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ABSTRACT

This study examines the growth and development of one section of the town of Williamsburg during the 18th century as a test case for such an examination of the entire town. One city block adjacent to the Governor's Palace was chosen for a detailed study of how political, economic, and social changes were reflected in documentary, archaeological and architectural information. This area, Block 29, was selected because of the completeness of its extant documentary, archaeological and architectural record.

In this study, a general investigation of all lots within Williamsburg's town boundaries was conducted through the use of documentary sources, with overall maps created at intervals throughout the 18th century revealing patterns in physical growth, land use, and social and economic clustering. The detailed analysis of Block 29 was compared with information gathered from the overall survey of Williamsburg to determine whether changes occurring in this small segment of town were reflected in the larger patterns of growth and transformation evident in the broad-based study. Information was examined in the context of four major phases of the town's development, in order to define interrelationships between settlement patterns and the physical, social, and economic development of Williamsburg.

Through a combination of documentary, archaeological and architectural information, a clearer picture of Block 29 in the 18th century emerged. In the first half of the century, the character of the block was primarily mixed commercial and residential. This mixed character can perhaps be explained by the overall functions Williamsburg served during that period as Virginia's leading urban center. Later, as Williamsburg's social and economic importance declined, the commercial character of the block disappeared completely, becoming entirely residential after the early 1760s. With this abandonment of commercial establishments, Block 29 took on the aspects of a gentry neighborhood. The area remained inhabited by wealthy residents even after the removal of the capital from Williamsburg during the Revolutionary War.

As expected, changes on Block 29 were found to be reflective, in some aspects, of changes which were taking places throughout the city of Williamsburg as a result of social, economic and political factors. Perhaps one of the major contributions of this study has been the demonstration that through using a multidisciplinary approach to the study of communities, a more accurate portrayal of 18th-century life can be derived.
"NEAR THE GOVERNOR'S":
PATTERNS OF DEVELOPMENT OF THREE PROPERTIES
ALONG WILLIAMSBURG'S PALACE AND NICHOLSON STREETS
IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Study Area

Williamsburg, the capital of the Virginia Colony for over three quarters of a century, is possibly one of the most studied of North America’s colonial towns (Figure 1). From its inception as a series of tobacco plantations in its 17th-century Middle Plantation period, Williamsburg developed into a thriving community in the 18th century. Today the colonial capital has been restored to its late 18th-century appearance, a living museum where visitors can learn, not only about important events which took place there that affected the course of history, but also about daily life in the colonial period. One of the current goals of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation is to portray the evolution of American society in the 17th and 18th centuries (CWF 1985), with the basis for this interpretive effort rooted in extensive documentary, archaeological, and architectural evidence.

Today’s visitors to the Historic Area see the town as it appeared in the 1770s, on the eve of the American Revolution. At that time, Williamsburg was the capital of the Virginia colony, which stretched from the Chesapeake Bay west to the Mississippi River (Salmon 1983:121). In addition to Williamsburg’s role in the economy and politics of the Virginia colony, the town also served as the scene for
Figure 1.
many important events leading to the Revolutionary War. Williamsburg, however, had not always been the prosperous and powerful town it was in the third quarter of the 18th century; less than one hundred years earlier only a winding horse path and several tobacco plantations occupied the town's future location. Unfortunately, Williamsburg's rise to power was relatively short-lived, as well. Even before the end of the Revolutionary War, the Virginia capital had been moved west to Richmond. The last decades of the 18th century and the opening years of the next saw depressed economic conditions and a dwindling population for Williamsburg.

Throughout its existence, Williamsburg, like all other urban areas, has been a vital community, responding to meet the changing needs and functions of its inhabitants and those residing in its hinterlands. It is important, therefore, to view Williamsburg, not only as it appeared during the third quarter of the 18th century, but also in terms of the years preceding and following the American Revolution. One important aspect of that history is the actual physical growth of the town during the 18th century and beyond. Although generalities about Williamsburg's growth and development have been made based on documentary evidence, a detailed study of this sort has never been completed.

Study Goals

It is the purpose of this paper to study the physical growth and development of one section of Williamsburg during the 18th century as a test case for such an examination of the entire town. One city block adjacent to the Governor's Palace was chosen for a detailed study of how political, economic and social changes are
reflected in documentary, archaeological and architectural information. This area was chosen due to the relative completeness of the documentary record, as well as the quantity of archaeological research that has been conducted there.

For this study, a general investigation of all lots within the town boundaries was conducted through the use of documentary sources. Overall town maps created at intervals throughout the study period revealed patterns in physical growth, land use, and social and economic clustering. Information on Block 29, the area chosen for a detailed study, was generated from the integrated analysis of documentary, archaeological and architectural information. This detailed analysis of a small segment of the town will then be compared with information gathered from the overall survey of Williamsburg to determine whether the changes occurring on Block 29 are reflected in the larger patterns of growth and transformation evident in the broad-based study. The questions addressed in this study are concerned with the physical development of the block, the social and economic status of the property owners, and possible patterning produced within these realms. Information was examined in the context of four major phases of the town’s development (described in Chapter V), in order to define interrelationships between settlement patterns and the physical, social, and economic development of Williamsburg. Each of these issues will be discussed in detail in Chapter III.

Theoretical Framework

For the past several decades, community-based studies have been a focus of research in various disciplines within the social sciences. Growth and change is a
common theme among these studies, which encompass the fields of geography, history, anthropology, and archaeology. Social historians have focused on the development of towns and cities through the use of quantifiable documentary research, while social and cultural geographers study the ways in which man and his culture have fashioned the land upon which he lives. Anthropologists and archaeologists have also made valuable contributions to the study of urban areas, charting their rise within ancient civilizations, as well as in modern cultures. More recently, historical archaeologists have begun sorting out the complex problems of excavating densely settled urban areas, using archaeology and documentary evidence to answer questions about land use, consumer behavior, and cultural change.

the disciplines outlined above as a framework for an interdisciplinary discussion of 18th-century Williamsburg.

A holistic approach, which attempts to study a culture in its entirety, is a major component of anthropological research (Basham 1978:25, Garbarino 1977). In urban anthropological studies, this overarching perspective has proven to be difficult to accomplish, given the scope and scale of today's urban areas. One of the ways in which anthropologists have dealt with this problem is by restricting the spatial area of study (Whyte 1955, Warner 1963, Liebow 1967). By combining anthropological ethnographic methods with sociological survey techniques, a more holistic approach can be adopted. The large amounts of data generated through survey methods in combination with the intensive study of a few informants allows overall conclusions to be drawn without losing sight of the people the study involves. The Block 29 study will follow this format, comparing detailed information from one area with that generated from an overview of the entire town.

In the fields of historical geography and archaeology, interest in recent years has moved beyond the mere description of patterns in space, in an attempt to detect change as it is brought about by social, political, and environmental factors (Palm 1981:8). One popular approach in historical archaeology has been to view the city, not as a series of sites, but as a single system, with overall patterns and processes of change (Dickens 1982:xx). This shift in focus has been evident in the increased output of diachronic research studies, which concentrate on the processes which shape settlement patterns (Merrens 1965:545; Dodgshon and Butlin 1978:vii). Using a diachronic approach this study will chart the processes of change brought about by political, economic and social factors occurring in Williamsburg and the surrounding
area throughout the 18th century.

The structure, functions and interrelationships of urban areas have been one focus of urban historical geographers. Harold Carter’s book-length treatment of the subject, entitled *An Introduction to Urban Historical Geography* (1983) explores, in part, the origins of urban areas, the development of central business districts, and the transition between pre-industrial and industrial societies. Carter takes a functional approach in defining the status of towns; a perspective which is echoed in the research of other historical geographers, such as Ernst and Merrens (1973), O’Mara (1983:7), and Briggs (1970:1). Archaeological and anthropological studies have also taken a functional approach in classifying urban areas (Macfarlane 1977, Fox 1977, Cressey and Stephens 1982, Heite and Heite 1986). This approach was applied to Williamsburg in order to discover whether the town’s social, political and economic functions altered during the 18th century. In order to isolate changing functional patterns, each lot was coded at ten year intervals throughout the century, using documentary evidence. Functional categories were based on those used by Cressey and colleagues (1982) in their study of 19th-century Alexandria, Virginia. The categories were as follows: a) commercial/light industrial, b) residential c) mixed commercial and residential d) agricultural e) governmental f) religious or public, g) vacant/undeveloped and h) unknown. Williamsburg will be viewed as a single site, with the maps showing changes which affected the town as a whole. By examining the town functionally throughout the century, a diachronic approach, depicting processes of change within Williamsburg, was taken.

One of the main focuses of recent urban archaeology has been the search for patterns which relate archaeological data to human behavior. Interest has centered
on intra- and intersite land use and settlement patterns, particularly as they relate to the social and economic development of urban areas (Wall 1987, Castille 1985, Geismar 1985, Lewis 1984, Wall and Pickman 1985, Pendery 1977, Swauger 1978, Rothschild 1987, Cressey et al 1982). In this vein, much research has been directed towards finding patterns in material culture reflecting social and economic stratification (Baugher and Venables 1987, Shepard 1987, McBride and McBride 1987, Castille 1985, Dyson 1982, Rothschild, Geismar, and Wall 1985, Wall and Pickman 1985). Ceramics, and to a lesser extent, glass vessels, have been the artifacts used in socio-economic status research. These items have the advantages of being durable, commonly found in historic period archaeological assemblages, and have been shown to be reliable indicators of social and economic stratification (Dyson 1982, Spencer-Wood 1987). The mean ceramic dating formula and pattern recognition of Stanley South (1977), and the price indexing of Miller (1980) have figured prominently in the ceramic analysis of a number of these studies (Mrozowski 1984, Wall and Pickman 1985, Castille 1985, Geismar 1985, McBride and McBride 1987).

Another important advance in the study of historical archaeology has been its focus on household analysis (Beaudry 1984, Cressey 1983, Kramer 1982, Mrozowski 1981, 1984). A household has been defined as

"'co-resident domestic group' composed of 'those who share the same physical space for the purposes of eating, sleeping, taking rest and leisure, growing up, childrearing, and procreating'" (Laslett 1972:24 as quoted in Beaudry 1984).

The household, which serves as the basic social unit for most cultures, has long been used by anthropologists (Goldschmidt and Kunkel 1971, Horne 1982),

The detailed study of Block 29 will focus, not only on the function of each lot, but will examine socioeconomic data recoverable from the results of archaeological and architectural research. Through the analysis of glass and ceramics in archaeological assemblages at the household level, information on social and economic changes occurring on Block 29 will be determined. Households will not be strictly tied to kinship with the property owner, but will include others living on the property, such as indentured servants, lodgers, and slaves. A basis for comparison with the Block 29 data will be found in the results of historical research using the York County records. These sources are discussed more fully in the following sections.

**Research Design**

This study of the physical growth and development of Block 29 during the 18th century will make use of several types of data. A combination of primary
historical sources and data obtained through the archaeological excavation and architectural analysis of the block's properties will allow the delineation of trends. These trends should be evident in patterns of growth and area specialization, as well as residential and commercial development.

Historical records have been recognized and used for centuries as sources of information about past cultures. Only within the last few decades, however, has the importance of material objects recovered from historic period archaeological contexts been recognized as an important means of recovering information about those cultures who have left behind written records (Ferguson 1977; Deetz 1977a:9). Some social historians have argued that artifact studies have so far contributed little to developing the main themes of American history (Carson 1978:42), although not discounting the possibilities within future research. To be sure, artifact studies up until that point, in the late 1970s, had been concerned primarily with identification, dating, and site-specific conclusions. Historical archaeologists themselves admitted that as a group they were having difficulty realizing anthropological research goals (Brown 1977:4, South 1977:318, Willey and Sabloff 1980:208). In the intervening years, however, the questions asked by historical archaeologists of their data have moved beyond simple analysis and identification to encompass more broad-based concerns. Questions concerning settlement patterns (Lewis 1984, Paynter 1982, Cressey et al 1982), socio-economic status (Otto 1984, Deagan 1982, Wise 1976, Dyson 1982, Herman 1984, Felton and Schulz 1983) and the cultural adaptations of the English and Africans to life in the North American colony (Deetz 1977b:138-154, Neiman 1980, Singleton 1980, 1985) are topics which have been addressed with success through archaeological research.
Addressing the questions of archaeology's place in making a major contribution to our understanding of the past, Robert Schuyler asks

**How much does a culture record about its basic economic, political, social and ecological structure when frequently the individuals that compose the society in question are only superficially aware of or at least take for granted such patterns and processes? (1972:122)**

Those patterns and processes, he argues, are recoverable through archaeological research. Although artifacts left behind as yard scatter or in trash deposits make up a large part of archaeological data, material culture is now recognized as consisting of much more than just these broken objects. Material culture also includes a whole spectrum of behaviors, languages, and ideas which are expressed through building remains, property designs, and physical modification to the environment on various levels. This study will examine not only those artifacts assemblages left behind by man's activities on their property, but also other manifestations of behavior, such as use of space within lots, house form, and the larger aspects of functional patterning within the town.

**Limitations of the Data**

Archaeological and historical records are complementary sources of information; with each type of data often offsetting the limitations of the other. A few of the limitations of each data base will be discussed briefly here. In spite of the variety and quantity of historical data available for the project area, the standard limitations of all historical records must be taken into account. Perhaps the most serious limitation of historical data is its often erratic preservation (Merrens 1964,
Macfarlane 1977). For example, a majority of the pre-Civil War records for the southern half of Williamsburg have been destroyed. Although some of this information has been recaptured through the use of additional sources, reconstructing the history of many of the town's lots is impossible. Additionally, historical records can be biased in a number of ways. Many records are biased in favor of recording certain segments of the population; for example, male heads of household will be more frequently represented than women, minorities or the indigent (Garrioch 1986, Boulton 1987, Rosen 1981:145, Macfarlane 1977:206). Although these groups are vastly under-represented in the historical record, they do appear in the archaeological record. As Henry Glassie has stated, one of the tasks of historical archaeologists is "to rescue from anonymity the average people of the past" (Glassie 1977:29). Also, documents may sometimes be inaccurate or misleading for various reasons. For example, William Rogers of Yorktown, Virginia was described as a "poor potter" in the Governor's official correspondence to the Lords of the Board of Trade in England. Archaeological investigations have discovered, however, that he owned a large and thriving pottery operation (Barka 1985). This misleading representation of William Roger's business in the records may have served to divert attention from the success of this enterprise.

To be sure, archaeological data has its limitations as well. The archaeological record is often incomplete and imperfect, marred by the differential preservation of certain types of material and the effects of subsequent disturbances to the site. These and other cultural and environmental processes of archaeological site formation transform or distort the archaeological record, making it difficult to read behavior directly from archaeological data (Schiffer 1987, South 1977:297).
Fortunately, these formation processes exhibit patterns, making it possible for the archaeologist to correct for the distortions through the use of analytical and inferential tools (Schiffer 1987:10).

The archaeological profession has also suffered from a lack of methodological rigor, leading to insecurities about the knowledge produced within the field (Leone 1972:133). Perhaps Lewis Binford most effectively stated the problem:

The practical limitations on our knowledge of the past are not inherent in the nature of the archaeological record; the limitations lie in our methodological naivete, in our lack of development for principles determining the relevance of archaeological remains to propositions regarding processes and events of the past (1972:96).

Through the development of relevant questions and research designs, archaeologists possess a strong tool for the recovery of meaningful information about past cultures. Granted, artifacts are "less delicately expressive and reflective than most modes of human communication" (Glassie 1977:28), but are one of the few means of unbiased documentation available for some segments of society.

The problems inherent in conducting archaeological research in an urban setting have been discussed by numerous historical archaeologists (Dickens 1982, Staski 1982, 1987, Garrow 1984). Unlike single occupation sites whose ownership can be associated with one household, urban sites are a complex amalgam of features and structures dating to many time periods and multiple owners. Major land alterations, secondary refuse, and complex depositional sequences are just some of the problems which archaeologists working in urban areas face. Advances in the methodology of urban archaeology have allowed more confidence in the quality of data recovered from urban contexts (Staski 1982, 1987). Staski (1982) argues that despite the destructive processes of urbanization, the quality of data recovered by
urban archaeologists is generally good.

Since research in the social sciences has shown households to be a basic unit of analysis, it is imperative that archaeologists be able to isolate household data from their sites. This has been accomplished successfully on urban lots through the combination of archaeological and historical data (Moran et al 1982, Mrozowski 1984). The excellent documentation on Block 29 provides an almost unbroken chain of title for each lot. Artifact assemblages chosen for analysis were all from discrete features which had been used for the deposition of garbage, such as privies, trash pits, or gully fill. All features chosen had a tightly datable range of deposition. Although horizontal layers of debris which had been created through activity on the lots were excavated on each site, these are more difficult to attribute to household occupations in urban situations than discrete features, and thus were not used in this study. Periods of property ownership were compared with each assemblage’s ceramic date ranges using a technique discussed in Mrozowski (1984) to establish definite household associations. Additionally, other artifactual evidence, such as inclusions of gunsmithing or pharmaceutical debris in several of the analyzed features also indicated specific household associations.

Another possible problem arising in this study is the different sampling procedures used in archaeological data recovery on Block 29. For example, several lots, those comprising the Brush-Everard property, were almost fully excavated, while others were sampled in a non-random fashion. Waterproofing of the original house and kitchen of the Grissell-Hay property necessitated excavation in the immediate vicinity of these structures, and with the exception of one small salvage project, no other detailed archaeological research has been done on this property. Therefore,
the archaeological sample from Grissell Hay might be biased due to the limited scope of the excavations. Interpretations in this report were drawn from the data available at the time of the study. Further research on Block 29 may alter the conclusions derived from this work.

Archaeological and historical documentation are used as complementary sets of data in this study. It is in this integration of the documentary and archaeological evidence that one of the major strengths of historical archaeology lies. Through the use of documents, archaeologists can go beyond inferences evident within the archaeological data (Spencer-Wood 1987:2, Crumley 1974, Leone and Crosby 1987, Beaudry 1984). Both sets of data combine to provide a more detailed picture of 18th-century Williamsburg and its inhabitants than either could give separately (Deetz 1977b:35, Noel Hume 1978:27, Spencer-Wood 1987:2). Several recent studies effectively combine historical and archaeological data to make statements about social and economic change (Felton and Schulz 1983, Herman 1984). A closer examination of the available documentary and archaeological resources for this study will follow.

The Documentary Sources

An essential component of this project was the York County Records. The 18th-century town of Williamsburg straddled both York and James City Counties, with the boundary line between the two counties running roughly down the center of Duke of Gloucester Street. As with many of Virginia's counties, the James City County court records were moved to Richmond for safekeeping during the Civil
War. When the Capitol burned in 1865, so too did most of the county records. The official documents of York County, however, never made it to Richmond and as a consequence, most of the county records survived the war. They continue to provide an invaluable source of information to historians and archaeologists alike.

The York County records remain remarkably intact, with an unbroken chain of leases, deeds and land patents extending from the 1630s to the 1830s. The county court orders, containing information about criminal and civil justice, extend for the same time period, with a short gap between 1755 and 1758. Probate records, consisting of wills, inventories, and estate appraisals, run from 1650 to 1830, and personal property and land tax lists are available beginning in 1782.

Since 1979, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation has been involved in the York County Project, a research endeavor funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities (CWF 1984). Through the compilation of biographies over 2,000 late 17th- and 18th-century York County residents (Rowe 1988), project historians have been able to locate these individuals physically in space and time. With this data, questions concerning the development and growth of Chesapeake urban centers, like Williamsburg, can be addressed. The files compiled during this project and comprehensive research results (Hellier 1989, Rowe 1988, Walsh 1983, Carr and Walsh 1985, Carson and Walsh 1981), were used extensively in this study.

Additional sources of information were the Virginia Gazette, a weekly newspaper printed in Williamsburg from 1736 to 1780 and contemporary maps of the town. Mutual Assurance Society fire insurance records, beginning in 1796, were useful for property layouts for the latter portion of the study period. The account books of a number of tradesmen indicate repairs to homes and outbuildings, while
those of merchants record purchases made by residents (Harwood, Prentis). The surviving 18th-century houses and outbuildings of Williamsburg also serve as eloquent documents of man's attempt to control his environment and to display his social aspirations.

The Archaeological Sources

Although over sixty years of archaeological research has been conducted at Colonial Williamsburg, only the results of the last thirty years of investigation on Block 29 will be used extensively in this study. It was not until the arrival of British archaeologists Ivor and Audrey Noel Hume in 1957 that stratigraphic excavation and consistent recording and collection policies began. In some instances, archaeological maps generated before 1957 were used for structural information.

The detailed stratigraphic recovery methods and large-scale excavations conducted under the direction of Ivor Noel Hume and Marley R. Brown III allow a variety of questions concerning property use, internal divisions and socio-economic status to be addressed. Selected archaeological assemblages from some of the excavations conducted along Palace Green from 1957-1988 were chosen for analysis. These assemblages were selected based on their association with a documented household (Macfarlane 1977, Beaudry 1984, Mrozowski 1984), and on a tightly datable range of deposition.

Artifacts used for this study were inventoried in D-Base III Plus, the data base management program currently in use at the Department of Archaeological Research. After mending and crossmending each of the site's
ceramic and glass artifacts, minimum vessel counts were made. These vessels and their cross-mend information were catalogued in D-Base III Plus, to allow stratigraphic associations of ceramics to be made and the data to be queried about ceramic changes over time and between households. All artifacts and site records are stored at the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Department of Archaeological Research and the Office of Archaeological Documentation.

Summary

This current study of Block 29 will examine the changes brought about by social and economic factors occurring within the town. The studies discussed above will form the basic framework for interpretation of the evidence for Williamsburg and Block 29. A functional approach, used by historical geographers, anthropologists, and archaeologists in urban research will be employed in the interpretation of the Williamsburg data.

The methods of urban anthropology, involving gathering general data from the entire town, combined with the intensive study of a few residents, are applicable in this study of Block 29, and how it relates to the entire town. Models from social history that will be most useful deal with developmental patterns and focus on physical growth (Corfield 1982, Grove 1973, Large 1984), the occupational structure of residents (Armstrong 1971, Garrioch 1986, Boulton 1987, Soltow 1956, Reed 1981), and the spatial distributions of businesses and residents based on factors such as wealth (Beier 1981, Finlay 1981, Reed 1981, MacCaffrey 1975), location (Boulton 1987, Garrioch 1986) and economy (Earle 1975, Papenfuse 1975, Mitchell 1984).
Within the field of historical geography, perhaps the most important area of research for this Williamsburg study concerns the internal structure of urban areas. This structure can be defined in terms of physical growth, the composition of commercial, industrial and residential areas, and patterns of architecture. A number of studies have focused on these topics, with numerous investigations of 17th-, 18th- and 19th-century British, European, and American communities (Swauger 1978, Langton 1975, Bastian 1975, Boulton 1987, Garrioch 1986).

This study will rely on the quantitative methods of social historians in gathering and analyzing the lot specific data. Household analysis, favored by historical archaeologists, anthropologists and historians will be used for analyzing archaeological assemblages. In this study, only assemblages which can be associated with a known household will be used in the examination of the Block 29 area. Recent studies of 18th-century York County probate inventories have created profiles of households at various wealth levels throughout the century (Carson and Walsh 1981, Carr and Walsh 1985, Walsh 1983). Generalized information from these studies will be compared with specific information on households garnered from documentary and archaeological research.

The methods described above will be used to determine and interpret patterns relating to economic, political and social forces occurring within the town. These will be discussed in the context of documentary evidence, artifacts, and archaeological and architectural information. Changes occurring in the social, political and economic structure of Virginia’s Tidewater throughout the 18th century are expected to be evident in the data.
CHAPTER II
A BRIEF HISTORY OF WILLIAMSBURG

English settlers first reached Virginia in 1607, establishing a settlement at Jamestown Island, on the middle peninsula of a coastline whose rivers drained into the Chesapeake Bay. Although searching for a quick way to fortune, the settlers soon found that Virginia's shores held no gold or other precious metals. Her rich soils, however, were particularly well suited for agriculture. Tobacco rapidly became the area's primary cash crop, with 500,000 pounds exported to England annually by the beginning of the second quarter of the 17th century (Dabney 1971:25). This agricultural economy was instrumental in establishing the dispersed settlement pattern which characterized the Tidewater, since new land was continually needed to replace fields whose productivity was quickly depleted by the mono-crop agricultural system. Settlement on the Peninsula expanded along the major waterways, with the banks of the James River settled by the 1620s. Expansion along the York River, to the north, had occurred by the 1640s (Lewis 1975).

The first capital of the Virginia colony was located on Jamestown Island, settled by the colonists in 1607. The island was chosen since it was believed that it would be easily defensible, both from land and from sea. Although Jamestown
proved to be a swampy, mosquito-ridden lowland that was difficult to defend from Indian attack, it remained the capital of the colony until the end of the 17th century.

In 1622-23, the Virginia Colony passed the "Act for the Seating of Middle Plantation" (later to become Williamsburg), an action which represented a move away from the easy accessibility of the major watercourses and into the largely unsettled interior of the Peninsula. Due perhaps to fear of neighboring Indians in the wake of the 1622 massacre, settlement grew slowly at Middle Plantation. The first land was not patented until 1632, when Dr. John Potts received 1200 acres at the head of Archer's Hope Creek (Tyler 1907:10). Later that year, in order to induce settlement at Middle Plantation, the General Assembly offered fifty acres of land to every person who would settle there (Tyler 1907:10). Such inducements were common practice during the 17th century, and served the dual purpose of settling the hinterlands and providing land to those who normally would not have the means of acquiring it. By the following February, one out of every forty men in the area was ordered to be present at Pott's "newlie built" Plantation in order to erect houses, secure land and construct a palisade to span the Peninsula from the head of Queen's Creek to the head of College Creek (Hening 1823 1:208-209). Although the exact form of this palisade is not known, it most likely served as a defensive barrier against the area's Indian population, since the second Indian massacre in 1644 prompted a command to rebuild the 1634 palisade (YCR-Wills & Deeds, No. 2:142, 188-189).

Although Middle Plantation in the mid-17th century undoubtedly consisted of only a few tobacco plantations, it was recognized in 1676 as "the very Heart and Centre of the Country" (BPRO:482), second in importance only to Jamestown
Perhaps this attitude was reflected in the 1677 petition by some York County residents that the seat of government by moved from Jamestown to Middle Plantation (Winder n.d. 84-85). It did, in fact, serve a brief stint as such in 1677, when the Assembly was held in the house of Otto Thorpe in the wake of a fire at Jamestown during Bacon's Rebellion. Although the commissioners were unwilling to completely abandon Jamestown at this time, Williamsburg continued to grow, albeit at a slow pace. In 1693, a brick church costing £800 sterling was constructed on the horse path in the Middle Plantation old fields. During that same year, the General Assembly designated Middle Plantation as the site for an Indian school and the College of William and Mary, ordered to be built "as neare the Church now standing in Middle Plantation old Fields as Convenience will permitt" (Hening 1823:122). Although the exact configuration of the Middle Plantation settlement is unknown, it has been possible to reconstruct a partial picture of this early phase of Williamsburg. Figure 2 shows the location of known archaeological features and structures dating to the Middle Plantation period.

A fire in the statehouse at Jamestown in October of 1698 precipitated the moving of the colony's capital to Middle Plantation. Not only did this move provide a healthier, less swampy environment than that of Jamestown, it also represented a more central location of government for the expanding colony. In the legislation of 1699, which established the new town, Middle Plantation was renamed Williamsburg, in honor of the reigning British monarch, King William. Slightly over two hundred and eighty-three acres of land were set aside for the sole use of the city (McIlwaine
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The original body of the town, as surveyed in 1699 by Theodorick Bland, consisted of 220 acres and contained a central street running east-west through town, and partially following the old Middle Plantation horse path. Duke of Gloucester Street, as it was to be known, extended 7/8 of a mile in length and was 99 feet wide as surveyed.

The remainder of the 283 acres was set aside to be used for two ports, whose formations were specified in the legislation which established the town. Theodorick Bland's 1699 map of Williamsburg depicted two roads, extending north and south, from the town limits to these two landings. Queen Mary's Port (later known as Capitol Landing), was constructed on Queen's Creek, north of town and emptying into the York River. Princess Anne's Port (College Landing) was located about one mile south of town on Archers Hope Creek (later known as College Creek). Each port was navigable by sloops for the transporting of merchandise, an important facility for an essentially land-locked town such as Williamsburg. Warehouses, ordinaries, and homes sprang up at each location, making each landing virtually self sufficient. Archaeological testing at both landings and along the roads leading to them has revealed heavy development in these areas throughout the colonial period (Hunter, Samford and Brown 1984, Hudgins 1977, G. Brown 1986, Edwards 1987). These landings continued to play important economic roles to the town and surrounding area throughout the 18th century.

When the capital was moved to Williamsburg, the town consisted of Bruton Parish Church, an ordinary, several stores, two mills, a smith's shop, a grammar school, and the College of William and Mary (Anonymous 1930). Several years later, in 1702, Swiss visitor Francis Louis Michel noted that Williamsburg was "a
large place" where a city was "staked out to be built" (as quoted in Reps 1972:171). Some growth had apparently taken place, however, since his description included, in addition to the buildings noted in 1699, a State House, a Bishop's residence, eight ordinaries or inns, and a magazine (Hinke 1916:25-26).

Francis Nicholson, the colony's new Governor, designed the town of Williamsburg as one of the first planned towns in the British North American colonies shortly after the legislation of 1699. Based on French "bastide" towns of the 13th century, Williamsburg contained their characteristic rectangular, gridded street systems, with a central market square and a secondary open area around a church (Reps 1972:2). Most Virginia and Maryland towns of the 18th century were created following such a grid system (Reps 1969:124). Nicholson's town plan, and its relevance to Williamsburg, have been discussed extensively by John Reps in Tidewater Towns (1972). A group of directors, including Edmund Jennings, Philip Ludwell, Thomas Ballard, Lewis Burwell, John Page, James Whaley and Nicholson himself, was placed in charge of building Williamsburg (Tyler 1907:21).

After being surveyed and laid out by Theodorick Bland in 1699, the town was divided into half-acre lots, which were first offered for sale in 1700. Actual lot purchase and building construction in Williamsburg for the opening years of the 18th century can be closely monitored. The City Directors implemented a Building Act in 1705 whereby each landowner had two years from the date of lot purchase to construct a building of a predetermined size and construction. If no such structure had been completed at the end of the allotted period, the land would revert back to the City. Although the purpose of this act was twofold in the 18th century: to prevent speculators from purchasing large quantities of land for later resale and to
promote the rapid development of the town, it is today and invaluable aid to the
researcher attempting to discover early growth patterns.

Public structures were needed for the new capital, and during the first decade
of the 18th century, several important buildings were constructed. The Capitol,
begun in August of 1701, and completed in 1704, occupied the eastern end of Duke
of Gloucester Street, commanding a vista that terminated to the west with the
Christopher Wren Building on the college campus. In September of 1701, 63 acres
of land north of the town boundaries were acquired for the construction of a
Governor's Palace (Reps 1972:173-174). It was not until October of 1705, however,
that an act was passed for actually building the Governor's residence, with final
completion of the house and gardens not occurring until 1722.

While construction of public and private buildings was taking place, other
changes in the town's physical appearance were also being made. The Council
called for the straightening of Duke of Gloucester Street in 1702, necessitating the
removal of four old buildings and an oven which were in the right of way of the
surveyed street (Reps 1972:173, Tyler 1907:21). When Alexander Spotswood arrived
to take command as Lieutenant Governor in 1710, he ordered the filling of ravines
which bisected Duke of Gloucester Street, as well as rebuilding the church and
college, constructing a new magazine, and completing the Governor's Palace (Tyler
1907:24).

In the year 1722, Williamsburg, by the order of the colonial council, was
made a self governing incorporated city (Tyler 1907:26), empowering it to send a
delegate to the House of Burgesses. Official positions designated by the charter
included a mayor, a recorder, six aldermen, and twelve Councilors (Hoffschwelle
1980:41). It was also at this time that Williamsburg received its Hustings Court and city authorities given the right to hold markets every Wednesday and Saturday, as well as two annual fairs, in April and December.

As the capital of the Virginia Colony for most of the 18th century, Williamsburg served a number of functions. Primary was its position as the seat of government, boasting both a fine brick capitol and the Governor's Palace as visible displays of this judicial function. The General Court convened twice yearly, in April and October (Soltow 1956:5) and the General Assembly, the colony's governing body, met bi-annually as well. The Courts of Oyer and Terminer met each June and December in Williamsburg after 1710, as well as the monthly meetings of the James City County Court (Hoffschwelle 1980:31). After the incorporation of Williamsburg in 1722, the Hustings Court met there monthly (Tyler 1907:26). Also of importance were the Merchant's meetings, held quarterly, and "developed to meet the need of business for some kind of central system of exchange in a decentralized economy" (Soltow 1956:16). Williamsburg, during its years as the capital, was the place where Virginians gathered to discuss political issues, formulate and pass laws, and transact business.

Recent conclusions drawn from an account on Williamsburg's 1747-1748 smallpox epidemic provide a profile of the town at mid-century (Hellier 1987). Approximately 885 persons, residing in 97 households, comprised the town's population. The majority of its heads of households were young married men whose professions as artisans, merchants, or tavernkeepers provided goods and services for the town and its hinterlands. Immigrations in the late 1730s and 1740s added to the stable core population who had resided in Williamsburg for over ten years.
Williamsburg continued to grow throughout the 18th century, with its population more than doubling to 1,880 by 1775.

During Public Times, held during the sessions of the General Assembly and the General Courts, and bringing an influx of people from outlying plantations in Williamsburg, the town came to serve economic and social functions as well as judicial ones. It was during these times that the town's population swelled from its normal size of 1,500 in the second half of the 18th century, to between 5,000 and 6,000 (Soltow 1956:5). Held four times yearly, the Public Times gave persons from all over the Virginia colony a chance to conduct business as well as socialize.

With such fluctuations in the population occurring throughout the year, from the smaller swells during the local courts, to the peak times during the meetings of the General Assembly, accommodations had to be provided to those with business in Williamsburg. Taverns and ordinaries, such as Wetherburn's and Shield's, providing lodgings and food, enjoyed a lively business. Many households took in lodgers, as evidenced in numerous advertisements in the colony's Williamsburg-based newspaper, The Virginia Gazette. Fed and sheltered, those colonists visiting Williamsburg, usually from outlying plantations, saw their stay as a social occasion as well as a business trip. Billiards, drinking, horse racing and cards were popular forms of amusement for men, as well as being entertained at the homes of Williamsburg residents. Balls were held at the Governor's Palace, and at different times during the 18th century, Williamsburg boasted several dancing schools and a theatre where the latest London plays could be enjoyed.

The presence of industries in 18th-century Williamsburg was negligible, as the town was viewed primarily in terms of its political functions. Commercial efforts
here, as in most of the southern colonies, were centered on agriculture, with the Virginia Colony relying on Britain for most of its manufactured goods. Cottage industries and artisans were located in towns and on plantations, but there were, in effect, no large industries present in Williamsburg or the Tidewater during the first half of the 18th century. As the Revolutionary War drew near, however, one effect of American interdictions against British commerce was to promote local manufactories (Tyler 1907:56). A woolen and linen factory was constructed on Queen’s Creek around 1780, and a tannery was also operating on the same side of town (Tyler 1907:56,57). Several blacksmith shops operated in the center of town during the 1770s and early 1780s, producing goods for local consumption as well as providing the American Army with military supplies (G. Brown 1986:25, Foss 1977:8). On the whole, however, industry remained a small part of the economic focus of Williamsburg, as was typical for the majority of the South.

As the Virginia colony expanded to the west, and Williamsburg no longer remained a central location, efforts were set underway to move the capital. When, in 1746, the Capitol accidentally caught fire and was destroyed, an unsuccessful effort was made to change the seat of government to the Pamunkey River (Tyler 1907:32). Although a law was passed in 1748 to rebuild the Capitol at its former location, another proposal was made in 1749, this time to move the capital to Newcastle, on the York River (Hoffschwelle 1980:53). The town’s tenuous hold on its prestigious position was again threatened in 1752, despite the completion of the new Capitol building only one year earlier. This attempt, like the others failed. The House of Burgesses themselves threatened to remove the seat of government to a more convenient location in 1761, with this bill defeated by only a narrow margin
Rising political tensions with Britain soon began to take precedence in the colonist's minds, diverting the issue of the capital's location and thus insuring that Williamsburg was still the seat of power and scene of political activity throughout most of the Revolutionary War. The Revolutionary Council of Virginia met at Williamsburg in 1776 in order to discuss waging a defensive war against England (Tyler 1907:76). Although the town did not witness any major battles during the war with the British, Williamsburg certainly felt its effects. French and American troops were garrisoned there in 1781 in order to route Cornwallis from the Peninsula, and the Governor's Palace and the Capitol both served as hospitals to treat the wounded troops. It was during this time that the President's House at the College was destroyed by fire, followed one month later by the burning of the Governor's Palace (Reps 1972:189).

In the midst of war, Virginia's capital was finally removed from Williamsburg, with Richmond, at the fall line of the James River, becoming its new home in 1780. The citizens of Williamsburg fought to have the seat of government brought back, but their efforts were in vain (Reps 1972:189). Richmond has remained the capital of Virginia since 1780.

Although much has been written and compiled concerning 18th-century Williamsburg, a great deal less is known about Williamsburg after the removal of the capital. Much of the information comes from early 19th-century traveler's descriptions, of which most seem to use words like "gloomy" (Barry 1904:112-113) and "deserted" (Murray 1839:127-129). As early as 1783, visitor Johan David Schoepf noted that
Williamsburg is now a poor place compared with its former splendor. With the removal of the government, merchants, advocates, and other considerable residents took their departure as well, and the town has lost half its population (Schoepf 1911).

Rochefoucauld, visiting in 1797, also confirmed the population decline, stating that "every person who was connected with government has followed the legislature to Richmond, and the number of inhabitants is annually decreasing..." (Rochefoucauld 1799:23-24).

Although some of the public structures were no longer needed for government purposes, they found adaptive reuse. The Powder Magazine first served as a market house after the Revolutionary War (Tyler 1907:222); at other times during the 19th century it saw service as a Baptist Meeting House, a dancing school, and a livery stable. The office buildings of the burned Governor's Palace were used as dwellings. The Capitol was used as a grammar school and a court simultaneously at the end of the 18th century (Reps 1972:190). Visitors to Williamsburg during the 1820s and 1830s indicate that the town contained between 1400 and 1500 inhabitants (Lord 1934, Martin 1935) and about 200 houses (Martin 1835).

Although the moving of the capital certainly contributed to the decline of Williamsburg, the depression experienced in this area was inevitable. The diminished political influence of the area, coupled with the decreased productivity of Tidewater soils, were major factors contributing to the depressed economic conditions of Williamsburg and York County from the end of the 18th century up until 1840 (Smart 1986:22). By the mid-19th century, however, due to improvements in agricultural techniques, the Tidewater was experiencing a revitalization (Smart 1985:4-115). A different agricultural strategy, crop diversification, protected farmers
against the devastating effects of crop failures or low prices common to mono-crop
agriculture. By the 1830's signs of growth in Williamsburg were noted in the *New
and Comprehensive Gazetteer of Virginia*. (Carson 1965).

During the Civil War, Williamsburg lay strategically between the Union
stronghold at Fort Monroe and the Confederate Capital at Richmond (Goodwin
1972:88). The Confederate Army built defensive fortifications across the Peninsula
at Williamsburg in 1861. Union troops, moving up the Peninsula, however, occupied
Williamsburg the following year, remaining there until the end of the war. The town
became a central point for the transfer of news from the Confederate Capital to
Washington. During this period, much physical damage was done to structures in
the town, with the Wren Building burned and many other buildings dismantled for
firewood (Goodwin 1972:89).

Williamsburg remained a small town during the remainder of the 19th
century. The College of William and Mary resumed operations in 1865, only to
close its doors for seven years in 1881 due to fund shortages (Rouse 1973:68). Also
in 1881, the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad extended its services through the town
(Rouse 1973:70). Directories and promotional tracts printed during the 1890’s
provide a glimpse, albeit an optimistic one, of Williamsburg during this period.
With a population of over 2,000, the town supported three schools, over twenty
general stores, the Colonial Inn, several restaurants and saloons, a sawmill and a
wheelwright (Virginia Gazette 1898). The area around Williamsburg is described
as fertile and abundant in wildlife, as well as being touted for its historical
significance.

The twentieth century came quietly to Williamsburg, with only the First
World War breaking the calm of its first two decades. In 1917, Williamsburg became the supply center for the newly built town of Penniman, constructed to house workers at the nearby munitions plant (Kimball 1935).

It took a 20th-century visionary in the form of W. A. R. Goodwin to see Williamsburg's former importance and to possess the determination to recreate that past. Despite years of decay and destruction, the town still retained the essentials of its colonial town plan. With the advent of automobiles and other 20th-century conveniences, Goodwin knew these traces of the past would soon vanish, and he envisioned the full restoration of Williamsburg as it had stood in the 18th century. He took this dream to millionaire John D. Rockefeller, who authorized the preparation of drawings for the total restoration of the town (Hosmer 1981:31). When plans for the restoration were finally unveiled in June of 1928, reactions were mixed, with some citizens feeling that this was "a second Yankee Invasion" (Hosmer 1981:32).

Restoration began later that year, with efforts centering first on the reconstruction of public places such as the Capitol, the Governor's Palace, and the Raleigh Tavern. By 1934, one hundred and fifty buildings had been restored or reconstructed, while over 400 19th- and 20th-century structures had been destroyed or moved outside of the historic area (Goodwin 1972:114). In total, 88 original buildings have been restored, and over 400 reconstructed to represent pre-Revolutionary Williamsburg. The tourist industry created by the restoration of Williamsburg has sparked growth in the town, with an estimated one million persons visiting Williamsburg yearly.
CHAPTER III

EXPECTED TRENDS CONCERNING

THE DEVELOPMENT OF WILLIAMSBURG AND BLOCK 29

It is the premise of this study that changes occurring on Block 29 during the 18th century will reflect social, political, and economic changes taking place in the town of Williamsburg. This chapter will address in detail the expected trends concerning the development of Block 29 and how any changes there are related to those occurring throughout the town. These changes should be readily apparent through combining the results of extensive documentary, archaeological and architectural research.

The remainder of the chapter will discuss findings from general historical and anthropological research. These general features will serve as trends that may be evident in the development of Block 29 and on a larger scale, Williamsburg as a whole. They include factors of physical growth, such as the segregation of lot functions and activities within the town, and social and economic patterning in systems of behavior and mental processes.

Physical Growth

Physical growth is expected to have been fairly rapid during the early years
of the 18th century, as the town became the center of political activity for the Colony. The period from 1710 to 1750 was marked by a rapid rise in Chesapeake towns (Earle 1975:62), with concentrations of merchants, craftsmen and artisans forming in them. O'Mara, in his research on settlement systems in Tidewater Virginia, discovered that Williamsburg was the Virginia colony's leading urban center during the 1730s (O'Mara 1983:222). It contained the largest and widest range of functions, experiencing both political and economic growth during this period. By the 1750s, Williamsburg still held first place in the Tidewater, in terms of range of functions and activities, but was rapidly being replaced in importance as other urban places grew more quickly (Smart 1986:28). By 1775, with the population expansion westward, the dominance of Williamsburg as a leading urban center had virtually ended, with a subsequent increase in the number of functions located in other towns.

How will this rising and then waning importance be reflected in the physical development of Williamsburg, and, on a smaller scale, Block 29? It is expected that, consistent with findings from social historians and historical geographers (Noble 1987:16, Corfield 1982, Clark 1984, Large 1984:172, Withey 1984:xii), the number and diversity of services within the town will show sharp rises and falls reflective of the town's economic and political status.

Some components of the town, such as the Market Square, the Powder Magazine, the Capitol, and the Governor's Palace, were pre-planned by Nicholson for specialized activities or functions. These structures were among some of the first completed within the town, and were crucial to the town's public and political functions. Also, in accordance with principles of Baroque town planning, some of Nicholson's building sites were provided with special prominence through the
creation of vistas (Reps 1969:143). The Governor’s Palace is one such site, constructed at the terminal end of Palace Green, a 1000’ long grassy swale extending north from Duke of Gloucester Street (Figure 3). Additional sites of minor prominence, such as those of the Wythe House and Tazewell Hall, were created by changing the spacing of streets parallel to and entering Duke of Gloucester Street (Reps 1969:143) With the creation of such visual points of reference, the buildings occupying these lots served as objects of social display (Corfield 1982:174). Sites of such prominence contained structures of above average size and cost. It is expected that wealthy residents will purchase and occupy lots whose location may have been denoted prestigious due to other factors. For example, it is postulated that due to the placement of the Governor’s residence at the terminal end of Palace Green, the development around the Green will be accomplished largely by wealthy or gentry residents in the 18th century. Since portions of Block 29 abut Palace Green, its residents are also expected to be members of the gentry class.
Also, were there separate residential and commercial sectors within 18th-century Williamsburg? A characteristic of most pre-industrial towns was their mixed commercial and residential nature (Sjoberg 1960:103, Boulton 1987:187). One particularly common trait was that of families living above their shops or businesses, with single structures serving both residential and commercial functions. Pendery (1977:35) discovered that in 18th-century Portsmouth, New Hampshire, houselots were highly functional, combining both family-based services and craft production, characteristic of the mixed commercial and residential lot patterns predominating prior to the Industrial Revolution. It was only in the early 19th century that home and workplace were separated, with the subsequent creation of commercial and residential districts (Geismar 1985:175, Wall 1985:185). Does Williamsburg hold true to the form of pre-industrial cities? If so, it should show largely a mixed commercial and residential use of space within the town throughout the duration of the period under study. Since it is believed that the block served primarily as a gentry residential area, craft and commercial areas are not expected to have been evident within the houselots.

Throughout the 18th century, Williamsburg experienced population growth. With the increased demand for space brought about by the additional residents, the town expanded by enlarging its outer boundaries. In the late 1750s, tracts of land to the east along Francis Street and Capitol Landing Road, and to the south off of South England Street were added to the city (Tyler 1907:34). These formerly large tracts were subdivided into lots and sold like those within town half a century earlier. Although these additional allotments were one manifestation of the increased demand for space, it is expected that another response to this need will be the
increasing occurrence of lot subdivision. Research on pre-industrial towns has shown that growth is manifested in two ways: through expansion into unsettled areas, and by the infilling of existing properties (Corfield 1982:180, Smailes 1960:92, Boulton 1987:174, Rothschild 1985:163, Grove 1973:R186-3). It is common for the central or previously established areas to increase in density before expansion along the town outskirts. This subdivision or increasing density is expected to have been heaviest during periods of high level growth taking place after the town's initial settlement period and most frequent in areas settled first. It is not expected that lot subdivision would have occurred on Block 29. Research has shown that amount and quality of residential space is related to the status of its owner (Goodey 1973:29). Since Block 29 is believed, due to its location, to have been occupied by gentry during the 18th century, it is predicted that the trend would have been towards no subdivision of these lots.

Williamsburg's decline after the Revolution was remarked upon by numerous visitors, such as Noah Webster, who in 1785, described the homes and city as "decaying...by reason of the removal of the seat of Government to Richmond" (as quoted in Carson 1965:69). Robert Hunter Jr. discussed the lack of trade in 1786, and St. George Tucker, a resident of Williamsburg stated in 1795 that "not a few private houses have tumbled down; others are daily crumbling into ruins." (Carson 1965:76, 78). When the capital was removed from Williamsburg, physical changes relating to this move are expected to be evident in a diminished demand for space created by the removal of merchants and other residents, and the virtual cessation of new building construction within the town.

Additionally, with the departure of government functions from Williamsburg,
and the subsequent destruction of the Governor's Palace, the focal point of Block 29 was removed. The block, particularly along Palace Green, no longer would have been viewed by inhabitants and visitors as a prestigious location. Evidence of this decline is expected to be seen in the maintenance of properties and their standing buildings, in the quantity and quality of new building construction, and in the economic status of residents.

**Social and Economic Patterning**

Every culture adapts its own characteristic responses to social and environmental conditions. These responses form a patterned, but ever changing system, that reflects the behavioral processes of the culture’s members. Anthropologists study these processes in living cultures, while archaeologists examine those of the past. One of the primary goals of archaeology is the search for patterns which relate archaeological data to human behavior. These patterns can be then be attributed to the social, economic and ideological aspects of cultural systems.

James Deetz (1977b) and others (Glassie 1972, Leone 1982) have discussed at length the Georgian mentality which pervaded the American colonies during the 18th century. This concept, which embraced ideas about individuality, order and control manifested itself in all forms of daily life, including architecture (Morrison 1952), arrangement of living space (Wenger 1986, in press), and dining practices (Deetz 1977b). The Georgian mentality had become widespread throughout the colonies by the 1760s (Deetz 1977b:40). It is expected that this outlook will become evident on Block 29 in patterns of architecture, material culture and landscape alterations during the period under study. Trends within each of these areas will be
discussed below.

As the relatively impermanent medieval architecture of the 17th century gave way to the more substantial construction of the next, an increasing sense of structure and formality was manifested in buildings. In addition to practical purposes, social meanings began to be conveyed by buildings and their interiors. The Georgian style of architecture, which first made its appearance in Virginia around the turn of the 18th century, was a very ordered and symmetrical building style. This exterior symmetry was also characterized by increased order and specialization of building interiors. Wenger (1986) has found that the central passage house, common in Virginia in the 18th century, served to order the traffic flow through the home, separating family and private areas from more public areas. King (1988) found another common feature at St. Mary's City was the upgrading or renovation of houses in order to conform to Georgian ideas. It is hypothesized that the housing on Block 29 will show increasing exterior and interior symmetry throughout the 18th century, as well as separation of public and private spaces.

Another important category of behavioral questions which can be best answered through archaeological research concern the landscape alterations and internal use of property. Archaeological research has proven to be an excellent tool for interpreting landscape alteration (Kelso 1984). Recent research has shown that changing landscapes are tied to altering ways of viewing the world and the changing perceptions that accompany these new thoughts (Leone 1984). The increasing order of the Georgian age of reason should be evident through patterning within archaeological remains. For example, Julia King (1988) found increasing development of yards through the construction of outbuildings and fences at the site
of a Maryland household and ordinary. This she tied into the increasing urbanization of St. Mary's City at the end of the 17th century, as well as the developing Georgian concepts of formalized space. It is expected that Block 29 will show increasing differentiation within houselots throughout the 18th century, with a transition to Georgian concepts of formal front yards and service related backyards seen as 18th century progresses.

Recent works have discussed the relationship between consumer behavior and social status (Weatherill 1988, Smart 1986). Material possessions, such as household furnishings and clothing, were, and still are, visible symbols of accepted values and expected behavior. One motivation for increasing consumption of material goods was the emulation of those of higher social rank.

Anthropological archaeology has found strong correlations between the types of material culture found on archaeological sites and social and economic status (Becker 1973, Millon 1974, Rathje and McCarthy 1977, Leone 1977). Many recent studies which have made use of a combination of archaeological and documentary sources have focused on shifting patterns in social and economic status of urban residents (Shepard 1987, Baugher and Venables 1987, Castille 1985, Spencer-Wood 1987, Dyson 1982).

Through combining historical documentation of material possessions from sources such as probate inventories, wills, and merchants records, with data from excavated artifacts, examination of social and economic status patterning on Block 29 will be attempted. Extensive research using the York County Records has shown patterning among the purchases of 17th- and 18th-century York County consumers, based on the acquisition of luxury items or amenities (Carr and Walsh 1985, Carr
and Walsh in press, Walsh 1983, Carson and Walsh 1981). A dramatic change took place in the perception of essential versus non-essential items during the course of the 18th century. The middle class increased their participation in the consumer market, particularly in nonessential goods, such as fine ceramics, timepieces, and items to decorate their homes (Carr and Walsh 1981, Walsh 1983, Spencer-Wood 1987:14, Isaac 1982, Weatherill 1988). The attempts of the middle class to emulate their wealthier neighbors in the realm of personal possessions and the increasing acquisitions of luxury goods by the gentry class should be evident in the contents of archaeological assemblages from the documented households studied on Block 29.

Since Block 29 residents were expected to be members of the gentry class, it is believed that this socioeconomic status will be reflected in their material possessions. Items which were discovered to be indicators of high status or wealth were used as the determinants. Tea services have been demonstrated to be one of the most sensitive indicators of social activity and fashion recoverable from archaeological contexts (Dyson 1982:374). This category, along with fine ceramics, specialized dining equipment, timepieces, cutlery, and lighting equipment (Carson and Walsh 1981, Carr and Walsh, in press) are other wealth sensitive categories of items recoverable archaeologically. These items need to be viewed, not only in terms of their primary functions, but in the sociofunctional roles which they played as well. Many of these items were used for display, serving as signals to those around them that their owners were aware of socially correct behavior.

Ceramics, one of the most prevalent items recovered on British-American colonial sites, were used primarily in this study. In addition to their recovery in large quantities, ceramics provide evidence of "changing taste, ideologies and world views
within individual households" (Dyson 1982:374). Dyson found, in his study of eight ceramic assemblages from Connecticut, some variation due to owner occupation and social status.

In the Georgian mindset, the concept of "one man, one plate" became increasingly common. Stews and other one pot meals common to the medieval period (Anderson 1971) gave way to individual cuts of meat served on plates and other non-shared vessels. Documentary evidence suggests that this held true in Virginia and Maryland, with Carson and Walsh (1981) discovering that communal eating vessels gave way to individual ceramics during the 18th century. Archaeological evidence from New England and the Northern Neck of Virginia also shows this to be the case (Neiman 1980:36, Deetz 1972). In the archaeological assemblages of Block 29, this would be evident in the increasing individualization of ceramic tablewares as the 18th century progresses. It is hypothesized that there will be an increasing reliance on individualized ceramic vessel forms (plates, cups, tea bowls) as compared with more communal style eating vessels (dishes, chargers, large drinking vessels). This distinction should cross-cut all social and economic boundaries, particularly later in the 18th century when research has shown that the middle class was participating more in the purchase of ceramic tablewares and other similar items (Carr and Walsh, in press). It is predicted that the use of fine ceramic tablewares will increase at the expense of coarse food preparation and storage ceramics forms, as part of the new concern with dining and social display occurring in the 18th century.

Since teawares are sensitive social indicators, they are expected to show variation throughout the study period. It is also believed that percentages of
teawares will increase in proportion to tablewares as they became accessible to more social groups. In the early 18th century, only the wealthy could afford the tea and expensive accoutrements that accompanied its serving (Roth 1961). Later in the century, due to the falling prices of porcelain and the rising expectations of the middle class, tea drinking became more common. By the last quarter of the 18th century, there was an almost universal use of teawares by all social classes (Martin in press:10). The wealthy then managed to set themselves apart from the middling classes by acquiring expensive silver and matched Chinese porcelain tea sets.

Conclusion

The trends discussed in this chapter will serve as a framework for the investigation of Block 29. Whenever possible, all forms of evidence (documentary, archaeological, and architectural) will be used. In some cases, for example, the functional use of space over the entire town will rely solely on documentary evidence. In contrast, details of social and economic status of residence and land use patterns on Block 29 will be derived from archaeological and architectural sources as well.

If Block 29 conforms to the general pattern outlined in the preceding chapter, it is expected that its residents throughout most of the 18th century would consist of the gentry class because of its presumably prestigious location adjacent to the Governor's Palace. Physical features of the block are expected to be manifest in a) no subdivision of properties, unlike that predicted for the more commercial areas of town, b) the decline in the socioeconomic class of residents after the Revolutionary War, and c) a decline in physical growth after the Revolution. Increasing
differentiation in yard use and landscape modifications due to Georgian concepts of order are expected throughout the century.

In terms of the material possessions of Block 29 residents, it is expected that the archaeological assemblages and probate inventories will show increasing acquisitions of amenities throughout the century as the middle class tried to emulate the upper classes, and those of the gentry took steps to keep ahead of the masses encroaching from below. These amenities should take the form of sets of elaborate ceramic table and teawares, increasing specialization of dining and food preparation equipment, expensive furniture, and social display items to go in the newly specialized spaces within Georgian style houses.

The following chapters will describe Block 29 residents and the changes they implemented on their properties during the 18th century. From the information presented, it is expected that patterns relating to the trends described above will be revealed.
CHAPTER IV
ARCHAEOLOGY OF BLOCK 29

The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation has sponsored a total of twelve archaeological excavations on Block 29 since the inception of restoration in the late 1920s. Of these, six consisted solely of archaeological cross-trenching and other non-stratified digging, done in an effort to locate structures shown on the Frenchman's Map of 1781. Since the 1960s, six projects of varying scopes have been completed. Each project will be summarized here, with more specific information on the findings detailed in Chapters V through VIII.

The archaeological data recovered from Block 29 will play a substantial role in the study of the development of the block throughout the 18th century. Although the archaeological excavations conducted prior to 1957 did not generate any artifact assemblages which were excavated stratigraphically, these investigations located the footprints of buildings constructed throughout the 18th and 19th centuries. The archaeological maps, with their extensive notations, were the primary sources used for interpretation of these excavations. To a lesser extent, photographs taken during the excavations, and the very general archaeological reports produced, were also used.
The quality of archaeological research greatly improved under the direction of Ivor Noel Hume, who arrived at Colonial Williamsburg in 1957. Artifacts began to be recovered from stratified contexts, and thus can be associated with specific time periods and households on sites. For this study, a total of ten artifact assemblages, representing seven households, were selected for analysis. These are listed in Table 1 and discussed in more detail in Chapters V through VIII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTS</th>
<th>OCCUPANT</th>
<th>FEATURE</th>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165/166</td>
<td>J. Brush</td>
<td>Ravine</td>
<td>1717-1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165/166</td>
<td>J. Brush</td>
<td>Privy</td>
<td>1717-1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-174</td>
<td>A. Blair</td>
<td>Trash Pit</td>
<td>1716-1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163/164/169</td>
<td>G. Gilmer</td>
<td>Trash Pits</td>
<td>1735-1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165/166</td>
<td>T. Everard</td>
<td>Ravine</td>
<td>1751-1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165/166/172</td>
<td>T. Everard</td>
<td>Ravine</td>
<td>1770-1781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170/171/173/174</td>
<td>P. Hay</td>
<td>Bulkhead Fill</td>
<td>1763-1766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170/171</td>
<td>G. Hay</td>
<td>Trash Pit</td>
<td>1766-1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170/171/173/174</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Sump Fill</td>
<td>c. 1790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brush-Everard Property (Colonial Lots 165, 166, 172)

Three archaeological projects have taken place on the Brush-Everard property since the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation gained control of it in 1947. Prior to
the restoration of the house and yard to its 18th-century appearance, archaeological investigations were undertaken under the direction of archaeologist James Knight in 1947. Photographs from the excavations show the cross-trenching typical of Knight's investigations (Figure 4). Knight's purpose in the 1947 excavations was to reveal the remains of those outbuildings shown on the 1781 Frenchman's Map, as well as document structural changes to the house. Archaeological exploration around the kitchen and smokehouse occurred in 1967, under the guidance of Ivor Noel Hume. The purpose of this excavation was to document and date the various phases of kitchen construction. Finally, the most recent archaeological project at the
Brush Everard property began in 1987, with funding from a grant provided by the AT&T Foundation. This work was confined largely to Colonial Lot 166, the area to the north of the house. This purpose of this archaeological project was to locate two previously undiscovered structures shown on the Frenchman's Map of 1781. The results of these three projects will be discussed in more detail in Chapters V through IX.

Three original 18th-century buildings (the house, kitchen and smokehouse) remain standing on the Brush-Everard property and these were explored archaeologically. Table 2 shows the standing buildings on this property and their conditions. Archaeological assemblages relating to John Brush, gunsmith, and Thomas Everard, mayor of Williamsburg, were examined from this property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Original with reconstructed wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>Reconstructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokehouse</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potting Shed</td>
<td>Reconstructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>Reconstructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Reconstructed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--------------
The St. George Tucker Property (Colonial Lots 163, 164, and 169)

Like the Brush-Everard property, Lots 163, 164, and 169 have been explored frequently over the course of the last sixty years. Of primary interest to the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation was the First Theatre in the American colonies, constructed around 1718 by William Levingston on one of these lots. Locating this building was the focus of several early excavations. In 1930 and 1931, cross-trenching on Lots 163 and 164 revealed the foundations of what was thought to have been the theatre, but is now known to have been the Levingston House (Ragland 1931, Duell and Ragland 1930, Shurtleff 1930). The Levingston Kitchen and several other outbuildings were also excavated at this time.

Later, primarily as a result of disagreement about the accuracy of the theatre location, additional excavations were conducted on Lots 163 and 164 (Moorehead 1947). On Lot 164, the remains of a large building, measuring 86.5' x 30' were discovered (Knight 1947d). This was subsequently interpreted as the First Theatre, and today, the Play Booth Theatre has been reconstructed on this site. Additional excavations conducted in 1988, however, have revealed dating information which indicates that this building could not possibly have been the First Theatre, and that it most likely represented a late 18th-century stable (Samford n.d.).

During the 1967 archaeological investigations at Brush-Everard, limited excavation took place on the northwestern portion of Lot 164. Here, five trash pits associated with mid-18th century apothecary George Gilmer were located (Figure 5). The artifacts contained within these pits represent the best collection of colonial period pharmaceutical artifacts recovered in Williamsburg to date (Frank 1967).
The artifact assemblage from Gilmer's trash pits were examined for this study.

The St. George Tucker House (Figure 6), an original late 18th-century structure created by moving an earlier house from Colonial Lot 164 to Lot 169 and subsequently enlarging it, has not been the focus of any archaeological excavations. Excellent documentation concerning the house and its development are contained within the Tucker-Coleman papers and these have been used extensively in this study. In 1930, however, archaeological trenching revealed the remains of the late 18th-century kitchen which has been reconstructed to the west of the house (Fauber 1930b). This has been the extent of excavations around the St. George Tucker House. Table 3 shows the condition of standing buildings on the St. George Tucker property.

------------------

TABLE 3

CONDITION OF BUILDINGS ON LOTS 163, 164 AND 169

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tucker House</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokehouse</td>
<td>Reconstructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy and Kitchen</td>
<td>Reconstructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levingston Kitchen</td>
<td>Reconstructed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Grissell Hay Property (Colonial Lots 170, 171, 173 and 174)

Only four small archaeological projects and one salvage excavation, have been completed on Colonial Lots 171 and 174 since the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation acquired the property in 1930. This is primarily because the original 18th-century house, although owned by Colonial Williamsburg, was leased to a life tenant from 1930 to the mid-1960s. As a matter of policy, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation has not normally conducted large scale excavations on properties that are the residences of such tenants. In the summer of 1930, however, the 18th-century front steps of the house were investigated archaeologically. A brief report and map were prepared for this limited excavation (Duell and Ragland 1930, Fauber 1930a), but the original porch was never reconstructed.

Two limited excavations took place in the 1950s and 1960s. In 1954, James Knight cross-trenched portions of Lot 174, and located the remains of a 62' x 20' stable facing North England Street and a 19th-century 30' x 30' pier supported structure (Knight 1954). The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation sponsored another excavation on Lot 171 in 1966, this time under the direction of Ivor Noel Hume. The purpose of these excavations was to date the construction of the no longer extant northwest wing (Noel Hume 1966).

In 1985, the installation of a natural gas line on the property prompted salvage excavations by the Department of Archaeological Research. The foundations of an 18th-century privy and a trash pit dating to the occupation of Archibald Blair (1716-1733) were discovered (Samford 1985). Additionally, as part of a waterproofing project for the house and 19th-century kitchen on Lot 171, excavations
were conducted around the perimeters of both buildings in 1989. Evidence of an early rear porch, a sealed bulkhead entrance, and a sump were revealed through archaeology adjacent to the house. Excavations around the kitchen revealed the traces of numerous trash deposits from the 18th century, as well as the brick foundations of the early 18th-century kitchen constructed on the property.

Since the extensive cross trenching which characterized early excavations on properties such as Brush-Everard has not occurred, the potential for archaeological data recovery is substantially enhanced. The Grissell Hay property had retained many of its colonial characteristics into the early 20th century. Three 18th-century outbuildings (dairy, smokehouse, and privy) remain on the property, as well as a 19th-century kitchen. The three 18th-century dependencies have been restored to their original appearances. Table 4 shows the conditions of the structures on Lots 170, 171, 173, and 174.

---

TABLE 4
CONDITION OF BUILDINGS ON LOTS 170, 171, 173, AND 174

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grissell Hay house</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Reconstructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privy</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corncrib</td>
<td>Reconstructed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
CHAPTER V

THE INITIAL SETTLEMENT OF WILLIAMSBURG, 1700-1730

The results of historical, archaeological, and architectural research on Block 29 will be presented in the following four chapters. The time subdivisions for each chapter were based on broad stages within Williamsburg’s development, as suggested by historical research. The period 1700 through 1730, discussed in Chapter V, covers the initial development of Williamsburg. Chapter VI covers the years between 1731 and 1750, a period when Williamsburg was the Colony’s leading urban center. The period 1751-1780 was a time of increasing political importance for the town, culminating in the Revolutionary War and the removal of the seat of government from Williamsburg. The final results chapter spans the period from 1781 to 1810, after the removal of the capital and into the opening years of the 19th century. When household occupations on Block 29 spanned more than one of the above time periods, they were assigned to the period which covered the longest number of years.

After the City of Williamsburg was founded in 1699, the area within the city limits was divided into half acre lots. These lots began to be sold by the City Trustees in 1700. In an effort to promote the rapid growth of the new city, the city trustees affixed a building clause to each lot sold. According to the Act of Assembly of October 1705, failure to build a house conforming to the Assembly standards within twenty four months caused the lot to revert to the city trustees.
Block 29, located along the eastern edge of Palace Green, contained ten one-half acre lots (numbers 163-166, 169-174). Figure 7 shows the position of Block 29 within the city of Williamsburg, and Figure 8 depicts the lot divisions within the block. The initial settlement of Block 29 began in the second decade of the 18th century.

Lots 170 - 174
The Archibald Blair Household 1716-1733

The first person to purchase land within Block 29 was Lieutenant Governor Alexander Spotswood, who bought Lot 174 in September of 1713 (DAB 2:428-429). Since Spotswood held title to the land until 1723, he obviously constructed a dwelling in accordance with Assembly standards within the specified two year period. Although the Governor's Palace was not completed until 1716, it is likely that Spotswood was renting the structure built on Lot 174 and not living there himself (Hellier 1989).

Of all the lots sold on Block 29 during the second decade of the 18th century, only Lots 169 and 172 reverted to the trustees, having been initially granted to Daniel Groome of James City County and Christopher Jackson of York County, respectively, in 1713 (CWF Manuscript Collection, DAB 3:30-31). The remaining lots on the block did not get sold until 1716 and 1717, and were purchased in groups of two or more lots. Archibald Blair purchased the largest parcel on the block, having been granted four lots (170, 171, 172 & 173) in July of 1716 (DAB 3:126-127).
Blair, a merchant in his early fifties at the time he purchased land on Block 29, arrived in Virginia from Scotland in 1690 (Tyler 1899). Educated at the University of Edinburgh, Blair was also described in the York County records as an apothecary and surgeon.
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Figure 8.

It was Blair's mercantile activities which provided his largest source of income, however. According to Governor Nicholson's report to the Council of Trade and Plantations, he had opened a store in Williamsburg around 1702 (CSP, CS v. 22:412). Blair's storehouse, located along Duke of Gloucester Street on Colonial Lot 46 (DAB 2:60), continued in operation until at least 1719 (DAB 3:288 - 290).
Additionally, by 1718, he had formed a partnership with his brother James and Colonel Philip Ludwell, in "one of the most considerable Trading Stores in this Country" (Spotswood). Even later, Blair became a partner with his former indentured servant, William Prentis, in Williamsburg's leading mercantile, the Prentis Store.

In addition to his numerous mercantile activities, Archibald Blair served an active role in local and colony politics. He was named one of the directors of the town of Williamsburg in 1705 (Henings 3:419-432) and served in the House of Burgesses for interrupted periods between 1718 and 1733 (Spotswood, Volume II, p. 278). At the local level, he was a vestryman for Bruton Parish, an alderman for Williamsburg in 1722 (Charter of Williamsburg), and he served on a committee to build the prison (Henings 4:114-116).

The Archibald Blair House

Since Blair's four lots did not revert to the trustees, he obviously constructed his home on Block 29 within two years of purchasing the lots. Based on documentary and archaeological evidence, it is hypothesized that Archibald Blair constructed his house on Lot 171 at the corner of Nicholson and North England Streets. Not much is known about the appearance of this structure, since later construction appears to have obscured most traces of the first period house.

The house currently standing on Lot 171 (Figure 9) has been a source of debate for years. Originally believed to have been the house constructed by Archibald Blair by 1718, further research had suggested that the architectural style
of the house was consistent with structures dating much later in the 18th century. Results from dendrochronology performed in the spring of 1989 on the original timbers throughout the house confirmed that the framing of the house dated to the early 1780s (Heikkenen, personal communication).
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If the present house on Lot 171 dates to the last quarter of the 18th century, then where did Blair construct his home? Although only limited archaeological excavations have taken place on the property, no traces of Blair's house had ever been located. The 1989 excavations done prior to waterproofing, however, may have solved the mystery of Blair's missing house. Based on map and archaeological evidence, it is hypothesized that later modifications to Blair's original home have given the building its present form. This theory will be discussed at length in Chapter VII.
Although there is a small chance that the Blair house was constructed on Lot 170 to the west, this is not likely. If the house had been constructed there, the extensive planting of boxwood on this lot by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation would have revealed traces of its brick foundations. No such foundations were ever located.

Although the size of Blair's original house is not known, archaeological and architectural evidence leads to the conclusion that it measured 30' x 30' (Figure 10). It is believed that the eastern half of the house comprised the original foundation walls, with the present north-south interior partition wall having once formed the western exterior wall of the house. During this period, Blair's house contained a full basement, and an exterior entrance to the cellar along the north wall of the structure. Sometime later, in the early 1780s, the house was apparently enlarged to the west. In order to do this, the original framing of the house was removed, and the house foundations extended to the west, bringing the house to its present day dimensions of 46' x 30'. Locating traces of the western addition along the interior basement walls was hindered by extensive 20th-century repairs to the brick, and several coats of paint.
which obscured any change in brick color that would indicate the beginning of the later addition.

The appearance of Blair's house is not known, but it may have been similar to the first period construction of the Peyton Randolph House, built between 1715 and 1724 by friend and neighbor Sir John Randolph, directly across North England Street. The Randolph House, during the second quarter of the 18th century, was a 28' square building containing four rooms and a central chimney. During this period, the Peyton Randolph House faced west along North England Street, changing to its present orientation facing south toward Market Square only in the mid-18th century (Edwards et. al. 1988). Although it may never be possible to prove, Archibald Blair may have constructed his house to face east towards that of Randolph's. Another neighbor of Blair's was Gawin Corbin, who constructed a house at the north end of North England Street during the second decade of the 18th century (DAB 3:345).

When Blair purchased the lots, his household consisted of himself, his second wife, Sarah Fowler Blair, and their two small daughters. It is likely the son from his first marriage, John Blair (born 1686) was no longer living with his father. William Prentis, indentured to Blair in 1714, may have also lived somewhere on the property. Although the number of slaves that Blair owned when he purchased Lots 170-174 is not known, records document two female slaves owned by Archibald Blair (OW 16:511, 592) during the late 1720s.
Archibald Blair Outbuildings and Garden

Since the Blair property is one which Colonial Williamsburg has never had a chance to systematically excavate, the exact number of outbuildings constructed by Blair is not known. However, recent archaeological excavation around the foundation walls of the house and within the yard revealed some details about the appearance of the property during the tenure of Archibald Blair.

Excavation around the standing early 19th-century brick kitchen uncovered the foundation of what is currently believed to have been the earliest kitchen on the property (Figure 11). Although establishing the exact dimensions of the kitchen was out of the scope of the recent project, the limited excavations there were able to provide some structural information about the building. It was a frame structure on a 1 1/2 brick wide foundation measuring 20' EW and at least 13' NS. The fireplace, located at the northern end of the kitchen, was constructed with an enclosed gable end chimney and hearthbase. In front of the hearth, to the south, was a brick lined storage pit, or root cellar, filled with kitchen ash, animal bone, and other debris dating to the 1730s and 1740s. A layer of packed yellow clay, 8 to 10" in thickness formed the floor of the kitchen.

Although other outbuilding locations have not been pinpointed through archaeological excavation, it is likely that Blair would have also constructed, at minimum, a dairy and smokehouse on his property within the first few years of his tenure. His slaves would have resided in outbuildings such as the kitchen. Several small trash pits dating to Archibald Blair's occupation of the property, were excavated north of the first period kitchen.
Figure 11.
Throughout the 1720s, Blair continued to acquire land in Block 29. In 1721, he assumed the mortgage of Lots 163, 164, and 169 of William Levingston (OW 16:692), as well as Lots 176 and 177. In 1724, Blair purchased Lot 174 from Sir John Randolph, presumably located at the corner of Scotland and North England Streets (DAB 3:424-425). The acquisition of this lot allowed Blair to gain control over the entire eastern half of Block 29, with his lots fronting on Nicholson, North England and Scotland Streets.

When Randolph purchased Lot 174 from Alexander Spotswood one year earlier, the property was described as containing a tenement and as being contiguous to the gardens of Archibald Blair (DAB 3:404-405). Combining this bit of information with archaeological data on the location of Blair’s kitchen and trash pits, it is hypothesized that his gardens stretched along the lots west of the house (Lots 170 and 173), one of which is contiguous to Lot 174 described in the 1723 deed. The 1954 excavations located the corner of a large rectangular pit (over 32’ in length), west of the present stable. From its size and description, this pit sounds similar to planting beds which have been excavated recently in Williamsburg (Edwards et. al. 1988, Samford et. al. 1986), and may represent a planting bed on the Archibald Blair property.

Archibald Blair Trash Pits

Several small trash pits dating to Blair’s occupation of the property were recorded and partially excavated in 1985 and 1989 (Samford 1985, Moodey n.d.). The trash pits contained quantities of household and kitchen-related garbage and,
although neither feature was completely excavated, the two combined provide a profile of Blair’s ceramic assemblage and his diet. Tables 5 and 6 detail the trash pit ceramics functionally and by vessel form and type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type*</th>
<th># of Vessels</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teawares</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablewares</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet/Pharmaceutical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Teawares included tea bowls, handled tea or coffee cups, saucers, tea pots and slop bowls.
* Tablewares included plates, soup plates, punchbowls, tureens, patty pans, mugs, bowls, and cans.
* Toilet/Pharmaceutical wares included drug jars, ointment pots, and chamberpots.
* Storage wares included milk pans, butter pots, jugs, storage jars and pitchers.

The three plates represented in the assemblages were blue handpainted English tin enameled earthenwares with floral and geometric motifs. Not surprisingly, comparing the flat (plates, saucers) to hollow (bowls, soup plates, mugs, tea bowls, punch bowls) tea and tableware vessels from the trash pits shows that only 16% of the vessels were plates. The remaining 84% of the table or teaware ceramics were hollow drinking or serving vessels, such as bowls, tea bowls, cans, or tankards. This minimal number of ceramic plates suggests that Archibald Blair was
eating the majority of his meals from pewter. The importance of pewter plates, particularly in the early 18th century, has long been recognized (Martin 1989a, Beaudry et. al. 1983:25, Main 1982:242).

---

**TABLE 6**

**CERAMIC BREAKDOWN BY TYPE AND FORM**

**ARCHIBALD BLAIR'S TRASH PITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th># Vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colono-Indian</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red sandy ware</td>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorktown-type</td>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft, English</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft, English</td>
<td>Chamber pot</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft, English</td>
<td>Drug jar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft, English</td>
<td>Fireplace tile</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft, English</td>
<td>Ointment pot</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft, English</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft, English</td>
<td>Punch bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft, English</td>
<td>Tea bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerwald Stoneware</td>
<td>Chamber pot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham Stoneware</td>
<td>Mug/Tankard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire Stoneware</td>
<td>Mug/Tankard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham Stoneware</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham Stoneware</td>
<td>Storage Jar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Salt Glazed, dipped</td>
<td>Can</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Salt Glazed</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Salt Glazed</td>
<td>Mug/Tankard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Porcelain</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Porcelain</td>
<td>Cup, handled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Porcelain</td>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Porcelain</td>
<td>Tea Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  

38

The custom of serving tea was an important social ritual in the 18th-century colonies (Mudge 1962). The specific and costly equipment associated with the tea ceremony restricted its participation to the wealthy, particularly in the early 18th
century (Roth 1961:65). Blair’s teaware of choice was blue handpainted Chinese porcelain, with five vessels, all in teaware forms, present in the trash pits. Porcelain was an uncommon household item for this time period, with only 18% of inventoried estates over £491 listing porcelain (Carr and Walsh in press). No plates or tablewares in Chinese porcelain were recovered, probably reflecting the prohibitive cost of porcelain at that time period.

English stonewares, such as Nottingham, Staffordshire, and white salt glazed stoneware formed the core of Blair’s everyday drinking vessels like tankards and cans. Two leaded stemmed wine glasses were also included in the fill of the trash pits. The inverted baluster stems of these glasses were a style which was popular between 1730 and 1740 (Noel Hume 1969:191), so Blair was using leaded stemwares which were then fashionable.

The presence of numerous oyster shell and animal bone in the trash pits document the Blair family diet. In addition to the usual complement of cow, pig, and sheep/goat bones common to 18th-century assemblages, were turkey, chicken, raccoon, passenger pigeon, and the skull of a calf. In the 18th century, calves heads were boiled and used as elaborate centerpieces in formal dinner (Hooker 1984:46).

The architectural materials included in the fill of the trash pits were limited, but do suggest that Blair had delft tiles surrounding some of the fireplaces in his home. Fragments of mirror glass also attest to some of the further embellishments with which a man of Blair’s status decorated his home. Walsh’s study of York County probate inventories (1983) found that the purchase of amenities such as mirrors, prints, and teawares began to set the Tidewater elite apart from common people during the middle of the first quarter of the 18th century.
Summary

Archibald Blair continued to reside on his Block 29 lots until his death on March 4, 1733 (Webb-Prentis Papers). Documentary evidence suggests that he used the property solely for residential purposes, restricting his mercantile activities to other parts of the town. Blair continued to acquire land on Block 29 throughout the 1720s, and by 1724, he owned all but Lots 165 and 166.

Archaeological evidence suggests that Blair's house stood on Lot 171, at the corner of Nicholson and North England Streets. A kitchen was revealed north of the house along North England Street. Documentary evidence indicates that Blair's property contained a garden, possible formal in nature, and probably located on Lots 170 and 173 west of the house.

Blair's participation in numerous mercantile activities, as well as his political positions, made him a wealthy and powerful man in early 18th-century Williamsburg. This position is reflected in his personal possessions and diet, as revealed through the contents of his trash pits. His diet showed the mixture of domestic and wild animals common on sites of higher social and economic status (Otto 1984). Additionally, the calf skull suggests the elaborate and formal presentation of food, which was beginning to evolve as a formal ritual in the 18th century (Wenger, in press). Blair and his guests were being served on fine English delftwares and Chinese porcelains, at a time when the average York County citizen did not own elaborate ceramic tablewares.

In addition, Blair was also participating in the ritual of taking tea from elaborate Chinese porcelain teawares. The expense of tea and the accoutrements
associated with serving it restricted its access to a large proportion of York County society. This was also true for leaded glass tablewares, such as wine glasses. These vessels were used for social occasions and mark the increasing formality which was beginning to appear among the elite in the early 18th century. Blair’s position, not only as a politician, but as a merchant, would have made it necessary that he be able to entertain in style.

Another highly visible indicator of wealth and power would have been reflected in the house which Blair constructed on his property. Archaeological evidence suggests that Blair’s house was comparable with that of fellow gentryman and neighbor, Sir John Randolph. Although the interior appearance of the house is not known, it was decorated with mirrors and delft tile fireplace surrounds, as well as quality ceramics which would have most likely been used for display as well as for eating and drinking. In sum, Blair was representative of his social and economic class, a gentleman member of the elite class.
Lots 163, 164, and 169
William Levingston Household 1716 - 1723

Just months after Blair’s July 1716 lot purchase, William Levingston of York County, was granted Lots 163, 164, and 169 (DAB 3:204-205). Lots 163 and 164 faced Palace Green, while Lot 169 fronted on Nicholson Street, adjacent to Blair’s property. Levingston, like Blair, was also a merchant and surgeon in his forties. Formerly a merchant in New Kent County, Levingston moved to Williamsburg around the time he opened a dancing school at the College in 1716 (Proceedings 1716). Perhaps Levingston anticipated a market for entertainment in Williamsburg, since, in addition to the dancing school, he also constructed a bowling green and the colony’s first theatre on his property. Construction was probably completed on the theatre by May 28, 1718, when Governor Spotswood recorded that a play had been enacted on that date. (Spotswood Letters).

The William Levingston House

Archaeological trenching conducted on Lots 163 and 164 during 1930 and 1931 revealed a number of colonial period brick foundations (Knight 1931a, 1931b). Levingston’s house, constructed during the first two years of his tenure, was a central hall plan 1 1/2 story frame structure measuring 40’ north-south by 18’ east-west (Reed 1933:18). The house, which faced Palace Green, was covered with beaded weatherboarding. Two rooms, flanked a central hallway on the first floor. In its
appearance, the house was very similar to that constructed by John Brush on the adjoining property between 1718 and 1719 (Figure 12). Archaeological excavations within the unheated cellar of the house revealed a recessed floor drain and an exterior brick sump, located adjacent to the bulkhead entrance into the cellar.

A 24' north-south by 16' east-west wood frame kitchen was constructed directly south of the house, with a 24' x 6' shed added to the east at a later period. The kitchen, which had a paved brick floor, contained several brick features, one of which appeared to be a bake oven. A small outbuilding, probably representing a smokehouse, was located east of the kitchen and linked to it by a marl pathway.

Here, on lots 163 and 164, Levingston lived with his wife, Susannah, who he married sometime before 1723. It is not known whether they had any children, or whether either partner had been previously married. Records indicate that Levingston employed the services of four indentured servants (two male and two female) during his tenure on Lots 163, 164 and 169 (OW 15:584, OW 15:590, OW 16:10, OW 16:38). They were most likely housed in the kitchen, in the small unheated 14 1/2' by 6' room to the south and the 24' by 6' shed addition on the first floor.

In May of 1720, Levingston applied for and received a licence for keeping an ordinary in his dwelling home in Williamsburg for the upcoming year (OW15:587). He renewed this licence once in May of 1721 (OW16:38), operating an ordinary on the property for a total of less than two years. The 1721 license contained a clause that Levingston was to provide his customers with a stable and pasture for their horses (OW 16:42). This stable and pasture area may have been located to east of the house and garden.
Figure 12.
It is during the early 1720s that evidence of Levingston's financial difficulties begin to appear in the York County records. On May 25, 1721, nine days after he was granted his second ordinary license, he mortgaged his five Williamsburg lots to Archibald Blair, his neighbor to the east (OW15:688). It is probable that he continued to occupy the property for several years, since he appears frequently in the York County records during this period, usually in actions where he is being sued for debts. In June of 1723, Levingston tried to repossess the mortgaged property from Blair, which had been let to Robert Faldo for a period of five years (OW15:688). Levingston never recovered the lots, and by 1726 he is described in the York County records as Dr. Levingston of New Kent County (OW 16:383). It is likely that he moved soon after losing possession of the lots, and that Robert Faldo occupied the property. No other mention of Robert Faldo appears in the York County records, so no additional information is available concerning him.

Although archaeological trenching was conducted around Levingston's house and kitchen in 1931, no archaeological assemblages which can be associated with Levingston's household were recovered.

First Theatre in America

One objective of the archaeological excavations conducted on Lots 163, 164 and 169 during the 1930s and 1940s was to locate the foundations of the First Theatre constructed in the British colonies. Levingston's house foundation, after it was uncovered by the 1931 cross trenching, was first believed to represent the theatre (Ragland 1931). Much debate by Colonial Williamsburg's architectural
historians about the building's size and the configuration of 18th-century theatres in England, however, followed by additional archaeological excavation, resulted in another structure on the lot being designated as the theatre (Smart 1986). This foundation, located north of Levingston's house on Lot 164, measured 86.5' east to west and 30' north to south (Figure 13). The thickness of the brick walls indicated a frame structure set on the brick foundation. This portion of Lot 164 has since been interpreted by Colonial Williamsburg as the site of the First Theatre in the English speaking colonies.

Recent evidence, however, has come to light which suggests that this large building was constructed for entirely different reasons and somewhat later in time than the theatre. In using interpretations made by the early Foundation archaeologists and architectural historians, it must be remembered that they were working with less accurate dating tools than archaeologists currently at work in Williamsburg. Excavation which involved cross-trenching to expose brick foundations, no stratigraphic soil removal, and little or no regard for the recovery of artifacts made dating of building foundations virtually impossible. This was the case with the so-called theatre foundations.

Archaeological test excavations conducted on the site in the summer of 1988 re-examined some portions of the foundation walls that had been excavated in 1947 (Samford n.d.). In doing so, a section of the foundation was dismantled and lifted to allow excavation of the soil layers directly below the foundation. In doing so, archaeologists found fragments of three different types of ceramics whose beginning manufacture date falls after 1720, two years after the theatre had supposedly been completed and in operation. One of these ceramic types, a highly fired earthenware
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with a black glaze and known as Jackfield, did not begin manufacture until after 1745 (Noel Hume 1969:123).

Additionally, examination of the archaeological map of the excavations prepared in 1947 by James Knight, showed an oval area within the foundation walls demarcating the location of a trash pit. Notes on the map indicate that the trash pit contained a "considerable fill of broken ale bottles, broken and whole pill cups, broken and whole medicine bottles, -also china fragments" (Knight 1947d). From 1735 to 1757, Lots 163, 164 and 169 were owned by an apothecary, George Gilmer. Excavations conducted in 1967 by Ivor Noel Hume directly to the north of the "theatre" building located five trash pits associated with Doctor Gilmer's occupation of the lot (Frank 1967). The most well represented categories of artifacts located in those trash pits were delft drug jars, ointment pots, and glass medicine, wine and Piermont Water bottles. Although the artifacts collected by Knight during the 1947 excavation could not be located, the descriptions of the artifacts within that trash pit sound remarkably similar to those excavated in 1967.

Since it is very unlikely that anyone would dig a trash pit within a standing building, the pit would have to have been created and filled either prior to the "theatre" construction, or after the building was destroyed. Based on the evidence provided by the post-1745 ceramics found in the soil under the foundation walls, and from historical documentation that the theatre was still standing as late as 1769 (Va Gaz, March 23, 1769), it is very likely that the foundations which have been interpreted as a theatre for almost forty years, were actually constructed many years later and served an entirely different function. Structural, dating and documentary evidence seem to suggest that this building may have actually been constructed as
a stable during the third quarter of the 18th-century. This will be discussed in detail later. Although it is known from York County records that Levingston had a stable on his property, the building under discussion would have been constructed much too late for it to have served as his stable. It is postulated that Levingston's stable may have been on Lot 164, an area which has not been explored archaeologically.

This still leaves the theatre location in question. York County records describe the property in 1723 as containing "2 Messuages, 1 house called the playhouse one Stable one Acre & half of land called the bowling Green and one Acre of Garden w/the [sic] appurtenances" (OW 15:688). The two messuages certainly refer to the house and kitchen on Lots 163 and 164, while the one acre garden may have been east of the house. The theatre would have surely been adjacent to either Nicholson Street or Palace Street, meaning it could have been located at the southern end of either Lots 163 or 169. A 1751 newspaper advertisement revealed that George Gilmer, later owner of Lots 163, 164 and 169, sold drugs "at his Shop, nigh the Court-House, the Corner of Palace-Street" (Va Gaz). The Courthouse referred to would be the First Theatre building, which had been sold to a group of subscribers and refitted for use as a courthouse in 1745 (DAB 5:153-155). The Frenchman's Map shows a structure believed to be Gilmer's apothecary shop still standing on Lot 163 at the corner of Palace and Nicholson Streets in 1781 (Figure 14). Since no unexplainable structures were located north of the apothecary shop on Lot 163 by cross trenching, and since no archaeological excavation to prove otherwise has taken place east of the shop, evidence points to the original location of the First Theatre as to the east, on Lot 169, near the site of the present Tucker-Coleman House.
Only comprehensive archaeological excavations on Lot 169 can prove or disprove this hypothesis. Since this property, although owned by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, is inhabited by a life tenant, these proposed excavations will of necessity be a future project.

Summary

Levingston's use of his Palace Green property was both commercial and residential. After acquiring his three lots on Block 29 and two in Block 20 in 1716, he constructed a house and outbuildings within two years. The house, a central hall structure similar to that constructed by John Brush, displayed a floor plan which was just beginning to make its appearance in Virginia during that period (Wenger 1986).
Several years later, Levingston operated an ordinary in this building for visitors coming to Williamsburg to conduct business. Levingston was also responsible for constructing the first performing theatre in the colonies.

Within several years of purchasing his Palace Street lots, Levingston had become mired in such financial problems that he was forced to mortgage his property. After defaulting on the mortgage, Levingston left Williamsburg, and the property was rented out by the new owner, Archibald Blair.

Unfortunately, little is known about Levingston’s personal possessions, either through documentary or archaeological research, so it is difficult to compare him with other York County residents.
Lots 165 and 166

John Brush Household 1717 - 1726

The last group of lots to be purchased on Block 29 were those two forming the northwestern corner of the block. On July 7, 1717, the trustees of Williamsburg granted to John Brush of James City County two one half acre lots numbered 165 and 166 (DAB 3:246-248).

The John Brush House

Brush, a gunsmith by trade, constructed his frame story and a half house on Lot 165 by 1719. This house, with subsequent modifications, is standing on the property today. Archaeological excavations around the foundation of the house (Knight 1947a, 1947b) and research conducted by architectural historians when the house was restored in the late 1940s (Kocher and Dearstyne 1950), indicate that Brush built a fairly modest home, measuring 44' 2" x 20' 0", with two rooms on the first floor separated by a central passage. These rooms, the hall and the chamber, were used for formal entertaining and family living, respectively. This central passage type of floor plan had begun making its appearance in the Virginia colony during the first quarter of the 18th century (Wenger 1986:137). Since the house, as originally constructed, contained no dormer windows that would emit light into the second
story of the house, it is believed that the second floor was used for little more than storage during Brush's occupation. The roof was sheathed with wooden clapboards and the interior of the house was floored with yellow pine.

Sometime within a few years of 1720, John Brush constructed the northeastern wing of the house (Figure 15). Dendrochronology performed in 1984 indicated that 1720 was the last growth year for the trees used in constructing the framing of the wing (Heikkenen 1984). Measuring 16' EW by 18' NS, this wing added 288 square feet of living space to the first floor of the original house. The 1947 archaeological excavation revealed evidence of a matching southeastern wing (Knight 1947a, 1947b). It is possible that this wing was constructed at the same time as the northeastern addition.

During Brush's occupation, the northern room of the house was plastered, with a cornice molding, while the hallway and southern room contained no cornice or any other form of decorative woodwork at that time (Kocher and Dearstyne 1950). This more elaborate treatment of the northern room suggests that Brush used this as the more public space in his home. The original stairway to the second floor was replaced later in the 18th century, so its original appearance is not known. It is possible that the second floor was reached by a simple ladder arrangement (CWF Guidebook).

Brush's estate inventory suggests the multifunctional use of some of the rooms in the house. Recent research has suggested that many early 18th-century homes were built modestly, with multipurpose space common (Upton 1979, Walsh 1983, Wenger, in press). It was only later in the 18th century that specialized use of rooms for dining or entertaining began to take place.
Phases of House Development

Brush House, c. 1719 - c. 1721

Brush House, post 1721

Everard Period, c. 1751 - 1781

Map not to scale

Figure 15.
Brush's inventory also lists a minimum of furniture, and some of it bore the designation "old". The clustering in the inventory, however, of a clock, a desk, a looking glass, a tea table and a chest of drawers suggest that these items were placed together in one room. The nature of the items, plus their valuation of £12 relative to the value of all of Brush's other furniture (£7), suggests that these were grouped in the more public room of the house. Perhaps here is evidence that the emphasis of Brush's buying power was being placed on public display areas and activities, such as the ritual of tea taking. This may also indicate that Brush is beginning to use some space in his home for specialized purposes.

At the time of his lot purchase, Brush was around the age of forty, and was a widower with four children. There is no documentation that he owned any slaves or employed the services of indentured labor. Brush, a gunsmith by trade, was trained in England, receiving his admittance into the Gunmakers Company Guild in 1699 (Brush 1977). There is some indication that Brush was brought to Virginia by Governor Alexander Spotswood sometime after 1710 to serve as a gunsmith (Anonymous 1922:299). Brush was keeper of the arms at the Magazine and also ran a gunsmithing operation on his Palace Green lots. The 1967 excavation of a Brush period trash pit, which contained large quantities of iron waste, indicated that John Brush was performing many general blacksmithing jobs, as well as making and repairing guns (Frank 1967:29).

Although the remains of his shop have not been positively located through archaeological excavation, evidence from the work done around the colonial period kitchen in 1967 and again in 1988 suggest that Brush's shop was east of the house, in the vicinity of the present kitchen building. Since Brush was required to construct
two buildings on his lot in order to retain title to them, it is likely his shop constituted one of those buildings. Ashes and iron slag beneath the clay floor of the kitchen indicated that the kitchen was not in existence during Brush's occupation (Frank 1967).

The 1967 excavations found two shallow slot trenches, predating the construction of the kitchen, which possibly represent the locations for the wooden sills of an earlier outbuilding (Frank 1967:27). Significant amounts of gunsmithing debris located in this area, both from yard scatter and within trash pit and privy fills, suggest this possible structure may have been his shop. Although no forges were found during the 1967 excavations, the possible sill building was only partially excavated. Figure 16 shows the conjectured location of the shop as well as other features present on the property during Brush's occupation.

The kitchen currently standing on the property was constructed as a frame building on a brick foundation after 1730, at least several years following Brush's death. No early kitchen building has been located through archaeological excavation, and it is suspected that cooking
may have taken place in the basement of the house during Brush's tenure. The danger of fire from the constantly lit kitchen hearth and the odors of cooking may have prompted the construction of an exterior kitchen on the property after 1730.

The John Brush Privy

Only one outbuilding which can be positively identified with John Brush has been located through archaeological research. This structure represented a privy, measuring 8' x 10', with a large (6' x 5') rectangular pit within its foundation walls (Figures 17 and 18). Sometime during the ten years Brush owned the property before his death in 1727, he removed the frame superstructure from the building foundation and began to fill the privy pit with debris from both his gunsmithing operations and his household. Only the bottom soil layers in the pits showing any evidence of being privy fill. The pit appeared to have been filled quickly, probably within less than a year, and then the remaining brickwork (or at least that which had not fallen into the open pit) dismantled for use elsewhere. The rapid demise of this building may be explained by the fact that it straddled the property line between Lot 165, owned by Brush, and Lot 164, owned by William Levingston. Although no
boundary dispute has been located in the York County records, it is possible that Levingston or later owner Archibald Blair may have wanted the building removed since it encroached on his property.

The quality of ceramics and table glass recovered from the privy (Table 7) suggests than Brush, a middle class artisan, enjoyed a much higher quality of life than his typical peers. The ceramics from the privy included English delft table and teawares, including one blue handpainted Chinoiserie cappucino cup (Figure 19). These ceramics, plus the listing of a tea table in the 1727 inventory of John Brush's estate, indicate Brush's participation in the formal proceeding of the tea ceremony. In the third decade of the 18th century, only 33% of York Country inventoried urban estates valued between £226 and £490 listed tea or teawares (Carr
and Walsh, in press:87), with the prohibitive cost of tea and its furniture restricting its access to only the very wealthy. Brush, with his entire estate valued at only £90 at his death in 1726, certainly did not fit into the category of wealth. During that same time period, no inventoried urban York County estates valued between £50 and £94 contained listings of tea or teaware. Perhaps more surprising than the delft teawares were the Chinese porcelain tea and tablewares included in the privy and other Brush period deposits. The costliness of porcelain in the early 18th century guaranteed its place as a symbol of wealth and status. For this reason, porcelain was commonly found only in the households of the upper class until the second quarter
of the 18th century (Noel Hume 1969:257), and generally was not available to middle and lower classes in local stores until the 1740s (Martin 1988). Fragments of two molded Silesian pedestal stemmed wine glasses, popular between 1710 and 1730 were also recovered, attesting to Brush’s acquisition of expensive and elaborate table glass.

Performing pollen and parasite analysis on the soil layers filling the privy revealed interesting information about the diet and daily lives of the Brush household. Seeds and pollen from plants such as broccoli, blackberries, French parsley, potatoes, and capers testify to the varied diet of the family (Reinhard 1988).

Figure 19.

The Ravine Deposits

Archaeological investigations of the western portion of Colonial Lot 166, directly north of John Brush’s house, revealed that no buildings stood there during the 18th or 19th centuries. Instead, the end of a large ravine bisected the northern end of the lot, making it noninhabitable. This ravine became the repository for the
garbage of the Lot 165 inhabitants over the next six decades.

The earliest layer of garbage in the ravine dated to the John Brush occupation of the property. Traces of household activities, as well as architectural renovations on the property were evident in the ravine accumulation. Fragments of twenty different ceramic vessels were recovered from the earliest layer of Brush fill (Table 8). The largest category of the ceramics were English delftwares (55%), ranging from table and teawares, to ointment pots. A white salt glazed stoneware tea pot, perhaps used with the delft tea bowls found in the privy and ravine, were also present.

---

**TABLE 8**

**BRUSH RAVINE LAYER - PRIMARY ASH LAYER**

Vessels Organized by Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th># Vessels</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yorktown-type</td>
<td>Chamberpot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorktown-type</td>
<td>Milk pan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>Drug jar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>Fireplace tile</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>Lid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>Salve pot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>Punch bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>Tea bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerwald stone</td>
<td>Chamber pot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham stone</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham stone</td>
<td>Storage jar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White salt-glazed</td>
<td>Coffee pot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese porcelain</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Fragments of four delft fireplace tiles, decorated in blue suggest a delft fireplace surround, and leaded window cameas from the ravine and the 1967 trash pit indicate casement windows were in use somewhere on the property, perhaps in the first period house or shop.

No objects identifiable as gun parts were recovered from the primary Brush ravine fill, further corroborating the idea that Brush's shop was located at the opposite, or southern, end of the property, where numerous gun parts were recovered through excavation.

---

**TABLE 9**

**BRUSH RAVINE LAYER - BRICK LAYERS**

Vessel Type Organized by Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th># Vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colono ware</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorktown-type</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorktown-type</td>
<td>Milk pan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>Drug jar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>Fireplace tile</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>Salve pot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>Punch bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>Tea bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerwald stone</td>
<td>Chamber pot</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham stone</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham stone</td>
<td>Tankard/Mug</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham stone</td>
<td>Storage jar</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White salt glazed</td>
<td>Cream Jug</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese porcelain</td>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese porcelain</td>
<td>Tea bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 32
A second soil layer excavated in 1987 may relate to the John Brush occupation of the lot. Sealing the Brush layer in the ravine was a layer of broken brick bats (Layer 139). This layer contained other debris indicative of architectural renovation, including plaster, wrought nails, window glass, and mortar. Table 9 lists the ceramic vessels from this layer.

It is believed that the brick layers represent renovation on the property by Brush; perhaps the addition of the northeastern wing generated the brick and mortar debris seen in the ravine. Another, smaller scatter of brick located between the house and the ravine (Layer 131), contained several gun parts, gun flints, slag, and iron tools that were also associated with the Brush occupation. Crossmends between the Brush household garbage layer and the two deposits of brick suggest that these layers were generated by the same household. This is further corroborated by comparing vessel profiles from all ravine layers, including two later layers, which show similar percentages of vessel forms in the two Brush layers. This comparison shows that the Brush primary ash layer and the brick were generated by the same household (Table 10).

When Brush died in 1726, an inventory was prepared of his estate (OW 16:424, 438). Valued at a little over £90, Brush's estate included household possessions as well as equipment and supplies associated with his shop. The house was furnished with some items which were unusual for a man of his social standing: a tea table, a desk, a corner cupboard, and a chest of drawers. Carson and Walsh (1981) found that owning desks, chests of drawers and other items of case furniture was very unusual for a man of Brush's economic standing during the second decade of the 18th century. His personal possessions also included a silver watch and a
clock. The kitchen equipment listed in the inventory is meager (one jar, one earthenware and two stoneware pots and one dripping pan), belying the wide range or kitchen, table and teawares found in Brush’s trash deposits.

---

**TABLE 10**

**RATIO OF TEAWARES TO OTHER VESSEL FORMS**

**THE BRUSH-EVERARD SITE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Toilet</th>
<th>Storage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brush</td>
<td>1 to 2.5</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick layers</td>
<td>1 to 2.75</td>
<td>1 to 1.9</td>
<td>1 to 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everard ash</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>1.3 to 1</td>
<td>1.1 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique ash</td>
<td>1 to 1.4</td>
<td>4 to 1</td>
<td>1.3 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privy</td>
<td>1 to 2.00</td>
<td>1.25 to 1</td>
<td>2.5 to 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5 contains information concerning vessel forms included in the table, tea, toilet and storage categories.

---

Brush was also listed as owning a horse and equipage. No stables have been located through archaeological excavations on the property, and it is possible that Brush boarded his horse elsewhere.

**Summary**

Through combining information from archaeological, documentary, and architectural research, a new picture of John Brush begins to emerge. Although a
gunsmith of middling wealth, Brush was leading a lifestyle beyond that of other artisans of the time period in several aspects. The central passage plan of Brush’s house, which was to become a standard feature of colonial period Chesapeake houses, was just making its appearance during the first quarter of the 18th century. This floor plan, with two rooms opening off of the passage, embraced new ideas about privacy and specialized use of space (Wenger 1986). The items of high social display listed in Brush’s inventory were clustered in one room, suggesting that Brush was beginning to participate in these new concepts about segregation of space.

Additionally, Brush appeared to be concerned about quantity of space, since within several years of purchasing his property and constructing his dwelling, he was able to build an addition and almost double his useable living space. Evidence from trash deposits suggest Brush may have changed from casement to more modern sash windows in the house at the time he added the northeastern wing. The discovery of delft tiles also indicate that his fireplaces had decorative surrounds.

Brush’s estate of household and shop goods, valued at only £90, placed him squarely in the middling ranks of York County society. Yet, some of his personal possessions suggest that Brush was emulating his social and economic betters. Although the 1727 inventory describes some of Brush’s furniture as old, he was able to set his table with finely painted English delftwares and some pieces of Chinese porcelain. Various other decorative and luxury items, such as a silver watch, a looking glass, pictures, and a tea table also set Brush apart from other artisans of the time.

The results of Walsh (1983:111) show that by the 1730s, middling families were beginning to acquire amenities which had been previously restricted to the
gentry. Items such as teawares, clocks, mirrors, and prints were finding their way into the homes of middling planters. Urban artisans and laborers were purchasing many more amenities than their rural counterparts. Perhaps this phenomenon is what is reflected in the inventory and archaeological possessions of John Brush. He had begun to exhibit some social display items, such as a clock and looking glass, while his English delftware and Chinese porcelain teawares would have probably served display as well as functional purposes.

The majority of Brush's personal possessions, however, were still more indicative of his middle class status although displaying some strange disparities. For example, Carr and Walsh (1985) discovered in their analysis of York County probate inventories that acquiring and upgrading beds and bedding were uppermost in the expenditures of early 18th-century York county citizens of all economic classes. The probate inventories of urban York County estates valued between £50 and £225 for the period between 1723 and 1732 showed 20.7% of the estate value consisting of beds and bedding. This is compared with only 7% of Brush's estate value placed in the same category. Obversely, Brush had 11% of his wealth contained in timepieces, compared with 4.3% for the average urban York county citizen of his same economic class (Walsh 1983). This disparity between comfort and social display by Brush is not easily explained.

As would be expected from analysis of the probate inventories of men of Brush's economic group (Carson and Walsh 1981), Brush's inventory did not contain specialized kitchen equipment, such as bake ovens, egg slices, or copper pans. The pollen samples and faunal material from the privy, however, suggested a varied diet for Brush and his household. This diet was one which was flavored with spices, and
supplemented with fruits and vegetables, such as potatoes and broccoli. Broccoli, which required specialized growing conditions, was one of the exotic vegetables which were favored by elite classes (Stiverson and Butler 1987:34).

Although Brush's personal possessions (such as the porcelain, teawares, and a mirror) bespeak of a man of wealth, the remainder of his household goods show a man who falls squarely within his wealth category (Carson and Walsh 1981). His purchases of amenities make him an aberration for his time period and wealth category; Brush was several decades ahead of the push by the middle class to purchase luxury items. Perhaps the patronage of Governor Spotswood was a factor in this behavior.
Overall Summary of the Early Residents of Block 29

The first residents of Block 29 cannot be easily characterized. Table 11 summarizes the block owners during the first quarter of the 18th century. Along the eastern half of the block, a gentry merchant and statesman had purchased half of the available land. Here, adjacent to fellow gentry neighbors, he constructed a house and its attendant outbuildings, and what was most likely a formal garden on his property.

---

TABLE 11
BLOCK 29 PROPERTY OWNERS, 1700-1730

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTS</th>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>1713-1723</td>
<td>A. Spotswood</td>
<td>Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>1713-1715</td>
<td>D. Groom</td>
<td>Tanner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>1713-1715</td>
<td>C. Jackson</td>
<td>Surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-173</td>
<td>1716-1733</td>
<td>A. Blair</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163/164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>1716-1721</td>
<td>W. Levingston</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165/166</td>
<td>1717-1727</td>
<td>J. Brush</td>
<td>Gunsmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>1723-1724</td>
<td>J. Randolph</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>1724-1733</td>
<td>A. Blair</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
On the west side of the block, lots around Palace Green began to sell about the same time Spotswood moved into the Palace. Although the construction of the Governors Palace began in 1706, when Spotswood arrived in June of 1710, the house was little more than an enclosed shell. Spotswood moved into the house by 1716, but the Palace itself was not completed until 1722. The Governor’s Palace was one of the finest houses of its kind in North America during that time period. Along the Palace Green, the lots were purchased by a middle class artisan and another merchant/entrepreneur. These men built houses of a type which were becoming more common during the early years of the 18th century. The central passage floor plan of Brush’s and Levingston’s houses show a awakening concern with the demarcation between public and private spaces within the household.

The functional character of the block as a whole also showed a mixed nature. Figure 20 shows buildings and other features on Block 29 in the 1720s. Although Blair seemed to be using his property strictly for residential purposes, running his business out of a store on the more centralized Duke of Gloucester Street, the other residents used their lots in several fashions. Brush plied his trade of gunsmithing on the property, adjacent to the home of the Colony’s Governor, while Levingston constructed a theatre and a bowling green on his lots. Levingston’s home also functioned as an ordinary for two years, no doubt serving out-of-town visitors who came into Williamsburg on business. Table 12 summarizes property use during the first decade of the 18th century.
Figure 20.
TABLE 12
FUNCTIONS ON BLOCK 29 1700-1730

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Use of Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163, 164</td>
<td>House and Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165, 166</td>
<td>House and Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-174</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The men who first purchased property on Block 29 were middle aged family men. Brush and Blair were both settled in their careers and financially stable, although of differing economic statuses. Levingston, who experienced financial difficulties during his occupation on Block 29, may have been involved in too many different ventures to be successful at any of them.

In accordance with the nature of the labor force during the early 18th century, the residents of Block 29 appeared to rely largely on indentured labor. The first mention of slave ownership came in 1728 for Archibald Blair, while there is no evidence that the other two residents owned slaves.

Although no archaeological assemblages have been excavated which can be attributed to William Levingston, comparison of Archibald Blair and John Brush is possible. Blair, as one of the more successful merchants in the Virginia colony, was a member of the wealthy elite, while Brush was a middling artisan. Surprisingly, however, their ceramic and glass tablewares were very similar. Both men owned Chinese porcelains, not surprising for Blair, but an expensive purchase for a man of
Brush's means. Despite the small sample size of the assemblage, Blair's ceramic assemblage did contain a larger percentage of porcelain vessels (13% compared with Brush's 6%), and he also owned a wider range of vessel forms in porcelain. Both men owned English delft teawares, another unexpected category for Brush when the taking of tea was a ritual restricted to the wealthy elite during the early 18th century.

Perhaps Brush's personal possessions are a foreshadowing of the coming shift in middle class consumer behavior towards purchasing nonessential items for their homes. Possibly affected by the patronage of Governor Spotswood, Brush perhaps felt a desire to acquire items which would state his desired position in life.
CHAPTER VI
WILLIAMSBURG AS THE COLONY’S LEADING URBAN CENTER, 1731-1750

Lots 163, 164, and 169
Dr. George Gilmer Household 1735-1757

After Archibald Blair’s death in 1733, his son John Blair, Esquire, executor for his father’s estate, sold the three lots mortgaged to Blair by Levingston in 1721. They were purchased by George Gilmer of Williamsburg in 1735, for a sum of £155, and were described in the deed as the site of William Levingston’s house and kitchen, the house called the Playhouse, and the site of the former bowling green. (DAB 5:153-155).

Gilmer, an apothecary and surgeon, was born in Edinburgh in 1700 (Anonymous 1907:225). Educated, like Archibald Blair, at the University of Edinburgh, Gilmer moved to London and set up practice there. His first marriage, to the daughter of his business partner, Dr. Ridgway, produced no known children. Soon after his marriage, business took Gilmer to the colonies, and upon returning, he found his wife had died (Gilmer, 1855). Leaving London again for the colonies, Gilmer arrived in Williamsburg in 1731. His second marriage to Mary Peachy, lasted from 1732 until her death in 1745 (Va Gaz, Oct 10, 1745) and produced two sons, Peachy,
born 1737/8, and George Junior, born 1743 (Gilmer 1855). By his third wife, Harrison Blair (married 1745), there were four children: two daughters and two sons. Only one child, John, lived past childhood (Brock Notebook).

The 1747/8 smallpox list shows thirteen people in Gilmer's household recovered from the disease, while one of Gilmer's daughters died. At least seven of those surviving were slaves living on the property. Between the years 1747 and 1753, Gilmer had ten slaves baptized, at least three of whom were adults. Listed in his will were four adult slaves and an unspecified number of slave children (WI 20:423).

Gilmer was thirty five when he purchased the lots along Palace Green. Although there are no documents which indicate that he made any alterations to the house immediately after purchase, it is known that he opened an apothecary shop in town by November 5, 1736 (Va Gaz). It is believed that Gilmer constructed this building on the corner of Palace and Nicholson Streets, since his apothecary shop was described in a May 27, 1737 Virginia Gazette advertisement as "near the Governor's" and later, more specifically as "Nigh the Courthouse, the Corner of Palace-Street, Williamsburg" (Va Gaz 9-5-51). Although the Frenchman's Map shows a small structure standing on this corner in 1781, archaeological cross trenching done there in the early 1930s revealed no traces of this shop.

In addition to his practicing as an apothecary and surgeon, Gilmer maintained a growing list of public duties. He was a Justice of the Peace from 1738 to 1756, and served a term as the Sheriff of York County beginning in 1743. He was also the Mayor of Williamsburg in 1746, and again in 1754/5. Towards the end of his life, he also became involved in business ventures. In 1752, Gilmer and John Chiswell purchased the Raleigh Tavern (DAB 5:493), which continued in its use as a tavern.
Three and a half years later Gilmer advertised the tavern for lease (Va Gazette 19 Dec 1755) but at his death, he still owned his share in the venture.

**The Gilmer House**

The interior appearance of Gilmer's house is suggested by the letter he wrote to his merchant Walter King in August of 1752. This letter states:

"Mrs. Gilmer is perfectly satisfied with your conduct about her China...I have just finished a closet for her to put it in as agreed on before you left us. I am wainscoting my dining room, which with a handsome marble chimney piece &c with glass over it, will make it a tolerable room for an Apothecary" (Brock Notebook).

Gilmer refers in detail to the interior renovation of his house. One of the recorded items was the installation of a marble chimney piece. Perhaps this stone replaced a fireplace surround of delft fireplace tiles, of which four decorated examples were found in trash pits dating to his occupation.

The results of Gilmer's renovation may be evident today in the parlor of the Tucker-Coleman house, whose core was formed by moving the Levingston/Gilmer house to Lot 169 in the late 18th century. The parlor contains 18th-century wainscoting, carved chair rails, cornices and baseboards. The original corner cupboard in what is today the parlor of the Tucker Coleman House may represent Mrs. Gilmer's china cupboard. The Brock Notebooks also reveal that the interior of Gilmer's house was furnished with mirrors, status ceramics, and a desk. Additionally, he purchased two paintings from the estate of John Collett in 1751.
(OW 20:215-17) with which to decorate his home.

The Gilmer Trash Pits

As mentioned previously, Noel Hume's 1967 archaeological investigations along the northern portion of Lot 164 revealed five trash pits which were associated with Dr. Gilmer's house and shop. The large quantities of delft drug jars, salve pots, and pharmaceutical bottles contained within the pits constitute the finest assemblage of mid-18th century apothecary-related items ever recovered in a Williamsburg excavation (Figure 21). Table 13 lists the vessels excavated from these five trash pits. At the same time, the presence of substantial numbers of Chinese porcelain, delft, and white salt glazed stoneware table and teawares attest to the Gilmer household garbage which found its way into the trash pits along with the shop garbage.
### TABLE 13
VESSELS RECOVERED FROM GILMER TRASH PITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Devon, plain</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Devon, gravel</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colono-Indian</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberian</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White sandy ware</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red sandy ware</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorktown-type</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-glazed redware</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>tableware</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>pharmacy</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>toilet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerwald stoneware</td>
<td>toilet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English stoneware</td>
<td>tableware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham stoneware</td>
<td>tableware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham stoneware</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White salt glaze</td>
<td>tableware</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White salt glaze</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astbury</td>
<td>tableware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese porcelain</td>
<td>tableware</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese porcelain</td>
<td>teaware</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 301

In the previously quoted letter to merchant King, Gilmer mentioned the set of china that was being sent to Mrs. Gilmer, and the closet constructed to hold the porcelain (Brock Notebook). Twenty six porcelain vessels, including two matching blue and white Chinese porcelain plates were recovered from the trash pits (Figure
This porcelain, which contains an unusual design and detailed painting, is a high quality ware, whose shape and painting style place its production in the first quarter of the 18th century. Due to their earlier manufacture date, it is doubtful that these are the plates ordered by Gilmer in 1752. It is more likely that fragments of overglaze porcelain decorated in red and black also recovered from the trash pits represented this order. The Gilmer family also owned Chinese porcelain teawares in the forms of cups, saucers, tea bowls, and slop bowls. Tableware forms included seven plates, a platter, and four punch bowls, with Chinese porcelain making up nineteen percent of the Gilmer household ceramics. Ninety percent of the porcelain recovered was contained within the latest of the five trash pits. The only two molded white salt glazed plates, beginning manufacture after 1740 (Noel Hume 1969:115) recovered were also contained within this same trash pit.

In addition to the porcelain, numerous ceramics of English manufacture were included in the trash pits. Teaware forms were also found in white salt glazed
stonewares and decorated English delftwares. While delft tablewares were distributed evenly throughout all of the five pits, the only delft teaware vessel found was contained within an early period trash pit. Although delft was used in the 18th century as a low cost substitute for Chinese porcelain, it was not particularly effective as a teaware. The fragility of the glaze could not withstand repeated contact with hot liquids without cracking and breaking (Garner and Archer 1972:22). The scarcity of delft teawares and its position within the earliest trash pit indicates that Gilmer quickly replaced his delft teawares with English white salt glaze stoneware and Chinese porcelain.

Preliminary analysis of the Gilmer ceramics indicates that the family was eating from blue and white painted delft tablewares during their first years of lot ownership, replacing these with molded white salt glaze plates and other tablewares sometime after 1740.

Summary

The documentary and archaeological evidence portray Gilmer as a man in his middle age, successful both in business and public service. Part of this success is evident in his entrepreneurial activities, which consisted largely of purchasing rental property, such as his joint venture in the Raleigh Tavern (DAB 5:495-497). His letter to King shows that he is not only concerned with outward appearances of wealth, but that he felt he was successful. John Blair's diary records that Gilmer entertained the Governor at his home upon several occasions (Tyler 1899:148). He also maintained a close friendship with other gentry, including John Blair,
entertaining him at his home, corresponding with him, and eventually marrying his sister, Harrison Blair, in 1745.

This concern for outward appearances surely played a part in the Gilmer's decision to purchase Chinese porcelain tablewares, and to build a special cupboard for their display in one of the more public rooms of the house. Even at mid century, Chinese porcelain was still a luxury, with only 50% of all households in the highest wealth category owning specialized drinking and dining equipment (Carson and Walsh 1981). In addition, evidence from the trash pits indicates that some of Gilmer's porcelain was part of a matched set of excellent quality. Sets of ceramics were not common until the 19th century, another testament to Gilmer's concern with ownership of status items. The majority (76% or 19 vessels) of Gilmer's porcelains, in both table and teaware forms are blue underglaze handpainted in floral and Chinoiserie designs. Six vessels decorated in overglaze handpainted designs, in forms equally divided between tea and tableware, were found in the uppermost layer of the latest trash pit. This seems to indicate that this porcelain, which represented the most costly ceramic items found in the trash pits, was among the latest of Gilmer's ceramic acquisitions. These overglaze porcelain pieces, which show designs common to the second half of the 18th century (Noel Hume 1969:259), may have been part of the china ordered in 1752. Additionally, over 90% of the porcelain found in the Gilmer assemblage was from the latest trash pit, indicating that the bulk of his porcelain acquisition occurred during the latter portion of his occupancy on Block 29. Only three porcelain vessels were recovered from the four earlier trash pits, and these forms were decorated using the less expensive technique of blue underglaze handpainting.
Gilmer continued to live on the property until his death in January of 1757, leaving the property to his son, Peachy Gilmer (WI 20:423). His use of the property, consistent with that of Levingston before him was commercial and residential. Although archaeological excavations of the house in which he resided did not show evidence that Gilmer enlarged the house in any way, he is documented as renovating the interior in the early 1750s.
Lots 165 and 166
Occupants Between 1727 - 1749

Thomas Barbar and Elizabeth Russell

Very little is known about the owners of Lot 165 and 166 during the years immediately following the death of John Brush. In his will, Brush divided the Palace Green lots equally between his unmarried daughter, Elizabeth Brush, and his son-in-law, Thomas Barbar, wife of Susannah Brush (OW 16:424). By indenture dated February 2, 1727, several months after Brush’s death, Elizabeth Brush conveyed her portion of the property to her brother-in-law for the payment of £80 of Virginia currency (DAB 3:440). Barbar, a carpenter, died in May of 1727, leaving his wife, Susannah as the executor of his will. She probably continued to live on the property until she sold it, in November of 1728 to Elizabeth Russell, widow, of York County (DAB 3:496-497).

The York County records contain very little information about Elizabeth Russell, but it is possible that she was the former Elizabeth Brush, married and widowed within the space of approximately two years. Plans for marriage may have been the reason she initially sold her share of the house to brother-in-law Barbar. It is probable that Russell continued to reside on the Palace Street lots at least through May of 1729, when a slave belonging to neighbor Archibald Blair was accused of having broken into Russell’s home and stolen some linens (OW16:592).
The property may have been retained directly or indirectly by Elizabeth Russell throughout the 1730s, until its sale to William Dering in 1742. It was probably during Russell’s occupation that the kitchen now standing on the lot was constructed in its original form as a 17' x 20' frame kitchen on a brick foundation (Savedge 1969). The south end of the kitchen, that containing the hearth, was constructed entirely of brick, as a precaution against fire. A bake oven was also built on the eastern side of the hearth. Noel Hume’s 1967 excavations revealed that the original kitchen’s walls, fireplace and ceiling were plastered (Frank 1967).

Perhaps it was also during Russell’s occupation that the post-supported structure located during the 1989 archaeological excavations on Lot 166 was constructed. Measuring 15' east to west by at least 15' north to south, and standing 60' north of the kitchen, the building pre-dated the currently reconstructed laundry. Yorktown-type pottery fragments found within the fill of the postholes indicate that the building was constructed after 1720 (Barka 1985), and soil layers sealing the postholes contained ceramics which date the construction before the mid-18th century. It is postulated that this building may have been a stable or a slave house. No evidence of a hearth was discovered, but the entire building was not excavated in 1989.

Documentary evidence seems to suggest that Elizabeth Russell later married Henry Cary II. A clause in Henry Cary's will states that the executor of Cary's will was to pay Elizabeth Cary £220 "in consideration for the like Sum by me heretofore received for the sale of her house in the City of Williamsburg" (Chesterfield County Will Book 1:36-42). Henry Cary II lived in Williamsburg during the 1720s, and evidence shows that he and John Brush were at least acquainted. In 1723, records
show the two of them being paid for work they did at the Governor's Palace. Cary, like his father, was a contractor and builder, and was responsible for work on the Powder Magazine, the President's House, and the College Chapel, as well as the Palace. Since his work in Williamsburg continued as late as 1732, it is probable that Cary was residing in Williamsburg during this period, perhaps on Lots 165 and 166.

By 1742, the same year that William Dering purchased Lots 165 and 166 from Henry Cary and his wife Elizabeth (DAB 5:102-105), Cary is listed as residing in Henrico County. It is possible that Dering was a friend of Cary prior to the land sale, since William Byrd's diary mentions Dering socializing with a Mr. Cary in 1740 and 1741 (Woodfin and Tinling 1942). Another entry for 1741 mentions that Dering visited Byrd at Westover after having come from Mr. Cary's house, and later, visiting Mr. Cary's with William Byrd.

**William Dering Household 1742-1749**

Dering, an artist and dancing teacher, announced the opening of a dancing school at the College in the November 25, 1737 edition of the *Virginia Gazette*. After purchasing Lots 165 and 166 in 1742, Dering moved into the house constructed by John Brush with his wife, Sarah, and their young son, William (born 1738). There is no documentary or archaeological evidence that he made any changes to the property when he moved there.

In 1735 and 1736, Dering instructed students in dancing, reading, and needlework in Philadelphia (Pennsylvania Gazette). He also lived in Gloucester County prior to moving to Williamsburg (OW 18:549). In Williamsburg, Dering also
arranged and held balls and assemblies at the Capitol during Court Days in 1745 and 1746.

Dering was considered a "Gentleman" by his 18th-century peers and was friends with William Byrd of Westover. Byrd's diaries of 1740 and 1741 mention Dering visiting him numerous times on his Charles City County plantation (Woodfin and Tinling 1942). In the company of William Byrd, Dering socialized, played the French horn, and discussed art prints. Dering held no public offices during the time he lived in Williamsburg.

Perhaps Williamsburg at mid-century was still not ready for the caprices of entertainment. Like Levingston some twenty years before, Dering began to have financial difficulties almost immediately after purchasing Lots 165 and 166. The York County records indicate that he was being sued for debt by numerous people during the early 1740s (WI: 125, 370). He owed William Prentis, merchant of Williamsburg, a debt of £400 and in 1739, Prentis, George Gilmer and others brought an action of debt against him. In May of 1744, Dering was forced to mortgage his two lots, plus some slaves and personal property to Bernard Moore, Gentleman of King William County, and Peter Hay, Physician, of Williamsburg in order to pay his debt to Prentis (DAB 5:102-105). Dering was to retain use of the property until default on his mortgage.

A schedule of Dering's mortgaged goods, prepared in 1744, show the extravagant lifestyle led by Dering and his family. Among Dering's household goods were five beds, each with assorted bed clothing, numerous chairs, a desk, couch, table, and chest of drawers. Also included were two tea tables, each with their furniture, numerous pictures in gilt frames, china (or porcelain) plates, dishes and
bowls, plus kitchen equipment, including pewter dishes, brass candlesticks, and specialized items, such as two coffee mills, one fish kettle and a copper coffee pot. Dering also owned one male and two female adult slaves, plus one slave child. Four horses, plus a chariot, a chaise, and a chair without a carriage listed in the schedule indicate that a stable on the property was virtually a necessity. Perhaps the post-seated structure located in the 1989 excavations on Lot 165 and 166 indicate the remains of such a stable.

What Dering represented was a man living well beyond his financial means. Although paying off the 1744 debt, he was again forced to mortgage the property in 1745 to Philip Lightfoot of Yorktown, with a default date set for May 11, 1746. At this time, another schedule of Dering's property was prepared. It seems that being in debt did not deter him from spending, since this schedule is more extensive than that prepared just one year previously. Added to the list were a silver watch and spoons, porcelain dishes, table linen and table glass in the specialized forms of jelly glasses and decanters (DAB 5:136-139). Dering never paid off the 1745 debt to Philip Lightfoot, since at Lightfoot's death in September of 1749, his son William Lightfoot assumed the mortgage. Dering still owned a £200 balance of the principal still due, plus £35 for two years unpaid interest, and £35 for an additional advance (Deeds 5:343-345).

By December 1749, advertisements in The South Carolina Gazette show that Dering had moved to Charleston, obviously defaulting on his loan. The Palace Green property was sold at a public outcry on or before February 14, 1751 (Tyler 1899:136). Although Dering continued to advertise in Charleston in November of 1750, there are indirect indications that his wife Sarah may have still occupied the
property. For example, the sheriff of York County left a copy of a summons at "the House of the Defendant" on January 21, 1751 (JO I:394). In addition, John Mercer mentions lodging at the Dering house during his visits to Williamsburg in 1749 and 1750 (Mercer n.d.). The sale of the property at the outcry recorded in Blair's diary also suggests that Sarah Dering but not her husband was present at the outcry. Dering died in early 1751.

Summary

Like Levingston before him, Dering encountered financial difficulties trying to make a living in Williamsburg in the arts of entertainment and refined behavior. Williamsburg, although the colony's leading urban center, was still very much a provincial town. The small population it sustained throughout most of the year may not have been able to provide enough patronage to support Dering and his family. Only during Public Times, held four times yearly, did the population of Williamsburg swell to a total of five to six thousand people and provide a market for amusements, such as Dering's balls.

Dering's mortgage schedule shows that he was very much trying to emulate his betters through the acquisition of luxury items like table glass, silver, and horse drawn carriages. When compared with other York County citizens whose estates were valued between £296 and £490, Dering owned more luxury items than his peers. Whether the purchase of these items played a part in his financial downfall is not known. No artifact assemblages which could be definitely linked to the Dering household have been recovered from excavations on the property thus far.
The events occurring on Lots 170-174 are unclear during the first period from 1733 to 1763. Archibald Blair's son, John Blair, came into possession of the property after his father's death in 1733 (DAB 5:153-155). Although no documents which place Blair on the property have yet come to light, the excavation of a root cellar within the property's kitchen suggests that he may have lived on the property during an unspecified length of time after 1733. Among the finds contained within the fill of the brick-lined root cellar were several entire dip molded wine bottles dating to the 1730s and 1740s, as well as a bottle seal bearing the insignia "JOHN BLAIR 1731" (Figure 23).

Blair received a £10,000 inheritance from his uncle, James Blair around 1743, and although he may have left his father's property at that time, it is possible that he continued to occupy the lots until they were purchased by John Randolph Junior. Although the deeds documenting Randolph's purchase have been lost, a tentative date for this transfer can be estimated. Randolph, son of Sir John Randolph, was born in Williamsburg in 1727/8 (Warner 1924). After completing an education at William and Mary, he was sent to England to study law, not returning to Williamsburg until around 1758. During that year, his brother Peyton Randolph deeded John property at the south end of England Street (Southall Papers 1771-
By 1762, John Randolph completed his palatial home there, known for a later owner as Tazewell Hall (Hening 1819-1823:598-599). Inferring from this information, it is possible that John Randolph, Junior purchased Lots 170-174 soon after he returned to Williamsburg and moved into the house across North England Street from his brother. There he lived until his house was completed some four years later.

In 1763, Randolph sold Lots 170-174 to Doctor Peter Hay (DAB 6:521-522). In this deed the property was described as having lately been the residence of James Carter. Carter was probably renting the property from Randolph.
Overall Summary of Block 29 from 1731-1750

During the third and fourth decades of the 18th century, much of what happened on Block 29 is unclear. Figure 24 shows known buildings and features present on Block 29 around 1740 and Table 14 summarizes property owners. During this time, the First Theatre ceased to function as a performance hall. It was purchased by a group of subscribers in 1745, and refitted for use as the James City County Courthouse. The bowling green had also disappeared, and Gilmer had

---

**BLOCK 29 PROPERTY OWNERS, 1731-1750**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTS</th>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163/164/169</td>
<td>1723-1733</td>
<td>A. Blair</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163/164/169</td>
<td>1733-1735</td>
<td>J. Blair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163/164/169</td>
<td>1735-1757</td>
<td>G. Gilmer</td>
<td>Apothecary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165/166/165/166</td>
<td>1727-1728</td>
<td>T. Barbar</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165/166</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>E. Russell</td>
<td>Widow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165/166</td>
<td>1728-1742</td>
<td>H. Cary</td>
<td>Builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165/166</td>
<td>1742-1749</td>
<td>W. Dering</td>
<td>Dance Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-174</td>
<td>1716-1733</td>
<td>A. Blair</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-174</td>
<td>1733-1758</td>
<td>J. Blair?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


Figure 24.
constructed a shop on the corner of Palace and Nicholson Streets. The block still experienced a mixed commercial and residential nature at this time. Table 15 summarizes property functions during the period from 1731-1750.

-----------------

TABLE 15

Property Functions from 1731-1750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Use of Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163, 164</td>
<td>House and Apothecary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165, 166</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Theatre and Courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 - 174</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-----------------

If, as suggested by the documentary and archaeological research, John Blair did live on the block, he is perhaps the only gentry, or elite, resident on the block during the second quarter of the 18th century. The other residents, namely Gilmer and Dering, were middle class professional men obviously striving towards attaining a higher status or quality of life. While Gilmer was successful in attaining this goal, Dering experienced failure.
CHAPTER VII

WILLIAMSBURG IN THE PRE-WAR AND WAR YEARS, 1751-1780

Lots 165 and 166

Thomas Everard Household, 1752/6-1781

It is not clear what became of Lots 165 and 166 after William Dering defaulted on his loan, and his former property sold at a public outcry in 1751. The next documented owner, Thomas Everard, cannot be definitely placed on these lots until 1779, although, it is believed that he may have purchased the lots at the 1751 outcry and first occupied them sometime between 1752 and 1756. It was in August of the latter year that planter Thomas Everard and his wife, Diana, sold their residence on Lots 263 and 264 on Nicholson Street to Anthony Hay. (Deeds 6: 65-67) and it is possible that he purchased the Palace Street property when he sold those lots. The last reference to Everard living on Lot 263 was in 1752 (DAB 5:475-477).

There is archaeological evidence, however, to suggest that Everard occupied the Palace Street lots long before 1779. Fragments of a decorated delftware plate found in the 1967 excavations on Lot 165 match those found in Everard period contexts at his earlier home on Nicholson Street (Frank 1967:24). Since fragments bearing this design have not been found on any other Williamsburg property, the
likelihood of both plates having belonged to Everard is strong. Additionally, finding the Block 29 fragment in a context dating between 1745 and 1760 strongly suggests that Everard owned and occupied this property well before the first documented reference of 1779 (Frank 1967:24).

Everard, two time mayor of Williamsburg and Clerk of York County for thirty six years, did not begin life at an advantage. He was born in England around 1719 and was an orphan in London in 1734. That same year, he was bound as an apprentice to Matthew Kempe, merchant of Williamsburg for a period of seven years. In this apprenticeship, he served in the Secretary's Office in Williamsburg (Gibbs 1984). Between 1742 and 1745, Everard was the clerk of Elizabeth City County, a position for which his training with Kempe helped to prepare him. This job was just the first of a career of public service offices held during his lifetime.

In 1745, Everard became the Clerk of York County, a post he was to hold for almost four decades. Later that same year, he purchased the lots on Nicholson Street, where he and his wife Diana lived in a 1280' square foot frame house. Archaeological excavations conducted between 1959 and 1960 by Colonial Williamsburg revealed that Everard's house had a plastered interior, and contained delft tiles around the interior fireplace (Noel Hume 1961). Everard is documented as also owning two slaves by 1749 (BPR).

In addition to his duties as clerk and mayor, Everard can be classified as a planter as well. He was taxed for 600 acres of land in James City County in 1768. This plantation may be the same one he tried to sell near Archers Hope Creek, where Mrs. Tate lately resided (Va Gaz, October 6, 1774). He also owned 1136 acres in Brunswick County as early as 1768 (EJC Vol. VI:296), which he tried to sell.
in 1778 (Va Gaz October 16, 1778). Ten slaves were offered for sale with this plantation. This plantation in Brunswick County may be the same land formerly owned by his father-in-law Anthony Robinson. Everard is instructed to sell this land in Robinson’s 1756 will (WI 20:402).

Everard’s political power began to increase throughout the years. He rose from fairly unimportant local offices into county and colony-level offices throughout the third quarter of the 18th century. His first term as Mayor of Williamsburg was in 1766 and in 1771 he served a second term (Va Gaz). The official positions which he held were among the colony’s most important, and in addition to providing him with political power, they were financially rewarding as well. His yearly salary as clerk was 1248 pounds of tobacco (JO 1:145, JO 1:509) with additional tobacco allotted each year for extra services.

Everard’s moving from Nicholson Street to Palace Green was another indicator of this upward mobility. Although he owned the same amount of land (1 acre) as previously, this move brought him off of a back street and provided him the Governor of the Virginia colony as a next door neighbor. Palace Green at the beginning of the third quarter of the 18th century boasted a number of fine homes such as the stately brick Wythe house, residence of George Wythe, lawyer and Burgess for the Virginia Colony, and the recently constructed home of Robert Carter Nicholas, leader of the House of Burgesses and Treasurer of the Colony. The house Everard purchased on Lot 165 (Figure 25) was slightly larger than the one he sold on Nicholson Street. The Nicholson Street house contained 1280 square feet (Noel Hume 1961), while the Palace Street house contained 1760 square feet. Figure 26 shows the floor plan of Everard’s home. A small structure, located south of the
In March of 1770, Everard purchased Lots 175, 176, and 177, directly east of the Palace from Peyton Randolph for the sum of £13.10 (Deeds 8:38-39). Three years later, in September of 1773, Everard traded these lots, totaling 1 1/2 acres to John Blair, Esquire for a half acre lot (172) adjoining his own property to the east (Deeds 8:373-374). Archaeological investigations conducted on Lot 172 in 1947 revealed that an artificial pond had been created on this lot sometime in the 18th century (Knight 1947c). Tracing the silt lines of this pond established its size, depth, and irregular shape. The irregularity of the pond suggests that it was not a component of a formal garden (Brinkley, personal communication), and it is possible that this area served as a pasture and pond for livestock. Several times during the 1770s, Everard advertised for missing horses and cattle (Va Gaz August 16, 1770,
KEY
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Figure 26.
Everard owned numerous slaves at his Williamsburg home. The kitchen addition and the laundry may have been constructed as housing space for the seven to fifteen slaves documentary evidence suggests that Everard owned during the early 1770s (Gibbs 1984). He advertised a skilled carpenter for sale in 1773 (Va Gaz, December 23, 1773), and records indicate that Governor Botetourt hired one of Everard’s male slaves to serve as a footman at the Palace in April of 1770 (Dayly Acct. of Expenses). Everard had four liveried slaves working in his home (Norton Papers), two of whom were postilions who rode on his carriage.

Renovations during Everard’s Tenure

At some point during his tenure on Lots 165 and 166, Thomas Everard performed extensive renovations to structures on the property. The exact nature of these renovations is not known. It was felt by Colonial Williamsburg researchers that Everard added the two eastern wings off of the house, but dendrochronology shows that at least the north wing was constructed soon after 1720 (Heikkenen 1984). The nature of the 1947 archaeological excavations and the subsequent rebuilding of the other wing make dating its construction through archaeological means impossible. Although it is possible the southeastern wing was constructed by Brush at the same time as the northeastern wing, the wing could just as easily have been built by one of the property’s later residents: Elizabeth Russell, Henry Cary or William Dering. It is interesting to note that Henry Cary’s circa 1732 design of Ampthill in Chesterfield County was constructed with the same floor plan as that of
the Brush-Everard House (Kocher and Dearstyne 1950).

Also, due to the 1947 archaeological trenching, the construction dates for the reconstructed laundry, office and original smokehouse are not known. Ivor Noel Hume's 1967 excavation of the kitchen revealed that it was constructed in three phases. Originally constructed as a frame structure after 1730, the kitchen (Figure 27) was altered to become a brick structure in the mid-18th century (Frank 1967).

A layer of destruction debris associated with this renovation showed that the first period kitchen had plastered walls and ceiling (Frank 1967:23). A fragment of delftware plate, found within the renovation debris indicated that Thomas Everard was responsible for converting the kitchen to a brick building. The northern addition to the kitchen was probably constructed around the mid-18th century and possibly as late as 1790 (Frank 1967:18). When this addition was placed on the kitchen, three dormer windows were added to the west front roof, increasing the
light and livability of the space (Savedge 1969). This renovation may be related to Everard's need to house the increasing numbers of slaves living on the property in the 1770s. The laundry building, directly north of the kitchen, and its mirror image, may have been constructed by Everard when he converted the kitchen to brick. This building would have also functioned additionally as slave housing.

Although it has been widely felt that these renovations took place soon after he acquired the property, combining archaeological evidence with the documentary evidence suggests that this work did not begin until the late 1760s. Between 1769 and 1773, Everard ordered 40,000 nails, 100 feet of window glass and 100 pounds of white lead paint from John Norton, his merchant in England (Norton Papers). Some of these changes took place within the house. It is believed that Everard was responsible for the adding a new staircase to the front hall of the house. The elaborate floral carving on the stair ends is reminiscent of that at Carter's Grove and Tuckahoe plantations (Figure 28). The curved gooseneck type rail end on the stair and the fine panelling in the stair hall are also atypical of houses of the size and construction of Brush-Everard.

When architectural restoration was done on the house in 1949, it was found that the downstairs rooms in the original (1718/19) structure were fairly plain and
undecorated, with the exception of some cornice molding in the northernmost room. Later additions of carved chair rails and baseboards, panelling, six panelled doors, and carved fireplace surrounds made the downstairs rooms of the house more elaborate spaces for entertaining guests or clients. The difference between the public and the private spaces within the household are very evident in the finishings of the rooms. The second story rooms, which were used as sleeping areas during Everard's occupation, contained no cornices, chair rails or mantels. The baseboards found in the rooms were simple and undecorated. It was probably during Everard's occupation, at the same time the stairway was added, that the dormer windows were cut through the roof, allowing the second floor of the house to become a lighted, useable space.

Other documentary evidence indicates the elaborate nature of Everard's downstairs rooms. The wallpaper found in the library during restoration possibly dates from the mid- to the late 18th century (Pritchard 1985). Orders to merchant John Norton reveal that Everard's home contained upholstered furniture (Norton Papers) and he is also known to have owned a chess set and a backgammon table, purchased from the estate of Governor Fauquier in 1772 (WI 22:83-89). These elaborate furnishings and architectural detailing would befit a man of Everard's status and position.

Although evidently a widower throughout most of his stay on Palace Green, Everard did have two daughters, Frances and Martha, living with him at various times. Frances Everard apparently suffered from chronic ill health. After being widowed, she lived with her father during the last year of her life, finally dying in 1773 at the age of twenty six (Gibbs 1984). It is believed that the number of drug
jars, ointment pots, and glass medicine bottles found in Everard's garbage assemblages may be related to Frances Everard's illnesses. The pharmaceutical ceramics comprised 8% of the pre-1770 ceramics within the ravine debris and only 4% of the post-1770 ceramics. Noel Hume's excavations also recovered 16 ointment pots, thirteen decorated drug jars and eight glass pharmaceutical bottles in Everard's garbage on Lot 165.

**Everard Ravine Deposits**

Archaeological excavations in 1987 and 1988 on Colonial Lot 166 revealed that Everard continued to dispose of his garbage in the same natural ravine that was used by Brush before him. Everard's household generated a great deal of garbage, mainly in the form of kitchen and food related debris. The ashy soil of the ravine fill appeared to consist primarily of fireplace ash, containing large quantities of animal bone.

Ceramics, glass, and personal items from the Everard household were also predominant. Four hundred and twenty seven unique ceramic vessels were recovered from two Everard deposits of kitchen debris in the ravine. The major deposit of ash, whose deposition occurred between the beginning of Everard's tenure in the 1750s and about 1770, contained 288 vessels. A smaller deposit, dating to the 1770s contained 139 ceramic items. Comparing the two assemblages as shown in Figure 29 and Table 16 shows that there are few differences in their ceramic composition.
Ceramic Classification
Thomas Everard Period

Figure 29.

It can be seen from the illustration and table that the vessel profiles for the main ash (1751/6 - 1770), and the upper ash deposited from circa 1770 to 1780, are very similar. There is a slightly higher emphasis on drinking tea in the later deposit (up from 15% to 19% of vessel totals), as well as a decrease in the amounts of pharmaceutical accoutrements. The decrease in drug jars and ointment pots may be due to the marriage and removal from the property of Everard’s sickly daughter. The decrease of delft vessels from 35% of the ceramics assemblage in the main ash, to 26% in the later ash was mostly brought about by the decreasing percentages of delft drug jars and ointment pots.
TABLE 16
CERAMIC COMPOSITION OF MAIN AND UPPER ASH DEPOSITS
THOMAS EVERARD PERIOD, 1752/6 - 1781

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Type</th>
<th>Main Ash</th>
<th>Upper Ash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White salt glaze table and teawares</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft tablewares</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft teawares/drinking</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese porcelain</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined earthenwares</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft drug jars &amp; ointment pots</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surprisingly enough, the percentages of blue painted plates and other tablewares in delft remains consistently high throughout Everard's entire ownership of the property. In the main ash as well as the upper ash, 10% of the total vessel population were delft plates. Other tablewares in the main ash included two feather edged creamware plates, and numerous Chinese porcelain plates decorated in blue handpainted underglaze designs, as well as the more costly overglaze decorations.

It is likely that Everard was using delft tablewares at the beginning of the third quarter of the 18th century, supplemented by pewter tablewares which continued in popularity (Martin 1989a). Ceramics from the later ash included molded feather edged creamware plates, indicating that Everard was participating
in the purchase of fashionable ceramic tablewares at the beginning of the fourth quarter of the century (Martin 1989b). The continuing high percentages of delft tablewares (plates and punch bowls), however, may be explained by the large number of slaves who resided on the property at the beginning of the fourth quarter of the 18th century. Delft tablewares had largely been replaced by refined earthenwares and stonewares in many households around the mid-18th century, and the delft vessels may have been the ceramics that were being used by Everard's slaves. Colonoware, a low fired, unglazed earthenware commonly found on 18th-century sites in Virginia, is believed to have been used and perhaps manufactured by slaves (Ferguson 1980). The increase in colonowares from the main ash to the later ash also seems indicative of the increase of slaves on the property.

There was almost a total lack of white salt glaze stoneware tablewares contained within the Everard assemblage. Molded white salt glaze stoneware plates became common after 1740, and appear archaeologically to be the tableware of choice for typical households until the creation of creamware in the 1760s and its subsequent rising popularity throughout the 1770s and beyond (Noel Hume 1969:115). It is surprising that Everard's white salt glaze vessels consisted almost solely of drinking and teaware forms, and that serving and eating vessels were very rare. There were also no fragments of pearlware, a ceramic types which began production in 1779 (Noel Hume 1969:128) included in the Everard garbage.

Sometime around 1770, it appears that Everard, possibly during the course of other alterations on his property, decided to fill the ravine, and make the formerly unusable north end of his property level with the rest of the lot. Using yellow subsoil clay, perhaps generated from the digging of a cellar, he filled the low-lying
portions of his property. The scarcity of creamware (1% of the total vessel population), a ceramic type which became widespread in Virginia after 1769, in the garbage layers below the yellow clay, and its larger percentage in the layers directly above it (4%) suggest the circa 1770 date for the ravine landscaping. This date also fits well with the orders to Norton for building supplies (Norton Papers), suggesting that renovations on the property may have been the source of the yellow clay fill. On the Frenchman's Map of 1781, the ravine is shown as ending to the north, across Palace Lane, supplying additional documentary evidence of the ravine having been filled by that date.

After the filling of the ravine, a driveway of crushed coal was constructed leading towards the building shown at the northern limits of the property on the Frenchman's Map. This building is believed to have been a stable or coach house, based on the references in Everard's personal papers to his owning horses, cattle, and two vehicles. Everard's 1773 purchase from John Blair of Lot 172, directly east of the stable/coachhouse may have provided his livestock with water from the artificial pond that existed there in the 18th century. Figure 30 shows the Everard property as it is believed, based on historical and archaeological evidence, to have appeared around the mid-1770s.

Although Everard continued as the clerk of York County until his death in 1781, he began to give up public service positions as early as 1776. It that year he resigned from the Court of Admiralty and in 1780, he gave up his position as auditor (VCP/VSL). Thomas Everard died between January 31 and February 19, 1781. No will, or inventory of his estate has been located.
Summary

Documentary and archaeological evidence indicates that Thomas Everard rose in power and wealth during the time he lived on Block 29. His moving to Lots 165 and 166 adjacent to the Governor's Palace represented upward mobility, providing a more prestigious location in town, as well as a larger house. As his political power increased from official positions at the local level to colony-wide offices in the years preceding the Revolution, Everard's economic wealth also increased. Some of this wealth was expended on property renovations and personal possessions which served as signals to other members of Williamsburg society. Renovations to the house included adding an
elaborately panelled front entrance hall. Its carved staircase, rivalling that of the Carter’s Grove entrance hall, was a bold statement about Everard and his position as a Gentleman in Virginia society. Another social statement would have been made when visitors to Everard’s house were greeted by liveried slaves. The increasing percentages of expensive ceramics and table glass also indicated Everard’s increased expenditure on household items, and indirectly his rising socioeconomic status.
Lots 170 - 174
Dr. Peter Hay Household 1763-1766

After John Randolph moved to his new home on South England Street, it is likely that he rented the Nicholson Street lots. A later deed for the property indicates that James Carter was a former occupant there. (DAB 6:521) and may have been Randolph’s tenant.

On June 20, 1763, the sale of Lots 170 - 174 to Peter Hay by John Randolph was recorded in the York County Records (DAB 6:521-522). Hay, a prominent Williamsburg physician, probably moved into the house with his wife Grissell and their children soon after the purchase. Peter Hay was around 51 years of age when he purchased the Block 29 property. Dr. Hay first appears in the York County Records in 1741, opening a shop in town by July 31, 1746 (Virginia Gazette). From 1757 to 1763, prior to his Nicholson Street purchase, Hay rented property from William Lightfoot (Lightfoot).

Peter Hay Trash Pit

Archaeological excavations along the norther facade of the Hay house revealed an early backfilled bulkhead entrance into the cellar. The fill of this sealed
bulkhead contained a trash deposit dating to the time of the Peter Hay household. The bulkhead appeared to have been filled with debris within a short time after falling into disuse. Table 17 describes the ceramic vessels recovered within this assemblage.

---

**TABLE 17**

**CERAMIC VESSELS FROM PETER HAY PERIOD TRASH PIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire slipware</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire slipware</td>
<td>mug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>tile</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware</td>
<td>tea bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackfield</td>
<td>tea pot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White salt glazed</td>
<td>mug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White salt glazed</td>
<td>plate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White salt glazed</td>
<td>tea pot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese porcelain</td>
<td>plate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese porcelain</td>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese porcelain</td>
<td>tea bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Hay’s trash pit reveals that his main tablewares were white salt glazed stonewares, and Chinese porcelains, with these two ceramic types making up 62% of the tea and tableware forms. The vessel forms consist primarily of tea and tablewares, suggesting that this garbage was generated solely by activity occurring in the house.

Within three years of his Block 29 purchase, Peter Hay had died (Va
His widow, Grissell, was to retain use of the property for the remainder of her lifetime (WI 21:2950296). At his death, Hay was in debt to Peter Randolph for the sum of £825, the purchase price of the house (WI 21:295).

An announcement in the December 18, 1766 edition of the Virginia Gazette states that goods from Hay's estate, including valuable Virginia born slaves, furniture, a chariot and horses, were to be sold. These items were listed in an inventory of Peter Hay's estate, prepared after his death (WI21:444-448). Examination of the inventory shows that Hay had acquired many amenities with which to make his life comfortable. The inventory listed numerous fashionable and specialized dining items including a stand and cruets with silver tops, two japanned waiters, jelly and sweet meat glasses, glass salvers and patty pans, a silver punch strainer, and four silver salts. Symbols of Hay's wealth were evident, not only within his home, but to persons who encountered Hay around the town, wearing gold sleeve buttons and riding in one of his two chariots. Hay' total estate was valued at close to £900, and also included ten slaves and three horses.

In January of 1767, the sale of the remaining estate items, including a valuable library, was announced in the Gazette (January 29, 1767). Entries in the Virginia Gazette Day Book list some of the titles purchased by Hay in 1764, which included medical, religious and secular books. Although Hay's slaves were advertised for sale in 1766, it is unlikely that many were sold at that time, since, in May of 1767, an announcement appeared again in the Virginia Gazette that about ten Virginia born slaves from the estate of Peter Hay were to be sold. Perhaps Grissell Hay did not want to part with the family slaves, but was later forced to for financial reasons.
Grissell Hay Household 1766-1778

Probably plagued by debts, as suggested by the sale of slaves and her husband's library, Grissell Hay began to take lodgers into her home soon after her husband's death. An advertisement in the Virginia Gazette of February 18, 1768 states:

I take this method to inform the public that I have very commodious Lodgings to let for a dozen gentlemen, and their servants with stables and provisions for their horses, and shall be much obliged to those who will favour me with their company.

Grissel Hay

In early June 1769, the Virginia Gazette carried an announcement that the lots and houses she owned were to be sold later in the month. Dr. George Gilmer Junior, twenty six year old son of George Gilmer, purchased the property later that year. Grissell Hay continued to occupy the house and take in lodgers, however, as is seen in a letter from James Glassford to Neil Jamieson in August of 1773 where he states that he has left Southall’s Lodgings for Mr. Hays. Records show another known lodger, Dr. John Baker, who was living in the house in 1773. In addition to lodgers, Grissell Hay had up to five of her own children living with her on the property.

Grissell Hay Trash Pit

A trash deposit dating from the later portion of the lodging house period was excavated in 1989. This deposit, created between 1775 and the early 1780s, cut through the fill of a previously sealed bulkhead entrance. A 1773 Virginia halfpenny
contained within the pit provided the terminus post quem of 1775 for the creation of the trash pit. These coins, although minted in England and brought to Virginia in late 1773, were stored and not released until early 1775 (Noel Hume 1969:168). The feature’s lack of pearlware, a ceramic which began manufacture in 1779 (Noel Hume 1969:128), and enjoyed immediate popularity in the colonies, suggests a terminal date of the early 1780s for the filling of the trash pit.

The trash pit contained twenty nine ceramic vessels and included largely table and teaware forms. As seen from Table 18, delftware had largely lost favor in this household by the end of the third quarter of the 18th century, being replaced in the Hay household with the more fashionable cream-colored earthenwares in a variety of types. In addition to the colorless lead glaze finish on molded patty pans, cream jugs, and plates, Mrs. Hay also owned earlier types of cream colored wares, including a clouded ware teapot and a Wedgwood green-glazed plate. White salt glazed stoneware plates and drinking vessels were still seeing service in the Hay household, and Chinese and continental soft paste porcelain plates and bowls were also common.

Comparing Grissell Hay’s ceramic assemblage with that of the household prior to her husband’s death shows some changes in tablewares between the two households (Table 18). It can be seen that white salt glazed stonewares have lost favor to the newer and more fashionable creamware, which became available in the Virginia colony by 1769 (Noel Hume 1969). Percentages of delft plates and teawares surprisingly remained constant between both households, although Chinese porcelain in all forms decreased. This is perhaps tied to the financial difficulties which Grissell Hay supposedly experienced after her husband’s death.
Grissell Hay died by May 8, 1778 (Va Gaz). Although it is not documented that she occupied her husband's former home until her death, her dower rights in the property make this likely. By this time she had been renting the house for ten years. It is not known whether she continued to take in boarders throughout this entire period, although the listing of twenty-one beds in her inventory suggests that this was the case.

The estate of Grissell Hay was inventoried on July 24, 1778 (WI22:402-403). The contents of Hay's inventory, valued at £2310 Virginia money, do not reflect a struggling household, suggesting that any financial difficulties she may have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic type</th>
<th>Peter Hay</th>
<th>Grissell Hay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White salt glaze</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stoneware plates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft plates</td>
<td>04%</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft teawares</td>
<td>04%</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese porcelain</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese porcelain</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teawares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware plates</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>07%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
experienced had been resolved by the time of her death. In addition to the numerous porcelain, creamware and pewter tablewares listed, Hay owned a gold watch, three diamond rings, and 48 ounces of silver plate. The house was decorated with two floor cloths, a looking glass worth £5, a corner cupboard, and furniture. Some of the furniture was made of costly woods, such as mahogany, which lent itself well to the elaborate carving and shaping that were increasingly fashionable after the 1730s (Carr and Walsh forthcoming: 16). Specialized dining and cooking equipment was also listed, including a fish kettle, copper stew pan, a breadtoaster, knifecase and contents, brass chafing dishes and plate warmers. The inventory also listed two horses, one chariot, a milk cow, and thirteen slaves. Her inventory was representative of those at her level were experiencing at the end of the third quarter of the 18th century (Carson and Walsh 1981).

Summary

Although newspaper advertisements suggest that Grissell Hay was experiencing financial difficulties after her husband’s death, the contents of her inventory indicate that any money problems which she may have experienced were over before her death. Purchases of fashionable creamware tablewares and the ownership of diamond rings, a gold watch and silver plate are not indicative of a household with financial problems. Grissell Hay may have needed to run a lodging house during her first years as a widow to make ends meet, but perhaps the sale of her husband’s estate, plus the house changed her financial situation. Why she continued to run a lodging house, possibly until her death, is a mystery.
Lots 163, 164 and 169 Residents between 1757 - 1788  
Tarpley and Knox and John Tazewell

After the death of George Gilmer in 1757, Lots 163, 164 and 169 were inherited by his son Peachy Gilmer (Wills 20:423-424), while his two other sons were bequeathed other property in town. In April of 1759, Peachy Gilmer conveyed the three lots to merchants James Tarpley and Thomas Knox for the sum of £360 Virginia currency (DAB 6:184-187). The Playhouse and the land surrounding it, were not included in the sale. The indenture reveals that Tarpley and Knox were already tenants on the property at the time it was sold to them. The partnership between Knox and Tarpley was short-lived, since Tarpley sold his share in the lots to Knox in December of 1760 (Deeds 6:307-309).

Knox conveyed the lots to John Tazewell for a sum of £450 Virginia currency in August of 1764 (Deeds 7:45-49). The property was described in the deed as then in the tenure and occupation of Thomas Knox. Later, in September of 1770, Tazewell was able to acquire the land on which the First Theatre/Courthouse had stood. This was occasioned by the completion of a new Courthouse on Market Square during that year. The Courthouse was no longer standing by that date, since the city conveyed to John Tazewell the land on which the playhouse had stood (DAB 8:107).
John Tazewell and his wife Sarah conveyed Lots 163, 164 and 169 to Henry Tazewell in September of 1779 (Deeds 6:227-230). These lots were described as bounded on Palace Street to the west, by the lot of Thomas Everard on the north, by the lots of John Blair, Esquire, to the west and by the market square to the south. The length of time Tazewell held these lots is not known, but in September of 1782, he advertises in the Virginia Gazette as follows:

September 14, 1782

TO BE SOLD

To the highest bidder for ready money, on the premises, the 25th of this instant (September) THE LOT and HOUSES in the city of Williamsburg, whereon Joseph Thompson now lives, adjoining the lots of the Honourable John Blair. On this lot is a good dwelling-house with four rooms on the lower and three on the upper floor, a good smoke-house, dairy, kitchen and other convenient out houses, and a good garden well paled in. The situation is pleasant and healthy, and an indisputable title will be made to the purchaser.

HENRY TAZEWELL

It is likely that this advertisement describes Lots 163, 164 and 169. It is possible that Tazewell did not sell the lots, since later accounts with Humphrey Harwood in July of 1783 show him repairing a house for Tazewell (Harwood Ledger B:54).

By December 17, 1785, the property had come into the possession of William Rowsay (Va Gaz December 17, 1785), when Rowsay advertises for sale the "houses and lots in Palace Street, formerly the property of the Hon. Henry Tazewell". Evidently, Rowsay did not live on the property, but rented it, since tax records for 1785 list the property as having a rental value of £45. This property was advertised for sale again in May of 1786 (Va Gaz May 31, 1786). The lots came into the
possession of Governor Edmund Randolph sometime between May 31, 1786 and July 2, 1788, when he sold them to St. George Tucker.
Overall Summary for the Prewar and War Period, 1751-1780

The second half of the 18th century saw a shift towards gentry residents on Block 29. Correspondingly, the commercial aspects of the block appear to cease around 1760, when Knox sold his lots to lawyer John Tazewell. Table 19 summarizes the property functions for the period 1751-1780 and Table 20 lists the owners and residents for Block 29 during the same time period. Figure 31 shows Block 29 as it is believed to have appeared during the 1770s.

-------------------
TABLE 19
PROPERTY FUNCTIONS ON BLOCK 29, 1751-1780

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Use of Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163 &amp; 164</td>
<td>House and Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 &amp; 166</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-174</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-------------------
### TABLE 20
#### BLOCK 29 PROPERTY OWNERS, 1751-1780

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTS</th>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165/166/</td>
<td>1752-1781</td>
<td>T. Everard</td>
<td>Mayor/Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163/164/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>1735-1757</td>
<td>G. Gilmer</td>
<td>Apothecary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163/164</td>
<td>1757-1759</td>
<td>P. Gilmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164/164</td>
<td>1759-1760</td>
<td>Tarpley/Knox</td>
<td>Merchants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>1745-1770</td>
<td>City of Williamsburg</td>
<td>Courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163/164</td>
<td>1760-1764</td>
<td>T. Knox</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163/164</td>
<td>1764-1779</td>
<td>J. Tazewell</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>1770-1779</td>
<td>J. Tazewell</td>
<td>Laywer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-174</td>
<td>1733-1758</td>
<td>J. Blair?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-174</td>
<td>1758-1763</td>
<td>P. Hay</td>
<td>Physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-174</td>
<td>1766-1769</td>
<td>G. Hay</td>
<td>Widow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-174</td>
<td>1769-1771</td>
<td>G. Gilmer Jr.</td>
<td>Physician (rented to G. Hay through 1778)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-174</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>J. Blair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-174</td>
<td>1771-1772</td>
<td>James Blair</td>
<td>Physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-174</td>
<td>1772-1790</td>
<td>J. Blair Jr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20.

Everard, although middle aged when he purchased his Block 29 property, had not yet reached his career peak. His wealth, as evidenced by changes in his archaeological ceramics, and his political power continued to increase throughout his tenure on the property until soon before his death, when he began to decrease his official obligations. Peter Hay, resident of lots bordering Nicholson and North England Streets, was at the end of his life when he purchased property there. His probate inventory documented the material wealth he had been able to accumulate during his life. He was heavily in debt when he died, prompting his widow to sell many of the family possessions and open a lodging house in their Nicholson Street.
Known locations of buildings

Locations of buildings probably standing in 1775

Figure 31.
home. Some of the financial hardships she endured were evident in the ceramic contents of her trash pits.

Both Hay and Everard were apparently concerned with comfort and appearances of wealth. The increasing concern with the separation of space and rituals of dining were evident in the contents of Hay's inventory and Everard's house renovations. Hay's inventory shows a large number of items associated with the social display aspects of dining. The silver salts and stands would have served as signals to Hay's guests that not only could Hay afford to set his table with silver items, but that he knew they were socially desirable. Everard's personal manservant and liveried postilions were also very visible symbols of his position of power and wealth in the city.
CHAPTER VIII
WILLIAMSBURG AFTER THE REMOVAL OF THE CAPITAL, 1781-1810

Lots 165, 166 and 172
Residents between 1781 and 1819

One reference exists for Susanna Riddell, widow of Dr. George Riddell of Yorktown, renting the Brush-Everard house after Thomas Everard’s death (letter from Isaac Hall to St. George Tucker-Tucker-Coleman Collection). After Riddell’s Yorktown house had been destroyed by Cornwallis’ troops during the Revolutionary War, she moved to Williamsburg with her two stepdaughters. Riddell owned lots in Williamsburg, and Humphrey Harwood’s accounts list work which he performed for Mrs. Riddell (Harwood). It is likely that Riddell was renting the former Everard house while the property she owned was being renovated. Riddell had probably moved from the Brush-Everard house by 1782, since the land was taxed to John Stith in that year.

Little is known about John Stith, the next owner of the property at the corner of Palace and Prince George Streets. John Stith is charged in the Land Tax records in 1782, 1784, and 1785 for three lots.
In 1787, three lots valued at £9 were transferred to Dr. Isaac Hall from John Stith (Land Tax Records). Although Hall only owned the property a short time, he did some renovation to the house, since Humphrey Harwood documents removing two marble chimney pieces from the house to March 1787 for Hall. In 1788, the three lots valued at £9 were conveyed to Dr. James Carter from Isaac Hall.

Carter was a surgeon and apothecary, and he presumably lived in the house on Lot 165 until his death in February 1794 (Crozier 1954:15). Carter was not a newcomer to Williamsburg; he is listed in the Virginia Gazette as selling drugs and other goods during the period from 1751 to 1773. After Carter's death, a sale of furniture, livestock, slaves, a wagon, and other items was held at the home of the "late Dr. James Carter" on December 17, 1794 (Va Gaz 10 December 1794). Carter was taxed for these lots until 1797, and from 1798 to 1819, the three lots were taxed to Carter's estate.

Lots 170-174
Residents between 1778 - 1818

In 1771, Gilmer sold the property to John Blair, former owner of the lots (DAB 8:214). Blair only owned the property for a few weeks before he died, leaving Lots 170 -174 to his son, Dr. James Blair (WI 22:44). John Blair's will stated that Grissell Hay still lived in the house at this time. James Blair, who also lived only a short time after acquiring the property, devised the property to his brother John Blair in 1772 (DAB 8:374).
During the early 1780s, Blair rented the property to Reverend James Madison, President of the College of William and Mary. It is possible that Madison had occupied the house as early as June of 1782, after the College advertised for housing since the Presidents House at the College had burned in 1781. The first recorded instance of Madison occupying these lots does not occur until February of 1783 (DAB 6:169) and it is believed he stayed there until the fall of 1786, when the repairs to the President's House were completed.

The Desandrouins Map shows four outbuildings in the north yard of Lot 171 at the end of the Revolutionary War. Although the functions of these buildings are not known, based on archaeological and documentary data, it is likely that they included a stable and a kitchen.

Architectural Renovations on Lot 171

As discussed previously, there was a house constructed, probably on Lot 171, within two years after Archibald Blair purchased the property in 1716. The current house on the lot, however, dates to the early 1780s. It is not unreasonable to think that the first period house on the lot was torn down and replaced with another structure later in the century. The most logical place for the original house would have been either on Lot 171, where the current house stands, or to the west on Lot 170. Since no traces of this house have been discovered on Lot 170, it is therefore believed unlikely that it sat on Lot 171.

Recent archaeological excavations around the foundation walls of the present house did not reveal any traces of earlier foundations. What is theorized here is that
the first and second period houses rested on the same foundations, or at least a portion of the same brickwork. Archaeological excavation suggested some evidence of this in several ways, detailed below.

The excavation of the builder's trench around the house revealed very few artifacts, and these were all of an architectural nature; i.e. window glass fragments and nails. This scarcity of artifacts within a builder's trench is suggestive of a building constructed during the initial occupation of a property, not one constructed over fifty years after the property had first been occupied. During that time, the buildup of trash in the yard of the property would insure that some of it made its way into the builder's trench of a later building. On the same lot, for example, the excavation of the builder's trench of an early 19th-century kitchen recovered hundreds of artifacts dating to the 18th century.

The brick bonding pattern changes from the east to the west side of the house, suggesting a western addition. It is hypothesized that the first period house measured 30' from north to south, the dimensions of the present house. The addition is felt to have been added to the western end of the house, which would have extended at least 30' east-west, as evidenced by the first period bulkhead entrance discovered under the present central back door for the house (Figure 32).

Unfortunately, modern repairs to the foundation wall of the western portion of the house kept archaeologists from confirming this information. The house was constructed to its current appearance as a 46' x 30' frame Georgian structure in the early 1780s as revealed by dendrochronology. Adding two bays gave the house its then popular and fashionable Georgian exterior facade and floor plan.
James Henderson 1790/6 -1818

James Henderson purchased Lots 170, 171, 173, and 174 between 1790 and 1796. A minister by profession, Henderson was the Rector of the Yorkhampton Parish. Henderson's first wife, Jane Blair, died issueless in 1800, but his second marriage produced a daughter, Elizabeth Jane, and a son.

Insurance policies give us some idea about the appearance of Henderson's property during his ownership. The Mutual Assurance Society, the first fire insurance company formed in Virginia in 1794, began issuing policies in Williamsburg in January of 1796 (Gibbs 1979). James Henderson was among the first Williamsburg citizens to insure his property against fire. In April of 1796, he applied for insurance on his "wooden buildings fronting the Courthouse Square at Williamsburg" (MAS #178). Two buildings are described in detail on the policy: his house is shown as a 46' x 30' frame structure with a 12' x 8' addition. A frame kitchen, measuring 32 x 20' is depicted to the north of the house. Figure 33 depicts the map sketched on the 1796 insurance plat. Caution must be used in interpreting the sketches included with these insurance policies; often the buildings are not sketched in their proper locations or positions with respect to each other. For example, the wing shown on the 1796 plat was constructed on the west, rather than the east side of the house, as discovered during excavation in 1966 (Noel Hume 1966). In addition to the house and kitchen, the 18th-century dairy, smokehouse and privy still standing today on Lot 171, were surely present, but not insured at that time.
One interesting feature discovered during the waterproofing excavations was a sump located off of the northeastern corner of the house (Figure 32), this feature consisted of a 2.5' diameter brick well-like structure. This feature extended three feet below the base of the house foundation wall, and a portion of the sump feature bricks were incorporated into the second period bulkhead entrance. It is hypothesized that the sump and the bulkhead entrance were constructed simultaneously, with the sump added to drain water entering the basement from the bulkhead. The bricks used on constructing the bulkhead and the sump were identical, further substantiating that they were constructed at the same time. Unfortunately, all evidence of interior drains within the house have been destroyed by later renovation. When excavated, the sump was filled with household debris.
dating after 1787, based on a blue transfer printed pearlware tea bowl. It is believed that this household debris was associated with Reverend James Henderson. The following table illustrates the ceramic and glass vessels found within the sump fill. It appeared to have been filled from inside the cellar with household garbage consisting largely of ceramics and glass.

 TABLE 21
HENDERSON PERIOD ARTIFACTS RECOVERED FROM SUMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th># of Vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Tea bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham stoneware</td>
<td>Flask</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese porcelain</td>
<td>Cup, handled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese porcelain</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese porcelain</td>
<td>Tea bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Wine bottles</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Case bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Carboy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Toiletry bottle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaded glass</td>
<td>Tumbler</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaded glass</td>
<td>Decanter/carafe</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL                   | 32            |
Henderson lived on his Block 29 property until his death in late November of 1818 (Blow Papers). No further archaeological assemblages which can be attributed to his household have been discovered to date.
Lots 163, 164 and 169
St. George Tucker Household, 1788 - 1827

St. George Tucker purchased lots 163, 164 and 169, from Edmund Randolph, Esquire on July 2, 1788 for a sum of £75 each (Tucker-Coleman Mss). Tucker, lawyer and educator, was born in Bermuda in 1752. He arrived in Virginia, along with his brother in 1771, to study law at William and Mary (Tucker 1942). Although he practiced law in Williamsburg for a time after getting out of school, he later moved to Chesterfield County (Tucker 1942).

Tucker was thirty six when he purchased the Williamsburg lots. At this stage of his life, he had served as a member of the Continental Congress, had been a colonel in the Continental Army, a member of the State Legislature in 1786, and was currently a member of the State General Court, a position which he held from 1785 to 1803. Randolph may have purchased the Williamsburg property in anticipation of the law professorship which he held at the College of William and Mary from 1790 to 1804. Also an author, Tucker published Dissertation on Slavery (1796), and a five volume legal work entitled Blackstone's Commentaries (1804).

At the time of his Williamsburg purchase, Tucker was a widower, with the care of five children from his first marriage to Frances Bland Randolph, and three children from her first marriage. Other Tucker household members included Maria
Rind, the children's nursemaid, Tucker's personal body servant named Syphax, and a tutor, John Coalter, who lodged next door at Mr. Wickham's House on Lot 171. In 1791, Tucker married widow Lelia Carter (Skipwith Papers). His new wife brought two children from her previous marriage to the Block 29 property, so the Tucker household in the early 1790s was a substantial one.

The St. George Tucker House

At the time of his purchase, Lots 163, 164 and 169 contained the Levingston House, facing Palace Street, and probably the Levingston Kitchen. The First Theatre/Courthouse building had disappeared by this time, as probably had the Gilmer apothecary shop shown on the corner of Nicholson and Palace Streets on the 1781 Frenchman's Map. Immediately after purchasing the Palace Green lots, Tucker began to enact major changes to the property. One of the first things that he did was to contract with carpenter Humphrey Harwood to move the house constructed by William Levingston on Lot 164. Harwood's 1788 and 1789 accounts states that for a cost of £56, the house was "to be Mov'd on the South Side of the Street" (Harwood). Harwood's accounts also lists that he underpinned the foundation wall to a height of 6'6" above ground, and that he pulled down and cleaned the brick work of the original house.

Harwood moved the Levingston House from Lot 164 and placed it on Lot 169, facing Nicholson Street. It must be remembered that by 1788, Williamsburg was no longer the Capitol of Virginia. The Governor's Palace had burned seven years before and the Palace Green was no longer the prestigious neighborhood that
it once was during the third quarter of the 18th century. Tucker moving the earlier house off of Palace Green, and placing it facing another, current symbol of power, the Courthouse of 1770, was symbolic of this loss of prestige.

As originally constructed, the Levingston House measured 40' x 18' 6" (Reed 1933:6). Given the large size of Tucker's family, it is no wonder that he began enlarging the house immediately after it has been put into shape by Harwood. The Tucker family tutor, who stayed with the family from 1788 to 1791, stated in 1789 that "as Mr. Tucker's house is small and his family large, I sleep in the house of a Mr. Wickham next door" (Coalter 1789).

Tucker began to correct the space problem almost immediately, since records indicate that he added a one and a half story shed addition to the house in 1790 (Tucker-Coleman, uncatalogued folder 101). In 1791, east and west wings were added enlarging the house to its present size of 90' x 35' with 4380' square feet of living space. By 1791, the house had been altered so much from its 1789 state that in a letter to Tucker, Barraud referred to the house as "the Castle" (Tucker-Coleman Papers).

By 1796, the house had achieved its final form, as shown in the completed floor plan of the house (Figure 34). The inventory of Tucker's estate, taken after his death in 1827 listed the rooms in the house as a "study, passage, chamber, parlour, and dining room". Much of the original interior of the Tucker House survives to the present day, and was documented in an extensive architectural report prepared on the house in 1933 (Reed 1933). Tucker raised the roof of the former Levingston House to a full two stories, adding a Dutch roof and six dormer windows. The front door opened into a central hall with a library and parlor to either side.
Floor Plan of St. George Tucker House

Figure 34.
At the end of the hall, through an elaborate carved arch, was the great hall, with its double stairway leading to the second floor. The original stairway, which had been contained within the hall of the first period house was moved (Waite 1977). In 1791, Tucker had two closets finished and shelving placed in them. With the paneled doors, wainscoting, plastered walls, and venetian blinds (Tucker-Coleman), the house was probably deserving of the title of "Castle". Tucker stated that the children were not allowed to "lay hands or feet on the furniture in the Parlour", (Tucker-Coleman) indicating that it was a room used for socializing and entertaining guests.

The Tucker Outbuildings

John Saunders made repairs made to the kitchen, shed, meat-house and stable in 1788 (Tucker-Coleman Papers). In 1791, construction was begun on a new kitchen. This kitchen stood directly west of the house, and was completed by January of 1792. By 1795, a covered way was added between the kitchen and the house. Prior to the completion of the kitchen, the Tucker family probably used the Levingston kitchen, which stood in its original location on Lot 163. Archaeological excavations undertaken in 1931 revealed the foundations of a building with the same dimensions as the Levingston kitchen. Comparing the brick size, color, and mortar with that of the Tucker stable indicates that these buildings were constructed at the same time (Knight 1947d, Knight 1931b). It is hypothesized that Tucker moved the Levingston kitchen to face south, towards his newly remodeled house, and converted it into a laundry in the late 18th century. Charles, in his memoirs of Williamsburg, states that the Tucker family laundry was also used as a slave house in the 19th
century. An architectural report indicates that the fireplace within the building had been altered, so that the laundry fireplace stepped out into the room (Moorehead 1933:10).

Tax records for 1789 indicate that St. George Tucker owned two horses and a chariot (Tucker-Coleman Uncatalogued 103). Later records, from 1794 through the beginning of the 19th century, list three to five horses, some cows and a chariot and chair. It is believed that the large (86.5' x 30') building constructed at the north end of lot 164 was the Tucker stable. The long narrow shape of this building is similar to that of the Grissell-Hay stable, also believed to be a late 18th century structure (Knight 1954). Although currently interpreted as the First Theatre in the colonies, this structure could not possibly be that of the theatre, for reasons outlined beginning on page 75. It is possible that this was the stable repaired by John Saunders in 1788, and shown on a Mutual Assurance Policy of 1815 as located along Palace Street (MAS 1815). It is likely that this stable was already standing on the property when it was purchased by Tucker. The dairy and smokehouse on the property, as currently reconstructed, were not placed on colonial foundations, but located based on the Coleman family remembrances about the positions of these buildings (Figure 35).

Tucker continued with minor renovations to his property throughout the 1790s. In 1795, William Pigget presented Tucker with a bill for £11.18.9 for making one pair of six panel window shutters, constructing window sashes, putting up chairboards, replacing one window with two in Tucker's study and planing the parlor floor (Tucker-Coleman Papers). In 1796, he constructed a bathhouse, the first of its kind in Williamsburg. In this structure, copper wire was laid directly from the well
into a large copper bath, fitted with a vent for emptying the bath water. Letters mention an extensive garden on the property by 1798, containing espaliered peach trees, pears, grapes, and ornamental shrubbery (Tucker-Coleman Papers). In March and June of 1789, Tucker had a total of 1400 garden pales and 126 cedar posts delivered to him for fencing his garden (Tucker-Coleman Papers).

Tucker’s political power continued to increase during the first decades of the 19th century. He served on the Supreme Court of Appeals from 1803 to 1811, and the U. S. District Court between 1813 and 1827.

Tucker lived on his Williamsburg property until his death. Throughout his life, Tucker had suffered from malarial fever and his last years were spent in declining health. The letters of Thomas Tudor Tucker from 1825 indicated that Tucker’s health was failing, with his life drawing to a close on October 10, 1827, at the age of 75. An inventory of his estate was prepared by his son Nathaniel Beverley Tucker and included a wide range of furniture, carpets, silver teapots, tea urns, maps and books (Tucker Coleman Papers).

Unfortunately, little archaeological research has been conducted on Lot 169, the site of the present day Tucker-Coleman House. In 1930, the 1791 kitchen was excavated and then reconstructed.

Summary

The extensive documents kept by the Tucker and Coleman families allow a clear picture of the Tucker family at the end of the 18th century to emerge. Tucker changed the focal point of his property from Palace to Nicholson Streets, moving the
Levingston House to face Market Square. This decision may have been prompted, in part, by the destruction of the Governor's Palace and the construction of the Courthouse of 1770. He chose instead to place his outbuildings along Palace Street, probably restricting the more private space behind his house for a formal garden.
Overall Summary of Block 29 in the Late 18th Century

After the removal of the government from Williamsburg, and the burning of the Governor's Palace in 1781, Block 29 underwent a series of changes which can be tied to these events. Figure 35 shows structures and features on Block 29 as they appeared during the 1790s.

At the beginning of the fourth quarter of the 18th century, several long term residents, Thomas Everard and Grissell Hay, died, and their properties underwent a series of short-term occupations, both through rentals and purchases. Contrary to hypothesis, however, the block appeared to retain its status as a gentry neighborhood instead of declining into a middle class area. Residents included lawyer St. George Tucker, wealthy widow Susanna Riddell, several doctors, and William and Mary president James Madison. The wealth and status of these individuals was confirmed by documentary and archaeological evidence. Tables 22 and 23 list property owners and functions on Block 29 during the period from 1781 to 1810.
Figure 35.
### TABLE 22
### BLOCK 29 PROPERTY OWNERS, 1781-1810

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTS</th>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165/166/</td>
<td>1781-1782</td>
<td>Everard estate</td>
<td>(rental)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>1782-1785</td>
<td>J. Stith</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165/166/</td>
<td>1787-1788</td>
<td>I. Hall</td>
<td>Physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>1788-1794</td>
<td>J. Carter</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165/166/</td>
<td>1794-1819</td>
<td>Carter estate</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163/164/</td>
<td>1779-1783</td>
<td>H. Tazewell</td>
<td>(rental)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>1783-1788</td>
<td>W. Rowsay</td>
<td>(rental)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163/164/</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>E. Randolph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>1788-1827</td>
<td>St. G. Tucker</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170/171/</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>J. Blair, Jr.</td>
<td>(rental)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173/174</td>
<td>by 1790</td>
<td>J. Henderson</td>
<td>Minister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One change in the block, however, was occasioned at least in part by the destruction of the Governor's Palace. The change in orientation of the block, which was begun when the house on Lot 171 changed orientation, was continued when St. George Tucker moved his house to face Market Square.
TABLE 23
PROPERTY FUNCTIONS ON BLOCK 29, 1781-1810

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Use of Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163, 164, &amp; 169</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165, 166, &amp; 172</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170, 171, 173 &amp; 174</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

------------------------
CHAPTER IX
CONCLUSION

Through the combination of documentary, archaeological and architectural information, a clearer picture of Block 29 in the 18th century has emerged. Changes in Block 29 were found to be reflective, in some aspects, of changes which were taking place throughout the city of Williamsburg as a result of social, economic and political factors.

For the purposes of this study, the 18th century was divided into four periods which corresponded with broad stages in the history of Williamsburg’s development. These periods covered the initial settlement of Williamsburg (1700 to 1730), Williamsburg’s years as the leading urban center of the Virginia Colony (1731 to 1750), the years preceding and during the Revolutionary War, when Williamsburg was at its apex of political power (1751-1780), and the years following the removal of the Capital from Williamsburg (1781-1810). Chapter III outlined trends which were expected to be evident in the data for the entire town and Block 29. These are summarized briefly, and the results given below.
Physical Growth

Physical growth was expected to be rapid during the early years of the 18th century, as Williamsburg became the center of political and economic activity for the Colony. As the population of Williamsburg increased, one result of this growth was expected to be the subdivision of lots within the town. This subdivision was expected to be heaviest in the years around the mid-century, after lots had been initially purchased and while Williamsburg was still the leading urban center of the colony. After the capital was removed from Williamsburg in 1780, physical changes were expected to be evident in the diminished demand for space created by the removal of merchants and other businessmen from town, as well as the virtual cessation of new building construction.

Block 29, located adjacent to the Governor's Palace, was expected to show some variations in its development throughout the 18th century. Its prestigious location, with portions of the block fronting on the vista stretching in front of the Governor's Palace, was expected to attract wealthy or gentry residents beginning with the initial years of settlement. With this gentry ownership, primarily residential development was expected, with no subdivision of the lots occurring. After the removal of the seat of government from Williamsburg and the subsequent burning of the Governor's Palace in 1781, the block lost the focal point created by the mansion. It was expected that the block would have no longer been viewed as a prestigious location by inhabitants, subsequently experiencing the loss of gentry residents. Documentary evidence suggests that these residents followed the seat of government to Richmond. It was also postulated that renovation and new
construction would cease in this area.

Plotting land use in Williamsburg reveals growth was slow during the opening years of the century, but increased considerably during the second decade, with five times as many lots sold during then compared with the first decade (Hellier 1989:28). Development during that time period occurred mainly at the eastern end of town, near the Capitol (Figure 36), with development in the blocks adjacent to the Capitol of a largely commercial and mixed commercial/residential nature. Many of the early purchasers of lots in town (13 out of 24) were tavernkeepers (Hellier 1989:23), and development near the Capitol may have been an attempt to capitalize on the busy nature of this building.

A small amount of solely residential development occurred on one and two lot parcels at the eastern end of town, by persons of the middle class. The majority of the lots on Duke of Gloucester street in the four blocks adjacent to the Capitol had been sold by 1720 (Hellier 1989). At the western end of town, a few large gentry estates, each composed of six to eight colonial lots, were established. Archibald Blair’s purchase of four lots on Block 29 illustrates the tendency for the gentry and professional classes to purchase large numbers of lots for the establishment of residential and garden space. The town as a whole, however, including Block 29, appeared to remain largely undeveloped before the end of the second decade of the 18th century.

By the next decade, a great deal more residential development had taken place, although commercial growth had not yet appreciably expanded (Figure 37). Residential growth was particularly noticeable along the side streets of the northern side of town. Development of the Nicholson Street area was felt to be due to the
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proximity of the Capitol and the Public Gaol, both structures completed early in the town's history. During the period between 1716 and the early 1720s, the initial development of Block 29 occurred.

In the first half of the century, the character of the block, contrary to expectations, was primarily mixed commercial and residential. Before 1760, the block contained Brush's gunsmithing operation, a short-lived ordinary, an apothecary shop, the playhouse, a bowling green, and the shop of Tarpley and Knox. This mixed character can perhaps be explained by the overall functions Williamsburg served during that period. Williamsburg, as Virginia's leading urban center during the 1730s (O'Mara 1983:222) contained a large range of functions and activities. The residents of the Virginia colony could satisfy a wide range of needs in Williamsburg, whose services included those of a printer and bookbinder, apothecary, gunsmith, and shoemaker in the 1730s and 1740s. This dominance of Williamsburg continued into the 1750s, but was beginning to be eclipsed by towns forming in other areas of the colony. By the 1770s, Williamsburg had diminished considerably in economic and social importance as urban areas, such as Fredericksburg and Richmond, developed to the west.

The character of Block 29 conformed with this picture of Williamsburg as a service center in the first half of the 18th century. Although most taverns and stores clustered at the eastern end of Duke of Gloucester Street, near the Capitol, during the first half of the 18th century, this need for commercial and service establishments spilled over into other portions of town, including Palace Green.

Although diminishing in importance in economic and social functions, Williamsburg, as the Capitol of the Virginia Colony through 1780, did retain its
political importance. This, too, is reflected in the changing character of Block 29 after mid-century. Figure 38 shows property functions on the block for the specified time periods. As the need for consumer services decreased, the commercial character of the block disappeared completely, with function becoming entirely residential after the early 1760s. With this abandonment of commercial establishments, Block 29 took on the aspects of a gentry neighborhood. During the third quarter of the 18th century, the block was occupied by planter and politician Thomas Everard, lawyers John Randolph and John Tazewell, and Doctor Peter Hay, all of whom were considered gentlemen by their fellow citizens. This gentry resident status was maintained during the years preceding the Revolutionary Way, as Williamsburg played a key role in the political events foreshadowing the British-American conflict.

From the beginning years of the town's settlement until well past the mid-18th century, the focus of Block 29 was divided between Palace Green to the west and North England street, to the east. Brush and Levingston built their homes facing Palace Street, fronting on the green which terminated at the Governor's Palace. Another vista, although on a smaller scale, was created north of Market Square along North England Street. The terminal end of the street was occupied by a large structure, seen on the Frenchman's Map and probably representing the Corbin House, built during the second decade of the century. Sir John Randolph constructed his house at the corner of North England and Nicholson Streets to face west along this vista, while Archibald Blair's house, opposite, may have faced his.

Later in the 18th century, however, as a market house was constructed on the open square to the south, the focal point of the area began to change. Sometime
Property Functions on Block 29 during the 18th Century

Figure 38.
in the mid-18th century, Peyton Randolph had added a wing to his father's house and changed its orientation to face south (Edwards 1986). John Blair, during the renovation of his house in the early 1780s, probably changed the orientation of his home to face Market Square as well.

When Thomas Jefferson, then Governor of the Virginia Colony, moved the capitol from Williamsburg to Richmond in 1780, it robbed the town of Williamsburg of its position as the seat of political power and left the Governor's Palace without a function. Matters got worse the next year, when the Governor's Palace burned to the ground, leaving Palace Green without a focal point. In 1788, when St. George Tucker purchased lots on the block, his first task was to move the house constructed facing Palace Green by William Levingston. The new location of this house was the southeastern corner of the property, along Nicholson Street and facing Market Square, now the site of the new James City County Courthouse. The former prestigious frontage along Palace Street was downgraded to the location of the Tucker outbuildings, including a stable, a laundry, and a mid-19th century slave house. By this time, Thomas Everard had died, and his former property was being rented. Several short term owners took control after this. The Grissell Hay property was undergoing a similar period of rental and short term owners.

Population increases in Williamsburg during the 1730s and 1740s necessitated the creation of more space in town by the end of fifth decade of the century. It was during the late 1740s and early 1750s that the first lots were offered for sale outside of the town boundaries, in Waller's and Moody's subdivisions. The next three decades say new development concentrated in these outlying areas (Hellier 1989:65). Another method of dealing with space shortages as cities grow is the subdivision of
properties. One hypothesis of this study was that subdivision would occur on Block 29 as the 18th century progressed. Research showed that subdivision occurred mainly in the blocks along Duke of Gloucester Street, near the Capitol, beginning around the 1740s and 1750s. Lots in these areas were usually multifunctional, often serving both commercial/industrial and residential functions. Contrary to belief, however, Block 29 escaped this subdivision. Although the block contained ten half acre lots there were never more than three property owners at any time.

This can be explained, again, by the roles played by Williamsburg throughout the 18th century. Prior to the mid-18th century, Williamsburg was the Virginia Colony's leading urban center. Even so, the need for additional space did not begin to make itself felt until the 1740s and 1750s, when some subdivision of the lots began to occur and new lots added along the outskirts of town. This subdivision of lots and new lot sales occurred at the eastern end of town, near the Capitol and Exchange, apparently the key commercial areas in town. It was also around this same time period, that the economic importance of Williamsburg began to wane, resulting in less need for the commercial establishments, whose services visitors to Williamsburg could attain closer to home. There was no need for subdivision on Block 29, and as stated previously, the commercial nature of the block actually declined after the mid-century. The block came to be occupied by persons who were connected with the government in some fashion, such as Williamsburg Mayor and County Clerk Thomas Everard.

Although gentry residents were expected to diminish or disappear from Block 29 after the burning of the Palace, this trend did not really materialize. After a period of initial upheaval in the form of short-term renters on the block, brought
about largely by the removal of the capital from Williamsburg, things settled down again by the late 1780s and early 1790s. Wealthy inhabitants, connected with those institutions remaining in town (the College and the Public Hospital), inhabited the block. Although many secondary, or non-necessary services disappeared from the town, essential services present in any town, such as physicians, lawyers, and general stores, remained. Although contemporary accounts described the town in the late 18th and early 19th centuries as stagnant, growth on the block did not cease, as was expected. Extensive renovations were conducted in 1782, under the ownership of John Blair, to the house on Lot 171, and St. George Tucker undertook extensive renovations and new construction on his property in the late 1780s.

Social and Economic Patterning

James Deetz (1977:40) has concluded that by the mid-18th century, the Anglo-American culture was characterized by a pervading tendency to sort and categorize life and impose order and control. This was manifested in organization of living space, rituals, and practices of food consumption, and these patterns should be evident in the results of archaeological research (Deetz 1977b:43). A Georgian mentality seemed to manifest itself on Block 29 earlier than in other areas of the colony, beginning by the 1720s. This was evident in the specialized drinking and dining equipment seen in the archaeological assemblages as well as the segregation of space evident in the early architecture of the block.

Archaeological research has shown that during the 18th century, man was expanding control over his environment, as a result of increasing urbanization and
new concepts of symmetry and order. It was hypothesized that the lots on Block 29 would display increasing specialization over the period of this study.

Various sources document topographical changes taking place throughout the city in order to make certain areas more inhabitable. The residents of Block 29 were also participating in this attempt to gain control of their environment. Archaeological evidence suggests that they were altering their physical environment in a number of ways. In addition to more commonly occurring landscape features, such as pleasure and kitchen gardens, and fences constructed to separate properties and control animal, the owners of land on Block 29 were altering their personal environments in more extensive fashions. For example, Archibald Blair raised the grade of the southern end of Lot 171 immediately after constructing his house, and Thomas Everard filled a sizable ravine on Lot 166 in order to either build or convert a standing outbuilding to a stable or coachhouse. Additionally, some unknown owner of Lot 172 constructed a dam across the northern end of the lot, creating an artificial pond, probably for the use of livestock. Through archaeology, an expanding control over the environment, with increasing internal subdivision of lots is seen. This ordering of the environment can be related to the popular Georgian concepts of symmetry.

In a similar fashion to the control seen over the natural environment, an increasing concern for personal space is also seen in the architecture of the houses, with specialized spaces becoming predominant. Public and private spaces became increasingly differentiated as social entertaining became fashionable. Although Brush and Levingston were affected very early in the century by these concepts of segregated space, the interiors of neither of their houses were elaborately decorated
in ways which would make important social statements to persons entering their homes about their status in Williamsburg society. Mid-century residents, Everard and Gilmer, however, document extensive changes to the interiors of their homes, with additions of marble mantels, cupboards, panelling, chair rails, and carved staircases. These renovations occurred just about the same time that other properties in town, such as the Governor's Palace, the Raleigh Tavern, and Wetherburn's Tavern, were undergoing extensive additions of rooms for public entertainment and dining (Whiffen 1958:141-143).

Perhaps the urban nature of Williamsburg, as suggested by the results of comparing rural and urban York County residents in the 18th century (Carson and Walsh 1981, Carr and Walsh, in press) accounts for the early acceptance of Georgian-based ideas. Urban residents were much more likely to acquire amenities, this behavior extending even to those residents who were lower on the economic scale. On Block 29, early to mid-18th century middle class residents were striving to emulate their wealthier neighbors by purchasing, sometimes to their financial detriment, luxury items which bespoke of status and power.

The analysis of the archaeological assemblages and probate inventories were used to monitor changes in social and economic position through time. This analysis revealed, as expected, the increasing acquisition of luxury items by the residents of Block 29. These items were primarily in the realms of specialized dining and food preparation equipment, as well as increasing numbers of chairs and pieces of case furniture.

An analysis of the trends in ceramic acquisition by Block 29 residents during the 18th century (Figure 39) shows increasing proportions of table and teawares
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Figure 39.
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within the assemblages analyzed. This was expected, with the increased emphasis on formalized dining as the 18th century progressed. Two assemblages, those of Peter Hay and James Henderson, showed virtually no toilet or storage wares, indicating that these assemblages were formed from debris created within the main house and not from the kitchen or other dependencies. Since this could skew the data for all the assemblages represented, Figure 40 shows the same information, without Hay's and Henderson's ceramic data added. Even with these two assemblages removed, there is still a trend towards increased purchases of table and teawares during the century.

Figure 41 shows the ratios of flat to hollow tablewares for each of the residents represented by an archaeological assemblage. The table shows that hollow vessel forms (bowls, cups, mugs) decreased over time relative to flat tablewares, such as plates, and platters. This switch most probably represents the rising purchases of ceramics tablewares, at the expense of pewter tablewares. This was caused in part by innovations in the ceramic industry and the development of marketing skills by the Staffordshire potteries during the second half of the 18th century (Martin 1989a).

Contrary to hypothesis, however, the ratios of teawares to tablewares did not increase throughout the century. It was hypothesized that the increasing acquisition of consumer goods by the middle classes, coupled with the decreasing prices of porcelain in the second half of the 18th century, would show an increasing percentages of teawares. Perhaps this can be explained by the fact that the acquisition of ceramic tablewares was expanding at a like rate to that of ceramic teawares. As pewter lost favor as a tableware, and silver tea sets became more common for the gentry classes, ratios of ceramic tea and tablewares remained even.
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This study of Block 29 has shown that major changes were occurring on the Block during the 18th century. In the early part of the century, the block could be characterized as a mixed commercial and residential area with lot owners of assorted social and economic classes. This may be explained by the prominence of Williamsburg as the leading urban center for the Colony, and the multifunctional importance of the town. After mid-century, the character of the block began to move away from its commercial character, becoming completely residential with the removal of the James City County Courthouse to Market Square in 1770. This trend towards a residential character can be explained by the decreasing social and economic importance of Williamsburg as new urban centers were created to the west. With the lessened demand for commercial establishments, Block 29 no longer needed to serve this function. Commercial establishments tended to cluster along Duke of Gloucester Street, particularly near the Capitol. The town retained its political importance almost through the Revolutionary War, however, and this is reflected in the town in its entirety and to a smaller degree in Block 29. Williamsburg contained a large number of ordinaries and taverns, to service the people coming into Williamsburg for court days. This number reached its peak in the 1770s, when the town contained eleven such establishments (Figure 42).

Many of the town residents were also connected with the government in some fashion, with a high degree of lawyers and politicians present. Some of these resided on Block 29, which had become a gentry neighborhood by the third quarter of the 18th century. After the removal of the Capitol, the types of residents on Block 29 altered. Persons connected with the government followed Jefferson to Richmond and a transition was seen on Block 29 towards residents who were connected with
Figure 42.
the College and the mental hospital.

Consistent with the findings of the York County project, and the principles of Georgian mentality, the architecture, and material possessions of the Block 29 residents showed increasing differentiation and specialization throughout the century. As the middle class residents increased, in some cases with a struggle, their purchases of amenities, the gentry classes managed to keep ahead of them by acquiring more elaborate and expensive possessions.

Perhaps one of the major contributions of this study has been the demonstration that through using a multidisciplinary approach to the study of communities, a more accurate portrayal of 18th-century life can be derived. For example, without the combination of archaeological and research information, the most likely location for the First Theatre could not have been determined. Information concerning the Brush-Everard house and the Grissell Hay House construction sequences was also enhanced through the combination of archaeological, architectural and documentary information. Each type of evidence acts as a safeguard against the shortcomings of the other.

Although accomplished in a very summary fashion for the purposes of comparison with Block 29, a logical outgrowth of this project would be to expand its scope and perform this type of analysis for all blocks within the 18th-century town of Williamsburg. In this fashion, a more comprehensive representation of the processes of urbanization and changes which occurred in Williamsburg during its tenure as the capitol of the Virginia Colony can be obtained. Expanding from this, perhaps, it would be possible to compare Williamsburg with other colonial Chesapeake towns, such as Annapolis or Yorktown.
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