural production. Mid-nineteenth-century dairy farms such as the Porter farm generally did not have the technology or capital to focus entirely on dairy, hence a more diversified strategy occurred such as that reflected in the census schedules (McMurry 1995). Dependence on diversified farming mandated a constantly shifting strategy, as focus was placed on the crops that were doing well to make up for those that had a poor season. The peak years of the Porter farm came during the decline of the New York dairy industry, showing that farming strategies allowed for economic success even in a downturn. It is interesting to note that at the peak of the farm's operation, which was the most diversified period in terms of farm production, the apparent value of the Porter site ceramic assemblage begins to decrease. This could also be taken as evidence that the Porter family was being forced to make material concessions in order to maintain the economic viability of the farm.

Rural dairy farms were intensive in terms of labor and demanded much in the way of cooperation. Medium to large farms were forced to hire
live-in labor, generally young dairy maids or "helps" (McMurry 1995:65). No such assistant laborers are mentioned in any of the censuses for the Porter site, although day laborers would not have shown up in the censuses. As was discussed during the presentation of the project's research design, dairy farm work traditionally broke down into male and female roles. Women, in addition to helping with the men's labor as circumstances required, were traditionally responsible for maintaining stock herds and for the actual production of milk, butter, and cheese, which comprised the major products of the farm (McMurry 1995). The presence of women in the Porter household can be correlated with the known importance of women's labor on dairy farm operations. The majority of direct evidence at hand for farm production, including the manufacture of butter, maple sugar, molasses, and eggs, would in all likelihood have been the results of the labor of the Porter women. The importance of female labor on the Porter farm is highlighted by the fact that one daughter, Sarah, apparently never left the farm for school or outside work as her sister Lucy did. Many dairy farm women rejected the drudgery of farm life (McMurry 1995:146). Sarah, however, is still listed on the final available census for the property in 1875 at the age of thirty-four, the year with some of the highest production figures for the farm.

The brief glimpse of rural gender relations provided by the Porter site can best be viewed as exemplifying Osterud's (1991) portrayal of the mutuality of male and female labor in rural agricultural contexts. While dairy farming had a gender-based division of labor, men and women did not operate in "separate spheres" as has been modeled for nineteenth-century urban society (Wall 1994). Rather, male and female labor was mutually interdependent, and together provided the productive capacity of the farm. At the Porter site, documentary evidence indicates that Lorren Porter owned the property and presumably provided the capital that established and maintained the farm. Lorren's sons, Charles and Edward, are both listed as "farm laborers" on the censuses and would have been responsible for shaping and maintaining the farm landscape and crops. However, the transformation of the various farm products into marketable goods would have been the responsibility of the Porter women, first Eliza, then Lucy and Sarah, and finally Sarah alone.

What material evidence there is at the Porter site for the farm production described in the documentation relates exclusively to this female labor; the male contributions must be inferred from the documentary record. The material evidence includes gullet stones, evidence of poultry production (also supported by faunal evidence in the form of chicken bone), maple spiles, evidence of syrup production, and small amounts of canning jar fragments (evidence of low levels of in-home production and preservation). The vast majority of the vessel assemblage was domestic in character, related to food consumption, and pertains to both men and women and the interaction of the genders within the social context of the family farm (Osterud 1991). The maintaining of poultry for egg production, the tending of maple taps and the time-consuming process of boiling the sap into syrup, occasional canning—all of these productive aspects of the Porter family would have centered on the dwelling, and would have come under the female labor component of the Porter family farm.

Despite the necessary mutuality of male and female labor in rural contexts such as the Porter site, that same female labor tended to be devalued; "gender interdependence was reciprocal, but not symmetrical" (McMurry 1995:103). The exploitation of female labor, coupled with the preferential property ownership by men at the time, is a primary internal contradiction for which the Agrarian Myth of a classless, undifferentiated rural population of "middling" farmers fails to account. This tendency to exploit female labor was a major contributing factor to the flight of many rural women away from the farm at the close of the nineteenth century. Given these historical facts, it is interesting to note that the final divestment of Lorren Porter's property immediately prior to his death some time after 1885 took the form of deeding all of his farm assets to his son Charles; Sarah Porter isn't mentioned in the document, and presumably received none of the estate.

**Benefits of Porter Site Study**

The contributions of the Porter site to historic archaeology can be divided arbitrarily into methodological and theoretical categories. The primary methodological implication for the Porter site relates to dealing with sheet midden contexts on historic
sites. Identifying "horizontal stratigraphy"—chronological variation across space—allowed us to draw conclusions on chronologically distinct periods and calls into question characterizations of all sheet middens on historic sites as inherently lacking integrity and data potential (Versaggi, this volume). To be sure, not all middens are created equal, and some do lack integrity or data potential, but this is determined by formation processes unique to each context. At Porter there was enough spatial segregation in the deposits to allow diachronic analysis, and only through appropriate sampling could archaeologists make such an assessment.

The ability to distinguish spatially discrete chronologic episodes in the Porter site sheet midden allowed us to turn potential disadvantages in the assemblage into positive contributions for the research program. For instance, we were concerned that the very late nineteenth- to early twentieth-century artifacts would overshadow periods of middle nineteenth-century occupation. In fact, the various periods of the site were spatially distinct (presumably with some overlap at the edges), and we were able to trace changes in material culture over time rather than have to deal with a totally mixed assemblage.

Porter provided a useful case study to compare consumption and production behaviors between rural and urban middle-class contexts and the few numbers of rural sites with sufficient samples to draw comparisons. For instance, the varying characteristics between the Mather property at the Binghamton Mall site and Porter show that while we are studying families placed at a similar level in the social hierarchy of the time, they were consuming in very different ways. Mather seemed to have been collecting in matched sets for display purposes (although we lack form information for the site, the sheer number of table and teawares points to set purchases), while Porter seems to have had a more ad hoc approach, collecting ceramics to fulfill functional needs, although relatively expensive decorations.

Finally, the Porter site study has implications for undertaking documentary research in conjunction with historic archaeology. A comparison of the background research (specifically for censuses) and the archaeological findings shows some interesting disjunctions. Most economic information from the census agricultural schedules focused on the operations of the dairy farm as a whole, while the archaeological evidence focused much more on the domestic contexts of the Porter household. As such, the documentary evidence in this case tells us relatively little with regard to social history. The cultural material relating to agricultural activity that was recovered was generally auxiliary to the dairy operation. Since these areas of farm production were traditionally associated with female household labor, this allowed us to address issues of gender relations along the lines suggested in the work of Osterud (1991) and McMurry (1995). These domestic production issues were only approachable through the use of both archaeological and documentary evidence.

Also, by using both archaeological and documentary evidence, we can place the site in a wider context. We can see the Porters' reaction to the decline of the dairy industry in rural New York State in documentation, through a shift to a more diversified stock assemblage during the later half of the nineteenth century. We can also see this trend archaeologically, in a shift toward the purchase of a less-expensive and more mundane ceramic assemblage. These changing farming strategies reflected in documentation and the changing consumption strategies reflected in the archaeological data show decision-making which allowed Lorren Porter to increase the size, output, and net worth of his holdings during the same period as dairy farming in general became more industrialized and moved west out of New York State. If these issues had been approached using only documentation (or for that matter only archaeology) we would have had at best half the picture, thus illustrating the importance of using documentation in conjunction with archaeology, rather than only one or the other.

To conclude, the Porter Site project, despite the common ubiquity of the type of site in question, has some valuable implications for historic archaeology in New York State. The combination of documentary research, area excavation, and a defined research design has conclusions about several significant social issues. It is our hope at PAF that the application of a similar research strategy at other nineteenth-century farmstead sites in New York State will contribute further to our understanding of the varied social identities and economic strategies represented by this undervalued class of sites.
References Cited


Chapter 10

Farmstead Archaeology and the Impact of Agrarian Change at Three Sites in Eastern New York State

Joseph Sopko

In the first half of the nineteenth century John Griffen, Daniel White, Thomas and Walter Hobby, and James O'Connell were inhabitants of rural New York State. Their lives were similar in many ways, particularly in the daily and seasonal rhythms of county life. It is unlikely however, that the complex web of local and regional relationships were the same for each of these individuals. It is just as improbable that social and economic changes in their livelihoods followed similar paths. Recent archaeological and historical investigations at the sites occupied by these individuals provided evidence of the diversity and complexity of their lives and the broader changes in agriculture during this period.

There is general agreement among scholars that rural life in the Northeast was transformed in the nineteenth century. The economic strategy of farmers shifted from basic production for use to obtaining surplus production for sale. Recently Summerhill (1997) has suggested that this change in the lives of rural residents occurred during the period from 1855 to 1865 in New York State. In order to observe the diversity of daily life among rural inhabitants, this hypothesis was evaluated against the evidence acquired from archaeological studies carried out by the New York State Museum in advance of New York State Department of Transportation construction projects at the residences of the Griffen-White, Hobby, and O'Connell families.

The change from near-subsistence to capitalistic commercial agriculture is one of the most discussed issues in contemporary historic studies of the Northeast (Bedell et al. 1994; Wood 1994). Scholars working on this problem no longer argue that early settlers were self-sufficient and completely separated from the market economies. There is general agreement that the degree of subsistence agriculture decreased during the nineteenth century and was replaced by increased involvement in market production.

Social, economic, and ideological transformation occurred as the orientation toward commercial agriculture increased. Family structure, spatial organization of farms, the development of the rural working and middle classes, and increased participation in the regional, national, and international economies accompanied the growth of commercial agriculture. The broad pattern of this change has been identified and described from his-
Historical documents, but the details of social change and diverse regional adaptations can be seen from archaeological comparison of specific experiences of rural residents.

Recent investigations at three nineteenth-century farmsteads in Westchester, Putnam, and Oneida Counties (Figure 10.1) by the New York State Museum provide an opportunity to explore these issues (Sopko 1996, 1997; Sopko and Lain 1996). Each of these sites reflects different reactions to the larger forces that had an impact on local agricultural economies. These varied reactions not only occurred at different times, but also reflected differing geographic and socio-economic settings that affected market access.

All of the sites are stratified with discrete occupations that can be associated with a specific family and time period known from documentary sources such as deeds or the federal or New York State censuses. The White Farm site located in the town of North Castle, Westchester County, was occupied from circa 1780 to 1915 by two generations of the Griffen family who were Quakers, and by three generations of the White family. Both of these families originally settled in Connecticut during the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century and represent the start of the western migration to the undeveloped portions of New York State. In 1915 the site was purchased by New York City and demolished for the construction of the Kenisco Reservoir.

The O'Connell site, located in the town of Southeast, Putnam County, was occupied by the O'Connell family from 1850 to 1871 and by the Conners family from 1871 to 1890. In 1890 the site was purchased by New York City and was later demolished for the construction of the Bog Brook Reservoir. The O'Connell site represents the settlement of Irish immigrant families in New York State during the mid-nineteenth century and represent the start of the western migration to the undeveloped portions of New York State. In 1915 the site was purchased by New York City and demolished for the construction of the Kenisco Reservoir.

The Hobby Farm site located in the town of New Hartford, Oneida County was originally settled by Julius Goodrich prior to 1835 and was occupied by three generations of the Hobby family from 1835 to 1922 and by the Scholl family from 1922 to 1959. The Hobby family originally settled in Connecticut during the seventeenth century and moved to the town of Southeast in Putnam County, New York prior to the Revolutionary War. The Hobby family represents the post-Revolutionary War migration to the undeveloped lands in western New York during the early nineteenth century.

To date, each site has been subjected to a site examination (Phase II testing) to assess National Register eligibility. Although excavations have been limited, they clearly demonstrate the potential of these sites to document both the transformation from near-subsistence to capitalistic commercial agriculture in the nineteenth century and the impact of this transformation on the lives of nineteenth-century rural New Yorkers. The following sections summarize the results of research conducted to date at each of the sites.

**Analytical Methodology**

The transformation from subsistence to a capitalistic or commercial agriculture economy on the White, O'Connell, and Hobby sites was accompanied by changes in family structure and spatial organization, in the development of the rural working and middle classes, and in increased participation in local, regional, national, and international economies. This study focuses on change in these areas through the examination of historical documents and archaeological evidence.

The first step in this process is to define the household, which is the consumer unit on these three sites. Often the household and family units are the same, but certain adaptive responses to the shift from subsistence to commercial agriculture on these sites result in the development of extended family households and/or non-familiar households. The types of households present at the White, O'Connell, and Hobby sites during the different periods of occupation were reconstructed through the use of documentary resources, especially the federal and New York State censuses.

The results of archaeological testing were then examined to determine the impact, through the arrangement of features and the kinds of artifacts on the site, of the transformation from subsistence to commercial agriculture on the everyday life of the site households. The spatial organization of domes-
tic sites and the architectural and landscape features represent the remains of the occupants’ material expressions and how they perceived themselves in the physical, social, and economic world (Gibb 1996). The construction of farmsteads and other buildings, and the expansions, maintenance, and active modification of landscapes reflect ideas regarding improvement of the farms. If an older arrangement could no longer produce wealth, then a new site layout was necessary to maintain or improve the household’s lifestyle. The spatial organization of each site was documented by features and artifacts recovered from stratified deposits. Concentrations of architectural artifacts, along with associated diagnostic artifacts, were used to locate and date various structural features and determine what structures were built or modified during each period of occupation.

Domestic artifacts were examined to determine the economic status of each household, to document the rise of the rural working and middle classes, and to evaluate the level of the household’s participation in the local, regional, national, and international markets. This analysis was based on the premise that artifacts are a direct statement of how the occupants perceived themselves, or what they hoped to become. Artifacts of a similar form and function are found among households that are similar in terms of their self-perception. Broken ceramics, bottles, and discarded fauna and flora provide evidence of the household’s consumption pattern. This material can be viewed as the residue of the household’s attempt to define and assert itself as a group (Gibb 1996).

Household consumption includes those processes by which goods and services are created, acquired, and used. Goods are charged with cultural meaning that is used to express cultural categories and principles, cultivate ideas, create and sustain lifestyles, and create and survive cultural change. The application of McCracken’s theory of consumption to the analysis of archaeological assemblages presupposes that systems of meaning can be reconstructed from available archival and archaeological data (Gibb 1996). The principal strength of the consumer behavior approach is suitable for placing artifacts into larger socio-economic contexts. This framework provides links between site-specific archaeological data and levels of cultural behavior from household to cultural subgroup and national market (Spencer-Wood 1987).

The artifacts examined in the market-oriented consumer choice framework include ceramics, bottle glass, tin cans, clam and oyster shells, coal, and kaolin tobacco pipes. These items have the most potential to determine the household’s consumer behavior and how the household members perceived themselves. Miller (1980) developed a four-level ceramic classification for late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century ceramics based on consumer cost, with transfer-printed vessels being the most expensive, followed by hand-painted vessels, then minimally decorated vessels; undecorated ceramics were the cheapest. Majewski and O’Brien (1987) have suggested that there are several general trends in ceramic production linked to consumer preference that are a source of valuable information for analyzing and interpreting period lifeways. These general trends include the shift to undecorated whiteware and ironstone during the second half of the nineteenth century, which demonstrates the increased popularity of undecorated ceramics over decorated wares. During the third quarter of the nineteenth century a second shift is seen, with lighter semi-vitreous china and semi-porcelains replacing the heavy ironstone and whiteware ceramic vessels for household use. This shift is linked to consumer preference for lighter ceramic vessels due to the association of the heavier ironstone with a lower economic status. A third trend is the shift back to decorated ceramics with decal transfer printing during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. This type of decoration was more costly than the traditional methods of transfer printing (Majewski and O’Brien 1987:123-135).

While Miller and Majewski and O’Brien deal primarily with refined earthenwares, Herman (1984) examines differences in the types of utility wares used for food processing, preparation, and storage. Herman (1984) suggests that the use of imported utility vessels or decorated rather than cheaper locally produced redwares is an indicator of middle-class economic status in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century households. These ceramic types were not only functional but were also part of the display of the household’s economic and social status.

Farmstead Archaeology and the Impact of Agrarian Change at Three Sites in Eastern New York State
Finally, the presence of china sets on the site may reflect the ritualization of family meals that occurred during the mid- to late nineteenth century, which was characterized by the elaboration and specialization of family meals (Wall 1994). The importance of family meals was marked by the dinner meal shifting from the afternoon to the evening and the elaboration of ceramic vessels used in its preparation and serving, as well as by the number of dishes and courses it contained. The structure of the meal became highly ordered and specialized, and both food and table settings became more elaborate. In larger urban areas, by the mid-nineteenth century this meal, with the involvement of all family members, had become ritualized as a daily family reunion that was the focal point of the women’s sphere (Wall 1994:123-125). Wall (1994) suggests that the ritualization of family meals was related to the shift from the extended family to the nuclear family social organization, the separation of the sexes by a more rigid division of labor, and the more rigid class structure of the Victorian era. The ritualization of family meals may also be reflected in the change in the spatial organization of the house on sites during this period, such as the construction of kitchen wings which separated the food preparation area from the food consumption or formal dining areas.

The manner of smoking tobacco also changed during the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Kaolin tobacco pipes during the first half of the nineteenth century were the most common way to smoke tobacco. The use of tobacco during this period is associated with leisure or non-work activities and social interactions (Cook 1989:215-222). As new methods of smoking came into fashion, such as briar pipes and cigars, they became the height of fashion and were adopted by the upper and middle classes as the preferred method of consuming tobacco. Kaolin pipes during the period from 1860 to 1880 became established as the workingman’s preferred method of smoking and as a symbol of the working class; cheaper kaolin pipes were preferred over the more expensive cigars, cigarettes, and Meerschaum pipes, which were the choices of the middle class. The continued use of kaolin pipes by the working class during the third and fourth quarters of the nineteenth century can be seen as a rejection of middle-class values which viewed smoking as a leisure activity. Thus the clay pipe, which would be smoked during the workday, became a symbol of the working class, setting them apart from the middle-class and their value system (Cook 1989:215-222). The continued use of kaolin tobacco pipes during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century could indicate a household identified with the working class rather than with the middle class.

Finally, bottle glass, clam and oyster shells, pieces of lamp chimney glass, and tin can fragments recovered from the various occupation periods were also examined. Coal and kerosene from Pennsylvania, and whale oil and clam and oyster shells from the coastal areas of New York or New England, represented participation in a regional trade network. The origin of bottled products and canned food varied, and possibly represented participation in local, regional, national, or even international economies. The use of these items not only represented expanded wealth but also the household’s adoption and investment in new technologies for heating, lighting, and food preparation. The adoption of these new technologies may have represented attempts not only to improve one’s lifestyle but also to change the daily and seasonal rhythms of country life.

**FIELD METHODOLOGY**

A similar testing strategy was used on all three of the sites, which resulted in the recovery of comparable information. Shovel test pits (STPs) were excavated to determine the stratigraphic sequence on the sites and to locate features not visible on the ground surface, such as outbuildings or privies, associated with the nineteenth-century occupations. Larger excavation units (e.g., 1 x 1 m) were excavated in stratified deposits to determine the relationship of various features to the stratigraphic sequence. This provided the date of feature construction, modification, and/or demolition, as well as the recovery of artifacts associated with the various periods of occupation.

The Phase I and II testing conducted on the White Farm site consisted of the excavation of forty-three 40 x 40 cm STPs at 7.5 m intervals on 4,020 m² of the property located in the project area. Nine 1 x 1 m units, a 1 x 1.2 m unit, and one 1 x 2 m unit were
excavated in the 2,727 m² area of stratified deposits (Figure 10.2). Testing on the O'Connell site consisted of sixty-nine 50 x 50 cm STPs at a 7.5 m interval on 4,047 m² of the property located in the project area. Sixteen units ranging in size from 0.50 x 1 m to 1 x 2.25 m were then excavated in the 1,429 m² area of the stratified deposits (Figure 10.3). During the Phase I testing, all fifty-two acres of the Hobby Farm were tested with STPs at a 15 m interval. The first part of the site examination consisted of the excavation of seventy-seven 50 x 50 cm STPs in eight transects on a 7.6 interval in a 4,800 m² area to define the location of stratified deposits. Thirteen units, ranging in size from 0.50 x 1 m to 1 x 1 m were then excavated in the 3,397 m² area where stratified deposits were located (Figure 10.4).

**The White Farm Site**

The White Farm, located adjacent to Bear Gutter Creek in the town of North Castle, Westchester County, was situated in an ideal location for the development of market agriculture. In 1777, Dr. David Dayton, Supervisor of North Castle, stated that the area adjacent to “Bear Gutter Creek was a beautiful spot for farming and very convenient for getting products to market by going eastward down King Street to Sawpitts Landing where they could be transported to New York City” (Sandford 1976:106). Prior to the Revolutionary War, the agricultural surpluses in the town of North Castle were sold in the local and regional markets. During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, North Castle farmers were engaged in farming and marketed to New York City wheat, apples, potatoes, and other specialty products such as rye straw, which was used for packing (Sandford 1976: 275).

By the early to mid-nineteenth century, there were seven farms located on King Street within three miles of the White site. By 1872, the number of farms had increased to fifteen. The size of the farms ranged from 30 to 300 acres and averaged 85 acres in size. The 215-acre White Farm was one of the larger farms in the town of North Castle during this period. Deed research indicated that the White Farm was owned by five different individuals from the late eighteenth to early twentieth centuries: John Griffen Jr. (c. 1780-1810), Daniel Griffin (c. 1810-1827), Jacob Chapman (1827-1830), Daniel White (1830-1882), and Stephen White (1882—c. 1915). These five periods of ownership represent three major periods of occupation that can be identified in the archaeological record: John Jr. and Daniel Griffen (c. 1780-1827), Daniel White (1830-1882), and Stephen White (1882-1915).

**Archaeological Results**

The excavation of 19 m² revealed six features and recovered 7,433 artifacts from the stratigraphic deposits and plowzone on the site (Figure 10.2). Artifacts were present in two to four soil levels associated with the construction, modification, use, and demolition of the house (Features 1 and 2) and outbuildings (Figure 10.2), representing the three periods of occupation, the 1830 house enlargement, and the 1915 demolition of the house. The following narrative presents the results of documentary research and archaeological excavations and analysis for the Phase II site examination.

John Jr. and Daniel Griffen (c. 1780–1827). The White Farm site appears to have been settled during the 1780s by the Griffen family. The Griffen family was originally from Connecticut and moved to Westchester County, New York by 1779, since John Griffen Sr. first appears on the tax list in that year. The Griffens moved to the town of North Castle to take advantage of the availability of undeveloped farmland. The Griffens may have been Quakers, which could account for their absence on the Revolutionary War militia muster rolls from the town of North Castle (Sandford 1976). In the 1790 census there are four Griffen families listed in the town of North Castle, headed by John, John Jr., Elihu, and Gershom (Federal Census 1790). In 1797, John Griffen owned a house and a store located south of the White site and the current intersection of NY 120 and 22 (Sandford 1976). It is possible that upon John Griffen’s death, his landholdings were divided between his five sons, one of whom may have been John Jr.

The evidence for the initial settlement of the site is based on the presence of John Griffen Jr. and his family in the 1790, 1800, and 1810 census, either adjacent to or in proximity of the dwellings of the Birdsalls and Cock families (Federal Census 1790, 1800, 1810). These farms are described as being located on the south and east side of the 68-acre farm sold by Daniel Griffen, most likely the son of
Figure 10.2. Archaeological testing conducted on the White Farm site (NYSM Site 10366).
John Jr., to Jacob Chapman in 1827 (Westchester County Clerk’s Office Deeds, Volume 30, 1827). John Jr. and Daniel Griffen’s occupation represents the initial settlement and development of agriculture on the 68-acre farm. This period is characterized by the shift from subsistence to market agriculture, which provided agricultural products to the local market via John Griffen’s store or to the regional market and the growing New York City population.

The federal censuses of the period from 1790 to 1820 provide evidence of the shift from the nuclear family to the extended family, or the nuclear family with domestic servants and farm laborers, as the primary social and economic organization. The population of John Griffen Jr.’s household between 1790 and 1810 decreased from fourteen to four individuals (Federal Census 1790, 1800, 1810). The drop in population may be associated with his sons and daughters marrying and leaving the household. Between 1810 and 1820, John Jr. appears to have left the farm to his son Daniel and his family. In 1820 Daniel Griffen’s household included two other adults who may have been members of his or his wife’s family, or possibly an unrelated male farm laborer and a female domestic servant (Federal Census 1820). The presence of two other adults in the household suggests that the farm was a part of the incipient commercial economy, where the labor provided by the two extra adults in the household was exchanged for wages, room and board, or a part of the farm profits. The presence of domestic help during this period indicates a prosperous household and farm (Larkin 1988:13).

During the first portion of the Griffens’ occupation, wheat and other grain crops may have been the primary cash crop (Sandford 1976). The introduction of the Hessian fly, which feeds on wheat, during the Revolutionary War most likely forced the Griffen family to shift to dairy farming, with the production of butter and/or cheese becoming the primary market crop on the farm (Heneretta 1976). Secondary cash crops may have included the production of wool, beef, pork, chicken, eggs, potatoes, turnips, rye, and straw (Sandford 1976).

A total of 7,433 artifacts were recovered from the White Farm site. Seventeen percent (1,238) of the artifacts were recovered from soil layers associated with the ca. 1780 to 1830 occupation by the Griffen family. The artifacts from this period were recovered from the west or back yard, the front yard, and from the interior of the house foundation adjacent to the west and north sides of the 15 x 18 ft central stoned line cellar (Feature 1E). The highest concentration of artifacts was located in the back yard area (Figure 10.2).

The recovery of a substantial number of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century artifacts from the interior of the ca. 1830 foundation indicates that the central portion of the house foundation represents the dwelling that was constructed by the Griffen family during the late eighteenth century. Other features that date to this period include the alignment of King Street on the west side of the site (Feature 6), possibly the well (Feature 5), the plow zone on the north side, and the pasture and stone wall on the east side. The location of any outbuildings from this time is not known, nor is it known whether the barn (Feature 3) was constructed during this period.

Domestic artifacts suggest that the Griffen family was actively participating in the regional economy and the consumer society. Sixty-two percent, or 682 of the ceramic sherds recovered from the site, were associated with the ca. 1780 to 1830 period of occupation. The ceramic assemblage from this period includes 4% brown-combed or dot-decorated yellow lead-glazed buff earthenware; 42% redware; 2% stoneware; 22% pearlware; 5% whiteware; and 3% miscellaneous ceramic types including porcelain, Delft, and white salt-glazed stoneware (Sopko 1996). The 682 ceramic sherds represent at least eighty-six vessels, fifty-two hollowware, thirty-two flatware, and two unidentified vessel forms. Fifty percent or forty-three vessels, are utility wares, 49% or forty-two are refined earthenwares, and one (1%) is porcelain. The ceramics from this period consist of both locally produced and imported wares.

The utility wares composed of the buff earthenwares, yellowware, redwares, and stonewares account for 48.4% of the ceramic assemblage. The utility wares were not only used for food preparation and storage, but also for food, beverage, and tea consumption based on the presence of plates or platters, mugs, bowls, and teapots. The yellow slip-trailed redware; the brown-combed and/or dotted yellow lead-glazed buff earthenware; the Wester-
wald, Rhennish, and Nottingham stonewares; and Jackfield-type redware appear to be associated with food or beverage consumption and were imported from England or Germany during this period. The other redware types in the assemblage appear to have been manufactured locally and would have been used mostly for food preparation and storage. The use of imported and decorated utility vessels rather than cheaper, locally produced redwares appears to be an indicator of middle-class economic status in late eighteenth-century households. The decorated utility vessels were not only functional but also a part of the display of the household’s economic and social status (Herman 1984).

The refined earthenware, Delft, white salt-glazed stonewares, Whieldon-type creamware, creamwares, pearlwares and whitewares account for 49.4% of the sherds. During this period the refined earthenwares shifted from creamwares to pearlwares to decorated whitewares. The presence of Delft and Whieldon-type creamware represents earlier ceramic types that the Griffen family brought with them from Connecticut. The pearlware ceramics are composed of edge-decorated, underglaze hand-painted, and transfer-printed vessels. These represent a shift from undecorated ceramic vessels such as creamware. The presence of decorated pearlware and whiteware ceramic vessels on the site shortly after they were introduced into North American markets essentially reflects the height of middle-class fashion during this period (Majewski and O’Brien 1987).

The refined earthenwares used for food and beverage consumption were probably purchased individually rather than in sets. The vessels were obtained at different times and purchased only when pieces needed replacement. This practice may account for the continued use of older ceramic vessels such as Delft, white salt-glazed stoneware, Whieldon-type creamware, and the wide variety of redwares, decorated pearlwares, and whitewares.

Other items such as clams, oysters, kaolin pipes, bottle glass, and lamp chimney glass representing the use of tobacco, alcohol, and whale oil also reflect participation in the local, regional, and global economies. Tobacco and alcohol were most likely chosen because they were accessible, affordable, and a part of everyday life during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. They are also associated with social interactions during this period. The low amount of bottle glass (ten dark green fragments) recovered from these deposits suggests that alcohol was not important on the site, or that it was purchased in large quantities in casks or barrels, or bottles were only used to decant the alcohol. Sixty-eight percent of the kaolin pipe fragments are associated with the ca. 1780 to 1830 period of occupation. The majority of the pipe fragments were recovered from the kitchen midden in the back yard area. The recovery of the pipes from this location could indicate that they were smoked inside the house, thus representing leisure activities and/or social interactions.

The Griffen family apparently relied on firewood produced on their farm as the source of heating and cooking, as suggested by the absence of coal in the deposits associated with this period of occupation. Eleven percent of the lamp chimney glass is associated with the Griffen family’s occupation. Based on the cost of whale oil, the use of lamps during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century was confined either to the coastal areas or the more affluent inland households (Woodhead et al. 1984).

Daniel White (1830-1882). The occupation of the site from 1830 to 1882 is characterized by increased participation in the commercial agricultural economy through dairy farming and the production of cheese and butter for the New York City market. The change in farm production from grains to dairy products resulted in a shift from the extended to the nuclear family as the primary social and economic organization, the use of farm laborers, crop specialization, diversification of farm products, and use of mechanized farm equipment (Federal Censuses 1830 to 1880).

Between 1830 and 1849 the farm increased in size from 68 to 215 acres (Westchester County Clerk’s Office Deeds, Volume 39, 1830; Volume 83, 1839; Volume 134, 1849). The extended family, consisting of Daniel and Rebecca White, their three sons (Edmond, Daniel Jr., and Hanford), and their wives, was the primary social and economic organization (Federal Census, Westchester County, 1840). The economic focus of the White farm during this period was dairy farming and the production of butter and cheese for the New York City market. This was accompanied by diversification of crops,
which added barley and buckwheat to the other crops such as potatoes, corn, rye, and oats, as well as production of pork, chickens, eggs, and possibly apples for the local and regional markets (New York State Census, Westchester County, 1845). The size of the farm decreased in 1855 and 1872 from 215 acres to 115 acres to 68 acres. In 1850, Daniel constructed a house for Edmond and his family on the 47-acre parcel located north of his house. It appears that Daniel still retained the title to this parcel, since Edmond in the 1850, 1860, and 1870 censuses listed his occupation as a farm hand (Federal Census 1850, 1860, 1870). Finally in 1872, Daniel sold this 47-acre parcel to Edmond (Westchester County Clerk’s Office Deeds, Volume 804, 1872). By retaining title to Edmond’s portion of the farm, Daniel attempted to insure generational continuity of the corporate or communal farm economy by fully incorporating Edmond’s economic identity into the family’s agricultural business. The successor or heir to the parental homestead was then held responsible for supervising the corporate economy in order to ensure its survival, as well as for caring for his father’s widow and his younger brothers and sisters. In 1855, when his other sons reached their ages of majority or married, Daniel subdivided the farm by selling 100 acres of land to his sons Daniel and Hartford for $1,750 (Westchester County Clerk’s Office Deeds, Volume 293, 1855). By selling a portion of the farm, Daniel was able to provide cash for his daughters’ inheritance and/or dowries as they left the household via marriages (Ryan 1981). As Daniel’s children and in-laws left the farm, farm hands and domestic servants were hired to replace their labor (Federal Census 1850, 1870, 1880).

Subsurface testing indicated that the shift in the farm’s specialization and crop diversification resulted in or was facilitated by changes in the spatial organization of the farm and house. The size of the house (Feature 1) increased from 16 x 18 ft to 50 x 25 ft with a 17 x 25-ft addition (Feature 2) on the east side. This addition, which included a large hearth, may have served as a kitchen that would also have been used to process the milk into butter or cheese. The spatial organization of the farm also changed; it appears that a barn (Feature 3) and a second domestic residence (Feature 4) were constructed during this period. The latter appears to be associated with farm laborers. During this period the well (Feature 5) was situated an equal distance between the house and the barn. The location of the plowed fields and pasture did not change.

Artifacts from the 1830 to 1882 occupation were recovered from both the north or back yard area and the east side adjacent to the barn (Features 3) and the farm laborers’ house (Feature 4), in distinct stratigraphic contexts. Thirteen percent of the site assemblage, or 968 artifacts, are associated with this occupation. Of these, 425 (44%) were recovered from the west side of the site adjacent to the house, and 543 (56%) were recovered from the east side of the site adjacent to the barn (Features 3) and farm laborers’ house (Feature 4). The highest concentrations of artifacts were on the north side of the house in the back yard, the north side of the barn, and the west side of the farm laborers’ house (Figure 10.2).

Twenty-eight percent, or 309 of the ceramic sherds recovered from the site, were associated with the ca. 1830 to 1882 period of occupation. The ceramic assemblage from this period includes 18% redwares, 4% stonewares, 1% creamware, 3% pearlware, 15% decorated whiteware, 48% undecorated whiteware, 3% ironstone, 7% semi-vitreous china, and 1% porcelain (Sopko 1996). The 245 sherds recovered adjacent to the house (Features 1 and 2) represent at least thirty-eight vessels comprising twenty-one hollowware, fourteen flatware, and three unidentifiable forms. The vessels include one creamware, four pearlware, twelve decorated whiteware, seven undecorated whiteware, five ironstone, two semi-vitreous, one porcelain, three redware, and five stoneware vessels. The 57 ceramic sherds recovered from the vicinity of the farm laborers’ house (Feature 4) represent seven hollowware and two flatware vessels. The nine vessels include four redware, two stoneware, and three whiteware. The increase in the percentage of undecorated whiteware and ironstone on the site demonstrates the increased popularity of undecorated ceramics over decorated wares that occurred during the second half of the nineteenth century (Majewski and O’Brien 1987:123-135).

The recovery of ceramic sherds, kaolin pipe fragments, and bottle glass from the area adjacent to the second structure (Feature 4) suggests that this structure was a domestic residence possibly
used by farm laborers during the mid- to late nineteenth century. Ceramic vessels associated with Daniel White's occupation were purchased in sets that had matching place settings, serving bowls and platters, and tea saucers and cups. The recovery of sherds from pieces of at least three sets of china not only indicates a greater participation in the regional economy, but it may reflect the ritualization of family meals that occurred during the mid- to late nineteenth century, characterized by the elaboration and specialization of family meals (Wall 1994). The ritualization of family meals may also be reflected in the change in the spatial organization of the house on the White Farm site during this period. The construction of the possible kitchen wing separated the food preparation area from the food consumption area or formal dining area (Wall 1994:151-163). The White family continued to rely on wood for heat during the first forty years of their occupation, as indicated by an absence of coal in the deposits associated with the period. The absence of coal may be the result of the lack of a railroad or canal to transport coal into the region.

During this 1830 to 1882 period of occupation, the amount of bottle glass, lamp chimney glass, tin cans, and clam and oyster shells used on the site increased. Fourteen percent of the bottle glass, 57% of the lamp chimney glass, 11% of the tin cans, and 26% of the clam and oyster shells were recovered from the 1830 to 1882 deposits. This increase is not only due to the greater availability of these items, but also reflects the White family participation in the local and regional economies. The increase in the amount of lamp chimney glass suggests that the Whites were dependent on whale oil from the coastal areas of New England and New York for lighting. The increase in the use of bottled products such as soda and tonic water, beer, whiskey, and patent medicines from New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts, and ceramics manufactured in England and New Jersey, also suggests a greater participation in the local and regional economies.

Stephen White (1882-1915). The third occupation was characterized by the capitalist commercial farm economy. Although Stephen White was a clergyman, the property continued to be farmed with hired laborers (New York State Census, Westchester County, 1905). Under the commercial agrarian economy, the White Farm continued to be a productive property supplying agricultural products to the local, regional, and possibly world markets. During this period the barn was either modified or repaired, and the second house on the site continued to be used as a residence for farm workers. The modification of the barn may reflect the adoption of new agricultural practices and technologies to keep the farm productive and participating in the local and regional economies.

A total of 3,140 artifacts, 43% of the total assemblage, is associated with the 1882 to 1915 period of occupation. The remaining 28%, or 2,075 artifacts, are associated with the 1915 demolition of the site for the construction of the Kensico Reservoir. Two percent of the artifacts were recovered from the west side of the site adjacent to the house (Features 1 and 2), and 98% were recovered from the east side of the site adjacent to the barn and farm laborers' houses (Features 3 and 4). The recovery of large numbers of architectural artifacts indicates that the barn and possibly the farm laborers' house were remodeled or extensively repaired during this occupation (Figure 10.2). The high concentration of domestic artifacts, 3,082, recovered from the area adjacent to the farm laborers' house could indicate that either the household refuse disposal pattern changed or that Stephen White was an absentee owner and the farm laborers house was the primary domestic residence during this period.

The 1882 to 1915 ceramics assemblage consists of 4% yellowware, 14% redware, 14% stoneware, 1% Delft, 2% pearlware, 15% decorated whiteware, 24% undecorated whiteware, 11% ironstone, 8% semi-vitreous china, and 7% semi-porcelains. Sixty-eight percent of the assemblage was recovered from the area adjacent to the farm laborers' house (Feature 4). The ceramics recovered from this location represent at least fifty-three vessels. These vessels consist of twenty-three flatware, twenty-seven hollowware, a stoneware bottle, and two unidentifiable vessel forms. Fifty-one percent of these vessels are undecorated whitewares or ironstones.

The other 32% of the ceramic sherds were recovered from the area adjacent to the main house (Features 1 and 2). The sherds represent at least thirteen vessels, which include three flatware, six hollowware, two stoneware bottles, and two
unidentifiable vessel forms. Thirty-one percent of the vessels are decal transfer-printed whitewares, 15% are semi-vitreous china, 15% are stoneware bottles, and the other 39% are utility wares. The ceramic assemblage associated with the main house is characterized by the shift to the lighter decal-decorated whitewares, semi-vitreous china, and semi-porcelains, replacing the heavier undecorated whitewares and ironstones. The ceramic assemblage recovered adjacent to the farm workers’ house (Feature 4) is characterized by a higher percentage of the undecorated whitewares and ironstones than semi-vitreous china and semi-porcelains. The difference in the ceramic assemblages indicates that the residents of the farm workers house (Feature 4) had a lower economic status.

Participation in local and regional economies increased during the 1882 to 1915 occupation of the site. The amount of tin cans, oyster and clam shells, and bottle glass used on the site increased, and coal became the primary source of fuel for heating and cooking. Seventy-six percent of the bottle and table glass, 83% of the coal, 32% of the lamp chimney glass, 88% of the tin cans, and 81% of the clam and oyster shells recovered from the site are associated with the 1882 to 1915 period of occupation. The increased use of bottle glass, stoneware bottles, canned food, and coal could be related to the construction of a railroad in the western portion of the town of North Castle during the 1860s. The opening of the railroad could have established new trade networks and provided a more efficient distribution system that allowed increased access to consumer goods, especially coal.

Fourteen percent of the kaolin pipes are associated with this period of occupation. Eighty percent of the pipe fragments from this period were recovered from the area adjacent to the farm workers’ house (Feature 4), and on the exterior of the barn (Feature 3). The other 20% were recovered from the area adjacent to the kitchen wing (Feature 2). The kaolin pipes during this period are associated with farm laborers and the rural working class rather than with the middle class (Cook 1989).

Summary

The White Farm site represents the initial settlement and development of agriculture in a rural area adjacent to the New York City market. Archaeological testing conducted on the site, along with supporting historical documentation, provides evidence of the shift in the regional agricultural economy from subsistence to market agriculture as early as the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, during the Griffen family’s period of occupation. The high percentage of redware, which forms 42% of the ceramic assemblage from this period, and 26% of the total ceramic assemblage on the site may be associated with the preparation of dairy products for the New York City market. The redware also reflects the Griffen family’s participation in the local production and exchange system during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century.

The commercial agricultural economy in the region was fully developed by the 1830s when the White family occupied the site. The economic and social changes that accompanied the development of commercial agriculture include use of the extended family or hired hands for labor, increase in farm size from 68 to 215 acres, changes in the spatial arrangement of the house, farm outbuildings, plowed fields, and yards, and trash disposal areas at the site. Other changes that accompanied the development of commercial agriculture include the development or acceptance of specialized room functions and the concept of public versus private spaces. This is reflected by the construction of the kitchen wing (Feature 2) and the farm laborers’ house (Feature 4), a separate domestic residence for farm laborers, and the modification of the barn into a bi-level structure maximizing and increasing the space needed for dairy farming. The artifacts associated with the various households demonstrate not only participation in the local, regional, and national markets, but also appear to represent the Griffen and White families’ identification with the middle class. Undoubtedly the presence of one of the largest markets in North America, a rapidly increasing immigrant population, and the ability to get products to market within twenty-four hours via well-developed road and water transportation systems contributed to the development of commercial agriculture and a rural middle class during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

The O’Connell Site

The town of Southeast in Putnam County, New York was initially settled during the mid-eighteenth
century. During this time, the town of Southeast remained a sparsely populated frontier community characterized by small, mostly subsistence, family farmsteads. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the agrarian economy began shifting from subsistence to commercial agriculture, which provided agricultural products to the growing urban population of New York City. Agricultural surpluses were transported to the village of Cold Spring, where they were then shipped down the Hudson River to the New York City market. By the early to mid-nineteenth century, the majority of the land suited for agriculture was developed. The absence of undeveloped agricultural land forced many of the males either to move to the western states or exchange their labor for wages in the local economy. During this period one of the few jobs available in the agricultural economy was farm laborer on one of the larger farms. By the mid-nineteenth century, a large population of farm laborers was present in the town of Southeast (Pelletreau 1886).

The opening of the Harlem Railroad to the town of Southeast in 1849 had a tremendous impact on the mid- to late nineteenth-century development of the area, and resulted in the establishment of the village of Brewster. The opening of the railroad not only helped the agricultural economy with a direct market link to New York City, but also allowed the Tilly Foster iron mine in Brewster to reopen. The Tilly Foster mine was opened in 1806 and operated until 1810, when it shut down due to the high cost of shipping the ore to the nearest foundry. The opening of the railroad lowered the cost of transporting the ore ore and allowed the mine to become a profitable operation. During the period from 1853 to 1879, the Tilly Foster iron mine employed 150 men who mined 7,000 tons of ore a month, making it one of the larger iron mines in New York State. Soon after the railroad and mine were opened, the population of the village of Brewster increased as numerous individuals came from New York City looking for work. Many of these individuals became day laborers who found employment at the mine, the local furniture factory, the Borden Condensed Milk Factory that opened in 1863, or on the surrounding farms during haying or other labor-intensive activities. The availability of jobs and the influx of workers brought about development of the capitalist economy in the village of Brewster, where labor was exchanged for wages (Pelletreau 1886).

The O'Connell site, located north of the village of Brewster, demonstrates how the shift from an agrarian to a capitalist economy affected the development of the rural working class, family structure, spatial organization of house lots, and participation in local and regional economies. During the early to mid-nineteenth century, the O'Connell site and nine houses were located along the segment of NY 22 between Federal Hill Road and NY 6. The 1850 population consisted of three farmers, two carpenters, a hatter, a painter, a laborer, a handicapped person, and a retired farmer (Federal Census 1850). By 1860, the number of houses increased to eleven and the population included four farmers, three farm laborers, three day laborers, and a master carpenter (Federal Census 1860).

There were four periods of ownership of the O'Connell site: Ebenezer Foster (1827–1865), James O'Connell (1865–1871), James Conners (1871–1890), and the post-1890 ownership by the Conners and the New York City reservoir system. There are two major periods of site occupation represented in the archeological record: James O'Connell (1850–1871), who rented the house on the site between 1850 and 1865, and James Conners (1871–1898), which also includes the demolition of the site for the construction of the Bog Brook Reservoir in 1898. The following sections summarize the results of archeological and document research done on the site for the Phase II site examination.

Archaeological Results
The excavation 28m$^2$ revealed ten features and recovered 1,864 artifacts from the stratified deposits and plow zone (Figure 10.3). Artifacts are present in one to five soil layers associated with the construction, use, and demolition of the ten features representing the two periods of occupation. The following sections provide summaries of the changes that took place on the O'Connell site from the mid-nineteenth to early twentieth centuries in response to economic forces.

O'Connell Family (1850–1871). The first occupation is associated with the initial settlement of the site and the participation of James O'Connell in both the agrarian economy through subsistence farming and the wage economy as either a farm or
day laborer. This period is also characterized by the development of the capitalistic economy, where wages were exchanged for labor, and resulted in the rise of the rural working class (Federal Census 1860). During this time there was a division of labor within the nuclear family based on age and sex. In general, as soon as children reached the age of sixteen, females entered the work force to supplement family income and males helped run the family's subsistence farm (Federal Census 1870). Subsistence farming was conducted on a marginal piece of land that was not developed until 1850, when James O'Connell rented the six-acre parcel from Ebenezer Foster. The property appears to have been made agriculturally productive through reorganization and modification of the landscape. Participation in both the wage and agrarian economies enabled the O'Connell family to buy the land they were renting in 1865 for $500 (Putnam County Clerk's Office Deeds, Volume 42, 1865), to participate more fully in the local and regional economies, and maintain a traditional way of life during the period of transition from an agrarian to a wage economy.

Subsurface testing indicated that the house (Feature 1), the barn (Feature 4), two cisterns or wells (Features 2 and 5), possibly an outbuilding (Feature 8), the west yard retaining wall (Feature 9), and the stone walls on the north and south property lines were constructed during James O'Connell's occupation (Figure 10.3). The stone walls (Feature 10) located on the south and north property lines defined the limits of the O'Connell site. The stone walls start twelve feet west of the edge of the pavement of NY 22 and extend 300 ft west to a north-to-south-oriented stone wall located ten feet west of Bog Brook. The walls are 238 ft apart, define the house lot encompassing 1.6 acres of land, and separate it from the other 4.4 acres, which were used for plowed fields and pastures (Figure 10.3). The stone walls not only served legal and symbolic functions to define the property, but also the more practical function of confining livestock to certain portions of the property (Adams 1990:93).

Feature 1, the 35 x 25-ft stone house foundation, is located in the southeast corner of the site, thirty feet west of the edge of the pavement of NY 22. The foundation was constructed on the south and east side of a bedrock outcrop and is located on the lot's highest elevation. The bedrock on the east side of the wall in the interior of the foundation appears to have been removed for construction of the cellar. Once the cellar was constructed, a stone cistern or well (Feature 2) was constructed either into the bedrock or a crevasse located on the northwest corner of the foundation. The bedrock and soil excavated from the house's cellar hole (Feature 1) and the well or cistern (Feature 2) were redeposited on the north and west side of the foundation and around the cistern or well as a landscaping fill. This fill raised the ground surface in order to drain surface water away from the foundation (Figure 10.3).

The west yard was leveled around a bedrock outcrop to create a terrace that extended to the top of the slope on the west edge of the back yard. In this location, a north-to-south-orientated stone retaining wall (Feature 9) was constructed to retain the soil and prevent erosion of the extended yard area. A possible outbuilding (Feature 8) was constructed on the artificial terrace adjacent to the stone retaining wall (Feature 9) in the southwest corner of the west, or back yard. The north yard located between the house and barn was used for agricultural purposes represented by a buried plow zone that is currently overlain by a late nineteenth-century A horizon. A plow zone is located on the east, south, and west sides of the barn (Feature 4). The barn was located eighty feet west of the edge of the pavement of NY 22, and seventy feet north of the house foundation toward the center of the property. The barn (Feature 4) and a well or cistern (Feature 5) were apparently originally constructed into the north and east sides of a slope. Construction of the barn in this location created a bi-level structure that provided easy access to the house, the other outbuildings, fields, and the highway (Adams 1990:94) (Figure 10.3).

The locations of the house, barn, outbuildings, stone walls, retaining walls, and cistern or well in relation to natural topographical features such as bedrock outcrops and slopes may have been the most effective manner to organize the buildings at this time, in order to increase its agricultural potential and productivity. By increasing the agricultural productivity of the property, the O'Connells would have been able to produce dairy products, vegetables, grains, and meats that supplemented the wages James earned as a day or farm laborer and increased the family's participation in the local and regional economies.
A total of 318 artifacts, 17% of the total assemblage, is associated with this period of occupation. Fifty-one percent of these artifacts were recovered from the house vicinity, 19% from the outbuilding complex in the west yard, 14% from the north yard, 12% from the area adjacent to the barn, and 4% from the plow zone. The highest concentrations of artifacts are located adjacent to the house.

Thirteen percent, or 107 of the domestic artifacts recovered from the site, are associated with the O'Connell family occupation. Although sampling error is possible, the low percentages of domestic artifacts suggest that the O'Connell family had a limited participation in the local and regional economies. Fifty-two sherds, 26% of the ceramic assemblage, are associated with the O'Connell fam-
ily occupation. The ceramics include thirteen utility ware sherds (one yellowware, seven redware, and five stoneware), thirty-seven refined earthenware sherds (one pearlware, eight decorated, twenty-eight undecorated whiteware), and two ironstone sherds. This assemblage represents at least twenty-seven vessels, seventeen (63%) of which are hollowware, six (22%) are flatware, and the forms of four vessels (15%), which could not be identified.

Based on the high variety of ceramic patterns, the majority of the ceramics was probably purchased individually rather than in sets. The high percentage of hollowware vessels may reflect the preparation and consumption of traditional foods, such as porridges, stews, potages, or soups rather than elaborate specialized meals preferred by middle-class households at this time (Wall 1994: 123-125). The ceramic assemblage from the 1850 to 1871 occupation is characterized by the absence of sets of china, a high percentage of hollowware, and the continued use of older vessel types and forms. These attributes of the ceramic assemblage, in conjunction with James O'Connell identifying himself as a day laborer in 1860 and as a farm laborer in 1870, can be seen to reflect a working class, rather than a middle-class, status. The only possible evidence of the O'Connell family's middle-class aspirations is the shift from decorated to undecorated vessels during the second half of the nineteenth century. The high percentage of undecorated whiteware and ironstone vessels demonstrates the increased popularity of undecorated over decorated ceramics by the middle class during the second half of the nineteenth century (Majewski and O'Brien 1987).

The bottle glass, coal, and kaolin pipe fragments also represent the O'Connell family's participation in the local and regional economy. Only eight fragments, or 7% of the bottle glass from the site, are associated with the O'Connell family occupation. The bottle glass represents only three bottles, one of which originated in New York City. Twenty-four percent of the coal was recovered from the O'Connell occupation. Coal appears to have been a necessity for heating and cooking, since a wood supply was not available on the site. Forty-eight percent of the kaolin pipe fragments were associated with the 1850 to 1871 occupation. Two of the kaolin pipes were made by the McDougall Pipe Company in Glasgow, Scotland. The pipes were recovered from the exterior of the possible outbuilding (Feature 8), the barn (Feature 4), and the plow zone in the north yard between the house and barn. These locations suggest that the pipes were being smoked during work, although they might not have been smoked inside the outbuildings or barn. The absence of gas lamp chimneys, clam shells, or tin cans suggests that the O'Connell family relied on the vegetables, fruits, meats, and beeswax produced on their six-acre parcel as the source of food and lighting.

The Conners Family (1871–1898). The second period of occupation, from 1871 to 1898, is associated with James Conners and his family. James Conners purchased the property from James O'Connell in 1871 for $1,000 (Putnam County Clerk's Office Deeds, Volume 42, 1865). The Conners household during this period was composed of James, his wife, their son, and James' elderly mother (Federal Census 1880). In the 1870 Federal Census, James Conners listed his occupation as a farm laborer, and in the 1880 census as a day laborer. By 1890 he had increased the property to twelve acres. In 1890, New York City purchased the twelve acres for $5,120 for the construction of the Bog Brook Reservoir (Putnam County Clerk's Office Deeds, Volume 72, 1890).

James Conners apparently participated in both subsistence farming and the cash economy during the late nineteenth century. His family not only subsistence farmed at a time when many agricultural workers left rural areas for urban areas and higher wages, but they also relandscaped and structurally modified the parcel to make it more productive during the period from 1871 to 1890, based on the recovery of 508 architectural artifacts. Forty-three percent of the architectural artifacts were recovered from the area adjacent to the house (Feature 1), 33% from the western outbuilding complex (Features 3, 7, and 8), 23% from the area adjacent to the barn (Feature 4), and 1% from the plow zone. The distribution of the architectural artifacts indicates that the house (Feature 1) was modified or structurally altered during the period from 1871 to 1890. The cistern or well (Feature 2) adjacent to the house was also modified through the addition of brickwork, which raised its elevation above the ground surface. It appears that a privy (Feature 3) and an additional outbuilding (Feature 7) were constructed south of the first outbuilding.
(Feature 8) in the west yard on top of the slope adjacent to the north-south retaining wall (Feature 9). It is possible that the outbuilding (Feature 8) associated with the O'Connell family occupation may have been demolished during this period and replaced by Feature 7. The barn (Feature 4) was modified into a bi-level structure and the ground surface on the east and south sides of the barn was raised in elevation through the construction of a stone and earthen ramp (Feature 6). The increase in elevation on the east side of the barn made it necessary to raise the height of the cistern or well (Feature 5) adjacent to the southeast corner of the barn through the addition of bricks and concrete. As a result of the relandscaping of the site, the function of the north yard area appears to have changed, since it was no longer plowed during this period of occupation (Figure 10.2). The addition of six acres and the spatial reorganization of the property during the Conners family occupation may have served to increase the property's agricultural potential and productivity, allowing the Conners family to produce dairy products, vegetables, grains, and meats to supplement James Conners's wages earned as a day or farm laborer (Federal Census 1870, 1880) and to increase the family's participation in the local and regional economies.

A total of 720 domestic artifacts, 38% of the total assemblage, is associated with the Conners family occupation. Fifty-two percent of these artifacts were recovered from the area adjacent to the house, 13% from the outbuilding complex in the west yard, 8% from the north yard, 25% from the area adjacent to the barn, and 2% from the plow zone. The highest concentrations of artifacts were recovered from the area adjacent to the house and well or cistern (Figure 10.2).

The 148-sherd ceramic assemblage from this period is composed of 3% yellow ware, 18% redware, 4% stoneware, 34% decorated whiteware, 31% undecorated whiteware, 1% ironstone, 3% semi-vitreous china, and 6% semi-porcelains. These ceramic sherds represent at least fifty-one vessels. Twenty-nine (57%) of the vessels are hollowware, fourteen (27%) are flatware, and the forms of eight or 16% of the vessels could not be identified. Thirty-one percent of the vessels are undecorated whiteware and ironstone vessels, 25% are transfer-printed and decal-decorated whitewares, 4% are semi-vitreous china, 6% are semi-porcelains, and 34% are utility vessels. The minimal-percentage vessels demonstrate the increased popularity of undecorated over decorated ceramics that occurred during the second half of the nineteenth century, the resurgence of decorated ceramics, and the introduction of semi-vitreous and semi-porcelains during the last two decades of the nineteenth century (Majewski and O'Brien 1987).

Based on the high variety of ceramic patterns, it appears that the majority of the ceramics was purchased individually rather than in sets during this period. As with the O'Connell occupation, the high percentage of hollowware vessels may reflect the preparation and consumption of traditional foods such as soups, potages, and stews rather than elaborate specialized meals preferred by middle-class households during this period (Wall 1994:123-125). The ceramic assemblage for the Conners family occupation is characterized by the absence of sets of china, the high percentage of hollowwares, and the continued use of older vessel types and forms.

The Conners family had a greater participation in, and were more dependent on, the local and regional economies than the O'Connell family, based on the recovery of larger numbers of ceramics, kaolin pipes, tin cans, coal, lamp chimney glass, and bottle glass. Ninety-three percent of the bottle and table glass recovered from the site is associated with the Conners period of occupation. The increase in the number of bottled products such as soda water, beer, whiskey, and patent medicines also suggests a higher level of participation in local and regional economies. The increased amounts of coal and lamp chimney glass used on the site suggest that the Conners were dependent for heating and lighting on coal and kerosene from Pennsylvania, and on whale oil from the coastal areas of New England and New York shipped to Brewster via the Harlem Railroad. The low number of tin cans and clam shells on the site suggests that clams and canned food were either considered a luxury or not preferred by the site residents during this period.

Fifty-two percent of the kaolin pipe fragments were recovered from the Conner family occupation. The use of kaolin pipes by James Conners during the third quarter of the nineteenth century is indicative of the site residents' identification with the working class (Cook 1989). Kaolin pipes recov-
ered from the exterior of the outbuildings (Features 7 and 8) and barn (Feature 4) and from the plow zone suggest that they were smoked during work.

The kaolin pipe fragments recovered from the Conner family occupation of the site suggest that they identified with the rural working class, but the ceramics recovered from this period suggest that the family had middle-class aspirations. By participating in both the subsistence farm and the wage economies, the family not only produced its own food and maintained a traditional lifestyle during a period of transition in the American economy from a rural agricultural to an urban industrial economy, but also participated more fully in local and regional economies.

**Summary**

The opening of the Harlem Railroad in 1849 allowed the development of the O'Connell site. The railroad not only helped the agricultural economy with a direct market link to New York City, but also allowed the Tilly Foster iron mine to reopen. The development of commercial agriculture in the region and the presence of one of the larger iron mines in the state created a need for a local population of farm or day laborers. The influx of Irish laborers such as James O'Connell and James Conners and their families produced a need for additional housing. This housing was usually constructed on land that was only marginally suitable for agriculture. The O'Connell site represents the development of the rural working class during the mid- to late nineteenth century and evidence of the shift in the regional economy from an agrarian to a capitalistic wage-based economy. The household composition for both of these periods of occupation was the nuclear family. During the O'Connell occupation, it appears that James O'Connell’s daughters found work in the wage economy as domestic servants, while his sons most likely worked the subsistence farm.

In order to survive in the rural capitalistic economy during the transition from an agrarian to wage economy, rural laborers had to participate in subsistence farming to augment their wages, especially because the majority were hired by day. Participation in both the agrarian and wage economies resulted in the rise of the rural working class during the mid- to late nineteenth century.

The development of the rural working class has been documented in the construction and arrangement of the house, and in the spatial organization of the farm outbuildings, plowed fields, orchards, yards, and trash disposal areas at the O'Connell site. The spatial organization of the property served to increase the property's agricultural potential and productivity. By increasing agricultural productivity, the site’s residents were able to produce dairy products, vegetables, grains, and meats to supplement wages and increase the family’s participation in local and regional economies. The utilization of space can be viewed not only as a strategy for facilitating production and change, but also as a reproduction of society and its values. It can be argued that the landscaping activities were necessary to create more space through land reclamation or erosional control. It is also possible that the alterations of the terrain served as an expression of the inequalities inherent in the capitalistic system, which forced rural wage laborers to participate in the agrarian economy on marginal plots of land for survival (Rubertone 1989:50–53).

**The Hobby Farm Site**

During the seventy-five-year period from 1790 to 1865, Utica, in Oneida County rapidly advanced from a sparsely populated frontier community to a small-scale, commercial-capitalist village to an industrial city. The change in the economy was accompanied by a rapid rise in the population from 3,000 individuals in 1817, when Utica was incorporated as a village, to 9,000 individuals in 1832 when it was incorporated as a city, to 22,529 individuals by 1860 (Ryan 1981). Ninety percent of these settlers came from Connecticut or Massachusetts, and were attracted to the area by large undeveloped tracts of land and the water power of Sauquoit Creek (Ryan 1981). Similar changes occurred in the agrarian economy on the surrounding rural farmsteads in the towns of Whitestown and New Hartford. Changes in the family structure and the spatial organization of the farm, the rise to a middle-class status, and increased participation in local and/or regional economies accompanied the transformation in the agrarian economy from subsistence to commercial agriculture.
The Hobby Farm site, located in the town of New Hartford, demonstrates how the shift in the agrarian economy affected family structure, spatial organization of the farm, and participation in local or regional economies. During the nineteenth century, there were five farms located on Middle Settlement Road, north of NY 5 in the town of New Hartford, which ranged in size from 52 to 233 acres. The 52-acre Hobby Farm was the smallest. The occupation of the Hobby Farm can be broken down into six periods of ownership: Julius Goodrich from ca. 1830 to 1835, Thomas Hobby (1835-1855), his son Walter Hobby (1855-1907), his grandson Nathan Hobby (1907-1922), the Scholl family (1922-1959), and the McCubben family (1959-1996). The six periods of ownership represent four major periods of occupation in the archaeological record: Thomas Hobby (1835-1855), Walter and Nathan Hobby (1855-1922), the Scholl family (1922-1958), and the McCubben family (1958-1996).

Archaeological Results

The excavation of 31.5 m² revealed eleven features and recovered 8,413 artifacts from the stratigraphic deposits and plow zone on the site (Figure 10.4). Artifacts were present in one to four soil levels and were associated with the construction, use, and demolition of the ten features representing the four periods of occupation. The following paragraphs present a summary of the changes that occurred on the Hobby Farm from the mid-nineteenth century to the early twentieth century in response to economic forces.

Thomas Hobby (1835–1855). In 1835, Thomas Hobby purchased fifty-two acres of land from Julius and Anna Goodrich for $2,150 (Oneida County Clerk's Deeds, Volume 68, 1835). At the time of the sale, only half an acre of land owned by the Goodrich family was improved (New York State Census 1835). Thomas Hobby's occupation represents the initial settlement and the development of agriculture on the 52-acre farm. This period is characterized by the shift from subsistence to market agriculture, which provided agricultural products to the growing population of urban workers in the nearby village of New York Mills and the city of Utica. During this period the primary social and economic organization shifted from the nuclear to the extended family. The household included Thomas, his wife Mary, his son Walter, and Walter's wife and two daughters (New York State Census 1850). By 1850 dairy farming, especially the production of butter, was the primary market crop on the farm. Secondary cash crops included the production of beef, pork, chicken, eggs, wool, potatoes, apples, and honey. In 1850, the Hobby farm produced thirty bushels of potatoes, 400 pounds of butter from six cows, seventy-six pounds of wool, 150 pounds of honey and bee wax, $25 worth of apples, and $75 worth of beef and pork. In addition, the farm produced other crops used for the family's subsistence and for livestock feed. These crops included twenty-six bushels of winter wheat, eight bushels of rye, twenty-six bushels of oats, thirty bushels of corn, and twenty tons of hay (New York State Census 1850). By 1850, it appears that the Hobby farm had made the transition from subsistence to commercial agricultural economy.

The distribution of 275 architectural artifacts recovered from the soil layers associated with this period indicates that the ca. 1820 to 1855 spatial organization of the farm included the ca. 1830 house (Figure 11), the ca. 1840s house (Feature 8), a well (Feature 7), and the barn (Feature 5). The recovery of hand-painted pearlware and creamware from the builder's trenches of Features 11, 5, and 7 indicates that these were the first structures built on the site. During the 1840s, the current house (located closer to Middle Settlement Road) was constructed on the site. The function of Feature 11 during the period from ca. 1840 to 1855 could have shifted from a domestic residence to a summer kitchen that was also used for dairy processing. The spatial organization of the Hobby farm during this period was linear in design (Figure 10.4).

Two hundred and seventy five or 8% of the domestic artifacts associated with this occupational period, were recovered from the back yard area between the two houses (Features 8 and 11), the south side of the 1840s house (Feature 8), and adjacent to the barn (Feature 5). Ninety-two percent of these artifacts were recovered from the back yard area located between the current house (Feature 8) and the 1830 domestic residence (Feature 11); 8% were recovered from the barn complex (Figure 10.4).

The domestic artifacts suggest that the Hobby family had limited participation in the regional economy. The ceramic assemblage from this period consists of 1% yellow lead-glazed buff body earth-
Figure 10.4. Archaeological testing conducted on the Hobby Farm site.
enware, 10% yellowware, 9% redware, 14% stoneware, 3% creamware, 4% pearlware, 25% decorated whiteware, 31% undecorated whiteware, 2% ironstone, and 1% porcelain. This assemblage represents at least forty vessels and includes twenty-two hollowware, twelve flatware, and six unidentifiable vessel forms. The ceramics, except for the redwares and stonewares, were manufactured primarily in England and were probably purchased individually rather than in sets based on the absence of similar decorative patterns and maker's marks. The predominance of hollowware vessels, which include the utility wares, could be related to either dairy processing and/or food preparation and storage.

Only 3% of the bottle glass is associated with this period of occupation. The bottle glass represents only six bottles, colors of which include one dark green, one green hand-blown, one aqua, two clear, and one amber. The low number of bottles could indicate either a limited participation in the local and regional economies or that cider and alcohol were purchased in bulk and the bottles were used only to decant the liquids from the cask or barrel. Also, 3% of the lamp chimney glass, 10% of the coal, and 12% of the clamshells from the site is associated with the ca. 1820 to 1855 occupation of the site. Apparently the Hobby family was still using beeswax produced on their farm for lighting, and wood for heating and cooking. The use of wood for a fuel source appears to have continued to at least 1855. In Thomas Hobby's 1855 will, he specifies that his son Walter should provide his mother with all the wood she needs (Oneida County Clerk's Office Deeds, Volume 513, 1894). During this period of transition from subsistence farming, the Hobby family had a limited participation in the national and international economies.

Walter and Nathan Hobby (1855–1922). The occupation of the site from 1855 to 1922 is associated with the development of the capitalist commercial agricultural economy on the farm. The capitalist or commercial farm economy is characterized by the nuclear family as the primary social and economic organization, the specialization of crops, the diversification of farm products, and the use of mechanized farm equipment. During this period, a shift occurred in the primary economic focus, from dairy farming and the production of butter to sheep farming and the production of wool. In 1875 the Hobby farm had half the number of milk cows (three), two and a half times the number of sheep (thirty-nine), half the number of beef cows (three) and pigs (three) as it had in 1850; chickens were added most likely for egg production. The farm produced three times the number of bushels of winter wheat (seventy-five) and corn (100), six times the number of bushels of oats (150), potatoes (150), and apples (150), and almost twice as many pounds of honey and beeswax than was produced in 1850. In 1865 and 1875, the farm was also producing between ten and twenty barrels of cider a year. Two new crops, barley and buckwheat were produced on the farm at the same time the butter production dropped from 450 to 100 pounds between 1850 and 1875. One of the possible ways Walter Hobby increased crop yield was through investment in mechanized farm equipment. The evidence for the mechanization is the 330% increase in the value of the farm equipment that occurred during the twenty-five year period from 1850 to 1875 (New York State Census, Oneida County 1850, 1865, 1875).

The distribution of the 1,067 architectural artifacts indicates that the shift in the farm's specialization and diversification of crops resulted in or was facilitated by a change in the spatial organization of the farm. During this period the farm consisted of the house (Feature 8), with the addition of a rear wing (Feature 9), a possible summer kitchen or dairy (Feature 11), a well (Feature 7), a privy (Feature 2 and 3) constructed at an equal distance between the house and two barns (Feature 5 and MDS 10), a barn or stockyard located on the south side of Feature 5 and the east side of MDS 10; a well (Feature 6) adjacent to the barns, and plowed fields (Figure 10.3). A second barn was apparently built during this period and could be associated with the increase in the number of livestock, especially sheep, on the farm (New York State Census, Oneida County, 1850, 1865, 1875).

A total of 1,280 domestic artifacts is associated with the 1855 to 1922 occupation of the site. Sixty seven percent of these artifacts were recovered from the privy (Feature 3), which was filled in between 1890 and 1910. The artifacts in the privy fill date from 1841 to 1910, representing the entire period of this occupation. Thirteen percent of the artifacts were recovered from the rest of the yard.
adjacent to the house (Feature 8), 9% were recovered from the barn complex (Feature 5, 11, and MDS 10), and 11% were recovered from the plow zone area of the site.

The ceramic assemblage from this period is composed of 1% buff body earthenware and creamware, 8% yellowware, 7% redware, 5% stoneware, 1% pearlware, 7% decorated whiteware, 54% undecorated whiteware, 15% ironstone, 1% semi-vitreous china, and 1% porcelain. It is possible that the buff earthenware, creamware, pearlware, and some of the decorated whiteware could have been redeposited from the disturbance of the 1820 to 1855 A-horizon during this period. The sherds from the 1855 to 1922 occupation represent at least sixty-seven vessels, which include thirty-two hollowware, twenty-eight flatware, and seven unidentifiable vessels. The most popular ceramic types during the period from 1855 to 1922 were undecorated whitewares and ironstones. Ceramic vessels were purchased in sets that had matching place settings, serving bowls and platters, and tea saucers and cups, based on the recovery of several ceramic sherds from different vessel types with the same maker’s marks. The recovery of pieces from at least five sets of china from this occupational period not only indicates a greater participation in the regional economy but may reflect the ritualization of family meals that occurred during the mid- to late nineteenth century (Wall 1994:151-163).

At the Hobby site the ritualization of family meals may also be reflected in the change in the spatial organization of the house, by the construction of the rear wing. The rear wing could have been constructed for a kitchen, which would have separated the food preparation area from the food consumption or formal dining area.

Forty-eight percent of the bottle glass, 26% of the clamshells, 23% of the coal, and 69% of the lamp chimney glass recovered from the site is associated with the 1855 to 1922 occupation of the site. The increase in the amount of coal and lamp chimney glass used on the site indicates that the Hobbys were dependent on coal and kerosene from Pennsylvania and whale oil from the coastal areas of New England and New York for heating and lighting. The increase in the use of bottled products such as soda and Florida water, beers, whiskey, and patent medicines from Utica, Binghamton, Rochester, and Chicago, and ceramics manufactured in England and New Jersey, are also indicators of greater participation by the family in the national and international economies.

The Scholl Family (1922–1958). This occupation is also characterized by the capitalist commercial farm economy. During this period, however, it was based on the production of a single cash crop: apples. Archaeological testing indicated that the shift in the farm’s specialization to apples resulted in or was facilitated by changes in the spatial organization. The distribution of the architectural artifacts indicated that the original barn (Feature 5) was demolished for the construction of a secondary domestic residence (Feature 4), used either for members of the Scholl family or migrant workers. The construction of the secondary domestic residence had an impact on the northern portion of the ca. 1820s house (Feature 11). A small barn that could have been used for a garage (Q3a) and a barn (Q3b) were constructed, and the plowed fields were converted into an orchard. The other features on the farm during this period included the house and rear wing (Features 8 and 9), a barn (MDS 10), and the two wells (Features 6 and 7) (Figure 10.4).

A total of 2,005 domestic artifacts is associated with the 1922 to 1958 period of occupation. Twenty seven percent of these artifacts were recovered from the vicinity of the house, and 73% were recovered from the area adjacent to the secondary domestic residence (Feature 4) and adjacent to the mid- to late nineteenth century-barn (MDS 10). The highest concentrations of artifacts were recovered from the privy (Feature 10) located north of the early twentieth century barn (Q3b) adjacent to the orchard. The distribution of domestic artifacts during this period shifts from the back yard area to the west side of the early twentieth-century domestic residence (Feature 4). This shift could be associated with a change in disposal patterns, or could indicate that the early twentieth-century activities on the site were centered on the secondary domestic residence (Feature 4) (Figure 10.4).

Participation in local and regional economies continued to increase during the Scholls’ occupation. The shift to a single cash crop indicated that the Scholls were not only dependent on the national economy for heating and lighting but also on the local economy for food and beverages. This
dependence is seen in the increase in the amounts of coal, tin cans, oysters and clams, and bottle glass. Forty-nine percent of the bottle glass, 62% of the clam shells, 67% of the coal, 28% of the lamp chimney glass, and 84% of the tin can fragments were recovered from the 1922 to 1958 occupation of the site.

**Summary**

The transformation in the agrarian economy from subsistence to commercial agriculture occurred during the period from 1855 to 1865 when Walter Hobby occupied the site, and again during the early twentieth century during the Scholl family’s occupation when the farms’ focus shifted to the production of a single cash crop. The capitalist or commercial farm economy is characterized by the nuclear family replacing the extended family as the primary social and economic organization, the specialization of crops, the diversification of farm products, and the use of mechanical farm equipment. During the period from 1855 to 1922, a shift occurred in the primary economic focus of the Hobby Farm. Dairy farming and the production of butter were replaced by the production of wool for the local textile mills and fruits, vegetables, and eggs for the large population of mill workers in the nearby village of New York Mills and city of Utica. Subsurface testing indicated that the shift in the farm’s specialization and the diversification of crops resulted in changes in the spatial arrangement of the house, farm outbuildings, plowed fields, yards, and trash disposal areas at the site. Other changes that accompanied the development of commercial agriculture included the development or acceptance of specialized rooms and outbuilding functions, and the concept of public versus private spaces. The realization of these concepts is reflected by the construction of the rear kitchen wing (Feature 9), a second barn (MDS 10), a privy (Features 2 and 3), and the excavation of a second well adjacent to the barn complex (Feature 6). The addition of the rear wing may be related to the separation of the kitchen from the dining area and the use of a large coal cookstove. The second barn may also be related to the specialization of farm buildings and may have been needed due to the increase in the number of sheep kept on the farm, or for maximizing and increasing the space for the storage of hay and farm equipment. Other changes on the site included the development of a yard area around the house and a stockyard located on the south side of the barns. Other indicators of the impact of commercial farming on the household included an increase in the amount and diversity of ceramics and bottle glass and the shift from wood to coal for heating and from candles to oil lamps for lighting.

The second shift in the Hobby Farm’s economic focus—to the production of apples as the single cash crop during the early twentieth century—also resulted in the spatial reorganization of the farm. The original house that was possibly later used as a summer kitchen and dairy (Feature 11), as well as the barn (Feature 5) and privy (Features 2 and 3) were demolished. These structures were replaced by two new barns (Q5a and b), a second domestic residence (Feature 4), and a privy (Feature 10) that were constructed in different locations. During this period it also appears that the site was electrified. The domestic cultural material used on the site increases throughout the nineteenth and into the early twentieth century. Only 8% of the domestic artifacts is associated with the first period of occupation from ca. 1820 to 1855, while 36% is associated with the 1855 to 1922 period, and 56% is associated with the 1922 to 1958 occupations.

The development of commercial agriculture on the Hobby Farm and in the surrounding area may be directly related to the growing urban population of wage laborers in the numerous textile mills in the city of Utica and the village of New York Mills. The growth of commercial agriculture is also tied indirectly to the development of an extensive transportation network, consisting of the Erie and Chenango Canals and several railroads, that was needed by the textile industry to transport its products to the larger eastern markets. Since commercial agriculture developed on the Hobby Farm during the period from 1855 to 1865, another factor that may have contributed to the shift from subsistence agriculture is the Civil War. The increase in farm stock, grain, hay, and other products produced on the Hobby Farm during this period may be related to agricultural shortages created by the Civil War, such as cotton, and also to maintenance of a large army in the field. It is quite possible that some of the farm’s products, especially wool, pota-
toes, and pork, were produced for the national market via the Union Army. Another possible reason for the increased agricultural production was to make up for shortages caused by the secession of the primarily agricultural Southern states.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

The shift from near-subsistence to commercial agriculture on the three sites discussed is reflected in the changes in household composition, spatial organization of the house and farm, and consumption patterns. The transformation of the agrarian economy occurred at different times on the sites. The shift to commercial agriculture on the White Farm site first occurred during the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century, and again during the White family's occupation during the period from 1830 to 1850, when dairy farming became the principal economic activity. On the Hobby Farm site, it first occurred during the period from 1855 to 1865, as suggested by Summerhill (1997) for most of New York State. A second shift in the agrarian economy occurred on the Hobby Farm during the early twentieth century, when the farm's focus changed to the production of a single cash crop: apples. On the O'Connell site, the transformation never quite occurs, due to the fact that the primary source of income of the occupants resulted from wage labor.

Documentary research for the White, O'Connell, and Hobby farms provided information on the size of the farms and the social organization of the household. The size of the sites or farms varied. The White farm was originally sixty-eight acres, and expanded to 215 acres during the early to mid-nineteenth century. In 1855 and 1872, the farm was subdivided among Daniel White's sons, which reduced its size to the original sixty-eight acres. The fifty-two-acre Hobby farm stayed the same size throughout the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century. The O'Connell site, originally six acres in size in 1865, increased to twelve acres by 1890.

The composition of the household on the White and Hobby farms appears to have shifted from the nuclear to the extended family by the 1850s. On the White site, a non-related household composed of Daniel White, female domestic servants, and male farm laborers replaced the extended family during the late nineteenth century. The household on the Hobby site during the second half of the nineteenth century shifted from the extended family back to the nuclear family, as Walter's sons left the farm either to go west to develop land or to find other occupations in the Utica area. In contrast, the O'Connell household throughout the second half of the nineteenth century consisted of the nuclear family. The use of the extended family on the White and Hobby farms could be related to ensuring the generational continuity of the farm by incorporating the economic identity of the heir into the family farm. The successor or heir to the parental homestead was then held responsible for supervising the farm economy in order to ensure its survival, as well as for caring for his father's widow and his younger brothers and sisters (Ryan 1981).

Archaeological testing conducted on these three sites to date has produced information on the spatial organization of nineteenth-century farmsteads and recovered cultural material associated with their occupations. The artifacts not only date the occupation periods, but also provide information on the changes that occurred on the sites during different occupation periods in the spatial organization of the houses and buildings and the refuse disposal patterns. Analysis of the artifacts provides information on the diet and methods of food preparation and consumption, economic status, and changes in the household's participation in local and regional markets.

The spatial reorganization of these sites represents the transformation from near-subsistence to capitalistic or commercial agriculture that occurred during the nineteenth century. The spatial organization of the three sites during the period of near-subsistence farming consisted of a small house, well, and barn. When this arrangement was no longer productive, the farms were reorganized to either maintain or improve the site residents' lifestyle. On the White site, the shift to commercial agriculture was accompanied by enlargement of the 1780s house, construction of a kitchen wing, remodeling of the barn into a bi-level structure, and construction of a separate domestic residence for the farm laborers. On the Hobby Farm the transformation to commercial agriculture was reflected in the construction of a new domestic residence,
privy, and second barn and well, and conversion of
the original house into a summer kitchen and/or
dairy. Additional changes in spatial organization
also occurred during the early twentieth century,
when farm production shifted to a single crop.
These changes included demolition of the original
house, barn, and the mid- to late nineteenth-century
privy, and construction of a new barn, second
domestic residence, and privy in new locations.
Even the O'Connell site underwent changes during
the late nineteenth century. These included con¬
struction of a privy and shed, as well as conversion
of the barn into a bi-level structure between 1871
and 1890. These improvements, along with the
increase in the property’s size from six to twelve
acres, might have allowed the Connerses to provide
a greater proportion of their own subsistence needs
and decrease their reliance on wages. The diversi¬
fication in size, type, and specialization of farm
outbuildings during the second half of the nine¬
teenth century on these sites is a result of the
attempt to make the farms more productive by the
use of specialized activity areas.

The transformation from near-subsistence to
commercial agriculture also appears to have had an
impact on the location and size of the houses on the
White and Hobby farms. In 1830, the 15 x 18-ft
house built by the Griffen family was expanded
into a 50 x 25-ft structure with a 25 x 17-ft kitchen
wing on its east side. On the Hobby farm site, a new
32 x 40-ft house was constructed in the 1840s clos¬
er to the road. The old 15 x 26-ft house located
closer to the barn could have been converted into a
summer kitchen that was also used to process dairy
products. During the late nineteenth century, a 15 x
18-ft addition or wing was added onto the north¬
west corner of the house, to separate the kitchen
and cookstove from the dining area. Changes in
the size and spatial arrangement of the houses
could be related to the development or acceptance
of specialized rooms and outbuilding functions
and the concept of separating public from private
spaces. Although it doesn’t appear that the 35 x
25-ft house on the O'Connell site was expanded, the
interior of the structure could have been modified
or extensively repaired during the period from 1871
to 1890.

The concept of public and private space also
appears to have been extended to the exterior of the
houses on all three sites. Yards with grass were
developed around the houses, and artifacts were no
longer deposited in the front yards or on the pub¬
lic side of the house. In the back yard area artifacts
were still being deposited as sheet refuse, but trash
middens appear to have been moved further away
from the house.

The domestic cultural material recovered from
these three sites provided information on the house¬
hold’s economic status, class identity, and con¬
sumer patterns. This analysis is based on the
premise that the artifacts which surround the house¬
hold are a direct statement of what the occupants
believe themselves to be, or what they hope to
become. Artifacts of a similar form and function
are found among households that are similar in
terms of their self-perception. Ceramics recovered
from the sites are perhaps the best indicators of
what the household thought of their economic sta¬
tus, based on their abundance, their relative low
cost, and the periodic changes in their style and
popularity.

The ceramic assemblages from the White and
Hobby sites are fairly similar in nature. Utility
wares composed of yellowware, redware, and
stoneware vessels form from 21% to 48% of the
ceramic assemblage throughout the nineteenth and
into the early twentieth century. Decorated, pearl¬
wares, and whitewares comprise 25% to 27% of the
ceramic assemblages on both sites during the
late eighteenth century and the first half of the
nineteenth century. During the second half of the
nineteenth century, the popularity of undecorated
whitewares and ironstones increased. By the late
nineteenth century, undecorated ceramics form 69%
of the assemblage on the Hobby site and 51% of the
assemblage on the White site. Finally, the ceramic
assemblages recovered from both sites during the
last two decades of the nineteenth century and the
first two decades of the twentieth century demo¬
strate the shift from heavier undecorated white¬
wares and ironstones to decal-decorated whitewares
and lighter semi-vitreous china and semi-porce¬
lains. During this period, the percentage of semi-vit¬
reous china and semi-porcelains forms 7% of the
assemblage on the Hobby site and 8% on the White
site. On both sites there is evidence that sets of
china made in England and New Jersey were pur¬
chased and used on the sites by the 1880s or 1890s.
The ceramic assemblage recovered from the O'Connell site differs from the other two site assemblages by a lower number of ceramic vessels, a higher percentage of hollowware, and the absence of sets of china. However, the ceramic assemblage shows similarities to the other two assemblages in the shift to undecorated whiteware and ironstones during the second half of the nineteenth century and in the later nineteenth- and early twentieth-century shift to semi-vitreous china and semi-porcelains. These similarities can best be explained by the fact that perhaps both the O'Connell and Conners families had middle-class aspirations, which was expressed through the use of relatively low cost ceramics on the site.

Kaolin smoking pipes are another artifact group that provides evidence of the class identity of site residents. During the period from 1860 to 1880, kaolin pipes became established as the working-man's preferred method of smoking and as a symbol of the working class. The use of kaolin pipes on sites during the second half of the nineteenth and the early twentieth century indicates that the residents identified with the working class. Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century kaolin pipes were recovered from both the O'Connell site and from the farm laborers' house on the White site. In contrast, only two kaolin pipe fragments were recovered from the Hobby site. Both of the fragments were recovered from contexts such as the plow zone, suggesting that they could have been deposited by a day laborer rather than by members of the Hobby family. The absence of kaolin pipes indicates that either tobacco was smoked in some other form (such as the cigars or cigarettes that were preferred by the middle class) or that the Hobby family did not use tobacco.

Other artifacts such as bottle glass, clam and oyster shells, coal, lamp chimney glass, and tin cans provide evidence of consumer preference, household consumer patterns, and participation in local, regional, national, and international economies. The use of these items not only represents expanded wealth but also the household's adoption and investment in new technologies for heating, lighting, and food preparation. The adoption of these new technologies could have been an attempt to change the daily and seasonal rhythms of country life.

Several factors appear to influence the timing of the transformation from near-subsistence to capitalistic or commercial agriculture. Necessary factors include a nearby market where a fairly large percentage of the population was not involved in the agrarian economy (and this could provide the demand for products), a pool of local wage laborers to supplement the labor of either the extended or nuclear family, and a well-developed transportation system that allowed cash crops to be transported to markets in a timely manner. The Civil War created huge demands for and shortages of agricultural products, and had a great effect on agricultural production in New York.

The O'Connell site provides evidence of cultural factors that must be considered. The site is located near a major market with a well-developed transportation system, but the transformation from near-subsistence to commercial agriculture never took place at this site. The low number of domestic artifacts indicates the site occupants did not participate in the developing consumer society. Perhaps this was related to the cultural mind-set of wage laborers or tenancy. What is important is that even though the site looks like a farm, it represents a completely different lifestyle than that of a laborer living in a rural context.
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In 1818, 24-year-old David Beaman migrated from Westminster, Massachusetts to the western foothills of the Adirondack Mountains, in what is now Fort Drum (Figure 11.1). He had been apprenticed as a hatter, but hired himself out to raise enough money to pay for the forty-two acres he bought in Jefferson County, New York in 1820. Within three years he had more than doubled his acreage, and by mid-century had acquired nearly 300 acres of land. Soon after he had established himself on his forty-two-acre farm, Beaman sent for his widowed mother and his seven younger siblings. His brother Ira, who may not have come to Jefferson County until 1832, eventually established his own farm across the road from David (Figure 11.2).

David Beaman was married twice: first to Lucy Porter (1811-1839), who may have died of complications arising from childbirth, and then to Sally Ann Mosher (1814-1901). He had three children, Harriet, Jane, and George, with his first wife; and three children, Alonzo Mosher and the twins, Alice and Annis, with Sally Ann. The sons would all move away, although the youngest, Alonzo, appears to have managed the farm for his father during the 1870s. The two youngest girls, who never married, eventually inherited the farm, which they sold in 1919 (Louis Berger & Associates, Inc. [LBA]; 1993b).

In 1860, David Beaman’s farm was valued at $10,560, more than double the state average (LBA 1993b; McMurry 1988; H. Barron, personal communication 1996). While the Beamans’ farm operation was more extensive than those of their neighbors, it was in many ways typical of northern New York agriculture around mid-century. The family raised wheat, oats, barley, corn, and potatoes; livestock included dairy and “other” cattle (the herd ranging from twenty-eight to forty animals), horses, swine, and sheep. Home manufactures included wool (up until 1865), eggs, butter (an average of 1,900 pounds per year), maple sugar (averaging 480 pounds per year), and occasionally molasses. The Beamans produced some 300 pounds of cheese in the census years of 1850 and 1855 and, like most farm families, stopped making cheese during the third quarter of the nineteenth century. By 1870 the Beamans were selling fluid milk, probably to local cheese factories or creameries (Friedlander et al. 1986; LBA 1993b).

David Beaman lived until 1883, long enough to witness the sweeping changes that overtook rural society in New York’s “North Country.” What historians have called the Great Transformation of the countryside is well known in its general outline, as summarized by Robert Gross: “Farmers gradually abandoned producing their own food, clothing, and tools, and turned to supplying specialized urban markets for a living” (Gross 1988:520). The development of this rural capitalism thus went hand-in-hand with the market and industrial revolutions that were changing forever the face of America’s cities.

The Great Transformation

Until relatively recently, the principal focus of historical interest has been on the dramatic social and economic changes that occurred during the early
Figure 11.1. Location of Fort Drum.
Figure 11.2. The Beaman farmsteads (U.S.G.S. 7.5-Minute Series, Antwerp and Philadelphia Quadrangles, 1949, photorevised 1982).
nineteenth century in cities like New York, Philadelphia, and countless other urban places. Rural folk, on the other hand, were often looked upon as recipients of the blessings of the market, people who attempted to emulate their urban middle-class contemporaries or, alternatively, as market victims.

The transformation of urban life was exemplified by the division of labor, the separation of home and workplace, and the rise of the middle class with its attendant ideology of the separation of men's and women's spheres and the cult of domesticity (Blackmar 1979; Blumin 1976, 1989; Bushman 1992; Cott 1977; Gordon 1978; Horlick 1975; Kasson 1990; Matthai 1982; Rock 1979; Ryan 1981; Sellers 1991). While the transformation of rural life mirrored to some extent the social, economic, and ideological ferment occurring in the cities, conditions in the countryside served to mold—at least partially—these new relationships to suit the needs of the farm and rural village populations (Sally McMurry’s 1988 discussion of how the urban parlor was first adopted and then transformed into the rural living room provides a good example of this phenomenon).

The work of historians Christopher Clark (1990), Joan Jensen (1980, 1986), and Sally McMurry (1988, 1995), among others, has demonstrated that the impetus for change in the countryside frequently came from within rural society itself. For example, McMurry’s recent (1995) study of nineteenth-century dairy farmers in Oneida County, New York (a study particularly relevant to a discussion of the Fort Drum area in the 1800s) focused on the instrumental role played by farm women in the transferral of cheese making from farm to factory during the second half of the nineteenth century. Cheese production was a burden that was borne largely by women, a fact that created considerable tension in farm households. With the rise of the cheese factory it was possible to transfer this work from the farm, resolving domestic tensions while at the same time freeing women for other tasks, increasing reliance on the market economy, and emphasizing wage labor (McMurry 1995). Even earlier in the century, it was the demand by rural folk, together with their urban counterparts, for inexpensive yet refined goods, which helped spur the Industrial Revolution (Bushman 1992). As historian Robert Gross has observed, without the revolution in the countryside, the creation of an urban industrial society would have been impossible (Gross 1988).

**The North Country and the New England Heritage**

Throughout much of the nineteenth century, North Country farmers struggled to maintain a balance between the demands of household and market. As they did so, they embodied the tension between “traditional” rural lifeways and the changes accompanying the expansion of the capitalist market into the countryside.

The Beamans were part of the stream of migration that erupted from New England beginning in the 1790s and accelerated after the War of 1812, spreading across central and northern New York and into the Midwest. By the last quarter of the eighteenth century, population growth, coupled with a relative land shortage, had made it harder for many New England families to divide their farms in order to provide property and livelihoods for their offspring (Clark 1990). In response, some families sought to acquire more land if they could afford it; many, failing that, intensified their agricultural production, clearing and improving what they already owned. Others began to acquire new skills with which to earn a living either separately or in conjunction with farming. Finally, some, like the Beamans, chose to migrate (Clark 1990; Lockridge 1968). All of these strategies were followed, sometimes singly, sometimes in combination, by New England farmers in an attempt to maintain their independence and to pass the resources for independence on to their children (Clarke 1990; Henretta 1978).

The rural economy in the northeastern United States at the beginning of the nineteenth century was, as Clark (1990), Henretta (1978), and others have argued, essentially a subsistence–surplus one. Farm families supplied most of their own basic needs and exchanged surplus agricultural produce for necessities—often foodstuffs and cloth they were unable to produce themselves—or luxuries like tea, coffee, and sugar. Farming operations were diversified and included the cultivation of a variety of grain crops and the raising of livestock. Exchange was overwhelmingly local and reciprocal and was part of the cooperation between households which
ensured their economic survival. Cash in such an economy was scarce and was not a frequent medium of exchange, except for the payment of taxes and occasional purchases from local merchants, most of whom extended credit and accepted payment in kind (Clark 1990). Farm households were never self-sufficient, but rather relied on kin and neighbors for support (Henretta 1978; Pruitt 1984; Sellers 1991; Shammas 1983); in fact, the independent yeoman farmer, wholly reliant on his own resources, was largely a myth, created by eighteenth-century authors like Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, and further romanticized by writers in the following century who waxed nostalgic for “simpler times” (Gross 1988).

In a sense, then, early nineteenth-century Northeastern farmers still adhered to a form of communalism—that hallmark of New England society during the seventeenth century—leavened by the individualism that superseded it. Cooperation was the key to survival. The neighborhood, which provided the geographic basis for interhousehold cooperation, consisted of a network of farm families who operated more or less independent farmsteads in a loosely drawn geographic district and who assisted each other through a wide variety of work and social activities (Hubka 1986:14). For Stilgoe (1982), the rural neighborhood outside of the earlier-settled portions of New England was a distinctly American space that resulted from the perfection of individualistic, increasingly market-oriented agriculture (Stilgoe 1982:81). The neighborhood identified that space beyond their own property in which farmers had “vital interests, close knowledge, and frequent reason to travel” (Stilgoe 1982:82).

Neighborhood cooperation, essential to the survival and well-being of each farm family, would have included a wide range of shared activities, such as education (district schools); work sharing (the exchange of labor, tools, animals, and machinery); health care (assistance in sickness, birth, and death); craft or services specialization (blacksmith, carpenter, herbalist); road maintenance (construction, snowplowing, and repair); assemblies and celebrations (barn raisings and huskings); disaster relief (fire, sudden death); and general information exchange and socializing (Hubka 1984:152).

By the last two decades of the eighteenth century, as the influence of the market, and the middle-class ideology that underpinned it, began to extend further into the countryside from the seaports and market towns, New England farmers began to reorganize their farmsteads. Middle-class ideals of respectability and self-disciplined effort came to be expressed in a new rural aesthetic that influenced both appearance and the organization of space (Bushman 1992). Emulating the ordered, genteel appearance of the towns, farmers began to align their dwellings with the road. This seemingly simple change marked a profound transformation in outlook; although rural builders in the Northeast had always constructed their houses close to the road (a legacy of their English forebears), these structures usually faced south, with little regard for orientation toward the closest public thoroughfare (Hubka 1984). By changing the orientation of their houses, however, New England farmers began to relinquish their traditional nature-directed lifestyle for one more firmly connected to the town and the market. The public facade of their road-aligned houses were now often accompanied by the creation of a formal front yard space, set off by fences and enhanced with ornamental plantings. This same period also witnessed the widespread construction of the classically inspired temple-front house while, in northern New England, farmers were beginning to create the connected farmstead.

These changes are indicative of the hold that the new town and commercial orientation was beginning to have on the rural New England population, an orientation (juxtaposed with the desire for economic independence) that was transplanted to the new lands opening up in northern New York during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. By and large, settlers in the Fort Drum area, most of whom had migrated from Vermont, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, replicated New England patterns of rural settlement. Both the information derived from cartographic sources and the results of archaeological surveys demonstrate the roadside orientation of these farmsteads. Out of a total of 105 nineteenth-century farmhouse foundations mapped during the Fort Drum project, 84% were located within 100 ft of the nearest road. A mean distance of just under eighty-four feet from house to road was calculated for the entire sample; David Beaman’s house, situated fifty feet from Watertown Road, falls well under the average. Although other loca-
tional variables, such as access to a water source, the presence of well-drained soils or, in one case, desire for a scenic vista, each played some role in farmstead siting, proximity to the transportation and communication network was by far the primary concern in the location of the structural core of the farm. The overwhelming majority of the mapped dwelling foundations (98%), including the remains of the Beaman house, were oriented with the front, or public façade, parallel to the road.

The architectural forms and ways of organizing space associated with these early nineteenth-century farmsteads also appear to have derived from New England traditions. Nearly all of the dwellings investigated archaeologically at Fort Drum had evidently been of frame construction, and the original sections of most of these structures (81.2%) appear to have been built more or less along the lines of either the one-room-deep, hall and parlor type or the two-room-deep center hall type (Hubka 1984; McAlester and McAlester 1984), both of which were common among the vernacular farmhouses of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century New England. Nineteenth-century barn forms, at least in those few examples at Fort Drum where later alterations have not obscured the original configuration, also appear to have been built along traditional lines, and include the English or Yankee barn and the basement barn.

From the standpoint of layout, the nineteenth-century arrangement of the farmsteads at Fort Drum remains a largely open question. Except for farmhouses and barns, obviously pre-twentieth century structures have, for a variety of reasons, not been uncovered at these sites. However, the seemingly stable locations of barns vis-à-vis the dwellings at these farmsteads indicate a certain continuity in the architectural landscape, despite changes in the agricultural economy during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The spatial relationship between house and barn, by far the two dominant elements of the farmstead, was the determining factor in the overall arrangement of the farm complex, and these buildings were themselves influenced, in terms of their respective locations, by tradition, topography, location of agricultural fields, etc.

Rural neighborhoods in the Fort Drum area coalesced as settlers, many of them kin, established their farmsteads along the roads that crisscrossed Jefferson County. Families like the Beamans, Taggarts, Childs, Jewetts, and Coopers formed clusters of kin-related farm properties. At one time or another in the early to mid-nineteenth century, for example, no fewer than nine farmsteads associated with the Jewett family were established along a two-mile stretch of road (Figure 11.3). The property originally purchased by Ezekiel Jewett Sr. in 1819 was subsequently divided among his heirs and descendants, some of whom continued to occupy these tracts well into the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The cooperative ethic that underpinned the rural neighborhoods in Jefferson County survived, in one form or another, into the twentieth century. Interviews with former residents of the Fort Drum area are sprinkled with accounts of shared work and equipment, particularly high-cost items like threshers. In at least one instance in 1915, relatives maintained a communal cow barn (LBA 1993a).

THE AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY OF THE NORTH COUNTRY

Fort Drum farmers, much like their western New England contemporaries during the first half of the nineteenth century, followed a diversified agricultural regime that mixed grain cultivation and livestock raising. Research conducted by Amy Friedlander has shown that in the 1820s and 1830s, during the first generation of farm formation, agriculturists appear to have invested substantially in livestock, particularly cattle and sheep. The typical farm in 1825 contained two or three horses as compared with twelve to thirteen head of cattle (apparently beef and dairy animals), thirty sheep, and ten hogs. Ten years later, the typical farm still housed only two or three horses in contrast to twenty head of cattle, sixteen sheep, and fourteen to fifteen hogs (Friedlander 1990). Over the next two decades sheep raising was gradually abandoned and hog raising sharply curtailed. As the market expanded into the North Country, particularly following the completion of the Black River feeder canal in 1840 and the Watertown-Ogdensburgh Railroad some seventeen years later, farmers began to place a greater emphasis on dairying. Surplus dairy products, especially butter and to a lesser
Figure 11.3. The Jewett properties during the mid-nineteenth century (U.S.G.S. 7.5-Minute Series, Black River Quadrangle, 1958, photorevised 1982).
extent cheese, found a ready local and subregional market. Market-oriented dairying fit fairly comfortably with the household unit of production, and even a modest-sized herd of dairy cows (eight to twelve on average in northern New York) could yield a respectable surplus for sale or exchange (Friedlander 1990:447). During the second half of the nineteenth century, farmers continued to cultivate a mix of wheat, barley, corn, oats, and potatoes. Income, primarily from the sale of butter and later fluid milk, was supplemented by many Fort Drum area farmers through the sale of maple sugar, eggs, or other produce.

Although there could be considerable overlap, men’s and women’s work roles on northern New York farms around mid-century were divided into separate and distinct spheres. Men’s work generally involved plowing, grain and root crop cultivation, harvesting, and to a certain extent livestock management, along with a wide variety of maintenance chores. Women, on the other hand, cared for the kitchen garden, raised poultry, tended the stock, milked the cows, dealt with domestic matters, and processed the butter and cheese which formed a substantial portion of many farms’ marketable surplus. By 1850, butter production in the Fort Drum area had largely replaced spinning and weaving, a pattern that seems to have occurred, at different times, throughout the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic regions (Jensen 1980, 1986; McMurry 1988). Once the family’s own needs had been met, the surplus could be exchanged between neighbors for other necessities, or sold to a local merchant in exchange for manufactured goods or “luxury” items.

Just as work roles on northern farmsteads overlapped, at least to some extent, so too did workspaces, and the house and barn (and surrounding yards) were the locations where this most frequently occurred. Although the house was considered to be the woman’s domain, men often worked indoors, at least during the winter, at tasks like repairing tools or maintaining harnesses. The barn, too, was a shared workspace, particularly since women were traditionally responsible for milking the cows and carrying the milk to the milk house where it would be poured into wide, shallow pans to allow the cream to separate. As the nineteenth century progressed, however, the proxemics of the North Country farmstead changed, as farmers sold increasing quantities of fluid milk and as men took on a more predominant role in dairying (McMurry 1995).

Friedlander’s (1990) research strongly indicates that the response of Jefferson County farmers to the expansion of the market was essentially a cautious one. She observes that “much in this model of farm management in which self-sufficiency was considered a precondition to achieving profit is consistent with Vickers’s (1990) recent studies of early nineteenth-century farmers. Vickers argues that the important value was economic independence and that there was no inherent distaste for market involvement. Thus, while market-oriented dairying may have been new to inhabitants of Jefferson County, the approach that farmers embraced, which preserved their economic independence and perceived self-sufficiency as necessary to achieving profit, appears to have been quite conservative. Moreover, the technology and household mode of production remained reassuringly familiar through the 1890s.” (Friedlander 1990:7-3-7.4)

Response to the Market

Pressure on northern New York farmers to involve themselves in the expanding rural capitalist economy came from a number of quarters during the nineteenth century. Local and county agricultural societies, usually formed by groups of gentlemen farmers, fostered a climate of competition by awarding prizes for livestock or crops or for the efficient, businesslike way a particular farm operation was conducted. As early as 1829, for example, William Cooper was awarded a premium by the Jefferson County Agricultural Society for his dairy operation. The viewing committee, however, noted that Cooper’s farm was not as clean as it might have been (LBA 1994:39).

The virtues considered to be embodied in outward appearance and other aspects of middle-class ideology were aggressively pushed by the rapidly expanding print media. Agricultural reformers like Solon Robinson (1864), Henry Stevens (1857), and Lewis Allen, in his widely published book Rural Architecture (1852), emphasized the values of efficiency, rationality, commercialism, and profit in farmhouse design and farmstead organization—
the farm as manufactory. Other writers such as Downing (1853) stressed the importance of aesthetics (and performance, see Kasson 1990) in the development of moral character (Clark 1988, McMurray 1988). The familiar series of prints by Orasmus Turner (1849) (Figures 11.4—11.7), showing the progression from rude cabin to large comfortable farmhouse, illustrated the progress expected of the striving, self-making farm family (see Bushman 1992:245–255, 384–385; Sellers 1991:154–156).

The response of Jefferson County farmers to the admonitions of agricultural/architectural reformers during the nineteenth century varied from family to family, and reflected the tension between more traditional folk-oriented lifeways and market-oriented cultural forms. Some, like David Beaman, strove to create a refined, respectably middle-class public facade for their properties. Between 1855 and 1865 (the exact date is unknown), Beaman constructed a large addition to his farmhouse. Archaeological excavations at the Beaman farmstead suggest that the new addition was gable-front in plan (based on its dimensions and the placement of the front steps)—the temple-front form described by Glassie (1968)—and was built onto a one-room-deep, hall and parlor dwelling constructed in the 1820s (Figures 11.8 and 11.9). There is also some evidence that the front yard was landscaped more or less concurrently with the new addition, which may have contained a front parlor or sitting room. Why would a successful, if not wealthy, farmer like David Beaman build in a style that by this time had fallen out of public favor, when other well-to-do farmers in the Northeast (including Peter J. Brown in northern New Jersey [Affleck 1995]) were following the dictates of the architectural and moral reformers (Clark 1988) and constructing dwellings in Gothic Revival or Italianate styles? Although we cannot know for certain, perhaps it was a desire on David Beaman’s part not to stand too far apart from his neighbors by flaunting his economic success, preferring a less obvious, less ostentatious appearance of refinement and thus trying to balance the pull of community with the push of striving middle-class respectability.

Figure 11.4. The First Winter (Turner 1849). Courtesy of New York Public Library
Figure 11.5. *The Following Summer* (Turner 1849). Courtesy of New York Public Library

Figure 11.6. *Ten Years Later* (Turner 1849). Courtesy of New York Public Library
Yet refinement only went so far, because around this same time the Beamans were in the process of creating an extensive midden directly behind the house that would yield over 8,000 bone fragments, 105 ceramic vessels, and a variety of other artifacts (Figure 11.10). Some late nineteenth-century farm households in the Fort Drum area would create a refined front yard space while disposing of kitchen and other household trash away from the house; others, following an earlier aesthetic, would continue to dispose of household refuse in their front yards or even in the roads fronting their property (LBA 1993a).

In contrast to the Beamans’ large capital investment in creating a refined public facade for their property, archaeological and historical evidence suggests that many of the Fort Drum farm households during the third quarter of the nineteenth century took a more economically cautious approach. Some chose to landscape their front yards, others added decorative trim to their houses, and many opted to elaborate the interiors of their dwellings (Friedlander 1990; LBA 1993a). Store records from the late 1840s examined by Amy Friedlander indicate that, buying mainly on credit, farm families concentrated on purchasing machine-made cloth that could be fashioned into curtains, pillowcases, and other furnishings. Cotton fabric was also purchased to expand wardrobes as older garments were reworked, retrimmed, and redecorated.

By mid-century, as the market revolution was transformed into the Industrial Revolution, there is a veritable explosion in the availability and variety of consumer goods reflected in the archaeological record. Decorative furnishings, mirrors, table lamps, pressed glass bowls, clock parts, and other items begin to appear with increasing frequency in the refuse deposits excavated at Fort Drum, indicating that more and more local farm households, including the Beamans, were spending more of their earnings to appropriate the symbols of middle-class respectability (LBA 1993a). The Beamans, for example, acquired several matching sets of white-ware tea- and tablewares in the transfer-printed “Tyrolean” and “Abbey” patterns and the sprig-decorated “Chelsea” pattern, examples of which...
Figure 11.8. Plan view of the Beaman House foundation (LBA 1993b:5–4)
Figure 11.9. Artist's rendering of a typical temple-front house. The Beaman dwelling may have looked something like this.
Figure 11.10. Plan view of the midden to the rear of the Beaman house. (LBA 1993b:5-53).
were recovered from the large midden behind the house. One can surmise that these sets, together with the stemwares also present at the site, were used for relatively formal occasions—Sunday or holiday dinners, for example. Everyday meals were probably eaten from shell-edge plates, while beverages were consumed from glass tumblers and from teacups decorated with polychrome hand-painted motifs. Interestingly, the Beaman household also discarded a large number of small bowls, mostly whiteware and most with dipped decoration. The wear on these vessels suggests that they were used for the consumption of soups or stews.

The various furnishings-related artifacts and other items recovered from the Beaman farmstead—drawer pulls, lamp crystals, mirror glass, decorative sconces, and oil lamp parts—all hint at the manner in which the house was furnished during the mid-to late nineteenth century, and point to refined, if not opulent, Victorian tastes. While the Beamans and other relatively well-to-do farm households may have been remarkable for their ability to afford and, evidently, purchase a wide variety of consumer goods to express and reinforce their identities as successful middle-class agriculturists, the archeological evidence from nearly all of the farmsteads investigated at Fort Drum suggests that most households acquired at least some of the trappings of success and refinement, regardless of their economic state.

During this same period, items such as canning jars—indicating the preservation of home-grown fruits and vegetables—become increasingly common in the archaeological record, while the type and variety of faunal remains from late nineteenth-century deposits indicate the consumption of meat produced on the farm; in the case of the Beaman family, there is some tentative evidence for the sharing of meat between households. The presence of canning jars on rural (and urban) sites is an interesting phenomenon, and just one of many examples of the multi-dimensional character of material culture. While the purchase of these mass-produced items implies a certain level of involvement in the market economy, conversely the use of canning jars to preserve home-grown fruits and vegetables points to efforts to maintain some level of independence from the market. People, of course, still undertake these activities today (maintaining kitchen gardens, canning, home-brewing beer, etc.).

The desire for a measure of independence is also indicated by census records from the mid- and late nineteenth century, which suggest that most farm households in the Fort Drum area were able to produce more than enough grain to feed themselves and their livestock (LBA 1993a, 1993b). The same held true for butter, which on most farms investigated at Fort Drum was produced in quantities sufficient to meet household needs while yielding a surplus for sale or exchange. Unlike home canning, however, the archaeological evidence for butter production—and indeed for dairying in general—at Fort Drum during the nineteenth century is scant. Ceramic (i.e., redware and stoneware) milk pans, used to cool the milk and separate the cream, are very poorly represented in the Fort Drum site assemblages, at least for those sites like the Beaman farmstead (a total of only four) where Minimum Numbers of Vessels (MNVs) were determined. By the early nineteenth century, the use of lead-glazed redware for milk pans had declined due to a fear of lead poisoning. Redwares were replaced by other, non-lead-glazed ceramic types and by milk pans fashioned from glass or metal (Jensen 1986:98-99). There is no evidence for the use of glass milk pans at Fort Drum, so it may be reasonable to assume that metal forms, which would have been purchased locally, were in use, and not being as subject to breakage are poorly represented, if at all, in the archaeological record. In any event, the archaeological and documentary evidence indicates that while most Fort Drum farm households were becoming more closely tied to the consumer market, relative self-sufficiency still appears to have been an economic goal for most agricultural families well into the third quarter of the nineteenth century.

**Transition and Transformation**

Until nearly the end of the nineteenth century, market involvement was still essentially conservative when compared to less-rural areas. Farmers still strove for economic independence, if only as an ideal, and were still able to provide for many of their own needs. Yet by the turn of the century, economic and social competition and a reliance on cash as a medium of exchange had pushed Fort Drum dairy farmers into more open-ended production for the market—which, in turn, worked to
undermine neighborly cooperation and family equality. The sale of fluid milk to creameries and cheese factories, which began in the 1850s and accelerated during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, served to remove women in large measure from the profit-generating aspect of farm life, marking a shift toward an emphasis, in McMurry’s words, on “child rearing, self-improvement, and strictly house-related work” (McMurry 1988:100), a shift that was not necessarily involuntary on the part of women (McMurry 1995).

Like many of their contemporaries, the Beamans stopped producing cheese by the 1860s, and over the next two decades also cut butter production by over 60%. The sale of fluid milk became a major source of income, while butter appears to have been produced mainly for home consumption. If the household followed the trend that predominated in northern New York during the last quarter of the century (McMurry 1995), it is possible, if not probable, that dairying on the Beaman farmstead became a primarily male occupation. And as men began to dominate dairying activities, the barn, once a workspace shared by men and women, became a largely male preserve. Exactly how this may have played out on the Beaman farm is uncertain. Did Sally Ann Beaman and her daughters willingly give up the physically demanding tasks associated with dairying on the Beaman farmstead to concentrate on more domestic activities? Did they expand their involvement in other farm-related work, such as poultry raising? The surviving records, both documentary and archaeological, are silent on this issue, although perhaps someone in the future will, with different eyes, see things more sharply. What is clear is that as men’s and women’s spheres diverged, and as Jefferson County farmers became more closely dependent on the market, they followed the Northeast’s progressive farmers into the twentieth century.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I must gratefully thank John Hart for inviting me to participate in the “Colloquium on Nineteenth-Century Domestic Archaeology in New York State,” for which this paper was written. I would also like to thank my friends and colleagues at Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., who worked on the Fort Drum project, all of whom, over the years, have shared their insights into the history, archaeology, and material culture of nineteenth-century farmsteads: Amy Friedlander, Meta Janowitz, and Marie-Lorraine Pipes. Finally, I thank Hal Barron and Linda Stine for reading and commenting on earlier drafts of this paper. Any errors in fact or interpretation are, of course, my own.

NOTES

1 Established in 1908 as a training facility, known first as Pine Plains and then as Pine Camp, Fort Drum has grown to encompass a total of 107,265 acres in Jefferson and Lewis Counties in New York. The outbreak of World War II precipitated a major expansion of the post, resulting in the purchase, in 1941, of 75,000 acres of land and construction of over 600 temporary wooden buildings. Upon acquisition by the Army, civilian-owned structures were demolished; during the war, the post served as a training facility and prisoner-of-war camp.

Pine Camp was renamed Camp Drum in 1951 after Lt. Gen. Hugh A. Drum, Commander of the First Army. It was redesignated Fort Drum in 1974, and ten years later in 1984 the post became the headquarters for the first new light infantry division formed since World War II, subsequently named the 10th Mountain Division and formally activated on February 13, 1985. To accommodate the expansion in Fort Drum’s mission, a new cantonment as well as related installation, operation, and training facilities were required. In 1985, Louis Berger & Associates, Inc. was awarded a contract to provide cultural resource management/historic preservation services. Between 1985 and 1991, thirty-four task orders were completed covering inventory, evaluation, recordation, data recovery, documentation, and preservation planning. Among the archaeological sites investigated was the David Beaman Farmstead (A-045-03-0007), one of over 150 farmsteads examined at the post.
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Chapter 12

The Betsey Prince Site: An Early Free Black Domestic Site on Long Island

Mark S. LoRusso

The Betsey Prince site is a late eighteenth-to early nineteenth-century free black domestic site located on North Country Road/Route 25A in the Town of Brookhaven, Suffolk County, Long Island (Figure 12.1). The site was discovered and initially investigated by the New York State Museum during a 1989 Phase I reconnaissance survey and Phase II site examination for the proposed widening of Route 25A by the New York State Department of Transportation (LoRusso 1989). Based on this investigation, the site was determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places because of its ability to provide data on the Revolutionary period and, specifically, on early free black settlement on Long Island. The State Museum performed a data recovery investigation of the site in 1993, due to the Department of Transportation’s inability to avoid destruction of the site.

The Betsey Prince site, when it was established, occupied a thinly settled area between the seventeenth-century villages of Miller Place and Wading River. In later years it became part of a loosely connected group of farms that extended between North Country Road and the north shore of Long Island, collectively known as Rocky Point (Gerdes 1838; Hulse 1797). The site lay undisturbed for 150 years after its abandonment, protected from twentieth-century development under the ownership of the Radio Corporation of America, and more recently as part of the Rocky Point State Resource Management Area (New York State Commission of Highways 1922; U.S.G.S., 1957).

The people who settled the Betsey Prince site were among the earliest black freedmen and-
documentary research and archaeological investigations and provides interpretations of how Jonah Miller, Betsey Prince, and others lived on North Country Road. The investigation showed that the architecture, landscape utilization, and material culture of the site were generally consistent with a modest lifestyle of the period. Though documentary sources showed that the site was occupied by free blacks throughout its history, archaeological evidence of this cultural affiliation was weak. Two aspects of the dwelling, its form and a cellar storage pit, were possible clues to an African-American presence, based on comparable findings on Southern slave and free black sites, and on Northern free black sites. The chapter will consider whether the archaeological findings of the Betsey Prince Site may be used to identify African-American occupations on other modest domestic sites of the late Colonial–early American period in the Northeast.

**Slavery in Eastern Long Island**

Slavery was introduced to eastern Long Island during the initial English occupation in the mid-seventeenth century. Colonists brought Native American slaves from New England, captured others from indigenous groups on Long Island, and obtained small numbers of black slaves via the nascent trans-Atlantic slave trade. Over the next 125 years, the demand for labor in the growing local economy, diversified in small-scale agriculture and secondary industries, spurred the steady growth of the slave population of eastern Long Island. Most slaves were obtained by importation from the West Indies and Africa in the first half of the eighteenth century, and later principally through an internal trade network. The majority of slaves filtered in small numbers to yeoman farmers, artisans, widows, and lower-status merchants and professionals. Slave numbers averaged 1.3 to 2.5 per household in Suffolk County during the eighteenth century and in the second half of the century, slaves occupied 40% of households (Greene and Harrington 1932; Moss 1985; Wortis 1974).

Despite official sanctions against it, many slaves on Long Island were permitted to own property, farm land for personal benefit, and conduct business. Yet prior to the Revolution, few achieved freedom due to the steady demand for, and affordability of, slave labor, and because of a 1712 statute that made owners responsible for the welfare of slaves in society. Slave manumissions became more frequent beginning in the 1770s due to the softening of earlier laws, and because of changing attitudes toward slavery, championed by Quaker abolitionists. Manumissions increased after the Revolution in the face of state anti-slavery legislation. An act of 1788 provided for the manumission of slaves except for older or infirm slaves requiring care. The Gradual Emancipation Act of 1799 granted freedom to slaves born after July 4, 1799, when females reached twenty-five years of age, and when males reached twenty-eight years of age. An act of 1817 provided for the freedom of all slaves in ten years, and in 1827 slavery was effectively abolished in New York State (Lydon 1974; Moss 1985).

In Suffolk County, approximately 50% of the black population already was free by 1790, compared to 3% in neighboring Kings County, where Dutch slave-holding traditions and labor-intensive tobacco plantations prevailed. By 1820, 78% of Suffolk County’s blacks were free, and by 1825 over 98% were free. The large majority of freedmen initially remained in their former owners’ households, and probably saw limited change in their daily routines. A few established independent households on lots given them by their former owners or purchased from them, despite codes that prohibited blacks from owning property until the early nineteenth century. Even fewer acquired enough land for an independent farm, and many worked as laborers on others’ farms well into the nineteenth century (Hough 1857; Moss 1985, Table XIV; New York Journal of the Senate 1826).

**Site Background and History**

The Betsey Prince site occupies Lot 41 of the 1728 Wading River Great Lots, an original land division which extended from North Country Road to the middle of Long Island (Office of the Advance 1880; Tuthill 1949). The early ownership of the site and encompassing lands was reconstructed from deeds for land sales in 1818 and 1820 (Figure 12.2). In these sales, farmer Henry Mather acquired a 500-acre parcel west of the site, and free blacks Jonah Miller and Mineus Lyman together acquired 200...
acres east and south of the site. Descriptions of pre-existing parcels bordering these lots showed that Israel and Wells Davis together owned lands south of the site, while Josiah Miller and Jonah Miller individually owned lands close to and potentially including the site (Town of Brookhaven Liber 84:585, E:287). Earlier evidence of Jonah Miller’s ownership of property is the state tax assessment of 1799 to 1804, which values his house and land at $300. Significantly, he is the only black in the Town of Brookhaven who is assessed, and presumably he was the only one who owned substantial amounts of land in the town (New York State Comptroller’s Office 1799–1804).

The first evidence of land ownership under the Prince name is shown in the 1818 deed for a land sale between Israel and Wells Davis and Henry Mather (Brookhaven Liber 84:585). This deed describes two parcels owned by black settlers along North Country Road. The “estate of Prince, a coloured man,” is described as extending from Mather’s lands in Lot 42, east to the property of Jonah Miller in Lot 41 or 40, and south to the property of Josiah Miller. A one-acre lot located in the northwest corner of Lot 42, to the adjacent west of Prince, was “reserved and sold by Daniel Davis to Benjamin (a coloured man) on which his house now stands.” Betsey Prince is named as the owner of the Prince lot in 1824 and 1832 deeds for parcels located nearby, east of the Davis lot (Brookhaven Liber E:285, Q:183).

Jonah Miller and two to four other free black heads of family, including “Prince a Negro” and Betsey Prince, are listed in close succession in the federal censuses of 1790 to 1830 (Table 12.1). Although the censuses do not provide locations for these households, and although the exact route of the census taker is unknown, the pattern of enumeration of these heads of family over time implies residence in shared or adjacent dwellings. “Prince"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1800</th>
<th>1810</th>
<th>1820</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>Jos Hallock</td>
<td>Philip Hallock</td>
<td>Daniel Soriese</td>
<td>Benj Glover</td>
<td>H. Munson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Israel Davis</td>
<td>Hend Hallock</td>
<td>James More</td>
<td>Minor Hallock</td>
<td>Thos Helmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Brown</td>
<td>David a Negro (5)</td>
<td>Philip Hallock</td>
<td>Betsy Davis</td>
<td>H. Woodhull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jos Hallock</td>
<td>Benj Heaton</td>
<td>Ann Ruggles</td>
<td>Josiah Hallock</td>
<td>Rich Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Woodhull</td>
<td>Prince a Negro</td>
<td>Henry Turner</td>
<td>Richard Wood</td>
<td>Betty Prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacob Eaton</td>
<td>Robbin a Negro</td>
<td>Levi Tucker</td>
<td>Levi Tooker</td>
<td>Benj Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonah Miller</td>
<td>Jonah a Negro</td>
<td>Jonah Miller</td>
<td>Jonah Miller</td>
<td>Jonah Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David (3)</td>
<td>Levy Tucker</td>
<td>Tutus Sills</td>
<td>Mother Limon</td>
<td>Ma. Hallock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bett Miller</td>
<td>Jacob Heaton</td>
<td>Rice Jessup</td>
<td>Betsy Prince</td>
<td>Dr. Heaton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priss Miller</td>
<td>Wil Robertson</td>
<td>Rich Wood</td>
<td>Henry Matthers</td>
<td>Joel Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thos. Helmes</td>
<td>Nath Ruggles</td>
<td>Noah Hallock</td>
<td>Benj Davis</td>
<td>Jas Hallock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Davis</td>
<td>Cain a Negro</td>
<td>Peter Davis</td>
<td>Jos Lupton</td>
<td>Jos Hallock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Woodhull</td>
<td>Wm Skidmore</td>
<td>Luther Brown</td>
<td>Jon Hallock</td>
<td>T.W. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Woodhull</td>
<td>Philip Hallock</td>
<td>Jos Hallock</td>
<td>Henry Turner</td>
<td>Jon Hallock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Black heads of family are italicized; total family members are shown in parentheses.
first appears as a head of family in 1800, and Betsey Prince appears as a head of family in 1820 and 1830, coinciding with her ownership of the Prince property. Neither Jonah Miller or Betsey Prince is listed in the census in 1840, implying that both were deceased by this time (U.S Census Population Schedules, First-Sixth Censuses).

The origins of the free black people listed in the census are unknown. The names “Prince,” “Cain,” and “Robbi,” were first names adopted under slavery and later used as surnames. These names do not allow connection with a possible former owner by similar surname. Among those with surnames, Rice Jessup did not come from a local slaveholding household based on having a common surname with a former owner; no other Jessups are listed in the census for Suffolk County between 1790 and 1820. Tutus Sills was manumitted by Wessel Sills in April 1811, despite being listed as a head of family in the previous year’s census (Times Steam Job Print 1888:150). Benjamin Davis, a native of New Jersey, was a former slave of Daniel Davis who became a permanent settler on North Country Road, residing on his one-acre lot through 1860.

The census records also reveal that slaves and free blacks resided in a relatively large proportion of the households near Jonah Miller in 1790. Of forty households enumerated before and after Miller, 40% had a total of sixty-four slaves, and 48% had a total of twenty-four free blacks. By comparison, of the total 557 households enumerated in the Town of Brookhaven, 18.5% had 233 slaves and 30% had 275 free blacks. Among Brookhaven’s free blacks, only forty-eight lived in thirteen independent households. Based on the order of enumeration, these households were scattered through the town except where clustered around the Betsey Prince property and one other location (U.S. Census Population Schedules—First Census). As a small group of independent householders, the early free black families on North Country Road thus represented an exceptional group.

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATIONS**

The Betsey Prince site consisted of the ruins of a small dwelling and the proximal yard areas, within the boundaries of the data recovery project area. The project area extended seventy-five feet along the highway, between the edge of sheet deposits associated with the site and an adjacent residential parcel; and fifty feet back from the highway shoulder to the DOT project limit (Figure 12.3). The data recovery plan proposed the excavation of one-tenth of the site area, or a total of 375 square feet. Approximately 40% of the excavation investigated the dwelling ruins, 40% investigated three sheet artifact concentrations and a midden feature behind the dwelling, and 20% sampled other artifact-producing locations identified by testing.

The investigation combined shovel testing, soil sampling, and excavation. Shovel tests (1.5 ft squares) were excavated at ten-foot intervals to confirm the eastern boundary of the site and to sample a previously uninvestigated fifteen-foot strip along the rear edge of the project area. Soil samples were taken from ten-foot grid corners at the base of the plow zone and from depositional features to identify concentrations of chemicals associated with domestic waste disposal. These included potassium, phosphorous, and calcium, potentially indicative of wood ash, human waste, and food waste, respectively. Excavation units (three-foot squares) were combined, as needed, to form block excavations over features and sheet concentrations. Excavation was performed according to arbitrary and cultural levels, and all soils were screened through one-quarter inch mesh screens. All cultural materials were collected except for dense quantities of brick chimney rubble, which was weighed and sampled in the field.

**RESULTS OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS**

The objective of the data recovery investigation was to broaden the knowledge of early free black settlement in eastern Long Island through the study of selected research topics. These topics consisted of delineating the form of the dwelling architecture and identifying possible changes over time, understanding the development of the domestic landscape, and identifying patterns of ceramic consumption on the site. An overriding theme of the research was determining if, and how, African cultural traditions had influenced the development of the site.
Architecture

The dwelling of Betsey Prince occupied a low sandy rise approximately twenty-five feet from the (existing) edge of North Country Road. The dwelling consisted of an 11 x 13-foot main block, oriented perpendicular to the highway, with an approximate 6 x 8-foot kitchen wing off the west side. The main block was built on an unmortared cobble and boulder foundation that lined a dirt cellar three and one-half to four feet deep. The wing apparently rested on a stone sill connected to a large chimney base at the west end of the house (Figures 12.4 and 12.5).

The associated ceramics indicated that the median occupation date for the dwelling was around 1800, based on mean dates (South 1977) for provenience groups throughout the dwelling ruins. The ceramics suggested that the dwelling was occupied as early as the mid-1760s and abandoned by ca. 1840, based on the mean beginning and ending dates for the provenience groups (Salwen and Bridges 1977; Thompson 1987) (Table 12.2). These dates were close to the visual occupa-
Figure 12.4. Photograph of the Prince dwelling ruins looking northwest toward North Country Road. The cellar hole and foundation are visible in the foreground. The stone chimney base/sill (rock pile) is visible in the center and background.

Figure 12.5. Site plan of the Prince dwelling ruins.
tion period bracket dates for the site (South 1977),
which largely spanned the date ranges for
creamware, pearlware, and locally produced slip-
trailed redware, comprising 83% of the assemblage
by sherd count; and overlapped the ranges for
other represented wares, including Jackfield, fine
red stoneware and tin-glazed earthenware on the
early end, and whiteware, ironstone, and yel-
lowware on the late end. Notably, these dates do not
account for the possibility of a lag in acquiring
ceramics, or the continued use of older ceramics
by the household, both of which would potential¬
ly would skew the dates toward the early side. The
absence of an intact builder’s trench for the foun-
dation, resulting from the instability of the cobble
foundation construction and sandy soil, prevented
the possible use of this feature for dating the con¬
struction of the dwelling. The presence of 50%
wrought nails in the dwelling ruins only support¬
ed a construction date before ca.1790, when
wrought nails were losing favor, although a possible
lag in the use of wrought nails should be con¬
sidered. The presence of Rockingham yellowware
in the cellar fill did provide a terminus post quern
of ca.1840 for the abandonment of the site, corre¬
borating the other ceramic evidence.

Archaeological investigation showed that the
dwelling was originally built with a wing and did
not evolve over time. Mean ceramic dates for
deposits around the chimney base, adjacent to the
exterior of the foundation, and on the cellar floor,
did not differ significantly: the mean dates all were
between 1793 and 1797 excluding redware, and
between 1798 and 1801 including redware (Table
12.2). The distribution of wrought nails and cut
nails suggested a later date for the wing, however,
the slightly higher proportion of cut nails around
the chimney base potentially reflected later repairs
to the house and not original construction. There
was no evidence of an earlier cultural stratum,
beneath the chimney base, that predated the con¬
struction of the wing. The absence of an earlier
chimney on the main block was shown by com¬
paratively low amounts of brick on the east and
south sides of the foundation, and by a lack of evi¬
dence of stonework for a chimney base on the west
side. The high density of brick in the cellar fill orig¬
inated from the wing chimney as it toppled east¬
ward with the collapsing house.

The structure of the Prince dwelling can be
further understood from the archaeological record
and from comparison with contemporaneous
dwellings in the Town of Brookhaven and neigh¬
boring areas. The Prince dwelling was probably
constructed of wood frame and clapboards, not
logs, based on New England building traditions
in eastern Long Island. The absence of a tradition
of log construction in this area is shown by the state
census of 1855, which lists no log houses in Suffolk
County at a time when virtually all counties in New
York had log houses (Hough 1857). The
dwelling would have had plank flooring over the
cellar hole and presumably also in the wing. Com¬
mon nails found throughout the dwelling ruins
may have originated from floorboards, clapboards,
and roofing shakes. The use of a brick chimney
reflects both the availability of brick and the poor
quality of the local building stone. According to
Bassett, brick could have been obtained locally
from small brickyards near the many intermittent
clay beds across eastern Long Island (Bennett
1965:5). Clay mined at the nearby Prince-Miller site
(LoRusso 1998) (Figure 12.2) may have been used to
make bricks for the chimney, although no evidence
of a kiln was identified on either site. The use of a
large number of boulders for the foundation and
chimney base indicates that substantial effort was
expended in gathering building materials for the
house. The relative scarcity of fieldstones on the
ground surface near the foundation suggests that
the builder cleared the site of stone and potentially
brought in additional stone from the surrounding
area during the foundation construction.

The modest scale of the dwelling indicates
that the main block was one or one-and-one-half
stories, and based on English building traditions it
probably was side-gabled. The kitchen wing may
have been side-gabled or shed-roofed, and appar¬
tently was set back from the main block. Though the
dwelling presumably was entered from the north or
highway side, an easterly orientation may have
been preferred due to the stronger light and warmth
provided in winter months.

The archaeological record provides some evi¬
dence of the general arrangement of entries into
the house. The lower artifact densities, and the lim¬
ited wood ash deposition in the area between the
dwelling and the highway and on the east side of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenience Group</th>
<th>DWELLING</th>
<th>YARD</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date without Redware</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date without Redware</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date without Redware</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date without Redware</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Begin</strong></td>
<td><strong>Middle</strong></td>
<td><strong>End</strong></td>
<td><strong>Begin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(90)</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>1793</td>
<td>1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(381)</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(472)</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 12.2** Comparison of Mean Ceramic Dates of Provenience Groups.

The Betsey Prince Site: An Early Free Black Domestic Site on Long Island
FIGURE 12.6. Cross-section of the cellar hole and storage pit or pit cellar (east wall profiles of Units N39E27, N40E27, and N43E27).
the dwelling near the highway, suggest that the principal entry may have been either on the north or east side. A second entry on the south side of the dwelling would have provided access to the rear yard for the deposition of stove ash, food remains, and other household waste. An apparent gap in the stonework between the chimney base/sill and the foundation may indicate that the entry was located at the junction of the wing with the main block. If South's Brunswick pattern of waste disposal applied to the site (1977), concentrated artifact deposits would be expected near the locations of the rear door. However, the relatively low counts of kitchen artifacts and clam shells, and limited evidence of wood ash directly adjacent to the house, indicates that the occupants tried to restrict the deposition of waste to designated midden areas. A moderately high concentration of ceramics near the front side of the kitchen wing showed that some indiscriminate deposition of waste did occur near the house.

Activities inside the dwelling would have been centered around the fireplace. Food preparation and consumption in this area is shown by five cutlery and dining utensils, six metal pot and skilet fragments, four hooks and rings possibly associated with these tools, and one andiron leg on and around the chimney base. Food storage, preparation, consumption, and tea drinking in both parts of the house are shown by comparable proportions of ceramic ware and vessel types associated with these activities around the chimney base, adjacent to the foundation and in the cellar fill. The slight separation of the fireplace from the main room would have provided more space for dining, work, and rest without significantly compromising heat and light for activities in the main room. A loft, if present, would have been used primarily as children's sleeping quarters.

The cellar probably was used primarily to store perishable foods. The lack of evidence of an exterior entry and the shallow depth of the cellar suggest that access was through a door cut in the floorboards. The relatively high numbers of buttons and personal items on the cellar floor reflect the downward filtering of items lost or discarded during day-to-day activities in the house.

A small pit located in the center of the cellar floor, ostensibly used for storage, measured 24 to 30 inches in width, and 16 to 18 inches in maximum depth (Figure 12.6). The south, east, and west sides of the pit were approximately vertical; the north side sloped at a 45-degree angle. The sandy fill of the middle and upper part of the pit contained dense stone and brick rubble associated with the collapse of the dwelling foundation and chimney into the cellar hole. The underlying dark clayey sand stratum, apparently a pre-destruction stratum, contained a notably lower proportion of these materials. Sterile subsoil underlay the pit at four- and-one-half feet below the ground surface. The pit contained a large pot handle, a jackknife blade and, most notably, large sawed fragments of a deer antler base that suggested a specialized storage function within the cellar. The mean ceramic date for the pit was 1797 excluding redware, and 1799 including redware, consistent with other artifact provenience groups from the dwelling. The presence of pearlware provided a terminus post quern that showed use of the pit after 1780.

In terms of size, the Prince dwelling was representative of dwellings built and occupied by other free black and slave families in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (Table 12.3). The Prince dwelling enclosed an area of approximately 191 square feet on the ground floor, including the hearth area, plus 143 square feet in a possible loft. By comparison, the Caleb Smith slave dwelling in Commack, Long Island; Black Lucy's house in Andover, Massachusetts; the Cato Turner dwelling at Parting Ways in Plymouth, Massachusetts; twenty ca.1780 to ca.1789 slave cabins in St. Mary's County, Maryland; and antebellum slave cabins throughout the South had floor plans ranging from approximately 131 square feet to approximately 256 square feet, with proportional increases for possible loft space. These dwellings consisted of one-room ground-floor layouts with end-placed fireplaces (Bullen and Ripley 1945; Deetz 1977; McDaniel 1982). The Prince dwelling was an expanded version of this basic layout, possibly intended to be a compromise between a one-room and a full two-room house, the latter requiring a second fireplace. The Prince dwelling and Black Lucy's dwelling gained additional space for storage in cellars located beneath the house.

In using one principal room, the Prince dwelling may have been generally comparable to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling/Site</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Period of Occupation</th>
<th>Occupant</th>
<th>Layout</th>
<th>Cellar</th>
<th>Dimensions (feet)</th>
<th>Floor Space (square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Betsey Prince site</td>
<td>Rocky Point, northeastern Long Island</td>
<td>c.1770s to c.1840</td>
<td>one or more free black families</td>
<td>one room with small kitchen wing, fireplace at end of wing</td>
<td>shallow cellar under main block, pit in center</td>
<td>11 x 13, 6 x 8</td>
<td>191, plus 143 for possible loft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caleb Smith II slave dwelling</td>
<td>Commack, central Long Island</td>
<td>possibly late 18th century +</td>
<td>slave/free black family or families</td>
<td>probably one room with loft, side-gabled with end fireplace</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>15 x 15 (approximate)</td>
<td>225, plus 225 for loft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Lucy's house</td>
<td>Andover, Massachusetts</td>
<td>c.1815 to c.1845</td>
<td>free black woman and son</td>
<td>one room with end fireplace</td>
<td>full cellar</td>
<td>11 x 12</td>
<td>131, plus 131 for possible loft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parting Ways</td>
<td>Plymouth, Massachusetts</td>
<td>c.1800 to early 20th century</td>
<td>free black man in late eighteenth to early nineteenth century</td>
<td>originally one room, second room added c.1830</td>
<td>original house had no cellar, added room had cellar</td>
<td>12 x 12, 12 x 12</td>
<td>144 plus possible loft, expanded to 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early slave cabins</td>
<td>St. Mary's County, Maryland</td>
<td>c.1780–1789 c.1790–1799</td>
<td>slave family</td>
<td>one room two rooms</td>
<td>no cellar no cellar</td>
<td>12 x 16, 16 x 24</td>
<td>192, plus possible loft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>later slave cabins</td>
<td>throughout the South</td>
<td>early to mid-19th century</td>
<td>slave family</td>
<td>one room</td>
<td>no cellar, some with pit cellars</td>
<td>16 x 16</td>
<td>256, plus possible loft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey's House</td>
<td>Concord, Massachusetts</td>
<td>c.1666 to c.1825</td>
<td>freed slave from c.1783 to c.1822</td>
<td>two rooms around central chimney, kitchen el</td>
<td>half cellar</td>
<td>12 x 17, 15 x 18, kitchen el?</td>
<td>474 plus kitchen el and possible loft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building B</td>
<td>Milton, Saratoga County</td>
<td>c.1800+</td>
<td>tenant farmer/miller*</td>
<td>probably one room</td>
<td>cellar</td>
<td>18 x 20</td>
<td>360, plus upper half-story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Farm</td>
<td>North Castle, Westchester County</td>
<td>c.1780–c.1915</td>
<td>Griffith* farm c.1780 to c.1830; White* farm after c.1830</td>
<td>c.1780 to c.1830, probably one room, expanded c.1830</td>
<td>full cellar under original house no cellar under expanded part of house</td>
<td>15 x 18, expanded to 25 x 50</td>
<td>270, plus possible loft, expanded to 1,250 plus possible loft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Williams House</td>
<td>Roslyn, western Long Island</td>
<td>c.1775 +</td>
<td>cooper* c.1775 to c.1827</td>
<td>one room, with sleeping chamber and loft, end chimney</td>
<td>full cellar</td>
<td>18 x 18, 9 x 18, 18 x 27 attic</td>
<td>486 plus attic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nostrand-Starks House</td>
<td>Roslyn, western Long Island</td>
<td>c.1680 +</td>
<td>blacksmith Joseph Starks* in the late eighteenth to early nineteenth centuries</td>
<td>c.1680 to c.1740: one room with end chimney, loft c.1740 to c.1810: added lean-to form saltbox c.1810: added wing</td>
<td>full cellar under original house</td>
<td>16 x 20, 9 x 20 lean-to, 14 x 14 wing</td>
<td>500 expanded to 656, plus loft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*denotes occupant of non-African descent
the dwellings of white tenant farmers and resident farmers also at the lower end of the economic scale, but may have been among the smallest of these dwellings. The ca.1800 dwelling of an early farmer/miller in Milton, Saratoga County, probably a tenant, had one room and a ground floor plan of approximately 360 ft$^2$, a half-upper story, and a cellar (Davis 1992). The ca.1780-1830 Griffith farmhouse in North Castle, Westchester County, occupied by an early farmer in this area, probably had one room and a ground floor plan of 270 ft$^2$, a possible loft, and a cellar. Like the Prince dwelling, this dwelling housed relatively large numbers of people, including a total of fourteen in 1790, resulting in limited floor space per person (LoRusso 1996; Sopko 1996).

The Prince dwelling also was smaller than the dwellings of owners at the middle occupational ranks. During his occupancy of the Van Nostrand-Starkins House in Roslyn, Long Island in the late eighteenth to early nineteenth centuries, blacksmith Joseph Starkin enlarged the existing two-room saltbox from 500 to 656 ft$^2$ by the addition of a side wing that had 486 ft$^2$ of space on the ground floor, plus an equal amount in a full-sized attic. During this same time period in Roslyn, cooper Wilson Williams built and occupied a two-room house with a ground floor plan of 456 ft$^2$, plus a full-sized attic (Roslyn Landmarks Society 1969). In North Castle, Daniel White expanded the ground floor of the Griffith farmhouse to 1,250 ft$^2$ after ca.1830, reflecting his success as a crop and dairy farmer (Sopko 1996). In Concord, Massachusetts, Casey, a freed slave, occupied a relatively large hall and parlor dwelling with more than 474 ft$^2$ of floor space. Casey seems atypical in occupying a house this large, however, he did not own the house, and may have lived on the property with one of the owners (Roslyn Landmark Society 1969; Snow 1969).

**Landscape Development**

The 50 x 75-ft area investigated for data recovery encompassed the primary domestic activity areas associated with the Prince dwelling. This area included the former front yard, the proximal portion of the west side yard, the east side yard, and the rear yard up to thirty feet behind the dwelling. Although the rear yard may have extended outside the project limit, the presence of significant domestic middens at fifteen to forty feet behind the dwelling indicated that the most intensively used portion of the yard was within the project limits. The modest scale of the site suggested that possible outbuildings and pens for subsistence animals such as milk cows, if present, would have been located relatively close to the dwelling for simple convenience.

The delineation of three sheet artifact concentrations and one midden feature (Figure 12.7), and areas of high potassium density, indicative of habitual wood ash deposition (Figure 12.8), suggested that Betsey Prince and her family tried to manage the use of associated yards, limiting the disposal of household wastes to designated areas and maintaining the cleanliness of other areas. A well-defined sheet concentration, centered around a shallow pit feature containing rocks and larger artifact fragments, was located thirty to forty feet southeast of the dwelling foundation. This was a disposal area for secondary refuse consisting largely of broken ceramic vessels and clamshells. Wood ash habitually was dumped in this area, as shown by soil potassium counts of 90 to 120 parts per million, compared to background counts of 50 to 70 ppm over most other portions of the site (Figure 12.8). A more extensive sheet concentration, located fifteen to thirty-five feet southwest of the dwelling, contained a much higher proportion of food storage and kitchen vessels than elsewhere on the site, possibly due to its closer proximity to the kitchen, where these types of vessels were used more frequently. The northern edge of this area, close to the kitchen, and an area directly behind the fireplace revealed habitual use for the deposition of clamshells and wood ash.

Significant counts of architectural materials, in the sheet concentration thirty feet southwest of the dwelling, and in a smaller concentration fifteen feet southeast of the dwelling, may have originated from the dwelling or from small structures which stood in these locations. The relatively high proportion of nails in the southwestern area, higher than in any part of the dwelling ruins except the cellar fill, was probably the most indicative of an outbuilding site. The fact that this part of the midden was relatively free of shell and wood ash,
and contained redware milk pans and other large hollowware vessels that could have been used for milk collection, may indicate that it was the location of a small shelter for a cow. The nails southeast of the dwelling were combined with relatively high counts of window glass, and potentially represented debris from the dwelling itself.

The southeastern comer of the yard may have been used for human waste, possibly shown by the small pit feature with rock infill, and relatively concentrated shell and ash, which could have been used to cover this waste. The virtual absence of nails in this area tended to refute the use of a privy structure; however, this could have been a less-formal latrine area disguised by woods or brush, a common feature of rural domestic sites of the period (Larkin 1988:160). Soil testing for phosphorous, an indicator of human waste deposition, was inconclusive of a potential privy or latrine location due to consistently low values throughout the rear and side yards.
The areas near the highway, in front of and east of the dwelling, were kept relatively clear of debris, revealing an emphasis on maintenance of the principal access area to the dwelling. Significantly, an area approximately thirty feet in width directly behind the dwelling also was kept relatively clear of debris. Materials identified in this area consisted of relatively low counts of ceramics, shell and architectural artifacts, and limited wood ash deposition. This area potentially represented a pathway to the middens, latrine, and possible animal shelter.

Mean ceramic dates for the midden feature and the three sheet middens, ranging between 1796 and 1801 excluding redware and between 1803 and 1805 including redware, suggested very limited change in the use of the rear yard during the occupation of the site (Table 12.2). These dates were slightly later than the mean ceramic dates for the...
dwelling ruins (excluding the cellar fill, comprised of a higher percentage of materials in use during the final occupation of the site), which ranged between 1793 and 1797 excluding redware and between 1798 and 1801 including redware.

The pattern of waste disposal around the Prince dwelling generally fits a pattern that became more common during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, in which the use of discrete midden areas replaced the earlier pattern of random waste disposal (Deetz 1977:125–126). This pattern is also demonstrated at Black Lucy’s Garden, where wastes were concentrated in two middens, one approximately twenty feet in length and one five feet in length, located close behind the dwelling (Bullen and Ripley 1945). Another aspect of this pattern was the maintenance of front yard areas and other areas close to the road.

No evidence of a well, cistern, or other water source was identified on the Betsey Prince site or in the area behind the site. Historic and modern maps both indicate that no streams or ponds were located near the site; the nearest fresh water was in ponds over two miles to the northwest and over two and one-half miles to the south. Though not always available, collected rainwater would have supplied a more convenient source of water for daily household needs.

CERAMICS

Ceramic vessels were used for a large proportion of the food storage, preparation, and consumption activities that occurred on the site. The minimum of 117 vessels, identified from 5,386 ceramic fragments, represented a full range of vessel types consisting of crocks, jars or pots, jugs and bottles, milk pans, pitchers, a porringer, deep dishes and plates, drinking mugs, teapots, teacups and saucers, a creamer, a salt, and a strainer (Table 12.4). The ceramics consisted of English refined and coarse earthenware and stoneware, German stoneware, Chinese export porcelain, and domestic coarse earthenware and stoneware, representing types commonly available on Long Island during the last third of the eighteenth century and the first third of the nineteenth century. A small number of glass containers which supplemented the ceramics, identified from 155 recovered fragments, consisted of two tumblers and a goblet or carafe, and three bottles for wine and medicine. No evidence of metal or wooden vessels was identified. Pewter plates and mugs represented durable and valued items that, if used, probably would have been removed from the property with its abandonment. Wooden vessels such as bowls and trenchers may have been abandoned but potentially were not identified due to a lack of stability in the very acidic soils.

The following comparison of vessel functional groups may show the consumption patterns of Betsey Prince and her family, patterns related to the family’s self-sufficiency and dietary habits and its ability or desire to use ceramics as symbols of social status.

Dairy and Storage

The dairy and storage vessels are indicators of a household’s self-sufficiency through the processing and preservation of home-produced and locally available foodstuffs. The Prince assemblage contained five milk pans (redware), four to eight jars, pots, or jugs (redware, buff earthenware and salt-glazed stoneware), one crock (salt-glazed stoneware) and four bottles (buff earthenware and salt-glazed stoneware).

The milk pans were large, deep vessels used to collect milk and to begin curing the milk for cream, butter, cheese and curds. Dairy foods would have been an important part of the diet in summer and fall, or milking season, supplementing bread as an important source of protein. One or more cows quartered nearby could have supplied milk for the household. Covered jars in different sizes would have been used to store foods such as butter, herbs, and condiments. Some of the vessels identified as jars may have been open “pots,” which with crocks would have been used for preserving foods such as oysters, vegetables, and fruit, and for keeping soap, dye, and lard. Some of the pots also may have been used for cooking foods such as beans and pudding. Jugs and bottles would have been used for molasses and vinegar and for beer and cider consumed in the house and in the fields (Arps-Corbett 1985; Booth 1971:186; Larkin 1988:173; Watkins 1950).

Kitchenwares

Kitchenware corresponds primarily to the “mugs and jugs ware” named by Staffordshire potters for wheel-thrown hollowware, excluding teaware,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Vessel Functional Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storage/Dairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 plates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>1 small jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Red</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Red</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 pots or jars (including possible pitchers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>1 large bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 porringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff Earthenware</td>
<td>3 possible jars or pots (including possible pitchers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 jug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt-glazed</td>
<td>3 jugs, jars or pots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>1 jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerwald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which was sold separately from “tableware” (Grettler et al. 1996:142; Miller et al. 1989:19). Kitchenwares consist of food preparation and serving vessels and hollowware food consumption vessels. The Prince kitchenwares were largely coarse earthenwares, consisting of six to eleven possible...
pitchers (redware and buff earthenware), three large bowls (redware and buff earthenware), five small bowls and one porringer (redware), one small jar (pearlware), two mugs (redware and Westerwald), and one strainer (redware). Redware dishes classified as tablewares (see below) may have been closer to bowls and probably also were used for pie and pastry preparation (Arps-Corbett 1985:15; Booth 1971:184).

The kitchenware assemblage represents a variety of food-related functions centered on the kitchen. The potentially large number of pitchers suggests the importance of this vessel for transferring liquids from larger vessels to eating and drinking vessels. The large bowls and deep pans typically were used to mix and raise bread and to prepare puddings. The platters, a smaller and shallower pan, may have been used for pastries, meat pies or deep-dish apple pies (Watkins 1950:54, 235). Some of the deep pans and pitchers also may have provided an intermediate vessel, between the kettle and bowl, for the preparation and serving of stews (Booth 1971:81–90). The redware bowls and porringer would have been used to consume bread and milk, porridge, meat broth, chowder, and stew (Larkin 1988:173; Watkins 1950:237). The relatively small numbers of these types of vessels for a household of eight or more people might suggest a relatively weak emphasis upon stew-type meals. However, the significant numbers of redware and slipware dishes, included below with tablewares, probably were used also for some of the less-watery stewed meals. The very limited faunal evidence on the site indicates that wild animals (deer) and domestic animals were consumed, but does not reveal how the meat was prepared. Clams, which were a favored source of protein for the household based on the archaeological findings, may have been consumed in pies, or as pickled meals served either in bowls or dishes.

Tablewares

Tableware consists largely of flatware associated with the consumption of larger cuts of meat and fish, and dishes probably used for stew-type meals. The Prince household used a combination of English refined earthenware and porcelain plates (ten creamware, four pearlware, three whiteware and one Chinese export porcelain) and coarse English and domestic earthenware dishes (four buff earthenware and seven to ten redware).

Miller (1980; Miller et al. 1989) has shown that before 1795, creamware was the most popular tableware, but by 1810 it was largely overshadowed by pearlware. Creamware was commonly purchased for utilitarian tableware through the 1820s, however, and represented the least expensive refined tableware available in the early nineteenth century. The vast majority of creamware was not color-decorated. Pearlware was a cheaper alternative to Chinese porcelain, and it became favored over creamware because of its decoration. Edge-decorated pearlware and its successor, edge-decorated whiteware (after ca. 1820), were the least expensive color-decorated flatwares available at this time.

The household appears to have used creamware initially, possibly purchasing or otherwise acquiring a set of the plain-edge plates most common in the assemblage, and gradually replaced these with edge-molded creamware plates and the more expensive edge-decorated pearlware and whiteware plates during the early nineteenth century. The decline in Staffordshire prices after the War of 1812 (Miller et al. 1989) may have been a factor in the choice of painted wares over the plain creamwares for replacement pieces. The few pieces of Chinese porcelain tableware would have been treasured and presumably used only on special occasions.

The purchase of combed and slip-trailed coarse earthenware dishes, in conjunction with the refined earthenware plates, was partly related to the different function of these vessels. The earthenware dishes were deeper and may have been used more like bowls, for thicker stew-type meals, whereas the flatter refined earthenware plates would have been used for larger cuts of meat and fish. The true flatwares were better suited to cutting meats; the bat-molded redware dishes were rounded on the bottom and would have been less stable under cutting pressure. The domestic earthenware also was less expensive than the imported ware (the “poor man’s china” of the eighteenth century, according to Watkins), and so cost was probably also a factor in the use of these dishes (Miller 1980; Watkins 1950:57). The imported combed slipware dishes apparently were replaced by domestic slip-trailed redware dishes beginning in the last decade.
of the eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century. In both cases the vessels were highly decorative, and probably were valued for this reason. The apparently balanced use of flatware and deeper dishes indicates that the Prince household enjoyed a varied diet that included both the larger cuts of meat and fish associated with wealthier households, as well as the preserved foods, meat pies, and thick stews consumed in quantity in most households of the period.

Teaware

Teaware consists primarily of the teapots, cups and saucers, creamers, and other vessels used in the serving and drinking of tea, and later coffee. Tea drinking was commonplace in the late eighteenth century, having filtered down from the wealthiest households to the very modest. Tea drinking was a primary household social event which could include neighbors and important visitors, and thus the equipage associated with it was important (Larkin 1988; Roth 1988).

A large proportion of the Prince ceramics consisted of teaware, indicating the importance of tea drinking in the Prince household over time. A total of forty-one of the forty-nine identified teaware vessels were cups and saucers or small bowls (twenty-four decorated pearlware, nine Chinese export porcelain, four creamware, and four fine red earthenware), and seven vessels were teapots (two Jackfield, two fine red stoneware, one brown-glazed redware, one ironstone, and one Rockingham). Also present was one creamer (pearlware).

The Prince assemblage demonstrates the increasing preference for color-decorated teaware typical of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century households (Miller 1989). The teaware initially may have consisted of a combination of creamware, fine red earthenware, and Chinese porcelain cups and saucers, and Jackfield and fine red stoneware teapots. The porcelain teas, largely available before 1800, were relatively expensive decorative items that would have enhanced the visual display of a tea service of red, black, and white. The porcelain apparently was purchased or otherwise acquired one vessel at a time—at least seven different decorative patterns, all overglaze enamel except for one blue underglaze, were present among the nine identified porcelain teas. Over time, the Prince teaware became dominated by color-decorated pearlware, which was developed by Staffordshire manufacturers as a less-expensive alternative to porcelain and supplied in large quantity to the American market. The absence of other types of teas is partly related to the lack of availability of creamware teas and the apparent lack of production of teas in domestic redware, except for teapots (Miller 1989; Watkins 1950).

The identified pearlware teas included one blue transfer-print pattern and approximately five sprig-decorated polychrome patterns. Among the latter, at least five color and floral schemes were present. The most popular scheme, brown stripes with yellow banding, also appeared to have a fair amount of variation in the placement of the decoration on the vessel rim. The pearlware teas, like the porcelain, also may have been acquired in a piece-meal fashion, one or two vessels at a time. The variation in decoration may reflect subtle stylistic changes over the period that purchases were made, and also could show the limited availability of a full range of styles, allowing the household to maintain only general color and decorative schemes in the tea set. The teapots differed from the other vessels due to the fact that teapots were a distinct item produced separately from other teaware (Miller 1989). The household apparently favored the common red stoneware and red earthenware teapots for much of the site’s occupation, but apparently shifted to more current types toward the end of this period.

On some sites, ceramics have been considered to be indicative of the social and economic status of late eighteenth- or nineteenth-century households (Garrow 1987; Heberling 1987; Miller 1980; Spencer-Wood and Heberling 1987). Teaware may be the best measure of status in a ceramic assemblage because of its association with social events in the household and its presumed importance for status display (Spencer-Wood and Heberling 1987:70–71). The relative value of the Prince teaware can be compared to teaware from other sites based on indices of potters’ price lists and invoices established by Miller (1980) for fifteen separate years between 1787 and 1874. An assemblage may be scaled according to the price index of the specific year closest to the median date of the site. To provide a broad comparison, the Prince assem-
The assemblage was scaled according to three separate index years, 1796, 1814, and 1824, reflecting the middle to later part of the site's occupation. The assemblage was compared with assemblages from nine other sites that previously had been scaled based on their median dates (Table 12.5).

The comparison shows that the Prince teaware had a significantly higher index value than teaware from other sites of modest socio-economic affiliation (Table 12.5). The average index value of the Prince teaware was 2.11 to 2.23 (based on price lists of 1796, 1814, and 1824 for pearlware and creamware, and 1824 for porcelain), compared to index values of 1.44 for the Moses Tabbs tenant farm in St. Mary's County, Maryland, 1.53 for a free black domestic site in Skunk Hollow, New Jersey, and 1.68 for Black Lucy’s Garden (based on price lists of 1824 and 1833). The low index value of 1.45 for a frontier farmhouse in Hale County, Ohio was considered by Miller to be more indicative of the limited access of this site to market goods than the economic status of the site's occupant, Jonathan Hale, a substantial landowner (Miller and Hurry 1983). The Prince index value was closer to the 2.24 index value for an overseer’s household on Canon’s Point Plantation in Georgia and a 2.36 index value for a slave household on this same plantation. Notably, the relatively high value of the slave household has been attributed to the availability of more expensive hand-me-downs from both the plantation overseer and the planter, whose teaware had an index value of 2.78 (Spencer-Wood and Heberling 1987:73). The Prince assemblage had a significantly lower value than assemblages from merchant households in Monterey, California, and Windsor, Vermont, at 3.04 and 3.59, respectively.

The high index value for the Prince teaware, relative to values from comparably modest sites, reflects a high ratio of Chinese porcelain to mostly painted Staffordshire teas in the assemblage (9:24). By contrast, Black Lucy’s teaware (Bullen and Ripley 1945) had a very low ratio of porcelain to Staffordshire teas (1:16). The porcelain teas may represent land-wealthy Jonah Miller’s early occupancy of the dwelling, and/or later acquisitions from Miller or from former slave owners. The possibility that porcelain was purchased by the household, in addition to pearlware, would emphasize the importance placed on tea drinking in an otherwise very modest household. It could suggest that despite a modest living situation, and probably limited capital, the household chose to purchase porcelain teas in an effort to demonstrate status.

As the Canon’s Point slave site and the Jonathan Hale frontier site examples illustrate, ceramic economic scaling is not a foolproof measure of social and economic status. Ceramics as a whole typically represented only a small fraction of the total expenditure of a household, and thus may be limited as indicators of status (Grettler et al. 1996:206-207). However, in combination with documentary and other archaeological evidence, ceramics are important in illustrating how actual consumption patterns fit with expected patterns based on cultural affiliation and other economic indicators.

**African Cultural Traditions**

The importance of African cultural traditions in the lives of Betsey Prince and other free blacks in her household and in neighboring dwellings is difficult to determine from the documentary evidence. One or all of these people could have been the distant descendents of slaves brought into New York from Africa early in the eighteenth century, both temporally and geographically isolated from their homeland. Alternatively, they may have been first-generation descendants of slaves born in Africa or the West Indies imported by an overseas slave trade which continued well into the mid-eighteenth century. It is possible that their parents may have imparted first-hand memories of Africa to them, yet the dispersal of slaves among many households in eastern Long Island may well have diluted their traditions amidst pervasive Anglo-American traditions.

Archaeology has the potential to show whether traditions retained in slavery were practiced on the Betsey Prince site. Archaeologists have used architectural and artifactual patterns, as well as individual artifacts, to identify African and African-American sites and to explain how people lived on these sites. On southern plantations, for example, modest dwelling plans, pit cellars, and low-cost ceramic assemblages have been used as indicators of the locations of slave quarters (Samford 1996). Distinctive artifacts identified on plantations, both
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TABLE 12.5. Inter-Site Comparison of Price Index Values for Tea Cups and Saucers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time Period Represented by Indexed Ceramics</th>
<th>Occupant</th>
<th>Ceramic Index Year&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Average Index Value&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of Vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moses Tabbs (Miller 1980)</td>
<td>St. Mary’s Co., Maryland</td>
<td>c.1800 to c.1840</td>
<td>tenant farmer&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Hale Cabin (Miller 1980)</td>
<td>Hale County, Ohio</td>
<td>c.1810 to c.1830</td>
<td>frontier farmer&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skunk Hollow (Geismar 1982)</td>
<td>Skunk Hollow, New Jersey</td>
<td>c.1798 to c.1829</td>
<td>free black laborer/minister</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Lucy’s Garden (Felton and Schulz 1983)</td>
<td>Andover, Massachusetts</td>
<td>c.1815 to c.1845</td>
<td>free black woman and son</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsey Prince</td>
<td>Suffolk County, Long Island</td>
<td>c.1770s to c.1840</td>
<td>free black families</td>
<td>1824, 1814, 1824 porc., 1796, 1824 porc.</td>
<td>2.11, 2.15, 2.23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon’s Point Plantation</td>
<td>St. Simon’s Island, Georgia</td>
<td>c.1793 to c.1860</td>
<td>slave</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon’s Point Plantation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>overseer&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon’s Point Plantation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>planter&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Mansion (Spencer-Wood and Heberling 1987)</td>
<td>Windsor, Vermont</td>
<td>c.1791 to c.1866</td>
<td>merchant&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Diaz (Spencer-Wood and Heberlig 1987)</td>
<td>Monterey, California</td>
<td>c.1842 to c.1850</td>
<td>merchant&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Denotes occupant of non-African descent  
<sup>b</sup>Ceramic index values compiled from Staffordshire price fixing lists by Miller (1980)  
<sup>c</sup>Average of the index values for undecorated, painted and transfer-printed earthenware, and porcelain. The base value of 1 is represented by undecorated cream-colored earthenware.
imported from Africa and made on the plantations, include ornamental, symbolic, and spiritual items such as glass beads, drilled coin amulets, lucky bones, possible talismans made from prehistoric lithics, and conjurer's kits made from assemblages of items; gaming pieces such as "x" marbles and modified ceramic sherds; and musical instruments made from jawbones, keys, or buttons (Russell 1997; Samford 1996:103–113). The manufacture of Colonnoware, an eighteenth-century hollowware type, has been attributed to African-Americans both in slave and free contexts (Samford 1996:102–103).

It may be unreasonable to expect the distinctly African artifacts identified on southern slave sites to be present on the Betsey Prince site. The circumstances of slave culture on eastern Long Island differed from the South. Probably the need to retain cultural traditions as a means of resistance in an oppressive society (Samford 1996:100), was not as strong in the less-developed and more permissive slave economy of eastern Long Island. Also, without a large body of comparative archaeological data, it may be impossible to attribute modest dwellings and low-status ceramic assemblages on sites on Long Island and elsewhere in the Northeast to cultural differences. The relative absence of known free black domestic sites in the region for comparison is itself a limiting factor. Yet existing research does allow some general observations to be made about the possible influence of African culture on the development of the Betsey Prince site.

Architecture

Lacking knowledge of the cultural origins of its builders, it is difficult to attribute the 11 x 13-ft plan of the Prince dwelling to a specific African prototype. Potential prototypes were diverse, varying significantly in size and proportion across West Africa (McDaniel 1982:33); a possible similarity to one of these types might be only coincidental. One of the most recognized West African forms is a square house that averages 10 x 10 ft in plan. This form has been cited by Vlach as the basic building block for the shotgun house, a two- to three-room linear form replicated by Yoruba slaves in Haiti and brought to the American South by Haitian freedmen in the late eighteenth century (Vlach 1976). Deetz has cited the use of square 12 x 12-ft building modules at Parting Ways, a late eighteenth-century free black settlement at Plymouth, Massachusetts. He has suggested that the two-room Turner-Burr house at Parting Ways was similar to a shotgun house in dimension and form, its difference in entry placement and orientation reflecting adaptation to Anglo-American building traditions (Deetz 1977). McDaniel has suggested that in southern Maryland, slaves did not reproduce traditional dwelling forms due to differences in farming, topography, settlement patterns, and climate from their homeland. He has emphasized that the relatively small size of the plantations in southern Maryland, resulting in a dispersal and limited interaction between slaves, restricted cultural cohesive-ness and the emergence of pure African architectural forms (McDaniel 1982). Perhaps African house forms adapted to local conditions may be expected in eastern Long Island and in other parts of the Northeast where dispersed slave settlement prevailed.

The Betsey Prince dwelling and three other dwellings show that African-American domestic architecture varied in the Northeast due to several factors, one of which was the size of the household. A photograph of the Van Brunt slave cabin in East Setauket, Long Island reveals a structure very similar to a shotgun house, based on its narrow elongated shape and gable entry (Marcus 1988:61). This probable two-room dwelling could represent a two-family slave house. By comparison, the late eighteenth-century Caleb Smith III slave cabin in Commack, Long Island was a side-gabled building, approximately 15 x 15 ft, with a center entry and a ridge-placed end-chimney (HABS Photographic Recordation). Black Lucy's dwelling had an approximately 11 x 12-ft plan with a cellar, an off-center entry, and a corner-placed chimney (Bullen and Ripley 1945). The 11 x 13-ft Prince dwelling differed from these other dwellings by its inclusion of a small kitchen wing in the original structure and by the slight separation of the fireplace from the main living area. The reason for this separation, which would have reduced heating and illumination of the main living area, may demonstrate an effort to maximize space for a large family without building a full-sized hall and parlor house. The Prince dwelling probably housed eight or more people over much of its history.

Despite the differences, the basic plans of these dwellings could support the influence of African building traditions cited elsewhere by Deetz
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and Vlach. The plans of both the Prince dwelling and Black Lucy’s dwelling are approximately twelve feet square, and thus are comparable to the Turner-Burr House at Parting Ways. Also, the Van Brunt slave cabin appears to be a true shotgun house, a two-room structure built from small square modules. The larger size of the Caleb Smith cabin could have resulted from the slave owner’s influence over the construction of the building. This idea is based on the use of an approximate sixteen-foot wall dimension, commonly associated with Anglo-American construction and typically used for one-family antebellum slave cabins in the South. However, these cases represent a very small sample of buildings, and further research is needed to determine whether the apparent similarities to African house forms are valid.

**Pit Cellars**

The Prince dwelling, like Black Lucy’s, included a cellar beneath the main part of the house. But the Prince cellar differed in its shallow depth and most notably by the inclusion of an auxiliary pit dug in the center of the dirt floor (Figures 12.5 and 12.6). Archaeological investigations of eighteenth-century domestic sites in Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky have identified similar features, primarily on slave sites. Typically these features, described as “pit cellars,” were dug into the earthen floor of the house in front of the hearth. This pattern has led some archaeologists (Kelso 1984; Nieman 1990; Sprinkle 1992) to see the features as markers of African-American culture (Samford 1996; Young 1997). Kelso (1984, 1986) has suggested that pit cellars may have been used to conceal valued objects, sometimes stolen from slaveholders, and McKee (1992) has suggested that in the early nineteenth century slave cabins were built above the ground partly to limit this use of pit cellars. Young (1996) believes that pit cellars on slave sites were used primarily for the storage of home-grown foods, demonstrating that slaves retained some control over their own living situations. Young (1996) has suggested that pit cellars do not routinely appear on slave sites outside the Upland South, and may have been a regional adaptation related to non-cultural factors such as well-drained soils and the use of stone building foundations. Small pit cellars are not restricted to slave sites in the South, and have been described by Faulkner (1986) as common features of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century southern Appalachian domestic sites, used to store apples, cabbages, turnips, pumpkins, meat, milk, and root crops. Young has indicated that in general, below-ground cellars identified on both European-American and African-American sites functioned as storage features regardless of location or ethnic affiliation (Young 1996:100).

The use of sub-floor pit cellars apparently was uncommon in the Northeast, unlike in the South (Faulkner 1986), based on the lack of identification of these features on other domestic sites in the Northeast. A possible association with either slave or free African-American sites, which are poorly represented in the archaeological literature, could explain this absence; yet perhaps notably, pit cellars were not identified at either Black Lucy’s Garden or at Parting Ways (Bullen and Ripley 1945; Deetz 1977). The storage of food represented a vital part of subsistence in the late eighteenth century, and full or half-cellars were routinely excavated beneath houses in the Northeast for this purpose. The builders of the Prince dwelling dug a shallow cellar for storage, and for unknown reasons, added a pit cellar. The advantage of the pit may have been better cooling and possibly better protection from vermin. Representing the most hidden part of the house, the pit cellar also could have been used to stash valuable items, though not in the capacity whereby a slave concealed items from an oppressive owner. The decision to build this pit is intriguing, and is indicative of individual choices which may or may not be related to African-American cultural traditions.

**Artifacts**

The Betsey Prince site contained only a few artifacts related to individual adornment or spiritual belief, and provided no positive evidence of African cultural influence. The large majority of personal and clothing artifacts identified on the site consisted of common shirt and jacket buttons and a few buckles. Four jewelry items were a Christian cross and anchor pin, a loop earring, a green glass bead, and a chipped stone pendant. The pendant, made from non-indigenous red jasper, may have been valued both as an amulet, based on its attractive obverse side, and as a knife-sharpening stone, based on the
scratches on its reverse side. This object could represent the modification of an artifact originally manufactured by prehistoric people who inhabited the area. The pendant is a unique item which may suggest a cultural-based preference.

The ceramic assemblage contained no evidence of consumption which can be related specifically to African-Americans, other than showing a modest lifestyle common to many households of the period. The limited comparative data from African-American assemblages in the Northeast does not yet allow the identification of patterns which could be related specifically to African-American culture.

**DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATIONS**

In the years following the Revolution, New York State began the long process of freeing its slave population, which was the largest population north of Maryland. Although half of Suffolk County’s black population was free by 1790, more than 80% of free blacks in the Town of Brookhaven still resided in white households. Jonah Miller and three other heads of family who settled with him on North Country Road, west of Rocky Point Village, were part of a small group who had established independent households by this time. Over the next four decades other freedmen joined Miller, and by 1825, Jonah Miller, Minetus Lyman, Betsey Prince, and Benjamin Davis owned contiguous properties that extended for more than one-half mile along North Country Road in this area.

The archeological evidence suggests that the Betsey Prince site was occupied prior to 1775, potentially by Jonah Miller. In 1820, the federal census lists Miller as twenty-six to forty-four years old, indicating that he was born after the site was established. In the census of 1830, however, Miller is listed at fifty-five to one hundred years old, potentially indicating an earlier date of birth. Clues supporting an older age for Miller, and a possible original connection to the site, reveal that as an adult in 1789 he registered an earmark for cattle, and in 1837 his second wife and presumed contemporary died at the age of ninety-four (Marcus 1995:190–192, 203).

In the state tax assessment of 1799, Miller’s property, including a house that may have been the Prince dwelling, is valued at $300. In an 1813 assessment, Miller’s farm, described as a house, barn, and 270 acres of land, is valued at $515 (Marcus 1995:196–197). The 1799 assessor’s notation that Jonah Miller was a “millatoe” (mulatto), and possibly a descendant of a local white landowner, could explain his access to this much property. Black land ownership was technically illegal at this time, and few blacks owned more than small home parcels.

In 1790, Jonah Miller may have lived on his farm with the eleven other free blacks enumerated near him in the federal census of that year. Miller may have built another house after the original house was sold to “Prince,” who first appears in the 1800 census. This census lists three separate free black families in close succession, including the families of Miller and Prince, with a total of nineteen people. Though possible, it is doubtful that so many people lived in the very small Prince dwelling, implying that a second dwelling stood nearby.

Betsey Prince’s story is based on a few direct references and many ambiguous clues in the census records and deeds. Betsey Prince probably lived much of her free life on North Country Road. The time of her arrival is unknown. Born before 1775, she may have been the wife of “Prince,” and lived on the property by 1800. Possibly she was a relation of Jonah Miller, the “Bett Miller” enumerated in 1790, and thus could have lived on the property at this time. “Prince” is first linked to the property by a deed reference of 1818, but he may have already owned the property when living there in 1800. He is not listed in the state tax assessments of 1799 to 1804, but based on later tax assessments, no blacks who owned land, except substantial landowner Jonah Miller, would have been listed in the tax assessment. “Prince” disappears from the household by 1810, and is replaced by Rice Jessup. Based on a later deed reference that ties Elizabeth Jessup to the property, Betsey Prince may have married Rice Jessup, and with him had a child named Elizabeth. In 1820, after Rice Jessup’s disappearance from the household, Betsey Prince is listed as a head of family, and by 1824 she gains ownership of the property. In 1830, her household contains a woman aged thirty-six to fifty-five years, and two children under the age of ten. The woman may have been Elizabeth Jessup, who acquired the property after Betsey Prince’s death.
Neither Jonah Miller or Betsey Prince remained on North Country Road in 1840. Jonah Miller had died in 1837, one year after his wife Sarah (Marcus 1995:203). Betsey Prince was at least sixty years old in 1835, and possibly was deceased by 1840. The archeological evidence supports the departure of Betsey Prince in the 1830s and suggests very limited or no subsequent occupation of the Prince property.

The Prince dwelling afforded a very modest lifestyle for its many occupants. The small house would have been very crowded at times, with limited living space per person. Daily activities occurred around the fireplace, which was enclosed in a small kitchen wing, and in the 11 x 13-foot main room. A possible loft would have supplied extra sleeping space, and a sub-floor cellar provided storage space for food. These conditions appear to be extreme but would have been familiar to many households of the period, including the free blacks, tenant farmers, and pioneer farmers who occupied the lower economic ranks. The domestic yard area was small but appears to have been maintained to some degree; debris was kept away from the main entry area and confined to two primary middens in the rear yard. The yard also may have been used to shelter or tether animals, although archaeological evidence of this is weak.

Like other rural families, the Prince household would have supplied much of its own food through growing grain and vegetables, keeping farm animals, and harvesting wild resources. Jonah Miller probably kept his own farm on the land and probably some of the people in associated and other nearby households worked on this farm or on land owned by Betsey Prince. Others may have worked on the farms of former owners in the area. Perhaps significantly, as late as 1855 virtually all of the blacks in the Rocky Point area are described as farmers or farm laborers (1855 New York State Census Population Schedules). The surrounding woods were a ready source of deer and other animals, and clams and fish could have been obtained at the north shore, approximately one- and-one-half miles away. North Country Road linked the household to fresh water, to the shore, and to the neighboring villages of Miller Place and Wading River. These villages could have provided needed goods such as ceramic and glass vessels, lamps, personal and clothing items, and tools.

Food was consumed in season or stored for winter. The household had a varied diet, probably consisting of larger cuts of meat and fish, meat pies and stews, bread, milk, butter, cheese, and preserved foods. As in other households of the period, tea drinking was an important part of the daily routine and a principal social event that could have included friends and other visitors. The household used ceramic vessels for a large proportion of its food storage, preparation, and consumption needs. Except for the porcelain teas, the ceramics were not atypical for a modest household of the period. Locally produced and relatively cheap redware was used for a broad range of needs over the history of the occupation, supplemented with domestic stoneware and English buff earthenware for food storage and preparation, and with English tablewares for dining. The many slip-trailed redware and combed slipware plates are notable and probably were valued for both their decorative and functional use. The teaware, perhaps important to the household for status display and representing the most expensive ceramics purchased, consisted largely of decorative English pearlware and Chinese porcelain. The porcelain is unusual in a household of this scale and may have originated from landwealthy Jonah Miller or a former owner.

An apparent lack of change in the use of the property over time suggests limited change in the living conditions of the household. Significant changes did occur, however, in the size and composition of the household, reflecting the movement of free black families, apparently recently freed slaves, through the house. After possible occupation by the families of Jonah, "Bett," and "Priss" Miller, and "David" in 1790, families headed by "Robbin," Tutus Sills, and Mother Limon may have lived in the house in addition to the Prince and Rice Jessup families. In 1830, when most slaves in Suffolk County had been freed and local free black settlement began to stabilize, only Betsey Prince and her small family of three occupied the house.

Many aspects of Betsey Prince's lifestyle remain unknown. The site produced very few unique or personal objects that might elevate her story beyond the day-to-day work routine of a rural farm woman. Based on a cross and anchor pin, Christian religion appears to have been practiced in...
the household, and Sundays would have offered a 
break from work for worship and other social activ¬
ities that included visits with neighbors and friends. 
The presence of family in the household, and other 
free black households nearby, suggests that a sup¬
supportive home environment existed for Betsey Prince, 
which probably became increasingly important as 
she grew older. Although her mobility in the larg¬
er society would have been restricted because of 
race and gender, Betsey Prince may not have 
endured excessive hardship from racial prejudice. 
The less-developed and relatively permissive slave 
culture of eastern Long Island and the high inte¬
gration of slaves and free blacks among white 
households may suggest that free blacks were more 
accepted there than in northern cities or in the 
South.

Certainly, part of the reason that a large pro¬
portion of free blacks in the Town of Brookhaven 
remained in white households in 1790 was due to 
the lack of alternative living and working situa¬
tions. The possibility of establishing an independ¬ 
ent household depended on the ability to obtain 
land and the resources to build a house. For 
unknown reasons, Jonah Miller and Betsey Prince 
had these advantages. Their long tenure on North 
Country Road reflects a measure of stability that 
probably was remarkable for independent free 
blacks during the period of slave manumission in 
New York.

CONCLUSIONS

The data recovery investigation of the Betsey Prince 
site represents one of only a few archaeological 
investigations of early African-American settlement 
in the Northeast. Occupied by free blacks over its 
estimated seventy-year history, the site may be con¬
sidered a good example of a property whose devel¬ 
opment was directly shaped by African-Americans. 
The site contributes to the currently limited knowl¬
dge of how African-Americans lived after the 
Revolution, during the transition from slavery to 
independence.

The site contains two features that hint at 
African-American cultural influence. The presence 
of a pit cellar, a feature associated with slave and 
free black sites in the South, may be the strongest 
evidence of this influence. Apparently used for 
storage in conjunction with the main house cellar, 
the particular advantage of this feature is unknown. 
A specialized storage function, potentially a place to 
conceal valuables, could explain the feature. The pit 
cellar may reflect a culture-based preference. Its 
apparent absence on modest white domestic sites of 
this period in the North could support this, yet the 
feature also is absent on the few early free black 
sites investigated in this region. Based on the lim¬
ited comparative data from early free black sites, it 
is premature to associate this type of feature specif¬
cally with African-American settlement in the 
Northeast.

The plan of the Prince dwelling also suggests 
a possible African-American cultural preference. The 
11 x 13 ft structure is comparable to the original 
12 x 12 ft Turner-Burr House at Parting Ways in 
Plymouth (Deetz 1977) and to the 11 x 12 ft Black 
Lucy’s House in Andover, Massachusetts (Bullen 
and Ripley 1945). Perhaps significantly, these 
dwellings bear closer similarity to some West African 
houses, averaging ten feet square (Vlach 1976), than 
to Anglo-American houses that typically used six¬ 
teen-foot wall dimensions. In terms of cellar con¬
struction, entry location, and chimney placement, 
the dwellings are dissimilar, however, reflecting dif¬
erences in individual preference, household com¬
position, available resources, and local building 
traditions. Based on these variations, and without a 
larger body of comparative data, the dwelling foot¬
print alone is unreliable as an indicator of an 
African-American presence on these sites.

The material culture of the Betsey Prince site 
provides no specific clues to African-American cul¬
ture. The few personal and clothing objects are con¬
sistent with a modest lifestyle of the period, and the 
chipped-stone pendant, though unique, may not 
be specifically indicative of African-American cul¬
ture. The ceramics suggest only a modest- to aver¬
age scale household of the period. The diet appears 
to have consisted of potted foods with some cuts of 
meat and fish, and extensive tea drinking. Relatively 
inexpensive Connecticut redware filled a broad 
range of storage, preparation, and consumption 
needs, and the less-expensive creamware and pearl¬
ware supplied the table and tea vessels. Knowing 
the background of the site, the large proportion of 
porcelain teas in the assemblage may be attributed 
to hand-me-downs from former slave owners; but
without this knowledge, the proportion may simply reflect the greater means of the household, or a greater desire for status display, than otherwise expected on a modest domestic site.

In conclusion, it would be difficult to attribute the Betsey Prince site to an African-American occupation based solely on the archaeological record. It also would be premature to use the pit cellar and dwelling footprint as indicators of an African-American occupation on other local and regional sites without more investigation of both early black sites and modest white domestic sites of the period. Further investigation may show that recognizable combinations of features such as these are unique to the African-American sites. Investigation also may show that due to the overall simplicity of modest early American sites, differences among these sites cannot be attributed specifically to ethnicity. Unfortunately, the historical documentation typically provides only vague reference to where free blacks resided, thus limiting the ability to locate African-American sites for future investigation. The North Country Road case was fortuitous due to the documented clustering of free blacks in a sparsely settled area, characterized by several recurring names and landmarks.

In the South, extensive archaeology of slave quarters on well-documented late eighteenth- to early nineteenth-century plantations has provided a basis for interpreting African-American sites. The slave quarters have produced individual artifacts, architectural features, and artifact assemblages that are distinctive within the plantation context. The use of these as indicators of African-American settlement in non-plantation contexts may be misleading, however, due to the different cultural and environmental settings that shaped African-Americans (Sanford 1996). For the Betsey Prince site and other free black sites in the Northeast, the Southern plantation data is only a starting point. The forces that shaped early African-American settlement in eastern Long Island were different due to the smaller proportion of blacks in the population and the high integration of slaves, and later free blacks, into the society. Future research must establish an independent basis for interpreting African-American sites within Northern slave and free black contexts. The Betsey Prince site represents an early component of this research.
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Chapter 13

The Spain's Boarding House Site and Early Twentieth-Century Settlement of the Western Adirondacks

Martin Pickands

As historical archaeology approaches the end of the century, and nineteenth-century domestic sites become increasingly acceptable as appropriate subjects for CRM archaeologists to study, the question is asked more and more often, "When are we going to take the archaeology of the twentieth century seriously?" This question is often asked as though the year 1900 were a natural cutoff point for doing serious archaeological research. Whether or not to take an archaeological endeavor seriously is not a matter of definition, however, but of relevance. The archaeology of nineteenth-century domestic sites demonstrates a sequence of rapid changes in material culture, consumer choices, and domestic refuse disposal practices, especially during the last quarter of the century when the availability of manufactured consumer goods increased dramatically. These changes are correlated with social processes which did not end in 1900, but continued into the twentieth century; these processes ceased to be of major importance to domestic archaeology only when and where the institution of public refuse collection put an end to on-site deposition.

The early twentieth-century Spain's boarding house site (Figure 13.1) and adjacent portions of the Dowling house site, both located in the hamlet of Thendara in the western Adirondack Mountains of New York, have been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (Kuhn and Little, this volume) on the basis of their potential to reveal information about a poorly understood period in the history of New York and the social and economic processes which brought it about.

The majority of the residents of the community, then known as Fulton Chain, belonged to a transient working population who were dependent on forest resource harvesting and forest product manufacturing for their livelihood. Because they lived in boarding houses and company-owned tenements, their specific residences tended to change frequently. They represented many different backgrounds and nationalities, but all shared the marginal existence of poor people trying to find a place in the expanding market economy of early twentieth-century America. They were people whose activities were taken for granted, and whose lives were seldom recorded. Nonetheless, they are the people on whose labors the future of the Adirondack frontier depended, and an understanding of their lives is basic to an understanding
of frontier life in New York State during the early part of the twentieth century.

**Historic Context**

For the first two centuries of New York State’s history, the frontier had been agricultural, but within fifty years of the end of the American Revolution, almost all remaining suitable land was under cultivation and the agricultural frontier stopped expanding. Vast tracts of forest land unsuitable for farming remained, however, and as late as the turn of the twentieth century were still referred to as the Adirondack Wilderness.

In 1797, during the rush of farmers from the east to take the lands rapidly being vacated by the Six Nations of the Iroquois, a parcel of land in the western Adirondacks consisting of 210,000 acres was acquired by John Brown, a successful merchant from Providence, Rhode Island. He took possession of the land in 1798, and constructed a road, the precise route of which is unknown, from what is now Remsen in Oneida County to the present location of Old Forge. Brown dammed the Moose River at the site of the present dam in Old Forge, approximately 2.2 miles to the northeast of present-day Thendara, and constructed a sawmill and grist mill for the expected settlers. By 1800, twenty to thirty families were living in the area, but crop yields of the farms proved disappointing, and after Brown’s death in 1803 the settlers gradually abandoned the area, having by then discovered the hard way why the Native peoples of New York had never settled permanently in the region (Beetle 1948; Brown and Walton 1980; Herkimer County Historical Society 1992; Williams 1977).

Brown’s Township No. 7, named “Economy,” included the Old Forge and Thendara region. It was acquired by Brown’s son-in-law Charles Frederick Herreshoff from Brown’s heirs, and Herreshoff arrived to take possession in 1812. The Remsen Road had largely disappeared, and Herreshoff constructed a new road, later known as the Brown’s Tract Road, which passed through present-day Thendara near the railroad station (Figure 13.4). Adjacent to this road he constructed the first frame house in the Adirondacks, a spacious residence which he named Herreshoff Manor. This was located on a knoll (now a sandpit) approximately 150 m (500 ft) to the southwest of the location of the sites described in this chapter.

Herreshoff’s attempts to attract settlers to the area met with only marginal success. Farming in the settlement was disastrous during 1816, the “Year Without a Summer,” and the region rapidly acquired a bad reputation for farming. As farmers once again began to leave the area, Herreshoff decided to explore the potential for mining and processing iron ore, which was becoming a profitable industry in the eastern Adirondacks. He began to explore the iron deposits in a ridge approximately one-quarter mile north of his house, and spent much of his personal fortune optimistically constructing ore processing facilities before he had actually located a suitable iron source. The ore from his exploratory mine shaft proved to be of poor quality, and only a small amount was ever processed. Herreshoff exhausted his personal fortune, as well as the credit available from friends and businesses in Providence, exploring for suitable ore. When the mine flooded with water in 1819, Herreshoff shot and killed himself in despair. The mine works were abandoned and the old forge, from which the village of Old Forge takes its name, stood empty for many years below the dam Brown had built. The wilderness slowly reclaimed the remnants of the tiny community, except for Herreshoff’s own house (Beetle 1948; Brown and Walton 1980; Herkimer County Historical Society 1992; Williams 1977).

The tourist industry in the region began modestly a few years after Herreshoff’s death when Otis Arnold, a farmer from Oneida County, discovered Herreshoff’s abandoned home and moved in. Arnold’s new home, located at the end of the Brown’s Tract Road, was for many years the only place in the area where travelers who wanted to hunt and fish in the region could stay. It therefore became the first inn in the western Adirondacks. The area which would eventually become Thendara was then known as Arnold’s Clearing (Beetle 1948; Webb 1891).

The tourist business began in earnest after the publication of William H.H. Murray’s popular travelogue *Adventures in the Wilderness* in 1869; when the Forge House hotel was constructed in 1871 overlooking the dam in Old Forge, visitors flocked to the area. At that time the only means of getting
there was a grueling trip by foot, horse, or buggy along the notoriously rugged Brown’s Tract Road. As a result, in 1888 a company was formed to construct the small wooden-railed Fulton Chain Railroad, known locally as the “Peg Leg,” running along the Brown’s Tract Road from the tannery hamlet of Moose River to a point where it diverged eastward to reach the steamboat landing at Minnehaha, four miles southwest of present-day Thendara on the Moose River. At the landing, travelers boarded the small, side-wheeled steam launch Fawn, operated by local landowner William S. DeCamp, for the remainder of the trip to Old Forge. The “Peg Leg” Railroad ceased operations in 1892 when it was superseded by the new Adirondack and St. Lawrence Railroad (Kudish 1996; Palmer 1978).

Large-scale logging began in the eastern Adirondacks in the early nineteenth century as an adjunct to the iron industry, providing fuel for the furnaces and bloomeries and lumber for company housing, mining construction, and such ancillary products as nail kegs and railroad ties. As the seemingly endless forests of New York disappeared under the rapid advance of farming, however, logging in the Adirondacks became an industry in its own right. Vast tracts of forest in the central Adirondacks were cut to feed the lumber and paper mills at Glens Falls, which could be reached by log drives on the Hudson River (Hochschild 1962).

The western Adirondack region was at first much less accessible. It did not have major waterways comparable to Lake Champlain and the Hudson River, but was drained by a series of smaller rivers. The flow of these rivers was highly variable, a fact which inhibited milling operations and rendered the transportation of logs a longer and more difficult process than it had been in the central region. It was not until the coming of the railroad that logging on a large scale arrived in the western Adirondacks. Due to the mountainous terrain and the difficulty of constructing a railroad through hundreds of miles of unbroken wilderness, railroad access was not accomplished until 1892, when the Adirondack and St. Lawrence Railroad opened the western Adirondack region to loggers and vacationers. The last decade of the nineteenth century was therefore the first truly successful settlement of present-day Thendara (Beetle 1948; Grady 1933; Herkimer County Historical Society 1992; Williams 1977).

By the late 1890s, the lumber industry was booming in the vicinity of Arnold’s Clearing, which had become the growing hamlet of Fulton Chain. At first only softwoods had been harvested because of the difficulty of floating heavy hardwoods downstream, but the railroads made it possible in most areas to ship hardwoods. About the same time hemlock, formerly used only by tanneries for its bark, became acceptable for lumber. Demand for hemlock and hardwoods resulted in the devastating practice of clearcutting. This practice, together with several extremely destructive forest fires caused by sparks from the railroads, depleted the timber stocks to such an extent that even in Fulton Chain the logging industry had dwindled to almost nothing within thirty-five years (Beetle 1948; Grady 1933; Hochschild 1962).

During the early twentieth-century logging boom, however, Fulton Chain was a center of the lumber industry. Three lumber mills operated there from approximately 1900 until the 1930s, supporting nearly a dozen lumber camps in the area. The Pullman Brothers’ mill cut spruce for piano soundboards and violins, the Brown’s Tract Lumber Company cut spruce for millworkers in Utica, and the Deis Planing Mill produced finished lumber (Beetle 1948).

Lyon DeCamp, son of William S. DeCamp, was in many ways the founder of present-day Thendara. As the great-grandson of the tannery baron Lyman R. Lyon, who had purchased the majority of the Brown Tract from the heirs of John Brown, he inherited the land in and surrounding Fulton Chain at the beginning of the twentieth century. Upon the death of his father, his siblings inherited the family fortune and he inherited all the land. In order to make a living from his inheritance, DeCamp reluctantly left New York City for the Adirondacks (Annin, personal communication 1996), where he was listed in the 1905 census as a twenty-seven-year-old real estate owner. He began his own lumbering operation on the land he had inherited, building a mill in Fulton Chain downstream from the present Moose River bridge. Much of the time he resided at nearby Van Auken’s Tavern, across Forge Street from the Fulton Chain railroad station and next door to his offices (Figures
13.2 and 13.4). At other times he resided in a large house which he had built on Second Lake.

When the lumber industry began to decline, DeCamp attempted to bring new industries into the area without success. He initiated several real estate ventures to improve the local economy. These included the planning of an elegant hotel, which was never constructed due to the advent of the Great Depression, and the construction of a development of Japanese-style cottages with an accompanying tea room about 2.5 miles southwest of Fulton Chain along the shores of the Hellgate Ponds. Because the name of the ponds was unlikely to attract potential buyers, he renamed them "Okara Lakes." It was at this time, and for much the same reason, that he arranged for the village of Fulton Chain to be renamed Thendara (Beetle 1948; Annin, personal communication 1996).

DeCamp built most of the village of Thendara not simply as housing for his employees but also as a real estate venture, collecting rents not only from his own employees but from anyone who chose to rent them. This construction effort included both rental homes and boarding houses. The cluster of five structures to the north of Fulton Chain Station, along what was then named Terrace Street (Figure 13.3), included two of the town’s three boarding houses (Mrs. O’Melia’s and Spain’s) and two tenements.

The number of occupants of the rentals and boarding houses on Terrace Street is difficult to determine from census data, since all the houses in the area lacked street numbers and many of the occupants were transient. However, the two boarding houses appear to have been home to approximately twelve to fifteen people in 1915 (New York State Census 1915). According to the federal and New York State censuses, most homes in Fulton Chain also rented rooms to one or two boarders. Many of these boarders were laborers working for the lumber companies and the railroad, along with a small number of employees of local businesses and a few Adirondack guides (Beetle 1948; New York State Census 1915; U.S. Censuses 1900-1920).

Spain’s boarding house, along with Mrs. O’Melia’s boarding house, appears for the first time on the 1915 New York State Census. It was occupied throughout most of the logging era. Spain’s boarding house is shown in Figure 13.3 as the second structure from the right. It was a two-story "T"-shaped structure with porches at the front. The

Figure 13.2. Postcard view of Thendara, ca. 1925. The rail station is behind the locomotive, and the roof of Van Auken’s Tavern can be seen behind it. The small building with the pillared portico to the right and behind the station is the DeCamp company office. The road leading uphill to the left is Terrace Street. This photo was taken from the top of the sand hill where Arnold’s house once stood. Photo courtesy of Ceil Buckley, Thendara, New York.
central portion of the house extended forward at right angles to the two wings. Only the central portion had a cellar; the two wings had only footings. The footprint of the structure, as shown in Figure 13.5, has two small additions to the rear of the wings. These are not evident in the layout of the foundation as it is visible on the surface today or in the structure’s appearance as shown in Figure 13.3, but may represent later shed additions similar to the shed bathroom seen at the rear of the Dowling house in Figure 13.3.

Census records show that in 1915, Ida Spain lived there with her son, Edward, age nineteen, a sawmill laborer employed at the Deis mill (Buckley, personal communication 1999). Ida Spain’s boarders were not DeCamp employees, but the family of Sam Cartwright, a “milk dealer,” who lived there with his wife Mary E., their seven-year-old daughter Mary E., called by her middle name “Electa,” and their four-year-old son Sam, all of whom were probably living there temporarily while constructing their small dairy farm nearby on Russell Road (Buckley, personal communication 1999). According to the federal census, the Cartwrights had left by 1920, to be replaced by two more lumber mill laborers, a German lumberjack, a Canadian day laborer, and a telegrapher employed by the railroad.

Although Spain’s was owned by Lyon DeCamp, not all of the boarders were his employees. The boarding house was not built primarily as company housing for his own logging business but as a for-profit commercial venture with the housing needs of the general logging community in mind. This situation differed substantially from urban industrial boarding houses such as those in Lowell, Massachusetts (Beaudry and Mrozowski 1989a), rents from which were initially deducted from the workers’ wages. Those boarding houses wages were also an attempt at social engineering and worker control by company owners.

DeCamp sold two structures at the southwest end of Terrace Street to John Kennedy in 1910. Kennedy in turn sold them to Ellie O’Melia in 1914, after which the larger residence, still extant, became Mrs. O’Melia’s boarding house. The small residence to the rear became Mrs. O’Melia’s own residence. A map of the property drawn prior to its conveyance from the estate of Harold W. Boudreau to Alice Smith in 1989 (on file at the Herkimer County Clerk’s Office) shows Mrs. O’Melia’s one-and-a-half story house to the rear and an “old garage,” both of which have since been torn down.

Spain's boarding house had a much shorter life. It was occupied for about fifteen years, entire-
Figure 13.4. Composite map of the railroad station vicinity in 1927, with the former locations of the Brown’s Tract Road and Arnold’s house shown. Terrace street buildings appear in order, from left to right: Mrs. O’Melia’s boarding house with her residence to the rear; the Dowling house (before and after move); Spain’s boarding house, and the Smith house (before and after move). The new alignment has cut away the part of the terrace which supported Terrace Street itself, and has truncated the front of Spain’s boarding house, which is shown as a foundation only.
Figure 13.5. Map of the Dowling and Spain's sites showing the locations of features and excavations.
ly during the logging era of Fulton Chain (now Thendara), and was inhabited primarily by sawmill workers and lumbermen until it was destroyed by a catastrophic fire around 1925. The cause was never determined, but DeCamp's former business manager, Marianne Annin, speculated it was the result of the habitual drunkenness of the loggers who lived there (Annin, personal communication 1996).

By 1925 the lumber industry was beginning to decline. Because of the reduced need for housing, DeCamp did not rebuild Spain's. The site has remained undisturbed since the 1929 realignment of NY 28 destroyed Terrace Street and the front of the boarding house's yard and foundation. The associated in situ deposits located on the site therefore represent only the logging era.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

The Dowling site and Spain's boarding house site were discovered during a Phase I reconnaissance survey performed in 1995 (LoRusso 1995) in conjunction with a proposed realignment of NY 28. The Dowling site covers an area roughly 100 x 200 ft and is located adjacent to the northwest side of NY 28 (Figure 13.5). The disturbed foundation of the Dowling house was identified as a shallow depression approximately 30 x 25 ft. Four shovel test pits at that location encountered a concentration of artifacts. A poured concrete building foundation was identified to its rear, along with two early to mid-twentieth-century middens and associated sheet refuse. The site was determined at that time to have been occupied potentially from the late nineteenth to mid-twentieth century.

The Spain's boarding house site covers an area of 100 x 80 ft, approximately eighty feet to the northeast of the Dowling house foundation in second-growth woods adjacent to the northwest side of NY 28 (Figure 13.5). The disturbed foundation of the Dowling house was identified as a shallow depression approximately 30 x 25 ft. Four shovel test pits at that location encountered a concentration of artifacts. A poured concrete building foundation was identified to its rear, along with two early to mid-twentieth-century middens and associated sheet refuse. The site was determined at that time to have been occupied potentially from the late nineteenth to mid-twentieth century.

Phase II site examinations were conducted on both sites in 1996 to determine their eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (Pickands 1996). The results of that investigation led to a recommendation for eligibility which was subsequently supported by SHPO (Kuhn and Little, this volume). The remainder of this chapter summarizes the results of the Phase II site examination and identifies the significance of the sites in the context of an early twentieth-century Adirondack lumbering community.

FIELD METHODOLOGY

A five-meter grid of eighty-three shovel test pits (STPs) averaging forty cm in diameter was excavated across the two sites (Figure 13.5) to determine the nature of the soils and to refine the boundaries of the artifact distribution. This was followed by the excavation of larger units (1x1 m, 1m x 50 cm, and 1m x 75 cm) to explore the nature and integrity of various features observable on the surface.

At the Dowling site, the visible depression representing the filled foundation of the Dowling house (Feature 1) was probed to locate the foundation wall. Units 1 and 5 were excavated as two 1 m x 50 cm units placed end to end in the form of a trench straddling the foundation wall. This was done in order to examine the remains of the house foundation, look for a builder's trench, and determine the integrity of the side yard in relation to the foundation. Unit 8 was excavated to the northwest across the gravel drive to test for features and examine the stratigraphy of the former back yard area (Figure 13.5).

The remainder of the site consists of seven discrete surface midden features ranging in size from approximately eight to twenty feet and in depth from four to twenty-four inches. These are distributed up the hillside between boulders and...
outcroppings to the rear of the house foundations. Features 6 and 8 were chosen as representative of these features for extensive testing. Features 7-9 were surface-collected. Feature 5 was tested by an STP as part of the five-meter test grid. Features 3 and 4 were not tested directly, but nearby STPs and surface finds were used to obtain tentative date ranges for them.

At the Spain’s boarding house site, units were excavated in various sections of the structure’s foundation in order to examine its construction, collect examples of the artifact assemblage deposited during the fire, and look for evidence of identifiable activity areas. Unit 2, a 1 x 1 m excavation unit, was placed inside the southwest wing footing against the middle of the cellar wall to look for a builder’s trench and to sample the artifacts found in that wing of the structure. Units 4 and 6 were excavated as two 1 m x 50 cm units placed end to end in the form of a trench straddling the visible foundation wall at the rear of the northeast wing to examine the remains of the footing, look for a builder’s trench, and examine the integrity of the back yard in relation to the foundation. Units 9 and 10 were excavated in the northeast and southwest side yards, respectively, in order to test for features and examine the stratigraphy of those areas.

**RESULTS**

**Foundations**

At the Dowling site, excavations determined that the foundation and the entire surrounding area had been graded down several feet, and no intact deposits remained near the house from the period of occupation. The probed outline of the main foundation (Feature 1) corresponds to the dimensions shown for the house on Figure 13.5, with about a third of the foundation at the front cut away during the 1929 realignment of NY 28. A secondary footing to the east (shown on Figure 13.5) appears to be the footing for a porch or terrace not shown on Figure 13.3.

The profile of Units 1 and 5 showed that grading done at the time of demolition had truncated the upper part of Feature 1, leaving only 3.5 feet of the bottom of the foundation. What remained was set into a sterile subsoil encountered seven inches below the top of the remaining wall. Probing revealed that the boulders from the foundation walls were used to fill the cellar hole. All that remains of the builder’s trench is a trace of sterile greyish sand against the outside of the wall.

At Spain’s boarding house, the excavation of Units 2, 4 and 6 (Figure 13.5) revealed that the structure burned down while still in use, leaving in situ deposits of its contents. A lens of ash and burned wood was visible near the surface of Unit 2, and most of the glass recovered there was melted. The overall artifact assemblage from these units included large quantities of architectural debris including flooring, common and roofing nails, brick and mortar, electrical wiring parts, heat-shattered toilet bowl fragments, burned porcelain enamel from a cast iron bathroom fixture, and two clusters of door hardware, all of which appeared, either from their location or their association with thematically related personal items, to be in situ. Kitchen ceramics were mixed in with the bathroom-related items in the vicinity of the rear wall of Feature A, suggesting the presence of a pantry or storage shelving on the opposite side of the wall from the bathroom.

The front wall of the cellar was pushed into the cellar hole, filling most of it with foundation stone to a depth of several feet. Nevertheless, the cellar appeared to be largely intact and was not filled with trash deposits. Deposits from the time of the fire are probably in situ beneath the stone rubble. The foundation (Feature A) consisted of three main sections; a cellarless footing for a wing to the southwest, the central cellar hole, and a second cellarless wing footing to the northeast, which included a bulkhead entry to the cellar accessible from within that wing. Each wing appeared to have an additional extension to the rear, as shown on Figure 13.5 (Features B and C), but no footings for these were visible on the surface. Artifacts were recovered in Units 4 and 6 confirming the existence of Feature B and identifying it as a shed bathroom. The existence of Feature C was confirmed by artifacts found in an STP, but its function remains unknown.

On the basis of the artifacts excavated within the foundation, it was possible to determine several facts about the architectural features and activity areas within the boarding house. The recovery of porcelain fixtures and wire fragments showed that...
the structure had electricity. Electricity was provided for all of Fulton Chain by the Fulton Chain Electric Co., which used sawdust as fuel to power a steam-operated generator at the Deis Bros. planning mill (Annin, personal communication 1996; Foley, personal communication 1999). Unit 2 roughly coincided with a door into the central part of the house from the southwest wing, and Unit 4 coincided with the wall between the rear of the northeast wing and a shed bathroom addition, probably similar to the shed bathroom addition at the rear of the Dowling house in Figure 13.3. Unit 6 extended Unit 4 to form a trench. It was entirely located within the bathroom addition. The house had indoor plumbing, including a toilet with wall-mounted tank and either a cast-iron sink or bathtub later removed for scrap.

The artifact assemblage recovered during the site examination has already provided a limited amount of information concerning the inhabitants of the boarding house at the time of the fire. The bathroom contained items such as an atomizer, a locket piece, women’s clothing buttons, and a decorative frame (probably from a hand mirror) likely to have been used by a woman, probably Ida Spain. Unit 2 produced a .38-special cartridge which was apparently prepared for reloading, implying that that section of the house was used by a man who did enough shooting to warrant reloading his own ammunition. A shovel test in the vicinity of Feature C contained what appeared to be beads from a rosary, implying residence by at least one Catholic, most likely French, Irish, or Polish, as were many of the lumbermen. Unit 9 in the yard yielded a fragment of a bisque doll’s face which probably belonged to Electa Cartwright, the only little girl known to have lived there (New York State Census 1915).

Backyards and Middens

The back yards were used for a variety of activities, as evidenced by Figure 13.3, which shows a possible corn crib, a clothesline, and shed or livestock pen behind the Dowling house. No features related to these were encountered in the yard of that structure during testing because of the extensive grading that occurred during the structure’s demolition. Gardening, washing, and raising occasional livestock in back lots were common in the case of urban boarding houses, but a significant difference exists here. For instance, pictures of the back lots of urban boarding houses generally show fences dividing lots and therefore also dividing dumping and other activity areas (Beaudry and Mrozowski 1989b). Judging from Figure 13.3, however, there were no such lot divisions on Terrace Street, despite the fact that Mrs. O’Melia’s boarding house was independently owned and operated. As described below, it seems clear from the archaeological record that several different structures shared midden areas, and it is certain that Mrs. O’Melia’s boarding house was dumping kitchen refuse on DeCamp land behind the Dowling house.

The dumping of refuse without regard to legal boundaries demonstrates a casual attitude towards property rights not found in urban environments where land is at a premium, and apparently reflects both the abundance of undeveloped land and a frontier attitude toward property lines. The back yard of Spain’s was much more confined than the back yards of the other houses on Terrace Street because the slope and rock ledges extended to within a meter of the back of the structure. As is shown in Figure 13.3, the extensive porches of Spain’s boarding house assumed some of the usual functions of back yards. For example, ropes strung between porch pillars were being used in place of a clothesreel or line in the back yard for laundry. No features were encountered in the yard areas at Spain’s during the site examination, but a sparse sheet refuse scatter was found, heavier on the southwest side near the midden deposits (Features 3 and 4, Figure 13.5).

Middens

Because of the local topography, the many residents of Terrace Street used the area behind the Dowling house and elsewhere on the slopes behind Terrace Street for refuse disposal (Figure 13.5). Midden features close to the structures (Features 3 and 4) appear to have been used primarily by the tenants during the occupation of the structures. Those further up the hillside, beginning with Feature 6, contained artifacts such as discarded tools, paint cans, and quantities of glass condiment bottles and cans that suggest use by boarding house keepers for disposal of refuse related to their duties. After the fire at Spain’s boarding house, the resi-
dents of the Dowling house and Mrs. O’Melia’s boarding house continued to dump at the locations of Features 6-9.

Several depositional processes appear to have formed the middens. Small amounts of everyday refuse which appears to have belonged to the residents, such as shoes, soda bottles and the doll fragment, were deposited in middens in the immediate vicinity of the houses. The boarding house keepers and householders from the single-family houses deposited larger quantities of dangerous or unsightly materials such as cans and bottle glass uphill and well away from the residences. Embarrassing or illegal liquor bottles were thrown away in the same area so as to be out of sight. When boarders moved away, there were cleanup and repair episodes in which leftover maintenance supplies, architectural materials, and items left behind by vacating tenants were dumped in the more distant middens.

The distribution of various types of refuse was therefore dependent upon the nature of the material being discarded. Large amounts of glass and metal would tend naturally to be disposed of well away from the houses for reasons of safety and appearance. The boarding house keepers would have the added incentive of keeping the premises tidy in order to attract tenants. The tenants themselves, however, when disposing of smaller amounts of their own trash, apparently were less inclined to take it far from the houses but rather disposed of it in backyard “burn piles” such as those still seen in rural areas today.

The distribution of refuse also changed through time, possibly because of changing attitudes towards rubbish in the years preceding the commencement of public refuse collection. Where the location of Feature 6 was sufficiently far from the houses for kitchen refuse during the logging era, the residents of Mrs. O’Melia’s began dumping the same materials much further uphill during the 1930s.

The presence of liquor bottles almost exclusively in the upper slope area suggests that while many of the residents of Fulton Chain drank considerable amounts of alcohol, a practice for which lumberjacks were well known, drinking still attracted a degree of social disapproval. The advent of Prohibition apparently did not prevent the consumption of alcohol or change the disposal pattern of liquor bottles, despite the fact that alcohol had become illegal. In fact, it was well known that Van Auken’s Tavern, across the railroad tracks from Spain’s, operated a “speakeasy” downstairs throughout the Prohibition era (Cohen, personal communication 1999).

Examination of sources of manufacture evident in the artifacts recovered from these middens reveals a major characteristic of consumerism during the early years of the mass-market economy: items came from many different locations, some quite far away, although mostly from the northeastern quarter of the United States. Sources of glass manufacture included New England, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, New York, Georgia, Virginia, and Maryland (with some glass from England and Canada in the form of gin and rye bottles smuggled from Canada during Prohibition). Ceramics came from potteries as far away as Mount Clemens, Michigan; East Liverpool, Ohio; and Baltimore, Maryland, reflecting the growth of the new American ceramic industry.

Returnable bottles such as milk, beer, and soda tended to have more local sources of distribution, for instance Utica (the Erie Bottling Works, the Graffenburgh Dairy, and Borden’s) and soda bottlers from the Adirondack region such as Ogdensburg, Tupper Lake, and Fulton Chain itself.

The logging era, which lasted from 1892 to about 1930, saw the founding and initial growth of Fulton Chain, which became the present-day hamlet of Thendara. Features 3, 4, and 6 on the Dowling house site and A-C on the Spain’s boarding house site have the potential to yield information that can be used to address questions related to the living conditions and economic choices of the Terrace Street residents during those years. The occupants of Spain’s boarding house probably shared the use of these three midden areas with the occupants of the adjacent residences. Features 3 and 4, being closer to Spain’s boarding house than to the Dowling house, may have been used primarily by the residents of Spain’s.

Although the site examinations produced a large collection of artifacts, the deposits explored related primarily to the economic choices made by the boarding house keepers rather than by the residents themselves, and reflected decisions based
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primarily on the economic requirements of the boarding house keepers as entrepreneurs in the boarding house business. For instance, the ceramic patterns used at Spain's show that the majority of the ceramics appear to have been of good quality; many were decorated in a matching decal pattern, a situation very different from that discussed by Dutton (1989), who points out that most boarding house keepers in urban situations strove for economy by buying used tableware or odd lots, mainly undecorated. This suggests that Ida Spain was not under the same economic constraints as many boarding house keepers, and the relative expense of the finer wares was not an issue. The presence of a decorative planter, marble dresser top, and a decorative porcelain knickknack on the site support the probability that she wished to provide an attractive home either for her own satisfaction or in order to encourage prospective tenants.

The glassware recovered from the middens showed the consumption of large quantities of condiments ranging from ketchup and relish to mustard and other kinds of sauces and dressings. This suggests a bland diet, which required these additions to make it more interesting. Glass bottles indicated differing attitudes concerning the consumption of wine and hard liquor in relation to beer and soda. While wine and hard liquor bottles were disposed of in a manner intended to conceal their presence from casual onlookers, the consumption of beer does not appear to have possessed any more social stigma than the drinking of soda. Beer bottles were distributed in a manner similar to soda bottles: close to the houses with other items which were discarded by the residents.

Additional excavation and study of Features 3, 4, and 6 will provide a sample of the kinds of items discarded by the tenants of the Terrace Street community, and the in situ artifact assemblage representing the household inventory of Spain's boarding house will provide a sample of the kinds of items used by the residents at the time of the fire. This will present a unique opportunity to study the lifeways and economic choices of the community's largely transient working population during the logging era in Fulton Chain.

The extremely short period of occupation, the variety and integrity of deposits, and lack of subsequent disturbance, coupled with the possibility of obtaining eyewitness and documentary information to complement the archaeological record, make this site and the relevant midden deposits from the adjacent Dowling site a unique archaeological resource for information concerning the development of this early twentieth-century frontier industrial community.

**Conclusions**

The Spain's boarding house site, in conjunction with the refuse deposits in Features 3, 4, and 6 of the Dowling site, is a unique opportunity to shed light on the lives of transient industrial workers on New York's last frontier, bringing to life a relatively undocumented chapter of New York's history. Information is available from a variety of sources: census data, eyewitness accounts, and possibly even business records, as well as the archaeological examination of in situ deposits from the occupation of a household and related refuse deposits.

The unique combination of characteristics which this site possesses includes excellent integrity combined with the catastrophic deposition of the household inventory of its inhabitants and associated refuse deposits. This will provide information on major activity areas within the house and information about the kinds of consumer goods which were being chosen by the inhabitants for use in their homes. Such choices have been shown to reveal information about changing behaviors through time, the availability of particular commodities, and even the self-perception of the members of a particular community (Modell 1978).

It has been implied in one published history of Thendara (Beetle 1948) that Fulton Chain was a "rough-and-ready" lumber town. It is difficult to know whether the inhabitants themselves thought much about this "rough-and-ready" image. They were simply struggling to fit into their perception of the mainstream of the new consumer society, but constrained to the "rough-and-ready" life by the exigencies of living and working in the wilderness. Marianne Annin (personal communication 1996) spoke from her experience as a long-time resident at Van Auken's Tavern across the railroad tracks from Terrace Street. Many of the lumberjacks stayed at Van Auken's, and Annin spoke of how they were...
mostly good men, many of them immigrants, who were working hard in an environment where there was little to do to pass idle time but drink. Most of them do not appear to have been especially attracted to a rough lifestyle on the frontier; rather, they were only trying to make a living the best way they could.

The study of life stages has proven very informative in situations where the individual identities of site occupants were known and could be observed through generations (Hareven 1978). In this case, however, the majority of the individuals who resided here were transient industrial workers whose residence changed every few years at the longest. This does not mean that life stage information is unavailable, only that it is available for a class of people within a community over a short period of time. It is not information about how behaviors changed through time in response to changing home environments, but rather information about what individual life stages the transient residents represented and how this lifestyle related to their lives at that time. Lumberjacks and sawmill workers with a transient lifestyle were likely to have been in that place and situation for a limited number of reasons. They are likely to have been either relatively young and vigorous men seeking to make their way in the world, immigrants struggling to find their place in American society, or older unmarried career lumberjacks from areas where logging had already ceased.

The shortness of the occupation of this boarding house is another factor which adds to its usefulness as an information resource. One of the difficulties of examining the archaeological record of historic boarding houses is the transiency of occupation. This produces an archaeological record which is very complex and difficult to relate to individuals or social processes. In the present case, the occupation was less than a generation, and the available information will be augmented by eyewitness information and company records.

Considerable literature has been generated since the 1970s on the subject of boarding house life and the archaeology of boarding houses and boarding house lots (e.g. Beaudry and Mrozowski 1989; Davidoff 1979; Landon 1989; Landon and Beaudry 1988; Modell and Hareven 1977), especially with regard to company housing in the context of urban environments. While Terrace Street was a company housing community, it differs significantly from the communities mentioned in these studies. In fact, as the site of a boarding house on the wilderness frontier it is at this time the only site of its kind in New York studied outside an urban environment. The concept of an industrialized wilderness frontier is still quite new to most researchers, but in many parts of the United States archaeological remains of numerous ephemeral logging and mining communities still exist. Their former occupants represented a substantial percentage of the local population at the time. These workers made major contributions to the growth and development of America as a whole and their respective regions in particular. Some attention must therefore be given to understanding their lifeways and the differences between their living environments and that of urban industrial workers.

This suggests another interesting line of research: the differences between urban and rural industrial housing. Some differences are visible even from the present site examination. The most obvious is the casual attitude towards house lot divisions, even legal boundaries, evidenced by the sharing of midden sites by the residents of neighboring structures and the absence of fences. Not so apparent is the increased space for such activities as livestock raising. This activity is hinted at by the presence in Figure 13.2 of what seems to have been a corncrib in the back lot of the Dowling house, and by the near-complete absence of bone from household trash in the community, which may have been due to the collection of organic garbage for livestock feed, perhaps for the pigs raised nearby by the Brown’s Tract Lumber Company (Buckley, personal communication 1999).

Opportunities to study the archaeological record of the early development of a community with the assistance of living witnesses to the process are very rare. This is a unique opportunity to complement the archaeological interpretation with eyewitness accounts, business records, and census data. It is an equally rare opportunity to study the household inventory and spatial organization of a boarding house through the catastrophic deposition of in situ remains and a comparison of this inventory with discard behavior.
Wilson (1992) points out that the best historic archaeological studies “have usually been those where extensive documentary evidence has been available to inform the excavation strategy and enhance the results.” This should apply doubly to the study of a site where eyewitness accounts are also available.

Spain’s boarding house was a key component of Lyon DeCamp’s Terrace Street housing complex, constructed to house his own employees and other members of the community during the logging industry boom which brought about the establishment of the present-day hamlet of Thendara. Together with an adjacent portion of the neighboring Dowling site, the Spain’s boarding house site has great potential to shed light on a poorly known part of New York State history.
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