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ABSTRACT

Mount Pleasant was the childhood home of President James Madison and was occupied from the 1720s through the 1790s. Early excavations at Mount Pleasant lacked organization and a clear focus that led to less-than-ideal site documentation for current researchers. With various analytical techniques, it is still data that can be used to interpret and understand the Mount Pleasant service complex. The methodologies used to salvage information from the existing data will be explained, site interpretations of this historically significant plantation will be made, and recommendations for other researchers of previously excavated sites will be provided as the valuable lessons learned from this case study are applicable to any site regardless of geographic location or time period.

Although a fair amount of the data from early excavations at Mount Pleasant was compromised due to misguided excavation techniques and improper recording techniques, enough data from these years was salvageable, in addition to data collected post 2000, as to allow researchers to reconstruct the site’s history. Though documentary evidence for Mount Pleasant is scarce, we can now describe and date at least four structures in the service complex area, in addition to a large borrow pit in the eastern yard and a fence line demarcating the western yard from the family cemetery. We can recreate the sequence of events at the site in relation to the building and demise of these structures as well as define three succinct occupational periods. Between two of these occupational periods a major shift in land usage was detected. All of this information would have been lost to history had archaeological excavations not taken place at the site. Archaeological investigations not only illuminated what was known of Mount Pleasant through documentary sources, but through analysis and interpretation, basically defined and described the history of the Madison family’s first Piedmont plantation.
THE MOUNT PLEASANT SERVICE COMPLEX
CHAPTER 1
SITE BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

Usually the term *salvage* in relation to archaeology brings to mind archaeologists racing against time to rescue what they can from a potentially historically significant site before construction or some other occurrence destroys it. But what does an organization do when their own archaeologists have plenty of time to excavate a site yet leave behind a data set that does not stand up to modern day standards? The following thesis began as a salvage attempt of a different kind. Through extensive reorganization of the data and some creative thinking, many interpretations were able to be made about the Mount Pleasant service complex at Montpelier, which includes a detached kitchen, a root cellar, a borrow pit, and a fence line. As research continued, I realized there were valuable lessons to be learned from the analysis and interpretation of previously excavated archaeological remains.

As is common knowledge, one learns as much from their mistakes as their accomplishments. This adage may be extended to include learning from others’ mistakes as well. Early archaeological work at Montpelier was riddled with mistakes, including excavation techniques and recording methods, from which valuable lessons can be learned. Most significantly, this thesis is an explanation of the problems that arise when excavations are done improperly or not to current methodological standards, the methods that can be used to analyze a flawed data set, and the valuable interpretations that can still
be made about dated materials, illustrated within the context of the Mount Pleasant service complex.

Throughout this thesis, the terms Montpelier and Mount Pleasant will be used quite frequently. Mount Pleasant always refers to the site of the original Madison family plantation. However, the term, Montpelier, will be used in several different contexts: (1) there is Montpelier as a whole, meaning the entire property and museum; (2) there is Montpelier, the mansion, which was the Madison’s second plantation home on the property; (3) there is Montpelier, as in The Montpelier Foundation, which is the backbone of the entire operation, including the departments of administration and finance, archaeology, architectural research, education, and historical research. Every attempt will be made to make clear in which context the term Montpelier is being used.

It should also be noted that scant documentary evidence exists for the early history of the Madison family at Montpelier. The majority of personal papers, including family business and plantation records, were burned by Madison family members in an attempt to retain the family’s privacy (Miller 2001:4). The records pertaining to Mount Pleasant that did survive include the patent improvement accounts submitted by Ambrose Madison and Thomas Chew in 1726, Ambrose Madison’s will and the inventory of his estate upon his death in 1732, several of Frances Madison’s accounts books and several of James Madison, Sr.’s account books.¹ However, no period description exists that

¹ The patent improvement accounts of Ambrose Madison and Thomas Chew and the inventory of Ambrose Madison’s estate are recorded in Spotsylvania County Will Book A pp. 42–43 and pp. 183–186, respectively (Miller 2001). A copy of Ambrose Madison’s will is in the collections of the James Madison Museum in Orange, Virginia and is excerpted in Miller 2001, p. 57. For more information regarding both the inventory of Ambrose Madison and the account books of both Frances Madison and James Madison, Sr., see Ann L. Miller’s “Historic Structure Report: Montpelier, Orange County, Virginia, Phase II: Documentary Evidence Regarding the Montpelier House [1723-1983],” an unpublished report on file at Montpelier Archives, Montpelier Station, Virginia, which can also be accessed online at www.montpelierresearch.org/text/historic/hsr_miller_1991.doc, pp. 15–34.
conveys the look or layout of the Mount Pleasant settlement. Therefore archaeological investigation remains the only way to understand, interpret, and recreate this site.

As is often the case, more effort is expended on the excavation of archaeological sites than on their subsequent analysis and interpretation. When Dr. Matthew Reeves took over the archaeology department at Montpelier in 2000, data from four years of excavation at Mount Pleasant, spanning more than 10 years’ time was sitting, waiting to be analyzed. Bags upon bags of soil samples, architectural samples, and artifacts had yet to be water screened, weighed, and washed. Over the next three years, Dr. Reeves had various volunteers, interns, and employees begin the overwhelming task of washing, weighing, and cataloguing the multitude of artifacts from the Mount Pleasant service complex. Throughout this time, Dr. Reeves came to realize the data set had flaws, but when Dr. Reeves hired me in the summer of 2003 to analyze and interpret these materials, the number of flaws grew larger than either of us could have imagined.

As the days and weeks of organizing the recorded data went by, more and more discrepancies and unsolvable mysteries, such as differences between recording in the field and lab and missing provenience data, were brought to light. These discrepancies led to the passing thought that the data may have been so compromised as to be uninterpretable. With the amount of confusion caused by incorrect and inconsistent recording of such things as stratum depth and artifact provenience, along with altogether missing records from certain extensive periods of time, the accuracy of the remainder of the field records was called into question. Much cross-checking was completed in order to know which data could and could not be used for purposes of interpreting the site. Because Mount Pleasant was such a significant historic site, it was decided to find ways
to analyze and interpret the flawed data. With some collaborative brainstorming between Dr. Reeves and I, and his expertise with complex database analyses, interpretations regarding structures, landscape usage, and change over time were able to be made.

The significance of this thesis can be found in returning to the idea that less writing about sites is completed than excavating of them, often resulting in warehouses full of under-interpreted data. Sharing my experience of analyzing and writing about four years’ worth of inconsistent data from a site at which I had never personally excavated will illustrate for future researchers of previously excavated sites the problems that arise as excavation methods and standards change over time and the methodologies that can be used successfully for organizing and interpreting the remaining data.

In order to convey the context and significance of the Mount Pleasant archaeological site, the background and history of Montpelier, the larger estate of which it is a part, will be presented. Second, the excavation and recording techniques from the previous archaeologists will be explored, followed by an explanation of the problems these techniques created when it came time to analyze their findings. Fourth, creative methodologies for dealing with these problems will be outlined, along with the interpretations that resulted from their application. Finally, recommendations for dealing with problematic data sets on other sites and contexts will be made.

**MOUNT PLEASANT**

Mount Pleasant was a substantial and highly profitable 18th-century Piedmont Virginia plantation owned by the Madison family. Both Frances Madison and her son, James, Sr., diversified economic enterprise on their plantation to include such industries as tobacco production, a brandy distillery, and a thriving blacksmith shop (Reeves...
Prior to its success, the plantation infrastructure had to be carved out of the piedmont wilderness. For insight into the early history of Mount Pleasant, Ann L. Miller pieced together what remains of the Madison’s documentary evidence to tell the story of the president’s grandfather, how the Madison family came to reside in the piedmont region, and the circumstances surrounding his untimely death (Miller 2001).

President James Madison’s grandfather, Ambrose Madison, split a land patent for 4,675 acres of prime Piedmont property with his brother-in-law, Thomas Chew. The patent had been given to them by their father-in-law, Colonel James Taylor, in 1723. Before permanently settling the land, the patent had to be perfected, a system by which the owner had to make improvements to the land of a certain financial amount in order to gain full rights to the property (Miller 2001). As was a typical practice of the time, Ambrose sent an overseer along with a group of slaves from his Tidewater home2 to Mount Pleasant where they spent almost 10 years clearing the land, planting the fields, and constructing the plantation’s main residence and outbuildings (Schlotterbeck 1980:20–21).

Several comparisons attest to the extensive work accomplished at Mount Pleasant during those years. When Ambrose and Thomas submitted their patent improvements in 1726, the Mount Pleasant quarter was valued at £340.0.0. This valuation was almost twice that of his brother-in-law’s plantation which was valued at £175.0.0 (Spotsylvania County Will Book A, pp.42–43). Ambrose’s father-in-law, Col. Taylor, had twelve quarters listed on his 1725 patent, including “eight one-to-two room dwellings, extensive fencing, over eight hundred fruit trees, five other buildings…and two tobacco barns”

2 Although the name of Ambrose Madison’s Tidewater plantation is not known, a 1725 Spotsylvania County court record suggests the location was in what is now known as northwestern Caroline County on or near the Mattaponi River (Miller 2001:39 n.19).
These improvements were valued at £207.3.0, nearly half the valuation of Mount Pleasant. With these valuations as comparison, it can be said that by the time the Madisons settled into their new piedmont home, the plantation infrastructure was clearly established and quite extensive.

Ambrose, his wife Frances, and their three children permanently settled at Mount Pleasant in the early spring of 1732. Within three months, three slaves—one from a neighboring plantation and two of their own—conspired to and succeeded in fatally poisoning Ambrose Madison. In his will, Ambrose left the Mount Pleasant property to his son, the president’s father, James Madison, Sr., upon his coming of age in the early 1740s. Until that time, Ambrose’s widow, Frances, managed the plantation and proved herself to be a highly successful proprietress.

It is not known when construction began on James Madison, Sr.’s, new, statelier mansion about a quarter of a mile away from the Mount Pleasant complex. Nor is the exact date of the family’s relocation there known, but it is generally thought to have been sometime in the early 1760s, possibly after Frances’ death in 1761. What is known with certainty is that the new house was situated in stark contrast to their modest original home. The new house was a brick Georgian mansion, known today as Montpelier, which is situated on a prominent ridge with a spectacular vista of the Blue Ridge Mountains. Shortly after the family’s relocation to Montpelier, their former residence at Mount Pleasant was intentionally burned. Archaeological research to date suggests that the house was in a state of disrepair and had become structurally unsound, leaving it uninhabitable (Reeves 2004:12). Despite losing this structure, the service complex just to the west, which included a series of buildings and fences that had been associated with
the main plantation home, continued to be used for the next 30 years, most likely as an overseer’s complex/slave quarter. A series of unintentional fires in the 1790s destroyed Mount Pleasant’s remaining structures as attested to by the presence of a large amount of late 18th-century burned materials recovered throughout the complex. After this final series of fires destroyed what remained of the Mount Pleasant complex, the area was returned to agricultural fields and subsequently endured years of intensive plowing.

To summarize, there were three distinct periods of occupation at Mount Pleasant. During the first period, from 1723–1732, an overseer and group of slaves cleared the land and set up the plantation infrastructure. As known from other sites in the region, plantation service complexes typically included buildings such as kitchens, dairies, smokehouses, slave quarters, barns, granaries, and other domestic-type structures (Kelso 1984:129). In addition to the main residence, a detached kitchen and overseer/slave dwelling have been discovered at Mount Pleasant to date. Future excavations are likely to reveal additional structures. The second period, from 1732–1760, was the one in which the Madison family occupied Mount Pleasant. During the third period, from 1760–1790s, either enslaved domestics once engaged by Frances Madison (the president’s grandmother), or enslaved field hands, continued to occupy the site in association with an overseer’s complex located just south of the complex.

Throughout the occupational history of the Mount Pleasant complex, African Americans belonging to the Madison family twice occupied the site: first, from the early 1720s to the early 1730s and, again, from the 1760s to the 1790s. The African American presence at Mount Pleasant has yet to be studied in depth and should be a focus for future research and analysis. Due to the lack of historical documentation regarding Mount
Pleasant, archaeological research at the site has the potential to further contribute to
general plantation studies in piedmont Virginia, a region which, according to Douglas
Sanford, has been largely neglected thus far (Sanford 1994:118). Other promising topics
to which the site may well contribute are the female management of a plantation in the
$18^{th}$-century$^3$ and the African-American landscape in the $18^{th}$-century Virginia piedmont.

**MONTPELIER**

Today, Montpelier is a 2,700-acre estate owned by the National Trust for Historic
Preservation (NTHP) and operated as a public museum. Throughout Montpelier's
history, the property changed ownership nine times (See Table 1). Prior to acquisition by
the NTHP, the most recent owner was Marion duPont Scott who resided on the property
until her death in 1983. She was Montpelier's longest resident, having lived there for
some 82 years. Upon her death, she bequeathed the entire Montpelier estate, along with a
substantial sum of money to the NTHP. Mrs. Scott wanted the NTHP to open Montpelier
to the public as an educational resource focusing on James Madison and his contributions
to the foundation of our country, as well as to continue as a social venue for her beloved
sport of horse racing. As a consequence, the site functions as a historic house museum
and hosts the annual Montpelier Hunt Races.

---

$^3$ For more information on the female management of Mount Pleasant, see Chapter 1 in *Montpelier, The Archaeology of the Madison Family Plantation 1723-1844* (Reeves, ed. 2005).
TABLE 1
OWNERS OF THE MONTPELIER PROPERTY: 1723–present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madison Family</td>
<td>1723 – 1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry W. Moncure</td>
<td>1844 – 1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Thornton</td>
<td>1848 – 1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Macfarland</td>
<td>1854 – 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred V. Scott</td>
<td>1855 – 1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas J. Carson and Frank Carson</td>
<td>1857 – 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis F. Detrick and William L. Bradley</td>
<td>1881 – 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles King Lennig</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duPont Family</td>
<td>1901 – 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>1983 – present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE SEARCH FOR MOUNT PLEASANT

One of the NTHP’s first tasks in transforming Montpelier into a public museum was to evaluate the historic resources throughout the property. The NTHP quickly hired a team of specialists from many different fields to survey, research, and interpret the history of the larger Montpelier estate. Archaeologists were among those hired to complete this task. Lynne G. Lewis, a senior archaeologist with the NTHP, arrived at Montpelier in 1985 and subsequently hired Scott K. Parker, George C. Logan, Anna S. Bruce, and Donald E. Melvor under a Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR) grant, to begin surveying the estate’s vast acreage with hopes of locating and identifying significant archaeological sites, including the Madison family’s homestead called Mount Pleasant.

Not surprisingly, the initial Phase I survey found 39 sites on the property, composed of 22 historic and 17 prehistoric sites (Lewis and Parker 1987). Although the size of the testing area is undocumented, a shovel test pit (STP) survey of 200-meter-long transects was conducted at a 20-meter interval. This survey, undertaken near the Madison family cemetery, located a concentration of early 18th-century artifacts which led the archaeologists to believe this area might have been the site of Mount Pleasant. The STPs were expanded upon in a Phase II survey with 10 5 x 5 ft. units excavated in a checkerboard pattern. The goal of this survey was to better interpret the artifact concentration located by the STP survey. This excavation resulted in the discovery of a root cellar also dating to the early 18th century. Although this was a substantial discovery, work at the site diminished as focus shifted to excavations up the hill at Montpelier mansion where they remained for the next 10 years. In 1997, preparations
were underway for the 250th birthday celebration of James Madison. These preparations included the desire to locate the original Madison family homestead. At that time, Montpelier staff archaeologists revisited the heavily concentrated area of 18th-century artifacts located in 1987 just east of the Madison family cemetery and found several substantial archaeological features verifying that this site was the location of the Mount Pleasant settlement.
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS AT THE MOUNT PLEASANT SERVICE COMPLEX

The Mount Pleasant service complex was mainly excavated in two separate periods: an initial survey in 1987 and a more extensive excavation from 1997–1999. All of the excavations were completed by Montpelier staff archaeologists in conjunction with James Madison University’s Summer Field School Program under the direction of Scott and Tamarra Parker. The 1987 and 1997 excavations were completed using square test units, the standard excavation technique used on most historic sites, while the 1998 and 1999 excavations used the locus/lot system. A lack of proper recording techniques for all four years proved problematic for future analyses.

During the 1987 field season 115 x 5 ft. units were excavated in the area where a previous STP survey had revealed a concentration of 18th-century artifacts. A small root cellar was uncovered during this period. The 1997 field season started with the mechanical removal of a 50 x 70 ft. area of plow zone surrounding that root cellar for purposes of quickly locating additional substantial sub-surface cultural layers. Over the course of the next three years, approximately 24 test units were excavated, measuring from 10 x 10 ft. to 10 x 25 ft. in size, and 54 loci of various shapes and sizes were excavated. These excavations uncovered such features as a detached kitchen, a large borrow pit, and a fence line and yielded approximately 211,000 individual artifacts. The

---

4 For purposes of this thesis, the focus is on the early years of excavation at Mount Pleasant; however, post-2000 Dr. Matthew Reeves continues to excavate at the site in collaboration with the James Madison University annual field school program.
substantial 18th-century features led researchers to believe that the Mount Pleasant site had been located. The location of the main house during the 2001 field season, under the direction of Dr. Matthew Reeves, confirmed that the site had been discovered. What follows is an in-depth look at each of the main features excavated from 1987–1997.

**FEATURE 53, THE ROOT CELLAR**

In 1987, Montpelier’s staff archaeologists surveyed a section of land adjacent to the Madison family cemetery and came across a heavy concentration of 18th-century artifacts. A grid measuring 10 x 55 ft. was laid out and 11 of the 22 5 x 5 ft. test units were opened in a checkerboard pattern running north-to-south across the site. Three of these units revealed the presence of a 6 x 8 ft. root cellar (Feature 53). The entire fill was designated as Stratum D and subsequently excavated in four levels: D1 through D4. The soil descriptions for each layer are identical, leading one to conclude that the four levels must have been arbitrary distinctions. The field notebooks from that time reveal no further insight as to the reason for the separation of Stratum D into four levels. In addition to the lack of information in the written records, no photographs exist of Feature 53 during excavation, nor were any profiles drawn of the stratigraphy of the fill. The final stratum card for Feature 53 leaves one wondering if it was ever completely excavated, as closing depths were never recorded.

The importance of stratigraphy in interpreting depositional sequence at archaeological sites has been discussed in depth by both Willey and Sabloff (1993) and Harris (1989). In order to analyze this important aspect of an archaeological site, it is important that it be recorded properly as the excavation is taking place. However

---

5 Stratum cards are used by Montpelier archaeologists to record all pertinent information regarding each stratum, including a sketch of the unit illustrating the relationship between strata, depth of the stratum, soil description and artifacts recovered.
stratigraphy is recorded at a site, be it on stratum cards, as at Montpelier, or on some other special form, all pertinent information must be recorded accurately, for “if such information is accurately recorded in writing for each unit of stratification on a site, the stratigraphic sequence can be constructed without reference to any other sources…” (Harris 1989:72). Dr. Edward Harris developed a methodology which allows archaeologists to create a diagram, known as the Harris Matrix, of the stratigraphy of a site in order to more clearly view, understand, and interpret the relationship between stratigraphic layers at a site (Harris 1989).

In the case of Mount Pleasant, the stratigraphic recording of many features were compromised; therefore, I lost the chance to recreate the history of that feature, was unable to create a Harris Matrix of the site, thus my ability to analyze the relationship between features across the site was compromised. In the case of Feature 53, the root cellar, the written records leave more questions than answers, such as “Was Stratum D actually one cultural layer?” and “Did Stratum D4 reach subsoil or might there have been a remaining cultural layer in the cellar?” The only way to answer the latter question would be to reopen the test units and clear away the backfill to see what lies beneath it.

*THE PLOW ZONE*

In 1997, Montpelier staff archaeologists revisited the area of the 1987 root cellar discovery in hopes of verifying that this site was the Madison family’s Mount Pleasant. Typically, a successful excavation begins with a research design asking questions that articulate with the state’s historic preservation plan, its guidelines and themes. In addition to this document, extensive plans are made as to how many units will be opened, the approximate amount of time it will take to excavate them, how many people will be
needed in order to complete the excavation, and how serendipitous discoveries or other contingencies might be addressed. In hindsight, it appears that Montpelier staff archaeologists at the time did no such planning in relation to the Mount Pleasant site, at least for the first few years. Excited about the previous discovery of an early 18th-century root cellar, along with heavy concentrations of other early artifacts in the area, staff archaeologists were anxious to see what additional features might exist in the vicinity. Rather than planning a standard excavation sequence by plotting units on a grid and excavating an amount that could be reasonably handled with the manpower available, a decision was made for the wholesale removal by backhoe of a 50 x 70 ft. area of the plow zone surrounding Feature 53. This mechanical stripping strategy is known as Operation 1 (OP1) and was undertaken in hopes of revealing additional cultural layers and features related to the root cellar.

Unless sub-surface features exist, most artifacts recovered from an archaeological excavation are located in the plow zone. Many studies have proven the importance of using plow zone data to assess the spatial distribution of artifacts across historic sites (Heath and Bennett 2000; King 1988; King and Miller 1987; Pogue 1988; Riordan 1988). Barbara Heath and Amber Bennett go so far as to say that “ignoring the plowzone on African-American sites may mean throwing away most or all of the information concerning occupation of that site” (Heath and Bennett 2000:46). While plowing compromises the vertical provenience of plow zone artifacts, their horizontal displacement is limited enough to permit valid interpretations of the data (Roper 1976:372-375). By using plow zone data to analyze artifact distributions across a site, researchers can locate both substantial features beneath the plow zone as well as activity
areas within the historic landscape. The key to making these interpretations is to record precise provenience data of the recovered plow zone artifacts. What follows is a discussion of this lack of precise recording at the Mount Pleasant service complex site.

In 1997, a backhoe operator who was inexperienced with stripping plow zone for archaeological sites was employed for the task. The plow zone soil was stripped from a 50 x 70 ft. area (OP1) just east of the Madison family cemetery in 10 x 25 ft. sections. This process created 14 large units. Each 250 sq. ft. section of plow zone was pushed into a pile along the edge of the site. Archaeologists designated each 10 x 25 ft. section as a provenience unit and numbered them MT200 to MT213, moving west across the site with the odd numbers lining the northern half of the site. Each plow zone pile was labeled accordingly and the 1997 field school students, along with various K–12 school groups that made visits to the site that summer, screened soil from several of these piles. No documentation exists as to why certain piles were screened and others were not; however, it is known that no pile was ever screened in its entirety that season. Due to the lack of screening documentation, it is impossible to make an approximation of how much plow zone soil was screened.

Staff archaeologists clearly had no plan for the treatment of the massive amount of plow zone soil removed during OP1. A not-to-scale sketch was drawn in the master field notebook showing each pile at the end of its respective unit. Likewise, no photograph of the piles in this arrangement exists. At an unknown point in time, the southern piles were moved across the site and lined up alongside the northern piles. A photograph of this arrangement does exist. One of my initial tasks was to determine at what date and with what rationale the piles were moved. No records—either written or
photographic—survive to provide any information as to when, why, or how the piles were relocated. With this move, the maintenance of the already limited stratigraphic control may have been additionally compromised. Once rearranged, wooden stakes were hammered into the ground at the edge of each pile designating its original unit number in permanent ink. While at the time this may have seemed a permanent way to mark these piles, by the time Dr. Reeves arrived at the site in 2000, the markers were gone. As a consequence, no provenience data existed for as-yet unscreened plow zone artifacts.

Seven unmarked plow zone piles have continued to be screened to the present day. They have been used as an educational resource for visiting school groups who participate in Montpelier’s archaeology presentation by allowing students, while being closely monitored by archaeological staff, to find plenty of historically significant artifacts within the screens. Due to the abundance of artifacts recovered, there was a great desire by Dr. Reeves and myself to identify the provenience of each plow zone pile in relation to their respective units in order to strengthen the analytical studies; however, this task proved unsuccessful. The artifacts found in the plow zone piles have been carefully washed and catalogued and have assisted in the overall interpretation of the site; however, due to their lack of provenience data they have been omitted from the more scientific analyses of site materials.

As previously mentioned, though the majority of Mount Pleasant’s plow zone soil has been rendered useless for scientific analyses, some portions of the plow zone piles were screened and properly recorded. Also, because the backhoe did not remove the plow zone in its entirety, almost an entire field season was dedicated to the non-mechanized removal of the remaining plow zone. In addition, plow zone soil from the
1987 field season was properly recorded. All of this data was able to be manipulated and assisted with the interpretation of the site. Overall, the amount of plow zone screened from OP1 at Mount Pleasant most likely represents a 5–10 percent sampling strategy which—in this author’s opinion—is less than ideal considering the value currently placed on the importance of plow zone data previously discussed. Although the mechanized removal of the plow zone and the handling of the soil piles was a misfortune, it was not the only hindrance to the analysis of the plow zone data.

The 1997 field season uncovered several substantial features in OP1, including a large stone-lined kitchen cellar (Feature 42) and a large borrow pit (Feature 54), in addition to the previously identified root cellar (Feature 53). Beginning with the 1998 field season and to handle the newly unearthed features, the original test units containing them were decreased in size. The two large units containing Feature 42, MT201 and MT203, were subdivided into four smaller units, two of which measured 10 x 10 ft. (i.e., MT203 and MT211) and two of which were 10 x 15 ft. (i.e., MT201 and MT213) (See Figure 8 on page 41). The same process of subdivision was undertaken on Features 53 and 54. This change in designation added six units to OP1. At this time, plow zone soil still existed around the features; therefore, this process increased the complexity of analyzing OP1’s plow zone data.

As discussed in Chapter 1, Mount Pleasant had three distinct periods of occupation with three different groups of inhabitants. One area of interest for current researchers was to analyze the changes in landscape usage over time. One way to detect patterns in land use is by comparing the prevalence of certain artifact classes between particular areas of a site. Once artifacts recovered from the plow zone of a site are
entered into a database, one methodology to analyze spatial distribution is to generate
three-dimensional Surfer plots\(^6\) (cross-tabulated against temporal indicators). Because
there was such a distinct shift in residency at Mount Pleasant in the 1760s—from the
Madison family's occupation to a solely African-American occupation—it was thought
that that shift would be discernible in sub-surface cultural strata as clear land use patterns.

At first, this task seemed straightforward and Surfer plots were generated for all
the ceramics designated as having come from Stratum A. However, some strange
patterns occurred, suggesting heavy artifact concentrations in several of the 10 x 25 ft.
units in OP1. This led to two realizations: one, not all of the plow zone piles were
screened identically and two, the units were too large to meaningfully track artifact
concentrations. The Surfer application used only 14 grid points\(^7\) to plot concentrations
across an area that, had it consisted of 5 x 5 ft. units, would have had 140 grid points,
thus diluting the plow zone artifact concentrations. It was suggested that a 5 x 5 ft. grid
be retroactively superimposed over OP1 in hopes of getting a better read from the Surfer
plots by better distributing the data across the site. This grid would also allow artifacts
recovered from loci surrounding the main excavation block, as well as those recovered
from the 1987 units, to be used. But first, the Stratum A data had to be distinguished.

When new units were designated in 1998, plow zone data came from three
sources: from the plow zone piles, from the original large test units, and from the
subsequent, smaller unit designations that were effectively quarters of the original units.
All plow zone soil was designated as Stratum A, including plow zone pile soil along with

---

\(^6\) Surfer software is a contouring and three-dimensional surface mapping program that quickly and easily
converts data into contour, surface, wireframe, vector, image, shaded relief, and post maps. http://www.ssg-

\(^7\) Grid points tie into a site's layout by using each unit's north and east coordinates.
hand excavated plow zone. Both were recorded as MT201A and entered into the
database as such; therefore, the first task was to figure out which artifacts came from
plow zone piles and which came from the actual units. The inventory number system
used at the time assigned a new inventory number each day, regardless of whether the
artifacts were being recovered from the same unit and stratum on subsequent days.
Because new numbers were assigned each day, it was possible to make a designation
between plow zone dirt from the piles and from the units. Designations were also
accomplished partly by sorting old artifact bags to look for ones labeled as having come
from the “plow zone pile” and by matching excavation dates on the bags to plow zone
pile excavation dates mentioned in the field notebooks. Once plow zone pile artifacts
could be identified, they were labeled as such in the database, with a PZP (plow zone
pile) extension. The next distinction to be made was between the plow zone removed
from the large MT201 as opposed to the new, small MT201 by verifying dates of
excavation against the date the units were redesignated. Once all the various plow zone
data was properly clarified, a 5 x 5 ft. grid was superimposed over OP1 and
 corresponding northing and easting grid points were entered for each unit. To handle the
discrepancy in unit size, a column was added to the database that provides the total 5 x 5
ft. unit count for each larger expanse excavated. For instance, the 10 x 15 ft. unit MT201
was subdivided into six 5 x 5 ft. units, while the 10 x 10 ft. MT203 was subdivided into
four 5 x 5 ft. units. This 5 x 5 ft. unit designator was divided into the total amount of
artifacts contained within the unit in order to equalize the spread of artifacts from
different sized units and to provide more points for the Surfer program to plot.
With all the plow zone data indicators entered into the database—including 140 total grid points to be mapped—new Surfer plots were generated. Plots were generated for early- and late-dating ceramics, wine bottle glass, and window glass. As illustrated in Figures 1 and 2, the additional effort to manipulate the plow zone data and provide more points for the Surfer software to plot failed to provide a more even distribution of artifacts. Each figure shows concentrations of ceramics in several of the 10 x 25 ft. units. These concentrations were not limited to the ceramic distributions but were also reflected in the plots of wine bottle and window glass. While it was hoped that superimposing a 5 x 5 ft. grid over OP1 might even out the unit concentrations for a better read, the Surfer plots proved otherwise. Each generated plot showed similar concentrations in clear unit designations, so rather than leading to any valuable site interpretations, the plots only illustrated that certain units were more heavily sampled than others.

However, Surfer plots are not the only way to analyze spatial distributions on an archaeological site. As discussed in Chapter 4 of Reeves, ed. (2005), a much simpler analysis was done comparing quantities of ceramic sherds with regards to their date of manufacture between various excavation units (See Table 2). This analysis proved much more successful in detecting the hypothesized land use shift from Occupation Period II to Occupation Period III. The Madison’s occupation of the site was its most intensive period, and yet it is represented by only about 10% of the ceramic assemblage. Nearly “three-quarters of the 3,600 ceramic sherds recovered from the plow zone date to the last quarter of the 18th century” (Reeves, ed. 2005:n.p.) Why would so few artifacts be recovered from such an intensive occupation period? Current interpretation holds that

---

8 For this analysis, early-dating ceramics refer to the pre-1760s period and late-dating ceramics refer to the post-1760s period.
during the Madison’s occupation of the site, the service complex yard, especially the area between the main house and the detached kitchen was kept clean and free of debris. However, when the Madison’s relocated, the main house was intentionally burned and the enslaved laborers left behind clearly began to use the yard to the east of the detached kitchen more extensively.9

It was hypothesized that a shift in land usage patterns might be detected through the comparison of early-dating ceramics to late-dating ceramics. Although Surfer plots only revealed concentrations in several of the 10 x 25 ft. units, a simpler analysis of sherd count by unit and date revealed a major shift in land usage between Occupation Period II and Occupation Period III. The Surfer plots confirmed heavy concentrations of domestic debris throughout all periods of occupation against a fence that ran north-south in the western part of OP1 between the service complex and the family cemetery, just south of the root cellar, and just west of the north wall of the detached kitchen. This area, away from the direct view of the main house appears to have been used as a midden throughout the entire occupation of the site. However, once the Madison’s relocated to their new home and their old house was burned, the enslaved laborers still in residence at Mount Pleasant began to utilize not only the area to the west of the detached kitchen as an activity area, but also the area to the east.

9 For more information regarding land usage of the service complex, see Chapter 4 in Montpelier, The Archaeology of the Madison Family Plantation 1723-1844 (Reeves, ed. 2005)
TABLE 2
CERAMICS BY UNIT/LOCUS AND PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>&lt;&gt;</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>I or II</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205/207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207/209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Units with sherd counts of less than 20 were excluded from this table.
FIGURE 1

INITIAL SURFER PLOT OF EARLY DATING CERAMICS FROM PLOW ZONE
FIGURE 2
SECOND SURFER PLOT OF EARLY DATING CERAMICS FROM PLOW ZONE

This is the Surfer plot generated after using the 5 x 5 ft. designators to equalize unit size and to give the software more grid points for plotting.
As has been illustrated, the original archaeologists working at Mount Pleasant had no research questions in mind to determine the best course of action for excavating the site, nor did they have a clear execution plan to effectively deal with the 3,500 sq. ft. of plow zone soil subsequently removed from OP1 and the artifacts contained therein. They chose to mechanically remove a massive amount of soil, rather than take the time to manually excavate a manageable amount of standard test units, which could have been properly sampled. The haphazard screening of plow zone soil is clearly illustrated in the heavy unit concentrations appearing in the Surfer plots. However, analyzing the properly recorded plow zone soil data from the Mount Pleasant service complex revealed a major shift in land usage in the yard space at the Madison’s first homestead on the Montpelier property.

With clear research objectives and the right planning, mechanical removal of plow zone soil might be the best method for the investigation of some sites, especially those with time constraints. One such instance includes a Phase III data recovery project completed by the William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research (WMCAR) used mechanical stripping, but only after a controlled sampling of the plow zone had occurred (Higgins et al. 2000). Another Phase III recovery effort by WMCAR used mechanical stripping to remove backfill from a previously opened area (Higgins and Downing 1993). In each case, mechanical stripping allowed researchers to gain quick access to sub-surface features; however, the stripping did not occur before a controlled sampling of the area took place. Only six STPs were excavated in the immediate area of Mount Pleasant prior to mechanical stripping (Lewis, personal communication 2004). The lack of extensive plow zone sampling prior to the mechanical removal at Mount
Pleasant led to the contextual loss of an extreme amount of data. All artifacts recovered from the plow zone piles have been washed and catalogued, but due to the loss of provenience cannot be used for meaningful interpretive purposes. The handling of Mount Pleasant's mechanically removed plow zone, along with the random and varied amounts of screening from unit to unit, clearly illustrates the importance of a well-planned excavation and the consequences that result without one.

THE LOCUS/LOT SYSTEM

Beginning with the 1998 field season, attention shifted to the substantial features that had been located the previous season. To focus on these features, the archaeological team at Mount Pleasant decided to switch from a standard excavation system using test units and strata, to using loci and lots.\textsuperscript{10} As with the rapid removal of plow zone from OP1, this switch in excavation methodology illustrates the team's eagerness to excavate the sub-surface features without having to spend time completely excavating a test unit that only partially contained the feature. It also demonstrates their lack of commitment to a well thought out excavation strategy. The main problem with the use of the locus/lot system is that features are excavated in such a way that leaves no profile, thereby losing the ability to be able to analyze the relationships between various stratum. The rigorous, three-dimensional control that comes from excavating consistent and identically sized test units was completely lost with this system, and, more importantly, data collection from year to year was no longer consistent.

The rationale for using this system came from Tamarra Parker, who was trained to use this system while doing archaeological work in Turkey. The Locus/Lot system can be an effective way to excavate the remains of monumental structures in deeply buried

\textsuperscript{10} Loci are analogous to units and lots are analogous to strata.
rubble deposits (Reeves, personal communication, 2003b). However, Mount Pleasant was by no means a monumental site, and although a rubble-filled feature was unearthed, the application of the Locus/Lot system to the site created many more problems than it solved—of course these problems were encountered years later at the organizational, comparison, and analysis stages once fieldwork was terminated.

To start, each large MT unit and each feature was redesignated with a locus number. For instance, Feature 42 became Locus 42. Unlike standard excavations where a feature might be excavated separately in different units, each feature under the Locus/Lot system was excavated as its own entity. This left the large square or rectangular MT units surrounding the features irregularly shaped. With each feature having been excavated as a single entity, each stratum was almost always removed in its entirety. This method of excavation left no clear profiles with which to analyze the stratigraphy of the feature.

Looking at a photograph of Locus 42 (Figure 3), the detached kitchen’s cellar, it is clear to most archaeologists that the top layer is a uniform rubble/destruction layer, yet it was interpreted by its excavators as representing 36 discrete strata.¹¹ When adopting standard excavation techniques, this feature should have been excavated in the separate test units in which it was found; however, it was designated as its own locus (or unit) and this one rubble layer was excavated in 36 separate lots. Standard field practice in historical archaeology also dictates that strata are most often designated vertically as you

---

¹¹ It should be noted that the excavation of Feature 42, the detached kitchen cellar, and Feature 54, the large borrow pit, were not completed by the original staff archaeologists. After 2000, Dr. Matthew Reeves, along with staff archaeologists and field school students, completed the excavation and analysis of Feature 42 and partially completed the excavation and analysis of Feature 54. For every error made by the earlier staff in excavating and recording the top strata of these features, Dr. Reeves' staff properly excavated and recorded the deeper strata using standard test units that allowed each feature to be profiled both in width and length. These excavations generated useful data for site interpretation.
work your way down through a feature. Using the Locus/Lot system, many of the lots were designated horizontally across the feature in randomly amorphous shapes.

Documentation in the field notebooks gives no indication that even slight differences between the lots, such as size of rubble, existed. There is no explanation why one rubble layer of Locus 42 was separated 36 times or how each lot’s shape was determined.

Stratum cards normally provide all the necessary information to be able to recreate the layer’s size, shape, texture, and contents. Unfortunately, the stratum cards for most of the 36 lots of Locus 42 recorded no horizontal dimensions or elevations—which makes it extremely difficult to reconstruct these deposits and their formation processes.

Typically, a strata’s description is not only recorded on a card, but is also documented with a photograph, a plan view drawing, and sometimes a profile drawing. Since the stratum cards for Locus 42 offered little insight, it was thought that photographs might provide some additional information. But when viewing a photograph of a particular lot, such as Lot 2 from Locus 42, it is indistinguishable from the surrounding lots because they are all technically the same layer. It would have been helpful if archaeologists had defined the boundaries of each lot with brightly colored string in order for the photograph to be of some use.
FIGURE 3
LOCUS (FEATURE) 42: THE PARTIALLY EXCAVATED DETACHED KITCHEN CELLAR
FIGURE 4

LOCUS (FEATURE) 42 LOT 2: INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM ITS SURROUNDINGS
FIGURE 5
SKETCH OF FEATURE 42 FROM MASTER FIELD NOTEBOOK WITH OVERLAY
OF INTERPRETIVE CONTEXTS
Few plan view drawings exist for the lots of Locus 42. Several sketches of Locus 42 were found in the master field notebook that illustrated the various lots as they were being designated, yet they were not drawn to scale and their dimensions were not recorded. Under ideal circumstances, stratum cards, photographs, and plan drawings should provide future researchers much to work with in terms of recreating various parts of an excavation. The documentation of Locus 42, among other features, however, was so imprecise that detailed analysis of the rubble layer was largely impossible, although meaningful analysis was accomplished as related to the site as a whole, and, more specifically, as related to the main house’s cellar.

An attempt was made to assess and compare artifact assemblages across the rubble layer of Locus 42. The first task was to make sense of the 36 lots within the kitchen cellar. I decided to separate the cellar into four interpretive contexts (Figure 5)—the bulkhead, the center section, the south wall, and the west wall—and two depths by assigning each lot a location and depth. The depth analysis quickly proved unsuccessful due to the lack of recorded data regarding each lot’s closing elevations. By organizing the random lots into specific sections, I had hoped that spatial and temporal relationships between areas and events could be ascertained. Again, it was not long before it became apparent that a lack of proper documentation hindered even such a basic analysis.

Analyses that suffered as a result of the improper excavation and recording techniques of Locus 42 included pinpointing the location of a chimney fall to further define the look of the structure and pinpointing the location of ceramic concentrations that may have helped to interpret specific activity areas within the structure. An attempt was made to analyze architectural materials recovered from each lot to look for a
concentrated area of brick rubble designating the chimney fall, and thus the location of the chimney. Unfortunately, the sampling of architectural materials had been extremely inconsistent from lot to lot, making it difficult to compare concentrations of brick to mortar to plaster between the four contexts. The results of ceramic cross-mending completed by Dr. Reeves’ staff members were analyzed in hopes of distinguishing unique strata that contained the majority of ceramics, as well as locating any specific concentrations of ceramics within the rubble layer that may have designated an activity area. However, analysis proved unable to distinguish any unique strata or activity areas. This is either because layering within the rubble was indistinguishable or because excavation technique failed to distinguish, and thus record, any unique strata. While ceramic cross-mending was helpful for analyzing relationships between features across the site, the lack of information regarding lot size within Locus 42 made it difficult to accurately assess artifact concentrations as quantities per soil volume for each of the four contexts.

As has been illustrated using examples from Feature 53, the plow zone, and Feature 42, the excavations that took place at the Mount Pleasant service complex during the late 1980s had several minor errors while the excavations that took place during the late 1990s were fraught with errors. These mistakes included a lack of proper recording, sampling, and excavation techniques, as well as the apparent absence of a research design guiding the work. Some of these errors were minor, such as not recording a closing elevation for Feature 53, which may be remedied by removing the backfill and reassessing the bottom of the feature. However, other errors were far more serious—errors such as the impermanent marking of 14 plow zone piles, which resulted in the loss
of context for the majority of the data collected from the site and which is something that cannot be remedied by reexcavation. Chapter 2 serves to reinforce the importance of having a carefully defined plan and research design for the excavation of historical sites by discussing the details of an excavation that was conducted without a well-defined plan (which includes the use of a consistent methodology and the recording of all pertinent details throughout), and by exploring some of the creative ideas that were used to interpret the data set from such an excavation. Despite the number of errors made and the considerable frustration they caused subsequent investigators, a number of important insights could be generated about the service complex based on the properly recorded data from the site. These interpretations are discussed in Chapter 3.
CHAPTER 3
THE MOUNT PLEASANT SERVICE COMPLEX:
AN INTERPRETATION

Eighteenth-century plantation service complexes typically included buildings such as kitchens, dairies, smokehouses, slave quarters, and other industrial-type structures such as blacksmithing shops, granaries, and tobacco barns (Kelso 1984:129; Lewis 1985:38; Hudgins 1990:66-67). The Mount Pleasant service complex consists of features initially discovered in the late 1980s and late 1990s. These features include a series of buildings and fences that were associated with the main plantation home occupied by members of the Madison family from the early 1730s to the early 1760s. To date, a kitchen, a slave quarter, an outbuilding of unknown function, and a fence line have been identified at the Mount Pleasant service complex. Ongoing excavations are likely to reveal additional utilitarian farm structures, yards, and work spaces and the activities that occurred within them.

Research for this interpretation focused on the excavations that were completed in the late 1980s and late 1990s at the Mount Pleasant service complex (Recording). However, Feature 42 (the detached kitchen) and Feature 54 (the borrow pit) continued to be excavated under the direction of Dr. Matthew Reeves, in addition to Feature 100, a stone-lined cellar located within the Madison’s main residence at Mount Pleasant. The data derived under Dr. Reeves’ direction provided a controlled set against which to compare and contrast the OP1 data set. The interpretation of the service complex which
follows includes the use of data from both the earlier excavations and those completed by
Dr. Reeves beginning in 2000.

As discussed in Chapter 1, the Mount Pleasant service complex saw use for nearly
60 years. Three distinct periods of occupation were identified for the site. During Period
I, from the early 1720s to the early 1730s, the site was occupied by an overseer hired by
the Madisons and a group of slaves who were sent in advance to prepare the land and
build the plantation complex. Unfortunately, no written evidence survives to document
the experience of this overseer. Period II marked the occupation of the site by the
Madison family, presumably along with their enslaved domestic help, from the early
1730s to the 1760s. Twenty-nine slaves are recorded in the 1732 probate inventory of
Ambrose Madison: 10 men, 5 women, and 14 children; however, there is no indication
how many of these slaves were domestic help and how many were field hands
(Spotsylvania County Will Book A, pp.183–186). Reeves suggests that by the 1740s the
Madisons may have owned between 30–50 slaves (Reeves 2004:3). Period III began in
the 1760s when the Madisons relocated to a new, Georgian-style mansion approximately
¼ of a mile away from the Mount Pleasant site. For the next 30 years, until the 1790s,
the service complex area was occupied by as-yet unidentified African Americans owned
by the Madison family. Specific features can be identified, interpreted, and associated
with each occupational period. This information is the subject of the current chapter.
FIGURE 6

PLAN VIEW OF OP1 EXCAVATION BLOCK AT MOUNT PLEASANT SHOWING THE FENCE LINE, ROOT CELLAR, BORROW PIT, KITCHEN CELLAR, AND ALL EXCAVATED UNITS
FIGURE 7

PLAN VIEW OF OP1 EXCAVATION BLOCK AT MOUNT PLEASANT SHOWING UNITS EXCAVATED IN 1987
FIGURE 8
PLAN VIEW OF OP1 EXCAVATION BLOCK AT MOUNT PLEASANT SHOWING UNITS EXCAVATED IN 1997
OCCUPATION PERIOD I (1720s–1730s)

Period I consisted of the first 10 years of occupation from the early 1720s to the early 1730s. In 1723, Ambrose Madison, President James Madison’s grandfather, sent an overseer and a group of slaves to carve out a plantation complex on his newly acquired land. Upon arrival at this Piedmont property, they were faced with the task of clearing the forested land and constructing a plantation from scratch, including building a main residence for the family and all the associated outbuildings necessary for a functioning and profitable plantation, as well as clearing vast areas of land to be used for agricultural fields. This preparation continued for a span of ten years.

Regarding the landscape of early 18th-century Virginia, Carter Hudgins writes “One important fact has been made irrefutably clear. That is, Virginia was in the first decades of the eighteenth century, as it had been in the seventeenth century and as it remained until recently, a land of small wooden houses” (Hudgins 1990:66). Dell Upton describes the houses of Virginia slaves as “ordinarily wooden buildings, as often as not post-built...constructed of logs (Upton 1990:72).” The extensive research of Cary Carson et al. describes the prevalent earthfast construction of timber-framed dwellings throughout the 17th and early 18th centuries in Virginia (Carson et al. 1988). Camille Wells’ analysis of Virginia Gazette property advertisements further supports the theory that wooden structures in 18th-century Virginia structures were commonplace (Wells 1993:9). As demonstrated by these studies, it is likely that early structures at Mount Pleasant were most likely log dwellings built to house the overseer and slaves who were constructing the plantation complex.
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SLAVE QUARTERS AT ROCK HALL (N.D.), DICKERSON VICINITY,
FREDERICK COUNTY, MARYLAND

These early log structures were not meant to be permanent structures on the landscape, but temporary ones that could be constructed relatively quickly and inexpensively to serve the purpose of providing shelter (Sobel 1987:115-116). As discussed in Chapter 2, evidence for one of these dwellings was present in the form of a small root cellar (Feature 53) which was found during archaeological surveying in the late 1980s and was revisited again in the late 1990s (Lewis and Parker 1988; Lewis 1992; Reeves 2001). Another feature associated with Period I is a large borrow pit (Feature 54) that was used for clay extraction. The likely utility of this feature was that clays extracted from it were used as nogging during the construction of the detached kitchen, the main house, and possibly the structure surrounding Feature 53, the root cellar.

**The Root Cellar**

Because many 18th-century structures were impermanent and left no visible footprint in the subsoil of archaeological sites, the presence of root cellars is one of the most common indicators of where a structure once stood. Their widespread presence on slave sites throughout Virginia has been documented at many sites including Monticello (Kelso 1997), Poplar Forest (Heath 1999), Kingsmill (Kelso 1984), Flowerdew Hundred (Deetz 1995), Wilton Plantation (Higgins III et al. 2000), and Shadwell plantation (Kern 1995). An 18th-century slave quarter at the Randolph’s Wilton Plantation in Henrico County, Virginia, was defined by a series of closely spaced sub-floor pits that often had straight sides, flat bottoms, and some that were lined with boards (e.g., Higgins III et al. 2000: 144). These pits ranged in size from 3.6 x 4.6 ft. to 3.2 x 9.8 ft., and were from 3—5 ft. deep. At Jefferson’s Shadwell plantation located in piedmont Virginia, one 18th-century slave quarter was defined on the basis of a large root cellar six feet square and
four feet deep and due to the lack of structural elements such as post holes or sills, Kern suggests it was perhaps a log building (Kern 1995:8). In the late 1980s, Montpelier staff archaeologists dug a series of test pits near the Madison family cemetery less than one mile northwest of the Montpelier mansion. Three of these test pits revealed a roughly rectangular 6 x 8 ft. root cellar. Due to its commonality with other 18th-century Virginia slave sites, current interpretation holds that this root cellar is indicative of an early slave dwelling at Mount Pleasant. Other than their presence on early 18th-century archaeological sites in Virginia, what is common to all of these quarters is the absence of architectural features in the surrounding subsoil to help define the shape and dimensions of the structures they once accompanied.

Because the majority of the Madison’s 2,850-acre tract of piedmont land was forested, many trees had to be felled in order to create the plantation complex and its agricultural fields. This plenitude of available wood provided an excellent resource for the construction of plantation structures. As previously discussed, research on 18th-century Virginia architecture supports the idea that these dwellings were impermanent wooden structures designed to be built quickly and inexpensively. These were crude structures, often with sparse amounts of furniture and little in the way of storage space. Under these circumstances, root cellars were used by the inhabitants to store their food, and, perhaps, to stash their more cherished personal belongings, the occasional pilfered item, or spiritual items (Heath 1999:37).
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FEATURE 53: THE ROOT CELLAR
As discussed in Chapter 2, some questions remain as to whether or not the excavation of Feature 53 was completed (i.e., taken to sterile subsoil). However, until a reexcavation is undertaken, the current interpretation claims that the cellar fill was deposited in one episode as a mixture of household, architectural, and destruction debris from an intense fire that destroyed the associated structure sometime in the 1740s. Artifacts recovered from this cellar include tin-glazed and slip-glazed earthenware, Rhenish stoneware, hand-wrought nails, wine bottle glass, burned window glass, charred wood, eggshell, and architectural stone and brick. All of the artifacts recovered from the cellar date to the first half of the 18th century, thus dating the destruction of the structure by fire to that period, circa the 1740s. Due to this interpretation, the structure surrounding the root cellar predates both the kitchen and the main house. The presence of vast quantities of household items leads to the inference that the structure was occupied at the time of the fire. The presence of a large amount of window glass lends support to the theory that this structure was a dwelling, as opposed to some other type of unoccupied plantation outbuilding.

**The Large Borrow Pit**

Another feature present on the landscape during Period I of occupation was a large borrow pit located just eight feet east of the root cellar. This feature was roughly rectangular, 12 ft. x 18 ft. in dimension, and 2.5 ft. deep from the bottom of the plow zone. A similar pit was found at Poplar Forest where it was interpreted as having been used "to extract clay...to line a wooden chimney or to provide chinking for walls or mud mortar for stone piers supporting the sill (Heath 1999:41). This function of clay
extraction used for construction purposes is the current interpretation for the borrow pit found at Mount Pleasant.

The borrow pit was filled with three distinct clay layers; the topmost layer had a yellowish limonite clay that Reeves believes to have been from a deeply buried source (Reeves 2003). Most construction mortar found on archaeological sites tends to be white in color; however, the mortar recovered from both the detached kitchen and the main house at Mount Pleasant was yellow. The source of this yellow clay is unknown, but upon completion of the two structures, it seems the builders disposed of the remaining limonite clay by dumping it into the open borrow pit. The yellow clay was the topmost intact layer of the pit not affected by plowing and the disposal of the remaining yellow clay left its surface level with the bottom of the plow zone. Due to the post-occupational plowing of this area, the original topmost layer(s) of the pit cannot be distinguished.
FIGURE 11

FEATURE 54: THE LARGE BORROW PIT, PARTIALLY EXCAVATED
Burned artifacts found throughout the borrow pit’s fill lend support to the theory that the pit was filled in rapid succession, despite the presence of distinct layers within the feature. More specifically, almost all of the burned ceramics recovered from the fill provide evidence that the pit was filled as early as the 1730s, the time at which the Madison family would have relocated to the plantation. Ceramic types such as tin-glazed earthenware, North Devon gravel tempered ware, and Rhenish stoneware comprised the majority of sherds recovered from the fill. Several later dating sherds were recovered from the fill but were found in the layer closest to the plow zone, therefore not weakening the early-fill theory. Recent cross-mending data from the root cellar and the large borrow pit contexts prove that these features were contemporaneous, as sherds from each feature mend into one vessel. This fact, along with the early dating fill of the borrow pit and the knowledge that the first structure surrounding the root cellar burned sometime in the 1730s, provide strong support for the theory that the structure’s burned remains were pushed into the borrow pit.

*OCCUPATION PERIOD II (1730s–1760s)*

Period II began with the relocation of the Madison family from their Tidewater home to their new Piedmont plantation in the early 1730s. By the time the Madisons arrived at Mount Pleasant, the plantation would have been complete and consisted of a main residential home and associated outbuildings, including a detached kitchen. The initial log structure accidentally burned down during this period, though the exact date of the fire cannot be determined. Evidence for the main house and detached kitchen exists in the form of large stone-lined cellars. Artifactual analysis of these features reveals that these structures were more refined than the original dwellings at the plantation and they
appear to have been constructed with post-and-beam framing atop stone foundations with at least partially finished interior walls. The main residence and detached kitchen most likely resembled typical colonial construction (See Figure 10) with stone foundations, clapboard siding, paned windows, shutters, and at least one chimney. A post-set structure surrounding the root cellar was also in existence at this time. Another feature on the landscape during Period II was a fence along the western edge of the excavation block that separated the service complex from the family cemetery. Also likely in existence during Period II, but as yet undiscovered by archaeologists, would have been a number of additional plantation dependencies such as slave quarters, dairies, smokehouses, barns, and stables.

**The Detached Kitchen’s Cellar**

The largest and most complex feature found in Mount Pleasant’s service complex area was the detached kitchen’s cellar. A 12 x 13 ft. area of stone and brick rubble with a 5 ft. x 5 ft. bulkhead entrance located in the center of the northern wall of OP1 was uncovered beneath the plow zone. (See Figure 3 for picture of kitchen cellar.) An intact, straight stone wall existed on the eastern side of the feature while all the other sides were rounded from slumpage of the original stone walls into the void of the cellar hole. The large destruction layer was explained by the masses of burned artifacts recovered from the rubble leading to the theory that an intense fire, similar to the one responsible for destroying the root cellar’s structure, destroyed the detached kitchen. Dateable artifacts recovered from the detached kitchen date the fire to sometime in the 1790s.
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SKETCH OF A TYPICAL SOUTHERN COLONIAL HOME

Although an intact stone wall remained on the east side of the cellar, evidence of a collapsed stone wall was found beneath the destruction layer on the west side of the feature along with a series of post holes. When the stone support on the western side of the structure collapsed, the structure remained intact; however, some form of replacement support for the sill was needed. The presence of post holes along this wall supports the interpretation that rather than rebuild the stone lining, posts were erected to support the sill on the western side of the structure (Reeves 2003). No clay nogging or other wall materials were recovered from the excavation of strata beneath the burned rubble layer leading to the interpretation that the repair was left simply as exposed posts as opposed to a plaster finish (Reeves, ed. 2005).

Architectural materials recovered from the kitchen’s cellar lend credence to the theory that this structure was indeed a kitchen. As compared to architectural materials recovered from the main house, the kitchen cellar contained a much higher percentage of brick and mortar and a much lower percentage of nogging and plaster. The presence of a large amount of brick in a feature like this suggests the presence of a chimney with a hearth area. Although brick was recovered from the main house, including the rubble fall from a chimney, the amount of brick recovered there was much less than that from the kitchen cellar. This comparison of brick between the kitchen and the main house provides evidence of a large hearth area used for cooking meals in the detached kitchen. The low percentage of nogging and plaster in the detached kitchen cellar, as compared to the cellar of the main house, also lends support to the theory that this was an outbuilding associated with the main house, as the interior of this structure was not designed as a formal space with fully plastered interior walls. Although the presence of plaster and
nogging was found in higher quantities at the main house, its presence in both features supports the theory that these structures were more refined than the original slave dwellings at the site, having at least partially finished interior walls.

The detached kitchen’s cellar walls served as the foundation for the structure, while the cellar at the main house was located within the structure’s foundations; however, a stone-lined cellar of similar dimensions was present in each structure. From the outside, the detached kitchen and the main house most likely resembled typical early colonial homes with stone foundations, clapboard siding, paned windows, and shutters. No doubt these structures were purposefully designed to look similar in order to lend a unified look to the plantation complex as a whole. The similarity in construction materials and style certainly provides further support for the contention that these structures were contemporaneous and complemented one another.

**Post-Set Structure Surrounding Feature 53**

A series of post holes was discovered in the subsoil surrounding the root cellar indicating that some sort of structure was built around the cellar. The initial interpretation for these post holes was that they represented one of the earliest structures at Mount Pleasant. Because post-in-ground architecture was common in the early 18th-century, these post holes seemed to indicate this type of structure. Subsequent artifactual analysis of these features, however, tells a different story. Had these post holes been devoid of artifacts, the theory of a post-in-ground structure would have remained intact. However, just over half of the post holes (56%) contained burned artifacts, many of which were burned wine bottle glass fragments and melted window glass, leading to the
theory that the holes must have been dug after the 1730s fire that destroyed the original
dwelling; therefore, this structure post-dates the root cellar.

The post holes surrounding Feature 53 are irregularly shaped and spaced, yet they
create a rough rectangle approximately 15 x 30 ft. in dimension with a possible partition
wall across the center, dividing the space into two 15 x 15 ft. squares. While some
archaeological sites, like the Clifts Plantation, have nicely shaped square or round post
holes that are evenly spaced and create perfect geometric patterns in the ground (Neiman
1980:16), other sites, like Wilton Plantation and Shadwell plantation, have post holes that
are irregularly shaped and spaced and form only rough geometric figures in the subsoil
(Higgins III et al., 2000: 76; Kern, 1995).

Based on the presence of artifacts and their arrangement on the landscape, initial
interpretation of Mount Pleasant’s post holes argued that they were part of a fencing
system, either to protect a garden plot from free-ranging animals on the property (Miller
2001: 29) or to serve as an animal pen used to confine smaller livestock in the yard.
However, upon further consideration of their dimensions as compared to other sites in
Virginia, the theory that a second structure was built around the root cellar is supported.
Although these post holes were not in as perfect alignment as those found at an early
18th-century earthfast structure at Flowerdew Hundred (44PG98), for example, their
comparable size suggests that they held larger structural posts as opposed to smaller
fence posts (Deetz 1995:106-107). The main post holes around Feature 53 are
approximately 2 ft. in diameter which is similar to post holes for a comparable structure
found at site 44JC643, an 18th-century plantation site in Tidewater Virginia (Higgins III
and Downing 1993: 19).
Although the exact date of construction of the structure cannot be determined, its approximate time of appearance at Mount Pleasant can be surmised from the following factors. The presence of burned artifacts within the post holes’ fill suggests that they post-date the 1730s fire that destroyed the earlier log structure. A more significant factor is that the alignment of the post holes on the landscape matches that of the detached kitchen and the main house, suggesting that it was contemporaneous with Mount Pleasant’s other, more permanent, plantation structures (Reeves 2003). Because the structure is aligned with other significant features on the landscape and contains evidence from an early fire at Mount Pleasant, this structure was most likely constructed sometime in the 1730s, but after the fire that destroyed the initial log dwelling.

**The Fence Line**

In addition to the post holes surrounding the root cellar, another series of post holes was excavated along the western edge of the OP1 excavation block. While the post holes surrounding the root cellar ranged in size from 0.59 ft. to 2.5 ft., the post holes creating the fence line were smaller, ranging in size from 0.4 ft. to 1.47 ft. The fence line post holes were much more consistent in size, shape, and space when compared to the structural post holes surrounding the small root cellar. They appeared in pairs with approximately 10 feet between each set. Excavation of these post holes uncovered very few artifacts, and what artifacts were recovered consisted of small fragments of architectural materials, such as brick and mortar. The lack of artifacts present in these features suggests that this fence line was an early feature of the Mount Pleasant landscape prior to intense occupation of the site.
When research on these post holes began, it was thought that the second post hole in each pair represented a repair to the fence, or possibly the presence of a second fence constructed at a later date. Due to the high concentration of artifacts recovered from the plow zone in this area, it is likely that yard debris from years of occupation would have made its way into the second set of post holes. However, as discussed above, neither post hole in each set contained many artifacts. Another telling factor that these post holes were dug at the same time is that each post hole in a set had very similar depths and shapes. It is much easier to believe that a person digging two post holes at the same time would replicate the process consistently, as opposed to one post hole in each pair having been dug 20 years apart. Confident of the assumption that these post holes are contemporaneous, an interpretation of the fence’s appearance can be made.

While the worm fence (also known as the Virginia rail fence, the zigzag fence, and the snake fence, among other names) was highly popular throughout Colonial America during the 18th-century, it required a large amount of wood for construction and also consumed a lot of precious space (Nash 1997:11). The rail fence was another type of early colonial fence consisting of pairs of post holes approximately 10 feet apart with split rails stacked between them. It had several advantages: “Rail fencing anchored by paired, driven posts...made a strong fence that was more economical of materials and space than worm fencing” (Nash 1997:12). Evidence of rail fencing appears in a photograph taken at Montpelier in the early 1900s and may have resembled what was used at Mount Pleasant in the 18th century.
The Mount Pleasant site is located just northeast of the West Gate entrance to Montpelier. Note the rail fence along the left side of road.
OCCUPATION PERIOD III (1760s–1790s)

Occupation Period III began in the 1760s, when the Madison family relocated less than a mile away to their new, more prominent (and reflective of their social status) Georgian mansion named Montpelier. Mount Pleasant’s landscape during this period differed significantly from that of Occupation Period I. Specifically, by this time, a structure had been built in place of the original slave dwelling that had been destroyed by fire, the large borrow pit in the yard had been completely filled with debris from the burned quarter as well as with surplus construction materials, and the Madison family’s plantation home had been burned down intentionally—most likely due to its state of disrepair. Despite all these changes, archaeological research shows that the site continued to be occupied after the Madison’s departure, most likely by some of their enslaved African Americans.

The question remains as to who these occupants were. Perhaps they were field hands working the plantation or some of Frances Madison’s domestic slaves left behind when the Madison family relocated to Montpelier. It is unknown whether Frances Madison’s death in 1761 occurred before or after the Madison’s relocation. If the latter, it is possible that Frances remained at Mount Pleasant along with her domestic slaves and, upon her death, they may have been allowed to remain there. Nevertheless, some portion of the Madison’s enslaved African Americans continued to occupy the still-standing detached kitchen—and potentially other structures as yet undiscovered—at Mount Pleasant for another 30 years. These residents remained there until a fire in the 1790s destroyed the detached kitchen. After this fire, Mount Pleasant and its immediate area were abandoned and any remaining structures were most likely razed—as this area is
known to have reverted back to agricultural use at that time. It should also be noted that archaeological survey has detected evidence of an additional complex to the south of Mount Pleasant which could reflect an overseer’s complex illustrated on an 1844 land plat of the Montpelier property (Orange County, Virginia, Deed Book 41, p. 46).

**OCCUPATIONAL SHIFTS AND THEIR REFLECTION IN THE LANDSCAPE**

The area known as Mount Pleasant was a hub of activity for the Madison family and their slaves for some 70 years before reversion back to agricultural use. Prior to the discovery of a root cellar in the late 1980s, the precise location of Mount Pleasant was unknown. Subsequent archaeological research around that cellar revealed a whole complex of structures, including the main residential home, located less than a mile away from Montpelier mansion and just east of the Madison family cemetery (Reeves 2001). As an archaeological site, Mount Pleasant was rich with artifactual debris attesting to almost 70 years of occupation. Along with the artifacts, many sub-surface features were left intact to be found 200 hundred years later by Montpelier staff archaeologists. Despite serious flaws in methodology during the excavation of the service complex site, these artifacts and features have helped to illuminate the story of Mount Pleasant in the absence of documentary evidence left by Madison heirs.

The three periods of occupation at Mount Pleasant marked major shifts in the status of its occupants and it was thought that the landscape might reflect those changes. In the beginning, the landowners remained at their Tidewater home in southeastern Virginia, sending an overseer and group of slaves to their Piedmont property. The enslaved African Americans are likely to have enjoyed the additional privacy gained by not living in close proximity to their master. During the first 10 years at Mount Pleasant,
Madison’s slaves appear to have had ample time to establish and maintain strong ties with slaves on neighboring plantations. These ties were made clear through a defining moment in the history of Mount Pleasant, namely, the murder by poisoning of their master, Ambrose Madison. This method of murder was by no means unique in the 18th century. Philip Morgan suggests that restive Africans in the piedmont may have accounted for the large amount of poisoning cases in colonial Virginia. He states that in the second half of the 18th century almost two-thirds of the slaves tried for poisoning in Virginia county courts resided in the piedmont (Morgan 1988:441). Perhaps after 10 years of relative freedom from the eyes of their master, Ambrose Madison’s slaves sought to strike back from his now watchful eyes.

Within six months of the Madison family’s arrival at Mount Pleasant in 1732, two of Ambrose’s own slaves, Turk and Dido, and one from a neighboring plantation, Pompey, conspired to and succeeded in murdering him by poisoning. Pompey, who was the property of Joseph Hawkins, was the only slave hanged for this act. Turk and Dido were punished by whipping, returned to Frances Madison, and spent the remainder of their days working at Mount Pleasant (Miller 2001:26–28). This event left Mount Pleasant in a unique situation, as one of the few large Virginia plantations to have been owned and operated by a female. Frances flourished in her role as plantation owner, perhaps in part due to the support of a sister and three brothers living within close proximity (Schlotterbeck 1980:16). In any event, Mount Pleasant grew to be a profitable plantation under her guidance. Her son, James Madison, Sr., eventually gained part-
ownership of the plantation. Frances, however, remained a strong presence in plantation operations until her death in 1761\textsuperscript{12} (Miller 2002:32).

A shift in occupation at Mount Pleasant occurred once again when the Madisons moved into their Georgian plantation house named Montpelier, leaving some enslaved African Americans distanced from their master at the Mount Pleasant complex. Although the Madison family was in closer proximity to their slaves during this period than during the initial occupation when the Madisons remained in the Tidewater, the slaves were at least removed from the direct oversight of their master and thus had more privacy in their daily lives.

How did these significant changes affect the Mount Pleasant landscape? Other 18\textsuperscript{th}-century Virginia plantation complexes, including Shadwell plantation (Kern 1995) and Clifts Plantation (Neiman 1980), retain evidence of fence lines demarcating the space between the landowner's yard and the enslaved African-Americans' quarters. One slave quarter's fence line at Poplar Forest provided evidence of a purposely placed yard facing away from the main house (Heath 1999:44). Even James Madison, Sr.'s Georgian landscape at Montpelier had brick walls segregating the area between his personal living space and that of his slaves (Reeves, ed., 2005:n.p.). However, archaeological research at Mount Pleasant conducted to date has yet to reveal evidence for such a demarcation. The 2003 field season uncovered several potential post holes in the area between the main house and the kitchen where a fence line may once have existed; however, further excavation needs to be undertaken in that area before a definitive interpretation can be

\textsuperscript{12} For more information on the female management of Mount Pleasant, see Chapter 1 in Montpelier, The Archaeology of the Madison Family Plantation 1723-1844 (Reeves, ed. 2005).
derived. The only clear fence line as yet unearthed separates the space between the service complex and the Madison family cemetery.

If a fence line did not exist between the main house and the service complex, why might the Madisons have chosen to keep their landscape open and discrete activity areas unmarked? Perhaps it had something to do with Ambrose's murder. His demise, by poison, condemned him to a slow, painful death (Miller 2001: 25). Although highly conjectural, it is possible that after their slaves were found guilty of the crime that the Madisons may have thought it best to keep the landscape open in order to retain control over the everyday actions of their slaves and not allow them even the modest measure of privacy that a fence would afford. Other changes to the landscape that occurred during the Madison's occupation of Mount Pleasant included the burning and destruction of the original slave dwelling, the construction of a new structure around the root cellar, and the filling in of the large borrow pit.

The third and final shift in occupation occurred when the Madisons moved into their new home up the hill from Mount Pleasant. Archaeological research and analysis of Mount Pleasant's main residence shows that this structure was intentionally burned to the ground shortly after the relocation. Current interpretation suggests that their earlier home was purposefully burned due to its state of disrepair. Because no substantial construction hardware was recovered from the feature, it is thought that these items were stripped from the structure prior to the fire in order to reuse and recycle them in other structures on the property. With this structure removed from the landscape and the watchful eye of the Madisons gone from sight, it was hypothesized that a major shift in land usage would
have occurred. Archaeological investigations provide evidence of one such shift during Occupation Period III.

Changing patterns in land use can be detected by comparing the prevalence of artifacts between particular areas of a site. As discussed in Chapter 2, it was hoped that Surfer plots of artifact concentrations would attest to a distinct shift in residency at Mount Pleasant in the 1760s and that this shift would be reflected in the land use patterns. However, Surfer plots of early-dating and late-dating ceramics recovered from the plow zone at Mount Pleasant show that the highest concentration of domestic debris throughout all periods of occupation was located against the north-south running fence in the western part of the complex. This concentration is perhaps due to that particular unit’s plow zone soil having been more intensively screened than other units. However, if the plot shows an accurate distribution, then occupants of Mount Pleasant throughout the years used this area of the fence line as a midden. While Surfer plots showed consistent use of the site, a simpler analysis of ceramic sherd counts by unit and date shows a large scatter of late-dating ceramics during Occupation Period III throughout the entire excavation block. This analysis supported the theory that land usage patterns would have changed once the Madisons moved away from Mount Pleasant and the enslaved laborers left behind would have enjoyed more autonomy to use the area as they wished.

This major shift in land use was also detected through archaeological excavations at the main house. These excavations have revealed a substantial ashy layer over one foot thick filled with burned artifacts, including bone and eggshell, which are indicative of hearth sweepings (Reeves, ed. 2005:n.p.). It appears that residents of the detached
kitchen began dumping their hearth sweepings on top of the destruction layer of the main residence. During the Madison's occupation, the yard between the main house and the detached kitchen was kept clean, with trash being dumped out of their sight along the western fence line. However, Occupation Period III shows that the residents of the detached kitchen began using the remains of the main house and the eastern yard area as yet another midden area.

As previously discussed, evidence for a overseer/slave dwelling was located at Mount Pleasant and, more than likely, a number of these structures were once present. However, 10 years after the Madisons arrived at Mount Pleasant, at least one of these structures caught fire and burned to the ground. A recent shovel test pit survey conducted near Mount Pleasant detected another concentration of 18th-century artifacts that most likely represents another area of slave housing associated with the site (Reeves, ed. 2005:n.p.). While the Madisons needed their domestic slaves in close proximity to their house, the field hands and skilled workers that originally came to the property did not need to remain permanently at the service complex. Future research at Montpelier will focus on the newly discovered slave quarter site, which may prove to illustrate yet another shift in the landscape as slaves other than the domestic help were moved into quarters just south and across a historic road trace from the Mount Pleasant plantation complex.

Throughout Mount Pleasant's 70 years of occupation, the landscape was ever shifting. Fire, whether intentional or accidental, was responsible for destroying three of the four major structures that have been unearthed to date at Mount Pleasant. The first structure burned down accidentally sometime in the 1740s and was one of the log
dwellings that originally housed either the overseer or enslaved African Americans and later may have subsequently been used as an outbuilding. Some 20 years later, the main house was burned intentionally—soon after the Madisons relocated to their new mansion. This intentional burning most likely occurred due to deterioration having rendered the structure uninhabitable (Reeves 2004). Due to the lack of decorative hardware recovered from the site, it appears the Madisons salvaged these items in order to reuse them at various structures throughout the property. Another 30 years later the detached kitchen burned to the ground accidentally. This last fire marked the final abandonment of the site in the 1790s. After this final fire, the area known as Mount Pleasant was apparently cleared of destruction debris—including large stone rubble piles, and other extant farm structures—and the fields were once again plowed and tilled for agricultural use.

Due to the paucity of surviving documentary evidence regarding the Madison family's original homestead in Orange County, Virginia, archaeological investigation is the only way to recreate Mount Pleasant's history. Archaeological sites on private property can be destroyed unintentionally, for instance, through construction or intentionally, for instance, through treasure hunting. When a site remains intact and undisturbed, other than plowing, much can be learned from what remains in the ground. As such, making use of meticulously systematic data collection and recording strategies is essential. However, despite the many shortcomings discussed in Chapter 2, many interpretations were derived to illuminate Mount Pleasant's story and the stories of its past occupants.
CHAPTER 4
RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

Working with data and documentation from previously excavated archaeological sites can be extremely challenging, yet fruitful nonetheless. It is a particularly daunting task to take on a project in which the entire site has already been backfilled and all that is left to consult are photographs, field notebooks, and computer databases. If these sources are complete, and consistent in form and content, then the task is far more manageable. When many discrepancies exist in these records, the frustration level increases dramatically. Organization is a key component of any archaeological undertaking. It allows current as well as future researchers to gain an understanding of the site and all resources available for interpretation. If data collection and recording are not systematically organized, the subsequent researcher/interpreter must be additionally resourceful in rendering otherwise incomparable and uninterpreted data comparable and meaningful. And, finally, a certain level of acceptance must be reached as the data captured by one investigative strategy will not speak to all possible lines of inquiry.

When I was first hired to analyze and interpret the Mount Pleasant service complex, I was made aware that there would be some obstacles associated with the project. Initial estimates were that the task of organizing the data and writing the report would take approximately four months. It was known that data were missing regarding these early excavations, and as the organization process began, the amount of missing data and interpretive challenges posed by these gaps grew. Due to these issues, the
organization step alone took three months. However, once interpretation began, the added period of reorganization paid off. Due to the extra time afforded me to become so familiar with the site, I felt as if I had participated in the excavation myself. It allowed me to get a sense of the bigger picture while also getting to know the intimate details of the site.

During this time, I created reference materials, such as a master site spreadsheet and excavation history, that were often consulted when trying to answer basic questions about excavation sequence and the chronology of site stratigraphy, as but two examples. One document I compiled recreates the history of excavation for each distinct test unit/locus. This was accomplished by going through every page of the two master field notebooks and a sampling of the field school students’ notebooks. (This document is reproduced as Appendix A.) Another document was created that gives the history of excavation of the plow zone piles as documented in the field notebooks (Appendix B). A master spreadsheet was created that contains all pertinent information for each stratum excavated during the time period under consideration. While it is too large a document to include as an appendix, this spreadsheet became an invaluable resource as it listed every aspect of each stratum, including such designators as the dimensions, soil type, associated artifacts, mean ceramic dates, excavators’ initials, date(s) of excavation, and page on which it appeared in the field notebooks. This spreadsheet was the place where significant discrepancies in the data set were first noted. Provenience discrepancies were noted between field and lab records, and in every instance due diligence was exerted to resolve these contradictions. Each step of the way, the Access database had to be verified for accuracy by cross-checking against all other project records. Human errors occur on
even the most well-organized archaeological sites, but recording errors were only compounded by field strategies that were less than ideal. Collectively, these two factors compounded the challenge of site interpretation.

As time passes, methods of archaeological excavation change (Willey and Sabloff 1993). What is deemed essential baseline data by one generation will be redefined by subsequent generations on the basis of the analytical methods and techniques at their disposal. When interpreting data gathered in the past, a subsequent researcher must find ways to maximize insights and interpretive opportunities from data they would possibly have collected quite differently. Moreover, the original archaeologists may not be around to consult as to how or why a feature was excavated a certain way. The later researcher must be able to create ways to organize and manipulate the data to make it accessible, useable, and in compliance with the best practices of the later interpretive era. One might find that certain questions cannot be answered unless asked in a different way. And unfortunately, even with creative methodologies, certain questions may never be answered. At that point, acceptance will play a large role. The researcher must be able to accept that certain questions will never be answered, let them go, and focus on those questions that can be addressed.

Working with the plow zone data from Mount Pleasant necessitated a strong degree of acceptance. Creating Surfer plots from the data, realizing that not all discrepancies were resolvable, and then going through the meticulous process of re-evaluating each plow zone stratum and its associated grid points, only to generate subsequent Surfer plots that appeared almost identical to the originals was a profound source of frustration. Knowing that had the plow zone been treated differently, more
detailed interpretations of the site could have been generated was a continual source of aggravation. However, it was necessary to accept that much of the plow zone data generated from OP1 was so compromised as to be nearly useless in order to focus on data that could be interpreted meaningfully and contribute to ongoing site management and interpretation.

Although a fair amount of the data from early excavations at Mount Pleasant was compromised due to misguided excavation techniques and improper recording techniques, enough data from these years was salvageable, in addition to data collected post 2000, as to allow researchers to reconstruct the site’s history. Though documentary evidence for Mount Pleasant is scarce, we can now describe and date at least four structures in the service complex area, in addition to a large borrow pit in the eastern yard and a fence line demarcating the western yard from the family cemetery. We can recreate the sequence of events at the site in relation to the building and demise of these structures as well as define three succinct occupational periods. Between two of these occupational periods a major shift in land usage was detected. All of this information would have been lost to history had archaeological excavations not taken place at the site. Archaeological investigations not only illuminated what was known of Mount Pleasant through documentary sources, but through analysis and interpretation, basically defined and described the history of the Madison family’s first Piedmont plantation.

Analyzing and interpreting the excavations at Mount Pleasant from the late 1980s and late 1990s was as massive an undertaking as it was a necessary task. The site itself is historically significant and, due to the lack of surviving documentary evidence, all potential answers lie in the archaeological record. There are many significant sites in the
Tidewater and elsewhere that have been excavated, with artifacts washed and catalogued, but not yet analyzed and interpreted (Ferguson 1992:xxxix). For many students and researchers, these sites can provide a great source of material with which to work, without investing additional resources on excavation. If one chooses this path, he/she must approach the data in a creative fashion—first, to gain an overall understanding of the site, second, to identify and (if possible) rectify any discrepancies, and finally, to isolate the questions that can and cannot be answered and focus on the latter. This case study is a modest contribution to a larger effort which constitutes the salvaging of previously acquired data, perhaps generated in a less than optimum fashion, and offers an example for how students and researchers can profitably do the same at other sites.
APPENDIX A

UNIT SUMMARIES

**MT200**

3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104
4/4/97: Plow zone @ 7-8” thick; Rectangular feature w/N/S long axis appears with small circular feature to west. FN1, pg. 104
4/5/97: Some of backdirt pile was screened, early-18th-c. artifacts found. FN1, pg. 105
6/9/97: Some of backdirt pile is screened by 97 field school participants. FN1, pg. 108
6/24/97: SAC & KZ (BULL) removing rest of plow zone to level unit. SAC uncovered possible post hole and mold full of charcoal suggesting post had burned in place. FN1, pg. 118; FN4, pg. 16
6/25/97: SAC’s circular feature of charcoal is within 1.5’ of south wall and contained very large chunks of charcoal, at least a fistful. See sketch FN1, pg. 119; FN4, pg. 16
6/26/97: SAC says MT200B down to subsoil. FN4, pg. 19
7/1/97: EWA & RLP took cleaning passes in unit. FN6, pg. 3
7/3/97: MLW & SGR took cleaning pass on MT200B. More soil was removed from west side to help define feature that extends from MT210 and MT212. EWA, RAC, STE, MLW & KAT removed balk between MT200 and MT202 and artifact concentrations lessened as moved southward, away from the feature. EWA notes that the kinds of artifacts found differed between northern end (inside feature) and southern end (outside feature). Northern end artifacts inside the feature included more ceramics, including pipe stems and pipe bowl, a musket ball, glass, nails, and charcoal. Southern end artifacts outside the feature included more nails, brick, and mortar. FN1, pg. 123; FN6, pg. 7-9
7/7/97: RAC & MLW finish removing southern end of balk between MT200 and MT202. FN3, pg. 15
7/9/97: RAC, MLW & SLA close MT200B strat card. DSF & RAC open cards for MT200C, D, E & F.

**MT200C** is a sub-rectangular intrusion of yellowish red clayey loam in NW corner of unit.

**MT200D** is a circular intrusion along south wall of unit consisting of reddish brown clayey loam mixed w.30% charcoal.

**MT200E** is a semi-rectangular intrusion of reddish brown clayey loam mottled with dark red clayey loam near SE corner of unit.

**MT200F** was designated for the rest of the unit and is dark red loamy clay.
RAC excavates eastern half of MT200D and finds a large charcoal concentration in the northern section. Depth of feature is 1.67’. FN3, pg. 13-16

7/14/97: EWA working on MT200D but not finding bottom. Found no artifacts other than charcoal in the feature. Devin augers but finds no subsoil. EWA stops excavating so DSF & SKP can figure out what’s going on with it. EWA thinks the difference in soil content between north and south sides of feature are due to the feature being both a post mold and a post hole. See sketch of profile in FN6, pg. 19. FN1, pg. 126; FN6, pg. 16-19

**MT201**

3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104
4/4/97: Plow zone @ 7-8” thick. Two linear concentrations of brick, mortar, and stone were exposed. FN1, pg. 104
4/7/97: Scott trowels and finds laid stone in NW corner of unit. They’re within a loamy soil layer laden with mortar & charcoal mainly on south side of the stones and red clay bordering north and west of stones. Sketch in notebook, FN1, pg. 105-106
4/10&11/97: Layer B was opened, baked out reddish brown clay. Loamy soil continues about 6’ east and south of NW corner stone concentration which makes a circle or square surrounded by B soil. DSF uncovered another concentration of large stone on NE edge of loamy soil feature. Just east of that against the north wall of unit a circular dark stain w/red clay oval in middle was uncovered… had a pin flag stuck in it, may be previous stp. SKP finished a pass on Layer B, all dirt was screened and it was noted that there were more artifacts in northern 2/3 of unit where the loamy feature is. Probing was done throughout unit and hit lots of solid objects, probably rock mostly in northern ½ of unit. Nothing solid in the middle of the loamy soil feature. Except for occasional machine-cut nail, no diagnostic artifacts later than creamware. See sketch in FN1, pg. 106-107.
6/9/97: Some of backdirt pile is screened by 97 field school participants. FN1, pg. 108
6/10/97: “BULL” and Cara Crocker did cleaning pass and bagged artifacts as “MT201 Bottom B cleanup.” New layers appear at this point. MT201C remains loamy. MT201D is hard-packed red clay but not subsoil. Southern 5’ of MT201B is left unexcavated as C is removed. See sketch FN1, pg. 109. SKP started to uncover a piece of white salt-glazed stoneware along central portion of north wall of MT201C. FN1, pg. 111-112
6/11/97: Backdirt pile of unit screened this morning because of fox on site. FN4, pg. 5
SKP taking out MT201D. Coming down to same soil as MT201C which is soft, brown soil w/heavy concentration of stone, white mortar, yellow brick, and yellow mortar. Major concentration of brick & mortar seems to be running along south edge of large stones in NE quadrant of unit. More stones appeared beneath MT201D along w/concentration already uncovered. CAC uncovered more white salt-glazed stoneware in same
area as yesterday, all from shallow plate, dot/diaper/basket pattern. FN1, pg. 111-112

6/12/97: KND & CAC taking out MT201C. See sketch FN1, pg. 112

6/13/97: SKP & TCP cleaned down MT201C&D for VIP site visit. Came upon more large stones beneath MT201D especially in northern section. NE corner of unit beneath MT201D turned to solid red clay, possibly subsoil along the north edge of the stones, or may just be clay cap or fill. FN1, pg. 113

6/16/97: RLP & KKK closed out the rest of MT201B and designated area as MT201C. MT201C came down on slightly redder and loamier soil w/flecks of brick & mortar. (Removed line of stones running E/W across southern portion of unit and no more stones were found beneath. FN1, pg. 114) In northern section of C and part of D came down on concentration of yellow brick & mortar. New levels will be assigned tomorrow. FN1, pg. 113

6/17/97: RLP & KKK helped close out MT201C&D and opened up MT201E&F. See sketch FN1, pg. 113

DBG helps screen dirt from MT201A (backdirt pile?) FN5, pg. 21

6/18/97: SKP, RLP, & KKK exposing MT201E “rubble” layer. Found color film so photos were taken of white salt-glazed stoneware sherds along north wall that were pedestaled in MT201C. Photo log missing so started new one beginning w/log #MT97/50. (Additional photo log information here as well) Removed sherds (3 mend) and bagged them together with their own inventory number. Also recovered a piece of brown salt-glazed stoneware from pedestal. In afternoon, SKP dug on western side of MT201E and found an area of very brittle yellowish to whitish probable mortar about .5’ east of west wall. “Mortar” may be burned. Some very dark grey patches are in the soil within the mortar area. This brittle “mortar” appears very different from the pieces of white mortar uncovered in rest of MT201E. FN1, pg. 116-117

DBG & MLW screened dirt from a backdirt pile to the north of MT201E. FN5, pg. 33

6/19/97: RLP & KKK finished cleaning MT201E. Western 1/3 has less concentrated stone, brick, and mortar but does have patches of brittle mortar-like stuff w/some red brick mixed in. Took photos of MT201E facing south MT97/60 (2 color) and MT97/61 (2 B/W). RLP & KKK drew plan view starting on western half so that back can be taken out while the eastern half is being drawn.

6/23/97: SAC, KND & SGR continued removal of balk between MT201/203. Runs from N60/E30 to N50/E30. Used pick, shovel, and trowel and were removed down to the level of adjoining units. Had high concentration of artifacts, especially of glazed & unglazed brick and mortar and most artifacts burned. Artifacts increase as move northward along balk, same as for unit MT201. RRT & JWS work on MT201F covering southern 2/3 of unit. Also cut back east wall close to string line because had been left unfinished by backhoe removal of MT201A. FN1, pg. 117; FN4, pg. 11
Continued removal of balk between MT201/213. Runs from N50/E30 to N45/E30. FN1, pg. 117

6/24/97: RRT & JWS removing MT201F starting at north end and taking a medium pass. Potential post hole and mold discovered in Layer F. Waiting for water then will take light pass over southern 2/3 of unit to see if feature defines itself. In afternoon, it is determined that features that appeared are really still plow zone since dead grass in the area. They continue to remove MT201F working from east to west following the natural slope and hopefully coming down on brick/mortar/stone level. FN1, pg. 118-119

6/30/97: SAC & SLA work on leveling MT201F to that of MT201E. Once level, a deeper pass is taken and SLA uncovers brick and mortar in the western half of layer. SAC thinks will come to same layer on east half but a little deeper. FN4, pg. 21

7/1/97: SAC cleans MT201E for visit from NTHP president to site. FN4, pg. 23

7/3/97: SLA & SAC work on MT201F and start to find brick and mortar similar to western half on eastern half. FN4, pg. 27

8/6/97: DSF made semi-formal scale drawing of stone/brick feature in unit showing only the stone. Appears to have same configuration as SE corner kitchen fireplace/chimney layout with one chimney leg built as one corner of the building. See sketch in FN1, pg. 133.

8/8/97: Mike completing excavation of MT201G. FN1, pg. 134

6/24/98: Katy & Leigh Ann w/TCP & LBJ continue working in unit and formal drawing of feature is in progress. FN2, pg. 39

7/1/98: TCP w/various students & supervisors complete formal drawing of feature on 6/30/98. FN2, pg. 39

**MT202**

3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104

4/5/97: Some of backdirt pile was screened, more early-18\(^{th}\)-c. artifacts were found in 202 than 200. FN1, pg. 105

6/16/97: DBG, SLA & TCP are troweling down MT202A. Artifacts from screened soil went into #OR219-170. FN5, pg. 7

6/24/97: SAC & SLA did quick cleaning pass on top of MT202B to define feature. Found that original large square feature was nothing and that actual feature was small square with a circle within. Also another circular feature to the south. Removed MT202B. DBG & SLA are removing rest of plow zone. Artifact bag #OR219-234. DBG notes that they are exposing more rocks in Layer B. FN1, pg. 118; FN4, pg. 14-15; FN5, pg. 59

6/25/97: DBG, SLA & TCP are still leveling MT202B. Have exposed many rocks that are larger than previously thought to be. DBG finding patches of bright yellow eroded mortar in the layer. SGR is finding similar patches in bottom of MT212A. See sketch in FN5, pg. 68. Artifact bag #OR219-243, 245, 248. FB5, pg. 63-75

6/30/97: SKP & RLP worked on MT202B and area w/yellow “mortar” and stones started looking like a corner that lined up with stone concentrations in MT212. See sketch on FN1, pg. 121.

7/1/97: EWA & RLP took cleaning passes in unit. FN6, pg. 3
7/2/97: EWA reports that a nail that had been left in situ in the unit yesterday is now gone and must have been vacuumed out when they pumped water out of the site!!! FN6, pg. 5

7/3/97: EWA, RAC, STE, MLW & KAT removed balk between MT200 and MT202 and artifact concentrations lessened as moved southward, away from the feature. FN1, pg. 123; FN6, pg. 7

7/7/97: RAC & MLW finish removing southern end of balk between MT200 and MT202. FN3, pg. 15

7/14/97: EWA works within stone concentrations in NE corner of MT202, designated as MT202C and everything else is MT202D. Stones started to form lines, one running E/W along the south side of unit and one running N/S along the west side of the unit. FN1, pg. 126, FN6, pg. 21

7/15/97: DSF & EWA continue excavating MT202C. Have a hard time distinguishing line between Layer C and D so DSF draws arbitrary line to help with excavation. DSF & EWA start to define and work around large stone concentrations of feature. The stones start to form a perfect linear pattern with a corner in the SW end of the feature and in this corner DSF & EWA find 2 laid bricks underneath the stone layer. The stone layer is widening on the south side. See sketch in FN6, pg. 29, FN6, pg. 25-29.

7/16/97: DSF & EWA continue to excavate around stones in MT202C. DSF takes photos of feature. In afternoon LGL helps EWA finish troweling pass of Layer C. EWA notes that a circular feature seems to be forming inside MT202C. FN6, pg. 30-33

7/21/97: DSF & RLP finish MT202C and come down to a circular/rectangular brownish soil in center of feature area and is designated as MT202E. Surrounding MT202E is a technicolor mottled soil mixed w/high percentage of stone and brick which is designated as MT202F. MT202F very similar to fill in MT210B. See sketch in FN1, pg. 129. hyFN1, pg. 128-129

7/22/97: EWA bisecting MT202E. Bisect line runs NW/SE and NE half being removed first. Soil is brown clayey loam mottled with brownish yellow clayey loam and .5% charcoal. Some bone fragments visible. See sketch in FN1, pg. 131.

10/3/98: Karen takes a cleaning pass on old MT202 to see if yellow mortar-like soil continues to west of OP1 L54 Lot 3 and finds that it does. FN2, pg. 90

**MT203**

3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104

4/7/97: Unit was cleaned out. FN1, pg. 105

4/19/97: Dark circular stains seem to appear, but too dry to tell, unit needs to be wet down. FN1, pg. 107

6/9/97: RRT & SAC cleaned bottom of MT203A. Uncovered a semi-circular feature in north end of unit. Placed all artifacts in bag #OR219-128. FN4, pg. 1

6/23/97: SAC, KND, & SGR continued removal of balk between MT201/203. Runs from N60/E30 to N50/E30. Used pick, shovel, and trowel and were removed down to the level of adjoining units. Had high concentration of
artifacts, especially of glazed & unglazed brick and mortar and most artifacts burned. Artifacts increase as move northward along balk, same as for unit MT201. FN1, pg. 117; FN4, pg. 11

6/24/97: MBS & RLP are attempting to redefine MT203C&D. Ground really dry so waiting for water tank to return. In afternoon it is decided that feature MT203 doesn’t exist, unit is still high so whole unit is now MT203C and MT203D is voided. LGL combined the two cards and destroyed the MT203D card. MBS & RLP are taking substantial trowel pass. FN1, pg. 118-119

7/1/97: SAC cleans MT203C for visit from NTHP president to site. FN4, pg. 23
7/7/97: RAC & SLA level out MT203C. FN3, pg. 10
7/8/97: RAC & SLA continue leveling out MT203C, find brick and mortar mainly on the eastern side of the unit. FN3, pg. 11
7/17/97: EWA, SAC & SLA w/SKP close out MT203C and open MT203D, a dark brown circular intrusion w/brick, mortar, and stone on east side, is associated with feature MT201G. MT203E was designated for rest of unit consisting of a dark red soil. See sketch in FN1, pg. 128. FN1, pg. 127-128; FN4, pg. 35-36
EWA says that MT203B was closed today and MT203C & D were opened. FN6, pg. 35

MT204
3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104
4/19/97: Dirt is screened in afternoon. FN1, pg. 108

MT205
3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104
6/24/97: DBG, SGR, SAC remove previously excavated soil with shovels and getting unit to same level as MT215. Put dirt into buckets and into the soil pile. FN5, pg. 57
7/1/97: EWA, DSF & Doc removed more backfill dirt from unit. FN6, pg. 4

MT206
3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104
4/19/97: Dirt is screened in morning. FN1, pg. 108
7/30/97: BULL & SAC shovel skimmed surface for leveling and got unit ready for troweling. FN4, pg. 51

MT207
3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104
4/19/97: Dirt is screened in morning. FN1, pg. 108
7/29/97: SKP, TCP, KND & RRT took out balk between MT207 and MT209. Heavy artifact concentrations in balk. Deposited balk dirt on tarp south of MT209 for screening. FN1, pg. 132
7/30/97: TCP screening soil from MT209/207 backdirt pile and RRT troweled unit. FN1, pg. 132
7/31/97: RRT & SAC leveling unit to get ready for troweling. Found softer, darker spot in NE corner adjacent to MT209 stain that might get different designation. Darker spot had heavy concentration of brick and mortar. FN4, pg. 53

8/7/97: Scott Kuntz, SKP & TCP leveled out unit to match MT208 & MT209. A high concentration of artifacts has been recovered including numerous nails, glass, ceramics, mortar, brick, stone spalls, and some bone & shell. Some browner soft areas are showing up, especially a rectangular area in NE corner. Whole unit is disturbed by plow scars and backhoe teeth marks, but several areas appear to have different features, may be structural, but most have plow scar intrusions through them. Soil surrounding brown areas is hard-packed and red but not subsoil. It’s mixed with small fragments of brick, mortar, and charcoal.

8/8/97: SK completed Layer A but couldn’t open Layer B because lacked proper equipment. FN1, pg. 134

MT208
3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104
7/30/97: KND began cleanup of unit. FN1, pg. 132

MT209
3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104
4/19/97: Dirt is screened in afternoon. FN1, pg. 108
6/30/97: RAC, EWA, and others screened soil from backdirt pile. FN3, pg. 1
7/29/97: TCP, KND & RRT cleaned up unit. SKP helped take balk out between MT209 and MT207. Artifact concentrations heavy in MT209 & balk. Deposited balk dirt on tarp south of MT209 to be screened. FN1, pg. 132
7/30/97: TCP screening soil from MT209/207 backdirt pile. FN1, pg. 132
7/31/97: RRT & SAC leveling unit to get ready for troweling. Found softer, darker spot in NE corner adjacent to MT207 stain that might get different designation. FN4, pg. 53
8/8/97: Volunteer Larry Bennett screened dirt from unit. FN1, pg. 134

MT210
3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104
6/10/97: 210A was opened below MT200A this morning. FN1, pg. 108
6/10/97: KAT, AXG, MLW leveling unit and taking out backhoe scars. Mouse and insect intrusion along center of NE wall. Possible feature with more reddish-brown soil appears in SW corner. FN1, pg. 110
6/11/97: MLW levels unit all day, very few artifacts, still above 212 by 3-5 tenths. FN1, pg. 110
6/12/97: AXG, KAT, MLW continue leveling unit, very hard and red, possibly subsoil in patches but still finding pieces of brick and mortar. Browner area along central portion of west wall may be semicircular stain/significant feature.
6/16/97: Began removing balk between 210 and 212 because of corresponding feature in each unit. Designated as MT210/212A. Potential root cellar. 210
has dark brown soil matching 212’s semi-circle of stone with dark brown soil within. FN1, pg. 116

6/17/97: Finished removing balk between 210 and 212. Artifacts include ceramic, glass, nails, @15 prehistoric quartz flakes, some brick, mortar, and greenstone flaking spalls. FN1, pg. 116

6/23/97: SAC, MBS, and KAT cleaned MT210 and MT212 so feature could be defined and drawn. MT212 hadn’t been excavated beyond level A and feature not well defined so focused on that. By end of day feature was defined and drawn. See sketch on FN1, pg. 118; FN1, pg. 117

6/24/97: MBS & KAT finished drawing feature and closed MT210A card. Opened MT210B for the feature, rest of unit is MT210C. Feature can be seen really well by standing on/behind backdirt pile MT202A so photos were taken, 2 color (MT97/63) and 2 B/W (MT97/64). It is decided that feature should be bisected, so KAT works on NE quadrant. In afternoon, MLW & KAT work in unit leveling and removing MT210B. FN1, pg. 118-119

6/25/97: Feature developing nicely. Trying to find definite edge between MT210B&C. Artifacts in MT210B are minimal, extremely small specks of charcoal, shell, and mortar with a few brick fragments and a few small stones. Northern half of MT210B is very clear, however edge has not been redefined since 6/23/97. See drawing FN1, pg. 120. FN1, pg. 119-120

6/30/97: Feature in western half of unit defined nicely w/a roughly oval shape, rounded NE corner and straight east side. See sketch on FN1, pg. 121.

7/3/97: EWA, RAC, STE, MLW & KAT removed balk between MT210 & MT212. FN6, pg. 7

7/9/97: MLW, SLA, & JMH working on unit. Card first made for MT210B on 6/24/97 but new one made today as feature size and description has changed substantially. Was semicircular intrusion of dark red clayey loam, now much larger with light olive brown clayey loam (yellow “mortar”) intrusions. SLA found that yellow was spreading under MT210B. Will excavate around yellow, leave yellow as undesignated, and removed MT210B. SKP helps to define eastern edge of feature. FN1, pg. 123-124

7/10/97: SLA removed yellow “mortar” areas, was determined they were just mottling w/in MT210B and not distinctive features themselves. “Mortar” seems concentrated in southern portion of 210B and probably continues into MT200. FN1, pg. 124

7/14/97: MLW, SAC, & JRN removing MT210B. MLW uncovers wine bottle neck. Yellow “mortar” in southern section tends to be confined to western edge. Thin lens of dark gray soil w/charcoal pieces bordering yellow area to east. 3 buckets of dirt were screened through 1/8” screen and found ceramics, glass, & bone along with smaller stuff. Took photos MT97/76 (2 B/W) and MT97/77 (2 color) then continued taking Layer B down to level wine bottle at. Using 1/8” screen for leveling then will water screen rest of soil from MT210B. FN1, pg. 126; FN4, pg. 29

7/15/97: MLW, SAC, & JRN continue excavating MT210B. Will document where stones are and then remove them today. Once stones are removed, site is
excavated aggressively, taking about 2” off and all soil is waterscreened at this point. See sketch in FN1, pg. 127; FN4, pg. 32
SGR began excavating MT210D, a circular intrusion in NE quadrant. Feature was bisected and east half was removed first. Bottoms out early and appears to be tree/bush feature. FN1, pg. 127; FN4, pg. 31

7/22/97:
MLW, RAC & RRT excavating MT210B. Feature is now 1.3’ deep and not bottoming out. Artifacts include melted glass, nails, ceramics, egg shell, bone, and straight pins. Also some small mortar and brick fragments. In northern section of MT210B, RAC uncovering a concentration of Rhenish stoneware. Charcoal is spread across profile and bottom. Soil samples taken for water screening, #OR219-433. Artifacts are with #OR219-431. Photographs were taken of west (1st five) and south (last three) profile of MT210B. Photo log numbers are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log Number</th>
<th>B/W or Color</th>
<th>Roll #</th>
<th>Exposure #</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT97/87</td>
<td>4B/W</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT97/88</td>
<td>2 Color</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT97/89</td>
<td>2 Color</td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT97/90</td>
<td>2 B/W</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT97/91</td>
<td>2 Color</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT97/92</td>
<td>2 Color</td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT97/93</td>
<td>2 B/W</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT97/94</td>
<td>2 Color</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See sketch in FN1, pg. 131. FN1, pg. 130; FN3, pg. 21-24

7/1/98:
SKP, DSF, CTC & DSG drew formal plan view of MT210/212 “cellar” feature. See sketch in FN2, pg. 42. FN2, pg. 40

MT211

3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104

6/10/97: 211 was designated today out of MT201 and Layer A is below MT201A. FN1, pg. 108

6/16/97: DBG, SLA & TCP excavate Layer A and put artifacts in #OR219-174. FN5, pg. 7-13

6/17/97: DBG, SLA & TCP continue leveling Layer A to that of Layer B. Another artifact bag is opened #OR219-182

6/18/97: DBG, SLA & TCP continue leveling Layer A. FN5, pg. 25 Artifact bag today is numbered OR219-198. Starting to uncover large pieces of intact rock similar to those found in MT201 directly north. May be part of same foundation. FN5, pg. 29-30


7/16/97: SAC excavating MT211A trying to see if feature in MT201G continues in this unit. After removing @ 2” of soil, nothing appears. SAC thinks need to dig deeper. FN4, pg. 33
MT212
3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104
6/10/97: 212 was designated today out of MT202. FN1, pg. 108
6/16/97: Began removing balk between 210 and 212 because of corresponding feature in each unit. Designated as MT210/212A. Potential root cellar. 210 has dark brown soil matching 212’s semi-circle of stone with dark brown soil within. FN1, pg. 116
DBG notes there are two clusters of rock in unit that line up on N/S axis and are closer to the eastern end of unit. There is also a circular stain near the NW corner of the unit. Cluster 1 & 2 may be remnants of root cellar. FN5, pg. 1-3
6/17/97: Finished removing balk between 210 and 212. Artifacts include ceramic, glass, nails, @15 prehistoric quartz flakes, some brick, mortar, and greenstone flaking spalls. FN1, pg. 116
6/23/97: SAC, MBS, and KAT cleaned MT210 and MT212 so feature could be defined and drawn. MT212 hadn’t been excavated beyond level A and feature not well defined so focused on that. By end of day feature was defined and drawn. See sketch on FN1, pg. 118; FN1, pg. 117
6/24/97: SGR & DBG remove bottom of MT212A trying to define feature in east central section extending over from MT210. Unit is very dry and needs to be wet down in order to make determination. DSF & SGR leveling out unit and reveal limits of feature currently being excavated in MT210. DBG says there are two rock clusters in the unit and that more rocks are appearing as they remove Layer A. FN1, pg. 118-119; FN5, pg. 47-53
6/25/97: Feature developing nicely. DBG notes that SGR is finding yellow patches of eroded mortar in bottom of MT212A similar to those she’s finding in MT202B. See drawing FN1, pg. 120. FN1, pg. 119; FN5, pg. 73-75
7/1/97: RAC troweling SE corner of unit to help define the dark, circular feature running between this unit and MT210. In afternoon, RAC, STE, & EWA sifted dirt from MT210 and MT212. FN3, pg. 4-5
7/3/97: SGR & DSF working with SKP and defined west edge of feature. Discovered a 2’ wide linear feature cutting through the larger feature on an E/W line. The north side of the smaller feature follows the straight mortar line and makes a gap in the stones. Appears to be intrusive, almost like a pipe trench, but stops on east and west ends. See sketch in FN1 pg. 122
EWA, RAC, STE, MLW & KAT removed balk between MT210 & MT212. FN6, pg. 7
7/9/97: RAC & SLA take cleaning pass in unit for photos to be taken. FN3, pg. 13
7/1/98: SKP, DSF, CTC & DSG drew formal plan view of MT210/212 “cellar” feature. See sketch in FN2, pg. 42. FN2, pg. 40

MT213
3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104
6/10/97: 213 was designated today out of MT203. FN1, pg. 108

7/17/97: Opening south edge of feature associated with MT203D and MT201G as MT213B, rest of unit is designated as MT213C. See sketch in FN1, pg. 128. FN1, pg. 127; FN4, pg. 36

EWA excavates MT213C down to level that MT210G is in a feature that crosses MT201, MT203, MT211, and MT213. MT213C is almost all rocks, bricks, and mortar and there are few artifacts other than architectural fragments. FN6, pg. 37-38

EWA says that MT213B was closed today and MT213C & D were opened. FN6, pg. 36

**MT214**

3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104

6/10/97: 214 was designated today out of MT204. FN1, pg. 109

7/1/97: EWA & RAC took cleaning passes in unit. FN6, pg. 4

**MT215**

3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104

6/10/97: 215 (old root cellar) was designated today out of MT205. FN1, pg. 108

DSF & SAC did general cleanup of unit and re-excavated root cellar uncovered in 1987 (unit #s 11, 17, 18). Found nails, ceramic, and melted glass, and took down to subsoil. Found that cellar may be larger than previously thought. FN4, pg. 3-4

6/11/97: SAC & DSF start to remove root cellar balk, MT215A. Artifacts found include brick flecks, charcoal, mortar, egg shell, ceramic and nails dating to Ambrose period. FN4, pg. 5-6

6/12/97: DSF & SAC make plan view of root cellar and possible paling scar. FN4, pg. 7 Also see FN1, pg. 112.

DSF & SAC start excavating MT215B and MT215C. Photographs were taken of the excavated features and the ones to be excavated. Photo log couldn’t be found so not sure what photo numbers are. FN4, pg. 7


**Level A**, the balk between old units MT11 and MT18 from 1987 came down on subsoil. Artifacts found include Rhenish stoneware, hand wrought nails, charcoal, bone, brick, mortar, eggshell, oyster shell, and architectural stone.

**Level B** was designated as an unexcavated portion of the root cellar. B came down to subsoil everywhere except for a small semi-circular feature (MT215D). Same artifacts found in B as in A.

**Level C** was designated as an unexcavated portion of the root cellar. No artifacts found with the exception of small traces of charcoal, brick, and mortar.

**Level D** was a small semi-circular intrusion below level B and extending .41' into subsoil. Hints of this paling scar were observed earlier but wasn’t well-defined enough to designate boundaries. A similar stain is located
just east (.4’) Both features end in points as if to be some sort of structure-related palings or posts.
The entire root cellar bottomed out to subsoil. It extends southward into MT214 and westward into the balk. See sketch FN1, pg. 115. FN1, pg. 114

MT220
7/22/97: Newly backhoed area east of MT200/201 designated into 8 units. MT220 is 10’ x 15’ and adjacent to MT200/210. FN1, pg. 130
7/29/97: DSF, MLW & SAC picked and shovel skimmed unit. Screened all dirt and found almost nothing. Soil very red and hard-packed, may be subsoil. FN1, pg. 132
7/30/97: SKP troweled unit looking out for artifacts, but dumping all soil into sterile pile and not screening. Found several browner, possibly circular stains near west wall of unit. Possibly make a line, but are all associated with linear intrusions (either plow scars or backhoe teeth marks) which makes it hard to determine shape for sure. FN1, pg. 132

MT221
7/22/97: Newly backhoed area east of MT200/201 designated into 8 units. MT221 is 10’ x 15’ and adjacent to MT201. FN1, pg. 130

MT222
7/22/97: Newly backhoed area east of MT200/201 designated into 8 units. MT222 is 10’ x 10’ and adjacent to MT210. FN1, pg. 130
7/29/97: MLW, DSF & SAC picked unit to get it ready for troweling. FN4, pg. 49
7/30/97: MLW & SAC picked and shovel skimmed unit, screened first two buckets to see if needed to screen anymore, found ceramics, glass, and nails so decided to keep screening(?!?!?!). FN1, pg. 132

MT223
7/22/97: Newly backhoed area east of MT200/201 designated into 8 units. MT223 is 10’ x 10’ and adjacent to MT211. FN1, pg. 130
7/30/97: MLW uncovered a series of small-to-moderate sized circular stains in SW corner of unit. Possible fence post molds? FN1, pg. 132

MT224
7/21/97: SAC & STE picked and shoveled unit to level it. Dirt was put in MT220 backdirt pile. FN1, pg. 130; FN4, pg. 41
7/22/97: SAC & STE shovel and pick unit. It’s 10’ x 15’ in SE corner of newly backhoed area east of MT200/201. See sketch in FN1, pg. 130. Soil is hard packed loam and probably bottom of plow zone. Today dirt is not being screened, but being deposited in MT220 backdirt pile. Took 2 or 3 cleaning passes to find features but found nothing. SAC thinks need to dig deeper. FN1, pg. 129-130; FN4, pg. 43
7/28/97: After bailing water from rain, did clean up of unit before heading to lab in late morning. FN1, pg. 13

**MT225**

7/22/97: Newly backhoed area east of MT200/201 designated into 8 units. MT225 is 10' x 15' and adjacent to MT221. FN1, pg. 130

**MT226**

7/22/97: Newly backhoed area east of MT200/201 designated into 8 units. MT226 is 10' x 15' and adjacent to MT222/223. FN1, pg. 130

7/28/97: SAC, DSF & RRT worked on fixing eastern wall. FN4, pg. 47

7/29/97: DSF, MLW & SAC picked and shovel skimmed unit. Screened all dirt and found almost nothing. Soil very red and hard-packed, may be subsoil. FN1, pg. 132; FN4, pg. 49

7/30/97: DSF troweled unit looking out for artifacts, but dumping all soil into sterile pile and not screening. Found rectangular looking feature in SE quad of unit, a very soft browners soil. FN1, pg. 132

**MT227**

7/22/97: Newly backhoed area east of MT200/201 designated into 8 units. MT227 is 10' x 10' and adjacent to MT221/223. FN1, pg. 130

7/29/97: MLW, DSF & SAC picked unit to get it ready for troweling. FN4, pg. 49

**Locus 5**

Lot 1

6/22/98: SKP, CTC, DSG, Tim & Louise work on locus. Large number of nails present in this locus. FN2, pg. 37

**Locus 6**

Lot 1

6/24/98: SKP & CTC working on removing this locus which is a balk.

**Locus 8**

Lot 1

6/24/98: DSF, DSG, Tim & Matt finish this locus. FN2, pg. 39

**Locus 10**

9/28/98: Work study participants hacking out L10, the 20' balk along the southern end of OP1 south of the “cellar” feature. FN2, pg. 83

**Locus 15**

Lot 1

6/22/98: This locus is located within L17. FN2, pg. 38
SKP, CTC, DSG, Tim & Louise work on locus. Large number of artifacts present in this locus. FN2, pg. 37
6/24/98: DSF, DSG, Tim & Matt finish this locus. FN2, pg. 39

**Locus 16**

**Lot 1**

6/22/98: This locus is located within L17. FN2, pg. 38
SKP, CTC, DSG, Tim & Louise work on locus. Less artifacts in this locus than 5 and 15. FN2, pg. 37
6/23/98: Locus is finished by SKP & LBJ and closing elevations are taken.

**Locus 17**

6/23/98: Western 20’ x 50’ section of Operation 1 is designated Locus 17. The western 10’ of Locus 17 will be excavated first. This section contained Locus 15 & 16. FN2, pg. 38.

**Lot 1**

6/24/98: DSF, DSG, Tim & Matt begin excavating western half of this locus. FN2, pg. 39
7/1/98: SKP & rest of crew complete western half of Lot 1 and begin eastern half. A few circular stains appear in NW quad but are interpreted to be plow scars and backhoe marks. SW quad appears more promising. SE quad has a few promising circular stains. FN2, pg. 39-40
7/16/98: Finished removing lot 1 and came across some possible post holes. FN2, pg. 44

**Lot 2**

6/14/99: SKP, TCP, and 1999 Field School participants learn troweling techniques by excavating Lot 2. FN2, pg. 115
Donald uncovered a pair of oval intrusions thought to be a possible fence line as they line up with two oval intrusions previously designated as OP1, L17, Lot 40 & 41. See sketch in FN2, pg. 116.
6/15/99: ’99 field crew perform a cleaning pass then assess that more needs to be removed, level still lumpy in parts. FN2, pg. 118
6/23/99: ’99 field school crew working to remove all remaining plow zone in Lot 2. FN2, pg. 125
6/28/99: Field school crew performing cleaning pass to prepare for mapping exercise learning to draw in the features present. FN2, pg. 127
6/29/99: Drawing exercise continues in southern half of Lot 2 while several students continue to remove plow zone in northern half. FN2, pg. 128

**Lot 3**

7/16/98: This is a higher browner area along the western 1/3 of L17. The edges were unclear so it’s either a feature or just the remainder of the plow zone. After excavation it’s thought to be plow zone. May be a few small features within it. FN2, pg. 44
6/14/99: This lot seems to be changing shape and becoming extensive and more amorphous. The soil is dark brown mottled with reddish brown at the eastern edge. See sketch in FN2, pg. 116.

**Locus 18**

**Lot 1**

7/1/98: Locus is opened up. A 5' x 9' rectangular area directly north of/adjacent to MT201 (the possible hearth/detached kitchen/slave quarter feature). FN2, pg. 40-41

7/2/98: TCP, Tim & Matt working in locus and finish removing plow zone. Stones related to MT201 feature continue into locus and appear to end before northern end of locus. FN2, pg. 43

7/29/98: This locus now part of Locus 42. Designated as Lot 7. FN2, pg. 55-56

**Locus 19**

**Lot 1**

7/16/98: This locus is next to the south end of L17 from the south edge of the root cellar southward to the south wall of OP1. It’s 10’ wide east to west. It was completed with a cleaning pass where more features showed up, including the south edge of the root cellar along the northern edge of the locus. See sketch in FN2, pg. 45. FN2, pg. 44

7/20/98: This locus was completed and strat cards closed today. FN2, pg. 47

**Locus 20**

**Lot 1**

7/16/98: This locus surrounds the root cellar on the north and east and is 10’ x 15’. See sketch in FN2, pg. 45. FN2, pg. 44

7/20/98: This locus was completed and strat cards closed today. FN2, pg. 47

**Locus 21**

**Lot 1**

7/16/98: This locus is directly north of the root cellar and is 5’ x 10’. See sketch in FN2, pg. 45. FN2, pg. 44

7/20/98: This locus was completed and strat cards closed today. FN2, pg. 47

**Locus 22**

**Lot 1**

7/16/98: This locus is north of the root cellar and L21 and is 5’ x 10’. See sketch in FN2, pg. 45. FN2, pg. 44

7/20/98: This locus was completed and strat cards closed today. FN2, pg. 47

**Locus 23**

**Lot 1**

7/16/98: This locus is north of the root cellar, L21, and L22 and is 5’ x 10’. See sketch in FN2, pg. 45. FN2, pg. 44
7/20/98: This locus was completed and strat cards closed today. FN2, pg. 47

**Locus 24**

Lot 1

7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49
Excavated and interpreted to be a post hole/mold. FN2, pg. 50

**Locus 25**

Lot 1

7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49
Feature bottomed out quickly, not interpreted to be post hole/mold. FN2, pg. 50

**Locus 26**

Lot 1

7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49
Feature bottomed out quickly, not interpreted to be post hole/mold. FN2, pg. 50

**Locus 27**

Lot 1

7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49
Excavated and interpreted to be a post hole/mold. RSB found 2 hand-wrought nails, 1 cut nail, copper alloy button, and wine bottle glass in feature. FN2, pg. 50

**Locus 28**

Lot 1

7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49
Excavated and interpreted to be a post hole/mold. FN2, pg. 50

**Locus 29 (Associated w/L53-Feature 10)**

Lot 1

7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49
7/27/98: AMF & DSG working on L29. It’s getting very deep and looks like a very large post mold. Came across a lens of dark red loamy clay @ .0.6’ below surface. FN2, pg. 51

**Locus 30 (Associated w/L53-Feature 10)**

Lot 1

7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49
Excavated and interpreted to be a post hole/mold. FN2, pg. 50
Locus 31

Lot 1
7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49
Feature bottomed out quickly, not interpreted to be post hole/mold. FN2, pg. 50

Locus 32 (Associated w/L53-Feature 10)
7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49
Excavated and interpreted to be a post hole/mold. FN2, pg. 50
7/27/98: Became a large, roughly rectangular stain which may encompass L33 as well. FN2, pg. 51
7/29/98: Tim, CAP & SKP drew formal plan view of L32. Looks like it’s a large post hole/mold.

Lot 1
7/29/98: Tim & CAP began excavating Lot 1 of L32, the west half of the feature. After @ 0.25’ encountered a redder mottled soil throughout the western section of the lot w/more solid brown in a roughly semicircular pattern near bisect line. It’s possibly a post mold & hole. Will designate the browner soil as Lot 2 and the rest of the western half of feature as Lot 3. See profile in FN2, pg. 57.

Lot 2 No info
Lot 3 No info

Locus 33 (Associated w/L53-Feature 10)

Lot 1
7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49
7/27/98: CAP & Court working on L33. Looks like a square post mold and possibly a hole. FN2, pg. 52
7/28/98: Appears to be a small post w/partial post hole part of the way down. Fill from possible hole was not distinguishable from the mold so was excavated together. See sketch in FN2, pg. 54. FN2, pg. 53

Locus 34 (Associated w/L53-Feature 10)

Lot 1
7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49
7/27/98: CTC working on L34. May be a post hole with mold in center. See profile drawn in FN2, pg. 51.

Locus 35

Lot 1
7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49
7/27/98: Tim working on L35. Seems to be a post mold with a stone in it. FN2, pg. 52
7/28/98: Appears to be a small post w/partial post hole part of the way down. Fill from possible hole was not distinguishable from the mold so was excavated together. See sketch in FN2, pg. 54. FN2, pg. 53

**Locus 36**

**Lot 1**
7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49
7/27/98: MBS working on L36. Looks like post hole that was set in ground at an angle. Bottom of the feature angles under the edge to the north and east. See cross section in FN2, pg. 52.
7/28/98: MBS got to bottom of eastern half of L36. Western half was begun and is becoming very square. SKP thinks it looks like a square post mold w/a post put in at an angle. FN2, pg. 53
MBS conclusively determined that L36 was a rodent intrusion. FN2, pg. 54

**Locus 37**

**Lot 1**
7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49
7/28/98: Appears to be a small post w/partial post hole part of the way down. Fill from possible hole was not distinguishable from the mold so was excavated together. See sketch in FN2, pg. 54. FN2, pg. 53

**Locus 38**

**Lot 1**
7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49
7/27/98: DSF working on L38. Bottomed out quickly and doesn’t appear cultural. FN2, pg. 52

**Locus 39**

**Lot 1**
7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49

**Locus 40**

**Lot 1**
7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49

**Locus 41**

**Lot 1**
7/23/98: Began excavating circular intrusion in OP1. FN2, pg. 49

**Locus 42**
10/9/98: General observation made my TCP that the voids and soft spots that they have come across in L42 appear to line up along the western edge of the feature. All appear to be on center and in line with the burned post. Could
be that “building” had posts aligned in a circle or square. If it is a line of post molds/holes, the size of the building would be 10’ instead of previously thought 12’, assuming the stones on the east side are foundation stones. Circular voids are given lot numbers 22-27. See sketch in FN2, pg. 94. FN2, pg. 92

**Lot 1**
7/23/98: Brick/stone feature now given designation of Locus 42. SKP, FTS, Rob & Raleigh all working here. FN2, pg. 49

**Lot 2**
No info

**Lot 3**
No info

**Lot 4**
7/29/98: Lot 4 was opened on 7/28/98. Coming down on same soil as Lots 5 & 6, a very compact/concentrated brick/mortar layer. FN2, pg. 55

**Lot 5**
7/29/98: Lot 5 was opened on 7/28/98. Coming down on same soil as Lots 4 & 6, a very compact/concentrated brick/mortar layer. FN2, pg. 55

**Lot 6**
7/29/98: Lot 6 was opened on 7/28/98. Coming down on same soil as Lots 4 & 5, a very compact/concentrated brick/mortar layer. FN2, pg. 55

**Lot 7**
7/29/98: Located in northern portion of L42 and was opened to see if feature continues northward. This lot was originally Locus 8. See sketch in FN2, pg. 56. FN2, pg. 55

8/4/98: Last week CTC & DSG working on Lot 7 and began to define a roughly rectangular extension off the north side of L42, the stone/brick feature. It’s roughly defined by stones with what appear to be circular intrusions at the northern corners (post holes?). See sketch in FN2, pg. 61.

8/11/98: SKP & CTC started plan view of Lot 7 last Friday and continued today. FN2, pg. 65

**Lot 8**
7/29/98: Lot 8 is located within the central portion of Lot 2. It is an arbitrary lot placed as a window into the mortar rubble to see how deep it goes. See sketch in FN2, pg. 56. FN2, pg. 55

Rob & MBS came across a small hole with a fairly large void that measured 1.3’ to the north and .5’ to the east and was .5’ deep. Lot 8 was expanded to the north and east to catch the extent of the hole. FN2, pg. 57

**Lot 9**
8/11/98: SKP & CTC started plan view of Lot 9 last Friday and continued today. FN2, pg. 65

8/14/98: CTC leveling out Lot 9. FN2, pg. 69
8/19/98: CTC working in Lot 9. Came across two areas of different soil, eastern edge (Lot 15) has orangish soil and central portion of south edge (Lot 16) has oyster shell and mottled soil. He’s continuing to excavate rest of Lot 9 to uniform level and will excavate those sections separately. Is coming across lots of artifacts including white salt-glazed stoneware w/rolled rim, straight pin, and small possible bird bones. Eventually finished leveling out Lot 9. See sketch in FN2, pg. 75-76. FN2, pg. 74-75

Lot 10
8/11/98: TCP, Rob & Louise designated “void” from Lot 8 as Lot 10. Began excavating and came across a wealth of artifacts including large pieces of intact mortar w/plaster attached, complete foot ring from stoneware cup (in 2 pieces), hand wrought nails, large pieces of animal bone and a large piece of burned wood. See sketch in FN2, pg. 76. FN2, pg. 65

Lot 11
8/14/98: Rob & Louise taking out south section of Lot 11. Uncovered a large portion of the base of a probable creamware plate that’s burned and covered with charcoal. Ceramic and charcoal were bagged separately with their own inventory numbers. FN2, pg. 69
Rob & Louise came across another void, similar to Lot 10, on the eastern side of Lot 11 with a piece of charcoal/burned wood in it. As charcoal was cleaned off, the piece was getting bigger and going deeper until the void opened up into a hole with a large piece of burned wood standing vertically in the hole. It’s possibly the bottom of a post that burned. See sketch in FN2, pg. 70-71.

8/19/98: On 8/18/98 TCP, Rob & Matt removed the piece of wood and designated Lot 12 for the rubble area extending east of the wooden piece. The bottom of the wooden piece was deliberately cut at a 45° angle. See sketch in FN2, pg. 76. FN2, pg. 73

Lot 12
8/19/98: Opened on 8/18/98. Area below wooden piece found in Lot 11. See sketch in FN2, pg. 76. FN2, pg. 73
Rob & Louise uncovered more burned wood just east and south of where the large piece came from. FN2, pg. 75

8/20/98: Second piece of burned wood found is in situ and appears to be part of a square post measuring 0.4’ wide and 0.4’ deep. It’s actually a square. Similar in size to the square post features found in L17. Just south and east of the post, a burned piece of corn cob was found along with 1 whole and 1 fragment of burned peach pit. FN2, pg. 78

Lot 13
8/19/98: Raleigh & John working on Lot 13, the southern half of a circular intrusion within Lot 2. Lot 2 is mostly brick & mortar rubble and Lot 13 is devoid of rubble, may be a small post hole. See sketch in FN2, pg. 74. While excavating Lot 13, decided to stop bisecting and excavate it as one. Bottomed out quickly and came down same soil as a new level designated as Lot 14 which runs from south edge of Lot 10 to the north of L42
beneath where Lots 5 & 6 used to be. See sketch in FN2, pg. 76. FN2, pg. 75

Lot 14
8/19/98: Lot 14 opened today, running from the southern edge of Lot 10 to southern edge of L42 beneath Lots 5 & 6. See sketch in FN2, pg. 76. FN2, pg. 75
John uncovered a large piece of bar iron resembling a window sache weight in southern end of Lot 14. See sketch in FN2, pg. 77.
8/20/98: DSF found 2 copper alloy button eyes in the northern end of Lot 14. Also found @ 24 burned peach pit fragments and many burned walnut shell fragments. FN2, pg. 78
8/21/98: TCP & Raleigh finished Lot 14, found more peach pits and more rough coat mortar w/keys (for plaster walls). Lot 14 has yielded many mortar fragments w/evidence of plastering including pieces of mortar w/plaster attached, rough coat mortar with plaster keys, and rough coat mortar with lath impressions. FN2, pg. 80

Lot 15
8/19/98: Eastern section of orangish soil in Lot 9 designated as Lot 15. FN2, pg. 75

Lot 16
8/19/98: Southern section of oyster shell/mottled soil in Lot 9 designated as Lot 16. FN2, pg. 75.

Lot 17 (Below Lot 7/9?; associated with Lot 19, eastern half)
9/28/98: Work study participant Jeff Higgs works on Lot 17, the western half of the north section of L42 (“igloo entrance”). Found a kaolin clay figurine of a bird and a burned cherry pit. See sketch in FN2, pg. 86. FN2, pg. 83
9/30/98: TCP & Jeff continue excavating Lot 17. FN2, pg. 83
9/28/98: Stopped working on Lot 17 because came down to a harder, redder soil in most of the lot, a certain section mainly beneath the stones remains a softer, browner soil. FN2, pg. 85
10/2/98: TCP & Jeff are taking out large stones in SW corner of Lot 17 along with the soil pedestal beneath them as part of Lot 17. Stones were drawn and appear to have tumbled in on each other rather than being in situ. FN2, pg. 88

Lot 18
9/29/98: Set in and started excavating Lot 18 which almost bisects L42 along the E/W line. It comprises the brick/stone rubble. See sketch in FN2, pg. 86. FN2, pg. 83
9/30/98: Work study participants working on Lot 18, filling up lots of buckets with brick, mortar, and plaster but getting down through the rubble. FN2, p. 85
10/2/98: MBS, Cindy & Raleigh continue taking down Lot 18. Coming down on more charcoal patches, but they’re still mixed in with the rubble so leaving them as Lot 18. This is the same sort of layer as was found in Lots 10-14 just before hitting the solid charcoal burned layer. FN2, pg. 88
TCP realized that charcoal-laden level was mired in w/mortar and brick rubble and there was no way to differentiate between the two so took it all out together as Lot 18. Came down fairly quickly on a non-subsoil clay layer “lined” with stones. Stones were coated on top with gray→black charcoal/ashy material but appear to be embedded in the clay. Clay is orangish-brown and may have been affected by fire. FN2, pg. 92

Lot 19 (associated with Lot 17, western half)
9/30/98: Started excavating eastern half of northern section of L42 (“igloo entrance”). See sketch in FN2, pg. 86. Lots of good artifacts coming out of lot including lots of straight pins, a concentrated pile of oyster shell halves in the southern end, part of an iron drawknife blade with the part that fits into the handle, and a mammal vertebra. Photographed oyster shell and drawknife blade. FN2, pg. 85-87

Lot 20 (New name for Lots 17 & 19?)
10/3/98: See sketch in FN2, pg. 91.

Lot 21
10/3/98: Jeff opens Lot 21 located between Lot 20 (which is really Lots 17 & 19) and Lots 12 & 18 to the south. A narrow section of what looks like tumbled stone and brick on top of soil, some of which is almost pure sand. See sketch in FN2, pg. 91. FN2, pg. 90

Lot 22
10/13/98: Lot 22 designated as one of voids along western edge of L42. See sketch in FN2, pg. 94 for location. FN2, pg. 96
10/20/98: Lot excavated and determined to be a post hole. Depth is 1.37’. FN2, pg. 97

Lot 23
10/13/98: Lot 23 designated as one of voids (Lot 23 is original void excavated as Lot 10) along western edge of L42. See sketch in FN2, pg. 94 for location. FN2, pg. 96
10/20/98: Lot excavated and determined to be a post hole. Only excavated to depth of 0.5’ because still has part of post in it. FN2, pg. 97

Lot 24
10/13/98: Lot 24 designated as one of voids along western edge of L42. See sketch in FN2, pg. 94 for location. FN2, pg. 96
10/20/98: Lot excavated and determined to be a post hole. Depth is 1.11’ but may not be completed as there are stones in bottom. FN2, pg. 97

Lot 25
10/13/98: Lot 25 designated as one of voids along western edge of L42. See sketch in FN2, pg. 94 for location. FN2, pg. 96
10/20/98: Lot excavated and determined to be a post hole, still has part of post remaining. Only excavated to a depth of 0.37’ because post still in hole. FN2, pg. 97
Lot 26
10/13/98: Lot 26 designated as one of voids along western edge of L42. See sketch in FN2, pg. 94 for location. FN2, pg. 96
10/20/98: Lot excavated and determined to be a post hole. Depth is 1.44’. FN2, pg. 97

Lot 27
10/13/98: Lot 27 designated as one of voids along western edge of L42. See sketch in FN2, pg. 94 for location. FN2, pg. 96
10/20/98: Lot excavated and determined to be a post hole. Depth is 1.44’. FN2, pg. 97

Lot 28
11/17/98: From sketch in FN2, pg. 102, can see that Lot 28 makes up the southern portion of L42 except for the “igloo entrance” section.

Lot 29
11/17/98: From sketch in FN2, pg. 102, can see that Lot 29 is the SW corner of L42 and surrounds the post holes that are Lots 25 & 26.

Lot 30
11/12/98: TCP & SKP open new lot in L42. This portion is the southern end of L42. See sketch in FN2, pg. 102. Lot 30 was made up of brick, mortar, and stone rubble w/soil similar to the lots on the northern side and very much like Lots 10, 11, 12, etc. that started out w/mostly rubble and reddish brown soil and ended up grading into burned, charcoal-laden rubble and soil. The charcoal/burned area is only under the northern and western 2/3 of the lot. FN2, pg. 101
11/30/98: TCP got through most of Lot 30 except for eastern portion with large stones. Lots of artifacts, especially ceramics. FN2, pg. 104

Lot 31 (Above Lot 28)
11/12/98: Raleigh excavated this lot in the southern portion of L42 by removing large stones, no soil, and beneath them was the same soil as Lot 28. See sketch in FN2, pg. 102. FN2, pg. 101

Lot 32 (Below Lot 30)
3/31/99: Notes say this lot was opened last December within rubble of L42. FN2, pg. 105

Lot 33 (Below Lot 30)
3/31/99: Notes say this lot was opened last December within rubble of L42. FN2, pg. 105

Lot 34
3/31/99: SKP, TCP & Raven open final lot in L42 for the middle section of the rubble. FN2, pg. 105
4/9/99: SKP, TCP, Raleigh & Raven continue excavating Lot 34. Finding lots of artifacts including white salt-glazed stoneware and creamware, green wine bottle glass, hand-wrought nails, bone, burned floral material, and wood. Nails on eastern side of lot closest to stone foundation tend to be size and
shape of lathing nails while nails on western side of lot were larger, some headless, maybe more for flooring. Also, there are larger stones on the eastern side of the lot than the western side. There is a line of bricks & brick fragments along southern edge running west from the central portion of the lot. See sketch in FN2, pg. 109. FN2, pg. 107

7/8/99: ARL & MAC excavating east section that hasn’t been taken down yet. Yesterday they took out the large, cut stones that appear to have tumbled off the foundation and are excavating soil beneath them. FN2, pg. 132

7/15/99: DAG finishing this lot. FN2, pg. 136

Lot 35
7/27/99: TCP opened this lot in bottom of feature, an area with small stones. Some stones appear to be purposefully rounded and one was carved and looked fertility-like. FN2, pg. 137

Locus 43
Lot 1
7/28/98: DSF working on L43. It’s longer E/W than N/S with small circular stains (palings?) in bottom of east half at least. Looks kind of like a “palisade” trench but much too small. FN2, pg. 53

Locus 52
6/23/98: ’99 field school crew removing all plow zone left around L42, so all lots of L52 were excavated using picks and trowels to reveal any features. FN2, pg. 125

Lot 1
7/30/98: Located directly west of L42. Was opened up to get the area down to the same level as surrounding Loci 17, 19, etc. See sketch in FN2, pg. 59.
8/4/98: SKP, TCP, MBS, CTC, DSF, Rob & Louise continued taking down Lot 1. FN2, pg. 61
8/6/98: DSF & Rob are troweling Lot 1. Isn’t much in the way of artifacts. FN2, pg. 63

Lot 2
7/30/98: Located directly south of L42. Was opened up to get the area down to the same level as surrounding Loci 17, 19, etc. See sketch in FN2, pg. 59.
8/4/98: SKP, TCP, MBS, CTC, DSF, Rob & Louise began excavating Lot 2. FN2, pg. 61
8/6/98: MBS & CTC are troweling Lot 2. Isn’t much in the way of artifacts. FN2, pg. 63

Lot 3
7/30/98: Located directly east of L42. Was opened up to get the area down to the same level as surrounding Loci 17, 19, etc. See sketch in FN2, pg. 59.
8/6/98: SKP & Frank are picking out Lot 3. TCP & Louise are excavating eastern side around the stones as part of Lot 3. TCP & Louise are finding artifacts including ceramics and a straight pin, but the rest of Lot 3 there aren’t many artifacts. FN2, pg. 63
Lot 4
8/14/98: Opened Lot 4 on Tuesday, south of Lots 2 & 3 and moving toward the MT210/212 feature. FN2, pg. 69
9/24/98: SKP, DSF, Raleigh & Kristina (intern) picking down Lot 4. FN2, pg. 81
9/25/98: Frank continues cleaning Lot 4. FN2, pg. 82
9/28/98: Kristina continues cleaning rest of Lot 4. FN2, pg. 83

Lot 5
8/14/98: Opened Lot 5 on Tuesday, south of Lot 2 and moving toward the MT210/212 feature. FN2, pg. 69
9/24/98: SKP & Raleigh finish Lot 5 and have uncovered 3 features, one being a possible post hole/mold. See sketch in FN2, pg. 81.

Lot 6
9/25/98: SKP started this 4’ x 10’ lot south of Lot 5 and @ 1’ north of northern edge of “cellar” feature. See sketch in FN2, pg. 82.

Lot 7
10/23/98: SKP & TCP open Lot 7 to find the west edge of L54, runs from L54 to the south wall of OP1. In addition to finding more of the edge of L54, also found 2 more post holes/molds in line with the one found in Lots 5&6. See sketch in FN2, pg. 99. The post holes are defined by a ring of charcoal/burned wood. FN2, pg. 98
10/24/98: Found another post hole/mold in SW corner of Lot 7, in line with others.
10/25/98: Finally found western edge of L54 “cellar” feature which is roughly lined with stones. This edge runs along the same axis as L42 and the post features in L52, Lots 6&7. FN2, pg. 100
6/17/99: Part of ’99 field school crew does cleaning pass over Lots 7 & 8 together. Very few artifacts found, but post holes & molds found last fall are being freshly revealed. See sketch in FN2, pg. 122. FN2, pg. 121

Lot 8
5/11/99: This lot is located on the east side of L54. Excavated with Poplar Forest crew, digging through non-subsoil red clay. FN2, pg. 111
6/17/99: Part of ’99 field school crew does cleaning pass over Lots 7 & 8 together. Very few artifacts found, but post holes & molds found last fall are being freshly revealed. See sketch in FN2, pg. 122. FN2, pg. 121

Locus 53 (Feature 10)
9/29/98: DSF & Mary worked on L53, the remnant of the root cellar. FN2, pg. 83
9/30/98: DSF continues working on L53. FN2, pg. 85

Locus 54
9/29/98: SKP opened L54, originally the MT210/212 “cellar” feature, with work study participants. The feature is excavated in vertical 0.25’ arbitrary lots shaving off sections from top to bottom of the 1997 excavations. Taking out lots in visible soil levels and bagging artifacts by soil color but with all bags designated as same inventory # for entire lot. See sketch in FN2, pg. 84. FN2, pg. 83-84
'99 field school crew is working on cleaning entire feature. FN2, pg. 124

Notebook says field school participants were working in feature and opened new lots, but doesn't give descriptions or details about them. FN2, pg. 126

TCP, Rob, ARL, & SLM start mapping all lots in L54 feature. FN2, pg. 128

SRG & CTC clean up the floor of the excavated area and draw a formal profile of the bisected wall facing west. Balk on the south side of the bisected area will be excavated by strata. The charcoal/burned wood in the north section of the bisected area will be removed along with the pedestal beneath it. See sketch in FN2, pg. 136.

SRG & CTC are finishing profile of L54 then will start on balk and pedestal removal. FN2, pg. 137

CTC finished removing balk and SRG finished removing pedestal. Bottom was then broken into two lots (15 & ?) for further excavation. FN2, pg. 137

SKP, CTC & DAG mapped in all features surrounding L54 as well as the feature itself. FN2, pg. 137

Lot 1

Work study participants working on Lot 1. Yesterday artifacts from each soil color were bagged separately w/separate inventory numbers. That will continue for Lot 1 and go back to original plan for Lot 2. FN2, pg. 85

Finished Lot 1, will photograph profile and move on to digging Lot 2. FN2, pg. 87

Lot 2

Rick & Zack excavating Lot 2. Finished up soil color 2 (yellow mortar-like stuff). FN2, pg. 88

Rick & Zack finish Lot 2 and draw profile. FN2, pg. 90

Lot 3

Karen & Frank start Lot 3 in L54 which encompasses the SE corner of previously unexcavated L54 "cellar" feature. Found true edge of the feature. Found that where the east edge of the feature was originally thought to be a right angle corner was actually a diagonal line. See sketch in FN2, pg. 89. FN2, pg. 88

Karen continues taking out Lot 3 which is coming down on yellow mortar-like soil in NW section, red clay (like soil color #4 in Lots 1, 2 & 4 vertical sections) along eastern half and a concentration of brick and mortar in the west central portion of the lot. After taking cleaning pass of old MT202 and finding that yellow soil continues to the west, Lot 3 is closed and new lots will be designated based on soil color. Yellow mortar-like soil is now Lot 5. FN2, pg. 90

Lot 4

Zack & Rick start excavating next vertical lot after Lot 2. SKP & TCP decide to widen lots from 0.25' to 0.5'. Soil strata remaining fairly constant in vertical sections as move west in L54. FN2, pg. 90
Rick encounters a funky black rectangular substance in Lot 4, soil color #2 (yellow “mortar”) 2.5’ to 2.8’ north of south wall of Lot 4 situated next to and north of a brick fragment. Substance was removed in pieces and kept as an object. FN2, pg. 90

10/25/98: SKP works on cutting back profile wall and removing pedestaled stones. Removed soil color #4 (red clay) down to brown soil below which is same as soil in the bottom of the excavated area. Will take brown soil out together. FN2, pg. 100

Lot 5
10/3/98: Yellow mortar-like soil found in Lot 3 is now designated Lot 5. FN2, pg. 90
10/9/98: SKP & Karen continue to work on Lot 5 that encompasses most of old MT202, made up of yellow, brown, & red mottled all together. FN2, pg. 92

Lot 6
10/25/98: TCP leveled out L54 by designating all previously unexcavated portions as Lot 6. See sketch of profile in FN2, pg. 136. FN2, pg. 100

Lot 15 (Beneath Lot 6)
7/27/99: SRG opened this lot which is the western section beneath Lot 6. The soil is browner and softer than the eastern half. FN2, pg. 137

Locus 55 (Feature within L17, Lot 2)
7/7/99: Strat card was opened and excavation begun last week. FN2, pg. 129
7/8/99: SKP finishing L55. FN2, pg. 132

Locus 56 (Feature within L17, Lot 2)
7/7/99: Strat card was opened and excavation begun last week. FN2, pg. 129
7/8/99: SKP finishing L56. FN2, pg. 132

Locus 57 (Feature within L17, Lot 2)
7/7/99: Strat card was opened and excavation begun last week. FN2, pg. 129
7/8/99: SES & TRM finished excavating this feature yesterday. FN2, pg. 132

Locus 58 (Feature within L17, Lot 2)
7/7/99: Strat card was opened and excavation begun last week. FN2, pg. 129
7/8/99: SES & TRM finished excavating this feature yesterday. FN2, pg. 132

Locus 59 (Feature within L17, Lot 2)
7/7/99: Strat card was opened and excavation begun last week. FN2, pg. 129
7/8/99: SLM & MDS completing feature today. FN2, pg. 132

Locus 60 (Feature within L17, Lot 2)
7/7/99: Strat card was opened and excavation begun last week. FN2, pg. 129
7/8/99: SLM & MDS completing feature today. FN2, pg. 132

Locus 61 (Feature within L17, Lot 2)
7/7/99: Strat card was opened and excavation begun last week. FN2, pg. 129

Lot 1
7/7/99: SLC uncovers a large stone in the center of the northern half of the feature. See sketch in FN2, pg. 129.
7/8/99: SLC hopefully finishing excavation of feature today. FN2, pg. 132

Locus 62 (Feature within L17, Lot 2)
7/7/99: Strat card was opened and excavation begun last week. Located just west of L61. FN2, pg. 129

Lot 1
7/7/99: SBB found glass and ceramic fragments and corner of a brick in southern half of the feature, very little in northern half. FN2, pg. 130
7/8/99: SBB hopefully finishing excavation of feature today. FN2, pg. 132

Locus 63 (Feature (POST HOLE) within L17, Lot 2)
7/7/99: This feature was opened today by Don. FN2, pg. 130
7/8/99: TAF & JEB continue excavating L63. FN2, pg. 132
7/21/99: DAG finishing excavation of feature. Looks like possible post hole. FN2, pg. 137

Lot 1 (Post mold)
7/8/99: TAF discovers L63 extending to west. That area designated as Lot 2, the post hole. Excavated Lot 1 in two halves, north and south. Southern half has more charcoal. See sketch in FN2, pg. 132.

Lot 2 (Post hole)
7/8/99: TAF uncovered extension of feature today. FN2, pg. 132

Locus 64 (Feature within L17, Lot 2)
7/7/99: This feature was opened today by Don. FN2, pg. 130
7/8/99: TAF & JEB continue excavating L64. FN2, pg. 132

Locus 65 (Feature (TREE HOLE) within L17, Lot 2)
7/7/99: This feature was opened today by SES & TRM. FN2, pg. 130
7/8/99: SES & TRM continue working on feature. FN2, pg. 132
7/21/99: SKP finishing feature. Turned out to be a tree hole. FN2, pg. 137

Lot 1 (Post hole)
7/8/99: Feature was bisected with south half excavated first. While excavating north half, discovered post mold in western portion. FN2, pg. 135

Lot 2 (Post mold)
7/8/99: This lot has not been excavated yet. FN2, pg. 135

Locus 66 (Feature (TREE HOLE) within L17, Lot 2)
7/7/99: This feature was opened today by SES & TRM. FN2, pg. 130
7/8/99: SES & TRM continue working on feature. FN2, pg. 132
7/21/99: DAG finished feature. Turned out to be a tree hole. FN2, pg. 137
**Locus 67-106**

7/1/99: Status of these features is “unopened.” However, see FN2, pg. 131-134 for legend to where these features are located on plan map.
APPENDIX B

PLOW ZONE PILES

OP1
3/31/97: Plow zone removed by backhoe. (Layer A) FN1, pg. 104
4/5/97: Some of backdirt pile was screened, early-18th-c. artifacts found. FN1, pg. 105
4/19/97: Dirt was screened from MT204, 206, 207, and 209. FN1, pg. 108
6/9/97: Some of MT200 backdirt pile is screened in morning by MLW & RLP. FN1, pg. 108
6/9/97: Some of MT201 backdirt pile is screened in morning by KAT, DSF, AXD, SAC, & RRT. FN1, pg. 108
6/9/97: In afternoon MT200 (south side) backdirt is screened by MLW, CAC, SGR, RLP, KAT, KKK, SLA, SKP. FN1, pg. 108
6/9/97: In afternoon MT201A (north side) backdirt is screened by LGL, DSF, RRT, SAC, AXD, KND, TCC. FN1, pg. 108
6/10/97: Backdirt piles are screened this afternoon, but doesn’t designate which one. FN1, pg. 110
6/11/97: MT201A backdirt pile screened this morning b/c of fox on site. FN4, pg. 5
6/17/97: DBG helps screen dirt from MT201A (backdirt pile?) FN5, pg. 21
6/18/97: DBG & MLW screened soil from a backdirt pile to the north of MT201E. FN5, pg. 33
6/24/97: Feature in MT210 can be seen really well by standing on/behind backdirt pile MT202A so photos were taken, 2 color (MT97/63) and 2 B/W (MT97/64). FN1, pg. 118
6/30/97: RAC and others screened soil from backdirt pile of MT209A. FN3, pg. 1
7/1/97: RAC, STE & EWA sifted dirt from MT210 and MT212. FN3, pg. 5
7/3/97: A group of students from grade school (in valley?) came out for site tour and helped screen backdirt pile MT200A. FN1, pg. 122; FN3, pg. 7
7/16/97: EWA & RLP screen backdirt pile MT209A with a school group. FN6, pg. 32
7/21/97: SAC cleaned up walls of MT224 (newly backhoed area east of MT200/201) and put dirt in MT220 backdirt pile. FN1, pg. 130
7/22/97: Today dirt is not being screened, but being deposited in MT220 backdirt pile. FN1, pg. 130
7/30/97: TCP screening soil from MT209/207 backdirt pile. FN1, pg. 132
8/8/97: Volunteer Larry Bennett screened dirt from MT209A. FN1, pg. 134
9/23/97: Students from Doc’s archaeology class screened backdirt today. FN1, pg. 134

OP2
10/9/98: Students from Doc’s class screen back dirt from OP2 plow zone units MT231 & 233. Found lots of cool stuff. FN2, pg. 92

10/10/98: Students from Doc’s class finish screening MT233 back dirt and work on MT234 & 235. FN2, pg. 93

10/12/98: TCP & Frank finish screening MT234. Found lots of artifacts including large pieces of stoneware and other ceramics, various kinds of glass, brick, stone, nails and several interesting pieces of iron. FN2, pg. 93
SKP & Bill worked on MT235. Finished it and moved on to MT237. Found fewer artifacts than in MT234, but same assortment. FN2, pg. 93
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