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ABSTRACT

Scholarly research concerning the American frontier has resulted in specific constructs regarding frontier settlement pattern, settlement types, and their role in the process of frontier colonization. The purpose of this study is to examine the components utilized to define frontier towns.

Scholars have defined frontier towns as the focal points of the frontier economy, existing as a means of moving resources from the scattered settlements of the frontier to the entrepôt and the parent state, as well as moving commodities from the parent state into the frontier. In addition, frontier towns served as areas of integrating activities within the social, economic, political, religious, and military realms.

Kenneth Lewis has defined the components that should be present for a frontier settlement to be considered to be a frontier town. Utilizing the town of Camden, South Carolina as a model, Lewis showed how the functions served by Camden in the frontier of colonial South Carolina exemplify the components of a frontier town.

Some of the more ephemeral frontier towns did not exhibit all of the components defined by Lewis, yet they played an important role in insular frontier development. Because Lewis's study used a primarily economic framework, he did not observe the range of variation exhibited by frontier towns. This study delineates the components of an ephemeral frontier town and demonstrates that it should be considered to be an additional type of frontier town. The frontier town of Hanna's Town, Pennsylvania does not possess all of the components outlined by Lewis. A comparison of the aspects of size, layout, and content of the frontier towns of Camden and Hanna's Town, however, show Hanna's Town to be an additional type of frontier town. The example of Hanna's Town provides an additional type of frontier town and is suggested as an addendum to Lewis's model of frontier development. In addition, the comparison of the frontiers of Pennsylvania and South Carolina provides a test case of Lewis's model of insular frontier development.
HANNA'S TOWN:

A FRONTIER TOWN IN WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Frontier towns by their nature are an ephemeral phenomenon. Although several researchers have examined the components of frontier towns, Kenneth Lewis defined their types and functions. Lewis utilized and refined the settlement types and functions that were defined by Casagrande et al. (1964). Lewis, like Casagrande et al., suggested that frontier towns were the focal point of the frontier economy (Lewis 1977:155; 1984:26, 112, 181-200). Such towns existed, he theorized, as a means of moving resources from the scattered settlements of the frontier to the entrepôt and the parent state, as well as moving commodities from the parent state into the frontier (Lewis 1977:158). Frontier towns also served as areas of integrating activities within the social, economic, political, religious, and military realms. However, more ephemeral frontier towns existed as regional administration centers and as access points to the frontier. Because these more ephemeral towns were not integral parts of the economic system, except as service areas on the transportation network, they might not contain all of the components necessary to meet Lewis's definition of a frontier town.
Nevertheless, these more ephemeral towns were part of the frontier. Here, using an example from western Pennsylvania, Hanna's Town, an additional type of frontier town is suggested as an addendum to the type of frontier town defined by Lewis and as a test of Lewis's model of insular frontier development.

Spatially, the frontier can be defined as an area of colonization where the process of settlement takes place in a new territory which is under effective control of a state (see Lewis 1984:10). It is a zone between the settled and unsettled portions of a territory. Temporally, a frontier begins with the first permanent settlement and ends when an upper limit of growth is attained and stabilization of the settlement pattern occurs (see Kristof 1959:274; Casagrande et al 1964:311; Hudson 1969:367; and Lewis 1977:154). Lewis emphasized the economic component:

"the frontier may also be seen as a geographical expression of an exchange network designed to permit the incorporation of unsettled territory into a larger socio-economic system. Frontier settlements function as nodes in this network and reflect the distribution of personnel and materials in the most efficient way to permit the integration of activities in a sparsely settled area. The limits of the exchange network at any given time effectively mark the boundaries of the area of colonization" (Lewis 1977:154).

In the examination of frontier development, settlement pattern studies have provided a better understanding of the processes of frontier advancement, and of the settlement
types through which this advancement is manifested. Through the use of settlement pattern studies, Lewis identified criteria necessary to define a frontier town, as well as interaction spheres that show the interrelationship of the different settlement types on the frontier.

The advancement of the frontier and movement of people are facilitated by central settlements called frontier towns.

"The frontier town serves as a nucleus of social, political, economic, and religious activities within a portion of the colony and as the terminus of the transportation network linking the area of colonization to the homeland through the entrepôt. Because it serves as the primary link to the national culture, the frontier town forms the nexus of the communications network within the colony" (Lewis 1977:155).

With the growth of the frontier, population increase, and change in the transportation network, settlement role and function may change. The different settlements may take on new roles and evolve into large, established towns or may decline or be abandoned altogether (Casagrande et al. 1964:311; Lewis 1977:155).

The components utilized to define a frontier town include its: 1) being the focus of economic, social, political and religious activity and organization for a large portion of the area of colonization (Lewis 1977:155; 1984:112 and 181); 2) being founded very rapidly (Ibid.); 3) role in the economic integration of settlements on an
intraregional basis [i.e. linking the frontier to entrepôt] (Lewis 1984:112 and 182); 4) being the terminus of the transportation network linking the area of colonization with the homeland through entrepôt (Lewis 1977:155); 5) being the center of the communications network for the colony (Ibid.); 6) role in economically tying the settlements in the area of colonization into an interregional (world) economic system (Lewis 1984:182); 7) specific size [e.g. 28-50 structures] (Lewis 1984:183); 8) specific layout [i.e. planned allocation of space resulting in a gridiron layout] (Lewis 1984:186); 9) specific content evident in the material record [in addition to a domestic component this would include evidence of specialized economic, social, or political activities e.g. storage, maintenance, or repair facilities] (Lewis 1984:112 and 187); and 10) evidence of high status individuals (Lewis 1984:195).

Some of the more ephemeral frontier towns did not serve as resource distribution and collection points, but served to facilitate transport. These outposts, although not achieving the importance of distribution points, played an important role frontier advancement. Historic documents show that many towns served as focal points for military campaigns, safety staging areas, and regional administration centers. Due to the importance of these type of activities to frontier development, such towns should be considered to be frontier towns even though they may not contain all of
the components outlined by Lewis. Here, I delineate the components of an ephemeral frontier town, and demonstrate that it should be considered an additional type. In addition, the examination of Hanna's Town within the framework of Lewis's model of insular frontier development provides a test of his model and demonstrates some of its shortcomings.

Hanna's Town provides an example of an additional type of frontier town. Hanna's Town, situated on the Allegheny Plateau, existed a mere seventeen years (1769-1786). In that time armies marched through it, justice was served from it, and many travelers and immigrants passed through it. In addition, settlers lived in the protection of a defensive establishment, a block house. Hanna's Town failed to serve as any major resource collection, processing, storage, transport, or redistribution center. Its primary importance was as a transportation, military, and administrative center.

Hanna's Town was investigated using primary and secondary documentary evidence and archaeological information. Like Camden, Hanna's Town has no extant architectural evidence from the frontier period. The archaeological excavation at the site has provided much information on two taverns, a stockaded fort, a blockhouse, and five other domestic dwellings. Archaeological evidence
form Hanna's Town is primarily domestic and military related. The archaeology clearly shows the absence of features associated with the resource collection and distribution center, and repair and maintenance facilities, etc., which are so vital to Lewis's definition of a frontier town.

Although the archaeological evidence from Hanna's Town is a critical element in this study, specific artifact counts and ratios were not utilized in this analysis. The little use made of the artifactual evidence does not limit the results of this study. Instead, the discussion of the artifacts is combined with the documentary evidence to illuminate the brief history of Hanna's Town.

The scope of this paper is the examination of a duel-component hypothesis. First, Lewis's model of insular frontier development exaggerates the importance of the economy in the definition of frontier towns. As a result, some frontier towns may be overlooked. Second, although Hanna's Town contributed little to the frontier economy, it clearly played an important role in frontier development in western Pennsylvania. Thus, it should be considered to be an additional type of frontier town, and an addendum to Lewis's model.
Testing of this duel-component hypothesis involves the application of Lewis's model of insular frontier development to the frontier of Pennsylvania. Four points are presented. First, a new frontier town type will be defined with Hanna's Town as its archetype. Second, the application of Lewis's model and the definition of a new type of frontier town is a test of the model. Third, the definition of an additional type of frontier town will result in an addendum to and refinement of Lewis's model. Fourth, the application of Lewis's model will show the shortcomings of the model resulting from an over emphasis on economy, and lack of emphasis on other factors such as personal-gain motives, the need for administration of justice on the frontier, and staging areas for military maneuvers.
CHAPTER II
FRONTIER THEORY

Scholarly research concerning the American frontier has proceeded for approximately 120 years. Research, beginning with scholars such as F.A. Walker and Frederick Jackson Turner and continuing through to the present day has resulted in a number of specific descriptions. From these descriptions, scholars have made theoretical generalizations about frontier advancement and its effect on the national culture. Additionally, specific constructs regarding frontier settlement pattern and settlement types have been proposed.

The discussion of frontier studies began in 1893 and remained within the realm of history until the 1950's. In the 1950's, geographers began to pursue frontier studies. In the 1960's, settlement pattern studies began to be discussed in anthropological literature, and included the area of frontier research. Archaeologists became involved with the subject of frontier studies from the field of history.
In 1874, Francis A. Walker made the first significant contribution to the field of frontier studies. Walker, superintendent of the 1870 and 1880 U.S. Census, published the *Statistical Atlas of the United States* (1874). The *Atlas* contained a series of maps that showed population density and distribution for each decade between 1790 and 1870. The "line of population" or "frontier line" was the point where the settled territory ended and unsettled territory began. The maps also showed that the frontier line moved from east to west. This work made Walker the first scholar to cartographically represent and measure the frontier on the basis of statistical information (Mood 1952:17).

Frederick Jackson Turner, made the first theoretical contribution to the field of frontier studies when he was a young professor at the University of Wisconsin. In 1893, Turner wrote an essay entitled "The Significance of the Frontier in American History". This essay came only three short years after Robert P. Porter, the Superintendent of the Census of 1890, announced that "...up to 1880 the country had a frontier of settlement but at present... there can hardly be said to be a frontier... the frontier line... the discussion of its extent, its westward movement, etc.,... cannot, therefore, any longer have a place in the census reports" (Mood 1952:17; Turner 1893:1). This statement is
generally regarded by historians as marking the official close of the American frontier.

Turner's 1893 essay carried Frederick Jackson Turner to academic prominence. Turner's thesis was simple and straightforward. Turner theorized that "the existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the advance of American settlement westward, explain American development" (Turner 1893:1). Turner was mainly concerned with two concepts: first, the Americanization of a group of non-native American people who moved westward across and settled what had previously been an aboriginal landscape. Second, Turner considered the American character. He wrote that the American character was one of the rugged individualist. It was, Turner wrote, manifest in every aspect of American life, from Teddy Roosevelt's "Bully" and "Big Stick" politics to the literary action/adventure novel that was popular at the end of the Victorian era. Today, it seems evident that Turner was very much influenced by the Zeitgeist of his day.

The Turner thesis was a means of explaining American social development. Turner stated:

"...The frontier is the outer edge of a wave--the meeting point between savagery and civilization... American social development has been continually beginning over again on the frontier. ...Thus American development has exhibited not merely an advance along a single line, but a return to primitive conditions on a continually advancing frontier line, and a new
development for that area... The frontier is the line of most rapid and effective Americanization" (Turner 1893:2-3).

He wrote that these conditions were the essence of the American character.

When we consider the frontier to be both the entity and the process that created an American people, we must also look at the position of the parent state. As people advanced westward across the new continent, they put more distance between themselves and their mother country of Europe. This increased distance also meant increased independence for the westward tide of colonists. Turner addressed this concept in his writing:

"At first, the frontier was the Atlantic coast. It was the frontier of Europe in a very real sense. Moving westward, the frontier became more and more American. As successive terminal moraines result from successive glaciations, so each frontier leaves its traces behind it, and when it becomes a settled area the region still partakes of the frontier characteristics. Thus the advance of the frontier has meant a steady movement away from the influence of Europe, and a steady growth of independence on American lines" (Turner 1983:4).

Summarizing Turner's "Significance of the Frontier" article, it can be concluded that Turner viewed the frontier as a zone of influences. Turner made essentially eight points in his essay. First, Turner stated that the frontier "promoted the formation of a composite nationality for the American people... In the crucible of the frontier the immigrants were Americanized, liberated, and fused into a
mixed race, English in neither nationality nor characteristics" (Turner 1893:22-23).

Turner's second point was one mentioned above. It noted that the advancement of the frontier decreased America's dependence on Europe (Turner 1893:23).

The third point of Turner's essay was concerned with the growing political awareness in the young republic.

"The growth of nationalism and the evolution of American political institutions were dependant on the advance of the frontier... the legislation which most developed the powers of national government, and played the largest part in its activity, was conditioned on the frontier... Administratively the frontier called out some of the highest and most vitalizing activities of the general government" (Turner 1893:24-25).

An example of legislation resulting from the new political awareness would be the acquisition and dispersal of public lands (Ibid. 25).

Turner's fourth point involved the movement of goods to the frontier. As the frontier moved away from the coast, the feasibility of England supplying the needs of a growing interior population diminished. Thus, the frontier created a demand for merchants who could meet the needs of the frontier consumer. This demand for the products of the coast (i.e. the settled area) was the impetus for much of the internal improvements of frontier America (Ibid. 24).
Turner's fifth point was that "the economic and social characteristics of the frontier worked against sectionalism" (Ibid. 27). The people of the frontier were more influenced by the Middle section (i.e New York and Pennsylvania), than by the New England or the Deep South.

"The Middle region, entered by New York Harbor, was an open door to all Europe. The tide-water part of the South represented typical Englishmen, modified by a warm climate and servile labor, and living in baronial fashion on great plantations; New England stood for a special English movement—Puritanism. The Middle region was less English than the other sections. It had a wide mixture of nationalities, a varied society, the mixed town and country system of local government, a varied economic life, many religious sects. In short it was a region mediating between New England and the South, and the East and the West...Pennsylvania had been the seed-plot of frontier emigration, and, although she passed on her settlers along the Great Valley into the west of Virginia and the Carolinas, yet the industrial society of these southern frontiersmen was always more like that of the Middle region than like that of the tide-water portion of the South, which later came to spread its industrial type throughout the South" (Turner 1893:27-28).

Turner's sixth point concerned the effect that the mobility of the people colonizing the frontier had on the nation as a whole. Turner believed that the mobility of people helped to promote nationalism.

"Nothing works for nationalism like intercourse within the nation. Mobility of population is death to localism, and the western frontier worked irresistibly in unsettling population. The effect reached back from the frontier and affected profoundly the Atlantic coast and even the Old World" (Ibid. 30).

Turner's seventh point addressed what he considered to be the most important result of frontier advancement. The
most important effect of the frontier, said Turner, "...has been in the promotion of democracy here and in Europe" (Ibid.). This seventh point is based on the quality of frontier individualism. Turner stated that

"complex society is precipitated by the wilderness into a kind of primitive organization based on the family. The tendency is anti-social. It produces antipathy to control, and particularly to any direct control" (Ibid.).

He noted that this environmentally produced condition was the birthplace of frontier individualism (Ibid.). He wrote that it is this frontier individualism that "from the beginning promoted democracy" (Ibid.).

The eighth and final point Turner made concerned the effect that the frontier had on the intellect of the American people. Turner theorized that life on the frontier produced certain intellectual traits that have survived in an area even after frontier conditions ceased to exist. Turner noted, "that to the frontier the American intellect owes its striking characteristics" (Ibid. 37). Among these characteristics, he included such traits as coarseness, strength, acuteness, inquisitiveness, inventiveness, and individualism (Ibid.).

Turner proposed his frontier thesis at a time when the discipline of archaeology was still in its infancy. In 1893 the field of archaeology was in a period described by Willey and Sabloff (1980) as being Classificatory-Descriptive in
nature. At this time, the principal focus of archaeologists "was on the description of archaeological materials, especially architecture and monuments, and rudimentary classification of these materials" (Willey and Sabloff 1980:34). In order for frontier theory to become a usable concept to archaeologists, two concepts would need to be developed. These concepts were 1) settlement pattern, and 2) systems theory.

In the late 1940's, with encouragement from Julian Steward, Gordon Willey made the first archaeological study that used settlement pattern survey and analysis. Willey would observe the context and function of the regional settlement system of an archaeological culture through time (Ibid. 146). Willey's work in the Viru Valley of Northern Peru resulted in the now-classic monograph Prehistoric Settlement Patterns in the Viru Valley. This monograph demonstrated to the discipline of archaeology the value of settlement pattern analysis in the interpretation of a particular culture.

According to Willey, settlement patterns can be defined as

"the way in which man disposed himself over the landscape on which he lived. It refers to dwellings, their arrangement, and to the nature and disposition of other buildings pertaining to community life. These settlements reflect the natural environment, the level of technology on which the builders operated, and various institutions of social interaction and control
which the culture maintained. Because settlement patterns are, to a large extent, directly shaped by widely held cultural needs, they offer a strategic starting point for the functional interpretation of archaeological cultures" (Ibid. 146-147).

Using this concept of settlement pattern analysis, Willey was able to show how the communities in the Viru Valley were functionally interrelated through space and time.

Within a decade of Willey's Viru Valley study, archaeologists were already incorporating settlement pattern study into their research designs. As a result, settlement pattern study became one of the main focuses of archaeological studies. One such archaeologist, who successfully utilized the new concept of settlement pattern study, was K.C. Chang. Chang argued that the field of archaeology should employ settlement pattern studies in order to define local social groups, rather than using the time-spacing of material traits to define geographical areas, as was popular in the 1930's and 1940's. Chang wrote that it was limiting to study only isolated cultural traits and artifacts, "since cultural traits are meaningless unless described in their social context" (Chang 1958:324). "The reason we shift from artifact to settlement as the primary [archaeological] unit for conceptualization and operation is that we are primarily interested in social groups having common cultural traditions" (Chang 1967:39).
Chang used the settlement pattern methodology in his study of New World Neolithic social groupings. By defining different levels in the settlement or community pattern (i.e. household, community, and aggregate) Chang observed how the levels of these Neolithic settlements were arranged across the landscape. He noted the way in which the people of each settlement arranged the various structures within their community, and their communities within the aggregate. He theorized that these patterns reflected the occupants' social, political, military, commercial, and religious ties (Chang 1958:299 and 301).

Chang's goal pursued a correlation between the settlement pattern of a specific locus and the social grouping of its inhabitants (Ibid. 298). As Chang stated, "the settlement is an archaeological unit of behavioral meaningfulness" (Chang 1967:15). In his application of settlement pattern study, Chang noted that settlement pattern is implicitly associated with the environment. "...For a meaningful study of the man-environment interrelationship it is necessary to start with a settlement as an ultimate point of reference" (Ibid. 64). In his discussion of the articulation of settlement patterns and cultural ecology, Chang stated that the analysis of settlement pattern is "particularly useful to the archaeologist for the following reasons: ...it shows the spatial dimension of the man-environment in a very sensitive way that is
relative to the technological levels of the settlement's inhabitants; and ... it gives a concrete clue to the study of social organization which is ... interrelated with the environment primarily through the medium of the pattern of settlement" (Ibid. 95).

Bruce Trigger further developed settlement pattern studies. He elaborated on the correlation between settlement pattern and social relations. Trigger defined settlement archaeology as "the study of social relationships using archaeological data" (Trigger 1967:151). He suggested the use of a settlement pattern methodology to illuminate the structural and developmental aspects of social relationships as functioning economic, political, and affective systems.

In his article "Settlement Archaeology—Its Goals and Promise", Trigger noted that settlement archaeology can provide insights into the development of warfare among Iroquois-speaking people of the American northeast. He argued that studies utilizing three basic levels or primary units of settlement pattern analysis can provide insight into different levels of social interactions. According to Trigger, these basic levels consisted of the individual structure, the settlement, and settlement distribution across the landscape (Ibid.). These levels corresponded to Chang's (1958) household, community, and aggregate units. Through the study of individual structures, one can observe the structure of the nuclear family, class divisions, and
occupational specialization. On the level of the single settlement, social, occupational, and ethnic distinctions can be observed. Likewise, government, religious, and various other community-integrating institutions, and the economic structure and degree of self sufficiency can be examined. Across the landscape, the ecological and political arrangements of an aggregate of communities can be examined (Trigger 1967:151-152). Thus each level of settlement pattern analysis would reveal characteristics especially appropriate to the study of particular aspects of a culture.

In a later article, Trigger employed the three levels of settlement pattern analysis discussed above, to examine the factors which determine settlement pattern. He defined the determinants of settlement patterns as "those classes of factors that interact with each other to produce the spatial configurations of a social group" (1968:53). Trigger concluded,

"It is clear that settlement patterns represent responses to a number of different kinds of factors that influence them in different ways and degrees on different levels...If we conceive of the settlement pattern as an outcome of the adjustments a society makes to a series of determinants that vary both in importance and in the kinds of demands they make on the society, we must consider not merely the range of factors affecting settlement patterns but also the manner in which different factors interact with one another to influence a particular pattern" (Trigger 1968:70-71).
Trigger warned that settlement pattern studies have a certain functional limitation: they are limited by a restricted range of possibilities in the various aspects of a culture (Ibid. 71).

Since the 1960's, the use of settlement pattern studies in the field of archaeology has been refined. Presently, such studies are an invaluable and frequently-used research tool in the discipline of historical archaeology. This can be seen in studies done on the household, community, and regional scales.

At the regional, or macro scale was Robert Paynter's (1982) study of spatial inequality using settlement pattern analysis. He examined social stratification in the nineteenth-century Connecticut River Valley. Paynter argued that most archaeological studies have concentrated on the "material" inventory of sites. His study represents a departure from the norm in that

"...the spatial relations between sites, rather than the material inventories of sites, is the characteristic of the world system under analysis. Thus the goal is to study patterns in spatial relations effected by participation in large-scale socio-cultural systems" (Paynter 1982:85).

Paynter's study examined how spatial interaction in a stratified society affects the settlement pattern of that society. His study included how, through the identification of different characteristics of an area's settlement
organization (settlement pattern), one can examine the
impact of long distance processes in stratified socio-
cultural systems (Ibid. 20, 40).

Paynter suggested
"that the regional settlement pattern of an area
discloses the area's role in larger systems... and adds
yet another dimension of material patterning with which
historical archaeologists can study the transformation
of North American society and the processes responsible
for it" (Ibid. ix, 6).

On the household, or micro scale, settlement pattern
studies and landscape studies yield interesting results. A
symposium entitled "The Archaeological Use of Landscape
Treatment in Social, Economic, and Ideological Analyses" was
held at the 1987 meeting of the Society for Historical
Archaeology Conference on Historical and Underwater
Archaeology in Savannah, Georgia. Patricia Rubertone (1989)
in a discussion of the papers presented at the symposium
states
"...the papers present us with alternatives which
even landscape as land that has been modified by
human actions and conscious design to provide housing,
accommodate the system of production, facilitate
communication and transportation, mark social
inequalities, and express aesthetics. Yet, rather than
simply mirroring the organization of things or
mediating taste, the landscape is an active force in
creating the social order, in legitimizing it, and in
bringing about changes in it" (Ibid. 50).

A household, or micro scale study of New York City by
Diana Dizerega Wall (1987) utilized settlement pattern
analysis to look at how the settlement system of New York City changed between the late eighteenth and mid-nineteenth centuries. She demonstrated that during the late eighteenth century "the functional relationship between home and work sites among all of the cities socio-economic groups was the same: both sets of activities were performed at single sites with those of the elite clustering in the center of the city" (Wall 1987:74). Later in the nineteenth century, the elite and middle classes had moved their home sites away from the core of the city. Through the application of settlement pattern analysis Wall was able to elucidate the core-periphery relationship as expressed in the distribution of social classes within a preindustrial city.

Settlement pattern studies have also identified zones between settlements. Rubertone (1986) suggested that most of the settlement pattern research has been on the relationships between settlements or on the settlements themselves. She argued that previous studies have neglected the areas around and between the settlements, called "spaces" (Rubertone 1986:124). Rubertone suggested that the linking of the observations of place and space "can provide information on a number of issues ranging from social interaction to economic organization" (Ibid. 127).

As noted above, from the time of Turner until the 1950's, frontier studies were situated in the realm of
Much of the work concerning the frontier done between 1920 and 1950 was either a romanticized view of the conditions on the frontier (see Loehr 1943) or the analysis of how Turner originated the frontier theory (see Becker 1927, Mood 1938, 1943, 1945, and Holt 1948).¹

Beginning in the 1950's, geographers began to address the question of frontier significance. W.L. Morton (1951) addressed the topic of site in relation to the frontier. Although he did not use the terms cultural ecology or settlement pattern, his work undeniably used both the concepts cultural ecology and settlement pattern.

Morton suggested that a site's significance may vary due to environmental conditions and the society's level of technology. In his article, he argued that settlement of frontier sites is "the initial exploitation of a particular environment by means of a contemporary technology, for the needs of an immigrant culture" (Morton 1951:97). He concluded that the process of frontier settlement "was an experiment in the application of a given culture to a given complex of sites" (Ibid. 104).

¹Holt has suggested that the origins of Turner's frontier hypothesis and safety valve theory may be based in the writing of Hegel. Hegel's 1837 Philosophie der Geschichte describes the empty agricultural frontier of America as a safety valve. This statement by Hegel is one of the earliest statements of this theory (see Holt 1948).
Morton defined four types of frontier sites according to agricultural and ecological conditions. One type, primitive sites, were fur-trading sites set up at the seasonal gathering places of aboriginal populations. The second type, squatter sites, combined subsistence agriculture with hunting and herding. At the third type, the homestead site, the object of agriculture was to produce a surplus for sale. The fourth type, the distribution site, arose as a result of the homestead site and acted as a center of distribution for the surplus produced at the homestead sites (Ibid. 98-101).

Fulmer Mood (1952) examined American frontier lines during the period 1625-1790. Mood argued that Frederick Jackson Turner had mistakenly delineated a single continuous frontier or frontier line, and that this continuous line advanced in successive waves. Mood suggested that Turner's delineation of a single continuous frontier line was a result of his reliance on Census data and statistical maps compiled by Francis Walker, Superintendent of the 1870 and 1880 United States Census (Mood 1952:17).

Through the examination of different maps, Mood reached a conclusion about the frontier different from that of Turner. The maps, which Mood examined, were: first, maps published in Edward Channing's 1905 History of the United States, which consisted of three maps showing the extent of
settlement for the years 1660, 1760, and 1790; and second, maps in Herman R. Friis, "A Series of Maps of the Colonies and the United States, 1625-1790" appearing in the July 1940 issue of the Geographical Review, consisting of ten maps showing population between the years 1625-1790 (Mood 1952:20, 24).

The Channing maps indicate that in 1660 a number of separate frontier lines existed due to the lack of a geographical population continuum. By 1760, a population continuum had come into existence and was hemmed by a frontier line. Outside and beyond this frontier line existed discrete population nuclei, each having its own frontier line. A similar situation existed in 1790. The Friis maps exhibited a similar scenario. By 1780 an Atlantic-based population continuum existed with a corresponding frontier line. Outside of the frontier line were smaller isolated frontier settlements each having their own frontier line (Ibid. 23, 32).

Through his analysis of the cartographic evidence of the advancement of the frontier, Mood concluded that there existed a plurality of settled areas and a plurality of frontier lines. The major settled area was the Atlantic coastal region and the minor settled areas were west of the mountains. A major frontier line and several minor frontier lines encompassed the settled regions (Ibid. 33).
In the 1950's, frontier studies further developed, firmly grounded in both history and geography. Frontier studies, as a research theme, had proliferated in both disciplines. During this time, numerous scholars began to reevaluate, criticize, and expand on Turner's frontier thesis and other works, resulting in a frenzied academic volley between Turnerian critics (see Hacker 1933, Wright 1934, Pierson 1941, Malin 1944, and Hayes 1946) and disciples (see Burkhart 1941, Craven 1941, Elkins and McKitrick 1954, Lattimore 1955, Riegel 1956, and Taylor 1956).

Scholars in frontier research also began attempts to define specific terms, elements, and constructs regarding the frontier. Ladis K.D. Kristof (1959), a political scientist, examined the geopolitics of frontiers and boundaries. Kristof attempted to define the difference between a frontier and a boundary, utilizing a political standpoint. Kristof argued that frontiers and boundaries are manifestations of socio-political forces.

A boundary, as defined by Kristof is an inner-oriented entity which acts as a separating factor. It is a "meeting place of two socio-political bodies each having its particular interests, structure and ideology" (Kristof 1959:277). Boundaries are spatial expressions created and maintained by a legal system. A frontier, on the other
hand, is an integrating factor, a zone between two different ways of life. It is a phenomenon of history and a result of movement, and could be considered a stepping stone to a boundary situation. "Though frontier conditions may sometimes be deliberately created by governments, the state tends to view frontiers... as a temporary expedient; as appropriate to a period of transition. The ultimate goal is a boundary not a frontier" (Ibid. 280).

In 1960, Marvin Mikesell, in a review article written for the field of geography, called for the use of comparative studies in the interpretation of the significance of the frontier in America. Mikesell wrote that "the principal failing of Turner, his followers, and most of his critics has been a neglect of comparative research" (Mikesell 1960:64). Comparative studies, by utilizing the perspective of frontier process in other areas, would provide a foundation for generalization on frontier conditions. Mikesell suggested that, because most of the interpretation of frontier processes are based on American frontier development, one could look for similar comparisons in frontier development in Canada, Australia, and South Africa (Ibid. 67).

Mikesell concluded that there is much to be learned from systematic comparative studies of frontier development. He suggested that comparative studies need to address five
items: 1) the economic and social climate during the period of frontier formation; 2) relationships between aboriginal and immigrant populations; 3) the effect of the environment on the rate and direction of frontier movement; 4) the interrelationship of economic development and frontier movement; and 5) the influence of the frontier on the development of national institutions, as suggested by Turner (Ibid. 73).

In the early 1960's, anthropologists began to look at frontiers as a significant area of research. At that time, anthropologists studied colonization and frontier studies. They defined terms that are utilized in frontier studies today. Joseph Casagrande, Stephen Thompson, and Philip Young studied new areas of colonization in the Ecuadorian Oriente. Their 1964 article "Colonization as a Research Frontier: The Ecuadorian Case" discussed the importance of colonization as a focus of anthropological research.

Casagrande et al. wrote that traditionally anthropologists have concentrated on the consequences of colonization on the indigenous population of the region being settled. They argued that little attention has been shown to the process and cultural changes resulting from colonization (Casagrande et al. 1964:282). The authors suggested that the theoretical benefits of colonization studies are threefold. First, one may view the processes
where "an already established sociocultural system is extended, replicated, or reintegrated..." and the adaptive processes where colonists must adapt to new ecological, social, political, and economic niches (Ibid.). Second, demographic selection and divergence from the parent sociocultural system may be studied. Lastly, and most important, "colonization provides an opportunity to study social and cultural change in process rather than in its culmination" (Ibid.).

Casagrande et al. discussed several general factors that are important in colonization by human populations. These factors are: the spatial expansion of a population, the adaptation of the population to a new environment, and the competitiveness of the colonization process (Ibid. 283). Additional factors included: the re-establishment and maintenance of cultural features of the parent sociocultural system; initial maintenance of integration with the parent system; migration into an already occupied area; and lastly, the technologically more advanced nature of the intrusive population (Ibid.).

The unit of description and analysis has been defined by Casagrande et al. as the "area of colonization": "It is the area of colonization, from the entrepôt that links it with the long settled area to the unfolding frontier that constitutes the theater of the social and cultural changes with which we are concerned. Moreover, the overall settlement pattern within this
area—the types of settlements and the relationships among them—as it emerges during the period of colonization is one of the defining features of the process" (Ibid. 284).

Casagrande et al. examined general features of the area of colonization. They suggested the most important features were the rapidly changing and fluid nature of the boundaries, settlements, social, economic, and political structure within the area of colonization (Ibid. 311). They noted, that as one moves toward the frontier, the degree of fluidity increases. This phenomenon they defined as the "colonization gradient" (Ibid.). The colonization gradient is reflected in the settlement pattern of the area of colonization (Ibid., 312). The colonization gradient is similar to the folk-urban continuum developed by Robert Redfield (1962).

Within the area of colonization, the authors defined five types of settlements that constitute the colonization gradient. These settlement types...
area... The overall process is one of increasing stabilization" (Casagrande et al. 1964:314).

Casagrande et al. noted the five types of settlements, which are indicative of the colonization gradient: the entrepôt, the frontier town, the nucleated settlement, the semi-nucleated settlement, and the dispersed settlement. The entrepôt links the area of colonization with the metropolitan area, serving as an intermediate center for the collection and distribution of goods essential to the area of colonization. It is also "the terminus of the transportation system which serves the frontier" (Ibid. 312). The frontier town serves as the "focal point of social, economic, political, and religious activity" (Ibid.). It serves as a supply center for goods and services for the area of colonization and it may also serve as a collection point for products of the area of colonization "when such products are being produced for an outside market" (Ibid. 312-313). The frontier town also serves as "the terminus within the area of colonization of the transportation system linking the frontier with the outside metropolitan area" (Ibid. 312). The frontier town "in terms of the level of integration, appears to be most like settlements in the metropolitan area" (Ibid. 315). The nucleated settlement "consists of a cluster of households which are organized politically at least to the extent of having some form of municipal government. It is linked with
the frontier town... through its municipal government" (Ibid. 313). Although it may have several stores to provide for colonists, "it does not replace the frontier town as the main supply center" (Ibid.). The semi-nucleated settlement "is characterized more by its lack of integration and community facilities than by their presence" (Ibid.). The individual household is "the only facility for provisions" (Ibid.). The dispersed settlement consists of scattered households that are only loosely integrated with a larger corporate entity.

The settlements constituting the colonization gradient within the area of colonization can be studied from a spatial, temporal, and functional aspect. "As one proceeds away from the metropolitan area toward the frontier, settlements diverge more and more from those of the settled area... we are not talking about absolute geographical distance, but about accessibility" (Ibid. 314-315). The authors noted "colonization affords the anthropologist a unique opportunity to study the processes of culture change, integration, and reintegration while they are actually taking place; i.e., to study the processes in process and not merely retrospectively after their culmination" (Ibid. 320). They also stated that their colonization gradient may be a "cross-cultural universal" of the process of colonization (Ibid.).
During the late 1950's, the mindset of the discipline of archaeology was beginning to shift from its concern with chronology to a concern with context and function. Three contextual-functional approaches were developed. First, artifacts began to be treated more in terms of being material remains of social and cultural behavior. Second, settlement patterns were important in the understanding of socioeconomic adaptation and sociopolitical organizations. Third, environmental-evolutionary relationships existed between culture and the natural environment, i.e. cultural ecology (Willey and Sabloff 1980:130-131).

The 1960's saw the increasing use of the evolutionary, contextual, and functional approaches (Ibid. 181). Utilizing Julian Steward's concepts of cultural ecology and multilinear evolution as a theoretical base, archaeologists began to apply the cultural ecological concept of an environment's influence on the core elements of culture to their studies (Steward 1955; Willey and Sabloff 1980:151).

The period in the discipline of archaeology, beginning in the 1960's, is defined by Willey and Sabloff (1980) as the Explanatory Period of Archaeology. The Explanatory Period is characterized by the new archaeology, which is anthropological archaeology with a cultural evolutionary point of view. The new archaeology, borrowing from systems theory, attempted to utilize processual explanation to
arrive at laws of cultural dynamics. The systems theory approach played a large role in the new archaeology (Ibid. 185-187).

Systems theory or the systemic approach was developed in 1965 by Lewis Binford. It was "a fundamental statement about the nature of culture and how it can most profitably be studied" (Watson, LeBlanc, and Redman 1984:69). Watson, LeBlanc, and Redman (1984) wrote that "the contribution of systems theory to archaeological research is that it is a way to formulate testable models (hypotheses) of human social and cultural behavior... These hypotheses... serve as the bases for prediction about the nature of the archaeological record pertaining to the societies in question" (Ibid. 84-85).

In the early 1960's, historical archaeology had become an accepted field within the discipline of archaeology. The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology held its first meeting in 1960 (South 1977:18). The popularity of historic sites archaeology was elevated by the view that the large quantity and better quality of data, and the high precision in the dating of materials found on historic archaeological sites, would allow this branch of archaeology to be used to test archaeological techniques, methods, and assumptions (Willey and Sabloff 1980:244).
The frontier became an area of study in archaeology in the early to mid 1970's with the work of Stanley South and Kenneth Lewis. In 1977, South published *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*. In this book, South was concerned with the dynamics of past cultural systems and the delineation of culture process through the methodology of pattern recognition. South argued that

"the key to understanding culture process lies in pattern recognition. Once pattern is recognized, the archeologist can then ask why the pattern exists, why it is often so predictive it can be expressed as laws. In doing, so he can begin to build a theory for explaining the demonstrated pattern" (South 1977:31).

South further suggested that quantitative analysis was the methodology necessary to recognize patterns in archaeological remains (Ibid. 32).

South emphasized that the archaeologist must concern himself with the process of pattern recognition using artifact types, classes, and groups. He noted that once functional and behavioral processes have been recognized in the form of archaeological pattern, archaeologists can then study the historical documents, which sometimes do not agree with the archaeological pattern.

South began his focus of pattern recognition by defining the Brunswick Pattern of Refuse Disposal. This pattern showed that on British Colonial occupation sites the habits of people disposing of their refuse near the entrance
of their homes established a pattern of refuse disposal. The pattern was so common that the location of entrance ways of structures could be identified even if no architectural evidence existed. This was possible through the concentration of midden at doorways (Ibid. 47). South also studied variability in artifact frequencies in various parts of historic sites and how these replicated behavioral activity.

South argued that patterned regularity does exist in the archaeological record. In defining the Frontier Artifact Pattern and the Carolina Artifact Pattern, examination of ratios between artifact groups created broad regularities against which any deviation from these regularities could be contrasted (South 1978:228). South postulated that British colonial behavior should reveal regularities in patterning; specialized behavioral activities would reveal contrasting patterns; and that the patterns could be recognized through quantification of the fragmented by-products of that behavior, i.e. artifacts (South 1977:88; 1978:228). South's two artifact patterns were based on recurring artifact distributions observed at different historic archaeological sites (Waselkov and Paul 1980-81:315).

South defined the Carolina and Frontier Artifact Patterns utilizing ratios between artifact groups to
illuminate frequency variations within the archaeological record. In order to quantitatively show the Carolina Artifact Pattern and the Frontier Artifact Pattern, artifacts from various sites were classified by type, class, and group. Eight artifact groups were selected for the delineation of these two artifact patterns, consisting of kitchen, architecture, furniture, arms, clothing, personal, tobacco pipes, and activities associated artifacts (South 1977:107 and 145; 1978:229-230). The mean and percentage range for the various sites and artifact groups were formulated and these results revealed the different artifact patterns.

According to South:

"The Kitchen and Architecture artifact groups were found to be the most stable on an intersite basis... Furniture and Arms groups reflected a high degree of variability. This finding suggests that behavior resulting in by-products of kitchen related activities and artifacts architecturally related is far less sensitive in intersite comparisons than furniture- and arms-related by-products... those groups having low frequencies will be most sensitive to small variations such as the presence or absence of two or three objects" (South 1977:121).

The difference between the Carolina Artifact Pattern and the Frontier Artifact Pattern was the inverse ratio between the architecture and kitchen artifact groups. In the Carolina Artifact Pattern, the mean for the kitchen group was 63.1 and for the architecture group it was 25.5;
the Frontier Artifact Pattern with its inverse ratio had a kitchen mean of 27.6 and an architecture mean of 52.0 (South 1977:107 and 145; 1978:229-230).

South concluded that the patterns observed demonstrate that the Carolina and Frontier Artifact Patterns can be seen as empirical generalizations, which South called "A Law of Behavioral By-Product Regularity". He stated his law:

"The by-product of a specified activity has a consistent frequency relationship to the by-products of all other activities in direct proportion to the organized integration of the various activities. Stated another way, the broken ceramics discarded from a domestic kitchen will have a consistent frequency relationship to all other associated artifact classes in direct proportion to their organized integration within kitchen activity" (South 1977:122; 1978:228).

South suggested that the cause of the reversal of the percentage of kitchen and architecture groups in the frontier pattern is due to the increase in architectural associated by-products in the frontier situation. This may result from a shorter occupation period in each dwelling on the frontier. An alternative explanation could be a decrease in the kitchen associated by-products due to the remoteness of the frontier from supply sources (South 1977:146).

After comparing the ratios of nails, ceramics, and wine bottles from the sites used to define the patterns, South concluded that:
"The increase in nails on frontier sites tends to produce a higher Architecture group ratio, whereas at the same there is a decrease in ceramics on frontier sites acting to produce a lower kitchen group ratio. These variables working in opposite directions within the Kitchen and Architecture artifact groups produce the inverse ratios between the Carolina and Frontier Patterns" (1977:151).

In 1980, Donald Hardesty proposed the use of synecological models from general evolutionary ecology as a new theoretical framework with which to study frontier phenomenon. He suggested that the conceptualization of the frontier as an ecological community undergoing transformation resulting from internal and external forces could allow the explanation of the interactive patterns of frontier process (Hardesty 1980-81:67-69).

Hardesty explained that, in ecological studies, the individual or local group is the most useful analysis and interpretation. He argued that on the frontier the household is the equivalent of the individual and therefore the household should be the unit of analysis utilized in the study of the frontier (Hardesty 1980-81:69). Often the household was the colonizing unit or a fundamental part of such unit and is a "visible assemblage of persons sharing a common life space" (Ibid. 71). The household's adaptation to the social networks and environmental habitats defined a view of frontier process. Its visibility as a unit "makes
it a useful unit for study through both the documentary and archaeological records" (Ibid. 71).

Hardesty then utilized the element of homogenization from Frederick Jackson Turner's Frontier Thesis as an example to which he applies ecological principles. As noted above, Turner wrote that the isolation of the frontier forced the homogenization of colonists from various backgrounds and forged the new American character (Turner 1893:2-3 and 22-23). Hardesty's application of ecological principles seem to refute Turner's belief in the frontier experience resulting in homogenization (Hardesty 1980-81:71).

Ecological theory assumed that organisms under conditions of competition will change as to reduce the intensity of competition (Ibid. 72). Examples such as ethnic groups in Guyana and the Chinese on the frontier of the American west indicated

"that intensifying competition is likely to not only solidify traditional ethnic identities but also to define new ethnic groups. The implication of all this for frontier change is simply that as frontiers are colonized and fill up, the competition for such limited resources as farming land, water, and mineral resources intensifies. And with intensified competition, the conditions are optimal for the proliferation of ethnic groups and other distinct cultural traditions. Ethnic boundaries are solidified, not broken down, and cultural patterns become more heterogeneous, not the reverse" (Hardesty 1980-81:73).
Hardesty examined the ecological principle of environmental stability as a second ecological factor that disagreed with Turner's homogenization process. As was indicated by Kristof, the frontier process worked toward stability (1959:280). Hardesty argued that "increase in environmental stability creates the necessary ecological conditions for the diversification of patterns of human behavior on the frontier, a process which acts against the homogenization so essential to Turner's Frontier Thesis" (Hardesty 1980-81:74).

Hardesty concluded by saying that the ecological models of geographical variation, such as island biogeography, may be useful in looking at ecological diversity. He suggested that "changes in the diversity of cultural species that occurs during the frontier process is controlled by geographical and ecological impacts upon the demography of colonization" (Ibid. 77).

In 1975 Kenneth E. Lewis completed an archaeological study of the colonization of Jamestown, Virginia. In this study he identified Jamestown as a frontier town and created a frontier model utilizing the Virginia settlement. Lewis was concerned with changes in the subsistence, economic, social, trade, and communications subsystems of the colonial society. These changes were caused by the exposure of the colonizing English society to the alien environment of
A year later Lewis (1976) published an archaeological study of the frontier town of Camden, South Carolina. This work was the basis for his refinement of a model of insular frontier settlement and his book *The American Frontier: An Archaeological Study of Settlement Pattern and Process* (1984).

The process of frontier colonization covered a large geographical area. According to Lewis the frontier system was "...one of attenuated redistribution involving the rapid outward movement of a large amount of goods through a frontier town in exchange for the collection of the product of the frontier, often in a raw or semiprocessed state" (Lewis 1977:158).

In order to identify the frontier as a sociocultural entity, central economic features of the area of colonization must be identified. These features would be most apparent in the frontier town, the focal settlement of the area of colonization (Ibid. 157).

"The frontier town, because of its pivotal position in the economic network, contains the mechanisms relating to the centralization of activities within the area of colonization. An examination of this key settlement should permit the observation of those activities that characterize the frontier" (Ibid. 158).
In addition to the sociocultural aspect of frontier research, the examination of a frontier town would illuminate the temporal limits of the frontier, the chronological scale of the development of the area of colonization, and the form of dispersed settlements in the early stages of development (Ibid.).

Lewis's model of insular frontier settlement was organized according to six characteristics associated with the process of agricultural colonization of a region, and examined the patterned organization of a frontier region in both space and time (Lewis 1984:25).

The six characteristics that constitute the model of insular frontier change are as follows:

1) **Establishment.** "The colony must be established as a permanent settlement sustained by the production of competitive export staples destined primarily for markets in the parent state" (Lewis 1984:25). The frontier region maintains a strong cultural tie with the parent state, capital and resources are reinvested in the colony, and there is a subsequent development of a colonial society distinct from that of the parent state (Ibid.).

2) **Transport and Spatial Patterning.** "The form of a colonial area is determined by the spatial pattern of its transportation network linking the agricultural settlements
to the entrepôt and the parent state" (Ibid.). The transportation network would be normally characterized by a dendritic form, superceeding all pre-colonial networks. Settlement would follow the transport system since accessibility is imperative to commercial agricultural success (Ibid. 26). The size and shape of the frontier would be determined by the physical and cultural landscape, as well as the intrusive society's level of technology (Ibid.).

3) Expansion. "The frontier is characterized by a regular process of expansion which is an adaptive response to the increasing demand for staple export production" (Ibid.). The expansion would be furthered by consistent improvement in the methods and organization of the transport system. The increasing transportation efficiency allowed expansion of the zone of commercial production (Ibid.).

4) Settlement Pattern. "The settlement pattern of colonial areas changes through time in response to increasing population density and economic complexity" (Ibid.). The frontier area would pass through three evolutionary stages: colonization, spread, and competition. The frontier area would move toward an evenly spaced settlement pattern (Ibid.).
5) **Organization of Activities.**

"The initially low population density of a frontier region results in a more dispersed settlement pattern than that in the homeland. This settlement pattern is revealed in the organization of activities in the colony. The smaller number of settlements results in an abbreviated settlement hierarchy which tends to concentrate social, economic, political, and religious activities within the colony at focal points called **frontier towns**. These serve as termini of the transportation network in the colony and link the scattered settlements of the frontier to the entrepôt. In addition to the frontier town, **nucleated**, **seminucleated**, and, **dispersed** settlements occur, the last of which may extend into the **pioneer fringe**, a zone of transition not yet fully participating in commercial frontier agriculture" (Lewis 1984:26).

The type of crops grown, the requirements of labor, processing and transport would, to some degree, effect the settlement patterns and their distribution (Ibid.).

6) **The Colonization Gradient.**

"The hierarchy of settlements within an area of colonization shows a pattern of increasing socioeconomic complexity called the **colonization gradient**. This gradient is visible spatially at any given time, but it also may be observed temporally as the roles of settlements change in response to the region's development into a settled area. As the frontier region expands, the spatial patterning of the colonization gradient is likely to be repeated in newly settled areas" (Lewis 1984:26).

Changes in the colonization gradient would be reflected in the transport structure of the area of colonization. The dendritic growth of the transport system would be common as a frontier area passes through the stages of the colonization gradient (Ibid. 26-27).
Lewis noted the obvious necessity of utilizing both the documentary and archaeological record in the examination of the process of insular frontier development and change. Lewis then used South Carolina as a case study example to which he applied the frontier model.

Lewis began his study by examining the documentary record. He examined early cartographic evidence including such sources as maps of early roads, newly formed townships, courthouse locations and judicial districts, expanding transportation facilities, such as canals, and other early settlements. Recent cartographic evidence such as population maps were also examined. These maps were compiled from other historic period sources such as census data, tax lists, county, town, and local histories, traveler's accounts, genealogies, church records, and church location maps. Trend surface analysis and computer mapping such as SYMAP, and statistical analysis such as nearest neighbor values completed the sources in the review of the documentary evidence.

Through the use of the documentary evidence, Lewis was able to show that frontier evolution in South Carolina followed the characteristics which had been proposed in the frontier model. More specifically, this evidence suggested that frontier development began with an initial coastal occupation which eventually spread to the upper coastal
plane and proceeded to spread through the piedmont and interior regions.

In general, it was evident that the settlement pattern was characterized as evolving in a continuum from a randomly spaced population distribution to a population distribution which was more evenly spaced (Ibid. 70-71). Documentary data also helped to define a colonization gradient and the evolution of a settlement hierarchy characterized by a dendritic pattern. The dendritic pattern resulted from the trade and communications network centered on a single entrepôt. Lewis was able to define an entrepôt (Charleston), frontier towns (Camden), nucleated settlements (Ninety-Six), and various dispersed settlements (e.g. the area around Long Bluff courthouse). These settlements were joined by a dendritic transportation and communications network centered on the entrepôt.

A problem of the use of the archaeological record in the examination of colonial societies would be that the archaeological record represents only a portion of the whole colonial system. This problem did not lessen the effectiveness of the frontier model to show frontier change. Lewis wrote that "an information base that includes all sites occupied during the colonial period is not required to identify the existence a frontier" (Ibid. 107).
The activities of a colonial society would be subsystemic in nature. The archaeological patterning resulting from various combinations of subsystems within different types of frontier settlements allowed the identification of site function based on artifacts deposited as a result of past activity. Therefore, the use of the archaeological record would address the various subsystems within the larger colonial system. More specifically, the subsystems that are most likely to exhibit frontier change need to be examined (Ibid. 104 and 108).

Lewis defined three subsystems that are associated with frontier development. These subsystems would be observed on both a regional and site-specific level. Each of the characteristics defined in the frontier model would include at least one of these three subsystems. The subsystems would be: 1) the economic subsystem, consisting of activities that produce material artifacts; 2) the sociopolitical subsystem, consisting of activities that maintain and regulate the functioning of societies; and 3) the trade and communications subsystem, consisting of activities that involve the movement of material goods or information within or between settlements (Ibid. 108-109). These subsystems would exhibit behavioral patterning.

In order to link the behavioral patterning, which reflects the systemic nature of the organization of a past
culture, and the archaeological patterning, which reflects
the material remains resulting from such behavior,
hypotheses would be devised that predict elements that would
be expected to occur in the archaeological record. If the
elements would exist in the archaeological record, then the
hypothesis can be said to be valid. "The degree to which
the archaeological data support the hypotheses should
illustrate the ability of the archaeological methodology to
reveal the occurrence of regional processes without the
assistance of a separate form of evidence" (Ibid. 105).
Lewis suggested that it is not necessary to have both
documentary and archaeological evidence to define a frontier
situation (Ibid. 295).

Based on the six characteristics of the frontier model,
Lewis proposed eleven archaeological hypotheses designed to
explore the organizational aspects of a colonial society, as
well as its evolving form and distribution on a changing
frontier landscape. Each hypotheses would indicate changes
expected within one or more of the three subsystems. The
archaeological hypotheses were "intended to link patterning
in the existing material record with the organization and
operation of a past cultural system" (Ibid. 109). More
specifically, the hypotheses addressed the results of the
processes of insular frontier change on the systemic
structure of an intrusive society (Ibid. 114).
In testing the validity of the eleven hypotheses Lewis utilized two types of evidence from the existing material record. The archaeological remains were one type, and the extant architectural and cultural landscape features were the second type of evidence (Ibid. 109).

Hypothesis 1 suggested that evidence of the maintenance of cultural ties between the colony and the parent state should be present in the archaeological record. Artifact patterning should reflect a well-developed trade and communications network, as well as the culturally-specific use and disposal of artifacts (Ibid. 110).

In testing Hypothesis 1, Lewis indicated that the archaeological record would reveal the cultural affiliation of a colonial population and its parent state. The maintenance of cultural ties between the two for a sustained period of time would also be evident (Ibid. 115). The nationality of the intrusive society and its temporal association would be revealed in artifact classes.

The ceramic artifact class met both criteria. Ceramics have a diagnostic temporal appearance and a frequency of occurrence related to the ethnic background of the settlers. "The sites of colonial settlements... should be characterized by a predominance of ceramic artifacts emanating from the homeland, its trading partners, or its
other colonial possessions" (Ibid. 116). In addition, ceramics would reveal the time span during which a particular site was occupied.

Examination of the percentage frequencies of ceramics from twelve historic sites in South Carolina revealed a wide variety of English ceramic types and a near absence of ceramics from competing colonial states. Examination of ceramics thus indicated a continuous British occupation of South Carolina beginning in 1650 and lasting until 1800 (Ibid. 119-123).

Extant architecture was a second class of artifacts utilized in the testing of Hypothesis 1. Despite the development of distinct vernacular architecture resulting from the adaptation to frontier conditions, "the retention of building forms characteristic of the parent state is likely to occur where conditions exist that encourage the use of traditional styles and provide the resources to produce such structures" (Ibid. 123). In addition, architectural styles would be easily dated.

Usually it is the high-status individuals who can afford to continue building in the traditional styles. Using a survey of eleven colonial-period, high-status buildings, Lewis demonstrated elements and similarities to
English buildings of the same period. This also supported Hypothesis 1 (Ibid. 123-129).

Hypothesis 2 suggested that a distinct colonial society should be evident despite the close cultural ties with the parent state. The differences that make the colonial society distinct will be a result of its adaptation to the frontier environment and to conditions existing at the periphery of a world economy. New cultural traits would be patterns of behavior and artifacts adapted from societies with which contact has taken place (Ibid. 110-111).

In order to test Hypothesis 2, Lewis again utilized ceramics and extant architecture classes of artifacts. These two artifact classes were able to reveal behavioral modification resulting from conditions encountered on the frontier. In a frontier situation, the modification of behavior would be primarily a functional adaptation to the peripheral position in the economy of the parent state, as well as to the environmental conditions and resources encountered in a frontier region.

Because of the distance from markets in the homeland and the growth of the colony, not all demands for goods could be met through imports. Thus colonial industries developed to meet the demand. The demand for ceramics was
one example where the demand surpassed the supply, resulting in the production of locally-manufactured ceramics.

Lewis cited three ceramic traditions in South Carolina that supplied locally-produced ceramics to the area of colonization. First, the Moravian settlements; second, locally-produced English colonial-tradition ceramics, which copied English forms; and third, Colono wares. The existence of these three ceramic traditions was indicative of frontier economic conditions at the periphery of a world economy. The different roots of these traditions also indicated a cultural diversity of frontier inhabitants (Ibid. 129-136).

Lewis also utilized extant architecture to test Hypothesis 2. Architectural innovation would result from the natural and cultural environments encountered on the frontier. Architectural innovation would also be affected by available technology, resources, and cultural diversity of the frontier population. Changes in architecture in South Carolina included the adaptation to a humid climate, cardinal orientation of structures, the substitution of wood as a primary building material, and the development of a distinct form of rural vernacular architecture, i.e. the log house (Ibid. 129-141).
Hypothesis 3 indicated that the presence of a permanent colonial society would be evident by the long term occupation of the region which it settled (Ibid. 111).

In testing Hypothesis 3, Lewis observed the establishment of the entrepôt and the development of its hinterland. A frontier would grow outward from a point of initial settlement. This point therefore would be the oldest and longest occupied in the region.

"This area is likely to have played a central role in the continued economic development of the colony and should contain the site of its entrepôt. Additional settlements of progressively shorter duration should be found at increasingly greater distances from the entrepôt. The beginning dates of their occupations should mark the time expansion had spread into a particular area" (Lewis 1984:142).

Lewis again utilized ceramics and extant architecture to test Hypothesis 3. The beginning dates and the date ranges provided by ceramics would be used to identify the sites that have the earliest dates in their particular area. Ceramics would also be used to identify the sites that had continuous occupation throughout the colonial period. Extant structures would also be used to assign chronological positions based on architectural style. A third class of artifacts that would be used to support Hypothesis 3 was the dates from cemetery tombstones. This latter class would be beneficial in looking at the long term occupation of particular areas.
Ceramics, architecture, and cemetery data indicated that Charleston was the earliest and longest-occupied settlement, and served as the entrepôt. The dates of sites throughout the area of colonization were examined. The various date ranges revealed a progressive expansion over the area of colonization radiating from the entrepôt (Ibid. 142-145).

Hypothesis 4 indicated that an entrepôt would be established in an accessible area at the edge of the area of colonization. The entrepôt would be the center of centralizing political, social, and economic activity, and would therefore be the largest settlement in the colony (Ibid. 111).

"The entrepôt is the integrating hub of an insular frontier region. It is established as the first settlement of substantial size in an area of colonization and serves as the focal point of economic, social, and political activities there. The entrepôt usually evolves into the region's largest settlement" (Ibid. 146-147).

Because the entrepôt would link the frontier to the parent state, it must sit in an area accessible to the parent state.

Lewis utilized site size and extant architecture to identify Charleston as the entrepôt. Charleston was the largest site of the colonial-period in South Carolina. Its location on a deep-water port allowed easy access for the parent state. Extant buildings, which indicated part of the
centralizing role played by the entrepôt, were examined. These buildings included economically-related structures, such as warehouses, mills, stores, and market houses; politically-related structures, such as governor's houses, state houses, court houses, and custom houses; religious structures, such as churches and church yards; and other miscellaneous structures, such as high-status domestic architecture and permanent military installations (Ibid. 146-154).

Hypothesis 5 stated that a dendritic trade and communications network centered on the entrepôt will form. This network would be evident in both the transportation routes and the colonial settlement pattern (Ibid. 111).

To support Hypothesis 5, Lewis observed the transportation systems. Lewis defined a waterborne transport system along the rivers of the lower coastal plane and an overland network in the interior region. A dendritic road system emanating from the entrepôt into the area of colonization was apparent, as was the spread of settlement along the river courses in the lower coastal plane (Ibid. 154-160).

Hypothesis 6 suggested that continuous expansion and settlement would occur throughout the colonial period. Earlier settlement would cluster around the entrepôt, while
later expansion would be seen progressing outward along the dendritic spatial pattern (Ibid. 111).

In testing Hypothesis 6, Lewis plotted the sites of material evidence of British settlement at chronologically short intervals (10 years) onto maps. This mapping, coupled with trend surface analysis (SYMAP), provided a picture of the continuous expansion during the colonial period. The maps showed early settlement clustered around the entrepôt, and, as time progressed, a gradual spread outward. This gradual expansion along the transportation networks followed the dendritic form predicted by Hypothesis 5. Lewis also discussed three barriers to such expansion:

1) environmental, such as climate, soils, and topographical obstacles; 2) cultural-political, such as aboriginal populations; and 3) economic, such as market demand (Ibid. 161-177).

Hypothesis 7 stated that, as time progresses, a trend toward an evenly-spaced settlement pattern would be apparent (Ibid. 111-112). Information from the maps generated in Hypothesis 6 was utilized to support the trend toward the even spacing of settlements in colonial South Carolina. "This reflects the readjustment of settlement spacing in response to the growing competition for land and resources as the area of colonization moves nearer its capacity to support maximum agricultural production" (Ibid. 177). The
Hypothesis 8 suggested that frontier towns existed to maintain economic, political, and social organization within a frontier region. Though smaller than the entrepôt, these towns would be the largest settlements within the frontier region. The settlements would play a central role in the frontier economy and serve as centers of socially, economically, and politically integrating activities throughout the period of frontier settlement (Ibid. 112).

Lewis used the frontier town of Camden in Kershaw County, South Carolina as a model to define frontier towns. "Frontier towns on the South Carolina frontier are likely to have been characterized by a distinctive size, layout, and content and by the presence of high-status individuals. Although these may be found individually in other frontier settlement types, the combination of all four are unique to the frontier town and the entrepôt" (Ibid. 200).

The size of the frontier town would be about 30 structures. It would be laid out on a gridiron plan. It would contain structures for the storage and transport of agricultural commodities and imports, repair and maintenance facilities, structures associated with political, religious, and military activities, and domestic structures, some of
which contain manufacturing by-products as a result of the dual function of the structure.

Percentage ratios of subsistence and technological artifact classes were used to determine structure function in the absence of manufacturing by-products. Evidence of high-status individuals was observed through the unequal distribution of scarce goods and ceramic variety. Military fortifications indicated that the frontier town was central enough to have served as a fortified military base for a wide region. (Ibid. 181-200).

Hypothesis 9 suggested that nucleated settlements, which were primarily domestic settlements, would occur in the area of colonization. These settlements would show some evidence of specialized economic or political activity, but would remain secondary to the frontier town (Ibid. 112). The nucleated settlement would have a more limited economic role than the frontier town, and thus would be less complex than a frontier town.

The nucleated settlement would exist to have some integrating functions in an area of dispersed agricultural population. Like the frontier town, the nucleated settlement would be recognized by its size, layout, and content. The size of a nucleated settlement would be between nine and twelve structures. Its layout would
usually consist of a row settlement with buildings distributed along either side of a road, and usually situated at a crossroads. The area would be secure from hostilities, because a linear settlement form would not be easily defensible. In the content of a nucleated settlement, there would be evidence of some specialized, non-domestic function.

Ninety Six, Long Bluff, and Pinckneyville were identified by Lewis as nucleated settlements. The use of percentage ratios of subsistence and technological artifact classes, and extant architectural remains, indicated the presence of specialized, non-domestic, activity areas within these settlements (Ibid. 201-210).

Hypothesis 10 stated that the remaining frontier population would occupy dispersed settlements. These settlements would consist of individual households or small clusters of households having a domestic function, and which serve as the primary units of agricultural production (Ibid. 112). The dispersed settlements would be the most numerous and most briefly occupied (Ibid. 210).

Lewis identified two types of dispersed settlements: the farm and the plantation. The farm was the smaller and less complex of the two types. It was essentially an agricultural production unit centered on the residence of
the owner (Ibid. 210-212). The plantation was a capitalistic agricultural organization, which meets the following criteria: 1) a relatively large population and territorial size, 2) emphasis on the production of specialized cash crops, 3) the use of unfree labor, 4) labor controlled by the authority principle, 5) centralized control of cultivating power, 6) a relatively large input of cultivating power per unit of area, and 7) a necessity of producing subsistence crops to at least in part to support the plantation population (Ibid. 212).

Lewis utilized the architecture and artifact classes to identify these two settlement types. The farm was identified by its rectangular shape, its position adjacent the farmhouse and kitchen, and the function of its structures. The plantation was identified by its arrangement in a regular fashion on one or both sides of a central residence complex (Ibid. 210-213).

Lewis used extant architecture and percentage frequencies of artifacts to identify these two settlement types. He also observed secondary refuse disposal, as well as artifacts that were indicators of high and low status. Geographical plotting of the two settlement types revealed that farm site distribution occurred in the interior and supported the evidence of an overland transport network. Plantation site distribution was confined to the riverine
region of the coastal plane. This latter distribution supported evidence of a riverine coastal plane transport network. These two types of dispersed settlement with their distinct modes of agricultural production revealed an adaptation to environmental factors affecting cultivation and transport (Ibid. 210-249).

Hypothesis 11 suggested that older frontier settlements would grow in size and assume additional functions, or would be abandoned and new ones formed elsewhere in response to the changing economic system of the frontier. This pattern of growth and abandonment is, in effect the operation of the colonization gradient through time and over space (Ibid. 113).

In order to view the colonization gradient as a spatial feature, one would observe the distribution of settlement as a whole through time. The entrepôt would have a central location at the edge of the settlement, and would be easily accessible to the parent state. The frontier town would be closer to the entrepôt, while the nucleated settlement would be situated closer to the periphery. The dispersed settlements would exist on the periphery and would surround all other settlement types.

In order to observe the colonization gradient as a process of change, one would observe a settlement that
attained the level of a frontier town or an entrepôt. This settlement would show growth from a dispersed settlement with a primarily domestic function, to a large, multifunctional settlement.

In testing the validity of Hypothesis 11, Lewis inspected the frequency distribution of mean ceramic dates within the site of the frontier town of Camden. He calculated the occupation range of each structure based activity area (Ibid. 254-255). This calculation showed Camden's beginning as an isolated rural settlement on a through road, and its growth, which culminated in a town with a gridiron pattern. The early town site was abandoned as settlement shifted northward (Ibid. 255).

The temporal aspect of the colonization gradient was evident in the changing settlement pattern at Camden. Camden's longevity was due to its maintaining a central position on the trade and communication network throughout the colonial period. The distribution and evolution of complex settlements showed the operation of the colonization gradient.

Lewis concluded his study of the frontier process by examining cosmopolitan frontiers. These frontiers would be regions of specialized economic activity, which exhibited few of the indigenous changes associated with insular
frontier development. Cosmopolitan frontiers would be a transitory form of colonial settlement, which arose to accommodate specialized extractive economic activities. Such frontiers would usually be short term and impermanent (Ibid. 264). They would be characterized by the retention of close ties with the homeland and the intensity of land use (Ibid. 271).

Lewis defined six types of cosmopolitan frontiers: 1) trading such as fur trade frontiers; 2) ranching such as livestock; 3) exploitative such as sugar or rubber plantations; 4) industrial frontiers such as mining and lumbering; 5) military frontiers that would be adjuncts to the other types of cosmopolitan frontiers and would serve to protect the extractive industry; and, 6) transport frontiers that would be transport links between a cosmopolitan frontier and the parent state, such as railroad routes or the pony express (Ibid. 264-268).

The process of colonization of cosmopolitan frontiers would vary considerably. The nature of the resource exploited, the variability and size of the area of resource occurrence, the technological efficiency of exploitation, the cost of transport, and the market price of the resource being exploited would all effect cosmopolitan frontiers (Ibid. 274).
The nature of cosmopolitan frontiers would make them easy to distinguish in the archaeological record:

"Because cosmopolitan frontier societies are a product of the economic and social processes that govern their existence, their structure and organization are likely to reflect their basic role as producers of specialized commodities. Two basic elements of structure that are easily discernable in the archaeological record are settlement pattern and activity composition... settlement pattern and composition are linked to variables governing these activities: 1) the nature and location of the resources, 2) their accessibility, 3) the available extractive and transport technology, 4) distances to markets, 5) the presence of hostile groups (including competing colonial states), 6) the processing requirements of the product" (Ibid. 276).

As a result, cosmopolitan frontiers would be both site and time specific.
CHAPTER III
HISTORY OF HANNA'S TOWN

Physical Environment

Hanna's Town provides an example of a frontier town. Because the physical environment is critical to the setting of any frontier town, a discussion of it is merited.

The site of Hanna's Town (36 WM 203) is located 35 miles west of Pittsburgh and three miles north of Greensburg in Hempfield Township, central Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania on Legislative Route 64038 (Figure 1). The legislative route generally follows the path of the old Forbes Road built in 1758. In the eighteenth century, the Forbes Road ran through the frontier settlement (Cowin 1984:6).

Hanna's Town is situated west of the Chestnut and Laurel Ridges of the Allegheny mountains on the maturely dissected, unglaciated Allegheny Plateau Section of the Appalachian Plateaus Physiographic Province (Fenneman 1938:290-298). The topography of the area is characterized by gently sloping, rounded hills that have long, smooth
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convex slopes. The site rises at a 5-8 degree slope to the east. Crabtree creek, a small westward-flowing stream runs 1320 feet to the north of the site, and drains the area to the Loyalhanna watershed and eventually to the Allegheny River. The water supply for the site is furnished by a strong spring and two unclassified seasonally intermittent streams that occur at the base of an eastward-facing anticline.

In Westmoreland County prevailing winds from the west create a moderate humid continental climate with warm summers and cold winters. The average January temperature is between 25-33 degrees, and the average July temperature ranges from 67-75 degrees. Annual precipitation ranges from 40-50 inches with nearly half of this falling between May 1 and September 31 (Taylor et al. 1968:66-67).

Biotic Environment

The Allegheny Plateau physiographic region that Hanna's Town occupies lies on melanized soils that are characteristic of the central deciduous forest zone. More specifically, these soils correspond with a mixed mesophytic forest cover that extends over the moist, well-drained uplands and valleys of the area. The mixed mesophytic forest is characterized by a mixed climax community where the dominance of the arboreal layer is shared by a number of
tree species that include beech (Fagus grandifolia), tulip
tree (Liriodendron tulipifera), sugar maple (Acer
saccharum), chestnut (Castanea dentata), red oak (Quercus
borealis), white oak (Quercus alba), hemlock (Tsugu
canadensis), white ash (Fraxinus americana), hickory (Carya
ovata), basswood (Tilia heterophylla), and sweet buckeye
(Aesculus octandra). The flowering dogwood (cornus florida)
is the dominant tree in the understory (Braun 1985:27-97).

Climax mixed mesophytic forest communities once covered
most of the landscape, but due to deforestation and farming
the environment has been altered. Today the site of Hanna's
Town is covered with lawn, unmowed grasses, weedy plants,
and scattered trees. The herbaceous vegetation is
exceedingly rich and varied, but consists of open field and
meadow plant species indigenous to western Pennsylvania.

The local forest communities produced edible tubers,
berries, fruits, and other edible plant species. In
addition to plant foods, animal resources were abundant.
Faunal resources included deer, bear, small mammals, and
fish. The presence of streams, springs and rivers provided
attractive localities for prehistoric settlement. Fertile
agricultural land and a mild climate attracted historic
populations to the area.
General History

The Monongahela Woodland Complex is used to refer to the Woodland sequence in the Allegheny Plateau section of southwestern Pennsylvania. Attempts to connect the Monongahela Complex with historic tribes such as the Shawnee have been unsuccessful (Griffen 1978:557). W. C. Johnson has suggested that the Monongahela are actually the historic Black Minqua (see Johnson 1986, and Johnson et al. 1989). The region was largely devoid of population by the time of European contact, the result of a combination of factors, including population decline caused by introduced disease and conflict resulting from the European fur trade.

By the time that William Penn received his proprietary charter from King Charles II of in England in April of 1681, the indigenous Native American population had departed the area of southwestern Pennsylvania. Although the area was under the jurisdiction of the Iroquois Confederacy by 1650, the few aboriginal settlements present at that time consisted of Delaware and Shawnee refugees from the east. It was the Delaware, Shawnee, and the Six Nations of the Iroquois that played an important role in the colonial history of Western Pennsylvania.

The Delaware were culturally and linguistically similar groups of people who occupied the Delaware River Valley of
present-day New York and Pennsylvania. After being displaced by the Dutch fur trade, they migrated west and south and eventually settled on the north branch of the Susquehanna River sometime before 1709 (Goddard 1978:221). Around 1697, the Delaware settled among Shawnee refugees in eastern Pennsylvania. By 1724, the first Delaware had settled in the lower Allegheny and upper Ohio river valleys of western Pennsylvania. At this time, the Delaware were tributaries of the Six Nations of the Iroquois. By 1750 the majority of the Delaware had relocated to western Pennsylvania (Goddard 1978:221-222).

The history of the Shawnee prior to European contact is unclear, because they were always encountered as fragmented refugee groups or captives of other tribes (Callender 1978:630). There is some debate as to whether they may have come from central Ohio after 1692, migrating as a result of intense attacks by the Iroquois in the Fur Trade Wars. In post-contact times, the Shawnee settled among the Delaware in eastern Pennsylvania. As the result of the pressures of European-American settlement, they migrated to western Pennsylvania where they dealt in the trade of deer pelts. Estimated population figures show more than 1,400 Shawnee in western Pennsylvania by 1731 (Callender 1978:631). During the French and Indian War, the Shawnee changed alliances between France and England.
Like most Native American groups, the Delaware and Shawnee disliked European expansion and settlement. As an act of self preservation, the Shawnee joined the French and after 1755 attacked frontier settlements throughout Pennsylvania. The continued encroachment of white settlers and their disregard for European policies made it easy for both tribes to take an active part in Pontiac's War of 1763.

The first Europeans to enter western Pennsylvania were the trappers and traders working along the river courses. These traders were predominantly French. The French presence resulted in a British response, implemented by their provincial governments. In 1748 the Ohio Company was granted 500,000 acres of land west of the Allegheny mountains located south of the Ohio River between the Monongahela and the Kanawha Rivers. In August of 1749 Captain Louis Celeron was sent to the area to assert France's claims on the entire Ohio Valley and to enlist the Native Americans to aid the French cause against the English (Boucher 1918; Wilson 1898:30).

On February 17, 1754 a group of 40 Virginia soldiers under the command of Captain William Trent began constructing a fort at the point where the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers combine to form the Ohio River (present-day Pittsburgh). In April of the same year the French captured the unfinished fort and named it Fort Duquense.
The forces of the French and the Virginian provincials maneuvered for position for the next month. However, on May 27, 1754, the Virginian provincials, commanded by George Washington, attacked a French force.

Washington's victorious skirmish at Jumonville initiated a conflict that eventually spread to Europe and even to India. The more immediate result was an attack on Washington's provincials by a much larger force of French and Native American allies, resulting in Washington's surrender at Fort Necessity on July 3, 1754. Because the provincials had failed to dislodge the French, the British military took control. The next year, Major General Edward Braddock and his Coldstream Guards, augmented with Virginia provincial soldiers, marched into the region in a second attempt to dislodge the French and retake Fort Duquense. Less than ten miles from the fort the troops were ambushed by French and Native American troops. Braddock was fatally wounded and his second-in-command, Colonial Thomas Dunbar, retreated to Philadelphia. The French and Native Americans

2 Of Washington's actions, William Makepeace Thackey wrote, "It was strange that in a savage forest of Pennsylvania, a young Virginia officer should fire a shot and waken up a war which was to last for sixty years, to cost France her American colonies, to sever ours from us, to create a great Western Republic, to rage over the Old World when extinguished in the New, and of all the myriads engaged in the vast contest, to leave the prize of greatest fame with him who struck the first blow" (quoted in Klein and Hoogenboom 1980:67).
were left in possession of the region for three years (Klein and Hoogenboom 1980:68 and 72).

With encouragement and support from the French, the Delaware and Shawnee began isolated attacks on the individual farm settlements throughout the frontier. The Iroquois attempted to remain neutral throughout the French and Indian War (Tooker 1978:433-434). The small raiding parties would plunder and burn homesteads, kill livestock, and take captive or kill the settlers. The raids extended as far east as the Susquehanna River and by November of 1755, the fear of massacre had caused an exodus of nearly the entire white populus west of the Susquehanna. Britain formally declared war on France in May of 1756. The alliance of the French with the Native Americans continued. The isolated attacks continued through most of 1758.

In an attempt to quell the raids on the frontier and strengthen the friendship between the British and the Iroquois, the proprietary government decided that all of the land purchased from the Iroquois in the 1754 Albany land purchase would be returned. This action would allow the Iroquois to regain their control of the region, as well as to again assume rulership over the Delaware. In October of 1758 representatives of the Six Nations and several Delaware chiefs met with deputies of the Pennsylvania proprietary
party in Easton where a treaty was signed returning the lands to the Iroquois.

Shortly after the treaty was signed at Easton, General John Forbes, the new British commander, gathered over 7,000 troops with now-Colonel George Washington, Colonel Henry Bouquet, and Colonel James Grant in command. Forbes ordered a military road be built from Carlisle where his supplies were housed, through Raystown (present-day Bedford) where his troops were gathered, to Fort Duquense (Figure 2) (Klein and Hoogenboom 1980:71-72). Fort Ligonier, 50 miles southeast of the French fort, was established as a base of operations for the campaign to capture Fort Duquense. Following a British foray in which Grant was captured, and a French counter-attack, the mixed British and Provincial force marched toward the fort. In November of 1758 Colonel Washington and a regiment of 1500 men marched to Fort Duquense followed by General Forbes and Colonel John Armstrong with 4,000 additional men. Before the troops could arrive, however, the French burned the fort and abandoned the area.

The British and American troops erected a temporary shelter at the point to last through the winter. The area was named "Pittsburg" by Forbes in honor of the British prime minister (Boucher 1918). In September of 1759, after the death of Forbes, General John Stanwix took command and
FIGURE 2

COLONIAL ERA CITIES, TOWNS, FORTS, AND ROADS
initiated construction of Fort Pitt. This five-sided fort with ramparts was completed in 1761. In 1760 the three remaining French forts (LeBoeuf, Machault, and Presqu'isle) were taken over by the British.

With the French influence removed from Pennsylvania and the Native Americans neutralized, settlers began moving westward across the mountains between the years 1760 and 1763. The settlement of the frontier was contrary to pledges made in the Easton treaty. In addition, the British did not abandon the western forts as promised (Klein and Hoogenboom 1980:73). It became increasingly apparent to the Native Americans that their lands would soon be entirely settled by English settlers.

In February of 1763, the Treaty of Paris officially ended the hostilities between England and France. The French relinquished their claim to the land between the Allegheny and the Mississippi Rivers. Despite the Proclamation of 1763, which forbid English settlement, the Native Americans believed that they had been betrayed (Tooker 1978:434). Anticipating the treaty, Pontiac, Chief of the Ottawas, began to gather the warriors of all the tribes in the region. The purpose of his confederation of tribes was to drive the English settlers eastward across the Allegheny mountains and to destroy the British colonial establishment. Each tribe was to destroy the nearest
English garrison, and then unite to exterminate the frontier settlements. The ultimate goal of attacks was Fort Pitt, although the plan was to attack all the frontier forts at once in order to stop any reinforcements that might be sent to aid the frontier towns and other forts (Boucher 1918).

The attacks, known as Pontiac's War, initially succeeded. By mid-1763, the chaos of fleeing settlers and hastily-arming militia spread across the frontier. The Native Americans besieged Forts Pitt, Ligonier, and Bedford. Bouquet and a small force of 460 mixed British and provincial soldiers marched to relieve the forts. Near Bushy Run, a few miles from Fort Pitt, Bouquet was attacked by a larger Native American force under the command of the Delaware Chief Custaloga and the Seneca Chief Guyasuta (Dunaway 1948:112-113; Kelly 1980:473 and 479). Although Bouquet's force suffered more casualties than that of the Native Americans, the British and provincial force succeeded in dispersing them (Klein and Hoogenboom 1980:73; Kelly 1980:477-480). The siege was relieved, but the frontier remained unstable throughout the years of the American Revolution. Sporadic attacks on the frontier continued until 1794, when General Anthony Wayne defeated a Native American army near Fort Fallen Timbers (present-day Toledo, Ohio).
After the French had surrendered the area, a second land dispute occurred between Pennsylvania and Virginia. The Virginia Company had claimed the territory around the forks of the Ohio based on their 1609 charter, and in 1681 King Charles granted the lands of the company to the Virginia provincial government. This grant was in conflict with one made to William Penn the same year. Neither grant defined a western boundary, and both provincial governments claimed the area.

In November of 1768, the Six Iroquois Nations signed a land purchase treaty with the Pennsylvania authorities known as the New Purchase. The New Purchase granted the right to occupy land in an arc west of the Allegheny Mountains from where the Susquehanna River enters the state in the north, southwestward, to where the Ohio River crosses the present-day Ohio border (Figure 3).

What little settlement occurred in the region was under the auspices of the Virginia colony, who believed that the area was within their territorial boundaries. The Virginia colonial government was well aware of the strategic and commercial importance of the Forks of the Ohio, and attempted to strengthen their claim by promoting the settlement of the region by Virginians. The Pennsylvania colonial government disputed Virginia's claim, but did nothing to defend their own claim to the area, thus
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Virginian settlement of the region continued (Dunaway 1948:129).

By 1770 both Pennsylvania and Virginia began to actively assert their claim to the area around the Forks of the Ohio. In 1773 the proprietary government requested that the King aid in settling the boundary dispute. Around the same time John Murray, Lord Dunmore, who was the royal governor of Virginia had his chief representative, John Connolly, capture Fort Pitt and rename it Fort Dunmore. As an agent of Dunmore, Connolly issued proclamations claiming the disputed territory to be under Virginia's jurisdiction and raised a militia to enforce Dunmore's authority. Thus Virginia began to grant Virginia land titles to settlers in the region (Albert 1896:291; Dunaway 1948:130).

Both colonies attempted to strengthen their claim by creating counties in the area and attempting to govern them despite the other's presence. On February 26, 1773 Pennsylvania established Westmoreland County, the last county formed under the proprietary government. This region was also territory that Virginia had included in her District of West Augusta (Dunaway 1948:130; Eastman 1922:369-370). The county consisted of all the land north of the Mason/Dixon Line, east of Laurel Ridge, south of the New Purchase line, and west to the bounds of Penn's charter grant—where the west branch of the Youghiogheny River
crosses the boundary of the province (Albert 1896:290). Between 1775 and 1780 most of the settlers in the region were Virginians and therefore supported Virginia's claims. The dispute of title resulted in resentment between frontier settlers.

The land dispute between Pennsylvania and Virginia was settled in 1779, when both colonies agreed to extend the Mason/Dixon Line westward five degrees longitude from the Delaware River, and then directly north to Lake Erie. Virginia accepted the terms only under the condition that Pennsylvania honor the Virginia land titles which had been given to settlers prior to 1779 (Dunaway 1948:131). The same year, the Land Divesting Act was passed, which abolished the Penn's quit rents and canceled their title to Pennsylvania. The Penns were monetarily reimbursed for the land.

Site History

Prior to the construction of a state highway between 1789 and 1794, there were only two main roads that carried traffic westward. Braddock's Road, built by General Edward Braddock in 1755, ran northward from the Potomac River; while Forbes' Road, which General John Forbes had constructed in 1758, ran from Carlisle to the Forks of the Ohio (Dunaway 1948:246). The condition of these roads
deteriorated the further west they went. "During the period prior to 1785, Forbes Road 'lay through an almost unbroken wilderness' " (Geise 1927:87; quotes in original). The Allegheny Front was the major geographical barrier to settlement diffusion. Despite Forbes Road, Pennsylvanians did not move into the region in great numbers until the completion of a passable road into the area (Florin 1977:27 and 95). This road, approved in 1785 and surveyed in 1790, was located south of Forbes Road and ran through present-day Greensburg (Shank 1988:22).

In 1769 Robert Hanna secured title from the Proprietary Government for a tract of land situated along Forbes' Road. Here he established a tavern and laid out a small town site. Historians, such as Hanna (1911), suggested that the tract of land, which included a spring, may have been settled by Jacob Myers around 1763. By May of 1764, Myers had been driven from the tract as a result of an attack by a group of Native Americans. The property, including "Meirs Spring" came into the hands of Lieutenant-Colonel John Wilkins of Fort Pitt. From Wilkins it became the possession of Robert Hanna (Dahlinger 1922:25; Hanna 1911:286-287).

Hanna was well known in the region, having served as one of the justices of the first court held in Bedford County in 1771. Forbes' Road, was a major transportation
route, and allowed Hanna's tavern to also become well known in the region (Guffey 1924:150).

Hanna, as owner of the tract of land, laid out a town consisting of lots that were offered for public sale. The deeds of conveyance indicate that the common lot size at Hanna's Town was 60' X 240'. Larger lots, called "out lots" provided pasture for the livestock of the town's inhabitants. Lots at Hanna's Town cost approximately two pounds, in addition to a fifteen shilling per annum quit rent, paid to the Proprietors (Hahn 1977:10).

Deeds for the lots at Hanna's Town required that dwellings were to be at least 18' X 18' and be constructed within two years of the date when the lot was purchased. Archaeological evidence has confirmed the size requirement of the dwellings (Hahn 1977:10).

The area of western Pennsylvania was, at the time, under the jurisdiction of Bedford County which was formed in 1771. The county seat was in the town of Bedford which was approximately seventy miles east of Hanna's tavern. Aside from the distance, the western territory was separated by the Allegheny Mountains.

Arthur St. Clair, Thomas Gist, and Dorsey Pentecost had been appointed justices for the section of Bedford County
lying east of the Allegheny mountains. St. Clair was in high standing with the Penns, being a mediator between the authorities and Native Americans, and keeping the proprietary government abreast of the affairs of the western portion of the province. St. Clair, a former magistrate of Cumberland County, was also Prothonotary, Recorder, and Clerk of Courts for Bedford County. Being astute to the affairs in the area, St. Clair quickly realized that the seat of justice was too far away to adequately administer the region (Albert 1882:51).

St. Clair, his fellow justices, and other settlers in the region began to petition the Proprietary Government to create a new county west of the mountains. As a result of St. Clair's high standing with the Penns, the Proprietary Assembly began to consider the formation of a new county (Boucher 1906:42-43; Guffey 1924:151; Reid 1922:186).

Five trustees, Arthur St. Clair, Robert Hanna, Joseph Erwin, Samuel Sloan, and George Wilson, had been selected to determine the site of the courts. Hanna, Erwin, and Sloan favored the site of Hanna's Town, while St. Clair and Wilson favored the site of Fort Pitt. By way of a majority vote, Hanna's Town was selected as the site of the new county's seat. St. Clair reportedly believed that the site was selected due to the personal motives of Hanna and Erwin (Albert 1882:62; Beals 1929:79; Boucher 1906:49-50).
On February 26, 1773, the Assembly of the Proprietary Government of Pennsylvania established Westmoreland County from territory that had been part of Bedford County. Westmoreland County was the eleventh and final provincial county created under the Proprietary Government of the Penn Family. The date is also the founding date of the town of Hanna's Town. With the organization of Westmoreland County, a county seat and courts were formed and would be held at the house of Robert Hanna. Thus Hanna's Town became the first county seat west of the Allegheny Mountains, and because it was formed under the Proprietary Government, it administered public justice according to English common law (Albert 1882:52; 1896:291; Guffey 1924:150).

Governor Richard Penn appointed Arthur St. Clair as Prothonotary and Clerk of the Courts for the new county (Guffey 1924:151). He also selected twenty-six men to serve as justices of the courts or justices of the peace. The men had no formal education in law, but were men of high standing and influence in the community. Any three of them together could hold court (Albert 1882:52; Boucher 1906:45).

The first session of the courts were held at Hanna's Town on April 6, 1773 with William Crawford presiding. The division of the new county into eleven townships was the first order of business. The election of officials was held at Hanna's Town and a jail, whipping post, and pillory were
constructed shortly after the courts began (Albert 1882:52; Boucher 1906:45-48).

While settlement in the region continued, the land tension between Virginia and Pennsylvania became increasingly acute. The establishment of Westmoreland County and the territorial government within led Virginia to take Fort Pitt. Governor Dunmore's attempt to lay claim to the region was manifested through his agent John Connolly, who was sent to counteract the authority of the Pennsylvania magistrates (Albert 1882:64-65).

In January of 1774, Connolly and an armed militia took possession of Fort Pitt, changing the name to Fort Dunmore. Connolly created dissent by convincing the Virginia colonists that the militia was mustered due to Native American uprisings, and to protect their property from seizure from the Pennsylvania government. He led the Native Americans in the area to believe that the militia were called to secure the territorial claims of Virginia (Albert 1882:65-66).

Connolly issued proclamations asserting the claims of Virginia and mustered a mercenary militia known as the Militia of Western Virginia. He ordered the militia to shoot livestock and pillage the farmsteads of Pennsylvania
settlers in the area (Albert 1882:66; Dahlinger 1922: 34; Potter 1926:14).

Due to Connolly's actions of issuing proclamations and raising a militia against the Pennsylvania government, Arthur St. Clair, chief representative of the Pennsylvania Proprietary Government in western Pennsylvania had Connolly arrested and jailed at Hanna's Town. Connolly was released on bail and a requirement that he appear at the next court session. After his release, Connolly returned to Staunton, Virginia, county seat of the District of West Augusta (Albert 1882:66; 1896:291; Dahlinger 1922:34).

In Staunton, Connolly was given the title of justice of the peace. This act was to give Connolly legal sanctions as well as civil and military authority to continue to assert Virginia's claim in southwestern Pennsylvania (Albert 1896:292). Connolly returned to Pennsylvania in March of 1774.

When the first session of the courts began at Hanna's Town on April 6, Connolly and a militia of 150 armed men posted guards at the door of the court house and refused to allow the provincial magistrates to enter without his permission. He claimed that the magistrates had no authority to hold court sessions, and that his appearance satisfied his bail requirement of appearing before the
Connolly had three of the justices who attended the April session of the courts arrested and sent under guard to Staunton. These justices were Devereux Smith, Aeneas Mackay, and Andrew McFarland. Mackay, after meeting with Dunmore, secured their release. Two Pennsylvania commissioners, sent to the House of Burgesses as a result of the arrests, attempted to get the two governments to unite and petition the King for a boundary settlement. This attempt failed (Albert 1882:66-67; Boucher 1906:62; Buck and Buck 1939:164; Potter 1926:14).

Connolly continued to terrorize Pennsylvania settlers in the region for the remainder of the year. The Shawnee had learned that Connolly had told the settlers that it was they, not Connolly's men who were threatening the settlers. In addition, the Shawnee believed that the Virginia colonial government was attempting to exterminate them, and began to raid known Virginia settler's homes. Native American uprisings coupled with the tyranny of Connolly caused panic.
in the region and was the cause for many settlers to leave the area.

As a result of Native American attacks, a stockade fort and block house were constructed at Hanna's Town under the supervision of David Semple. The fort was erected at public expense. The original intention was that the fortification be only for temporary use during emergencies (Albert 1896:297; Boucher 1906:51 and 85; Cribbs 1919:81).

The Proprietary government left the organization of the military defense of the county to Arthur St. Clair. In an attempt to stop the exodus of settlers and to protect people, St. Clair organized a ranging party or militia company. The company was divided and stationed at points throughout the region, thirty of which were at Hanna's Town (Albert 1882:68; Boucher 1906:63).

By 1775 Hanna's Town was larger than Pittsburgh. It consisted of more than 30 domestic dwellings, several taverns, a jail, a stockade fort, and block house. In addition there were associated barns, stables, and outbuildings (Richardson 1976:154).

The colonies were in open revolt against England as a result of the outbreak of fighting at Lexington, Massachusetts in mid-April of 1775. This common revolt
created a lull in the political differences in the region. Fearing the strife with Great Britain, the citizens of Westmoreland County met in convention at Hanna's Town on May 16, 1775 to consider the situation with Great Britain (Dunaway 1948:158).

At this convention the courts created a document known as the Hanna's Town Resolutions. The document showed that the people of Westmoreland County believed that should the tyranny exhibited in the Massachusetts Bay colony succeed, it would spread to other colonies and that it was the duty of every American to oppose it. In order to oppose it, they resolved to form a military body of men from several townships known as the Association of Westmoreland County (Albert 1882:74; 1896:294-295; Boucher 1906:124; Force 1853:615-616). The resolutions were not meant to be disloyal to the king, but the people felt that they needed to preserve their rights. (For the actual verbiage of the Hanna's Town Resolutions see appendix A).

On May 24, 1775, in accordance with the Resolutions, the Association of Westmoreland County began forming themselves into companies which formed the Regiment of Westmoreland County Associators. This regiment consisted of two battalions under the command of John Proctor (Dunaway 1948:158). On June 30, the Pennsylvania Assembly called the Associators into service, reorganizing them as part of the
state militia. They were called to active service in Philadelphia in January 1777 (Dahlinger 1922:40).

On August 7, 1775 Captain John Neville, under the auspices of the Virginia Colony, took control of Fort Pitt (Fort Dunmore). Under the direction of the Continental Congress Neville held the post until 1777, and maintained the fort in the general interests of America. In November of the same year John Connolly was arrested at Fredericktown, Maryland. After being held in prison in Philadelphia by an order of Congress, he was released and relocated in Canada (Albert 1882:76-77).

In late 1775, Arthur St. Clair was made a colonel and was given command of the Second Pennsylvania Battalion, one of four battalions from Pennsylvania called to serve in the Continental Army. Another body of western Pennsylvania troops, the Eighth Regiment of the Pennsylvania Line, had seven out of eight companies formed in Westmoreland County (Boucher 1906:127; Dahlinger 1922:40-41).

In 1776 the fort at Hanna's Town was enlarged and strengthened. From 1776 onward, the fort at Hanna's Town had quarters to accommodate the Eighth Pennsylvania Regiment, and the militia companies that were occasionally recruited. It was also a locus where supplies were collected (Albert 1896:297). For the next several years
sporadic attacks by Native Americans were common in the region despite the military presence. Due to the presence of the soldiers in the fort, Hanna's Town escaped these attacks even though they were close at hand. There are numerous reports of people seeking refuge at Hanna's Town into the early 1780's (Albert 1896:298; Boucher 1906:85).

In March of 1779, Pennsylvania and Virginia agreed to a meeting in order to settle the territorial boundary dispute. In August a commission met in Baltimore and agreed that the Mason/Dixon Line should be extended westward and that all property rights were to be recognized by the Pennsylvania government. The results of the meeting were ratified by the Pennsylvania legislature the following November (Buck and Buck 1939:169; Dahlinger 1922:41).

Despite the settlement agreed to in Baltimore, Virginia sent three commissioners to adjust land titles in Pennsylvania in December of 1779. The commissioners granted certificates to claimants under Virginia settlement rights. Congress resolved that neither state should grant any territory in the disputed area until the dispute was finally settled. This somewhat settled the dispute, although the Pennsylvania Council adopted a resolution in March of 1780 which indicated that Pennsylvania's internal defense would take precedence to her recruitment and provisioning for the Continental Army (Buck and Buck 1939:169; Dahlinger
1922:41). The priority of internal defense was a direct result of the Native American attacks and the harassment of Pennsylvania settlers due to the land claims dispute.

During February of 1782 the winter was unusually mild and allowed attacks by Native Americans to occur earlier than in the past years. As a result of these attacks large portions of the population had gathered at places of security. By summer of 1782 settlers gathered at Hanna's Town to be near the fort (Albert 1896:298-299; Boucher 1906:171). Around this time the militia had deserted their posts for failure of being paid. Many settlers had also left the region (Albert 1882:139; 1896:301; Boucher 1906:173).

Due to sporadic attacks by Native Americans, the settlers planted few crops. Fields that were worked were harvested by reaping parties, which allowed some to stand guard while others worked. The reaping parties would also present a more formidable front to any attackers (Boucher 1906:171).

On July 13, 1782, a reaping party was harvesting rye from the fields of Michael Huffnagle about a mile and a half from the town. One of the men spotted a number of Native Americans approaching. The whole party ran for the town and
warned everyone to enter the fort and prepare for an attack (Albert 1882:139; 1896:301).

The raiding party did not immediately chase the reapers, believing that they would return to pursue them. It was the intention of the Native Americans to attack Hanna's Town without warning. Several men on foot and Captain Matthew Jack on horseback proceeded back to the fields where the enemy was spotted to assess the size of the raiding party. At this point the raiders gave chase to the settlers (Albert 1882:139-140; Boucher 1906:173).

Having had advance warning, the inhabitants of Hanna's Town fled to the shelter of the stockade, taking the court records with them. Between 40-50 settlers took refuge in the fort. Of these fewer than half would have been men able to fight. The fort was not armed and there were as few as nine guns, which were likely cast off pieces from the militia that had been garrisoned there. When the Native Americans arrived and found the people in the fort, they pillaged the town and burned the houses (Albert 1882:141; Guffey 1924:173).

Michael Huffnagle's report to President Moore in July 1782 and other letters written shortly after the attack have provided much of the historical documentation concerning the attack on Hanna's Town. Several of the letters have been

Michael Huffnagle's report of the incident indicated that at approximately 2 p.m. on Saturday July 13, 1782, Hanna's Town was attacked by approximately 150 Native Americans and Tories. The houses were ransacked. The leaders of the attack party appeared to be white men dressed in Native American fashion. Approximately one-third of the raiding party proceeded to Miller's Station, two miles south of the town and attacked that settlement and took prisoners, one of which was Mrs. Hanna (Albert 1882:140-143; 1896:305; Boucher 1906:182).

The portion of the raiding party that remained at Hanna's Town randomly fired on the fort and set fire to the buildings of the town. Two buildings that were close to the fort escaped being burned. One of these was the house of Robert Hanna, which served as the court house (Albert 1882:140; Boucher 1906:174-175; Guffey 1924:173).

Miller's Station, where people had gathered for a wedding held the day before, came under attack. The raiding party killed people and livestock, pillaged the houses and took as many as twenty prisoners. The party that attacked Miller's Station returned to Hanna's Town, and after rendezvousing with the remainder of the raiding party, set
up camp in the hollow containing Crabb Tree Creek. It was likely their intention to attack the fort at Hanna's Town the next morning (Albert 1882:144 and 148; Boucher 1906:179).

During the night a small relief party of approximately thirty men, who had gathered at Peter George's cabin nearby, made their way to the fort. In an attempt to deceive the raiding party, horses were repeatedly paraded over a foot bridge near the fort. This coupled with the playing of drums convinced the enemy that reinforcements had arrived from Fort Ligonier. During the night the raiding party left the area. The next morning a party from Hanna's Town tracked the band as far north as Kiskiminetas Creek, but did not follow due their small size and the unknown threats of the territory in the hands of the Native Americans (Albert 1882:145; 1896:306-307; Boucher 1906:182).

The prisoners captured at Miller's Station were released to the British in Canada and returned to the area in 1783. The attack on Hanna's Town was one of the last instances of a combined British and Native American attack on United States soil during the Revolutionary era (Albert 1896:307; Boucher 1906:185).

It is unclear as to who was in charge of the attack on Hanna's Town. Some speculation indicates that it may have
been Simon Girty, although conflicting reports place him in Kentucky around the time of the attack. The most likely candidate is the Seneca Chief, Guyasuta and people associated with John Connolly (Boucher 1906:183).

In 1788, General Irvine at Fort Pitt learned that the band that attacked Hanna's Town had been part of a larger British and Native American (likely Delawares and Munsies) force that had gathered at the head waters of the Allegheny, around Lake Chatauqua, New York. This larger band had the intention of attacking Fort Pitt. Due to the strength of Fort Pitt, the attack there never occurred (Albert 1882:147; Boucher 1906:185).

Hanna's Town never fully recovered from the attack. Court sessions continued to be held at Robert Hanna's house until 1786, although few of the houses were rebuilt. A state road from Bedford to Pittsburgh had been authorized and was becoming a more popular transportation route. The small village of Newtown (present-day Greensburg), three miles south of Hanna's Town, had come into existence along this new road.

In April of 1783 the Supreme Executive Council instructed its trustees to purchase a piece of property as a site for the construction of a new courthouse and jail, the location for the new county seat. The three likely
candidates were Hanna's Town, Pittsburgh, and Newtown. Trustees John Cavet, Joseph Irwin, and Robert Hanna agreed that Hanna's Town was the most convenient and centrally located place to hold court sessions (Baumann 1977:279; Boucher 1906:187). It is not clear what happened next, but on March 22, 1784 (not November 22, 1874, and erroneous citation perpetuated by many historians) the trustee's claim was dismissed and they were replaced by a new board consisting of five trustees (Baumann 1977:279).

Eventually three of the board members purchased a tract of land on the Pennsylvania state road, approximately four miles southwest of Hanna's Town. This resulted in a dispute and once again the recommendation of the board was rejected. By September of 1785, no decision had been made and a third board of trustees were chosen to select the site (Baumann 1977:280; Harper 1991:96). The act of selection of the new board, and new geographical restrictions limited the area where the county seat could be located, thus excluding the site of Pittsburgh. The decision was between Hanna's Town on the old Forbes' Road or Newtown on the new state road (Boucher 1906:187).

On December 10, 1785, after months of argument, a majority on the board legally selected Newtown as the site of the new county seat and repurchased the same tract of land as did their predecessors (Baumann 1977:281; Boucher
1906:187; Harper 1991:96). In 1786, Newtown was renamed Greensburg. A new court house and jail were completed by July of 1786, this being reported at the July session of court at Hanna's Town. The last court session held in Hanna's Town was in October of 1786, with the first being held in Greensburg in January 1787 (Albert 1896:314; Boucher 1906:188-193).

Little data exists on the actions of Robert Hanna following the attack in 1782. It is likely that he continued to live at the site since court sessions were held there. Hanna's will was probated in Westmoreland County on May 2, 1786. The lots constituting Hanna's Town, either by sale or abandonment, became parts of the adjoining farm and were returned to agricultural use (Albert 1896:307; Hahn 1977:8).

Archaeological History

The history of the archaeology at Hanna's Town began in the late 1960's, when the Greater Greensburg Planning Commission suggested that the Westmoreland County Historical Society acquire the site of Hanna's Town in order to administer it as a historic site. A bill to the legislature appropriating funding for the acquisition of the site was vetoed by Governor Raymond Shaffer twice in 1968. With the aid of the Westmoreland County Commissioners and the use of
Project 70 funds, the Historical Society acquired the property in September of 1969. The property was purchased from the William Steel family, who had owned it for a number of generations (Grimm 1972:231 and 233; Pollins 1972:1).

The same day that the deed to the property was secured, excavation began under the direction of Jacob Grimm, research associate of the Carnegie Museum in Pittsburgh, Richard Bittner, manager of Fort Ligioner, and other consultants from the Carnegie Museum. The first year of excavation revealed the remains of a structure, which was likely Hanna's Tavern. In 1970, the University of Pittsburgh held a field school at the site under the direction of Dr. James D. Richardson, III. The work of the field school discovered the site of Charles Foreman's Tavern. The site of the stockaded fort was discovered during the 1971 excavation season (Grimm 1972:233; Pollins 1972:2).

From the mid 1970's onward, archaeology at Hanna's Town was done on a predominantly volunteer basis under the auspices of the Westmoreland Archaeological Society and the Westmoreland County Historical Society. In 1983, the Westmoreland Archaeological Society in association with Westmoreland County Community College held a field school at the site under the direction of Dr. Verna Cowin. Since then excavation has proceeded on a small but continued basis
under the auspices of the Westmoreland County Historical Society and the direction of Anna L. Warren. At present archaeological investigation at the site continues. Hanna's Tavern, the stockade fort, the block house, several outbuildings, the pillory, and the whipping post have all been reconstructed. A major portion of the artifact inventory is housed at the site under the care of the Westmoreland County Historical Society.
Frontier Theory Applied to Pennsylvania

Although Lewis developed frontier theory utilizing information from South Carolina, his hypotheses should be applicable to many frontier situations. Pennsylvania underwent the same type of insular frontier development that Lewis saw in South Carolina.

During the 1600's the Dutch, English, and Swedish all had interests in the Delaware Valley of Pennsylvania. Their interests lay primarily in the further development of the fur trade. In 1610 the Delaware Bay was discovered by Henry Hudson. The earliest settlements in Pennsylvania were Swedish at the sites of Upland (present-day Chester) and Tinicum Island settled in 1641 and 1643, respectively. Early English settlement proved unsuccessful due to the presence of the Swedes and the Dutch.

The Treaty of Westminster in 1674 assured English control of the region and the English quickly took over the settlements (Muller 1989:80). In 1681, Pennsylvania was
chartered by William Penn (Klein and Hoogenboom 1980:18). By mid summer of the same year Penn made plans for laying out a town along the Delaware River. Under the direction of Provincial Surveyor, Thomas Holme, the town of Philadelphia was laid out on a grid pattern (Ibid.:23; Reps 1969:208). Thus an English colony resulting in a continuous British occupation of Pennsylvania had been established by 1681.

The presence of architectural styles of English origin, methods of building construction, and artifacts of English material culture recovered from the archaeological record of Philadelphia, indicate that close ties with the parent state existed for an extended period of time. The presence of "English" architecture and material culture in Philadelphia supports Lewis's Hypothesis 1.

Despite the close cultural ties of Pennsylvania to the mother country of England, a distinct colonial society developed. The society was distinct not only due to the adaptation to the frontier conditions, but due to the type of colonist who settled there. English people of the Quaker religion and German-speaking Protestant peoples from Switzerland, the Palatinate, and other sections of West Germany immigrated in vast numbers. Even the laws set up in 1682 were based on Quaker principles which included freedom of conscience and religious freedom (Klein and Hoogenboom

Cultural diversity of the frontier inhabitants of Pennsylvania can be seen in both architecture and material culture. Architectural innovations, such as log building techniques utilized in house and barn construction, have been attributed to the Pennsylvania Germans, the Swedes, and the Finns (Zelinsky 1973:21, Mercer 1976:21 and 31). This type of log building technology became a common building form in frontier America. The ceramic traditions of the Pennsylvania Germans, exemplified in their slip and sgraffito decorated utilitarian redwares, indicate the production of locally-manufactured ceramics (see Kauffman 1964:21-22). This cultural diversity supports Lewis's second hypothesis.

The site of Philadelphia played an integral role in the colonial society of Pennsylvania and was occupied continuously throughout the colonial period and through present day. Settlement spread outward from Philadelphia. The numerous farmsteads and the founding of new counties and county seats attest to this. Farm tracts called "liberty lands" were surveyed outside of the city. Some of these tracts were as large as ten thousand acres. These "liberty lands" appear on the first map of Pennsylvania likely drawn in 1687 (Reps 1969:213).
On a larger scale, towns serving as legal and administrative centers as well as secondary market towns for the collection of agricultural products grew up outside of Philadelphia. Between 1729 and 1752 the county seats of Lancaster, York, Reading, Easton, and Carlisle had all been established (Muller 1989:109). The continuous occupation of Philadelphia and the development and occupation of the hinterland of southeastern Pennsylvania support Lewis's Hypothesis 3.

Philadelphia became the entrepôt for the Pennsylvania frontier. The site of Philadelphia was on an easily accessible area at the edge of the area of colonization. The deep water port situated on the Delaware River led to the Delaware Bay and ultimately to the Atlantic Ocean, providing easy access for the parent state.

Philadelphia was the largest settlement in the area of colonization. It played a centralizing role in the political, economic, and social activities of the colony and was the integrating hub of the frontier area. Architectural classes representing economic, political, religious, and high-status domestic related structures all occur in Philadelphia (Reps 1969:215-217). These factors indicate Philadelphia's role as the entrepôt and support Lewis's Hypothesis 4.
A dendritic trade and communications network, centered in the entrepôt, formed. Maps that show the distribution of population indicate a dendritic spread of settlement outward from the entrepôt of Philadelphia (Figure 4). Settlement is evident along river courses of the Delaware, Schuykill, and Susquehanna Rivers by 1720 (Muller 1989:83; Florin 1977:41 and 45; also Figure 4). An overland road network connected interior settlements in the Philadelphia hinterland in the early 1700's. The French and Indian War resulted in the construction of Forbes' and Braddock's Roads, military roads which later carried commercial traffic westward across the mountains (Klein and Hoogenboom 1980:74). By 1775, Philadelphia was connected to the main market towns as far away as Carlisle by a road network. This trade and communications network, evidenced by a connecting system of roads supports Lewis's Hypothesis 5.

As is evidenced by the maps, continuous expansion and settlement occurred throughout the colonial period (Figure 4). The spread of settlement continued to follow a dendritic pattern. This settlement continued well into the 1790's despite interruptions caused by the French and Indian War in the late 1750's and early 1760's, mid-century land disputes, and the Revolutionary War in the third quarter of the 1700's (see Muller 1989:83). The continued expansion and settlement of Pennsylvania supports Lewis's Hypothesis 6.
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The maps in Figure 4 also indicate a trend towards a more evenly spaced settlement pattern during the colonial period. During the 1770's and 1780's despite the Revolutionary War "...areas which had been explored and only sparsely settled in the 1760's were filled out and became more densely populated" (Muller 1989:83). The movement toward a more evenly spaced settlement pattern supports Lewis's Hypothesis 7.

The growth of frontier towns developed along the frontier as it moved westward. Towns such as Lancaster, York, Carlisle, and Bedford were formed on the periphery of the frontier. These towns served the local agricultural economy as well as serving as local administrative centers. The growth of these Pennsylvania frontier towns support Lewis's Hypothesis 8.

The growth of nucleated settlements occurred in the area of colonization as the frontier progressed. This concept is supported by the numerous small villages which grew up around grist mills and saw mills. These small villages, hamlets, and crossroads serviced the local population, which consisted predominantly of agriculturalists. The growth of these nucleated settlements throughout Pennsylvania supports Lewis's Hypothesis 9.
Dispersed settlements constituted the remainder of frontier settlement. The farmsteads comprised major portions of the frontier area and were scattered throughout the area of colonization. More than 90% of Pennsylvania's population in the late eighteenth century resided outside of urban centers (Muller 1989:108). The large number of farmsteads (dispersed settlements) supports Lewis's Hypothesis 10.

The frontier process viewed in Pennsylvania through time reveals the operation of the frontier process as outlined by Lewis. The entrepôt of Philadelphia remained the center of activity throughout the colonial period. As the frontier advanced, frontier towns and nucleated settlements grew in the area of colonization. Dispersed settlement surrounded all of the other settlement types. This spatial phenomenon coupled with the temporal aspect shows the operation of the colonization gradient in Pennsylvania. The existence of the colonization gradient supports Lewis's Hypothesis 11.

Hanna's Town in Light of Lewis's Hypotheses

"In these successive frontiers we find natural boundary lines which have served to mark and to affect the characteristics of frontiers, namely: 'the fall line'; the Allegheny Mountains... The fall line marked the frontier of
the seventeenth century; the Alleghenies that of the eighteenth..." (Turner 1893:9). With this in mind I have selected the small settlement of Hanna's Town located in the western foot hills of the Allegheny Mountains of southwestern Pennsylvania to define an additional type of frontier town.

Lewis indicated that

"the dispersed settlement pattern within the area of colonization is focused around central settlements called frontier towns. The frontier town serves as a nucleus of social, political, economic, and religious activities within a portion of the colony and as the terminus of the transportation network linking the area of colonization to the homeland through the entrepôt" (Lewis 1977:155).

He also elaborated that:

"Frontier towns are more likely to have contained structures for the storage and transfer of both raw agricultural commodities and finished imported goods as well as repair and maintenance facilities linked to such commercial activities. Central political and religious activities should also have taken place within the frontier town where the confluence of trade and communications routes would have occurred" (Lewis 1984:187).

Lewis stated that in order to identify the existence of a frontier condition, it is necessary to identify the frontier towns within the area of colonization. Lewis concluded that the

"...existence of a frontier is witnessed by the development of a frontier town, a settlement located so as to permit the establishment of trade and communications linkages between the older settled area and the newly occupied lands. The frontier town becomes the nexus of the transportation network of the
area of colonization and its identification is crucial to the verification of frontier situation (Lewis 1977:194).

Some of the more ephemeral towns did not serve as resource distribution and collection points, only to facilitate transport and to provide access to the frontier. These outposts, although not achieving the importance of distribution points, played an important role in frontier development. Historic-period documents indicate that many towns served as focal points for military campaigns, safety staging areas, and regional administration centers. Due to their importance, such towns should also be considered to be frontier towns even though they may not contain all of the components outlined by Lewis.

Hanna's Town, in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania provides an example of an additional type of frontier town. Hanna's Town, situated in the foothills of the Allegheny Mountains, existed from 1769-1786. In that time armies marched through, justice was served, many travelers and immigrants passed through. In addition settlers lived in the protection of a block house. Hanna's Town failed to serve as a major resource collection, processing, or redistribution center. Its primary importance was as a transportation, military, and administrative center. The example of Hanna's Town provides an additional type of
frontier town and is suggested as an addendum to Lewis's model of frontier development.

Through the use of the archaeological and, to a limited extent, the documentary records, Lewis defined the town of Camden in Kershaw County, South Carolina as a model frontier town. Lewis defined frontier towns by examining three aspects of the settlement, its size, layout, and content (1984:181). I will compare the aspects size, layout, and content of the frontier town of Camden and the same three aspects of Hanna's Town and show Hanna's Town to be an additional type of frontier town.

**Size**

The settlement of Camden, South Carolina was analyzed using archaeological data alone. Seventy-five percent of the site of Camden was sampled through the utilization of a stratified systematic unaligned sampling technique (Lewis 1979-80:84), which allowed the collection of a one percent representative sample of archaeological materials distributed over the site. Activity patterning was interpolated through the use of SYMAP contour maps, which showed counts of particular artifact classes. The location of structures at the site was observed by mapping the distribution of architecturally related materials such as brick, nails, and window glass.
The methodology utilized at Camden revealed evidence of seventeen structures. Three additional structures were discovered through the use of magnetometer and geohm surveys. These were later confirmed through excavation. It is estimated that as many as eight additional structures may exist at the site, but are covered by modern construction. The total estimated number of buildings at colonial-period Camden is twenty-eight. The existence of two colonial-period cemeteries adjacent to the site bring the total number of structures to thirty (Lewis 1984:185). Maps of contemporary frontier towns in North Carolina allowed comparative information on the size of frontier towns. Cross Creek contained forty-six structures, Halifax contained fifty, and Salisbury contained twenty-eight (Ibid: 183).

Like Camden, the site of Hanna's Town has not been completely excavated. Excavation has revealed a palisaded fort, a block house, Hanna's tavern, Foreman's tavern, the town spring, and five other domestic dwellings (Cowin 1984:5 and Grimm 1972:233). A tavern owned by Robert Orr and a blacksmith shop are known to have existed on the site (Cowin 1984:5). Documentary evidence in the form of travelers accounts from the colonial period indicated the number of structures at Hanna's Town to be over thirty (Richardson and Wilson 1976:154). Documentary evidence also indicated the
presence of a jail, a pillory, and a whipping post (Beals 1929:80; Walkinshaw 1939:26).

**Layout**

During the thirteenth century a new era in town planning consisting of new towns built on virgin sites became popular in France and England. These new towns or "...bastide communities were small, more or less rectilinear in outline, and generally exhibited a checker-board or gridiron street pattern, often modified somewhat to conform to irregularities of the site" (Reps 1969:13).

Books on architectural theory published during the Renaissance and Baroque periods in Europe often dealt with the ideal layout of cities. Works such as that of Alberti in 1485 and Palladio in 1570 formed the theoretical basis for town planning. These works coupled with new advances in military technology influenced the layout of new cities (Reps 1969:7-12).

Published in 1586, William Camden's book *Britannia* gave a history of thirteenth century bastides, while in 1611, John Speed's *The Theatre of the Empire of Great Britain*, an atlas of Great Britain which showed town plans, was published. These two books served as models for town planning in both colonial America and Northern Ireland (Reps
1969:15). The plans for later American towns were influenced by the plans drawn for the rebuilding of London after the great fire of 1666. These plans included the work of John Evelyn, Christopher Wren, Robert Hooke, Richard Newcourt, and Valentine Knight (Ibid. 23-24).

Lewis suggested that the simplicity of the bastide type of town planning allows greater access to the town and that only the largest settlements of the frontier region (the entrepôt and the frontier town) would have this gridiron layout. A gridiron town plan at Camden is seen on the Heard Map (early 1770's), the Greene Map (1781), and a 1798 town plan (Lewis 1976:36-39 and 57). Archaeologically, the gridiron pattern was evidenced by the orientation of structural artifact clusters and the alignment of structural remains along roads lying at right angles. Contemporary entrepôts and frontier towns exhibited the gridiron street plan. These included in South Carolina the entrepôt of Charleston, and the frontier towns of Beaufort and Georgetown; and in North Carolina the entrepôt of Wilmington, and the frontier towns of Halifax, Cross Creek, and Salisbury (Lewis 1984: 186-187).

Town planning on the Pennsylvania frontier was no different. William Penn specified that the town of Philadelphia was to be laid out on a gridiron plan, which included a public square for market and state houses, as
well as specifications for the design of a waterfront which would be suitable for unloading deep draught ships (Reps 1969:206-212). Penn and Holme's 1683 plan for Philadelphia is very similar to Richard Newcourt's 1666 plan for the rebuilding of London (Reps 1969:212-213). Frontier towns such as Carlisle, Bedford, and Lancaster also exhibit a gridiron street pattern.

Hanna's Town also appears to exhibit a gridiron pattern of town layout with the Forbes Road, running east-west, as its main thoroughfare. Although no historic-period town plan could be located for Hanna's Town, a reconstruction in Albert (1896) tends to support the gridiron layout and the planned allocation of space. A later plan also showing the gridiron pattern was published by Walkinshaw (1939). This plan was pieced together from information gathered from descendants of settlers. The archaeological investigations at Hanna's Town have revealed some inaccuracies with the Walkinshaw map (Hahn 1977:9).

Evidence from property deeds support the argument that Hanna's Town was laid out utilizing a gridiron pattern. The deeds also allow a glimpse of lot and building sizes. The deed of conveyance to John Jack dated December 13, 1775, "...conveys a lot in Hannastown, marked on the general plan of said town as No. 115, bounded on the west by No. 33, on the east by Penn Street, on the south by Thompson Street,
which is fifty feet front and two hundred forty feet back" (Walkinshaw 1939:9). Other deeds indicate that lots measuring 60' X 240' were sold and had to have a house at least 18' X 18' built on them within two years. Archaeological evidence supports the size of structures in the town (Hahn 1977:10). Larger "outlots" were laid out on the outskirts of town and functioned as pasturage for the livestock of the town's residents.

Content

Regarding the content of frontier towns, Lewis stated that

"frontier towns serve as centers of specialized economic, political, and social activity within the area of colonization and should exhibit evidence of such in their material record. Because specialized activities are also found in the entrepôt and some nucleated settlements, evidence of their occurrence alone may not permit the three types of frontier settlements to be distinguished from one another. Their absence, however, would preclude a settlement's having been a frontier town or and entrepôt" (Lewis 1984:187).

Frontier towns are likely to have contained structures utilized in the storage and transfer of both raw agricultural commodities and finished imported goods. Repair and maintenance facilities linked to commercial activities would also have existed. In addition central and
political and religious activities should also have taken place there (Lewis 1984:187).

Because an extant architectural record does not exist at Camden, the archaeological record was utilized in the assessment of the site's content. The identification of activities was based on the contents recovered from individual activity areas (Lewis 1984:188). The comparison between pit and post hole features with the pattern of structural remains at Camden was accomplished with the aid of SYMAP. The analysis revealed ten clusters of these features, implying the existence of many activity areas (Ibid. 188).

On the basis of the clusters, Camden was divided into ten smaller units in order to analyze different activity areas within the site (1976:107 and 1984:188). Lewis defined three activity categories which allow the artifacts to be utilized in the determination of activity areas. The Subsistence category consists of domestic artifacts related to the production, preparation, and consumption of subsistence products. The Technological category consists of non-domestic artifacts associated with the manufacture, storage, shipment, repair, and modification of commodities. These will more likely be the by-products of the manufacturing process than the finished goods themselves. The final category, termed the Subsistence-Technological
category, consists of artifacts from both the subsistence and technological categories resulting from the combined domestic and non-domestic activities that commonly occurred in structures utilized as both living quarters and workplaces (Lewis 1984:190).

Occupation areas with different activity areas were distinguished by statistical manipulation. The recovered artifacts resulted in data that represented the proportional relationship between artifact classes from the three activity categories (Ibid. 190). High frequencies of specialized artifacts may not occur, but the presence or absence of these items may be more meaningful (Ibid. 191).

"The low rate of deposition of specialized activity artifacts makes the statistical measurement of Technological activity difficult...It is assumed that the Subsistence-Technological component of an area will remain constant regardless of the activity performed there...The presence of a specialized activity occupation, then is likely to be evidenced by the reduced size of the area's Subsistence activity component" (Lewis 1984:191).

The numerical artifact counts and the percentage frequencies of the three activity categories by area at Camden reveal different activity variation within the site. Of the ten units at the site three exhibit a strictly domestic function; five reveal a combined residence-business function; and two reveal a specialized, non-domestic function that was not able to be identified (Lewis 1984:191-193). The presence of occupation areas utilized for
specialized, non-domestic functions are "crucial to the identification of Camden as a frontier town" (Ibid. 193).

The Forbes Road, which ran through the site of Hanna's Town in an east-west direction, was the main commercial highway of the colonial period. Most of the goods imported into this region were transported by pack trains via the Forbes Road through Fort Bedford and Fort Ligioner (Walkinshaw 1939:9 and 287-288). Although Hanna's Town lay on a major commercial thoroughfare, there is no documentary or archaeological evidence that indicates that Hanna's Town served as a economic center. In addition there is no record of any religious activities taking place at Hanna's Town. Hanna's Town apparently never had a church building or congregation at any time during its existence (Walkinshaw 1939:171 and 370).

The central role of Hanna's Town was as a political center, military outpost, and pass-through point for the western Pennsylvania frontier. Hanna's Town was named the county seat of Westmoreland County in 1773, and a stockade fort and block house housing various militia groups were erected at the site in 1774. After the 1782 burning of the town it was never totally rebuilt, although it continued to serve as the Westmoreland County seat until 1786 when the courts were moved to Newtown (present-day Greensburg).
Hanna's Town was also a center for social activity having two taverns, those of Robert Hanna and Charles Foreman.

Another characteristic which Lewis used to define frontier towns was the presence of high-status individuals living within the town. The structures or living areas of high-status individuals would likely be able to be identified in the archaeological record. Again, evidence from both the architectural and archaeological records are utilized to look at the occurrence of high-status individuals in frontier towns.

In the frontier towns of Beaufort, Georgetown, and Camden evidence of high-status individuals was provided through architectural evidence, while archaeological evidence was available only from Camden. Architectural remains showed the existence of large Palladian double houses at these three town sites. This house type is indicative of a high-status dwelling (Lewis 1984:195-196).

Archaeological evidence of high-status occupation consisted of objects associated with clothing and personal items, and items associated with domestic occupation. At Camden, items associated with high-status clothing and personal effects consisted of two silver-plated brass buttons with engraved floral designs, an engraved silver
cane tip, an engraved brass button, and a number of ceramic wig curlers (Ibid. 197).

Items associated with high-status domestic occupation consisted of various types of ceramics. Evidence of high-status was seen through the use of ceramics by looking at the range of variation in ceramic types, the larger quantity of ceramics found in higher status occupation areas, and the proportion of locally-made American ceramics in the ceramic inventories of occupation areas (Ibid. 198-200).

The architectural evidence from Hanna's Town is inconclusive as a status indicator because little remains of the structures which constituted the town. The houses which were all of log construction with no basement, left little evidence in the archaeological record (Richardson and Wilson 1976:172). The houses of Robert Hanna and Charles Foreman were likely larger than the 18' x 18' size prescribed in the deeds (Hahn 1977:10). Archaeological excavations of Hanna's tavern indicate that the dimensions of the structure were 23' x 32' (Ibid. 9). Their size may not have been a factor of status, but one of function; whereas Hanna's served as both a tavern and the court house and Foreman's functioned as tavern.

A larger number of high-status clothing and personal items were recovered from Hanna's Town than were recovered
at Camden. These included such personal items as an ornate pewter buckle, a silver brooch, finger rings, an engraved silver ornament, pearl inlay buttons, glass jeweled cufflinks; one with a masonic emblem, a brass pendant, a lead wax seal with the impressed bust of a woman and the inscription of Queen Charlotte, consort of King George III, a brass rule, a small perfume bottle or decanter, and a brass drawer plate for a Hepplewhite-style drawer pull (Grimm 1972:227 and 234; Richardson and Wilson 1976:176-179).

High-status domestic-related items included an engraved silver shaker top, an engraved silver teaspoon, fragments of plain and air-twist stemware, a decanter stopper, and fragments of Bonnin and Morris porcelain3 (Grimm 1972:234; Richardson and Wilson 1976:175-177).

3The Bonnin and Morris factory, which operated between 1770-1772, was located in the Southwark area of Philadelphia. The factory produced blue and white soft-paste porcelain and "enameled" wares. Bonnin and Morris porcelain is a bone-ash, soft-paste porcelain similar in quality and chemical composition to contemporary English porcelains (Hood 1969:812-817). Hanna's Town is the furthest west that Bonnin and Morris porcelain has been found and, aside from the factory site, is the only site where it has been discovered in an archaeological context (Grimm 1972:227, 233-234; Richardson and Wilson 1976:175).
As indicated in the previous chapter, Pennsylvania underwent the same type of insular frontier development that Lewis saw occurring in South Carolina. A permanent colony was established in Pennsylvania. The colony was maintained with money and resources from the parent state of England, thus strong cultural ties were maintained with the parent state. The expansion and adaptation of the colony is evidenced by the growth and development of a dendritic transportation network emanating from the entrepôt of Philadelphia. As a result of increased population density and economic complexity, the settlement pattern in the area of colonization evolved with a trend toward even spacing on the landscape, forming the colonization gradient or hierarchy of settlement. The organization of social, economic, political, religious, and military activities were concentrated in focal points called frontier towns. Smaller nucleated and dispersed settlements filled in the remainder of the landscape.

Lewis defined frontier towns using the town of Camden, South Carolina as a model. The components found to occur at
the frontier town of Camden should also be found at other towns if they are to be considered frontier towns. I believe that the town of Hanna's Town in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania should be considered to be a frontier town even though it does not exhibit all the components that define frontier towns according to Lewis (Table 1). Ephemeral frontier towns like Hanna's Town should be considered to be an addendum to the type of frontier town defined by Lewis.

Some of the more ephemeral towns on the frontier did not play as large a part in the economy of the frontier (e.g. focal points of resource collection, processing, storage, transfer, and redistribution) as the model frontier town defined by Lewis. These towns played an important role in frontier advancement in other positions such as regional administration centers and as focal points of transportation, military, and safety staging activities. The components which make Hanna's Town a frontier town have been gleaned from both the archaeological and documentary records and follow.

Size

Although the entire site has not been excavated, excavations at Hanna's Town have revealed a palasaded fort, block house, two taverns, the town spring, and five domestic dwellings (Cowin 1984:5; Grimm 1972:233). Documentary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Camden</th>
<th>Hanna's Town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Role</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Role</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Role</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection and Processing Point</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage and Transport Point</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market and Redistribution Center</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair and Maintenance Facilities</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Communications Center</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Center</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepulcher Center</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Affiliation with Parent State</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Distinct Colonial Society</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of High-Status Occupants</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
evidence in the form of travelers' accounts dating to the colonial period indicate that the number of structures at Hanna's Town to have been over thirty, including a third tavern, a blacksmith's shop, a jail, a pillory, and a whipping post (Richardson and Wilson 1976:154; Beals 1929:80; Walkinshaw 1939: vol 2:26). The size of Hanna's Town is comparable to the size of Camden with approximately thirty structures (Lewis 1984:185) and falls within the size range of frontier towns defined by Lewis as being between twenty-eight and fifty structures (Ibid. 183).

**Layout**

Hanna's Town exhibits a gridiron pattern of town layout with Forbes Road as its main thoroughfare. This planned allocation of space is evidenced by information from property deeds and is supported by archaeological excavation (see Walkinshaw 1939:9; Hahn 1977:10). The property deeds indicate specific lot numbers, lot size, building size, and lots being bounded in the cardinal directions by named secondary streets. A gridiron pattern of town layout existed at Camden as was evident on three historic period maps (Lewis 1976:36-39, 57) and through the examination of the orientation of structural artifact clusters and the alignment of structural remains along roads lying at right angles (Lewis 1984:186-187).
Political Role

Hanna's Town was the site of centralized political organization and activities, and therefore served as a regional administrative center for colonial western Pennsylvania. In 1773, four years after its founding, Hanna's Town was named the county seat of Westmoreland County and was the first county seat west of the Allegheny Mountains. Being formed under the Proprietary Government, it administered justice according to English common law. The courts at Hanna's Town consisted of twenty-six justices of the courts, any three of which could hold court. Court sessions were held at the home of Robert Hanna. A jail, pillory, and whipping post were built shortly after the courts began (Albert 1882:52; Boucher 1906:45-48).

The political process of the courts at Hanna's Town included the division of the county into townships, the administration of justice, and the dealing with the effects of the land claim dispute with Virginia. When the colonies revolted against England as a result of the outbreak of fighting at Lexington and Concord in 1775, a convention of the citizens of Westmoreland County was held at Hanna's Town. The citizens created a document, known as the Hanna's Town Resolutions, which stated that the people would oppose the tyranny of England through the formation of a military body.
Camden also had a role as a political center as is evident by it being named the seat of the Camden District of the South Carolina Circuit Court Districts in 1769, and the presence of a courthouse and jail built in 1771 (Lewis 1976:23, 36, and 48).

Military Role

In 1774, a stockade fort and blockhouse, built at public expense, were erected at Hanna's Town in order to protect the local populus from Native American uprisings, which had become frequent in the region. A militia company was formed for the defense of Westmoreland County. The company was divided and stationed at points throughout the region. Thirty members of the company were stationed at Hanna's Town (Albert 1882:68; Boucher 1906:63).

As a result of the conflict with England and the Hanna's Towns Resolutions of 1775, a military body of men, known as the Association of Westmoreland County, was formed. (Albert 1882:74; 1896:294-295; Boucher 1906:124; Force 1853:615-616). In accordance with the Resolutions, the Association formed companies that constituted the Regiment of Westmoreland County Associators. The battalions were called into service in Philadelphia as part of the Eighth Pennsylvania Regiment of the state militia in 1777 (Dahlinger 1922:40).
In 1776, the fort was enlarged to house the Eighth Pennsylvania Regiment and a militia company. The fort offered protection not only for the town but for the region, as is evidenced by the numerous reports of people seeking refuge at Hanna's Town in the early 1780's (Albert 1896:298-299; Boucher 1906:85 and 171). In July 1782, when Hanna's Town was attacked and burned, the people fled to the fort and were protected despite the militia's desertion of their posts earlier in the summer for lack of payment. The fort and blockhouse were identified during archaeological excavation and have been reconstructed.

The frontier town of Camden also had a military component including two earthen redoubts, a palisade wall, and a munitions storage magazine (Lewis 1984:193). A hospital is also associated with the military occupation of Camden (Lewis 1976:62). Lewis stated that, since the military structures at Camden "...represent a short segment of the settlement's history, they would not have played an integral part of its long-term role as a frontier town. Their presence does suggest that Camden's position was central enough to have permitted it to serve as a fortified military base for a wide region" (Lewis 1984:194).

The military aspect of Camden came about in 1780 when the town became an interior British post through which military supplies and communications passed. In their
attempt to secure the colony, the British recognized Camden's role in the frontier communications network. They utilized the town as a communications link between the field army and occupied Charleston (Lewis 1976:23-25).

Social Role

The town of Hanna's Town served a social role as is evidenced by the existence of three taverns. Taverns were owned by Robert Hanna, Charles Foreman, and Robert Orr. The occurrence of the sessions of court were likely also to be a form of entertainment, which drew people to the town during the times when court was in session.

The frontier town of Camden also served as a social center. A fairground was in existence by 1775 (Lewis 1976:36). John Dinkins' tavern served as a social center in Camden, being the place where balls, banquets, tea parties, quiltings, and other activities took place (Ibid. 61).

Cultural Affiliation: Ties with the Parent State

As a frontier town within an English colony, Hanna's Town maintained cultural ties with the parent state. Because no architectural evidence exists which can support the cultural ties with England, the documentary and archaeological records must be utilized to show the connections with the homeland. As was mentioned previously, Westmoreland County and Hanna's Town (the county seat) were
established under the Proprietary Government. The administration of justice within the county according to English common law represents a cultural tie with England.

A majority of the artifacts recovered from excavations at Hanna's Town can be identified as being of English manufacture. Ceramic types attributable to England include delftware, saltglazed tableware, creamware, pearlware, and Jackfieldware. Chinese export porcelain represents a case of the re-exportation of a foreign pottery that likely came through England. Except for the incidence of two domestic ceramic types, all of the ceramics excavated at the site of Foreman's tavern are of English origin (Richardson and Wilson 1976:175). Non-ceramic domestic items, such as plain and air-twist stemware are also likely to be of English origin.

Non-domestic items recovered at Hanna's Town, which may indicate the cultural affiliation with England, include such things as: jewelry, buckles, kaolin clay pipe stem fragments, and a lead wax seal with the inscription of Queen Charlotte, consort of King George III. The majority of currency recovered a from the site of Foreman's tavern is of English origin (Ibid. 179-180).

The ceramic assemblage from Camden shows the site's cultural affiliation with England. Ninety-three percent of
the identifiable ceramic specimens, consisting of thirty-two distinct types, are from England or are of British colonial origin (Lewis 1976:80). As was the situation at Hanna's Town, there were a few incidences of types of domestic pottery being recovered at Camden.

Evidence from the documentary and architectural records at Camden also support the cultural affiliation with England. The presence of English forms of architecture, such as the Palladian double house and the colonial single house indicate English influence on the frontier (Lewis 1984:123-129, 136-138, 195).

Evidence of High-Status Occupants

With no extant architectural record at Hanna's Town, the identification of persons of high-status on the site must be accomplished solely through the use of the archaeological record. Archaeological evidence of persons of high status is seen in objects associated with clothing and personal items and items associated with high-status domestic occupation (e.g. ceramics).

At Hanna's Town, high-status clothing and personal-related items included an ornate pewter buckle, a silver brooch, finger rings, an engraved silver ornament, pearl inlay buttons, glass jeweled cufflinks; one with a masonic emblem, a brass pendent, a lead wax seal with the impressed
bust of a woman and the inscription of Queen Charlotte, consort of King George III, a brass rule, a small perfume bottle or decanter, and a brass drawer plate for a Hepplewhite-style drawer pull (Grimm 1972:227 and 234; Richardson and Wilson 1976:176-179).

High-status domestic-related items included an engraved silver shaker top, an engraved silver teaspoon, fragments of plain and air-twist stemware, a decanter stopper, and fragments of Bonnin and Morris porcelain (Grimm 1972:234; Richardson and Wilson 1976:175-177).

Architectural evidence at Camden supplemented the archaeological record in the examination of the site for evidence of high-status individuals. Architectural evidence, as previously mentioned, indicates the existence of a large Palladian double house, the Kershaw House, at the site. This house type is an example of a high-status dwelling on the frontier (Lewis 1984:196).

Archaeological evidence of high-status persons at Camden was evident in objects associated with clothing and personal items recovered from the site. These items include two silver-plated brass buttons with engraved floral designs, an engraved silver cane tip, an engraved brass button, and a number of ceramic wig curlers (Ibid. 197).
Items associated with high-status domestic occupation consisted of various types of ceramics. Evidence of high-status was seen through the use of ceramics by looking at the range of variation in ceramic types, the larger quantity of ceramics found in higher status occupation areas, and the proportion of locally-made American ceramics in the ceramic inventories of occupation areas (Ibid. 198-200).

Evidence of a Distinct Colonial Society

Evidence from both Hanna's Town and Camden exhibit that, despite close cultural ties with the parent state, a distinct colonial society existed. The distinct colonial society evolved as a result of the adaptation to a new environment, resources in a frontier region, and its existence at the periphery of the economy of the parent state.

Evidence of the development of a colonial society can be seen in both the architectural and material records. Because of the distance from markets in the homeland and the growth of the colony, not all demands for goods can be met through imports, thus colonial industries must develop to meet the demand. This can be seen in the production of locally-manufactured ceramics, where ceramics of local manufacture attempt to meet the demand that cannot be met through imported ceramics. Adaptation to the natural and cultural environment and to the available technology,
resources, and cultural diversity will also be reflected in the architectural record. New forms of architecture adapted to the conditions of a frontier area will evolve; this includes building styles, function, and materials.

Although Hanna's Town maintained close ties with the parent state, the development of a distinct colonial society is evident at the site. Evidence of ceramics manufactured in the Pennsylvania colony occur at Hanna's Town. Fragments of Bonnin and Morris porcelain have been found at Hanna's Town. Bonnin and Morris blue and white soft paste porcelain, similar in quality and chemical composition to contemporary English porcelain, was produced in the entrepôt of Philadelphia between 1770-1772. The site of Hanna's Town is the furthest west that this pottery type has been found and is the only site, other than the factory, where it has been found in an archaeological context (Hood 1969:812-817; Grimm 1972:227, 233-234; Richardson and Wilson 1976:175). Domestic red earthenware is the second ceramic type found at Hanna's Town. Although no archaeological or documentary evidence has been found to support this, Grimm suggested that the unglazed red earthenware found at the site of Foreman's tavern may have been produced in the Hanna's Town area, thus representing indigenous pottery production (Richardson and Wilson 1976:175).
Although no extant architecture remains at Hanna's Town, the documentary record provides insight into the development of a distinct form of rural vernacular architecture, which supports the existence of a distinct colonial society. The documentary evidence for the use of log houses at Hanna's Town indicates the adaptation to a frontier environment in the type of buildings constructed, the materials chosen for construction, and the technology utilized in construction.

At Camden the archaeological and architectural records revealed a similar situation. Evidence of three domestic ceramic types were found at the site. Moravian ceramics, produced at settlements in North Carolina, consisted of utilitarian culinary wares (Lewis 1976:171; 1984:130). English colonial ceramics, consisting of molded, white-paste, cream-colored earthenwares, similar to those produced in England, were produced at Camden between 1770-1780 (Lewis 1976:169, 1984:132). Colono wares consisting of unglazed, low-fired, undecorated utilitarian earthenwares were also locally produced (Lewis 1984:134-136).

The incidence of these three ceramic traditions revealed

"a collective response to the conditions brought about by the colony's peripheral position in the world economy. The rise and fall of these three ceramic traditions during the colonial period attests to adaptations characteristic of
Functional change in an insular frontier context... and reflects the cultural diversity of the frontier region's inhabitants" (Lewis 1984:136).

Architectural evidence from Camden revealed slight change in architectural style resulting from its adaptation to a new environment. The Colonial single house changed from its English form. The changes include such things as one room depth, an open gallery on each floor, and its being set at right angles to the street. These changes were to allow better ventilation in South Carolina's humid climate (Lewis 1984:136-137). Architectural styles such as the I-house and the log house, also likely to have occurred at Camden, show the evidence of an indigenous rural vernacular architecture, which supports the existence of a distinct colonial society (Lewis 1984:137-141).

Transportation and Communication Role

The frontier town served as the "terminus of the transportation network linking the area of colonization with the homeland through the entrepôt" (Lewis 1977:155). It permitted the

"establishment of trade and communications linkages between the older settled area and the newly occupied lands. The frontier town becomes the nexus of the transportation network of the area of colonization and its identification is crucial to the verification of frontier situation" (Ibid., 194).
Hanna's Town was the terminus of the transportation network for the Pennsylvania frontier. Forbes' military road, which runs through the site, was the only westward route of transportation over the Allegheny Mountains, and was the main commercial highway of the colonial period. Most of the goods imported into this region were transported by pack train via Forbes Road through Forts Bedford and Ligonier (Walkinshaw 1939:9, 287-288). Its central position on the major transport and communications route facilitated its rise as the Westmoreland County seat and as a frontier town.

Camden was also situated on a major colonial transportation and communications network. Like Hanna's Town, Camden was made a county seat, seat of the Camden District of the South Carolina Circuit Court Districts (Lewis 1976:23, 36-48). Its role in the frontier communications network lead it to be utilized during the British occupation as a communications link between field armies and occupied Charleston (Ibid. 23-25).

As discussed earlier, Hanna's Town does not contain all of the components defined by Lewis in his identification of frontier towns. The components outlined by Lewis that do not occur at the site of Hanna's Town are as follows:
Frontier towns and their entrepôts are the locus of specialized economic, political, and social activities. Lewis indicated that the presence of these activities may not allow the identification of a frontier town, but their absence "...would preclude a settlement's having been a frontier town or entrepôt" (Lewis 1984:187). The component of site content is four-fold and deals primarily with the economic realm of the frontier town. The four aspects of site content which should be exhibited in a frontier town are: 1) the role of the frontier town as a collection and processing point for raw and agricultural commodities, as well as other types of commodities produced in the area of colonization; 2) the frontier town serves as a focal point for the storage and transfer of raw agricultural commodities and resources; 3) the frontier town acts as a market center and redistribution point for imported goods, as well as goods being exported, and; 4) the frontier town would contain repair and maintenance facilities linked to the above commercial activities (Lewis 1984:187).

Collection and Processing Point

There is no evidence of Hanna's Town having had a role in the collection and processing of raw agricultural or other types of resources or commodities produced in the frontier region. The "outlots" referred to in the property deeds appear to be manifestations on the landscape of a
level of subsistence agriculture common in the more dispersed settlements of the area of colonization. The documentary and archaeological records do not show evidence of mills, distilleries, or other processing facilities. The site's distance from any large scale streams or rivers preclude the use of water power for a frontier industrial base.

Storage and Transfer

The documentary and archaeological evidence for the site of Hanna's Town gives no indication of the site's utilization as a storage and transfer point for processed goods and commodities produced on the frontier. Even if agricultural production and processing were situated in the hinterland of Hanna's Town near sources of raw materials or water power, the products would need to have been collected and stored in a centralized location to await their transfer to the entrepôt. Hanna's Town's location on the Forbes' Road, the main commercial highway of the colonial period, would certainly be the most central point in the region for the storage and transfer of commodities on the frontier. Archaeology at Hanna's Town has revealed no evidence of warehouses or loading facilities. The documentary record supports the archaeological record, and in addition there are no records of any commodities being exported from Hanna's Town. One further point is that the distance to the entrepôt through the rugged terrain of the Allegheny
Mountains would seem to preclude the shipment of agricultural products to Philadelphia, especially since the fertile areas of Berks, Bucks, Montgomery, York, and Lancaster counties could provide adequate agricultural commodities to support the entrepôt and allow a surplus for export to the parent state (Dunaway 1948:223-224; Florin 1977:24-27).

**Market Center and Redistribution Point**

Although Hanna's Town was situated on the main commercial route of the colonial period, there is no documentary or archaeological evidence for it being a market center or redistribution point for goods imported into the region. Archaeological evidence in the form of imported ceramics and non-domestic goods confirms the link of Hanna's Town to the entrepôt of Philadelphia and the parent state of England. What does not show up in the documentary or archaeological records is evidence of an established mercantile base. There is no evidence of stores, market places, or other types of retail establishments as is seen in other towns.

**Repair and Maintenance Point**

As was seen for the three previous points there is no documentary or archaeological evidence that would support Hanna's Town as having had the repair and maintenance facilities associated with the commercial and economic
activities discussed above. Reference to the existence of a blacksmith shop at the site (Cowin 1984:5) would not necessarily guarantee the presence of a repair and maintenance facility. A single blacksmith in a town the size of Hanna's Town would likely have been kept busy producing hardware utilized in construction and in the production and repair of domestic items locally.

At Camden, the documentary and archaeological records provide evidence of the existence of a large economic base. Evidence for the processing, storage, and transfer of goods exists at the site. In addition, an established retail base existed at the site.

The archaeological record at Camden was utilized to assess the site's content. As discussed in Chapter 4, the identification of activities was based on the contents recovered from individual activity areas (Lewis 1984:188). The use of the Subsistence, Technological, and Subsistence-Technological activity categories allowed artifacts to be utilized to determine activity areas. Statistical manipulation of artifacts resulted in data representing the proportional relationship between artifact classes from the three activity categories that allowed occupation areas having had different activities present to be distinguished from one another (Ibid. 190). Presence of specialized activity occupations were evidenced by the reduced size of
the area's Subsistence activity component (Ibid. 191). Of the ten units examined at Camden, three had solely a domestic function, five revealed a combined domestic-business function, and two revealed a specialized, non-domestic function that were not able to be identified. (Ibid. 191-193).

The documentary evidence for Camden revealed its role as a point for the collection, processing, storage, and transport of agricultural commodities produced in the region. It was an "inland collection point for wheat, corn indigo and tobacco grown in the backcountry ...and was the site of mills and warehouses for processing and storage prior to shipment to Charleston" (Lewis 1984:74). A tobacco inspection station was also present in the town (Ibid.). The role of Camden as a market and redistribution center is evidenced by the presence of a pottery, a brewery, a distillery, stores of at least four merchants, three taverns, a tannery, a bakery, a tailor, and a shoe maker (Ibid. 74-75). The repair and maintenance facilities at Camden are evidenced by the presence of a blacksmith's shop, a turner's shop, a saw mill, and a brickyard (Lewis 1976:63; 1984:75).

Religious and Sepulchral

The frontier town is also the center of religious and to a lesser degree sepulchral activities. There is no
evidence of Hanna's Town having played a role as a religious center for the region. Hanna's Town never had a church building or congregation at any time during its existence (Walkinshaw 1939:171 and 370). A cemetery is situated on the hill above the site (Figure 1). The tombstones in the cemetery all have dates after 1800, at least fifteen years after the town was abandoned and the county seat moved to present-day Greensburg.

Camden was known to be a religious and sepulchral center. The presence of the Presbyterian Church and Quaker meeting house indicate Camden's prominent role in the religious activities of the frontier (Lewis 1976:23). "Land also had been set aside for an Anglican church, but prejudice against the established church prevented its construction" (Lewis 1984:75). Sepulchral activities are evident at Camden by the presence of two colonial-period cemeteries adjacent to the settlement (Ibid. 185).

The Need to Define an Additional Type of Frontier Town

Frontier towns like Hanna's Town may not be identified as frontier towns in the archaeological record due to the absence of one or more of the components utilized by Lewis to define frontier towns (Table 1). Hanna's Town, by Lewis's definition, would not have been considered to be a frontier town, although it clearly is. Frontier towns, like Hanna's Town, which played only a minor role in the frontier
economy, existed on the frontier. In order to identify other "Hanna's Towns" on the landscape, researchers should examine the town's role in the overall advancement of the frontier despite the absence of one or more components characteristic of a frontier town.

When the application of frontier theory, does not identify a site that clearly played an important role in the frontier development of an area, as in the case of Hanna's Town, then an additional type of frontier town should be defined. The failure to identify Hanna's Town as a frontier town within the Lewis outline could be due to limitations in the theoretical framework utilized in the definition of frontier towns. As a result an additional type of frontier town, as an addendum to the theoretical framework and frontier town definition defined by Lewis, should be defined.

A type of frontier town modeled on Hanna's Town is suggested as an additional type of frontier town. This type of frontier town is characterized as being a regional administration center as well as a focal point for transportation, military, and safety staging activities. Like the frontier town defined by Lewis, it played a major role in the advancement of the frontier. It differs from Lewis's definition of a frontier town in that its role in the economy of the frontier was very minor.
CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSIONS

Frontier development is manifest in frontier towns. The study of frontier developmental processes and the recognition of the frontier as a sociocultural entity requires the identification of the centralized economic, social, and political features associated with a colonial area. These features are most apparent in the focal settlement within the area of colonization, the frontier town. Through the study of frontier towns, one can examine the centralized activities that characterize a frontier (see Lewis 1977:157-158).

In the examination of frontier towns, researchers have elaborated the numerous components indicative of them. These components include the frontier town's: role as the focal point of the frontier; role in the transfer of goods, commodities, and resources from the frontier to the entrepôt; role in the movement of commodities from the parent state to the frontier; role as an area of integrating activities in the social, economic, political, religious, and military realms; role in the transportation and
communication network; role as a regional administrative center; as well as its size, layout, and content.

Kenneth Lewis utilized Camden, South Carolina as a model for defining components necessary in the identification of frontier towns. Some of the more ephemeral frontier towns did not play major roles in the economy of the frontier. Although these frontier towns had no role as areas for the collection, processing, storage, and transport of resources, nor have the repair and maintenance facilities associated with them, they still played an important role in frontier development. These roles include regional administrative centers, focal points for military campaigns, safety staging areas, and areas for the access to the frontier. Due to their importance in frontier development, these towns should be considered to be frontier towns even though they may not contain all of the components necessary to be identified as a frontier town. For this reason an additional type of frontier town needs to be defined.

Hanna's Town in western Pennsylvania is a good example of an ephemeral frontier town. Hanna's Town, situated on the Allegheny Plateau, existed from 1769-1786. During its existence it failed to serve as any major resource collection, processing, storage, transport, or redistribution center. Its primary importance was as an
administrative, transportation, and military center. Its failure of performing a role in the economy of the frontier region should not preclude it from being considered to be a frontier town. Instead, Hanna's Town should be considered to be an additional type of frontier town.

A type of frontier town modeled on Hanna's Town is suggested as an additional type. This type of frontier town is characterized as being a regional administration center, a focal point for transportation, military, and safety staging activities, and a point of access to the frontier. Like the frontier town defined by Lewis, it played a major role in the advancement of the frontier. It differs from Lewis's definition of a frontier town in that its role in the economy of the frontier was minor.

The application of Lewis's model of insular frontier development to Pennsylvania and the town of Hanna's Town is an excellent test of the model. The overall framework indicates that Pennsylvania underwent the same type of insular frontier development that Lewis described in South Carolina. Colonial development in Pennsylvania followed the six characteristics of the model, and with one exception meets the eleven archaeological hypotheses designed to explore the evolving form, distribution, and organizational aspects of a colonial society.
The one point where Pennsylvania and specifically Hanna's Town departed from Lewis's model centered around economy. Unlike frontier towns defined by Lewis, Hanna's Town played only a minor role in the economy of the frontier. The overemphasis on the economic aspect of the frontier of Lewis's model resulted in limitations of the definitions of frontier towns. Hanna's Town would not have been defined as a frontier town, utilizing Lewis's model. The failure to identify towns such as Hanna's Town, which played only a minor role in the frontier economy, identify limitations in the theoretical framework utilized in the definition of frontier towns.

In order to have a more complete model of insular frontier development, other non-economic factors which may also play a role in frontier development must be considered. Such factors may include personal political ties and personal-gain motives. Such personal-gain motives and personal political ties may be important components in the establishment and existence of frontier towns such as Hanna's Town.

Hanna's Town's founder, Robert Hanna, was a man of political prominence. He secured land for a town site from the Proprietary Government and set up the town, sold lots, and also ran a tavern (the site of the courts and county seat). Contemporary sources first suggested that Hanna's
personal gain and political ties were important components in the siting of Hanna's Town. Arthur St. Clair suggested that Hanna's personal motives played a role in the selection of the site (Albert 1882:62; Beals 1929:79; Boucher 1906:49-50). After the 1782 burning of the town a board of trustees, which included Hanna, maintained that the site of Hanna's Town was still the ideal site for the county seat. The dispute with the Supreme Executive Council over the site for the county seat kept a new site from being selected until December of 1785, almost 3½ years after the attack.

The possibility of such factors as personal-gain motives and political ties playing a role in frontier development should be considered. In emphasizing the economic component of the frontier, Lewis's model of insular frontier development has minimized the personalities who moved there. Here, it is suggested that models of frontier development incorporate personal-gain motives and political ties. Turner's concepts of the frontier as a zone of influences on people can be viewed as a counterpoint to Lewis's economic emphasis.

Recent scholars have, to a degree retained personal-gain motives and political ties in their theoretical framework. Marvin Mikesell wrote about the "social climate" during the period of frontier formation (1960:73). Casagrande et al. referred to colonization as an opportunity
to study culture change, integration, and reintegration (1964:314-315). Donald Hardesty (1980) suggested synecological models from general evolutionary ecology provide the most useful theoretical framework in which to study the frontier phenomenon since they deal with the individual or local group (household).

The ideal synthetic framework for studying frontier development would include personal-gain motives and political ties. Ultimately, people's "motives" create the economic, political, social, religious, and military components of the frontier and are therefore the basic element which drives the entire frontier process.

Turner understood the importance of the role of the individual in frontier development. This is apparent for several reasons. First, is a demographic one in that due to the fact that there are few people on the frontier, individual personalities are important, where as in areas of higher population, individual personalities become submerged. Second, ambitious entrepreneurs often move to the frontier to prosper since their personal-gain motives are constrained in established regions. Thus, personalities tend to be more emphasized on the frontier.

The Turner thesis was more concerned with the impact of the frontier on the "development of the American
character". However, the antithesis must also be true, the individual must have had an impact on the development of the frontier. The values that Turner delineated as components of the American character must also been values of the entrepreneurs on the frontier. These values were components of the development of the frontier and were as important as the economic values that Lewis championed.
Appendix A


MEETING OF THE INHABITANTS OF WESTMORELAND, PENNSYLVANIA.

At a general meeting of the inhabitants of the County of Westmoreland, held at Hanna's Town the 16th day of May, 1775, for taking into consideration the very alarming situation of this Country, occasioned by the dispute with Great Britain:

Resolved unanimously, That the Parliament of Great Britain, by several late Acts, have declared the inhabitants of the Massachusetts-Bay to be in rebellion, and the Ministry, by endeavoring to enforce these Acts, have attempted to reduce the said inhabitants to a mere wretched state of slavery than ever before existed in any state or country. Not content with violating their constitutional and chartered privileges, they would strip them of the rights of humanity, exposing lives to the wanton and
unpunishable sport of a licentious soldiery, and depriving them of the very means of sustenance.

Resolved unanimously, That there is no reason to doubt but the same system of tyranny and oppression will (should it meet with success in the Massachusetts-Bay) be extended to every other part of America: it is therefore become the indispensable duty of every American, of every man who has any public virtue or love for his Country, or any bowels for posterity, by every means which God has put in his power, to resist and oppose the execution of it; that for us we will be ready to oppose it with our lives and fortunes. And the better to enable us to accomplish it, we will immediately form ourselves into a military body, to consist of Companies to be made up out of the several Townships under the following Association, which is declared to be the Association of Westmoreland County:

Possessed with the most unshaken loyalty and fidelity to His Majesty, King George the Third, whom we acknowledge to be our lawful and rightful King, and who we wish may long be the beloved Sovereign of a free and happy people throughout the whole British Empire; we declare to the world, that we do not mean by this Association to deviate from that loyalty which we hold it our bounden duty to observe; but animated with the love of liberty, it is no less our duty to maintain and defend our just rights (which with sorrow we have seen of late wantonly violated in many instances by a wicked Ministry and a corrupted Parliament)
and transmit them entire to our posterity, for which purpose we do agree and associate together.

1st. To arm and form ourselves into a Regiment or Regiments, and choose officers to command us in such proportion as shall be thought necessary.

2nd. We will with alacrity, endeavour [sic] to make ourselves masters of the manual exercise, and such evolutions as may be necessary to enable us to act in a body with concert; and to that end we will meet at such times and places as shall be appointed either for the Companies or the Regiment, by the officers commanding each when chosen.

3rd. That should our Country be invaded by a foreign enemy, or should Troops be sent from Great Britain to enforce the late arbitrary Acts of its Parliament, we will cheerfully submit to military discipline, and to the utmost of our power resist and oppose them, or either of them, and will coincide with any plan that may be formed for the defence of America in general, or Pennsylvania in particular.

4th. That we do not wish or desire any innovation, but only that things may be restored to, and go on in the same way as before the era of the Stamp Act, when Boston grew great, and America was happy. As proof of this disposition, we will quietly submit to the laws by which we have been accustomed to be governed before that period, and will, in our several or associate capacities, be ready when called on
to assist the civil magistrate in carrying the same into execution.

5th. That when the British Parliament shall have repealed their late obnoxious Statutes, and shall recede from their claim to tax us, and make laws for us in every instance, or when some general plan of union and reconciliation has been formed and accepted by America, this our Association shall be dissolved; but till then it shall remain in full force; and to the observation of it, we bind ourselves by everything dear and sacred amongst men.

No licensed murder! no famine introduced by law!

Resolved, that on Wednesday, the twenty-fourth instant, the Township meet to accede to the said Association, and choose their officers.
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