# PHASE III DATA RECOVERY AT THE TAYLOR SITE (44CS92), ASSOCIATED WITH THE ROUTE 664 PROJECT CITY OF CHESAPEAKE, VIRGINIA PROJECT: 0664-131-101, PE102

## Submitted to:

Virginia Department of Transportation 1401 East Broad Street Richmond, Virginia 23219

## Submitted by:

William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research Department of Anthropology The College of William and Mary Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

> Project Directors Dennis B. Blanton Donald W. Linebaugh

Authors Jane L. Smith Martha McCartney

**Technical Report Series No. 8** 

September 10, 1991

## MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

The Taylor Site (44CS92) lies within the construction corridor of the Route 664 Bowers Hill/Belleville Connector project in the City of Chesapeake, Virginia (Figure 1). In 1987, the James Madison University Archeological Research Center (JMUARC) identified the site during a Phase I survey of the corridor (Sherwood 1987). The Phase II was conducted by JMUARC in winter 1987 and spring 1988 (Smith 1989). The implementation of three stages of Phase II investigations yielded evidence of at least one post-in-the-ground building and two substantial subsurface features dating from the 18th century.

Phase III investigations were carried out by the William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research (WMCAR) in June 1990. The architectural features investigated at the Taylor site are representative of various construction modes and different periods of site use. The earliest historical component appears to date to the first half of the 18th century. This period of occupation is evidenced by the remains of a 7-by-8.5-foot, singlebay building (four large posts in Post Configuration A). A second period of occupation appears to date to the last quarter of the 18th century. This component consists of post additions to the single-bay structure (Post Configuration A), portions of at least two fences (Post Configurations B and C), a shed or outbuilding (Post Configuration D), three pit features (Features E, F, and J), an anomalous soil feature (Feature G), and a brick pavement feature (Feature H). Specifically, the building, the pit features, and the brick pavement are probable components of a work-area complex in which various activities were taking place. Of the various activities, the most apparent is forging, as indicated by the quantity of iron working byproducts recovered from Feature E.

These features, including the fence configurations, are believed to be associated with land owner Nicholas Noyall, who, along with his family, occupied the area from 1759 to at least 1885. Noyall's inventory, presented in 1785, indicates that he possessed a substantial quantity of household and farm-related goods and that he was a man of middling means. The inventory lists such items as shoemaker's tools and shoe leather, farming gear, and animals, all of which would require maintenance and special attention and facilities. Thus, the probability that the site served as a multi-functional work area is substantiated by archaeology and historical documentation.

The Taylor Site is situated in a geographic location optimal for both urban access and rural marketing. A craftsman such as Noyall would benefit from easy access to economic centers where specialized goods could be purchased. The placement of the site near Drum Point Creek would have facilitated travel to Portsmouth, the closest economic center. The position along the forerunner of Pughsville Road (Route 659) would have provided visibility and accessibility to patrons.

## **REPORT CONTRIBUTORS**

## Authors:

Jane L. Smith Martha McCartney

Graphics and Report Production Editor: Graphics Contributor:

Historical Research:

Artifact Inventory:

.

Copy Editor:

Donald W. Linebaugh Kimberley Becker Martha W. McCartney Deborah Davenport

Suzanne Erena

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

-	
Management Summary ii	
Report Contributors iii	
Table of Contents iv	
List of Figures vi	
List of Tables viii	
Chapter 1 - Project Background 1	
Introduction	
Chapter 2 - Research Design	
Introduction	
Chapter 3 - Research Methods 1	
Archaeological Field Methods11Laboratory Methods13Historical Research Methods13	
Chapter 4 - Historical Background 17	
Political Boundaries17Colonial Era Transportation17The Civil War Era18The Aftermath of War19Survey Area20Chapter 4 - End Notes32	
Chapter 5 - Historic Feature Descriptions and Associations	
Early to Mid-18th Century Features35Mid-to-Late 18th-Century Features43Summary70	

Chapter 6 - Historic Artifact Descriptions and Analysis	73
Chapter 7 - Prehistoric Component	81
Chapter 8 - Research Summary and Conclusions	85
References Cited	89
Appendix A - Artifact Inventory	91

# LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
1	Project area location	. 1
2	Project area and environs (U.S.G.S. 7.5-minute Bowers Hill Quadrangle) .	. 3
3	Relative elevation and relief of site area	. 4
4	Seventeenth Century-Sites in Virginia and Southern Maryland (Smolek and Clark 1982)	. 9
5	Mechanical and hand removal of plow zone overburden	12
6	Military Map of Suffolk and Vicinity (Soederquist 1863)	28
7	Map of Norfolk County (Sykes and Gwathmey 1887)	29
8	Excerpt from Norfolk County Deed Book 414:88	30
9	U.S.G.S. 7.5-minute Bowers Hill Quadrangle (1921)	31
10	Site 44CS92 plan	36
11	Bisected structural remains of main building (Configuration A)	37
12	Site 44CS92 "Shop" plan	38
13	Post Feature # 176	41
14	Post Feature # 212	41
15	Representative plan and profiles of Configuration A post features	42
16	Typical rectangular post remains from Configuration B (Post Feature #14)	45
17	Representative plan and profiles of Configuration B post features	46
18	Typical post remains from Configuration C (Post Feature # 294)	50
19	Representative plan and profiles of Configuration C post features	51

20	Representative plan and profiles of Configuration D post features
21	Plan of Feature E (#89) 54
22	Profile of Feature E (#89) 55
23	Plan of Feature E (#89), before excavation
24	Profile of Feature E (#89), after excavation
25	Plan and Profile of Feature F (#243) 57
26	Profile of Feature F (#243) 58
27	Plan and Profile of Feature G (#245) 60
28	Plan of Feature H (#219) 61
29	Profile of Feature H (#219) 62
30	Plan of Feature H (#219), before excavation
31	Plan of Feature H (#219), after excavation
32	Plan and profile of Feature J (#13) 67
33	Plan of Feature J (#13), before excavation
34	Representative plan and profiles of Configuration K post features
35	Selected historic artifacts
36	Mid-18th-century wine bottle
37	Eighteenth-century hoe
38	Selected prehistoric artifacts
39	View of excavated Taylor Site; shop - upper right, brick pavement - upper left, trash pit - lower left, possible anvil stump feature - center 86

# LIST OF TABLES

		Page
1	Post feature data for Configuration A	. 40
2	Post feature data for Configuration B	. 44
3	Post feature data for Configuration C	. 48
4	Post feature data for Configuration D	. 49
5	Artifacts recovered from Features E, F, G, H, and J	. 53
6	Post feature data for Configuration K	. 66
7	Post feature data for Miscellaneous Post Remains	. 71
8	Data on vessel type and form	. 75
9	Prehistoric artifact assemblage	. 82

# CHAPTER 1: PROJECT BACKGROUND

## Introduction

The Taylor Site (44CS92) lies within the construction corridor of the Hill/Belleville Route 664 Bowers Connector project in the City of Chesapeake, Virginia (Figure 1). In 1987, a Phase I survey of the corridor was conducted by the James Madison University Archeological Research Center (JMUARC) (Sherwood 1987). The survey located an open pit measuring 6.8 feet (2.1 meters) in diameter and 2.9 feet (90 centimeters) in depth in a wooded area south of Pughsville Road (Sherwood 1987: 97). Preliminary Phase I testing of the pit and the immediate vicinity did not produce evidence as to pit function. However, the presence of 18th- and 19thcentury artifacts prompted the initiation of limited Phase II archaeological research and documentary research.



## FIGURE 1 Project area location.

The Phase II was conducted by JMUARC in winter 1987 and spring 1988 (Smith 1989). The initial Phase II testing

of the pit determined that it was either of natural origin or the result of modern excavation. Still, testing in the vicinity of the pit recovered early to late 18thcentury and Woodland Period prehistoric artifacts. These finds led to an expanded shovel test and surface reconnaissance survey (Smith 1989:8). The survey focused on an area well-suited for human occupations: a relatively level terrace located uphill approximately 164 feet (50 meters) southwest of the pit feature. Here, the shovel testing produced numerous 18th- and 19th-century artifacts scattered across the crest of the landform. Thus, the Phase II focused on testing the higher elevated portion of the landform where artifact density was greatest.

The Phase II research concentrated on defining site size within the project right-of-way and on searching for any intact cultural deposits (Smith 1989). The implementation of three stages of Phase II investigations yielded evidence of at least one post-in-the-ground building and two substantial subsurface features. A sample of the post remains was bisected and the features were fully exposed. Based on this work, initial assessment of component age was made. A search of historical documents was also conducted, but yielded no information about the origin of the 18th-century component.

Nevertheless, the presence of relatively well preserved archaeological deposits and the opportunity to study an interior Coastal Plain, 18th-century site qualified the Taylor site for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. Phase III investigations were carried out by the William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research (WMCAR) in June 1990. The research was implemented in accordance with state and federal regulations governing the management of threatened, significant archaeological deposits.

This report presents information gathered during Phase III research and synthesizes the generated data with archaeological interpretations and historical information. The document includes statements concerning the intentions of the investigations; the natural, political, and social environment of the associated era; the nature of the archaeological record; and interpretations of the combined information.

Briefly, the archaeological record, coupled with information derived from Phase III historical research, suggests that the Taylor Site may have functioned as a work area or shop during ownership by shoemaker Nicholas Noyalls from 1759 to 1785. His wife retained the property until 1802, when she sold the parcel to John Groves, a planter. The span of time in which Novalls owned and resided on the property is consistent with the archaeological remains. A thorough summary of site interpretation is presented in Chapter 8.

#### **Environmental Setting**

The site is located in the northeastern portion of the City of Chesapeake within the Coastal Plain physiographic province of Virginia (Figure 2). It is on the United States Geological Survey (U.S.G.S.) Bowers Hill, Virginia, quadrangle in Zone 18, at 372,165 easting

and 4,078,420 northing. The site is situated on a northeast-trending terrace approximately 20 feet above mean sea level (see Figure 2) (Figure 3). Approximately 325 feet north of the site is Drum Point Creek, a southeasterly draining tributary of the Western Branch of the Elizabeth River. According to the Bowers Hill quadrangle, Drum Point Creek is currently navigable to within approximately 3,500 feet of the site and may have been navigable to a further interior point prior to siltation. An important feature of the cultural landscape is Pughsville Road, located approximately 1,000 feet west-northwest of the site. Historical research indicates this road has been in use since at least the early 19th century.

The area is comprised of surficial deposits of riverine and estuarine origin arrayed among coastal terraces and plains. These were deposited and formed during interglacial high sea stands. The soils belong to the Sedgefield member and are typically sandy and clayey silt. Both the Woodston and Dragston soils of loamy fine sands are present within the site area. They are severely leached, relatively low in fertility, fairly easy to work, and moderately well suited for cultivation (U.S.D.A. 1953:9, 18). These soils developed under forests of loblolly pine and hardwoods.

#### Past Land Use

Presently, most area forests have been either replaced by agricultural land or timbered, lending to secondary coniferous and deciduous growth with a herbaceous and shrub understory. During the Phase I and II periods of research, the site was covered with such secondary forest. Northeast-to-southwest-trending drainage ditches and an approximately



FIGURE 2 Project area and environs (U.S.G.S. 7.5-minute Bowers Hill Quadrangle).



FIGURE 3 Relative elevation and relief of site area.

seven-inch-thick plow zone were also observed at the site. A 1887 map by Sykes and Gwathmey depicts the tract as cleared farmland (Sykes and Gwathmey 1887). The area is thus suspected to have undergone extensive historical cultivation. During the 1920s, a small house and orchard were located on the property (City of Chesapeake Tax Assessment Book 1988; Mr. Jeremiah Gaines, personal communication). The 20thcentury artifacts recovered from the plow zone overburden probably are a result of this period of occupation. No 20thcentury structural features were observed.

# CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH DESIGN

## Introduction

At the close of Phase II testing, an array of post features and other subsurface cultural deposits were identified as part of an 18th-century historic component. Woodland Period prehistoric artifacts and 19th-century artifacts were also recovered, though no features associated with either of these periods of site use were identified. Hence, the Phase III research design focused on the 18th-century component.

The 18th-century post configuration appears to represent the remains of either a small dwelling or an outbuilding associated with a larger complex (Smith 1989:19). The other subsurface features, an irregularly-shaped pit (Feature E) and a four-by-eight-foot laid brick pavement (Feature H), were situated close to the post configuration and yielded artifacts similar in type and age to those found within the posts. This suggested both a temporal and functional relationship between the features and the post configuration. Subsequent archaeological investigations into the function of the various cultural deposits and a search for previously unidentified features would potentially clarify associations and generate data for overall site assessment. opportunity to examine local The economic and social trends evident in the archaeological record would then be available. In conjunction with historic documentation, the project results could be integrated with previous archaeological research to formulate a regional perspective on the nature of colonial

expansion and settlement patterns, particularly in the interior.

Specifically, the Phase III research designed to elucidate details was concerning site activites, duration of occupation, ethnic affiliation, and the socio-economic status of site occupants. During the course of the field work, newly gleaned information from archaeology and historical documentation necessitated additional research considerations. For example, as the Phase III work advanced, several details about the main post structure and related features suggested that the site may have functioned as a work area rather than as a dwelling and yard. First, the mechanical stripping of topsoil from a large area around the structure confirmed that the building was small and not part of a larger structure. Second, the large quantity of forge-related artifacts recovered from the irregularlyshaped pit (Feature E) suggested that small-scale industrial forging took place. Third, the careful construction of a brick pavement (Feature H) at a small interior site raised questions concerning its apparent specialized function. Finally, the historic document search revealed that Nicholas Novall, an artisan, owned and resided on the property during the period when the site was formed (See Chapter 4). The research focus was thus modified to integrate issues relating to artisan or small industrial activity areas with those research topics originally presented. The section below reviews the questions pertinent to the site-specific evaluation

and the site's placement in regional settlement trends.

#### **Research Questions**

Investigations of site structure are important for discerning aspects of a site's formation processes, function, composition and number of inhabitants, and social status. The spatial arrangement and association of features, as well as feature content, can aid in determining site age, intra-site evolution, duration of site use, and the social status of site occupants. Information derived from the evaluation of spatial associations provides a data base that enables comparative studies of documented site plans and historical descriptive research to be carried out.

To consider site function, questions as to the nature of site occupation and its temporally associated changes must be investigated. This can be accomplished by the analysis of artifacts with respect to functional and temporal parameters. Particular attention should be paid to the identification of domestic artifacts versus specialized or artisan-related artifacts. Consideration of structure size, the configuration of the structural deposits, and the modes of construction can also assist in the determination of site function. Again, historic documentation and a comparative review of recorded archaeological sites located nearby and across the region provide a context for evaluation.

The determination of the socioeconomic status of the site occupants is essential to establishing the role of the site within the regional settlement pattern. Basic questions such as the observability of social status as reflected in the archaeological record and the role the site's occupants served in the local economy are important. Economic and social lifeways can be identified by a combination of site-specific attributes. These examples include component size and complexity, structure size and diversity, modes of construction, feature types, frequency of artifact types, and geographical setting. A review of historic records is also a valuable tool in determining status.

As mentioned, investigations at the Taylor Site were sensitive to gathering information regarding site layout, modes of building construction, function, and the economic status of the site's occupants. A grasp of these patterns can lead to an appreciation of trends in settlement patterning. Important questions include: what factors account for the site's geographic location? What social and economic network were the site's occupants a part of, and what role did they play in the community?

The fairly rigorous historical and archaeological documentation of 17thcentury sites has led to the development models early Cheasapeake of of Expansion began in a settlement. radiating pattern of settlement from economic centers. The necessity of proximity to navigable water for the purposes of trade and social interaction guided colonial diffusion (Figure 4), (Smolek and Clark 1982: 1, 2). Not until the 18th century did colonists begin to permeate and settle interior sites. Some of the reasons behind the progression toward interior expansion can be addressed as a result of archaeological and historical investigations at the Taylor Site.

Because the site represents a small, specialized, industrial site, the research design had to be expanded to include



FIGURE 4 Seventeenth Century-Sites in Virginia and Southern Maryland (Smolek and Clark 1982).

some specific questions pertaining to artisan-related sites. For instance, the role the site's occupants played within the community seems very different when considering that they functioned as entrepreneurs as well as consumers. Also, differences in the types and structure of archaeological deposits can be expected. Aside from historic documentation, will these differences be perceivable in the archaeological record?

Reported artisan-related sites have exhibited special work areas in which certain specialized features are distinguishable in the archaeological record. The Shields Tavern Site, located in Colonial Williamsburg, contained a mid-18th-century component that consisted of a blacksmith's shop and work area (Draper's forge operation) (Brown et The archaeological al. 1990:137-141). remains, including a firebox and anvil stumps housed in a structure measuring 18 feet north-south by 13 feet east-west, were distinguishable from features easily indicative of an ordinary domestic site. The Anderson Forge Site, located along the main thoroughfare in Colonial Williamsburg, also exhibits evidence of artisan/industrial activities preserved in the archaeological record. Here, the remains of several anvil stumps that probably date to the 1780s were located in the work area (Brown 1991: personal communication). The work area at the Anderson Forge Site is larger and more complex than at Draper's forge and the Taylor Site.

Because the Taylor Site is probably representative of a rural enterprise and the aforementioned sites are from urban contexts, site-type comparisons between the shops is limited with regard to questions concerning supply and demand. Characteristics such as shop size, quantity of features, and material culture remains can, however, serve as points of comparison between the two site types. The Taylor Site, therefore, is not only important with respect to the general regional settlement pattern, but may also serve as a representative of specialized sites located in the colonial interior.

# CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODS

#### Archaeological Field Methods

The Phase III archaeological research plan was implemented to meet the goals presented in Chapter 2. Particularly, the plan stipulated gathering information on archaeological deposits identified during the Phase II research and focusing on the exposure and identification of any other features located within the site.

Phase III field work began with the establishment of a magnetic north-south grid incremented in the English tenths system. Data for a topographic map of the site area were then obtained by recording stadia readings every 20 feet along the north-south axis and every 25 feet along the east-west axis. These data were referenced to a semi-permanent datum located on the site. The datum was assigned an arbitary elevation of 100.00 feet.

Next, plow zone overburden and recent erosional soil deposits were removed from the areas in which cultural features were identified during the Phase This was accomplished by skim II. shoveling and troweling. Following the re-exposure of the previously identified features, a backhoe with a five-foot-wide was used to remove the bucket surrounding plow zone. Approximately square feet of relatively 19.075 undisturbed subsurface soils were exposed in this manner. Following mechanical stripping, the exposed surface was skim shoveled and troweled to remove any remaining plow zone and to identify and

define cultural features (Figure 5). All possible features were tagged during this stage of work. Recovered artifacts received "disturbed context" designations unless they remained in situ following exposure, in which case they were assigned exact provenience designations.

Immediately following the removal of the plow zone, a ten-foot-interval grid was established across the exposed surface. Utilizing ten-foot-square blocks as a means of horizontal control, observed soil anomalies were plotted on an overall site plan map and assigned Arabic numbers. A total of 368 soil anomalies were recorded in this manner. Artifacts remaining in situ, particularly prehistoric remains, were indicated on the site plan map, recovered, and labeled accordingly.

To begin excavations, each member of the field team was assigned a ten-footsquare block in which to work. Each tagged soil anomaly was detailed in plan on graph paper and documented with a **Feature Excavation Record** form. All soil anomalies were also logged in a field book to avoid numeral assignment duplications and to maintain control over center coordinates and feature locations. Major non-post features and a sample of post features were photographed during this stage of research.

All of the features identified as cultural were bisected. The southern half of these features was typically removed, though some were sectioned along the



FIGURE 5 Mechanical and hand removal of plow zone overburden.

long axis regardless of directional obtain maximum orientation to information. In general, feature soils were removed by troweling. Large features and a sample of posts were excavated using shovels and trowels. The posts excavated by shoveling were associated with fence lines. Two features were totally excavated with the expectation that they would yield more information regarding site function. Features were excavated according to discrete depositional layers when possible. All soils were passed through 1/4-inch mesh. Recovered artifacts were bagged and labeled with special reference to feature number, center coordinates, soil layer, and the portion/half from which they were recovered. Section profiles were then drawn and conclusions as to feature function were made. Five-liter soil samples were collected from those features that might yield information through flotation or other specialized analysis. Major features and a sample of post features received photographic documentation following excavations.

## Laboratory Methods

Artifact lots were arranged sequentially by feature number assignments and processed in that order. Those requiring special attention were removed for conservation. After washing, artifacts were sorted into ceramic, glass, metal, miscellaneous, and prehistoric groups to facilitate future comparisons and were catalogued in a standard descriptive format. Sources used in the identification of historical artifacts include A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America (Hume 1980), Historic Ceramic Typology with Principal Dates of Manufacture and Descriptive Characteristics for Identification (Brown 1982), and Glass in Colonial Williamsburg's Archaeological Collections (Hume 1969). In preparation for further

analysis and comparisons, the historic artifacts were catagorized according to South's Artifact Classification (1962). Each feature was then assigned a terminus post quem (TPQ) according to artifactual content. A minimum vessel count was performed by separating and analyzing all historic ceramic sherds that retained attributes indicative of specific vessel forms. Prehistoric pottery was identified by referring to Indian Ceramics from Coastal Plain Virginia (Egloff and Potter 1982). Selected pieces of metal were cleaned using an air abrasive unit to remove corrosion and assist in identification. Thirty pieces of metal and the hoe fragments were X-rayed to determine artifact type. All artifacts were stored in polyethylene bags for final curation.

Selected soil samples were processed by flotation separation and the recovered materials were subjected to paleoethnobotanical and zooarchaeological analyses. A soil sample removed from Feature H (brick pavement) was sent to the Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of General Division of Consolidated Services. Laboratory Services, and subjected to an exhaustive chemical analysis to search for tannens (see Chapter 5, Feature H).

## Historical Research Methods

Preliminary archival research conducted in support of archaeological investigations at the Taylor Site included the examination of maps in the collections of the Library of Congress, National Archives, Virginia State Library, Virginia Historical Society, Virginia Department of Historic Resources, and the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Research Archives. Maps reproduced in secondary sources such as *The Official Atlas of the*  *Civil War* and the *American Campaigns of Rochambeau's Army* also were utilized. Through map research, the courses of the area's historic roads were traced and cultural features were plotted.

Secondary source works examined included several local and regional histories, such as William H. Stewart's history of Norfolk County and publications of the Norfolk County Historical Society. Kermit Hobbs and William A. Paquette's Suffolk: A Pictorial History (1987) was useful in providing general background information on the region. Official military records were examined, as was E. B. Long's The Civil War Day by Day: An Almanac 1861-1865, which links people and events to lesser-known locations, such as specific farms and small communities. Johnson and Buel's Battles and Leaders of the Civil War was also searched.

More recently, the study area's history and chain of title were studied intensely and efforts were made to determine what role the Taylor Site's owners/occupants played in local and regional history. Record of the Virginia Land Office were reviewed in abstract form as a means of determining land ownership patterns in the study area and charting the spread of settlement. Research was carried out in records at the courthouse of the City of Chesapeake and at the Virginia State Library. Records groups that were examined included Chesapeake and Norfolk County deeds, wills, appraisements (inventories). chancery records, orphans accounts, orders, personal property and land tax lists, census records, appraisement books, plats, surveyors records, and agricultural census records. Attempts were made to locate wills and inventories pertaining to the site's owners/occupants. Personal

property tax rolls were also searched in Nansemond County.

Data contained in land tax rolls were used to trace the study area's owners/occupants as of 1787. References to individuals thus identified were then sought in deed books, will and appraisement books, and other pertinent records. Although previous research on the site's colonial history had been relatively unproductive, experimentation with phonic variations in the spelling of certain geographical references and landowners' names and analysis of the configuration of neighboring property boundaries led to the identification of the study area's 18th-century owners/occupants.

Land tax rolls were used to determine whether buildings were located within the study area at given points in time. Tax commissioners often revised property assessments when parcels when buildings changed hands. deteriorated, or when structures were improved or added. General observations were thus about the relative value of the structural improvements in the study area, that is, whether their value was in the low, middling, or high range in comparison to those of contemporary landowners. The availability of personal property tax data provided one means of gauging the socio-economic status of those who owned/occupied the property surrounding The household inventory of the site. shoemaker Nicholas Novall, whose family occupied the property for 38 years, provided insight into the material culture of a rural Norfolk County artisan.

Transcriptions of the official records of the Virginia government were utilized as needed. E. G. Swem's *Virginia* 

Historical Index and the index to The Virginia Gazette were examined. Attempts were made to determine whether the site's owners were literate and had left behind personal papers or ledger books.

Civil War-era maps by Soederquist (1863) and Sykes and Gwathmey (1887) made it possible to relate Norfolk County's historic roads to their counterparts in Chesapeake's transportation network. Most of the early maps that depict Norfolk County consist of schematic representations of the Hampton Roads area. Many of those renderings disclose the general courses followed by some of the region's early roads. The track of the old road from Portsmouth to Suffolk (forerunner of modern Route 337), Route 659's forerunner, and the road that ran toward Great Bridge were recognizable, but no antebellum maps were found that depict cultural resources in the vicinity of the Taylor Site.

Although the majority of Norfolk County's local court records are well preserved, very few early plats and surveys exist. A plat prepared in 1915 depicts the tract on which the site is located. Book #1 of Norfolk County's Surveyors Records spans the period 1790 to 1865, but contains no pertinent text or illustrations.

# CHAPTER 4: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

## **Political Boundaries**

The study area currently lies within the limits of the City of Chesapeake, formerly Norfolk County. As of 1634, the land on both sides of the mouth of the James River comprised a shire known as Elizabeth City. In 1636, its territory was divided and the land on the north side of the James retained the name Elizabeth City, while that on the south side became New Norfolk County. Only a year after its formation, New Norfolk County was subdivided. At that time, the land located nearest the seacoast and the James River's mouth was designated Lower Norfolk County, and the westerly (or upstream) portion became Upper Norfolk County (later Nansemond County. Between 1637 and 1691, the study area was within the bounds of Lower Norfolk County (Nugent 1969-1979:I, xxxiv-xxxv; Virginia State Library 1965:12).

In 1691, Lower Norfolk County was subdivided to form Princess Anne and Norfolk counties. Princess Anne County abutted the seacoast and the Chesapeake Bay, whereas Norfolk County extended from the North River (which formed part of Princess Anne's western border), westward to the Nansemond County line. It was bound by the James River on the north and North Carolina on the south. The seat of Norfolk County was at Portsmouth. In 1963, Norfolk County was consolidated with the city of South Norfolk, creating the City of Chesapeake (Virginia State Library 1965:12, 24, 32). Thus, the study area was within the bounds of Norfolk County from 1691 to

1963 and thereafter within the City of Chesapeake.

## **Colonial Era Transportation**

The earliest permanent European settlement in the region occurred along the banks of rivers and other navigable waterways during the mid-to-late 1620s (Nugent 1969- 1979:I, 21-22; Stewart 1902:21-22). The interior of Norfolk County and the land that was somewhat distant from navigable streams was settled at a slower rate. Overland transportation corridors developed as the area became From 1691 more populous. on. Portsmouth, the seat of Norfolk County, was the urban center toward which the county's rural inhabitants were oriented (Virginia State Library 1965:36).

Maps that predate the Revolutionary War shed relatively little light on how Norfolk County's interior developed. However, at the onset of the American Revolution, the county was mapped by military cartographers due to its proximity to the strategically situated Hampton Roads.

During the late 18th century, several roads passed through the countryside surrounding the project area. A road headed west from Portsmouth, crossing the Western Branch of the Elizabeth River by means of the Church Point Ferry, and then continued on to the Nansemond River. A thoroughfare also ran southward from Portsmouth, passed close to Bowers Hill, went through Great Bridge, and then continued on into Carolina. Close to the study area, one road ran on an east-west axis, connecting Portsmouth with Suffolk (located in the vicinity of current Route 337), and another ran from the western branch of the Elizabeth River, northwest toward the James. A side road extended from the latter byway and headed toward the Nansemond River. By 1781, the road that passed through the Bowers Hill area also was well defined (Anonymous 1781a, 1781b, 1781c; D'Opterre 1781; Hills 1781).

During the first quarter of the 19th century, the same transportation corridors. used at the time of the American Revolution still functioned as major thoroughfares (Chief of Engineers 1812; Madison 1807; Kearney 1818). Herman Boye (1826) showed prominently the east-west road toward Suffolk (Route 337's forerunner) and the route that headed north toward the mouth of the Nansemond River. The northerly road toward the Nansemond River followed a right-of-way now used by Route 626, forking in the vicinity of the community now known as Deane. At that point, the road's eastern-most branch followed the right-of-way now used by Route 659 (Pughsville Road). Robert Taylor's map (1840) identifies the site of John Hodges' ferry landing, in the vicinity of the community now known as Hodges Ferry, and reveals that the Church Point Ferry's landing (in use during the 18th century) was located slightly to the north of what later became Hodges Ferry.

Trends indicative of colonial transportation routes suggest that the project area was traversed in much the same manner throughout the 18th, 19th, and early 20th centuries. Importantly, the early thoroughfare now known as Pughsville Road is located immediately north of the site area. The site's proximity to this road and to the tributary of Drum Point Creek probably served the site occupants in various ways. First, the creek may have provided a viable transportation route to the western branch of the Elizabeth River, and thus watercourse access to Portsmouth, the nearest 18th-century economic center. Second, site occupants may have sought access to and visibility from a main road. particularly if they sold wares. It stands to reason that rural artisan shops would be strategically located along thoroughfares and near public road intersections.

#### The Civil War Era

When the Civil War began in 1861, many of Norfolk County's men left home to join the Confederate army. Meanwhile, Fort Monroe, a strongly fortified and wellmanned Union military complex, looked out upon Hampton Roads and the Confederate seaports of Norfolk and Portsmouth. In the spring of 1862, when Union General George B. McClellan marched out of Fort Monroe and began his advance up the James-York Peninsula toward Richmond, General John E. Wool, McClellan's comrade-in-arms, dispatched troops to Norfolk and Portsmouth, which quickly fell under their control. The citizens of Suffolk braced themselves for an attack as Union troops moved into Nansemond County. On May 12, 1862, the First New York Mounted Rifles rode Suffolk. Confederate forces. into retreated behind meanwhile, the Blackwater River, where they served under General Roger A. Pryor (Hobbs and Paquette 1987:52-53; Johnson and Buel 1956:151-152).

In January 1863, Pryor and his men advanced toward Union lines but ultimately were driven back. In response to the Confederate attack, the Union Army constructed fortifications along the Nansemond River, rimming Suffolk, and they increased their troop strength. Thereafter, and for the duration of the war, the Blackwater River became the dividing line between the two armies (Hobbs and Paquette 1987:53-55). It was likely during this period that the Union Army erected ten star-shaped fortifications at strategic points along the Elizabeth River's branches, surrounding Portsmouth (Sykes and Gwathmey 1887).

Oscar Soederquist (1863), a Union Army topographic engineer, prepared a highly detailed map of Norfolk and Nansemond Counties from April 11 to May 4, 1863. The map of G. Woolworth Colton (1863), shows the lines of military operations proposed by General U. S. Grant for his 1864 campaign, and indicates that one line ran through Norfolk and Nansemond Counties near a site where railroad lines crossed, a few miles west of the Bowers Hill area. This suggests that there was an on-going, if sporadic, Confederate presence throughout the countryside immediately adjacent to Union-controlled territory.

Several Civil War-era cartographers showed the old thoroughfare from Portsmouth to Suffolk (Route 337) and its branch that headed to the Sleepy Hole Ferry on the Nansemond River and the less prominent road that ran through Bowers Hill toward Great Bridge. Two railroad lines served the town of Suffolk: the Seaboard and Roanoke River and the Norfolk and Petersburg railroads. The former passed through the Bowers Hill area, whereas the latter swung in an arc across the southern branch of the Elizabeth River, going up its east side into Norfolk. The Hodges Ferry was available

to carry passengers across the Elizabeth River. Near the river's mouth was another ferry, from which landing travelers could set out overland toward Pig Point, using a road that followed the approximate right-of-way of Route 17, east of Courtland, before turning north on what later became Route 568 (Chief of Engineers [ca 1862]; Hove 1862; Bache 1862-1863; Soederquist 1863).

#### The Aftermath of War

During the war the Union Army's leadership had to confront the problem of providing food, shelter, and employment for the numerous former slaves who sought refuge behind their lines. After the fighting ceased, this responsibility was assigned to the Bureau of Refugees. One means that Bureau officials used to provide support for such refugees was to resettle them on private property abandoned by white families fleeing from Union-occupied territory or rural acreage that had been confiscated for back taxes. The Bureau subdivided some of these abandoned or confiscated farms, leasing small plots to black refugees, who paid their rent in crop-shares (Bureau of Refugees 1862-1866).

One of the 46 tracts allocated to black refugees on the southside of Hampton Roads was located on the forerunner of Route 337, in the vicinity of the boundary line between Norfolk and Nansemond counties (now the cities of Suffolk and Chesapeake), approximately a half mile east of Shoulders Hill (Freedmen's Bureau 1866). Although Norfolk County already had a substantial number of free black landowners during the second quarter of the 19th century. the presence of these refugees during the postwar period likely strengthened the black presence in the interior of Norfolk County (Norfolk County Land Tax Lists 1825-1850).

During the Reconstruction era, a number of local black citizens were elected to political office. This in time led to a white backlash that resulted in the election of a Conservative governor of and Conservative control the From 1883 onward, the legislature. Conservative party dominated Virginia politics and by the close of the 19th century blacks had been disenfranchised. Gradually, as the scars of war healed, the region began making slow but steady economic progress (Hobbs and Paquette 1987:71).

Although farming was the main form of employment in Norfolk County's rural interior during the first half of the 20th century, many people who lived in the vicinity of the study area worked for the Planters Manufacturing Company, whose 150 to 200 employees made baskets and other containers in which produce was packed for transportation to urban The Planters Manufacturing markets. Company's factory, which was the backbone of the local industrial economy, was destroyed by fire in 1937 and was not rebuilt. Afterward, the county's rural population increasingly sought employment in nearby Portsmouth or Suffolk, where they also did much of their shopping (Mr. Jeremiah Gaines, personal communication, 1988).

During the 20th century, many of Norfolk County's older roads were improved considerably and new roads were built, but fragments of its old transportation corridors continue to exist and are readily recognizable (U.S.G.S. 1921).

## Survey Area

Surviving land patents suggest that settlers began moving into the upper reaches of the Elizabeth River's Western Branch by the late 1630s. The Hodges and Powell families, who lived in that vicinity during the 18th and 19th centuries, had settled there by the 1680s. The 1704 quitrent rolls reveal that the Hodges, Powells, Ives, and Luellings families, whose descendants owned land in the immediate vicinity of the Taylor Site, then owned sizeable quantities of land in Norfolk County (Wertenbaker 1922:202-203).

The small stream that passes by the Taylor Site was known as the White Marsh Branch as late as 1838 (Norfolk County Deed Book 63:511). In 1711, William Powell occupied land along the White Marsh Branch of Langley's Creek, a tributary of the Elizabeth River's Western Branch (Nugent 1969-1979:II, 286;III, 114).

In December 1751, Richard and Courtney Powell sold to John Ives 100 acres on Longworth's (Langworth's, Langley's) Creek and adjacent to the property of Captain William Hodges. Ives's deed for the acreage was recorded in early 1752 (Norfolk County Deed Book 15:105).<sup>1</sup>

Ives retained this 100-acre tract from 1751 to 1757, at which time he deeded it to Thomas Creech, a Norfolk County planter. Creech retained the property for only two years, selling it on April 30, 1759, to Nicholas Noyall, whom he described as a cordwainer or shoemaker. In deeding the 100-acre tract to Noyall, Creech noted that the property had been purchased from John Ives, who had bought it from Richard Powell and his wife in 1752. Reference was made to the specific deeds by which the tract had been transferred from one owner to another, with the notation that the property bordered that of Captain William Hodges (Norfolk County Deed Book 15:105; 18:26, 247).

The tract was Noyall's first land purchase in Norfolk County and the only property with which he was credited.<sup>2</sup> Noyall, who described himself as a resident of Norfolk County, sold the 100 acres to William Hodges in April 1761 (Norfolk County Deed Book 19:191). Therefore, unless Noyall resided on land he rented from another property owner, it is likely that he occupied the 100-acre tract between 1759 and 1761.

On November 16, 1762, Jeremiah Creech sold Noyall 103 acres on the west side of the Western Branch of the Elizabeth River. Creech, a tailor, and Noyall, a shoemaker, were identified as When residents of Norfolk County, deeding his land to Novall, Creech noted that the property being conveyed bordered the land of Richard Powell. He also stated that originally it had belonged to Elias Price, who had sold it to Robert Hatton and that Hatton had mortgaged the premises to William Crafford and John Tatem, who had sold it to Creech in March 1761 (Norfolk County Deed Book 20:160-161).3

On June 8, 1772, Noyall deeded to Lewis Luelling (Lewelling), a ship-carpenter, 50 acres, "part of the tract where I now live."<sup>4</sup> Noyall's deed stated that the property he was selling to Luelling was a portion of the 103 acres he had purchased from Jeremiah Creech in November 1762. Although the tract's boundary lines were described vaguely, references were made to the "main branch" that ran through the acreage, to Noyall's pigpen, and to land that had belonged to Richard Powell. Nicholas Noyall signed his deed to Luelling with an "X," indicating that he was unable to write his name (Norfolk County Deed Book 25:235).

Relatively little is known about Novall other than his occupation as a shoemaker and that he was among a group of Norfolk County men who took an oath of loyalty to the British crown in 1781 (Palmer 1968:I, 319). Personal property tax rolls reveal that in 1782-1783 Novall was the only free white male in his household and that he then had five slaves: Luke, Siller (Silla), Cate, Mill (Mille, Milley, Millie), and Jack (John). Two of his slaves were of tithable age. Novall also owned two horses and thirteen cattle (Norfolk County Personal Property Tax Lists 1782-1783). The quantity of taxable personal property that he owned suggests that he was a member of the middle class.

On July 14, 1783, when Noyall made his will, he stated that he was sick, but of sound mind. Personal property tax rolls reveal that he died during 1784. Noyall was survived by his wife, Elizabeth, a son, William, two unmarried daughters, Mary and Rachel, and three married daughters, Lydia Manroe, Betty Lewelling, and Melea Manning. Noyall bequeathed to Elizabeth life rights in the plantation on which they resided plus all of the personal property that he did not bestow on his other heirs. Were Elizabeth to remarry, she was to receive only her dower third of their real estate, the rest of which was to go to his only son, William. To William, Noyall bequeathed a slave boy named Jack, "one whole set of shoemaker's tools," a feather bed and furniture, a horse, saddle and bridle, a flax hackle, a pair of steelyards, and a cow and calf. To his unmarried daughter, Rachel, Novall left the feather bed and furniture "she lies on" (an indication that she was still living at home), a slave girl named Cate, a pewter dish, and three plates. To Mary, another unmarried daughter, he bequeathed a slave girl named Milley, a feather bed and furniture, a pewter dish, and three plates. Noyall's three married daughters were allocated a variety of items. Lydia Manroe was to receive four silver dollars and life rights to a slave girl named Dinah; at Lydia's decease, Dinah was to become the property of Noyall Manroe, Lydia's son. Betty Lewelling was given a cow and a calf and Melea Manning was allocated a cow and calf, plus a feather bed and furniture. Novall named his wife and son as his executors. They presented his will for probate on July 21, 1785 (Norfolk County Will Book 2:272).

Novall's inventory, which was presented to the Norfolk County court on August 20, 1785, suggests that he was a man of middling means whose household was relatively well equipped (Appendix The family's household furniture C). included three high beds and a low bed (perhaps a trundle bed), along with a bed tick, feathers, and 13<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> yards of bed ticking, and three chests, eleven chairs, a table, and a looking glass. The family's culinary equipment consisted of 6 dishes, 16 plates, 4 basins, 3 small basins, a sugar pot, miscellaneous glass and earthenware, a case of knives and forks, and a parcel of spoons. A parcel of books and more than 22 pounds sterling (a substantial amount of cash) were said to be in the Noyall house. For food preparation the Novalls had a frying pan, a spit and sundry ironware, 3 large iron pots and a smaller

pot, 4 bread trays, a quart measure, a half-pint measure, 4 jugs, a case and bottles, 17 round bottles, 2 meal-sifters, and a grindstone. The presence of a meat tub, two old casks and some salt suggests that the Noyalls preserved their freshly butchered meat by salting it. Noyall's household had 6 fishing lures, fishhooks, and oyster tongs that would have enabled the family to exploit the Tidewater area's abundance of seafood. Novall also may have supplemented his family's diet by hunting for game animals, for he owned a gun. Foodstuffs on hand at the time of Nicholas Noyall's death included 377 pounds of bacon and 51 barrels of corn (Norfolk County Appraisement Book 2:48-49).

Among Noyall's possessions were the shoemaker's tools and steelyards he had bequeathed to William, plus 27 leather shoe-soles, a small cask of upper leather, steer hides, and 4 pounds of beeswax. He also was credited with a parcel of nails and one box of iron and Novall apparently farmed his heaters. land, for he had two plows and gear, a parcel of hoes, three sickles, four axes, a froe, an adz, and some miscellaneous tools. Hogsheads, baskets, barrels, and bags also were on hand. Elizabeth Noyall, her daughters, and the family's female slaves were equipped to perform skilled tasks, for they had a loom, high and low spinning wheels, and parcels of thread that already had been spun, plus fat pots and tubs for making soap. Thirty gallons of soap, along with three wash tubs, were included in Nicholas Noyall's inventory (Norfolk County Appraisement Book 2:48-49).

Noyall owned a horse, a saddle, and a bridle, as well as a cart and wheels and six sleighs (wooden runners that were used for hauling). His livestock included 6 large barrows, 7 hogs, 9 shoats, 2 large sows and their pigs, 4 cows and their calves, 3 heifers and 13 geese. His 2 stocks of bees would have produced the wax he used in shoemaking. Noyall's slaves included two adults (Luke and Silla) and three children (two girls and a boy), who may have comprised a nuclear family. According to the values Noyall's appraisers assigned to his personal property, the bulk of his financial investment (like many rural Virginians) was in cattle and slaves (Norfolk County Appraisement Book 2:48-49).

The death of Noyall in 1784 most likely brought about a significant reduction in the household's disposable income, for he was an experienced shoemaker who had been plying his trade locally for at least 22 or 23 years.<sup>5</sup> Although Novall left the tools of his trade to his son, who most likely had a working knowledge of shoemaking, it is probable that at age 21 William would have been a somewhat less efficient and skillful artisan. Also, if Noyall's married daughters claimed the money, household furniture, and livestock which he bequeathed them, the plantation's material assets would have been reduced.

In 1785, Norfolk County's tax assessor credited William Noyall with two slaves over the age of 16, three slaves under age 16, two horses, and six cattle. By 1787, another free white male, Thomas Elmon, who was under age 21, was listed as a member of the Noyall household. It is not known whether Elmon assisted William in one or more crafts-related activities or helped him run the farm. The addition of a third horse, ass, or mule to the household's taxable livestock in 1787 raises the possibility that William placed more emphasis on farming than his father. In 1789, William (then the only free white male in his household) was credited with two slaves over the age of 16 and none between 12 and 16 (Norfolk County Personal Property Tax Lists 1784-1790).

In 1787, Nicholas Noyall's estate was credited with 53 acres, i.e., the residue of the 103 acre Creech property that Noyall had retained after selling 50 acres to Lewis Luelling in 1772.<sup>6</sup> Although William Noyall was then a legal adult, the plantation continued to be credited to his late father's estate through 1798, because Elizabeth Noyall had not remarried and therefore had retained possession of the property. In 1799, the assessor transferred the property into Elizabeth's name (Norfolk County Land Tax Lists 1787-1800).

In April 1791, William Novall became ill, and prepared his last will and testament, bequeathing his interest in his late father's real estate and all of his own personal property to his mother and sisters. On September 19, 1791, his will was presented for probate (Norfolk County Will Book 3:78). No inventory was made of his estate. As of 1791, the tax assessor attributed William's personal property to his estate, including a free white male over the age of 21, whose identity is unknown. Two slaves over age 16 and two horses, asses, or mules also Beginning in 1795, were present. Elizabeth Novall was listed as head of household, in which there were no free white male adults. From 1795 to 1800, she was credited with two slaves over age 16 and one or two horses, asses, or mules (Norfolk County Personal Property Tax Lists 1791-1800).

In 1801, the tax assessor attributed to John Groves the 53 acres that in 1799 and 1800 had belonged to Elizabeth Novall. Tax rolls reveal that Grove, a man of very modest means, had only one adult slave and two or three younger ones (Norfolk County Land Tax Lists 1801-1803; Personal Property Tax Lists 1801-1803). In December 1803, John Groves made his will, he bequeathed to Sary (Sara?) Hilling a bed and furnishings, a table, three chairs, an iron pot, hooks and a hanger, six knives and forks, a bread tray, a small chest, a piggin and a noggin, "all the spun stuff in the house," 4 pounds of picked cotton, 300 weight of bacon, and her choice of the cows and calves on his plantation.7 He bestowed all his slaves on his daughter, Ann Groves, but left nothing to his unmarried daughters. Elizabeth and Ginmery. Groves directed his executor. Ezekiel Powell, to see that the residue of his estate was sold and that its proceeds were divided among his heirs. He left no written instructions to Powell with regard to his real estate, which tax records reveal remained unsold for the next 15 years (Norfolk County Will Book 4:41; Land Tax Lists 1804-1818). His 53-acre Novall tract apparently passed to his daughter Ann Groves. A 1819 deed indicates that Permelia Smith and Fanny Totersdale inherited the 50 acres that were "formerly known as Nials land" but "lately known as Ann Groveses [Groves's] land."8

In June and November 1819, Smith and Totersdale sold their half-interests in the 50-acre tract to John Powell, brother of John Groves's executor, Ezekiel Powell. The 50-acre parcel was described as bounded on the east and south by property John Powell already owned, on the northwest by Philip Johnson's plantation, and on the northeast by James Maxwell's acreage (formerly Richard Powell's) and the Free School land.<sup>o</sup> Four years earlier, in November 1815, John Powell had purchased from John and Jane Graham, residents of Nansemond County, 28 acres of Norfolk County land on the White Marsh Branch of the Elizabeth River's Western Branch, acreage that also was described as a part of the "Nials land." Although Nicholas Novall and his heirs are known to have occupied the 53acre Smith-Totersdale tract from 1762 to 1800, followed by John Groves and his daughter, Ann, from 1801 until ca. 1814, it is not certain whether the Grahams's 28 acres of "Nials land" comprised part of the 50 acres that Noyall had sold to Lewis Luelling in 1772 or whether it was a portion of the 100-acre tract that Novalls sold to William Hodges in 1761. However, as Novall is known to have sold half of his home farm to Luelling, and as John Powell, through his purchases in 1815 and 1819, succeeded in amassing 78 acres that comprised an entity called "Nials," it is more likely that the Grahams had bought Luelling's property.<sup>10</sup> Land tax lists, which by 1820 began including the estimated value of structural improvements, reveal that Novall's land in Norfolk County was vacant (Norfolk County Deed Book 46:246; 48:203, 205). A subsequent real estate transaction reveals that John Powell purchased from Jane and John Graham 50 acres of land in Nansemond County that also had belonged to "Nials". That parcel, which in 1822 reportedly contained a new house, abutted the boundary line between Norfolk and Nansemond counties and was contiguous to Noyall's Norfolk County property (Norfolk County Deed Book 51:212).

On December 1, 1822, John Powell of Norfolk County deeded to his brother, Ezekiel, then a resident of Nansemond County, 100 acres of land that lay to the northeast of the study area. The description of the acreage conveyed reveals that it abutted north on the Yeates Free School land and other Nansemond County properties in the vicinity of what became Belleville, and south and west on the property of James Maxwell. John Powell noted that he had procured the 100 acres from Samuel Powell (Norfolk County Deed Book 51:231).

Slightly more than month later, on January 9, 1823, John Powell conveyed to Ezekiel two other tracts that were located nearby: 80 acres "known by the name of Nials land" (i.e., the Smith-Totersdale 50 acres plus the Grahams's 28 acres), along with 50 acres of adjoining land called "Nials" that lay contiguous to the northwest, in Nansemond County. At the time of the sale, John Powell stated that he had purchased the Norfolk County tracts from Emmely (Permelia) Smith. Fanny Totersdale (and her husband, Robert), and Jane Graham, who had inherited them. John Powell appears to have been deeply in debt, for he deeded to Ezekiel not only the "Nials" (Noyall) tracts but also his home plantation, household furnishings, slaves, livestock, farming equipment, and wheeled vehicles (Norfolk County Deed Book 51:214).

Ezekiel Powell, shortly after obtaining the title to John Powell's real and personal property, deeded it to John's sons, Ezekiel and John Powell. That deed described more explicitly the boundaries of the tracts that the elder John Powell had conveyed to his brother. The 80<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> acres in Norfolk County (identified as "Nials land") were said to abut James Maxwell's property on the northeast, Philip Johnson's acreage on the northwest, and the meanders of a large branch. The 50 acres that adjoined it, on the opposite side of the county line, also were said to have belonged to "Nials" (Norfolk County Deed Book 51:212). Sixteen years later,

when one of Ezekiel Powell's grandnephews' sons disposed of the acreage containing the Taylor Site, the placement of Philip Johnson's and James Maxwell's acreage and the line between Nansemond and Norfolk Counties was described just as it had been in 1822 (Norfolk County Deed Book 63:511) (see below). Thus, these boundary references and land descriptions prove conclusively that the study area once was part of the Noyall home tract. Land tax lists confirm this sequence of transactions and reveal that the Noyall tract in Norfolk County contained no improvements between 1820 and 1840 (Norfolk County Land Tax Lists 1820-1840).

In 1830, the younger Ezekiel Powell deeded to his brother, John, his half-interest in the 80-3-acre Nials tract and the adjoining 50 acres which their uncle had conveyed to them. Four years later, in January 1834, when the younger John Powell prepared his will, he bequeathed to his son, Ezekiel Powell, Jr., the "Nials land," which was described as consisting of 81 acres in Norfolk County and 50 acres in Nansemond County (Norfolk County Will Book 5:354). The extensive inventory of the younger John Powell indicates that he was a prosperous farmer (Norfolk County Appraisement Book 5:354-360). Tax assessment records reveal that all of his land holdings on the Elizabeth River's Western Branch were devoid of improvements. By 1836. Ezekiel Powell, Jr., a resident of Portsmouth Parish, was credited with the tract his father had bequeathed to him in 1834 (Norfolk County Land Tax Lists 1830-1836).

On December 17, 1838, Ezekiel Powell, Jr., and his wife, Margaret, sold their acreage on the Western Branch, then described as 126 acres, to Wright and Catherine Manning. The tract was described as being bound by the land holdings of James Maxwell, John Smith, and Philip Johnson; the White Marsh Branch; and the boundary line between Nansemond and Norfolk counties (Norfolk County Deed Book 63:511). In 1839, the tax assessor credited Manning with the tract, which contained no improvements. The following year, however, he attributed it to Ezekiel Powell, noting that structures worth \$100 had been added. In 1841, Manning again was listed as owner of the tract. This variation in the tax records raises the possibility that Manning mortgaged his acreage to Powell in order to secure the funds to construct a home. then repaid the loan and obtained an unencumbered title to his property. The buildings erected in 1840 survived for only three or four years, for by 1844 they had been destroyed, removed, or dismantled. Manning appears to have lived on his Norfolk County land during the years it contained improvements, for between 1840 and 1843 he was described as a resident of the Western Branch area and his 126-acre farm was the only property he owned. Personal property tax rolls indicate that Manning was a man of modest means, for he owned one to two adult slaves over age 16, one younger slave, two horses, asses, or mules, and a gig (Norfolk County Census 1840; Land Tax Lists 1838-1844; Personal Property Tax Lists 1841-1846).

In 1845, Wright and Catherine Manning sold their vacant 126-acre tract to Willis D. Bidgood. Tax rolls indicate that Bidgood immediately constructed \$100 worth of improvements on it (Norfolk County Deed Book 70:350; Land Tax Lists 1845). It is likely that he was preparing to place tenants or a farm manager on the property, for he also owned 181<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> acres of land at Starting Point that contained buildings worth \$1,286, a substantial investment in comparison with his contemporaries. Tax lists attribute to Bidgood five adult slaves, three horses, asses, or mules, a gig, and a metallic clock, a taxable luxury item. He died prior to the tax assessor's visit in 1846 (Norfolk County Land Tax Lists 1845-1846; Personal Property Tax Lists 1845-1846).

In February 1847, Willis D. Bidgood, Jr., sold the property and its \$100 worth of improvements to Hincha McClenny. The deed noted that the tract being conveyed abutted the land holdings of James Maxwell and Philip Johnson (Norfolk County Deed Book 73:192). McClenny and his wife most likely made the tract their home, for they were Norfolk County residents and the only other land they owned, 100 acres that abutted the land he had purchased from Bidgood, was vacant. In 1850, when a census was made of Norfolk County's inhabitants, McClenny was listed as a head of household. In 1850, the buildings on McClenny's 126-acre farm were worth \$100, the value at which they had been listed since 1845. McClenny appears to have been a relatively successful middling farmer, for he owned four or five adult slaves, one young slave, and two horses, asses, or mules (Norfolk County Census 1850; Land Tax Lists 1844-1850; Personal Property Tax Lists 1847-1850).

In 1863, when Oscar Soederquist (1863) prepared a map of Norfolk and Nansemond counties, he compressed Route 625's forerunner and indicated that the Pughsville-Taylor Road (Route 659) connected with Route 568's forerunner to the north of Bethlehem Church. Soderquist attributed to "McClenna" a structure on the north, not south, side of Route 659's forerunner, which he straightened somewhat, and he indicated that the area was densely wooded (Figure 6). In 1866 and 1867, when the tax assessor visited the McClenny property, he noted that its improvements were worth \$300 (Norfolk County Land Tax Lists 1866-1867).

On April 4, 1867, Hincha G. McClenny and his wife, Martha S., sold 50 of their 126 acres to Joseph Weaver, a black man. The McClennys, in disposing of the property, noted that the acreage they were selling contained buildings. Joseph Weaver borrowed money to purchase the land, using other land as collateral; he deeded it to Arthur Emmerson, who served as his trustee (Norfolk County Deed Book 89:541-542). By 1887, when the Sykes and Gwathmey map (1887) was made, the Weaver tract was portrayed as cleared farmland devoid of improvements (Figure 7).

Gradually, Joseph Weaver disposed of all but 16 2/3 acres of his 50-acre He and his wife, Sally, who parcel. apparently were childless, bequeathed their land to John W. Rooks, her nephew, with the stipulation that in the event of Rooks's death the property would pass to his children or next of kin. When Rooks died, the Weaver tract passed to Jane, Robert, and Joseph Carr, Rook's next of kin (Norfolk County Deed Book 89:542; In 1914, the Carrs's heirs 98:284). undertook a partition suit so that the land could be sold and its proceeds divided equitably. In response to a chancery court decision, on August 4, 1914, the tract was offered for sale at a public auction, at which time it was bought by Louis J. Morris (Norfolk County Deed Book 406:280).

A year later, on May 19, 1915, Morris and his wife, Eva P., conveyed the parcel (described as 17 acres, more or less) to E. K. Rabey, who was black. The tract abutted the south side of the main road from Churchland to Suffolk and was said to be part of the 50-acres formerly owned by Joseph Weaver. A 1915 plat of Morris acreage and a 1921 the topographic quadrangle sheet reveal that no buildings were then located in the vicinity of the Taylor Site (Norfolk County Deed Book 414:88) (Figures 8 and 9). Mr. Rabey's daughter, Martha, who is elderly and does not occupy the tract, is the property's current owner of record. According to one long-time local resident, a small house and orchard were located on the Rabey property during the 1920s, at which time it was leased to tenants (City of Chesapeake Tax Assessment Book 1989; Mr. Jeremiah Gaines, personal communication, 1988).



FIGURE 6 Military Map of Suffolk and Vicinity (Soederquist 1863).


FIGURE 7 Map of Norfolk County (Sykes and Gwathmey 1887).



FIGURE 8 Excerpt from Norfolk County Deed Book 414:88.



FIGURE 9 U.S.G.S. 7.5-minute Bowers Hill Quadrangle (1921).

#### CHAPTER 4 - ENDNOTES

 John Ives, who was a blockmaker and a resident of the Western Branch area, also owned a house and lot in the town of Portsmouth. His will, executed in 1767 but not presented for probate until 11 years later, reveals that he had remarried. Reference was made to his new wife, Elizabeth, and daughters Ann and Elizabeth Ives (Norfolk County Will Book 2:73). Ives's inventory, which was compiled in February 1778, reveals that he was relatively affluent. By far his most valuable possessions were his blockmaker's tools (worth 60 pounds sterling) and his lignum vitae (worth a like amount) (Norfolk County Appraisement Book 2:6) (Appendix B).

2. It is possible that Noyall, prior to 1759, resided in nearby Nansemond County, where he eventually owned 50 acres. However, the destruction of Nansemond's antebellum court records render it impossible to determine when he purchased his acreage there. Nicholas Noyall's name does not appear in early-to-mid 18th-century patents, earlier dated Norfolk County records, or in Nansemond County land tax rolls, 1782-1784. He may have been a relatively new immigrant to Virginia.

3. Although the Hatton-Price deed has not been located, it is known that Thomas Hatton owned several parcels in the same general vicinity. In 1729, he bought 30 acres on the Western Branch from Thomas Brown, who had obtained it from Robert and Thomas Rowe. Four years later, he acquired 100 acres on the Western Branch's Langles (Langworth's) Creek, purchasing it from the heirs of John and Mary Cording. These parcels were contiguous and referenced each other in contemporary boundary descriptions (Norfolk County Deed Book G:188; 11:134-135).

 In 1763, Lewis Lewelling sold a lot in Portsmouth Town to Thomas Veale, a gentleman. Later, the lot came into the hands of John Groves, who also disposed of it (Norfolk County Deed Book 21:65; 24:134).

5. This estimate of Noyall's career is based on the fact that when buying property from Thomas and Jeremiah Creech in 1761-1762, he was described as a cordwainer or shoemaker.

 Although Virginia counties' assessors commenced compiling tax rolls in 1782, Norfolk County's earliest surviving lists open in 1787. Alteration books, in which property transfers were recorded, have survived for the period 1782-1786.

 Hillings's relationship to Groves and his daughters is open to speculation, for her name does not appear in court documents that have come to light.

- 8. Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Totersdale may have been daughters of Ann Groves or perhaps her sisters or nieces.
- These boundary markers are repeated in a later deed for the property on which the Taylor site is located, revealing that the Smith-Totersdale tract was Nicholas Noyall's home farm.
- 10. No deeds have been located whereby Lewis Luelling conveyed his land on the Western Branch to someone else.

## CHAPTER 5: HISTORIC FEATURE DESCRIPTIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS

Below the plow zone scatter, the Taylor site consists of a variety of 18thcentury post configurations, pit features, and a laid-brick platform. The following presentation provides a detailed description of the physical characteristics, association the with other site components, and suggestions of probable age and function of Post Configuration A, fence lines (Post Configurations B, C, and K), a portion of a building (Post Configuration D), and various features (Features E, F, G, H, and J). All measurements are presented in English tenths. To best present the data in an organized manner and to clarify their location on the site plan map, each configuration of associated posts and each isolated feature has been assigned a letter designation. The numbers that follow the designation are the Arabic letter designations that were assigned to features during the field work. Summary Tables containing information on post dimensions, depth, shape, and contents are provided for each post configuration and for miscellaneous posts. A table summarizing the contents of each feature is also presented.

The site also contains a prehistoric component. A discussion of the artifacts and features associated with this period of site occupation is presented in Chapter 7.

#### Early to Mid 18th-century Features

Post Configuration A (WMCAR post numbers 161, 162, 166, 167, 168, 169, 172, 174, 176, 181, 183, 212, 216, 256;

#### JMUARC post numbers 1, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 88; plus 18 suspected posts that did not receive numerical designations)

Potentially the earliest 18th-century feature at the site is represented by the remains of a post-in-the-ground structure initially identified during the Phase II research (Smith 1989:14-21). The structural remains were exposed in the vicinity of grid coordinates 200N 330E. They consisted of an approximately 41post configuration with the long axis extending in a northwest to southeast direction (Figures 10 and 11). Four large rectangular postholes with circular post molds and 37 smaller posthole and mold features, of varying sizes and shapes, were The configuration exposed. post represents a building that measured 8 feet across the gable end and as much as 27 feet along the bay side.

The four large postholes were positioned in a manner indicative of a single bay structure. Their post molds formed a 7-by-8.5-foot rectangle. One post hole (JMUARC post #12) showed the remains of two molds, one of which was probably a replacement post. This post hole was irregularly shaped, unlike the rectangular surface shapes indicative of the other three post holes (Figure 12).

A shed-like extension was represented by the remains of 34 posts positioned off the eastern end of the single bay structure. The absence of post remains along a portion of the southern face of the shed suggests that the structure



FIGURE 10 Site 44CS92 plan.



FIGURE 11 Bisected structural remains of main building (Configuration A).



FIGURE 12 Site 44CS92 "Shop" plan.

was only partially enclosed. The remains of several posts within the structure may have served as support or partition beams. Another possibility is that some of the interior posts served as work bench supports. Finally, the remains of 6 posts were located off the northern face of the building. These posts appear to represent a small addition to the shed-like portion of the structure (see Figure 12).

Data pertaining to post dimensions, shapes, and fill content are presented in These data were generated Table 1. during the Phase II and Phase III research. Unfortunately, some damage to the site occurred after the Phase II research and before the initiation of the Phase III work. Nineteen suspected posts identified during the Phase II investigations were destroyed. Most of these posts were located at the southeastern end of the building. The information gathered during the Phase II was sufficient, however, to extrapolate the dimensions of the southeastern end of the structure. As mentioned in the Phase II report, the dimensions derived from the posts that form the southeastern end of the building may be erroneous due to disturbances by trees. The presence of large trees in this area prevented the total exposure of the identifiable post remains and may well have obscured other unidentified posts. This may explain the structure's non-rectangular shape (see Figure 12).

The mode of construction is suggested by the nature of the archaeological deposits. It seems likely that two methods of earthfast construction were utilized in the raising of this structure. In the single bay portion of the structure, the large rectangular postholes exhibited post molds and were of a size and shape indicative of a conventional Chesapeake hole-set frame building (Carson et al. 1981:143, 149; Kelso 1984:58-61, 128-137; White 1986:103) (Figures 13 and 14). The structural evidence of this portion of the building suggests various forms of framed-building construction techniques. The lack of studpost remains may indicate either that shallow stud remains have been plowed away or that the building was raised off the ground on hole-set posts (Carson et al. 1981: 149). The building also may have been fully framed on hole-set blocks. a construction method common toward the end of the 17th century and thereafter (Carson et al. 1981: 153).

In the shed portion of the structure, it appears that less effort was taken in its construction. The post features are smaller and irregular in shape, vary in depth, and were generally more shallow (see Table 1) (Figure 15). These factors suggest that the posts were set up one at a time, a method of construction often associated with the raising of a shed-like building (Carson et al. 1981:150). Two of the posts (JMUARC post #13 and #88) appear to have been burned prior to being set.

The two diagnostic artifacts found within the post fill suggest a post-1720 date of construction. These artifacts consist of one sherd of white saltglazed stoneware and one sherd of Buckley earthenware. Both were recovered from the large, rectangular, structural posts, and both were assigned a Terminus Post Quem (TPQ) of 1720.

The structural remains suggest that this building probably served as a workshop or shed rather than a dwelling. Factors influencing this interpretation include 1) the small size of the single bay portion of the structure, 2) the presence

Post Feature#	N-S Dim.	E-W Dim.	Mold Dia.	Depth <sup>a</sup>	Shape <sup>b</sup>	Contents & TPQ
1°	2.5	2.5	.72	1.4	S	Brick fragment <sup>d</sup>
7°	2.6	1.6	.75	1.3	R	Brick fragments Aboriginal pottery
12 <sup>c</sup>	2,8	2,5	.52 .52°	1.3	I	Brick fragments, charcoal 1720+: Buckley earthenware
176	2.0	2.0	.60	1.3	S	Nail fragment Handmade brick fragments 1720+: White saltglazed stoneware
6°	1,75	1.1	.55	1.3	R	Aboriginal pottery Nail, metal fragment Charcoal
10 <sup>c</sup>	.95	.52	.46	.78	R	Brick fragments, coal
11 <sup>c</sup>	1.1	.85	.59	1.1	C	Shell, metal fragments
13°	.82	.72	.62	.90	Ĩ	Brick fragments, nail Charcoal
88°	.93	.68	.75	.67	1	Brick fragments, charcoal Seed
161	1.2	1.0	.70	.40	1	-2102
162	1.5	.90	.62	.30	I	
166	1.0	.55		.55	I	Burned ceramic fragment
167	.85	.77		.95	C	Brick fragments
168	.65	.70		.40	R	Brick fragments
169	.55	.60		.50	R	0
172	1.0	2.0		1.25	I	
174	.60	1.3		.51	1	Brick fragments
181	.92	.95	.50	.60	I	Brick fragments, nail Oyster shell
183	.75	1.05		.55	R	Brick fragments
212	.65	1.17		.60	I	
216	.70	.55	.55	.22	1	
256	.71	.52	.60	.10	R	

\*Depth below subsurface <sup>b</sup>S=square, R=rectangular, I=irregular, and C=circular \*Post feature # assigned by JMUARC <sup>d</sup>All brick fragments are probable handmade

Probable replacement post

# TABLE 1 Post feature data for Configuration A.



## FIGURE 13 Post Feature # 176.



FIGURE 14 Post Feature # 212.

Plan	Profile	Contents	Feature Number Center Coordinates
A C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	A' A	White Salt Glazed Stoneware Nail Aboriginal Pottery	176 195.5N 329.5E
		Nail Fragment Brick Fragment Oyster Shell	181 198N 334E
$\bigcirc$	Brick	Brick Fragments	167 197.5N 345.4E
$\bigcirc$			169 199.4N 340.8E
$\bigcirc$	$\bigtriangledown$		212 192.7N 361.8E
Post Mold Post	Hole Teet	Southern Section Excavated Unless Noted by A - A'	C

FIGURE 15 Representative plan and profiles of Configuration A post features.

of shed-like additions that constitute most of the building, 3) the possibly open southern side of the structure, 4) the absence of hearth or chimney-related remains, and 5) the absence of a root cellar or other domestic facilities.

Alternative interpretations are, however, considered. The different modes of construction and the early dates associated with the four large post features may indicate that the structure was erected during two different episodes of construction. It is possible that the deeply set, large post structure was already present when Noyall occupied the property and that the shed-like portion of the post configuration was added upon his arrival. Those features located within the area (Features E, F, G, and H) and presumably associated with the structure, date to the period when Noyall occupied the site. This suggests that he may have modified a small existing structure to create a larger sheltered work area and that the features in the yard area resulted from subsequent site use. Whether Novall enlarged the building to accommodate help or for himself is unknown. If the building did serve as quarters for assistants, it is possible that it functioned both as a meager dwelling and a shop.

Thus, the combined evidence archaeological accumulated by the research and the historic research suggests that this possibly modified building served as a work area or shop for Noyall who, along with his wife and children, occupied this property from 1759 until at least 1785. When Novall died in 1785, his wife, Elizabeth, retained the property until 1802. Whether she continuously occupied the property thoughout this time is not evident from the historical record. However, the archaeological record suggests that the "shop" and its associated

components were not utilized during the last decade of the 18th century.

#### Mid-to-Late 18th-Century Features

Post Configuration B (Post numbers 14, 19, 38, 59, 60, 61, 79, 81-85, 96, 98, 100, and 267)

This 16-posthole configuration represents the remains of a northwest to southeast trending fence line (Table 2). The exposed portion of the fence extended from grid coordinates 180.3N 257.3E to 117.3N 327E and traversed approximately 92.5 feet of the exposed surface (see Figure 10). The typical distance between posts was 6.3 feet. All posts but one were rectangular (see Table 2) (Figure 16). The mean dimensions of the postholes were .63 feet north-south by .61 feet east-west. The average depth below the stripped surface was .48 feet and estimated depth below the ground surface was 1.1 feet. Unfortunately, some degree of mechanical grading and tree removal, carried out prior to the Phase III research, has affected the latter estimate by obscurring the original elevation of the ground surface. A representative sample of plan and profile views of the post remains is presented in Figure 17.

The diagnostic artifacts recovered from this series of posts indicate a mid-tolate 18th-century period of construction. A general 18th-century TPQ was assigned to a neck fragment of a snuff or blacking bottle and a piece of Staffordshire slipware. A post-1780 TPQ was assigned to a piece of blue shell-edged pearlware.

## Post Configuration C (Post numbers 275, 277, 292, 293, 294, 339, 340, 347, 348, 369)

The 10 exposed postholes of this configuration comprised a fence line that

Post Feature #	N-S Dim.	E-W Dim.	Mold Dia.	Depth <sup>a</sup>	Shape <sup>b</sup>	Contents & TPQ
14	.55	.75		.85	R	18th c.: blacking-snuff neck frag
19	.92	.90		.60	R	Wrought nail
38	.50	.60		.62	R	and a second
59	.70	.60	.45	.35	R	
60	.80	.65		.95	R	
61	.74	.68		.63	R	
79	.75	.80		.80	R	Handmade brick frag.
81	.69	.51		.10	R	1780: pearlware Staffordshire slipware
82	.69	.42		.40	R	a service of the serv
83	.55	.56		.29	R	
84	.60	.49		.15	R	
85	.51	.51		.38	S	
96	.75	.75		.50	С	Handmade brick frag.
98	.55	.55		.30	S	
100	.62	.42		.29	R	
267	1.10	.50		.52	R	

<sup>a</sup>Depth below subsurface <sup>b</sup>R=rectangular, S=square and C=circular

 TABLE 2

 Post feature data for Configuration B.



FIGURE 16 Typical rectangular post remains from Configuration B (Post Feature #14).

Plan	Profile	Contents	Feature Number Center Coordinates
-67-		Green Bottle Neck Fragment	14 120.8N 322.8E
$\langle \rangle$	U	_	38 137N 305.1E
			59 149.9N 291.2E
-0-		Pearlware Staffordshire Slipware	81 148.5N 281.5E
	$\bigtriangledown$	Handmade Brick Fragment	96 171.4N 266.2E
	$\Box$		267 180N 257.6E
Post Mold O Po	ost Hole 0 feet	1 Southern S Unless Not	ection Excavated ed by A - A'



FIGURE 17 Representative plan and profiles of Configuration B post features.

trended in a west-northwest to eastdirection southeast between grid coordinates 286.5N 336E and 269N 384.5E (Table 3) (see Figure 10). The fence line traversed 52 feet of the exposed surface with a typical distance between post centers of 5.05 feet. All postholes were rectangular (Figures 18 and 19). The mean dimensions of the postholes were .76 feet north-south by .82 feet east-west. Due to the uniform nature of the fence post remains, only a sample of them were bisected. Of those excavated, the average depth below subsurface was .86 feet. Estimated depth below the ground surface was 1.5 feet.

Diagnostic artifacts were recovered from the three excavated posts. These included a small delftware fragment, two creamware sherds, and a pearlware sherd. The latest TPQ date assigned to the artifacts is post-1780.

Post Configuration D (Post numbers 278, 279, 280, 281, 282A, 282B, 298, 343, 365, 366)

This post configuration appears to represent a rectangular building located in the vicinity of grid coordinates 262N 352E (Table 4) (see Figure 10). The structure consisted of at least ten posts, nine of which were oriented in a west-northwest to east-southeast direction. Of these nine posts, six formed a relatively straight line at intervals ranging between four and five feet. Three posts were located just north of the six-post line and were not spaced at regular intervals. These posts probably served as replacements. A single post is oriented at a 90 degree angle from the northwestern-most post. The conjectured size of the structure is 10.5 by 26.5 feet.

The posthole remains were all rectangular and exhibited an average

dimension of .78 feet along both sides. Seventy percent of the posts within the configuration were excavated. These extended to a mean depth of .55 feet below the subsurface and to an estimated depth of 1.2 feet below the ground surface. Three postholes contained evidence of post molds. The post molds were circular and exhibited a mean diameter of .53 feet. A representative sample of plan and profile views is presented in Figure 20.

No historic diagnostic artifacts were recovered from these postholes. It is suspected, however, that this configuration is contemporaneous with the fence line located to the north (Configuration C) because 1) of their proximity to one another, 2) the long axis of the structure parallels the fence line, 3) they exhibited similar posthole shapes, 4) they exhibited similar posthole dimensions, and 5) the postholes extended to similar depths. Thus, this series of posts probably dates to the last quarter of the 18th century.

The incomplete record of Post Configuration D hampers interpretation of this earthfast structure. Certain inferences, however, can be made. The relatively small posthole and mold sizes and the conjectured dimensions of the building suggest that the structure may have served as a simple shed or outbuilding, or perhaps an animal pen.

#### Feature E (Feature 89)

This feature was a large, irregularly shaped soil discoloration, first identified during the Phase II work (Smith 1989:24, 25). It was positioned 45 feet south of the center of the probable shop (Post Configuration A) at grid coordinates 158.7N 321E (see Figures 10 and 12). This ovoid feature measured 11.5 feet

Post Feature#	N-S Dim.	E-W Dim.	Mold Dia.	Depth <sup>a</sup>	Shape <sup>b</sup>	Contents & TPQ
275	.95	.80		.85	R	1780: pearlware
277	.75	.75			S	
292	.75	.95	.65	.85	R	18th c.: delftware
293	.68	.75			R	
294	.90	.90			S	
339	.85	.80		.90	R	1770: creamware Aboriginal pottery
340	.75	1.4°			R	
347	.70	.88			R	
348	.80	.70			R	
369	.80	.90			R	

<sup>a</sup>Depth below subsurface <sup>b</sup>R=rectangular and S=square <sup>c</sup>Measurement distorted by bioturbation

TABLE 3Post feature data for Configuration C.

Post Feature#	N-S Dim.	E-W Dim.	Mold Dia.	Depth <sup>a</sup>	Shape <sup>b</sup>	Contents & TPQ
278°	.71	.55		1	R	
279	.90	1.0		.30	R	
280	.70	.75		.63	R	
281	.65	.67	.50	.40	C	
282A	1.0	1.0	.50	.57	S	
282B	.82	1.15		.40	R	
297	.63	.52		.60	R	
343	.85	.80	.61	.95	R	Brick fragment Aboriginal pottery
365°	.75	.65			R	
366°	.75	.71			R	

<sup>a</sup>Depth below subsurface <sup>b</sup>R=rectangular, C=circular and S=square <sup>c</sup>Not excavated

TABLE 4 Post feature data for Configuration D.



FIGURE 18 Typical post remains from Configuration C (Post Feature # 294).

Plan	Profile	Contents	Feature Number Center Coordinates
		Pearlware	275 278.5N 357.4E
		Delftware	292 275N 367.5E
		Creamware Aboriginal Pottery	339 280.7N 351.7E
Post Mold O Post	0 Hole feet	1 Southern Unless No	Section Excavated oted by A - A

FIGURE 19 Representative plan and profiles of Configuration C post features.

Plan	Profile	Contents	Feature Number Center Coordinates
			280 210.4N 306.3E
	A A'		282 A, B 265.5N 357.4E
	$\Box$	-	298 263N 345.4E
Post Mold	Post Hole 0 feet	Southern Unless No	Section Excavated oted by A - A

FIGURE 20 Representative plan and profiles of Configuration D post features.

north-south by 7.5 feet east-west, and was found to extend to a maximum depth of 1.3 feet below the exposed surface or, to an estimated depth of 2 feet below the ground surface.

Excavations began with the removal of the feature's west half. A basin-shaped pit, with several basal irregularities and differing soil lavers, was revealed (Figures 21 through 24). Soil Layer A was a dark brown (10YR3/3) silty sand that gradually changed into a mottled gravish brown (10YR5/2) sandy loam. Layer A contained the majority of the artifacts with a relatively higher frequency found in the dark brown soils in the upper central portion of the feature. Layer B was located immediately below Layer A and consisted of yellowish brown (10YR5/6), sandy clay mottled with gray (10YR5/1) and white (10YR8/1) sand. Layer B contained very few artifacts. Layer C was a small pocket of artifactfree white (5YR8/1) sand that extended one foot below the feature. Upon examination of the profile and the materials contained within each soil layer, it was determined that Layers B and C probably resulted from natural fill processes and that Layer A was the result of cultural deposition. Thus, it appears as though Feature E was left open for a period of time and later used as a trash pit. After photographs were taken and a profile was drawn, the east half of the feature was excavated.

Feature E yielded the largest quantity of artifacts found in any one feature at the site. In this relatively undisturbed context, a variety of artifact types including architectural, environmental, household, and specialized were recovered (Table 5). An unusually large quantity of forge-related materials such as soft coal and slag were present within the fill. In fact, Feature E contained 82 percent (n=161) of the coal and slag recovered during the Phase III work. Also included were several prehistoric lithic artifacts. The analysis of the artifactual remains suggests that this pit was filled sometime during the last quarter of the 18th century.

Evidence indicates that this pit probably did not serve a formal purpose (i.e., a root cellar). However, the irregular surficial shape, the intrusive nature in which it was excavated into the clay subsoil, and its proximity to the brick pavement feature (Feature H), suggest that it originally may have functioned as a clay borrow pit and later been filled with waste debris. Although informal in nature, the feature's proximity to the building (Post Configuration A) and other related features (Features G and H) suggests, alternatively, that the feature may have been created to serve as a central trash receptacle (see Figure 12). Therefore, Feature E is considered an integral part of the shop yard.

## Feature F (Feature 243)

This feature was an ovoid, filled pit located 25 feet south of Post Configuration A at grid coordinates 175N 325.3E (see Figures 10 and 12). It measured 5.9 feet north-south by 3.2 feet east-west and extended to a maximum depth of 1.6 feet below the exposed surface, or to an estimated depth of 2.25 feet below the ground surface.

The removal of the west half of the feature revealed a peculiarly shaped pit containing three layers of soil and a charcoal-filled lens (Figures 25 and 26). Layer A was a brown (10YR5/3), sandy loam that contained a small lens of charcoal and several artifacts. Layer B

				Featur	e Numbe	er		
Artifacts	13	89A <sup>a</sup>	89B	219A	219B	219C	243	245
Activities		0.07						
Slag		34	1		1			
Coal		96	1				2	
Architectural								
Brick		16		2 <sup>b</sup>	4 <sup>b</sup>		2	3
Wrought nails		53						
Spike		1						
Bolt		1						
Arms		10						
Lead shot					1			
Food								
Ovster shell	58	5		2		1		
Fish scale	1					÷.		
Nut Shell	Ĩ							
Household Items								
Ceramic								
Coarse earthenware		6					1	
Staffordshire slipware		2					•	
White saltglazed		2						
stoneware		2						
Delftware		1						5
Creamware		2						5
Pearluare		2		1				
Chinese Porcelain		1						
Class								
Container				2	1			
Table				2	1			
Miscellaneous					1			
Motol								
Linknown		1						
Elat band		14		1			1	
Fiat Dand		14		1			1	
ringe?		1						
Hoe		T						
TOTAL	60	236	2	8	8	1	6	8

<sup>a</sup>Letters represent soil layers within fill <sup>b</sup>Represents brick sample collected for analysis

TABLE 5Artifacts recovered from Features E, F, G, H, and J.



FIGURE 21 Plan of Feature E (#89).



A - Dark Brown (10YR3/3) Silty Sand to Grayish Brown (10YR5/2) Sandy Loam
B - Yellowish Brown (10YR5/6) Clay Mottled with Gray (10YR5/1) and White (10YR8/1) Sand C - White (5YR8/1) Sand D - Strong Brown (7.5YR5/8)

> FIGURE 22 Profile of Feature E (#89).



FIGURE 23 Plan of Feature E (#89), before excavation.



FIGURE 24 Profile of Feature E (#89), after excavation.



A - Brown (10YR5/3) Sandy Loam B - Brownish Yellow (10YR6/6) Sandy Loam C - Light Gray (10YR7/2) Sand

FIGURE 25 Plan and Profile of Feature F (#243).



FIGURE 26 Profile of Feature F (#243).

was a yellowish brown (10YR6/6), sandy loam, and Layer C was a light gray (10YR7/2), medium sand. No artifacts were recovered from Layers B and C.

The artifacts recovered from this feature indicate a general 18th-century date for the feature (see Table 5). The assemblage consists of coal and brick pieces, a fragment of flat iron, a sherd of coarse earthenware, and two pieces of shell-tempered aboriginal pottery. All artifacts were recovered from Layer A.

The proximity of Feature F to the building (Post Configuration A) and its position in relation to the other features (E, G, H) within the shop yard suggest that the feature was part of the shop complex (see Figure 12). Although no evidence of decayed stumps/posts remains in the feature, the size and placement of the feature and the presence of a large quanitity of forge-related debris within the immediate vicinity suggest that the cylindrical holes (evident in the feature profile) may have held anvil stumps. As Light (1984:57) indicates, anvils were generally mounted on stumps set in the ground. Such earthfast anvil stumps have been documented at other mid-18thcentury sites. At the Draper forge site, located in Colonial Williamsburg and dating to the last half of the 18th-century, the remains of two anvil stumps were found near the firebox opening (Brown et al. 1990:139, 140). Similarly, anvil stump remains were uncovered at the Anderson forge site, also located in Colonial Williamsburg and probably dating to the 1780s (Brown 1991: personal communication).

#### Feature G (Feature 245)

This feature was located 25 feet southwest of the shop at grid coordinates 176.5N 316.7E and is thought to be associated with shop activities. It is Lshaped; varied in width from .5 to 1.3 feet. It extended in a north-south direction for 3.2, feet at which point it turned in a westerly direction for approximately 2.9 feet (see Figures 10 and 12).

The exposure and bisection of the feature revealed an anomalous soil discoloration surrounding "pockets" of tiny brick colored flecks (Figure 27). The feature appeared to consist of a single soil layer (A) that was hardly distinguishable below the subsurface (see Figure 27). Layer A was a sandy brown (10YR5/3) loam with an orangish tint. The soil coloration and texture appear to be the remains of crushed brick rather than the result of heat alteration. Within Layer A the base of a delftware plate and brick fragments were present. The diagnostic artifacts indicate a general 18th-century date of deposit (see Table 5).

The archaeological scant information was not sufficient to determine the feature's function. However, its proximity to other features thought to be associated with the probable shop may indicate that it is the remains of a specialized feature. In consideration of the forge-associated artifacts and the possible anvil stump pits the possibility that the feature is the remains of a semipermanent forge is suggested.

#### Feature H (Feature 219)

Feature H was a laid-brick pavement originally observed and exposed during the Phase II research. It was located at grid coordinates 177.7N 306.2E, 30 feet southwest of the shop building (see Figures 10 and 12). The remains were at a depth of .82 feet below the ground surface.

The initial investigations uncovered a laid-brick rectangle measuring 4 feet north-south by 8 feet east-west. The average size of the large, handmade bricks is approximately .7 by .36 by .19 feet. The bricks were laid in a single stretcher course edged with a single shiner course. The shiner course formed a distinct edge surrounding the stretcher course, thus creating a formal border (Figures 28 through 31). None of the bricks were mortared, though a prepared fill consisting of yellowish brown (10YR5/4) to dark yellowish brown (10YR4/4), sandy clay was located immediately below and between the bricks, and appears to have been used as a mortar-like substance. Evidence of a narrow builder's trench was identified along the eastern end, and extended at least halfway down the feature's southern edge.

Few artifacts were recovered from the excavations (see Table 5). Those present include dark green bottle glass, a flat iron fragment, an oyster shell fragment, one piece of slag, a small lead shot, a colorless piece of table glass (possibly a stopper fragment), and handmade bricks. These items were assigned a general 18th-century date.

Feature Н was carefully constructed and probably served a However, postspecialized function. processes have affected depositional preservation and possibly destroyed certain diagnostic characteristics that might have permitted a thorough understanding of feature function. For instance, it is possible that the feature is the bottom portion of a structure lined with rows of shiners, thus forming a bricklined pit. The evidence of such a pit may have been demolished by plowing. Also, although no post remains were found in association with the brick pavement, it is possible that a sill structure enclosed the feature, creating a squat storage facility.









A - Handmade Bricks B - Brownish Yellow (10YR6/8) Clayey Sand (Builder's Trench) C - Brick Rubble (Resulting from Post-Phase II, Pre-Phase III impact)

> FIGURE 28 Plan of Feature H (#219).



A - Handmade Bricks B - Brownish Yellow (10YR6/8) Clayey Sand (Builder's Trench) C - Brick Rubble (Resulting from Post-Phase II, Pre-Phase III impact)

> FIGURE 29 Profile of Feature H (#219).



FIGURE 30 Plan of Feature H (#219), before excavation.



FIGURE 31 Plan of Feature H (#219), after excavation.

A structure such as this may have extended above the surface and therefore would have been more substantial than indicated archaeologically. A small building such as this may have stored any number of perishable or non-perishable items. A final possibility is that the feature represents the remains of a planting bed or "hot box".

A feature similar to Feature H was found at the Pettus Site, a 17th-century plantation site in Kingsmill (Kelso 1984:77, 78). Here, a framed addition to the manor housed a brick-lined dairy or buttery measuring 4 by 9 feet.

Investigations, including chemical analysis of the mortar-like soil that surrounded the bricks, flotation of soil samples to search for microscopic data, and documents research of 18th-century artisan sites, did not reveal conclusive evidence as to the function of this feature. The possibility that the feature is a component of some type of forge was considered, but the lack of charred remains and forging byproducts in the feature's matrix does not support this suggestion.

Since Novall was a cordwainer and hide preparation may have been an onsite task, it was hypothesized that the pit was a tanning or leather-curing vat. Such vats, however, were usually deeper, made of wood, and placed close to a running water source (Diderot 1978: 1685, 2215, 2232, 2233). According to Curtis Moyer, a conservator at the College of William and Mary, compounds found in tannic acid are stable and would remain in soil regardless of groundwater movement (Moyer 1991: personal communication). To test for such residue, an exhaustive chemical analysis of the soil between the laid bricks was conducted. The analysis

did not detect any tannens, further reducing the possibility that the feature functioned as a tanning vat.

The feature may be the remains of some kind of subsurface storage pit. The possibility that it was used for the storage of artisan-related materials was considered. Perishable items such as leather and thread would not, however, have been stored in a below-grade facility because of the threat of mildew and mold (D. Al Saguto: personnal communication).

Post Configuration I (Feature numbers 10, 18, 46, 66, 70, 72, 74, 94, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 111, 112, 113, 115, 122, 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 134, 136, 163, 178, 209, 240, 262)

The features included in this configuration are probably not associated with a formal post-in-the-ground structure. They were located in the southern portion of the exposed site area, particularly in the vicinity of grid coordinates 167N 328E (see Figure 10). The anomalies shared certain distinctive attributes. They were all small, circular to oval in shape, and contained charcoal and brick flecks mixed within the dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) matrix. These features typically measured .3 feet in diameter, exhibited bowl-shaped profiles, and extended from .05 to .55 feet below the exposed surface.

These post remains are characteristic of puncheons, or poles driven into the ground. No pattern typical of garden plots, animal pens, or arbors were discernible. The shallow depth of the perceivable remains suggests that similar features were possibly destroyed by historic cultivation.
## Feature J (Feature # 13)

Feature J was discovered in the southern portion of the site area at grid coordinates 127N 320.4E (see Figure 10). It consisted of a concentration of 56 nearly whole oyster shells (28 lower valve, 28 upper valve) and smaller fragmented pieces. Many of the recovered shells were still attached at the hinge and appeared to have been unopened when deposited. Shell sizes ranged from .12 to .35 feet in length. The oysters were confined to an area measuring 1.55 feet north-south by 1.8 feet east-west. The deposit was basinshaped and extended .25 feet below the exposed surface (Figures 32 and 33).

All of the soil associated with the feature was collected for fine screen processing at the WMCAR laboratory. Several artifacts other than oyster shell were found within the grayish brown (10YR5/2), sandy fill. These include pieces of carbonized wood, nut shell fragments, and fish scales (see Table 5).

The shell feature appears to be a small historic cache or refuse dump. Its compactness and the similar nature of its contents suggest a single period of deposition, probably the remains of a meal.

Configuration K (WMCAR post numbers 175, 197, 260, 270, 271, 319, 325, 327, 331, 332, 333, 334, 364; JMUARC post numbers 5, 108, 10N25W)

The remains of sixteen posts form an ambiguous pair of parallel post lines that traversed the site in a northwest to southeast direction (see Figure 10). The northern-most line of posts extended from grid coordinates 244.9N 291.5E to 203.8N 348.8E. It was comprised of eight posts, two of which were identified during the Phase II work. This line of posts traversed 70 feet of the exposed surface. The southern line of posts was located 15 feet south of the abovementioned post line. It was composed of eight posts, one of which was identified during the Phase II work. This fence line extended between grid coordinates 232.8N 281.8E to 196.5N 333.3E, traversing 62.5 feet of the exposed surface (see Figure 10).

The post configuration was composed of rectangular, square, and circular postholes (Figure 34). They exhibited mean dimensions of .69 feet north-south by .68 feet east-west and extended to a mean depth of .43 feet below the exposed surface (Table 6). The posts were set at an estimated depth of 1.08 feet below the ground surface and were typically set at nine-foot intervals.

No diagnostic artifacts were recovered from the posts excavated during the Phase III research. One post (JMUARC #5) excavated during the Phase II work contained brick, shell, a metal fragment, a piece of red coarseware, and two pieces of creamware. These artifacts indicate a 1770 TPQ.

The association and overall function of the post remains presented as Post Configuration K is not clear. Several interpretations are therefore suggested. Portions of the configuration appear to represent two parallel fence lines. If this is the case, the fences post-date the singlebay structure, for they bisect the building's plan and do not exhibit clear evidence of an earlier period of construction. Also, the post remains located east of the five westernmost post pairs exhibit differential spacing and were typically larger, and thus associated with may not be the westernmost pairs of posts. There is the possibility that these ten westernmost post

Post Feature#	N-S Dim.	E-W Dim.	Mold Dia.	Depth <sup>a</sup>	Shape <sup>b</sup>	Contents & TPQ
175	.70	.75		.10	с	
197	.83	.65		.32	Č	
260	.60	.60	.55	.65	S	
270	.70	.60		.30	R	
271	.50	.65		.40	R	
319	.50	.55		.30	R	
325	.50	.50		.20	S	
327	.50	.60		.25	R	
331	.90	.60	.69	.30	R	
332	1.0	1.0	.60	.70	C	
333	.60	.75	.58	.30	R	Brick fragment
334	.60	.60		.15	S	
364	.50	.50		.35	S	
5°	.98	.69	.66	1.03	R	1770: creamware
108°	.98	.98	.57	.85	C	Brick fragment
10N25W <sup>c</sup>	.72	.98		.93	C	Brick fragment

<sup>a</sup>Depth below subsurface <sup>b</sup>C=circular, S=square and R=rectangular <sup>c</sup>Excavated by JMUARC

TABLE 6Post feature data for Configuration K.



KEY

A - Grayish Brown (10YR5/2) Sandy Loam

FIGURE 32 Plan 113nd profile of Feature J (#13).



FIGURE 33 Plan of Feature J (#13), before excavation.

Plan	Profile	Contents	Feature Number Center Coordinates
ð.			271 212.2N 311.1E
Ĩ,			319 224.3N 320.8E
$\bigcirc$			327 234.8N 305.1E
	A A		331 227.6N 289.2E
			364 244.9N 291.5E
O Post Mold	Post Hole feet	1 Southern S Unless Not	ection Excavated ed by A - A'

FIGURE 34 Representative plan and profiles of Configuration K post features.

features represent the remains of a 15 by 35 foot outbuilding. This conjecture seems unlikely since the posts appeared too small to support a structure of such proportions.

#### Miscellaneous Posts

The 40 posts exposed across the site area do not form identifiable patterns. Obvious historical impacts and pedoturbation have affected the site and probably destroyed portions of the different components represented. Data for these posts are presented in Table 7 and are depicted on the site plan map (see Figure 10). These features are subdivided into different classes based on size and shape.

#### Summary

The architectural features investigated at the Taylor Site are representative of various construction modes and different periods of site use. The earliest historical component appears to date to the first half of the 18th This period of occupation is century. evidenced by the remains of a 7-by-8.5foot single-bay building (four large posts in Post Configuration A). These features exhibited attributes indicative of an impermanent post-in-the-ground structure and contained artifacts that post date the 1720s. A second period of occupation appears to date to the last quarter of the 18th century. This component consisted of post additions to the single-bay structure (Post Configuration A), portions of at least two fences (Post Configurations B and C), a shed or outbuilding (Post Configuration D), three pit features (Features E, F, J), an anomalous soil feature (Feature G), and a brick pavement feature (Feature H). Specifically, the building, the pit features,

and the brick pavement are probably components of a work-area complex where various activities took place. This is suggested in part by the size of the building, the nature of the post remains, and the arrangement of the features in relation to the building. Of the various activities, the most apparent is forging. This is indicated by the quantity of iron working byproducts recovered from Feature E. In an overall perspective, these features, including the fence configurations, are believed to be associated with landowner Nicholas Noyall who, along with his family, occupied the area from 1759 to at least 1785. A fuller discussion of the site complex is provided in the final chapter. The origin and function of the features representing Post Configurations I and K remain undetermined.

Post Feature#	N-S Dim.	E-W Dim.	Mold Dia.	Depth <sup>a</sup>	Shape <sup>b</sup>	Contents & TPQ
5	.65	.50		.30	R	
6	.74	64		.95	R	
7	75	70		50	C	
8	75	70		20	S	
15	1.55	80		65	D	
17	70	.00		.05	C	
17	.70	.00		.00	Č.	
34	.00	.00		.30	1	
34	.60	.05		.30	R	
35	.95	.65		.60	0	
36	.40	.50		.25	R	
42	.75	.64		.64	C	
44	.88	.75		.34	R	
47	.80	.85		.90	C	
49	.50	.60		.30	0	
58	.65	.75		.25	R	
69	.70	.90		1.10	C	
73	.70	.60		.90	č	
116	80	65		40	R	
135	1 70	1.10	55	20	ĩ	Nail fragment
141	.80	.85		.40	R	Dk. green glass
145	30	35		20	R	in a Britoni
152	70	80		60	C	
156	-10	20		.00	õ	
105	.00	1.05	70	.50	U T	
195	.95	1.25	.70	.00	1	
201	-			-		
202	.75	.65		.70	S	
210	.60	.90		.26	0	
215	.95	1.30		.75	C	
216	.70	.55		1.0	1	
237	1.40	1.40	.60	.69	1	
250	.63	.80		.90	R	18th c.: Staffordshire slipware Nail, brick, coal
255	1.0	90		50	0	stand errord con
266	.86	.90		.75	Ċ.	Coarse earthenware Nail & brick frag. Mid 18th c. wine bottle base
300	1 10	1 30		60	Ĩ.	bottle base
312	1 10	70	40	60	P	Brick & overar frage
3146	1.10		.40	.00	IX.	Aboriginal pottery
314*	1.55	1.07		.80	1	Aboriginal pottery
324	.65	.60		.50	I	
326	.60	.65		.15	R	Brick fragments
335°	3.50	1.50		.70	I	
344	.40	.70		.30	I	
356	.74	1.01	.70	.77	R	
363	10	90		1.25	T	

<sup>a</sup>Depth below subsurface <sup>b</sup>R=rectangular, C=circular, S=square, I=irregular, and O=oval <sup>c</sup>Possible feature

 TABLE 7

 Post feature data for Miscellaneous Post Remains.

# CHAPTER 6: HISTORIC ARTIFACT DESCRIPTIONS AND ANALYSIS

A total of 593 historic artifacts were recovered during the Phase III investigations. Of these, fifteen percent were recovered from disturbed contexts. Eighty-two percent of the collection was recovered from 75 cultural features, and the remaining three percent was found immediately below the plow zone within the relatively undisturbed subsurface soils. The collection size is, in part, a consequence of sampling bias inherent to the research design. Briefly, the research focused on analyzing site layout to assess site function, the socio-economic status of the site's occupants, and the site's role in the community. These goals could be attained through the exposure and investigation of subsurface cultural features.

The analysis began by categorizing the artifacts within the type-ware-classgroup classification developed by South (1962:92-93).The class and group categories received greater attention for reasons pertaining to the nature of the preserved archaeological deposits and the research design. The small quantity of artifacts in the assemblage limits our ability to discuss idiosyncratic behavior such as dietary practices and recreational activities through the statistical analysis of the assemblage. Focusing on the more generalized class and group categories best reveals the functional relationship between site activities and site layout. The assemblage includes artifacts from the following classes: ceramics, container glass, and table glass. It also contains artifacts from these groups: activities, food. kitchen, architectural. arms.

miscellaneous, personal, and farm tools. Artifact type and ware classifications are discussed when describing the ceramic assemblage.

The greatest quantity of artifacts falls within the architectural group. This group consists of 209 artifacts (35 percent of total), almost entirely brick fragments and hand wrought nails. Fifty-two features contained brick, two of which (Feature E, the pit feature, and Feature H, the brick pavement) yielded whole bricks, brick bats, and large brick fragments (typically weighing over 500 Brick recovered from the grams). remaining features were generally tiny fragments weighing less than 2 grams. Fifteen features yielded a total of 71 hand-wrought nails. Feature E contained 68.8 percent (n=53) of the total (n=77)hand-wrought nail collection. The remaining artifacts in the architectural group, in order of prevelance, are window glass, unidentifiable nail fragments, a spike, and a bolt. These artifacts constitute 7.6 percent (n=16) of the architectural artifact assemblage.

Of the Phase II artifact assemblage, 60 percent of the cultural materials belong in the architectural group. This collection consists of brick (93 percent), mortar (3 percent), nails (3 percent), and window glass (1 percent). Interestingly, a very small quantity of window glass fragments was recovered during both Phase II and III investigations (1 percent and 0.5 percent, respectively). This could indicate either non-domestic activities in which windows were not necessary or desired or that the windows were removed upon site abandonment because they were relatively precious items.

The next most prominent subsample of artifacts belongs within the activities group. These artifacts consist of heating/forge-related material such as coal (n=110) and slag/"clinker" (n=51)and represent 27 percent of the Phase III assemblage and 17.8 percent of the Phase II assemblage. This material is probably reflective of specialized activities. The type of coal present is soft coal, that which is usually associated with forging rather than cooking. Also, the presence of such relatively large quantities and sizes of slag/clinker (one piece of "clinker" weighs 548 grams) are indicative of intensive heating, not generally associated with kitchen activities. These associations support the interpretation of the site as a shop where forging was clearly important.

Feature E yielded 82 percent (n=161) of the coal and slag and, as mentioned, 68.8 percent (n=53) of the nail assemblage. The fact that this large pit feature (E) is centrally located within the complex and that it contained such a high percentage of heating byproducts and forge-related materials further indicates that it was a refuse pit used either during or just after the late 18th-century period of site use.

Kitchen or domestic items represent the third most prominent group of artifacts within the Phase II and III assemblages. The ceramic artifacts comprise 14.5 percent of the Phase III and 5.6 percent of the Phase II collections. Glass container and tableware sherds make up 3.4 percent of the Phase III assemblage and 1.2 percent of the Phase II assemblage.

Ceramics are generally useful indicators of dates of artifact deposition, socio-economic status, and consumer preference. The assemblage recovered during the Phase III research is small (n=86), but several inferences can be made concerning the nature of the As mentioned in the assemblage. preceding chapter, the primary site components date from the early to late 18th century. These dates were derived, in part, from ceramic-feature associations. Of the total number of features excavated at the Phase III level of work, 18 (24 percent) yielded ceramic sherds. These sherds (n=37) are representative of a of wares: Buckleyware, variety Staffordshire slipware, white saltglazed delftware, stoneware, creamware, pearlware, other refined earthenwares. other coarse earthenwares, and Chinese porcelain (Appendix A) (Figure 35). The sherds found in different features and the information derived from analyzing construction modes permitted temporal separation of the site's components.

A minimum of 15 vessels is represented in the assemblage. The representative sherds were recovered from the fill of eight different features (Table Vessel forms include plates, cups, 8). mugs, flatware, and hollowware. The variety of wares and the types of vessels they represent are typically associated with general domestic activites. This suggests either that the Noyall house was located near but just beyond the study area or that use of the "shop" area was frequent and intensive enough to warrant at least part-time habitation. Further, this assemblage is similar in its composition to assemblages at any number of "typical", small 18th-century sites. In other words, the ware types represented can be regarded as "common denominator" types

Post or Feature#	Ceramic Type	Vessel <sup>a</sup> Portion	Vessel Form	Decoration	Number of Vessels	TPQ⁵
17	Staffordshire slipware	Rim	Cup	Dot	1	18th c.
81	Pearlware	Rim	Plate	Shell-edged blue	1	1780+
89	Coarse earthenware	Rim Body	Flatware	Int. white slip w/ dk. brown glaze	2	1770+
89	Refined earthenware	Indeter.	Indeter.		1	
89	Coarse earthenware	Rim	Hollowware	Ext. white slip under cl. glaze	Ĩ	
89	Creamware	Base	Hollowware	0	1	
89	White salt- glazed stone- ware	Base	Mug		1	
89	Chinese porcelain	Rim	Hollowware	Under glaze blue	1	
89	Buckleyware	Indeter.	Indeter.		1	
219	Pearlware	Base	Plate	Printed blue	1	1795+
224	White salt- glazed stone- ware	Base	Сир		1	1720+
245	Delftware	Base	Plate	Monochrome blue	1	18th c.
266	Eng. mottled glaze	Body	Mug		1	Mid-18th c.
339	Creamware	Base	Plate		1	1770+

<sup>a</sup>All fragments <sup>b</sup>Represents date for feature <sup>c</sup>Recovered from soils above brick pavement

# TABLE 8Data on vessel type and form.



# FIGURE 35

Selected historic artifacts (a - Delft plate base fragment [CS92/243]; b - White saltgalzed stoneware handled cup [CS92/224]; c - Staffordshire slipware, flatware [CS92/Gen. Surface]; D - Green bottle glass, snuff or blacking [CS92/14]). at sites of this period and from that standpoint do not signify either low or high status.

The ceramic collection recovered during the Phase II investigations was considerably larger than the Phase III assemblage due to excavation procedures that involved screening the plow zone A total of 416 sherds, overburden. representing 5.6 percent of the assemblage, was recovered. The types of sherds are similar to those recovered during the Phase III research; however, a wider variety of wares, particularly whitewares, are represented in the Phase II assemblage. Several factors may account for this variation: differences in field recovery techniques, sample size, and the probability that some artifacts found in the plow zone are associated with later occupations outside of the project area. Information on the kinds of vessel forms present within the Phase II assemblage is not available.

The collection of glass artifacts (excluding window glass) recovered during the Phase III investigations consists of 19 sherds of container glass and 1 sherd of table glass. Eighteen of the container sherds are dark green bottle fragments representing various portions of vessels. In Feature 14 (a fence posthole), a fragment of a snuff or blacking bottle was found in the fill (see Figure 35). Blacking is a paste or liquid for polishing shoes; thus, the artifact may be associated with possible shoemaker's activities. In Feature 266 (a posthole), the bottom half of a mid-18th-century wine bottle was found in the fill (Figure 36). The single table glass piece, apparently a portion of a colorless bottle stopper, was recovered from Feature H (Feature 219).

Other groups of artifacts are poorly represented in the assemblage (Appendix A). The foods group is deceptively well represented because of the relatively large number of oyster shells in the Feature J sample. One tool, a hoe, was recovered from Feature E (#89) (Figure 37).

conclusion, the artifact In assemblage appears to support the interpretation of the main earthfast structure and associated features as a specialized work space, whether a shop associated with shoe production (Noyall) or with maintenance activities associated with a planter's operation (Groves). Artifact density and diversity is low in the case of domestic ceramics and glasswares, indicating at most only infrequent, shortterm habitation. Relatively speaking, however, craft/artisan-related items are common and consist primarily of byproducts of iron-working.



FIGURE 36 Mid-18th-century wine bottle.



FIGURE 37 Eighteenth-century iron hoe.

.

# CHAPTER 7: PREHISTORIC COMPONENT

In this section, prehistoric artifacts from the plow zone; the relatively undisturbed subsurface, historic features; and noncultural soil anomalies are described. Judging from the lithic and collection, ceramic least at two components are represented: Late Archaic and Middle Woodland. The total assemblage consists of 10 quartzite flakes, 4 quartz flakes, 1 chert flake, 12 pieces of fire-cracked rock, 3 cores, 1 hammerstone, 2 hafted biface fragments, and 31 ceramic sherds (Table 9). These artifacts were recovered from the entire site area though most were concentrated east of the 350 E grid transect where the terrain is most level (see Figure 3).

The Archaic component is represented by two metavolcanic, Savannah River hafted biface fragments. One is the base and midsection and one is a basal element (Figure 38).

The Middle Woodland component is represented by shell- and sandtempered sherds exhibiting various surface Of the 31 sherds in the treatments. assemblage, five are identified as Mockley net-roughened (Egloff and Potter 1982:103, 104) (see Figure 38). Seven sherds are identified as Stony Creek cord marked (Egloff and Potter 1982: 99, 100, 103). A final ceramic type is represented by two sherds that were characterized by fine sand tempering and fabric-impressed surface treatment (see Figure 38). A definite ware designation for these sherds is not assigned but they appear to be Late Woodland products. The remaining collection consists of 12 shell-tempered, four sand-tempered, and one smallpebble-tempered sherds, all of which are too small for positive identification. However, typical sherd thickness and paste qualities indicate a Middle Woodland association.

The remainder of the lithic assemblage consists of cortical (n=8) and noncortical (n=7) debitage of quartzite, quartz, and chert. This debitage ranges between .25 inches to > 2.0 inches in diameter (.25 to .50 inches: n=2; .50 to 1.0 inches: n=6; 1.0 to 1.5 inches: n=3; 1.5 to 2.0 inches: n=2; > 2.0 inches: n=2). The three cores found at the site represent one quartzite core fragment, one randomly flaked quartzite cobble core, and one randomly flaked, heated quartzite cobble core. The hammerstone is a quartzite cobble (431 grams) showing three different areas of wear.

Although the prehistoric artifact assemblage is small, it does show that the area was used recurrently and was a desirable location for at least temporary occupation. Short-term periodic site use is supported by the lack of features and the low density of artifacts. Also, it must be noted that the site may be at the margin of a larger site.

Context	Qtzt <sup>a</sup>	Qtz <sup>b</sup>	Chert	FCR	Core	Tool	Pottery
Plow zone	4	2		5		2	4
Piece plot							
130.5N365.2E				1			
138N357E				1			
139.2N358.2E				1			
179.5N371.3E				1			
187N317.5E							1
216.8N372.3E					1		
218.6N372E							1
221.8N371.4E						1	
240N379 1E							1
243 2N270 7F							1
251N360 1E					1		
2511309,1E					- T		1
Cultural							1
Cultural							
reature #	1						
15	1				1		
176	1			2	+		
1/6							1
195							1
243							2
312							1
314							2
339							1
343							1
Non-cultural							
Soil anomaly <sup>d</sup>							
119	1						
126			1				1
199			1.5				2
228	1						
229	9	1					
231							2
236		1					17
246		5					1
257				1			
284							1
204	1						1
200	1						1
302							2
304							4
344	÷						r
323	1						
346							1
				and a	1.1	100	1.1

<sup>a</sup>Qtzt=Quartzite <sup>b</sup>Qtz=Quartz <sup>c</sup>FCR=Fire Cracked Rock <sup>d</sup>Number assigned during field work

TABLE 9Prehistoric artifact assemblage.



# FIGURE 38

Selected prehistoric artifacts (a - Mockley net-impressed [CS92/243]; b - Late Woodland Fabric impressed, sand tempered [Block N350/E370]; c - Late Woodland Fabric impressed, sand tempered [CS92/314]; d - Savannah River variant [Block 220-230N 370E]).

# CHAPTER 8: RESEARCH SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Phase III investigations at the Site (44CS92) involved Taylor archaeological mitigation and archival research. The research was designed to address questions concerned with the types of activities, duration of occupation, ethnic affiliation and socio-economic status of site occupants, and the site's placement in the regional settlement Field investigations of site system. structure, coupled with historical research, proved informative. The exposure and investigation of cultural features revealed that the core of the site was probably the focus of specialized rather than domestic activities during the 18th century.

The remains of a small, rectangular post-in-the-ground structure are the earliest evidence of historical site occupation. This single-bay building consisted of four large postholes/molds and was possibly constructed as early as the first quarter of the 18th century. This period of construction is evidenced by the nature of the structural remains and by two diagnostic artifacts found in the fill of two of the large posthole/molds. The four post holes had average measurements of 2.5 feet north-south by 2.2 feet eastwest and extended 1.3 feet below the subsurface (see Figure 15). These remains are indicative of a Chesapeake hole-set frame building common in the 17th and 18th-centuries (Carson et al. 1981:149-160).

A less substantial though larger addition consisting of smaller, irregularly placed posts appears to have been made to the east side of the original structure. Artifacts recovered from these post 18thfeatures indicate a mid-to-late century period of construction. The configuration of the posts representing the addition indicates that a section of the addition's south-facing wall may have been open (see Figure 12). According to Light (1984:55), blacksmith work areas were arranged for convenience and included spaces for storage, refuse, work, and domestic activities. The model Light describes is similar to the layout of the Taylor Site. All of the substantial late 18th-century features at the site were exposed in proximity to the structure and, importantly, to the apparent opening in the addition. They are arranged in a measuring relatively small area approximately 30 by 30 feet; the center of this work area was approximately 25 feet southwest of the main building (Post Configuration A) (see Figure 12) (Figure 39). The nature of the features indicates that they served specialized functions. Feature E, an irregularly shaped pit, is located within the work area and yielded a large quantity of artifacts including coal and slag (see Table 5). Its position near Features F and G, possibly the locations of anvil stumps/posts and a semipermanent forge, respectively, suggests it was a refuse area and perhaps formerly a borrow pit. Feature H, also in the work area, appears to be the remains of a small storage facility or other specialized construction. These features form a complex where accessibility was considered in spatial arrangement. Further evidence that the site functioned as a shop area is the lack of features commonly associated with domestic



FIGURE 39 View of excavated Taylor Site (Shop - upper right; Brick pavement - upper left; Trash pit - lower left; possible anvil stump feature - center.

structures, such as a chimney or hearth, root cellars, or a well, and a general lack of artifact diversity.

Information from archival research supports the archaeological interpretations. During the latter half of the 18th century, Nicholas Noyall, a shoemaker by trade, owned and occupied the parcel of land on which the site is located. Novall and his family collectively owned the property from 1762 to 1803. These dates are consistent with the cultural deposits exposed at the site. Noyall's inventory, presented in 1785, indicates that he possessed a substantial quantity of household and farm-related goods, and that he was a man of middling means (Appendix C). The sheer quantity of his belongings and the size of his family indicate that the structural remains exposed at Site 44CS92 could not have served as his home. Further, Noyall's

86

inventory lists items such as shoemaker's tools and shoe leather, farming gear, and animals that would require maintenance and special attention and facilities. Thus, the probability that the site served as a multi-functional work area is substantiated by archaeology and historical documentation. The presence of domestic-related artifacts suggest either that the Noyall home was somewhere beyond but in the vicinity of the site or that the structure (Post Configuration A) was also used as a periodic dwelling by slaves, workers, or Noyall.

The socio-economic status of the site occupants was also addressed. Theoretically, the number of workers associated with artisan duties generally indicates work load or demand. To meet demand, the head artisan or owner must have the means to support apprentices, indentured servants, or slaves. Consequently, the availability of work space should be an indicator of demand and therefore may be suggestive of relative prosperity. It is not surprising, then, that archaeologically, the most convincing socio-economic indicator at the site is related to structure size and component complexity. At the Taylor Site, the size of the building is large enough to facilitate two to three workers. The quantity of substantial cultural deposits suggests that a multitude of activities, particularly blacksmithing, were taking place. A work area of these proportions and the array of features/facilities can be construed as an indicator of at least moderate prosperity.

Historical documents were also used to determine socio-economic status. The inventory of Noyall's belongings reveals evidence of a well-furnished home, a variety of craft-related objects (for both the men and women of the family), farming tools, and livestock. Noyall also owned five slaves. The combined worth of his estate, excluding any structural assets (for these were not listed), further indicates that he was a relatively comfortable middling artisan/farmer.

Regional settlement trends during the latter half of the 18th century are characterized by continued expansion and the gradual but increasing occupation of interior lands. While access to urban centers was important, population increase and an improved network of overland transportation routes contributed to the growing number of interior settlements. The Taylor Site is situated in a geographic location optimal for both urban access and rural marketing. A craftsman such as Noyall would benefit from convenience to economic centers where specialized goods could be purchased. The placement of the site near Drum Point Creek would

have facilitated travel to Portsmouth, the closest economic center. Drum Point Creek empties into the Elizabeth River's Western Branch just north of the location of the 18th-century Church Point Ferry. The ferry was used as a main connection between Portsmouth and Suffolk. An artisan would also need to be situated in a location where consumers had access to his wares. Noyall's position along the forerunner of Pughsville Road (Route 659) would have provided visibility and accessibility to patrons.

The Taylor Site is a distinctive example of 18th-century rural occupation in which a variety of factors influenced its position within the realm of colonial expansion. This research has provided an example of the factors that influenced the geographical location and structural layout of a small, rural industrial site and has gathered data with which site comparisons can be made to develop a holistic view of regional settlement trends. As local archaeological and historical research continues, a more thorough understanding of the economic role rural artisans played in westward colonization will emerge. More specifically, the degree to which market and goods availability has influenced settlement expansion can be realized. Such information can be applied regionally to afford insights into the contributions entrepreneurs made to development of the region.

Future work on similar sites should include systematic artifact recovery across sites to enable quantitative analyses. Comparisons can then be made between artifact distribution patterns and the structural layout of the features associated with particular components. Quantities and frequencies of artifact categories can also be compared to other site types, contributing to the development of site models. These models can be used to predict site type prior to mitigation, thus enabling the researcher to develop a research design specifically suited to industrial-related sites.

#### REFERENCES CITED

Brown, Ann R.

1982 Historic Ceramic Typology with Principal Dates of Manufacture and Descriptive Characteristics for Identification. DELDOT Archaeology Series 15.

Brown, Gregory J., et al.

1990 Archaeological Investigations of the Shields Tavern Site, Williamsburg, Virginia. Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

#### Carson, Cary, et al.

1981 Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies. The Winterthur Portfolio 16:135-196.

#### Diderot, Denis

1978 Diderot Encyclopedia, The Complete Illustrations 1762-1777. Vol. III, Plates 1544-2323. New York, NY: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., Publishers.

Egloff, Keith T., and Steven R. Potter

1982 Indian Ceramics from Coastal Plain Virginia. Archaeology of Eastern North America. Vol. 10.

Hume, Ivor Noel

- 1969 Glass in Colonial Williamsburg's Archaeological Collections. Colonial Williamsburg Archaeological Series No. 1. The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- 1980 A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

#### Kelso, William M.

1984 Kingmill Plantations, 1619-1800: Archaeology of Country Life in Colonial Virginia. New York, NY: Academic Press, Inc.

#### Light, John D.

1984 The Archaeological Investigation of Blacksmith Shops. Journal of Industrial Archaeology 10(1):55-88.

#### Smith, Jane L.

1989 Phase II Significance Evaluation of Cultural Resources in the Route 664 Corridor, City of Chesapeake, Virginia. James Madison University Archeological Research Center, Harrisonburg, Virginia. Submitted to Virginia Department of Transportation, Richmond. Smolek, Michael A., and Wayne E. Clark

1982 Spacial Patterning of 17th Century Plantations in the Chesapeake. Paper presented at Annual meeting of the Society of Historical Archaeology, Philadelphia.

Henry, Elvin F., James Chudoba, and H. C. Porter

1959 Norfolk County, Virginia. United States Department of Agriculture. Soil Conservation Service, in cooperation with Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station. Series 1953, No. 5.

South, Stanley A.

1977 Method and Theory in Historical Archeology. New York, NY: Academic Press, Inc.

APPENDIX A

## SITE: 44CS92

## **CONTEXT:** General Surface

- 4 Fire cracked rock
- 2 Debitage, quartz
- 3 Debitage, quartzite
- 1 Biface
- 1 Hammerstone?
- 3 Aboriginal pottery: coarse sand temper, sand temper, cord-marked
- 1 Aboriginal pottery: pebble temper, sandy paste, plain
- 1 Brown stoneware
- 1 Coarse earthenware: orange to dark orange body with mica flecks, interior white slip decoration under clear lead glaze
- 1 Coarse earthenware: rim fragment, hollowware, light orange body with sand inclusions, mica flecks, interior clear lead glaze
- 1 Delftware: rim fragment, hollowware
- 4 Pearlware: hand painted blue
- 1 Pearlware: hand painted polychrome, pastel palette
- 1 Pearlware: mocha
- 3 Pearlware: transfer printed blue
- 1 Pearlware: lid fragment, teapot, hand painted blue
- 1 Pearlware: rim fragment, plate, shell-edged blue
- 1 Pearlware: rim fragment, plate, shell-edged green
- 1 Pearlware: rim fragment, teabowl?, transfer printed blue
- 1 Staffordshire slipware: rim fragment, flatware, combed
- 1 Staffordshire slipware: rim fragment, flatware, trailed
- 1 White saltglazed stoneware: base fragment, hollowware
- 1 Whiteware: rim fragment, plate, embossed, edged blue
- 1 Whiteware: rim fragment, plate, shell-edged blue
- 1 Bottle glass, dark green: base fragment
- 3 Window glass

# CONTEXT: Disturbed Topsoil

- 1 Bennington-type Ware
- 1 Coarse earthenware: base fragment, hollowware, Buckley
- 2 Creamware
- 4 Pearlware
- 1 Pearlware: hand painted blue
- 1 Pearlware: hand painted green
- 2 Pearlware: dipped
- 1 Pearlware: rim fragment, saucer, hand painted green
- 1 Porcelain: base fragment, hollowware
- 1 Whiteware: base fragment, plate, transfer printed black partial Royal Arms mark, "WARRAN(TED)"
- 1 Bottle glass, dark green
- 4 Window glass
- 2 Iron fragments, indeterminate
- 2 Nails, indeterminate

CONTEXT: Disturbed Topsoil LOCATION: N160 E320

- 1 Clay pipe stem, English: SHD 4/64-1
- 1 Coarse earthenware: red-orange body with clay inclusions, interior dark brown lead glaze
- 1 Window glass
- 1 Nail, indeterminate
- 4 Coal
- 2 Oyster shell fragments
- 2 Oyster shell, lower valve

CONTEXT: Disturbed Topsoil LOCATION: N180 E190

- 2 Creamware
- 1 Creamware: mocha
- 1 White saltglazed stoneware
- 1 Bottle glass, dark green
- 1 Nail fragment
- 2 Slag
- 2 Coal
- 1 Flint fragment, grey
- 1 Oyster shell fragment

# CONTEXT: Disturbed Topsoil LOCATION: N180 E320

1 Bottle glass, dark green

# CONTEXT: Disturbed Topsoil LOCATION: N190 E330

- 1 Fire cracked rock
- 2 Coarse earthenware: buff body with interior and exterior clear lead glaze
- 1 Pearlware: hand painted blue
- 1 Pearlware: hand painted polychrome, bright palette
- 1 Band fragment, iron

# CONTEXT: Disturbed Topsoil LOCATION: N190 E340

- 1 Debitage, quartzite
- 1 Staffordshire slipware: trailed
- 1 Whiteware
- 1 Bottle glass, dark green

## CONTEXT: Disturbed Topsoil LOCATION: N200 E330

- 1 Coarse earthenware: buff body with interior and exterior black iron glaze
- 2 Bottle glass, green-blue
- 1 Nail fragment

## CONTEXT: Disturbed Topsoil LOCATION: N200 E340

1 Machinery hardware with cotter pin, iron; 6 1/8" length

# CONTEXT: Disturbed Topsoil LOCATION: N210 E320

- Pearlware: base fragment, saucer, hand painted polychrome, bright palette, stamped "E. W.../WAR...", with spread eagle, Enoch Wood & Sons, c. 1818-1846 mark
- 1 Pearlware: rim fragment, cup, transfer printed blue

CONTEXT: Disturbed Topsoil LOCATION: N210 E330

- 1 Creamware: burned
- 1 Flint fragment, grey

CONTEXT: Disturbed Topsoil LOCATION: N210 E340

1 Coarse earthenware: dark orange body with interior and exterior clear lead glaze

CONTEXT: Block N140 E350 LOCATION: N138 E357 Piece Plot

1 Fire cracked rock

CONTEXT: Block N140 E350 LOCATION: N139.2 E358.2 Piece Plot

1 Fire cracked rock

CONTEXT: Block N140 E360 LOCATION: N130.5 E365.2 Piece Plot

1 Fire cracked rock

CONTEXT: Block N150 E330 LOCATION: N141 E332 Piece Plot

- 1 Pearlware: hand painted blue
- 1 Nail, indeterminate
- 5 Brick fragments, handmade

CONTEXT: Block N180 E310 LOCATION: N171 E318.6 Piece Plot

1 Iron object fragment, indeterminate

CONTEXT: Block N180 E360 LOCATION: N179.5 E371.3 Piece Plot

1 Fire cracked rock

CONTEXT: Block N190 E310 LOCATION: N187 E317.5 Piece Plot

1 Aboriginal pottery: shell temper, silty paste, indeterminate surface treatment

CONTEXT: Block N220 E370 LOCATION: N216.8 E372.3 Piece Plot

1 Core

CONTEXT: Block N220 E370 LOCATION: N218.6 E372 Piece Plot

1 Aboriginal pottery: shell temper, silty paste, indeterminate surface treatment

CONTEXT: Block N220 E370 LOCATION: N221.8 E371.4 Piece Plot

1 Projectile point fragment, basal; stemmed

CONTEXT: Block N240 E370 LOCATION: N235.5 E378.7 Piece Plot

10 Bone

CONTEXT: Block N260 E360 LOCATION: N251 E369.1 Piece Plot

1 Core fragment?

CONTEXT: Block N260 E360 LOCATION: N253.7 E364.1 Piece Plot

1 Coal?, burned

CONTEXT: Block N260 E370 LOCATION: N252.5 E376.5 Piece Plot

1 Aboriginal pottery: coarse sand temper, sandy paste, fabric-impressed?

CONTEXT: Block N340 E370 LOCATION: N243.2 E279.7 Piece Plot

1 Aboriginal pottery: sand temper, sandy paste, indeterminate surface treatment

CONTEXT: Block N350 E370 LOCATION: N240.4 E379. 1 Piece Plot

1 Aboriginal pottery: sand temper, sandy paste, fabricimpressed

CONTEXT: CS92/3 TPQ: NDA

1 Bog iron

CONTEXT: CS92/5 TPQ: NDA

2 Brick fragments, handmade?

CONTEXT: CS92/13-north half TPQ: NDA

- 17 Oyster shell, lower valve
- 20 Oyster shell, upper valve

CONTEXT: CS92/13-south half TPQ: NDA

- 7 Oyster shell, lower valve
- 8 Oyster shell, upper valve

CONTEXT: CS92/14 TPQ: 18th c.

1 Bottle glass, dark green: neck fragment, snuff/ blacking

CONTEXT: CS92/15 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Debitage, quartzite
- 1 Nail, wrought?
- 6 Brick fragments, handmade

# CONTEXT: CS92/16 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Nail, indeterminate
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/17 TPQ: 18th c.

1 Staffordshire slipware: rim fragment, cup, dotdecorated

# CONTEXT: CS92/19 TPQ: NDA

1 Nail, wrought?

CONTEXT: CS92/20 TPQ: NDA

1 Flint fragment, amber

CONTEXT: CS92/26 TPQ: 18th c.

- 1 Clay pipe bowl fragment, English
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/27 TPQ: NDA

3 Brick fragments, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/34 TPQ: NDA

1 Iron fragment, flat

CONTEXT: CS92/35 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Nail, indeterminate
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade

# CONTEXT: CS92/44 TPQ: NDA

1 Brick fragment, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/56 TPQ: NDA

1 Brick fragment, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/77 TPQ: 18th c.

- 1 Delftware: monochrome blue
- 1 Nail, indeterminate

CONTEXT: CS92/79 TPQ: NDA

1 Brick fragment, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/81 TPQ: post 1780

- 1 Pearlware: rim fragment, plate, shell-edged blue
- 1 Staffordshire slipware: base fragment, cup
- 2 Nails, indeterminate
- 1 Nail fragment

CONTEXT: CS92/82 TPQ: NDA

2 Iron concretions

CONTEXT: CS92/86 TPQ: NDA

2 Nail fragments

CONTEXT: CS92/88 TPQ: 18th c.?

2 Window glass, 18th c.?
### CONTEXT: CS92/89A TPQ: NDA

#### 11 Brick bats, handmade

#### CONTEXT: CS92/89A-west half TPQ: post 1770

- 1 Coarse earthenware: Buckley
- 1 Coarse earthenware: rim fragment, flatware?, orangered body with sand inclusions, mica flecks, interior dark brown lead glaze
- 1 Coarse earthenware: rim fragment, flatware?, orangered body with sand inclusions, mica flecks, interior white slip decoration under dark brown lead glaze
- 1 Coarse earthenware: rim fragment, hollowware, orangered brick-like body with exterior white slip decoration under interior and exterior clear lead glaze
- 1 Creamware: base fragment, hollowware
- 1 Staffordshire slipware
- 1 White saltglazed stoneware: base fragment, mug?
- 6 Iron fragments, flat
- 1 Iron object fragment, indeterminate
- 26 Nails, indeterminate
- 3 Nail fragments
- 14 Slag
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade
- 34 Coal
- 3 Oyster shell fragments

CONTEXT: CS92/89A-east half TPQ: post 1770

- 2 Fire cracked rock
- 1 Debitage, quartzite
- 1 Core
- 1 Chinese porcelain: rim fragment, hollowware, underglaze blue
- 2 Coarse earthenware: orange-red body with sand inclusions, mica flecks, interior dark brown lead glaze
- 2 Coarse earthenware: rim fragments, flatware?, orangered body with sand inclusions, mica flecks, interior white slip decoration under dark brown lead glaze
- 2 Creamware
- 1 Delftware

## CONTEXT: CS92/89A-east half CONTINUED:

- 1 Refined earthenware: orange body with exterior clear lead glaze
- 1 White saltglazed stoneware
- 1 Bolt?, iron
- 1 Hasp/hinge fragment?, iron
- 2 Iron concretions
- 13 Nails, indeterminate
- 12 Nail fragments
- 20 Slag
- 4 Brick fragments, handmade
- 62 Coal
- 2 Oyster shell fragments

## CONTEXT: CS92/89B-west half TPQ: NDA

- 1 Slag
- 1 Coal

## CONTEXT: CS92/89B-east half TPQ: NDA

- 1 Hoe, iron
- 8 Iron fragments, flat

## CONTEXT: CS92/96 TPQ: NDA

2 Brick fragments, handmade?

## CONTEXT: CS92/105 TPQ: post 1770

- 2 Creamware
- 1 Slag
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade
- 1 Coal cinder

#### CONTEXT: CS92/106 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Slag
- 2 Brick fragments, handmade

#### CONTEXT: CS92/119 TPQ: NDA

1 Debitage, quartzite

## CONTEXT: CS92/126 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Aboriginal pottery: shell temper, sandy paste, indeterminate surface treatment
- 1 Flint fragment, grey

#### CONTEXT: CS92/128 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Slag
- 2 Brick fragments, handmade

### CONTEXT: CS92/133 TPQ: NDA

3 Brick fragments, handmade

# CONTEXT: CS92/135 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Nail fragment
- 1 Sand concretion, noncultural; discarded

#### CONTEXT: CS92/141 TPQ: NDA

1 Glass fragment, dark green

# CONTEXT: CS92/155 TPQ: NDA

1 Slag

## CONTEXT: CS92/166 TPQ: NDA

1 Ceramic fragment: burned

## CONTEXT: CS92/167 TPQ: NDA

2 Brick fragments, handmade

#### CONTEXT: CS92/168 TPQ: NDA

5 Brick fragments, handmade

### CONTEXT: CS92/174 TPQ: NDA

2 Brick fragments, handmade

## CONTEXT: CS92/176 TPQ: post 1720

- 1 Aboriginal pottery: shell temper, silty paste, indeterminate surface treatment
- 1 White saltglazed stoneware
- 1 Nail, indeterminate
- 2 Brick fragments handmade

# CONTEXT: CS92/177 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Nail, wrought
- 1 Nail fragment

#### CONTEXT: CS92/181 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Nail fragment
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade
- 1 Oyster shell fragment

#### CONTEXT: CS92/183 TPQ: NDA

2 Brick fragments, handmade?

# CONTEXT: CS92/189 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Nail fragment
- 2 Slag
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/190 TPQ: NDA

1 Brick fragment, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/195 TPQ: 18th c.

- 1 Aboriginal pottery: shell temper, silty paste, indeterminate surface treatment
- 1 Delftware
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/198 TPQ: NDA

1 Sand concretion, noncultural; discarded

CONTEXT: CS92/199 TPQ: NDA

2 Aboriginal pottery: shell temper, silty paste, indeterminate surface treatment

### CONTEXT: CS92/204 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Nail fragment
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade

#### CONTEXT: CS92/219A TPQ: post 1795

- 1 Pearlware: transfer printed blue
- 1 Bottle glass, dark green
- 1 Bottle glass, dark green: base fragment
- 1 Table glass, colorless: stopper fragment?
- 1 Iron fragment, flat

## CONTEXT: CS92/219A CONTINUED:

- 2 Brick fragments, handmade
- 2 Oyster shell fragments

## CONTEXT: CS92/219B TPQ: 18th c.

- 1 Bottle glass, dark green
- 1 Slag
- 4 Brick fragments, handmade

# CONTEXT: CS92/219C TPQ: NDA

1 Oyster shell fragment

#### CONTEXT: CS92/219D TPQ: NDA

- 1 Brick fragment, handmade
- 2 Brick bats, handmade
- 2 Bricks, handmade; 8 1/2" x 4 3/8" x 2 3/8", 8 3/4" x 4 1/8" x 2 3/8"

CONTEXT: CS92/224 TPQ: post 1720

- 1 White saltglazed stoneware: base fragment, mug
- 1 Slag

CONTEXT: CS92/227 TPQ: NDA

3 Brick fragments, handmade

### CONTEXT: CS92/228 TPQ: NDA

1 Debitage, quartzite

# CONTEXT: CS92/229 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Debitage, quartz
- 1 Slag

CONTEXT: CS92/231 TPQ: NDA

- 2 Aboriginal pottery: shell temper, sandy paste, indeterminate surface treatment
- 1 Nail fragment
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade

## CONTEXT: CS92/234 TPQ: NDA

3 Brick fragments, handmade

#### CONTEXT: CS92/236 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Debitage, quartz
- 6 Brick fragments, handmade

#### CONTEXT: CS92/237 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Nail, wrought
- 3 Slag
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade
- 1 Coal cinder

### CONTEXT: CS92/243 TPQ: 18th c.

- 2 Aboriginal pottery: rim fragments, straight, crimped, shell temper, sandy paste, net-impressed
- 1 Coarse earthenware: base fragment, indeterminate, red-orange body with yellow clay inclusions, interior dark brown lead glaze
- 1 Iron fragment, flat
- 2 Brick fragments, handmade
- 2 Coal

# CONTEXT: CS92/245 TPQ: 18th c.

- 2 Delftware
- 1 Delftware: bisque
- 1 Delftware: monochrome blue
- 1 Delftware: base fragment, plate, monochrome blue
- 3 Brick fragments, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/246 TPQ: NDA

1 Aboriginal pottery: shell temper, sandy paste, indeterminate surface treatment

CONTEXT: CS92/247 TPQ: NDA

1 Bone

CONTEXT: CS92/250 TPQ: 18th c.

- 1 Staffordshire slipware: trailed
- 1 Slag
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade
- 1 Coal cinder

# CONTEXT: CS92/251 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Iron concretion
- 1 Nail fragment
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/257 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Fire cracked rock
- 3 Brick fragments, handmade?
- 1 Oyster shell, lower valve

# CONTEXT: CS92/266 TPQ: c. mid 18th c.

- 1 Coarse earthenware: buff body with interior and exterior clear lead glaze
- 6 Bottle glass, dark green
- 1 Bottle glass, dark green: base fragment
- 1 Bottle glass, dark green: base, c. mid 18th c.
- 1 Nail fragment
- 2 Brick fragments, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/275 TPQ: post 1780

1 Pearlware

CONTEXT: CS92/282 TPQ: NDA

1 Sand concretion, noncultural; discarded

CONTEXT: CS92/284 TPQ: NDA

1 Aboriginal pottery: sand temper, sandy paste, indeterminate surface treatment

CONTEXT: CS92/285 TPQ: NDA

1 Brick fragment, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/286 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Debitage, quartzite
- 1 Aboriginal pottery: indeterminate temper, sandy paste, plain?

CONTEXT: CS92/292 TPQ: NDA

1 Sand concretion, noncultural; discarded

#### CONTEXT: CS92/295 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Nail fragment
- 3 Brick fragments, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/302 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Aboriginal pottery: shell temper, sandy paste, indeterminate surface treatment
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/304 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Aboriginal pottery: sand temper, sandy paste, indeterminate surface treatment
- 1 Aboriginal pottery: shell temper?, sandy paste, indeterminate surface treatment

CONTEXT: CS92/308 TPQ: 18th c.

1 Staffordshire slipware: trailed

CONTEXT: CS92/312 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Aboriginal pottery: shell temper?, silty paste, indeterminate surface treatment
- 3 Brick fragments, handmade
- 1 Oyster shell fragment

CONTEXT: CS92/313 TPQ: NDA

1 Brick fragment, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/314 TPQ: NDA

- 2 Aboriginal pottery: sand temper?, sandy paste, fabric-impressed
- 1 Nail, wrought
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade

#### CONTEXT: CS92/318 TPQ: NDA

1 Brick fragment, handmade

#### CONTEXT: CS92/322 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Aboriginal pottery: sand temper?, sandy paste, net-impressed
- 1 Brick fragment

### CONTEXT: CS92/323 TPQ: NDA

1 Debitage, quartzite

### CONTEXT: CS92/326 TPQ: NDA

2 Brick fragments, handmade

### CONTEXT: CS92/333 TPQ: NDA

1 Brick fragment, handmade

#### CONTEXT: CS92/339 TPQ: post 1770

- 1 Aboriginal pottery: shell temper?, sandy paste, fabric-impressed
- 1 Creamware
- 1 Creamware: base fragment, plate

CONTEXT: CS92/342 TPQ: NDA

1 Brick fragment, handmade

#### CONTEXT: CS92/343 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Aboriginal pottery: shell temper, sandy paste, indeterminate surface treatment
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/346 TPQ: 18th c.

-

- 1 Aboriginal pottery: base fragment, sand temper, sandy paste, cord-marked?
- 1 Delftware: monochrome blue

CONTEXT: CS92/358 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Brick fragment, handmade
- 1 Oyster shell fragment

CONTEXT: CS92/359 TPQ: NDA

1 Brick fragment, handmade

CONTEXT: CS92/360 TPQ: NDA

- 1 Slag
- 1 Brick fragment, handmade
- 1 Coal