FEARN PLANTATION 44PY339 CITY OF DANVILLE, VIRGINIA

PHASE II SIGNIFICANCE ASSESSMENT SURVEY DHR # 2011-0767

surveyed for:

CITY OF DANVILLE MR. JEREMY STRATTON DIRECTOR, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PO BOX 3300, 427 PATTON STREET, DANVILLE, VA 24541

(434) 793-1753

surveyed by:

LYLE E. BROWNING, RPA PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR BROWNING & ASSOCIATES, LTD. 2240 CHARTSTONE DRIVE MIDLOTHIAN, VA 23113 (804) 379-1666

Management Summary

Phase II Significance Assessment Survey of the Fearn Plantation on the Coleman Tract was performed. Survey methodology for archaeology was a combination of mapping with the excavation of 1 meter and smaller test units. Archival investigation was also conducted.

The terrain was knoll on an upland first terrace of the Dan River. Total area of the site was about 2 acres.

The lack of an appropriate historic context by which to evaluate the Fearn Plantation for the period of its major use after the Civil War to its dismantling precludes making a cogent recommendation for or against the site as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Acknowledgments

Historian Danny Ricketts provided a wealth of information about the Fearn family and their holdings in addition to predecessor and successor owners. This enabled us to effectively place the property in time and space for evaluation. We appreciate the efforts of the City of Danville in clearing the site so that evaluation could take place and for other logistical arrangements. We also appreciate Shawn Harden of Dewberry's assistance with mapping.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Management Summary	.ii			
Acknowledgments				
TABLE OF CONTENTS				
FIGURE LIST				
Project Description	.1			
Physical Setting				
HISTORIC CONTEXT	.8			
History of the Site	.8			
Previous Research	.9			
Archival & Map Research	.10			
Terrain Description And Survey Conditions	.12			
Research Design	.20			
Introduction	.20			
Survey Objectives	.20			
Historic Periods Research Design	.21			
Survey Methodology	.23			
SURVEY RESULTS	.24			
General Description	.24			
Individual Building Function Description	.34			
General Layout	.34			
The Main House	.35			
The Slave Quarters	.35			
? Slave Quarters 2	.36			
The Kitchen	.36			
Shed 1	.36			
Storage 1/Smokehouse	.36			
Well/Icehouse	.43			
Storage 2	.43			
Shed 2	.43			
Shed 3				
Well				
Shed 4	.51			
Drainage Ditch	.51			
Animal Enclosure	.51			
Privies	.51			
Homeless Camp/Dump	.51			
Barn	.52			
Cistern	.52			
Granary	.52			
Timbering Staging Area	.53			
Were the survey objectives met?	.53			
What Was Not Present	.53			
Correlating the Evidence	.54			
SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS				
References Cited				
Appendix A –Title Chain				
Appendix B – Land Tax Records	.64			
Appendix C – Finds List				

FIGURE LIST

Figure 1. Project General Location.	.1
Figure 2. Project Locale, 500K USGS Quad	. 2
Figure 3. Project Location, Danville USGS 100k Quad.	. 3
Figure 4. 44PY339 Location, Ringgold USGS 7.5' Quad.	.4
Figure 5. Project Area Contour Map	. 5
Figure 6. Project Contour Map Showing The Layout Of 44PY339	.6
Figure 7. Project Contour Map & Testing Regimen.	.7
Figure 8. 1805 MAS Policy Drawing Of Fearn House	. 13
Figure 9. 1805 MAS Policy Drawing Of Fearn House	. 13
Figure 10. 1807 Widow's Dowery Subdivision of Fearn Property	. 14
Figure 11. 1922 Pittsylvania County Soils Map	. 15
Figure 12. 1925 Danville 15' Quad Showing Project Area	. 16
Figure 13. 1948 USAS Aerial Photo Showing 44PY339 From Danville GIS	. 17
Figure 14. 1954 USAS Aerial Photo Of 44PY339.	. 18
Figure 15. 2006 Hudgins Re-Platting of Patents With Project & Fearn First Purchase	. 19
Figure 16. Aerial Photo of 44PY339 House & Compound.	. 26
Figure 17. Aerial Photo of 44PY339 Barn & Granary.	. 27
Figure 18. Project Contour Map Showing The Labeled Building Plan	.28
Figure 19. The Main House Plan	. 29
Figure 20. The Main House Photos	. 30
Figure 21. The S2 Slave Quarters Plan	. 31
Figure 22. The S2 Slave Quarters Photo.	. 31
Figure 23. The S2 Slave Quarters Photos	. 32
Figure 24. The Possible Second S3 Slave Quarters Plan	. 33
Figure 25. The Possible Second S3 Slave Quarters Vertical Aerial Photo.	. 33
Figure 26. The West Compound Wall S4 Kitchen & S6 Storage/Smokehouse Plans, North	. 37
Figure 27. The West Compound Wall Photos, North	. 38
Figure 28. The South Compound Wall S8 Storage 2 Plan, South.	. 39
Figure 29. The South Compound Wall S8 Storage 2, S9 Shed 2 & S10 Shed 3 Photos	. 40
Figure 30. The S11 Well, S12 Shed 4 and S13 Animal Enclosure Plan	. 41
Figure 31. The S11 Well, S12 Shed 4 and S13 Animal Enclosure Photos	. 42
Figure 32. The S13 Drainage Ditch Photos	. 44
Figure 33. The S15 Privies & Homeless Camp Photos.	. 45
Figure 34. The S17 Barn & S18 Cistern Plan	. 46
Figure 35. The S17 Barn & S18 Cistern Photos.	. 47
Figure 36. The S19 Granary Plan	. 48
Figure 37. The S19 Granary & S20 Staging Area Photos	. 49
Figure 38. The Surface Artifact Photos	. 50

Project Description

The City of Danville Industrial Authority has acquired the Coleman Tract on the southeast side of the city. A Phase I Intensive Cultural Resources Survey (Browning 2011) was performed on all of the approximately 153 acres of the property. Ten archaeological sites were identified of which two were recommended for further work and DHR 108-5652 Fearns Burying Ground was recommended for avoidance. This survey was performed on the Fearn Plantation complex (44PY339) to determine whether it was eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The other site recommended for Phase II is outside of any construction proposed and was not evaluated.

The project is located at the south-eastern edge of the City of Danville's Corporate Limits and south of the Dan River in the Piedmont Physiographic Province on the 500-520 foot contours above Mean Average Sea Level (MASL) The project lies on the Ringgold 7.5 Minute USGS Quadrangle sheet. The site is located on a small knoll on an upland first terrace topography in the Dan River watershed. The project area is bounded by Knight Celotex Road on the south, Gypsum Road on the west, a Norfolk-Southern rail line on the east, by a former waste management facility property on the north and by arbitrary property lines on the southeast. The project is entirely within the Dan River watershed.

The land was within a William Wynne's 1771 patent. He and his descendants in turn sold outparcels to individuals for development. The historic cemetery located on the project is from an outparcel resale to Thomas Fearn who began accumulating property in 1778. By his death in 1805, he had purchased nearly 1500 acres. By 1828 the Fearn family had sold their holdings entirely to son-in-law James Patton in a series of sales.



Figure 1. Project General Location.

The City of Danville contracted with Browning & Associates, Ltd., a cultural resources management firm, to evaluate the Fearn Plantation. The contour map was provided by Dewberry and overlaid with pertinent information for this survey and report. Lyle E. Browning, RPA was Principal Investigator for the project and authored the report. Summer Chaffman was field supervisor of the project. The PI, Summer L. Chaffman, Sarah A. Moore, Corey J. Tuton and Emma Browning performed the fieldwork for the project.



Figure 2. 500k USGS Quad Showing Projecct Locale.



Figure 3. Danville 100k USGS Quad & Project Area.



Figure 4. Ringgold 24K USGS Quad & Project Location.



Figure 5. Project Area Contour Map.



Figure 6. Project Contour Map Showing The Layout Of 44PY339.



Figure 7. Project Contour Map & Testing Regimen.

Figure 1 shows the project general location, Figure 2 shows the project locale on the 500k USGS Quad, Figure 3 shows the project location on the Danville 100k USGS Quad sheet with land patents. Figure 4 shows the project location on the Ringgold 7.5' USGS Quad. Figure 5 shows the project contour map provided by Dewberry. Figure 6 shows the Site 44PY 339 layout. Figure 7 shows the testing regimen on the contour map.

Physical Setting

The project lies east of Danville and south of the Dan River in the City of Danville on the outskirts of the city limits in the Piedmont Physiographic Province on the 500 - 520 foot contours above Mean Average Sea Level (MASL). Topography on the site was flat to sloping gently southward.

County soils encountered on the project were obtained from the NRCS Web Soil Survey of Pittsylvania County and in the Pittsylvania County Soil Survey publication (Kirk, Stevens, Drinkard and Patteson 1922). Table 1 shows the soils in the site. The main house and outbuilding compound are on State sandy loam, the slave quarters are on Appling sandy loam and the barn, cistern and granary are on Wilkes gravelly fine sandy loam. While soils can be used for site prediction, in this case, the determinants appeared to be landform in relation to road networks for the main house and the other two building sets were placed at a distance but in response to the needs of the owner.

Topsoil depth on the site was about 6 inches maximum.

Table 1, Project Area Soils

Unit	Map Unit Name	Acres	%
1C	Appling sandy loam, 7 to 15 percent slopes	0.3	10.6%
35B	State sandy loam, 0 to 4 percent slopes, rarely flooded	2.3	71.8%
43D	Wilkes gravelly fine sandy loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	0.6	17.6%
Totals fo	r Area of Interest	3.2	100.0%

HISTORIC CONTEXT

This section provides summary knowledge concerning the local area and the Fearn Plantation. This section starts with the larger context and works down to the project specific area. Expected site types, site function and known distribution patterns are discussed with specific reference to the project area in the section concerning expected cultural materials.

History of the Site

Lewis Green (1759) and John Parrish (1746-47) patented the floodplains of the Dan River immediately east of the project property. Using their patents as a base, along with what was then called the Country Line, basically the dividing line between VA and NC, the original patents were investigated to see who had taken letters patent on the property the first time. County and city histories cite William Wynne as the majority landowner who had a ferry and who saw the value of land patents at Wynne's Falls on the Dan River at what later became the City of Danville. Wynne did indeed patent large areas of land, but other smaller owners also were present. The major problem with patents is that there is a metes and bounds description and depending upon the time that the land was patented, there may be a drawing of the patented land. The problem comes in that there was no overall map showing where the patents fit together. This appears to have been done entirely within the minds of the various county surveyors in the colony and later the state of Virginia. Transcription errors, the problem of pulling chains over uneven terrain that had then no means of correcting for vertical angles and the like meant that in the later 18th and well into the 19th centuries, land boundary disputes were frequent visitors to the court systems. Surveyor transcription errors, surveyor errors based upon the "accuracy" of the instruments used for laying out the properties, inaccurate measurement devices such as stretched chains and similar problems were adjudicated by the courts over the centuries. The major problem with metes and bounds descriptions is that the vertical angle was not taken into account. Thus a chain pulled up a steep hill reads

the same as a chain pulled over flat terrain. The resultant error from the inability to account for the distortion caused by the vertical angle is the major problem.

The gold standard for a survey and for the document researcher was to be able to identify a point on the ground that can be identified today. William Byrd's 1728 Survey of the Dividing Line between VA and NC was one anchor point. The Dan River was another, albeit slightly less accurate due to shifts in the river banks due to natural and man-made actions.

Thanks to the efforts of Dennis Hudgins, the early patent records of numerous VA counties, including Pittsylvania, have been transcribed and placed in DeedMapper[©] archives. It is only when adjoining property shapes can be directly compared with the subject property can the inevitable errors of transcription sometimes but not always be resolved.

The Coleman Tract has the advantage of being near the intersection of the Dan River and the VA/NC border, both of which are mentioned in patent descriptions. In addition, Rutledge Creek north of the project is a tributary of the Dan River and is also mentioned in the patents.

However, inspection of the patents reveals various problems. William Wynne indeed patented large tracts of land that were later part of the City of Danville, but his holdings did not cover the project area entirely. Wynne's 1771 patent (VPB39:421) for 368 acres is south of his major Danville patent but encloses about 95% of the project area and abuts onto the above mentioned two floodplain patents, allowing for relatively accurate placement. John Armstrong's 1765 patent of 165 acres is bounded on the south by the VA/NC border and on the east by the 1759 Lewis Green 100 acre patent that had the VA/NC border and the Dan River as anchors (Figure 15). This allowed the Armstrong patent to be placed. And it also allowed the north abutting Wynne 1771 patent to be placed, as well as the 1746-47 Parrish patent of 204 acres to be placed as the southern edge of this patent abutted directly onto the northern edge of Green's and the eastern edge of Armstrong's patents. But, there were discrepancies in the metes and bounds between Parrish and Wynne's patents that were not resolved. Two legs of their patents coincided and it is most likely that a transcription error caused the apparent discrepancy along their shared border on the northwest of Wynne's and the southeast of Parrish's.

In a pre-bank era, larger land owners were known to have used smaller back-parcels as collateral for loans and one would find them traded back and forth between owners as needs arose. But, absent such needs, a larger landowner often subdivided the contiguous parcels among offspring that totally disregarded the internal purchase divisions. The external lines remained as vestigial alignments that can be discerned sometimes if still later subdivisions and acquisitions did not obliterate them.

The site was part of the holdings of Thomas Fearn who first bought property in Pittsylvania County in 1778. At his death in 1805, he owned about 1491 acres of rural land. It appears that the land was contiguous with the subject property being part of it. After his death, the property was sold by his widow and heirs to his son-in-law James D. Patton by 1828. The overall property appears to have remained intact through several subsequent sales until the early 20th century whereupon it was subdivided by will to several heirs. It is notable that throughout the history of the property, the property was by the standards of then and now, a large parcel of land. Through careful management of the income streams, the owners could provide themselves with a quite comfortable income. It was in the last 50 years of the history of the site that the acreage was reduced to a more subsistence level, based upon acreage and terrain type. However, whether the farm was involved in tobacco production was unknown as that can provide a quite comfortable living from a far smaller acreage than would be necessary for an agricultural economy based on animal husbandry or cereal crop production. By all indications, the upland soils on the site were suitable for bright tobacco production.

Previous Research

Pittsylvania County was predominantly rural and has an architectural range from small holdings to major plantation building complexes. The discovery of the Fearn Plantation was somewhat of a surprise given the limited nature of level terrain on the Coleman Tract.

Subsequently, contact was made with Danville historian Danny Ricketts about the property. His extensive research on the Fearn family was extremely valuable in providing details and for contextual information about the area. The presence of Fearn's Burying Ground on the property predisposed thinking that the site was a former Fearn property. The nature of the building remnants on the site showed a substantial presence, again indicating a person of means.

Phase I Intensive Cultural Resources Survey had been performed to locate sites on the property (Browning 2011). A total of 10 resources were identified, including the subject site and Fearn's Burying Ground. The standard background history with the prehistoric and historic contexts relative to DHR's Time Periods is within that report if needed.

Archival & Map Research

The Mutual Assurance Society (MAS) had separate City and Country divisions until 1820. Thomas Fearn's widow Mary took out a policy in 1805 for the house she occupied and a kitchen 60 feet away with no intervening buildings. The mill that Fearn had bought in 1802 was also insured on a separate policy. Both policies were again renewed in 1811. The value of these policies is that they usually provide drawings of the buildings they insure and they provide the value of the individual structures insured. The drawback is that what the owner insures is entirely elective. There may have been 50 buildings on a large property, but if the owner chooses to insure two, then those are what appear. Some of the drawings show the relative location and the distance to various buildings and have been proved accurate for field location in the past. Figures 8 & 9 show the two different versions of the structures.

The 1805 drawing appears to be a very odd composite of a plan view and an elevation in one drawing. The plan view conforms with the ground evidence to some extent, but there was no evidence of a porch, nor of a chimney off the south end of the ell. The kitchen is shown in front of the house. It would appear that the agent never saw the house in question. The 1815 drawing is equally bizarre as it shows a rectangular house, which would work if the ell had a porch extending to the south end of it. In this drawing the kitchen is shown west of the house. Both list the kitchen as 60' from the house.

In 1807 the Court ordered a plat of the Widow's Dower to be surveyed. The 1818 Court ordered the plat to be recorded. Danny Ricketts has provided the plat and annotated it to show the information. Figure 10 is the plat with Rickett's annotations.

The outside boundaries of the contiguous Fearn property was shown on a plat of partition of widow's dower compiled by court order after Thomas Fearn's death in 1805. The standard widow's dower of 1/3 of the estate was the 423 acres that Mary Fearn was given, including the plantation house. That is the one structure shown on the entire 1269 acres. The orphans of Thomas Fearn were allotted the remaining 846 acres. Figure 10 shows the Widow's Dower Plat provided by and annotated by Danny Ricketts. Figure 12 shows the layout of the partitioned land on the 1925 USGS 15' Quad Sheet.

The 1922 Pittsylvania County Soil Survey USGS Map at 1:63360 (1"=1mi.) (Figure 11) shows county soils with the features of the USGS quad except that contours are not shown. This map shows structures within the proposed project corresponding with the 15' Quad. The exception is that Gypsum Road has been straightened and crosses a hill now versus running a contour earlier. That put the road adjacent to the site. The roadbed is still a land feature. The Fearn Plantation is shown by a single square. This is the earliest depiction of structures on the property yet located.

The 1925 (reprinted 1944) Danville 15' USGS Quad (Figure 12) shows virtually the same structural information as does the current Ringgold USGS 7.5' Quad. The road networks can be extrapolated exactly onto the 7.5' and the Fearn Plantation house location is represented by three squares.

Danny Ricketts provided significant information about the social history of the site and its owners as well as the penultimate chapter of the house's history resulting in its dismantling. Bill Newell, the Warden at the City Farm in 1972 had a dual purpose. His thinking was that there was a good possibility that gold had been hidden in the walls of the plantation and that Danville's City Farm needed additional structures. So, using prisoner labor, the Fearn Plantation was intentionally dismantled and transported to Danville to be re-used for buildings on the City Farm. It appears that all of the buildings

on the site were dismantled. The barn and granary had no indications of collapse and decay in place. The slave quarters duplex also appeared to have been dismantled down to the floors. The remainder of the courtyard of buildings had flooring timbers remaining but again with no evidence of superstructures left. The main house was dismantled virtually completely, leaving in place some of the flooring.

The 1948 USAS Aerial Photo (Figure 13) from the City of Danville GIS shows the property in some detail. It shows all of the buildings in the compound, including the southern range. The slave quarters duplex is extant, but the structure north of it cannot be discerned. The barn was not there. The photograph also showed a large building where PY330 was identified during the Phase I. This now appears more likely to have been a barn rather than a domestic building.

The 1954 VDOT vertical aerial photo (Figure 14) shows the building layouts with some distinctive differences. The main house is shown, as is the slave quarters. But of the main house compound, it appears that the west compound wall of buildings was extant with the gap where the well/icehouse was located. However, the southern range of buildings was not then extant. The well with its attached shed was clearly shown, and which is show to extend farther north as a complete entity than the solid wall, indicating two build episodes for it. Also, the granary is shown, but the barn does not appear. The cistern with an associated structure over it may be visible.

Information obtained from the Caswell County, NC family website about Captain Azariah Graves Walters who owned the property from 1858 to 1899 indicates that the barn burned in 1900 with all of the farm produce and tobacco within it, valued at \$600. Graves had 54 slaves in Pittsylvania County.

The 1954 aerial photo shows an entrance road coming off the former main road. The entrance heads directly to the house and is lined by trees. There is also shown a large darker rectangle behind the house, extending as far south as the former southern building range and extending east almost to the bottom of the hill indicating a the formal space surrounding the house was demarcated.

A detailed title search was attempted in order to provide a chain of title from the original land patents to the present (Appendix A). This was not entirely successful but the chain of title is clear from the early 19th century onward. The original patent parcels that now include the project and all of Thomas Fearn's properties were identified. The difficulty was in platting out the 1500 acre holdings that Fearn accumulated as neither the parcel 1040 acre parcel sold was relatable to the mapping, and not all of Fearn's purchases had metes and bounds.

The Pittsylvania County Deed Records show a total of 7 property acquisitions beginning with the initial 1778 purchase of 165 acres. He acquired properties of 203, 208, 514, 200, 200 larger parcel acres and a 1 acre property in his lifetime (Appendix A). He sold a 200 acre parcel out of that. The nominal total was 1491 acres. His widow and son sold property to her son-in-law James Patton in the amount of 1269 acres±. Given the accuracy of surveying standards of the day, the correlation is approximately correct. Fearn purchased initial two parcels of 368 total acres in successive years and on about a 4.5 year cycle purchased more until the last two purchases of 200 acres each in successive years. The one acre purchase was at his mill site, undoubtedly in order to clear up some remaining issues with the mill.

The economic situation appears to have steadily improved for Fearn. Born in 1745 in Buckingham County, he was 33 when he bought his first property in Pittsylvania. His economic situation was improved by two factors: first, he had a mill on Rutledge Creek that would have provided a steady income as a base for his economic ventures. Second, he purchased former land patents that were apparently contiguous and used those to leverage his additional purchases. His purchases follow a trajectory in-place capital acquisition and acquisition.

The opacity of description has bedeviled those who have sought to unravel land tenure from the 19th century back. Rather than having a full metes and bound description, the bounds were often relative, referring to adjacent property owners. While the owners may have known their property bounds, that knowledge has now disappeared. Also, land surveying in the period did not account for the vertical angle, thus with land that was not flat, horizontal distances are exaggerated. It is absolutely necessary to not only find definitive points to tie particular transactions to a point on the landform, it is also generally

necessary to tie the points to bounding owners and sometimes owners at 2 removes from the owner in question.

Attempting to correlate land patent metes and bounds with later sales is sometimes ambiguous at best. Charles Wynn's 514 acre purchase has no metes and bounds description. But, if correlated with the original patent, it may show the location of the Fearn purchase.

Unfortunately, at this stage of investigation, platting the land transfers between the original patent holders and the property acquisition by Fearn was not possible due to the above stated ambiguities. Land patents are extremely fluid in terms of who the actual patentee was, who bought them from the original patentee and how they were either sold or subdivided afterward. Added to the ambiguous descriptions, working with land records is a time consuming venture, typically performed at the Phase III mitigation effort. Charles Wynne owned two tracts of land. The one sold to Fearn in PYDB 8:308 has no useful metes and bounds.

The floodplain patent of John Parrish has both ends on the river. The sale of land from Dudley to Fearn also has both ends on the river and within a few degrees has the same metes and bounds as does the Parrish patent. The land patents laid out by Hudgins in DeedMapper© in 2006 appear in Figure 15 along with the approximate placement of the project and the even more approximate placement of the Fearn 165 acre first purchase. It appears that Fearn's first purchase from Wynne in 1774 was on the higher ground followed by the Dudley purchase that gave him river access and also provided him with the valuable arable river floodplain.

Land Tax Records (LTR) were also investigated. Starting in 1820, a category was added for the value of buildings on the land. Prior to that, tax was appraised solely on the value of the land, based apparently on perceived productivity. Thus a plantation elite mansion and a log cabin had no value prior to 1820 for tax purposes. After 1820, the LTR come into their own as a more valuable research tool. The issues of where properties were located, what shape they had and so forth are described above. The LTR shows in a list by year how many properties a person owned, what acreage each parcel comprised, the distance and bearing from the courthouse, the value of the land and the value of the buildings. Also in notations to the side was information on how the property was acquired and what might cause a change in value of the property.

Thomas Fearn purchased his first property in 1778 of 165 acres. His subsequent purchases show in the LTR with one small problem. There is a 375 acre parcel described in the 1783 LTR and the subsequent books. This is probably the 165 acre initial purchase plus his second purchase of 203 acres giving 368 acres or it could be his first and third purchases of 165 and 208 acres giving 372 acres. Either is possible with the caveat accompanying the description of "more or less" and with a survey performed after purchase, acreages have been known to change.

Terrain Description And Survey Conditions

The terrain is flat only on the tops of upland landforms. The site is located on a knoll with a slight slope to the south. The site is located at the rear of the level terrain and faces north towards the City and along what was then the road to North Carolina. The USGS Quad sheet and the project contour map provide an accurate portrayal of the ground. Figures 4 and 5 show the project location. At the beginning of survey, the vegetation cover was in bamboo briar, bramble, privet, overgrown ornamentals, larger trash trees and no large shade trees. Periwinkle was noted northwest of the house. Numerous small cedar trees were also present. In addition, various weeds up to 3 feet high were then present and impeded the investigation. It was impossible to appreciate the extent or layout of the buildings due to vegetation cover.

The decision was made to clear the surface of the majority of vegetation in order to be able to adequately map the site and to make cogent decisions as to the placement of test units. Vegetation with the exception of the largest trees was removed to ground level leaving the stumps in place.

.0

Figure 8. 1805 MAS Policy Drawing Of Fearn House.

Im Mitchin One elles ala 20 yards Kno with a Shed 20 Leit, truit Alu here 31 within with wood (

Figure 9. 1815 MAS Policy Drawing Of Fearn House.



Figure 10. 1807 Widow's Dowery Subdivision of Fearn Property.



Figure 11. 1922 Pittsylvania County Soils Map.



Detail of 1925 Danville 15 Quad & Project Area.



Figure 13. 1948 USAS Aerial Photo Showing 44PY339 From Danville GIS.



Figure 14. 1954 USAS Aerial Photo of 44PY339.



Figure 15. Land Patent Re-Plats With Project & Fearn First Purchase .

Research Design

The viewpoint of this project was oriented towards first defining the scope of the problem. The initial objective was to obtain a layout of the buildings on the landscape and to allow that to drive the remainder of the fieldwork once identification was as complete as possible. The research design was oriented towards identification of the buildings on the property and integrating them into a coherent framework related to the changes in agriculture from the slave era to 1865 and contrasting that with the 1865-1975 period wherein mechanization of agriculture transformed farming and the labor dynamic with the decreasing need for farm labor gradually over that period. The Phase II sought to determine whether information relative to that progression existed. We were not as interested in the "Big House" investigation phenomenon, but rather in whether the archaeological record and the architectural remnants could together provide or potentially provide a comparative baseline or framework based on the socio-economic niche occupied by the owners and their tenants outside of the standard owner/slave dynamic.

This plantation has both. The short duration of slavery on the property as compared with the far longer length of time that it operated in a free-market economy, albeit a variant warped by the lingering effects of the Civil War and of the black/white dynamic that play out in the Reconstruction through Jim Crow eras.

Introduction

The objective of this survey was to determine whether the site met any of the four eligibility criteria for inclusion on the NRHP. These are listed below.

NATIONAL REGISTER CRITERIA

(National Register Bulletin 16a, How to Complete the National Register Registration Forms)

The quality of **significance** in American history, architecture, archeæology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess **integrity** of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

+ A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

+ B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

+ C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

+ D. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criterion A was not felt to be germane to the evaluation except in the most general sense. Criterion B was felt to apply in a regional sense as Thomas Fearn was one of the founders of the City of Danville. Fearn helped start the city on its way to becoming a regional power in the tobacco industry. Criterion C was felt to apply in a regional sense due to the formal layout of the property, the use of stone foundations for the outbuildings and slave quarters while setting apart the Fearn residence by building it in brick. These components make a significant and distinguishable entity as a group. Criterion D was felt to be the most applicable as the site was previously stripped of buildings down to their foundations with attendant loss of some integrity. While removing some information, the dismantling left intact the archaeological database on the site. Criterion D became the major evaluation point for the survey with minor supporting roles played by Criteria B and C.

Survey Objectives

The primary objective of the Phase II evaluation was to determine whether intact *in situ* cultural deposits were within the site and if they had the potential to provide significant information.

Specific research questions and survey goals for the project survey are as follows:

- 1. Determine whether the Thomas Fearn House was on the property.
- 2. Determine the layout of the buildings within the site.
- 3. Determine whether intact strata existed within the site.
- 4. Determine whether the intact strata could be related to specific owner occupation episodes.
- 5. Determine whether occupational information could be obtained from the strata.
- 6. Determine whether socio-economic data relating to specific owners could be obtained.
- 7. Determine the nature of the deposition of the strata for the site.
- 8. Determine the function of the structures on the site.
- 9. Determine whether sheet midden or pit excavation modes of disposal existed separately or together.
- 10. Examine the water procurement system.
- 11. Examine the waste disposal systems.
- 12. Determine whether occupants produced demonstrably different strata.
- 13. Determine demolition patterns for the house.
- 14. Attempt to determine any vertical integrity to the site.
- 15. Determine the temporal range of site occupation on the project.
- 16. Determine whether there was a one-build or a developmental sequence of buildings.
- 17. Provide an estimate of the ability of each lot to provide further information.

Historic Periods Research Design

European incursions into the Southeast Atlantic Piedmont began in the second half of the 16th century with various Spanish expeditions. See the Contact Period discussion below in the Historic Context section for more information. Those expeditions and those of the English explorers and traders of the second half of the 17th century would be expected to leave very small traces along major transportation corridors such as the Occanneechee Trail.

The following narrative is a generalized account. Settlement in the historic period was initiated in the first half of the 18th century. Properties were seated generally after 1730 by individuals who had patented lands in the interior. A county surveyor laid out the limits on the terrain and entered it into the Patent Books in sequential order. It was required by law that the lands be seated with a livable building within 3 years of the date of issuance. While abuses did occur where the structures occupants were literally porcine, in general the patent properties were placed within the bounds of the patent and occupied by individuals and their families.

The most desirable lands were the riparian floodplains with deep alluvial soils that were fertile. These lands were patented quickly along the Dan, Banister and Staunton Rivers. Upland interior lands were next patented. Large acreage patentees paid relatively little for their properties. The common practice among those who basically acted as developers was to subdivide the land into outsales parcels of 200-400 acres. These sales generated income for the grantor for other purposes.

Low lying riverine terrain was thought at the time to be the cause of disease and contagion and was avoided by the European settlers. Consequently, a floodplain would not be expected to contain patent period sites, nor in fact any sort of habitation. The advent of African slavery brought people thought to be resistant to malaria, but not immune. Therefore, slave quarters were not located on floodplains either.

Owners of large tracts of land placed their houses on locations that were felt to be a reflection of their status. Riparian owners tended to place structures on high, well-drained elevations overlooking the watercourses.

Owners of smaller tracts tended to follow the lead of the social elites. One would expect that historic period sites would be located on the highest local elevation available to the shape of the property.

Owners of the smallest tracts tended to have highly dissected upland terrain. As arable fields were at a premium, the house was placed at the edge of the level terrain. The focus in these was not status, but subsistence, hence the fields were of primary importance to the owners rather than the building. Given limited financial means, the structures were also of modest construction.

While much has been written about the plantation elites, and about the substantial plantation owners, little serious study has been given to the smaller owners. It is probably safe to say that slave quarters have received more study than have these humble buildings. Publications dealing with the origins of log cabins and the various notching styles of construction have provided background information and ethnic origins of corner notching styles, chimney styles and internal layout (Glassie 1968). What has not been done is to correlate the date of construction of the buildings with the properties.

Surviving log structures with stone chimneys use a minimum of nails thus dating to within a hundred years is often as close as is possible on stylistic grounds.

Ancillary domestic buildings on large plantations or farms were typically of three types: overseer/farm manager dwellings, slave quarters, and tenant farmer houses. Again, following the hierarchical social system, the main house occupied the dominant landscape position, the overseer house the middle and the slave quarters the least desirable of the group.

Ancillary farm buildings would include barns, tobacco barns, gristmills, and storage buildings.

The primary cash crop in the VA Piedmont was tobacco. A structure set for the culture of tobacco had several components. On a small farm, the typical scenario has the dwelling at one end of the fields overlooking a ravine wherein water might be had, with a string of tobacco barns riding up the ridge, and a barn for the animals and produce from secondary use of the land as a subsistence base. Subsistence farming was not uniformly about growing tobacco. All of the farms, large and small, largely grew their own food, primarily for consumption with any excess for sale. Garden plots were ubiquitous at all levels of society. Farm animals were raised for market and personal consumption. They required shelter and winter food. Consequently, barns were built to house the draft animals, to shelter the milk cows and beef cattle and to shelter what might be termed horse furniture, including tack, wagons, buggies and the like.

The economics of scale and optimal foraging theory adapted to the historic periods are revealed in the placement of buildings on large plantations. Clustering around the main house are ancillary buildings. It was remarked that the European great house had rooms devoted to particular tasks while the Southern plantation had individual buildings devoted to those tasks. Space tended not to be at a premium, the dangers of fire demanded space where possible and the separation of the elites from their workers or slaves also brought about the proliferation of outbuildings. If the farm was large enough, a second set of buildings might be built. Household workers and servants were set around or near to the main house. Field workers were placed near to their work where "commutes" were kept to a minimum. Farm barns were scattered across the landscape as needed.

On small farms, the landforms accentuated the linear aspect of building placement. Concentrated next to the fields, tobacco based agriculture developed into the typical signature string of buildings culminating in the dwelling.

In the historic period, transportation improvements fell into three categories. First were the roads. These were placed on elevated terrain following ridge lines and tended either to follow rivers or to follow a superimposed plan based upon organic growth of towns first in the Tidewater and later in the Piedmont. The so-called river roads followed the rivers on terrain set back from the river and tended to be quite serpentine in the Piedmont. Roads superimposed tended to be either major transportation routes established by Native Americans, such as the Occanneechee Trail, or if organically grown, were built to connect administrative centers within each county. The project area is directly adjacent to an historic arterial connector between the commercial center at Danville and the Caswell County Courthouse at Yanceyville. The improved road from Danville to Yanceyville was made into Route 86.

Second were the canal systems. In the Southside, private individuals and later Navigation companies first improved rivers by removing obstructions and by building small rock diversion dams to facilitate batteau traffic. The Dan and Roanoke Rivers empty into Albemarle Sound. While relatively easy to use in the up-country, the falls at Roanoke Rapids were a major obstacle that required large capital infusions to solve. The project area originally abutted the Dan River and Dix's Ferry was locate just southeast of it. This important river crossing was an important transport link.

Third were the railroads. First chartered in the Tidewater and Falls Zone in the late 1820's to 1830's, railroads had made their way to Danville by 1856 eight years after the 1847 charter of the Richmond and Danville Railroad. This railroad followed the southwest/northeast trend from the Capital at Richmond to the destination. A north-south line from Lynchburg to Danville was built in 1866 and was extended into North Carolina roughly following the Route 29 corridor. The former line of the Atlantic & Danville borders the project on the east.

The objectives of this survey were to evaluate site 44PY339 in accordance with Section 106 procedures. At its most basic, Section 106 calls for all archaeological sites and standing structures either on or eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places to be located prior to construction such that the effect of the project can be evaluated and taken into consideration. The objectives were to identify the limits of archaeological sites on the ground, to record their characteristics in two dimensions, to ascertain possible function and to provide recommendations for further work on any sites located.

The Phase I survey (Browning 2011) identified the site. The objective of this exercise was to determine whether the site could be recommended eligible for the NRHP.

Survey Methodology

The site was covered in dense emergent vegetation and needed clearing prior to survey. This was performed by the City of Danville prior to survey. A power line traversed the site and was used for access from the northwest.

After clearance, the site was surveyed using a Nikon NPL 352 Pulse Laser Station transit using three power poles shown on Dewberry contour mapping as base points tied to the VA State Plane Coordinate System. The survey located in space corners of buildings, vegetation patterns, surface features and debris fields associated with the last occupation of the plantation.

In order to obtain a series of photographs, the site was partially photographed using a JLG 800AJ Aerial Work Platform weighing 35 tons. Due to the presence of overhead electrical lines and soft soils, the life was usable for photographing only portions of the site. Subsequently, a helicopter was hired for aerial photography.

A total of 13 test units were also placed to identify whether disposal patterns included sheet midden, pit, spot or off-yard disposal and to investigate potential features. Additional tests were placed to elucidate the folk history of the house regarding its dismantling in 1972 and to determine the probable use of the large ditch abutting the ell of the house.

All soils were screened through 0.25" mesh to ensure uniform recovery of artifacts.

SURVEY RESULTS

General Description

The Coleman 1 Site (44PY339) is an historic house compound. Figure 16 shows the main house and compound. Figure 17 shows the barn and granary component to the east. Figure 18 shows an annotated outline view of the structures labeled for ease of reference.

The Fearn House is an L-shaped structure with an English basement. The building foundation was built using English Bond form-made brick. An addition to the west is evident by the abutting to the west wall of the main structure at the southwest corner. In addition to the main house, there is a 6' diameter stone lined well with a later concrete square cap with 3' square hole. That structure has an addition to the east. A set of structures forms a courtyard around the main house to the south and west. The western wall of the courtyard has a series of structures with a common west wall, culminating at the north in what appears to be a kitchen. Immediately east of the kitchen is another foundation stone pile of undetermined function. All of these are stone founded. Southwest of the compound is a probable slave quarters duplex of massive stone foundations with heart pine single beam footers about 40 feet long. The massive double fireplace has the bottom in stone with the top rebuilt in Common Bond brick. Another probable slave quarter is located north of that. All of the nails observed in the outbuildings were machine cut, apart from the collapsed privy building that had wire nails.

To the southeast is a 3 privy hole set with the collapsed remnants of the privy superstructure using dimensional lumber and wire nails. A probable privy for later tenants exists between the kitchen and the main house.

East of the main house is what appeared at first glance to be a bank barn. If so, it would have been a rarity, but there is no evidence of the characteristic ramp for the hay floor. The barn is quite large $(40x60'\pm)$ and is set into an "L" shaped cut into the bank to the north. At the southeast corner is a domed cistern of $6'\pm$ diameter. To the east of the barn is a granary.

The formality of the layout is evident and further enhanced by the vegetation scheme. Property and yard edges are demarcated by cedars. There are daffodils, forsythia, and privet in abundance around the house. Directly adjacent to the house are ornamental shrubs. There is also a boxwood tree that is about 25 feet high, indicative of some age since the abandonment of the house. The house compound is approximately square, with the front facing the north. The entrance road winds around the base of the hill to the south and west to the house, where it enters the compound on the west side. The ell of the house is on the back.

The unusual aspect of the house is a ditch that starts at the south wall of the ell and is dug south to a point where the elevation of the outfall is lower than that of the basement floor. The wall of the ell is built down into and across the bank of the ditch. The ditch has a total depth of about 6' with equal amounts of ditch and berm (which is to the east). It appears that the ditch was built to drain the basement. The wall of the ell has subsided into the ditch, indicative of erosional subsidence. The west side of the ditch top is paved with slabs of natural stone, while the eastern berm is earthen.

The western wall of the extension is actually two walls of unequal length. The house has a central chimney on the eastern wall and appears to have two chimneys on the western end. The ell to the south has no chimney. The addition to the west encloses both chimneys with little space west of them and has a rather wide opening into the basement. However, that entrance is blocked by a brick pier, probably for stairs, set freestanding within the basement. Figure 19 shows the plan of the structural remnant of the

house and the site layout based Nikon Total Station Transit survey and measurements taken with a Leica Disto A5 EDM to gather basic dimensional information on the house. Figure 20 shows photos the house.

This site had the appearance of having been abandoned and allowed to decay in place. There is no evidence of destruction. But, local history stated that the house was dismantled for re-use at the City Farm in 1972. Visible at the house, compound and slave quarters were flooring and floor beams. These evidently were of little value, probably due to powder post beetle infestation. The relative lack of nails visible on the site was another indication. The barn lacked any wood and the granary had a few remnants of what appeared to be floor beams and floorboards. No structural timbers above floor level were noted at the site.

The house was occupied by people of a distinctly different mindset at what appears to be two different occupational episodes in the past. The formality of the layout was ignored by the first set of occupants and the back yard was turned from a formal to a decidedly informal area with chicken wire enclosures for animals and irrigation pipes were retrofitted to the well. Debris was strewn through the back yard as well. The second occupation may have occurred after the structure was demolished as the evidence points toward a "TV Dinner" oriented occupation that the occupants then turned the aluminum trans into hollowed shapes, obliterating the original food divisions within the trays which were then discarded along with beverage bottles along the margins of the site.

The English Bond brickwork is complemented by mortise and tenon jointed timber framing. The majority of the nails observed were machine cut and thus postdate about 1785 and pre-date the widespread use of wire nails circa 1875. Of the 535 nails recovered, 38% of the identifiable nails were rosehead nails (n=89), 60% were machine cut nails (n=143), and 2% were 20p wire nails (n=4). Danny Ricketts had obtained some additional rosehead nails in his prior visit to the house site decades ago. Adzes were used on the slave quarters boards rather than sawing for at least one example. A single pine floor plate ran the entire length of the house on both long sides. The house provided most of the rosehead nails. We did not map the distribution of artifacts due to the limited sampling as that is appropriate for an in-depth analysis.

The ceramics recovered were late 18th century Pearl and Pearl/whitewares, 19th century whitewares with American stonewares. Glass was primarily aqua or clear, indicating 19th & 20th century.

Thomas Fearn (1745-1805) started property acquisition in 1778. Fearn was one of the original trustees of the Town of Danville in 1793. Fearn was reimbursed for providing supplies to the Continental Army during the American Revolution. Fearn's son Thomas (1789-1863) served in the War of 1812 and settled later in Alabama. By 1828 the Fearn descendants had sold it all to James Patton who had married one of the Fearn daughters. It is certain that this house is one of the Thomas Fearn houses based on archival investigation.

The occupation in the 20th century by two elderly Walters brothers was the last prior to sale and presumed vacancy until the dismantling of 1972. It would appear from surface scatters that the Walters brothers lived a frugal existence and used what can be termed curated items multiple commercial generations out of style.



Figure 16, Satellite View of 44PY339 House & Compound.

-Barn Foundation



Figure 17. Aerial Photo of 44PY339 Barn & Granary.



Figure 18. Project Contour Map Showing The Labeled Building Plan.





Aerial View of Main House. Bottom of House is North.

Main House Interior, View North Along Ell.



Main House Interior, View To Rebuilt Chimney.

Main House Interior, Center North Wall.

Figure 20. S1, The Main House Photos.



Figure 21. S2 Slave Quarters Plan View.



Figure 22. S2 Slave Quarters Photo.



S2 Fearn Slave Quarters, Aerial View.

S2 Fearn Slave Quarters, Chimney, View to WNW.



S2 Fearn Slave Quarters, South Wall, View to W.

S2 Fearn Slave Quarters, West Half, View to S.

Figure 23. S2, Fearn Slave Quarters Photos.


Figure 24. The possible Second Slave Quarters Plan.



Figure 25. The Possible Second Slave Quarters Vertical Aerial Photo.

That the original construction was done by people of means is indicated by several factors. The substantial size of the main building, the formal layout and number of buildings and the vegetation planting scheme around the house all suggest people of means. This would extend to the slave quarters as the walls have single stones that are 3.5 feet cubed. This would indicate an ample labor source and sufficient economic means to cause the construction using such relatively massive components.

Documentary evidence shows a first patenting in 1771 of 368 acres by William Wynne. He then sold 165 acres to Thomas Fearn in 1778. Machine cut nails are in the majority but rosehead nails are also present. Machine cut nails point to a general post-1785 start-up date but machine cut nails date to the 1770's. The site appears to have been occupied continuously from the original construction into the latter part of the 20th century, probably as a tenant or rental property. Subsequent possible squatter occupation may also have occurred. None of the structures have surviving elements above the foundation apart from severely decayed floor plates in one slave quarters.

Individual Building Function Description

General Layout

The site is laid out in three separate functional areas. The main house compound contains the remnants of a domestic building belonging to Thomas Fearn, a founder of the City of Danville. It was an 18th century English Bond brick basement with an addition to the west in 19th or 20th century irregular bond The lowest possible American Bond coursing was for 5 course but the evidence was ambiguous. The building above the foundation was a timber framed, and was dismantled in 1972.

The structures are numbered for ease of reference and are shown on the various figures. They are labeled as structures in accordance with the usual archaeological nomenclature in which each component of a particular building would have a separate feature number, but collectively would be a building. In this case, because there are constructed features on the site that are not buildings, but which are arbitrarily termed structures, including two artifact scatters.

Function
Main House
Slave Quarters
? Slave Quarters
Kitchen
Shed 1
Storage 1/Smokehouse
Well/Icehouse
Storage 2
Shed 2
Shed 3
Well
Shed 4
Drainage Ditch
Animal Enclosure
Privies
Homeless Camp/Dump
Barn
Cistern
Granary
Timber Staging Area

The main compound was visually open to the north with a set of boxwood funneling traffic to the front door of the house. It was also visually open to the east. To the south and west, the compound was walled off by the construction of a series of connected structures with a passageway between them that also had either a well or an ice-house between them.

Lightning rods or light pole anchors were present in the yard. No light poles were noted, nor were holes observed, thus the former interpretation has more weight. Also, the presence of gas cookers and a gas refrigerator were noted. In rural areas, it is not unusual for gas to be replaced by electricity so the presence of gas powered appliances may be either a hold-over or evidence of a curation effect or as back-up to the all too frequent loss of electrical power.

Separated from the main compound to the southwest were one definite slave quarters duplex and possibly a second quarters. These buildings were visually separated from the main house.

The third area contained a very large barn that was dug into the hillslope but which did not appear to be a bank barn, although it had a sort of berm around the north end. This building also had a cistern at the southeast corner. To the west of it was a large structure set on stone piers that was referred to as a granary by Danny Ricketts.

Temporally and functionally separated from the standard structures and which was done after 1972 when the buildings were dismantled were two distinct areas of late 20th century debris. These were distinguished by surface detritus consisting in one case of the aluminum foil from TV dinners and beverage containers. The other contained more plastic items and may have been an area used for timbering machinery maintenance. These informal debris fields were included in the evaluation as part of the evolution of site function.

The Main House

Structure 1 was the main house used for living purposes. The main house faces north onto what was the road from Danville to North Carolina. The 40'x31' house has an English basement and English bond brickwork. The original construction has an ell on the west end extending south. The brickworks shows that the walls were built at one time. The entrance is approximately central to the original building. The windows in the basement are set towards the end walls and are symmetrical in placement, including in the basement. The English Bond brickwork is complemented by mortise and tenon jointed timber framing. The majority of the nails observed were machine cut and thus postdate about 1785 and pre-date the widespread use of wire nails circa 1875. There were rosehead nails present in small numbers. Danny Ricketts had obtained some additional rosehead nails in his prior visit to the site decades ago. Figures 19 and 20 show the plan view and photos of the house.

The western entrance to the basement was at ground level due to slope whereas the house had been built into a slight upslope. The house was built on the south end of the knoll top. The walls were not of equal length.

Heating for the building was provided by a large exterior brick chimney to the east main room. This chimney appears to be bonded into the wall. The original basement had no heat. Two exterior chimneys that abutted against the outside walls on the west supplied heat for the upper floors. The ell chimney had been rebuilt in common bond with a basement fireplace.

An extension to the house was added on the southwest. A of 13' extending the long wall and 9.6' turning north were abutted to the southwest corner of the house. The walls were of irregular bond and very poorly made.

The western wall of the extension is actually two walls of unequal length. The house has a central chimney on the eastern wall and appears to have two chimneys on the western end. The addition to the west encloses the southern chimney and probably acted as a wood storage shed. However, that entrance is blocked by a brick pier, probably for stairs, set freestanding within the basement. Figure 19 shows the plan of the structural remnant of the house and the site layout based upon Nikon Total Station Transit survey and measurements taken with a Leica Disto A5 EDM to gather basic dimensional information on the house.

The Slave Quarters

Structure 2 was a 45' x 20' duplex domestic building consistent with a slave quarters in its original use. Figures 21 & 22 show the plan view and photos of the structure. The slave quarters has a

stone foundation comprised of large dry laid fieldstones running completely under the house. Due to slope, the SW corner had massive stone pieces used to overcome the 3'+ elevation difference. Adzes were used on the slave quarters boards rather than sawing for at least one example. A single pine floor plate ran the entire length of the house on both long sides. Floorboards were present, but had collapsed into the space beneath the floor. The eastern portion of the duplex was built at ground level on the northeast corner, but on the south wall the height was 3'+ over ground. A central stone chimney was present with fireplaces to the east and west. The stack of the chimney had been rebuilt using brick in Common Bond. All nails observed were machine cut. No evidence could be marshaled to show that the building had collapsed in place. The building remnants were consistent with the dismantling of the superstructure that occurred on the main house.

Evidence for a doorway was from a door lock, door knob and latch set found in the debris of the house east of the chimney on the north wall. These indicated a use after the Civil War and into the 20th century.

The building is labeled as a duplex as it was the most common slave quarters building type. But due to decay/dismantling, no evidence could be discerned to show partitions in wood. However, there were vertical slots cut into the chimney at the middle on both sides that were consistent with studs supporting partition walls.

Wire mesh was found inside the house, laid flat in overlapping strips in the east room. These were interpreted as a secondary use for the room as storage for items that required animal-proofing.

? Slave Quarters 2

Structure 3 was a foundation mound consistent with another slave quarters situated to the north and slightly west of the better surviving slave quarters. The observed stones were of a similar type and character as those used in Slave Quarters 1. The building had degraded to the point that discerning walls and possible chimneys was difficult. The building had also served later as a storage structure. A vehicle body was parked adjacent to it with an isosceles trapezoid shape, indicating a probable animal drawn type, although the metal fittings on it indicated an early 20th century date. Figure xx shows the possible second Slave Quarters plan and Figure xx shows a vertical aerial photo of the structure.

The Kitchen

Structure 4 was located at the north end of the main house compound. The dry laid building walls were made of irregular ashlar blocks with some infilling of brick and smaller stones. It was a rectangular structure (20'x18') with a massive interior granite platform at the south end. The remainder of the structure had open space. This was interpreted as a kitchen for the main house.

Shed 1

Structure 5 is an open fronted building south of the kitchen. Abutting the south end of the west wall of the kitchen was a dry laid stone wall that extended south for 30.5 feet that ended at the north wall of Structure 6 is what is interpreted as an open fronted storage structure. The north, west and south walls are solid ashlar blocks. The east wall facing into the compound has two large stones placed at the 25% and 75% length positions in line with the east walls of the adjoining structures. The 18.75' wide 3-bayed structure with an open front could have been used for equipment storage that required a roof over and quick access.

Storage 1/Smokehouse

Structure 6 was a 18.5'x17.75' structure with internal regularly set piers and a wooden floor. The exterior walls are dry laid ashlar blocks. The internal piers form a cross set at the center of the walls and converging at the center of the building. Remnants of the wooden flooring were observed. The building characteristics suggest that it was used as a floored and enclosed structure. It might have been used as a storehouse/larder or perhaps as a smokehouse although no evidence of the smoking apparatus was noted.



Figure 26. The West Compound Wall S4 Kitchen & S6 Storage/Smokehouse Plans, North.



The West Wall Compound Wall Photos, North S4 Kitchen, View to W. S4 Kitchen to left, Shed 1 in middle, S6 Storage/Smokehouse to right. View to E.



Aerial view of S6 Storage/Smokehouse.

S6 Storage/Smokehouse. View to E.

Figure 27, The West Compound Wall Photos, North.



Figure 28. S8 Storage 2 Building Plan View.





S8 Storage, SW Corner Compound, View to W.

S8 Storage E Wall, S9 Shed S. Wall, View to N.



East End, S10 Shed 3, View to S.

Figure 29. The South Wall S8 Storage 2, S9 Shed & S10 Shed 3 Photos.



Figure 30. The S11 Well, S12 Shed 4 and S13 Animal Enclosure Plan.



S12, Shed 4, Well Shed with Gas stove, irrigation Equipment. S11 & S12, Aerial View to N. Well is beneath 4x8' Plyboard & Aerial View



S14 Animal Enclosure, note line of saplings to left of barrel and across front of photo.

Figure 31. The S11 Well, S12 Shed 4 and S13 Animal Enclosure Photos.

Well/Icehouse

Structure 7 was a wall extending to a well/icehouse that continued the western wall alignment of the main compound. The exterior/west compound wall extended south and appeared to end. A depression over 15' in diameter and about 1.5' deep was next in line. This was investigated and found to be either a well or an icehouse that had been backfilled. Beyond the well/icehouse, the wall again was evident. For the purposes of this evaluation, we have combined the two wall segments and the well/icehouse into one structural complex. In keeping with the character of the compound, the interior facing east appeared to be open. The conjectured function was that the area marked a break in the wall for ingress from the slave quarters into the compound and provided a second well for the slaves or it was an entrance between the building to the north and the icehouse.

Storage 2

Structure 8 anchors the southwest corner of the main compound. It is a dry laid stone wall 17.5' square. There were no interior structural stones noted, nor were there any wooden flooring remnants, suggesting that the building was dirt floored.

Shed 2

Structure 9 is the southern wall of the main house compound. It extends east from the southeast corner of Structure 8 to a point at the center of the courtyard well (Structure 11) projected south. It has dry laid stone walls on the south and east ends. There are internal stones suggesting front posts. The building measures 35.75'x17.5'. This building is interpreted as an open fronted storage building, facing north.

Shed 3

Structure 10 is a continuation of the southern wall of the main house compound extended east of Structure 9. The building measures 24.5' x 27.5'. This building has dry laid stone walls on the west, south and east and appears to have been open on the front or north. This building is interpreted as an open fronted storage building, facing north.



S13 Drainage Ditch, Facing N.



Figure 32. S13 Drainage Ditch, Facing S. Note stones on W side.



C20 Privies, View To W.

C20 Dump Site, Household Refuse.



C20 Dump Site, ? Homeless Camp. Note plastic & aluminum trays.

Figure 33. The Privies & Homeless Camp Photos.



0

<u>1</u>0 FT

Figure 34. The Barn & Cistern Plan.



S17 Barn, Facing South.

S17 Barn, Facing West.



S17 Barn, Facing WSW.

S18 Cistern, Facing N.

Figure 35. The S17 Barn & S18 Cistern Photos.



Figure 36. Fearn Granary Plan View.



S19 Granary, Facing South.

S19 Granary, Facing South.



S20 Staging Area.

Figure 35. The S19 Granary & S20 Staging Area Photos.



Gas Stove, Adjacent to Slave Quarters.

Red Tin-Enameled Teapot, Main House Compound.



Slave Quarters Floor Board, Adzed.

Figure 38. The Surface Artifact Photos.

Well

Structure 11 is the well for the main house compound. This well is brick lined, with a diameter of 6 feet, making it one of the largest wells noted in the state. It is capped with concrete with a 11' square apron, leaving a rectangular opening for access. At some point, the well was also retrofitted with plastic pipe, probably for a continuation of the early-middle 20th century irrigation apparatus noted adjacent to the well.

Shed 4

Structure 12 forms the eastern wall of the compound, although Structure 10 extends beyond its eastern limit. This 13' x 70' building has dry laid stone walls and is configured into an "L shape with the open end facing west. The building abuts against the southeast corner of the well casing and appears to be contemporary with it. Inside the former building were a set of what appeared to be irrigation nozzles from the first half of the 20th century. This building appeared to have been a shed for equipment storage.

Drainage Ditch

Structure 13 is a drainage ditch of $59' \times 5' \pm$. An unusual feature of the main house complex was a large ditch that ran from the eastern half of the southern wall of the ell south to drain out over the adjacent downslope. The upcast for the drain was on the east side and formed a formidable barrier. The visual appearance was exactly that of a Civil War earthwork. The top of the bank had large flat stones in places, as did the west side, indicating possibly a form of walkway. There was no means of traversing the feature without going around the north side of the house or around the south end of the ditch, apart from climbing over it.

At the interior wall junction on the ell, a test unit was placed to see whether a formal drain could be discerned. The results were inconclusive. There was no arch or other opening visible. However, degradation of mortar in the wall was evident. It appears that the position of the house at the southern edge of the landform and the western ground level entrance may have contributed to flood issues in the basement. The ditch was a response to drain water and which had to be dug to below floor level. That required the rather large size for the venture.

Animal Enclosure.

Structure 14 is an animal enclosure of 38.5' x 23.5'. A combination of saplings along a line of wire fencing showed an "L" shaped enclosure that was largely flat at the time of investigation. This was situated at the back of Structure 12 but was separated from it by a narrow space. The type of animals held in the enclosure is unknown, but the wire mesh size and low height suggests fowl. No evidence of a chicken house was noted but Structure 12 is a possible candidate due to proximity.

Privies

Structure 15 is a set of three former privies. These are square in shape, set side by side, each about 5 feet across. The remnant of one outhouse has collapsed and decayed approximately halfway into one of them. The construction on the privy building was using dimensional lumber and wire nails, indicating a 20th century date.

Homeless Camp/Dump

Structure 16 is a probable homeless camp as well as a probable garbage dump for the last occupants of the house. The area was littered with aluminum TV dinner trays, glass jars, beverage bottles and similar detritus. From appearances, one individual appeared to have used the area. It also appears from the glass jars that the area may represent terminal occupation by the Walters brothers who used that area as a dump as it was beyond the privies and therefore the back of the back yard away from traffic along the road. The presence of aluminum TV dinner trays that were altered by flattening and creating curved surfaces is an unusual aspect that is perhaps more indicative of homeless individuals.

Alternatively, if the altered trays had holes punched at the small end, their function as bird and animal garden defenses is possible as well. Plastic partitioned TV trays that were a beige color were also present. There appeared to be two separate deposition episodes based upon the vegetation coverage of the glass component which was beneath the aluminum and plastic component.

Barn

Structure 17 is a 61' x 35.5' barn. This building occupied an "L" shaped cut into a higher bank but did not appear to be a true bank barn as there was no ramp on the upslope side. The southern side was walled and a ramp in the western wall with a stone revetting wall on the north side allowed access to the western end. A formed gap in the southern wall approximately at midpoint pointed to a doorway into the bottom floor. Presuming the barn followed the typical building regimen, the bottom floor would have been the cattle floor while the top was the hay floor where winter fodder was stored and where threshing of grain might have taken place.

As the barn was not extant on the 1954 aerial photo and was known to have burned in 1900 (Walters 2012). The complete destruction of the 1900 crop year's worth of harvest would also indicate that the granary was affected, assuming separate functions for the barn and the granary. The barn is typically used for animal shelter at the bottom, hay storage on the upper ground floor accessed from the bank and for any additional floors on the interior. Normally, barns are more or less open on the interior to allow for movement of hay inside. Loose hay was the norm until hay balers appeared. The typical barn had a hay fork that moved loose hay from wagons into the barn for storage for winter fodder. Barns also usually had a small granary for animal feed purposes occupying part of one bay of the barn. But, the dynamics of how a barn interacted with a granary on a large plantation operation are poorly known. On *a priori* grounds, the barn would hold hay while the granary would be a rodent-proofed structure designed to hold bagged or bulk harvested grain.

The size of the barn and granary are quite large, another indication of a financially secure operation.

Cistern

Structure 18 is a cistern built off the southeastern corner of the barn. The feature was brick domed and was filled with water when surveyed. The diameter was about 8 feet with an unknown depth. This would have supplied water for the barn animals, as indicated by its presence. Cisterns are an unusual feature on 18th to late 19th century farms. The date of construction of this feature was not ascertained.

Granary

Structure 19 was a granary set upon stone piers to prevent animal access. This was a quite large structure $(32.5' \times 59'\pm)$ designed to hold a harvest of a considerable acreage. Granaries are typically set on piers in order to minimize the opportunities for rodent infestation. Smaller granaries have piers with mushroom-cap shaped stones set atop them to prevent climbing by rodents to the wooden and therefore infiltratable superstructure. The interior of a granary may be subdivided into compartments to separate different harvest species, such as wheat from corn from barley and so forth. Storage on the interior may be in bulk or more typically in bags for ease of movement and uniformity of content for later sales. Small farm granaries have 9 piers. This building was approximately 10 times that size.

This granary was set on angular dry laid stone walls, similar in appearance to the piled rock wall of tobacco barns in that there was no discernible stone coursing. Four walls were discernible, running roughly north to south. Tree falls and probably staging area clearance for timbering had caused damage. Tree falls had removed the structural integrity of part of the west wall. There were notable piles of stone to the south of the building, consistent with a skidder blade pushing the larger rocks aside to provide a flat surface for machines to park.

Timbering Staging Area

Structure 20 appeared to be a staging area for the logging company that harvested the timber about 15 years ago. The materials consisted of plastic beverage bottles, including cans as well as 2 liter plastic bottles, snack containers and plastic quart oil containers. Not noted were old oil filters or areas where oil had been drained directly on the ground, although the latter might have dissipated in the interim. This set of artifacts occupied about half of the area of the granary. It would have dated to after 1972 when the buildings were dismantled.

Were the survey objectives met?

The primary objective of the Phase II evaluation was to determine whether intact *in situ* cultural deposits were within the site and if they had the potential to provide significant information.

Specific research questions and survey goals for the project survey and their results follow:

1.	Objective Determine whether the Thomas Fearn House was on the property.	Result Yes
2.	Determine the layout of the buildings within the site.	Done
3.	Determine whether intact strata existed within the site.	Yes
4.	Determine whether the intact strata could be related to specific owner occupation episodes.	No
5.	Determine whether occupational information could be obtained from the strata.	Yes
6.	Determine whether socio-economic data relating to specific owners could be obtained.	Yes
7.	Determine the nature of the deposition of the strata for the site.	Done
8.	Determine the function of the structures on the site.	Probable
9.	Determine modes of refuse disposal.	Sheet
10.	Examine the water procurement system.	Done
11.	Examine the waste disposal systems.	Done
12.	Determine whether occupants produced demonstrably different strata.	No
13.	Determine dismantlement patterns for the house.	Done
14.	Attempt to determine any vertical integrity to the site.	Done
15.	Determine the temporal range of site occupation on the project.	Done
16.	Determine whether there was a one-build or a developmental sequence of buildings.	Done
17.	Provide an estimate of the ability of each lot to provide further information.	Yes

What Was Not Present

The purported income of the property from the beginning in the 1770's until 1972 when the buildings were dismantled was based upon agriculture with a steadily decreasing acreage basis and

financial support system. The presence of one definite agricultural piece, and that was dual use, was a probable wagon frame. It was an isosceles trapezoid in shape, tapering about a foot from back to front. The sides had metal brackets to insert the uprights for sides. No discernible axle was noted.

The missing items were any sort of farm equipment. While this may have been sold or hauled off for scrap, it is unusual not to find some form of old farm equipment dump near the main house or major outbuildings.

What also was not present on the overall Coleman tract were field slave quarters. Those around the house were interpreted as household servants. The few locations where historic materials were found, apart from the Fearn's Burying Ground, had slim to no indications of domestic buildings. As the property holdings were 153 acres as compared with 1,047 post-Fearn acres, the missing field slave quarters are presumed to be on the other acreage. Just off the current property but within the former overall property was a school so it is probable that a larger community was enclosed by the property limits. The 1948 photo showed the extent of open fields.

However, what this survey was unable to complete was a plat of how the individual purchases tied together and their internal subdivisions. Reasonable surmises can be made, but without additional research, the limits of the property with their internal subdivisions were not platted.

Correlating the Evidence.

The working assumption has been that the house was built by and belonged to Thomas Fearn. Examination of deeds showed that Thomas Fearn purchased his first tract of 165 acres in 1778, a parcel of 203 acres in 1779, 208 acres in 1783, 514 acres in 1788, 200 acres in 1792, another 200 acres in 1793 and purchased William Wynne's 1 acre gristmill on Rutledge Creek in 1802. The Land Tax Records (LTR) show that of all of these parcels, two had buildings on them, each with a value of \$1500. These were the home parcel of 423 acres and the gristmill.

The functions of the ancillary buildings in the compound are speculative for most. The kitchen building construction points most accurately to that function. The piered structure on the west wing is some form of enclosed and elevated structure with a variety of ranges. The building at the SW corner of the compound and the building at the east end of the south range of buildings were definitely enclosed by four walls and probably functioned as storage for more valuable items. As the property seems largely to have functioned in the pre-automotive era, a tack room, repair shop and similar would be normal interpretations for their functions. The open ended building on the west range could have held farm equipment, household transport such as buggies and similar items. The south range was both at the end of the compound and on the downslope. They may well have served as household animal shelters. A chicken house, stables or other similar animal shelters are probable interpretations.

The well has its obvious domestic water procurement function but with the material found within its associated shed the well also had a subsistence/commercial aspect with the presence of irrigation equipment. While this may have been nothing more complicated than garden watering, it still spoke to a considerable effort and expense to set it all up into operation.

The animal enclosure to the east of the well may have served as a 20th century chicken yard with the adjacent well structure's rather more ephemeral northern part serving as an ad hoc or adapted chicken house.

The three side by side privies appear to be a middle 20th century construct that were dug in sequence as needed as the first and then the second became too befouled for use.

The agricultural compound east of the house designated by the barn and granary are suitable for a large holding, probably started by Thomas Fearn and kept in use on the shrinking agricultural base thereafter. We have attempted to look at the agricultural base for the area by comparing the 1948 US Agricultural Service Vertical aerial photograph with the 1954 to see what changes had occurred over that time. Azariah Walters acquired the property in 1858 and later divided that among his children. The two Walters brothers were the last to live and work the farm, which by that time had diminished from over a thousand acres down to a few hundred due to the subdivision. But the structures were still there.

The 1948 USAS aerial photo shows all of the buildings in the compound, including the southern range. The slave quarters is extant, but the structure north of it cannot be discerned. The barn was not there. The photograph also showed a large building where PY330 was identified during the Phase I. This now appears more likely to have been a barn rather than a domestic building.

The 1954 USAS aerial was used to gain an idea of the extent of open land on the property. While the Dan River floodplain is an obviously arable area, it appears that as much of the upland terrain was also use for agricultural purposes. The fields show as light and dark gray areas. The dark gray areas have what appear to be small cedars growing in them, suggesting pasturage while the lighter areas correspond with higher and more level terrain, suggesting tobacco patches or perhaps cereal crops. The floodplains were ideally suited for cereal crop production whereas the upland soils were used for tobacco. If bright tobacco was the crop, as it almost certainly would have been, then the upland soils would have been seriously depleted to grow the top value bright tobacco (Tilley 1948:4). She described the best soil a "light, infertile an siliceous in character; neither red soil nor black loam, whether fertile or not, will produce Bright Tobacco of good quality." Soils on the Coleman tract were neither red nor black, but rather a yellow tan in color.

The 1954 USAS aerial also showed that the building complex uncovered was in use at different times. The slave quarters and the associated possible second quarters are shown, but unfortunately it is not possible to determine whether the second one was actually a domestic or work building. Also, while the ground survey showed a courtyard of buildings, the 1954 photo showed a significant difference. The courtyard of the main house compound is markedly different than the walls uncovered by survey wherein an interrupted west compound wall turned east into the southern compound wall. Whereas on the photo, it appears that the west compound wall of buildings was extant with the gap where the well/icehouse was located. However, the southern range of buildings was not then extant. The well with its attached shed was clearly shown, and which is show to extend farther north as a complete entity than the solid wall, indicating two build episodes for it. Therefore the compound as such was a much less formal in layout than the original walls would suggest.

Also, the granary is shown, but the barn does not appear to be extant. The cistern with an associated structure over it may be visible. The cistern is in itself an unusual feature.

A barn and granary of the size identified on the site clearly demonstrate a large and well-funded agricultural base. The granary is consistent with cereal crop harvest from the floodplain fields owned by the Fearns and later owners. Thomas Fearn also had a gristmill on Pumpkin Creek that processed material from his fields and presumably from others as a money-making venture. The gristmill was originally started by William Wynne and was operating in 1754. Fearn purchased the 1 acre mill parcel in 1802 and had short use of it until his death in 1805. The mill tract was acquired by James Patton and was not part of the parcel sold to Francis Williams in 1843.

SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

The Fearn Plantation (44PY339) was tested for eligibility for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. There are 20 identified structures of varying degrees of permanence. Two are ephemeral, marked only by the presence of 20th century debris as casual discard locations. These are not considered to be part of the Fearn Plantation as an entity although one may represent terminal occupation disposal.

Topsoils were shown to be thin and composed of a combination of organic material and discard items consistent with casual loss or sheet midden disposal. Artifacts recovered point to a majority 19th and 20th century occupation with very little to suggest an 18th century presence. The house and the extant outbuildings appear to have been entirely removed by dismantling in 1972.

While the 18th century presence on the site is almost entirely represented by the building sets, their construction methodology is unusual in that they used quarried stone brought in from elsewhere.

Thomas Fearn was a founder of the City of Danville and owned over 1269 acres and at his death had 35 slaves. He was clearly a man of means. However, upon his death, his son-in-law Thomas Patton quickly bought up the several devised parcels and again accumulated most in his title. A succession of owners maintained the remnant 1047 acre plantation size through the 19th century. For the period from 1858 until 1961, a single family owned the property and appear to have used it as an income producing agricultural business and lived in the house. Two of Azariah Graves Walters sons inherited parts of the property, including the homesite and lived there until their deaths whereupon the property was sold in 1961.

Archaeology in the historic period was entranced with "The Big House" for decades. Finally, emphasis shifted to the people who actually did the work on these large holdings, the enslaved African-Americans. Emphasis has remained there with a sort of majority academic interest cut-off date of 1865. As always, not all people follow along in a docile fashion. In the last couple of decades, some interest has been shown in the post-Bellum era. This interest has manifested itself primarily in more sociological and anthropological questions than in the archaeological realm.

Reconstruction in Virginia was the period after 1865 that basically continued the system of human bondage that was all but slavery but in name only. African-Americans who had worked on plantations were primarily field hands who knew how to raise, harvest and process crops for market. A few had marketable skills such as blacksmithing and similar jobs. After the Civil War, landowners were land rich on land that was worth little in terms of resale and cash poor in an economy that demanded it. African-Americans had just been freed from bondage and were bereft of cash, had few marketable skills, virtually no job mobility and for that matter, even if movement were possible, job prospects were few. An uneasy accommodation was worked out wherein the cash-rent system was at the top of the lower end of the economic ladder. Sharecropping was at the bottom of the economic ladder. The south was mired in an American variant of what Elvin (1972) calls a high level equilibrium trap.

Elvin's theory, although written about China, has applicability to any agrarian society faced with mechanization and/or industrialization. Elvin argued that the ability of the Chinese to make a more than adequate living based upon traditional methods was a significant impediment to scientific progress. Production was at a perceived maximum, labor costs were low, the laws of supply and demand were "in balance", thus the profit motive for a movement away from manual labor to more mechanized means was viewed as impractical. In no little part, until the widespread use of mechanized farm equipment, the traditional thesis was workable, as long as labor was cheap and available.

The paradox of slavery is still an unremitting issue in academic circles 137 years after the end of the Civil War. That phrase in itself furthers another paradox. The dominant strain of thought is that the Civil War ended slavery. But the events of Reconstruction and the rise of Jim Crow until the birth of the Civil Rights Movement that culminated in the events of the 1960's is all part and parcel of the drama played out on southern farms. Slavery continued in the south on plantations in all but name until mechanized farming replaced the need for human labor for the majority of tasks. These tended to be seasonal needs that were met by the use of migrant laborers, typically either African-American or Central or South American laborers.

The basis is and has been that since the beginning of agriculture, one person is able to handle about 10 acres of land. If more land is needed to be farmed, then more people are needed to farm it. Slavery is just one of many means that people in power have managed to benefit from a legal system that was bent to their benefit. The southern aristocracy was not immune to the industrial revolution, nor to scientific advantage. In fact, the agricultural journals of the day were replete with articles on how best to farm all types of soil, how to use the latest advances in farming and so forth. The industrial base of the north was built not with slaves, but with market labor. The vast plains of the Midwest and mid-central portions of the USA were built using family labor and cooperation among farms, much as one sees Amish farm family cooperation where those populations exist. Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin with the express purpose of freeing slaves from the drudgery of removing seeds from cotton. His ulterior motive was to eliminate slavery. However, from the southern farm owners perspective, a cotton gin meant more acreage could be planted with the excess hours generated by the gin. And more slaves could be used for that effort. Contrary to some opinion, slavery was a profitable venture (Fogel & Engerman 1974a, 1974b). The use of mechanized equipment was always viewed through that prism, bringing the argument back again to Elvin. During the Civil War, steam engines were so valuable that they appeared on maps as items of actionable intelligence. Stationary steam engines had been used in sugar cane production, but only in processing. In short, more than 90% of the labor in the production of sugar from cane was still in manual labor. This approximate figure would hold true in cotton production acreage as well as any other throughout the agrarian south.

Two factors emerged after the Civil War that influenced labor and the laws of supply and demand. Emancipated African-Americans were no longer bound to the land and to a particular master and could in theory vote with their feet. The second factor was the rise of industrial jobs that required labor to which African-American responded. Railroads in the south were poorly developed as compared with the north by the Civil War. Any railroad in the south did not extend farther than 200 miles in any direction before gauge changes forced the entire cargo to be offloaded from one carrier and loaded onto another. This inefficient system was based in no little part by personalities of the individuals who built the systems and their individual desires to not cooperate with their competition. In the north, at the same time, it was possible to travel from New York to Chicago on the same rail car. Thus movement of people and materiel was far more efficient in the northern system than the southern. Railroad construction after the Civil War in the south provided jobs for newly emancipated African-Americans. Although wages were low, they were still higher than those on their former plantations or anywhere within the agricultural system.

Inventions of and incremental improvements to mechanized farm equipment brought increased production and eliminated low skill jobs in the south. From the first grain crops in the cradle of civilization in the Middle East up until 1834, harvesting of wheat was done with a one handed sickle, a two handed scythe and later a cradle which was still a scythe but with metal arms to lessen grain loss by preventing whiplashing of the cut grain stalks. A cradle could cut from 1 to 3 acres per day. The first successful mechanical reaper could cut from 12-15 acres of wheat per day. McCormick's reaper was first used in 1834 as a successful experiment. The machine was steadily improved but in essence, all that it did was to cut the stalks and move them off the platform where they still had to be hand-bound. In 1858 an improvement was made so that the cut wheat was moved by a belt to two men who bound the wheat. In 1872, a wire binder was invented and in 1880 a binder using twine was invented. These were incremental advances in the mechanization of farming. Motive power was still by animals. Once the wheat was bound, it was left in the field to dry and then hand threshed. A mechanical thresher was invented for the sole purpose of removing the seed kernels from the chaff. It was powered by a steam engine but had to be fed by hand. The binder twine had to be cut and the stalks then were pitchforked into the thresher where the seeds were separated and had to be bagged when the process was complete.

The thresher performed two operations. It removed the seed from the plant and disposed of the remainder. Prior to that, threshing was a physical process that was slow and time consuming. Flails were used to break apart the seed heads and in the process a large amount of seed was also broken. The resultant material had to be winnowed. This involved tossing the material into the air such that wind would move the undesirable parts to the side and the seed would fall straight down. In practice, considerable foreign material remained with the seeds. The mechanical thresher put both of these operations into one machine and resulted in a faster and more efficient operation. The seeds still required bagging and sewing when full.

By 1915, the McCormick's International Harvester Company had produced a machine that cut wheat, threshed it and augered the clean seeds into a wagon for transport. It was called a combine because it combined all of the formerly separate tasks. This all in one machine revolutionized the process of harvesting wheat. Concomitant advances in other agricultural endeavors slowly but surely removed more and more people from the agricultural process. Whereas from the beginning, 10 acres per person was the norm, with a completely mechanized late 20th century operation, 2 people could handle 2000 or more acres.

This level of detail is mentioned for two reasons. First is that because at each step, fewer farm workers were required. A single mechanical advance could put 60 farm workers out of business at one time. As a result, the configuration of buildings on a farm changed. Fewer worker houses were needed. The types of buildings on a farm changed as well from an animal based operation to a machine based

operation. The steam engine started the process but due to their size, weight and high cost, they were not able to catch on in the farming community. They were extensively used but required animals to tow them into place in fields where they were used until self-propelled models were invented.

With the advent of the internal combustion engine and its adaptation to tractors, a light-weight and less expensive tractor was in the reach of small farmers for which sales took off in the 1930's. Again, at each step in the process, fewer farm workers were needed. Those that remained tended to have mechanical skills. Second, while the discussion above was centered around the harvesting of wheat and the evolution of equipment that replaced human labor, all of the other crops that needed harvesting could, in the main, be shown to have followed a similar trajectory from human labor to replacement by mechanized farm equipment. Tobacco is a deviation rather than an exception. Mechanization has followed the preparation of fields, the planting of crops, initial cultivation of emergent plants and the curing of the product for market. The part that still requires human labor is managing the plants in the field and the harvesting of the leaves prior to curing. The allotment system also meant that small family farms were economically viable given the relatively small plots of land able to produce an adequate yearly income. Absent family ownership, share-cropping, tenant farming or wage labor hires on larger holdings essentially worked the same way as the smaller holdings, although in multiple rather than single family units.

Up to the Civil War, southern agriculture was generally either at a subsistence to small family level with the family providing the labor or it was plantation based with African-American slaves supplying the labor. Slavery was profitable, families in general were able to make a living. The high equilibrium trap espoused for China by Elvin has major points that are applicable to the agrarian south. In short, the system worked due to an enslaved labor supply. Agricultural inventions were adapted to the slavery system and enhanced it. Such machines as there were cost more than all but the plantation elites could afford, thus a mass movement was impossible.

The Civil War changed that dynamic, albeit very slowly. In its immediate aftermath, the system changed but little as there were very few opportunities for change, even had not the oppressive political system not legislatively kept African-Americans in virtual bondage through a system of laws designed to continue the previous system.

Inventions of mechanized farm equipment and adoption by increasing numbers of farmers as well as external factors brought about an enormous reduction in the numbers of farm laborers required (Daniel 1985). This in turn would inexorably lead to changes in building styles, how they were laid out, what they held, how they worked, how work was performed in them and so forth. The transformation from a human and/or animal powered farming operation to a mechanized farm occurred in the period 1865-1975. All of this should be reflected in the farm buildings at the site. This may well be reflected in the disappearance of the southern range of structures in the main house compound and the disappearance of the barn.

In summation, the fieldwork performed was designed to determine the NRHP eligibility of site 44PY339. The site has 19 structures ranging from those constructed by the original owner of first-class materials to ephemeral late 20th to early 21st century artifact scatters. With respect to the NRHP criteria, Criterion B is felt to be applicable as the property belonged to one of the founders of a major southside city that in itself was rooted in tobacco farming and which was a regional hub for tobacco, and invented the auction system for sales as well as being the hub for Bright Tobacco that basically mainstreamed tobacco with the invention of cigarettes.

Criterion C is felt to be applicable due to the quality of workmanship in the buildings, using as most did quarried granite that is not locally available and must therefore be considered a plantation elite material. The extent and size of the structures is another indicator of importance on the regional level.

Criterion D is the major significance indicator for the site. The layout of the site has been established, the buildings have been planned in, test units have established a fairly shallow topsoil that appears to be consistent with sheet midden. Numerous occupation episodes in terms of site function and socio-economic levels are indicated from documentary evidence.

The 18th century component of the site is least represented, due to the time it was built in the 4th quarter of the 18th century. There is a marked paucity of artifacts from that time period. The major occupation of the site was in the 19th century during the slave era and more importantly after the Civil War during the Reconstruction and Jim Crow eras for African-American occupants. The dynamic between enslaved African-Americans and their white counterparts has been well developed in archaeology. Contextual information to develop research designs to explore various aspects of the plantation is available.

What is not available is a context for the study of lifeways after the Civil War. This would include how farm workers interacted with owners and how that appears in the archaeological record. It would also include how this plantation fit into the sea-change from human/animal power to mechanized farming, especially on a larger farm where the owners might be expected to have the fiscal means to utilize mechanized devices to increase profits. This era was also the time when the two great migrations of African-Americans out of the south to the larger urban centers of the north took place. Archival investigation might shed some light on this aspect of southern life. The artifact from the site reflect their owners tastes and financial means. Comparison of post-Civil War to 1972 artifacts from the main house area to the house compound to the quarters to the barn and granary area have information to be gathered that has not been studied elsewhere. Artifacts not related to the domestic aspects of that sea-change are abundant on the surface and presumably beneath it within the compound. Archaeologists have traditionally worked on the domestic buildings as a primary focus of investigation.

The Fearn Plantation was owned by two families for over 100 years. One family owned the property for about 80 years. The Walters family owned 54 slaves in Pittsylvania County prior to the Civil War and owned the property after it at a time when the shift in labor was being worked out. It should in theory be possible to work with the material culture of that particular family and from that to extrapolate to similar socio-economic artifact groupings. That has formed the basis for similar endeavors in the past. Tracking the trajectory of a single family through the vicissitudes of the post-bellum disruptions to the "norm" of plantation life is the information set that is available from this plantation.

The unknowns in the equation are the economics. Orser (1988:56) refers to the permutations of share cropping as "croppers, half hands or half tenants". He addresses "furnishings" (Orser 1988:57), share-renting (Orser 1988:58) and shifting (Orser 1988:111-112). Traditional views of agricultural operations lean towards longevity of tenure. "Shifting" is a phenomenon that came about as a result of the end of human bondage in combination with amoral capitalism. During the slave era, owners of human beings theoretically had a vested interest in the well-being of their property. Even if only to ensure top productivity, owners provided food, clothing and medical care, such as it was, to their "property" and provided an overseer to ensure maximum effort within the confines of the "peculiar institution". With the end of slavery, this was no longer an imperative. Owners and former slaves worked out tentative agreements that in the larger view, worked their way into the share-cropper and tenant farmer dynamic. Owners were land rich and capital poor. Laborers had only their work to offer. The give and take was largely on the side of the owners who could find workers willing to endure as long as they were given subsistence at the most basic level. Orser's work is focused on a particular dynamic and does not examine the effect of other factors of farm dynamics, particularly the effective mobility of the work force and the mechanization of farming. Inter-site comparisons of upper echelon farms versus singlefamily operations is needed. Large numbers of comparables in each set are also needed such that what is valid for South Carolina farms in Orser's study population is also valid for Virginia and farms in other states. In short, stereotypical farming operations need to be generated against which to evaluate particular sites. This site is one such farm that would be able to populate a stereotypical large farming operation, if a context existed.

However, as the system evolved, shifting came into the nomenclature of owner/worker relationships. Whereas formerly plantation owners had a workforce that was literally fixed by law to the workplace, emancipation disrupted that dynamic to where the workers could choose among several admittedly poor but from the perspective of the worker, slightly better choices. In practice, this meant that workers could move from employment to employment opportunity as it suited their perceived needs. The uncertainty introduced into the system for the owners was cause for discussion among them. While not a cure-all, it caused a slight shift in favor of the employee part of the dynamic. The employee

could also for the first time choose not to work by moving out of the state with their labor capacity. The laws of supply and demand came into play.

In the discussion among archaeologists, anthropologists, social scientists and historians, the majority of the intellectual capital has been invested in the black-white dynamic. The elephant in the room is the poor white. It is a truism that those with financial means can weather market storms far better than those of lesser means. In the aftermath of the Civil War, white land owners of limited means and those who were of an agrarian background but who were not landowners had a far more limited ability to ride out "bad times". In response, it became necessary for some to enter into employment by the very same means as the recently emancipated slaves. Blee & Billings (in Inscoe 2001:172) indicates that 64% of Kentucky white household heads owned land in 1870 with the inverse that 36% of white household heads were involved in labor of some form or another and were not self-employed. How that particular dynamic played out in the post-bellum South is poorly understood.

In the archaeological record, long-term tenure has been the hallmark of investigation with the artifacts recovered having a strong correlation with the enslaved workers on a plantation. In the "shifting" population, one family might work for one year for one owner and in another year for another. These moves probably cannot as yet be correlated with rental agreements as the records that correspond with these management-labor transactions do not survive. Therefore the difficulty is in attempting to correlate the material basis, ie, the artifacts from housing to personal item ownership, be assigned to particular tenants. In short, archaeology is not able to deal with such fine distinctions. But as this property was owned by two families, one of which had a very long tenure, the dates of the artifacts should be able to provide dating evidence for the Brodnax ownership at one end and the Walters ownership at the other with an overlap between the two. This site is felt to be able to provide benchmark data for the evaluation of similar sites and for comparison with sites of individuals of lesser means.

In summation, this site has information of a type that is unusual, that is associated with a locally significant person and has the potential to answer questions about an era that has received relatively little study and for which a context is needed to formulate an appropriate set of questions to be asked. The primary evaluation criterion was the ability of the site to provide additional information. This site is not felt to be worthy of in situ preservation as the value of it lies more in the information potential than in the layout of the buildings, in the quality of workmanship, of the type of materials used in construction.

Regarding the building materials, the use of quarried granite in the construction of the foundations of some of the outbuildings speaks to the financial means of the owner. These buildings were functional, utilitarian and what survives are the foundations. The information contained within the foundations has been obtained, with the exception of establishing when the structures were built. The dismantling date of 1972 is known, as is the 1900 date of the barn fire that destroyed this large structure. In summary, the site has information about post-bellum farming activities for a property that was in the ownership of three families and should thus be able to provide information about the material culture of a post-bellum plantation in an economically important part of Virginia.

For these reasons, we are unable to make a conclusive case that the Fearn Plantation is eligible or not eligibile for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. The lack of a suitable context in any but the most general terms precludes such a determination. Before a recommendation can be made, it is recommended that a comprehensive context be compiled by persons familiar with the mechanization of farming, the history of agriculture from 1865-1975, the economic dynamics of the same timer period and the broader outlines of history in that same period.

Regardless of formal eligibility determinations, there is ample information to be obtained from the site that would aid in the construction of an appropriate context using an upper echelon property that appears to have undergone a slow degradation over the last 60 years of existence until dismantling in 1972. Absent a cogent context, factoids swimming in a narrative are essentially without form and void. Tilley (1948:97) refers to a yearly African-American farm laborers wage in 1872 in Pittsylvania County of \$75 with provisions extra and for a woman the yearly wage in cash was \$25 with provisions. The problem is that it is a number without meaning. A new Ford automobile cost \$600 at the same time. Wages also declined over time so spot-picking information is accurate for that time only and cannot be used as a baseline. First, an economic baseline needs to be developed, then the archaeological and archival results can be compared with it. In short, there needs to be an indexing system for evaluation of the relative amount rather than the absolute amount that the \$100 constituted and to be able to follow that over time. In short, obtaining "data" without meaning is a pointless exercise.

The information obtained from the investigation showed a building layout set. What is unknown is whether the structures were contemporary or were accretional. While the barn was known to have burned, the main house compound structures are from archival evidence known not to be entirely contemporary. The artifacts recovered from the test units were 19th or 20th century and provided little information beyond the basics and certainly nothing regarding the building of the property by Thomas Fearn and how the material basis for the plantation changed over time. The interval between the end of the Civil War and the 50 year Section 106 cut-off date saw a revolution in farming technology. Life in that period was not static. The incremental evolution of machinery was not gradual, but came in fits and starts with intermittent grand leaps. The resultant effect upon the farm laboring population and the local economy is known. There are two problems for the archaeological study of this era. The first is that the various studies are basically so broad or so narrow and deep (stovepiped), and the second is that there is no unification across the various studies to provide meaningful interpretation at the site level. The disconnect between the various academic broad base studies and the ability to work with that information at the archaeological site level awaits an in-depth contextual study. The concentration of archaeological work in the past with "Big House" studies, and then slavery studies all stops at the Civil War. Undoubtedly part of the issue is the perception that the information base does not lend itself to study as it is so near the present as to be "yesterday". Until that gap can be breached, valuable information will be discounted. We do not accept as intellectually valid cutting off discussion at 1865.

Regarding the physical remains of the property, the information from the buildings as to layout, construction methodology and to some extent function has been obtained. Photographic documentation has been accomplished, both aerial and terrestrial. Regardless of whether the site was felt to be eligible, we do not feel that *In situ* preservation is warranted.

References Cited

Blee, Katherine M. and Dwight B. Billings

2001 Race and The Roots of Appalachian Poverty, Clay County, Kentucky 1850-1910. In Appalachians and Race: The Mountain South From Slavery to Segregation, edited by John C. Inscoe. U. of Kentucky Press.

Browning, Lyle E.

2011 Coleman Tract, City of Danville, Phase I Intensive Cultural Resources Survey, DHR # 2011-0767. MSS on file at DHR.

Elvin, Mark

1972 "The High-Level Equilibrium Trap: The Causes Of The Decline Of Invention In The Traditional Chinese Textile Industries" in W. E. Willmott, Economic Organization in Chinese Society, (Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press, pp. 137–172.

Fogel, Robert William & Stanley L. Engerman

1974a Time On The Cross, The Economics Of American Negro Slavery.

1974b Time On The Cross, Evidence and Methods, A Supplement.

Hudgins, Dennis

2006 Pittsylvania County DeedMapper files at: www.directlinesoftware.com/pool.htm.

Kirk, N. M., E. H. Stevens, , C. H. Drinkard and G. W. Patteson

1922 Soil Survey of Pittsylvania County, Virginia. United States Department of Agriculture.

Orser, Charles E., Jr.

1988 Material Basis of the Postbellum Tenant Plantation. U. GA Press.

Ricketts, Danny

2011 Danville historian working on lower Pittsylvania County, City of Danville and Caswell County, NC.

Tilley, Nannie May

1948 *The Bright-Tobacco Industry* 1860-1927. UNC Press, Chapel Hill, NC.

Walters, Azariah Graves

2012 Website at: http://wc.rootsweb.ancestry.com/cgibin/igm.cgi?op=GET&db=caswellcounty&id=I13308 Appendix A –Title Chain

APPENDIX A - TITLE CHAIN

Grantor	Grantee	Date	Citation	Acres	Comment
Coleman, Benjamin F.					
Franklin Realty Co.	Coleman, Benjamin F.	5/14/93	DVDB 896:222		
Danville Area Dev. Co.	Franklin Realty Co.	10/18/66	PYDB 477:451		
700 Club	Danville Area Dev. Co.	10/8/66	PYDB 475:31		
Danville Realty Co.	700 Club	10/1/64	PYDB 450:139		
Talbott, Sp. Comm	Danville Realty Company	1/26/62	PYDB 416:271		
					Settle chancery suit of
Walters, Edmund	Talbott, Sp. Comm				Curtis vs. Walters
Walters, Archibald	Walters, Edmund	9/1/11	PYDB 136:95	584	
					Wills middle portion of
					Broadnax Tract to A.
Walters, Azariah	Walters, Archibald	11/15/1897	PYWB 4:244		Walters
Broadnax, John W.	Walters, Azariah G.	1/17/1859	PYDB 58:258	1050.5	
Broadnax, Robert	Broadnax, John W.	12/31/1857			From parents, by will
Willliams, Francis	Broadnax, Robert	10/17/1843	PYDB 48:29		
Patton, James	Willliams, Francis	3/21/1836	PYDB 38:291		
Dodson, Mary Fearn	Patton, James	5/1/1823	PYDB 26:214	1269	
					Acquires shares from T.
Fearn, Robert	Patton, James	7/171815	PYDB 19:193		Fearn will
					Acquires shares from T.
Fearn, Thomas	Patton, James	3/20/1815	PYDB 19:103		Fearn will
					Acquires shares from T.
Fearn, Thomas	Patton, James	6/17/1811	PYDB 17:330		Fearn will
					Acquires shares from T.
Fearn, Robert	Patton, James	4/19?1819	PYDB 22:228		Fearn will
Fearn, Thomas	Fearn, Mary	12/16/1805	PYWB 11:284		Via Will
Wynne, William	Fearn, Thomas	10/21/1778	PYDB 5:37	165	
Dudley, Thomas	Fearn, Thomas	3/26/1779	PYDB 5:130	203	
Wynne, John	Fearn, Thomas	11/18/1783	PYDB 7:155	208	
Wynne, Charles	Fearn, Thomas	11/17/1788	PYDB 8:308	514	
Lumpkin, Joseph	Fearn, Thomas	8/20/1792	PYDB 9:264	200	
Bynum, Samuel	Fearn, Thomas	1/21/1793	PYDB 9:335	200	
Worsham, John	Fearn, Thomas	6/21/1802	PYDB 13:2	1	
				1491	

Appendix B – Land Tax Records

LAND TAX RECORD

Year	Name	Location	Buildings \$	Acres	Comment
1821	Fearn, Thomas, Est.	S. Side Dan Riv.	0	375	
1821	Fearn, Thomas, Est.	S. Side Dan Riv.	0	200	
1821	Fearn, Thomas, Est.	S. Side Dan Riv.	0	491	
1821	Fearn, Thomas, Est.	Pumpkin Creek	0	200	
1821	Fearn, Thomas, Est.	Mill Tract	1500	1	
1821	Dodson, Mary Fearn	S. Side Dan Riv.	1500	423	Dower
					1690
1825	Patton, James, D.	S. Side Dan Riv.	1500	423	
	Patton, James, D.	S. Side Dan Riv.		375	
	Patton, James, D.	S. Side Dan Riv.		200	
	Patton, James, D.	S. Side Dan Riv.		491	
	Patton, James, D.	Pumpkin Creek		200	
	Patton James D	Mill Tract	1500	1	
				•	1690
					1000
1827	Patton James D	S. Side Dan Riv	1500	423	
1021	Patton James D	S. Side Dan Riv.	1300	375	
	Patton, James, D.	S. Side Dan Riv.		200	
	Patton, James, D.	S. Side Dan Riv.		/01	
	Patton, James, D.	S. Side Dali Riv.		200	
	Patton, James, D.	Mill Tract	1500	200	
	Factori, James, D.		1300	1	1600
					1690
1020	Datton Jamaa D	C. Cido Don Div	1500	422	
1020	Patton, James, D.	S. Side Dan Riv.	1500	423	
	Patton, James, D.	S. Side Dan Riv.		373	
	Patton, James, D.	S. Side Dan Riv.		491	
	Patton, James, D.		1500	200	
	Patton, James, D.	MIII Tract	1500		1 400
					1490
1007			1500	10505	
1837	Williams, Francis	On Waters Dan River	1500	1050.5	
1837	Patton, James	S. Side Dan River		238.5	Balance
		Pumpkin Creek	1500	200	
		Mill Tract	1500	1	
					1490
	The LTR shows that				
	one parcel owned by				
	Thomas Fearn and later				
	the subject property				
	had a domestic building				
	on it.				

Appendix C – Finds List

See Attached CD

44PY339 CONTEXT NUMBERS

TU #	ZONE #	LEVEL #	CONTEXT #
1	1	1	2
1	1	2	3
1	1	3	4
1	1	4	5
1	1	5	6
1	1	6	7
2	1	1	8
2	1	2	9
2	1	3	10
2	1	4	11
2	1	5	12
2	2	1	68
2	2	2	69
2	2	3	70
3	1	1	13
3	1	2	14
3	1	3	15
4	1	1	16
4	1	2	17
4	1	3	18
5	1	1	19
5	1	2	20
5	2	1	21
5	2	2	22
-			
6	1	1	23
6	. 1	2	24
6	. 1	3	25
0	· ·	0	20
7	1	1	26
7	1	י י	20
7		1	21
7	2	2	20
1	2	2	29
Q	1	1	30
ن م	1	ו ס	21
0	1		20
0	2	1	32
0	-		00
9	 		33
9		2	34
9	1	3	35
10	4	4	00
10	1	1	36
10	1	2	37
44PY339 CONTEXT NUMBERS

TU #	ZONE #	LEVEL #	CONTEXT #
10	1	3	38
10	2	1	39
11	1	1	40
11	1	2	41
11	1	3	42
11	1	4	43
11	2	1	45
11	3	1	46
11	3	2	47
11	4	1	48
11	4	2	49
11	4	3	50
12	1	1	51
12	1	2	52
12	1	3	53
13	1	1	54
13	1	2	55
	1	3	56
14	1	1	57
14	1	2	58
15	1	1	59
15	1	2	60
15	1	3	61
15	1	4	62
16	1	1	63
16	1	2	64
16	1	3	65
16	1	4	66
16	1	5	67

Parts present		Material		Color	
Base	b	Ceramic	с	Amber	am
body	y	Earthenware	е	Aqua	а
Fragment	f	Glass	g	Black	b
Rim	r	Plaster	pl	Blue	bl
Whole	w	Porcelain	p	Blue, dark	bd
Lip	1	Stone	s	Blue, pale	bp
Neck	n	Stoneware	s	Brown	br
		Ironstone	Ι	Clear	с
Style		Quartz	q	Cream	cr
Angular	a	Quartzite	qz	Frosted	f
Burnished	b	Slate	sl	Gold	g
Floral	fl			Gray	gr
Fluted	f	Ware		Green, Dk	gd
Medicine	md	American Brown	ab	Green, pale	gp
Molded	m	Bellarmine	b	Purple	р
Plain	р	Black glazed redware	bgr	Red	r
Ribbed	r	Buckley	bu	White	W
Royal	ro	Creamware	cr		
Scratch Blue	sb	Delft	d	Form	
Scratch Blue, de	sbd	English Brown Stoneware	eb	Bottle	bt
Shell Edge	sh	Glazed Red Refined Stoneware	grr	Bowl	b
Slipped	sl	Hand Painted poly	hppc	Chamber pot	ср
Sprigged	s	Ironstone	Ι	Compote	ct
Starburst	St	Jackfield	j	Container	со
Transfer print	tr	Lead glazed earthenware	lge	cup	с
Willow	w	Lead glazed redware	lgr	Dish	d
		Peal Whiteware	pww	Door knob	dk
		Pearlware	pw	Flask	f
		Porcelain	p	Flatware	fl

 		Glass	g
		Holloware	h
Redware	r	Jar, storage	j
		Medicine	bm
Refined Red	rr	Mug	m
Westerwald	ww	plate	р
White glazed stone ware	ws	Pot, tea	tp
Whiteware	w	Saucer	s
		Tableware	tw
Manufacture Method		Wine bottle	w
Mould blown	mb		
Moulded	m		
Material			
Ceramic	с		
Earthenware	e		
Glass	g		
Plaster	pl		
Porcelain	р		
Stone	s		
Stoneware	s		
Ironstone	Ι		
Quartz	q		
Quartzite	qz		
Slate	sĪ		

C #	#	ID	MAT'L	D	MAN.	HEAD	TIP	Comments
2	6		Fe	5	m	rs	rs	
2	3		Fe	u	m	rs	u	Partial nails
2	1		Fe	9	h	r	р	
3	11		Fe	4	m	rs	rs	
3	8		Fe	5	m	rs	rs	
3	1		Fe	8	h	r	р	
3	3		Fe	u	m	rs	u	Partial nails
4	7		Fe	4	m	rs	rs	
4	1		Fe	4	h	r	р	
4	2		Fe	5	m	rs	rs	
4	1		Fe	8	m	rs	rs	
4	1		Fe	u	m	rs	u	Partial nail
5	4		Fe	4	m	rs	rs	
5	2		Fe	8	m	rs	rs	
5	4		Fe	u	m	u	u	Partial pieces
5	1		Fe	4				Screw
6	2		Fe	u	m	rs	u	Partial nails
7	2		Fe	u	m	rs	u	Partial nails
8	1		Fe	10	m	rs	rs	
9	1		Fe	4	m	rs	rs	
10	1		Fe	12	m	rs	rs	
10	3		Fe	4	m	rs	rs	
11	2		Fe	4	m	rs	rs	
12	1		Fe	3	m	rs	rs	
12	1		Fe	4	m	rs	rs	
14	1		Fe	u	h	r	u	Partial
14	1		Fe	u	u	u	u	Partial
15	5		Fe	u	m	rs	u	Partial nails
15	1		Fe	u	h	r	p	No head
16	1		Fe	25	h	r	p	
16	1		Fe	12	h	r	p	
16	1		Fe	u	m	u	rs	
17	1		Fe	45	h	r	р	
17	2		Fe	25	h	r	p	
17	1		Fe	10	h	r	р	
17	1		Fe	6	m	rs	rs	
17	1		Fe	4	m	rs	rs	
17	1		Fe	8	h	r	р	
17	1		Fe	u	m	u	rs	
18	1		Fe	40	w	r	р	
18	1		Fe	u	h	u	р	
18	1		Fe					tack (2 cm)
18	1		Fe	4	h	r	р	
18	4		Fe	u	m	u	rs	
18	2		Fe	5	m	rs	rs	
18	1		Fe	7	m	rs	rs	
19	1		Fe	12	m	rs	rs	
19	2		Fe	5	m	rs	rs	
19	1		Fe	u	h	u	р	Partial
20	2		Fe	63	m	rs	rs	
20	1		Fe	8	m	rs	rs	

C#	#	ID	MAT'L	D	MAN.	HEAD	TIP	Comments
20	5		Fe	10	m	rs	rs	
20	3		Fe	10	h	r	р	
20	3		Fe	3	h	r	р	
20	5		Fe	2	h	r	р	
20	1		Fe	4	m	rs	rs	
20	1		Fe	5	m	rs	rs	
20	1		Fe	2	h	triangle?	р	
20	18		Fe	u	h	u	u	Partial nails
20	11		Fe	u	m	u	u	Partial nails
21	1		Fe	20	h	r	р	
21	4		Fe	8	h	r	р	
21	4		Fe	3	m	rs	rs	
21	1		Fe	4	m	rs	rs	
21	1		Fe	6	m	rs	rs	
21	1		Fe	4	h	r	р	
21	4		Fe	u	m	rs	rs	Partial nails
21	1		Fe	u	h	r	u	Partial
22	2		Fe	8	m	rs	rs	
22	2		Fe	5	m	rs	rs	
22	4		Fe	4	m	rs	rs	
22	3		Fe	3	m	rs	rs	
22	1		Fe	8	h	r	р	
22	16		Fe	u	m	rs	u	Partial nails
22	6		Fe	u	h	r	u	Partial nails
23	2		Fe	30	h	r	р	
23	2		Fe	10	h	r	p	
23	1		Fe	9	h	r	p	
23	1		Fe	u	h	u	p	
24	2		Fe	6	m	rs	rs	
24	1		Fe	7	m	rs	rs	
24	6		Fe	u	m	rs	rs	
25	1		Fe	10	m	rs	rs	
25	1		Fe	7	m	rs	rs	
25	1		Fe	u	m	u	rs	
27	1		Fe	4	m	hl	f	clutched
27	1		Fe	4	m	hl	р	clutched
27	2		Fe	4	m	rs	br	straight
28	2		Fe	4	m	hl	р	
28	1		Fe	9	h	u	br	
28	3		Fe	4	m	rs	br	
28	1		Fe	4	m	r	br	
28	1		Fe	4	m	rs	р	
29	2		Fe	4	h	r	br	
30	1		Fe	7	h	r	р	
31	1		Fe	4	h	r	br	
31	1		Fe	4	m	rs	br	
31	1		Fe	4	m	rs	р	
31	1		Fe	9	m	rs	р	
32	3		Fe	4	m	rs	br	
32	1		Fe	4	m	rs	р	
32	1		Fe	4	m	hl	br	

C #	#	ID	MAT'L	D	MAN.	HEAD	TIP	Comments
32	1		Fe	5	m	hl	br	
32	1		Fe	4	m	hl	br	bent
33	1		Fe	4	m	rs	b	
33	1		Fe	6	m	rs	b	
33	1		Fe	8	m	rs	b	
34	1		Fe	9	m	rs	f	
34	3		Fe	12	m	hl	b	
34	6		Fe	4	m	hl	f	
34	8		Fe	4	m	rs	b	
34	1		Fe	4	m	hl	f	bent
34	1		Fe	4	m	hc	b	
34	1		Fe	5	m	rs	b	bemt
34	1		Fe	7	m	rs	f	burnt,twisted,bent
34	4		Fe	4	m	hl	b	
34	1		Fe	6	m	rs	f	
34	1		Fe	6	m	rs	b	bent
34	4		Fe	7	m	rs	f	
34	1		Fe	8	m	rs	f	
34	1		Fe	9	m	rs	b	
34	1		Fe	12	h	с	f	bent
34	1		Fe	20	h	с	р	
34	2		Fe	-4	m	hl	b	
34	1		Fe	20	m	rs	f	bent
34	2		Fe	5	m	rs	f	bent
34	2		Fe	4	m	rs	р	bent
34	1		Fe	4	m	hl	b	bent
34	1		Fe	4	h	hl	р	bent
35	1		Fe	8	m	rs	b	
35	1		Fe	4	h	rs	s	
35	1		Fe	4	m	rs	s	twisted
35	3		Fe	4	m	rs	b	
35	2		Fe	4	m	rs	b	burnt
35	1		Fe	4	m	hl	f	burnt
35	1		Fe	4	m	hl	b	burnt
35	1		Fe	5	m	rs	b	bent/torn
35	1		Fe	4	m	rs	b	
35	1		Fe	4	m	rs	f	bent
35	1		Fe	4	h	hl	s?	
35	2		Fe	4	m	hl	b	
37	1		Fe	7	h	r	р	
38	7		Fe	u	u	u	u	
38	1		Fe	8	h	r	р	
38	1		Fe	10	h	rs	p	
38	1		Fe	12	m	rs	rs	
39	1		Fe	10	m	rs	rs	
39	2		Fe	8	m	rs	rs	
39	3		Fe	4	m	rs	rs	
39	2		Fe	u	u	u	u	
40	2		Fe	20	w	r	р	
40	3		Fe	3	h	r	р	
40	2		Fe	8	h	r	р	.5 cm head

C#	#	ID	MAT'L	D	MAN.	HEAD	TIP	Comments
40	1		Fe	8	h	r	р	Bigger head
40	1		Fe	10	h	r	р	smaller head or hl
40	1		Fe	8	h	r	р	smaller head or hl
40	1		Fe	4	m	rs	rs	
41	2		Fe	u	h	u	р	
41	2		Fe	20	h	r	р	
41	2		Fe	10	h	r	р	
41	1		Fe	9	h	r	р	
41	5		Fe	8	h	r	р	
41	5		Fe	u	m	rs	u	Partial nails
41	1		Fe	4	h	r	р	
41	3		Fe	2	u			Partial nails, Tacks?
41	1		Fe	3	m	rs	rs	
42	17		Fe	u	u	u	u	Partial nails
42	1		Fe	2	h	r	р	
42	1		Fe	5	h	r	р	bigger head
42	2		Fe	8	m	rs	rs	
42	1		Fe	7	h	r	р	
43	5		Fe	u	h	u	u	
43	2		Fe	2	h	r	р	
43	1		Fe	8	h	r	р	
43	1		Fe	10	m	rs	rs	
45	1		Fe	30	u	u	u	
45	1		Fe	6	m	rs	rs	
45	2		Fe	u	m	rs	rs	
45	1		Fe	u	h	u	u	
46	2		Fe	u	h	u	u	Partial nails
46	1		Fe	10	h	r	р	
46	1		Fe	2	h	r	р	
46	3							Tacks?
47	5		Fe	u	u	u	u	Partial nails
48	17		Fe	u	u	u	u	
48	1		Fe	10	m	rs	rs	
51	1		Fe	8	m	rs	rs	
55	1		Fe -	8	h	r	р	
55	1		⊦e –	16	h	r	р	
55	1		⊦e −	u	m	u	rs	Partial nail
55	1		⊦e F	u	h	u	р	Partial nail
55	2		Fe ⊏	8	m	rs	rs	
55	3		Fe F	9	m	rs	rs	
55	1		Fe	20	n	r	р	
55	9		Fe	u o				Horseshoe tacks?
55	- 2		Fe	3	m	rs	rs	
50			re Fo	30	111 b	15	ns n	
50			re Fo	10	11 m	ro	p	
57	1		Fo	0 10	111	15 r	n n	
57	1		Fo	10	vv h	r	р р	
57	- 1		Fo	9	n h	r	р р	
57	- 1		Fo	0 5	n h	r	р n	
57	ו ה		Fo		h	r	Р II	Partial nails
51	J		10	u	11	P	u	

C#	#	ID	MAT'L	D	MAN.	HEAD	TIP	Comments
57	1		Fe	8	m	rs	rs	
57	1		Fe	u	m	rs	rs	No head
58	1		Fe	6	m	r	rs	Head is 2 cm
58	1		Fe	4	h	r	р	
58	1		Fe	5	h	r	р	
58	1		Fe	8	m	rs	rs	
58	1		Fe	12	m	rs	rs	
58	3		Fe	9	h	r	р	
58	1		Fe	7	m	rs	rs	
58	1		Fe	3	h	r	р	
58	1		Fe	4	h	r	р	
58	1		Fe	5	m	rs	rs	
58	6		Fe	u	m	u	u	Partial nails
58	3		Fe	u	h	u	u	Partial nails
60	1		Fe	4	m	rs	rs	
60	1		Fe	10	w	r	р	
60	1		Fe	8	h	r	р	
61	1		Fe	10	m	rs	р	
61	1		Fe	u	m	u	rs	
64	1		Fe	9	h	r	р	
64	3		Fe	u	m	u	u	Partial nails
65	3		Fe	u	u	u	u	
66	1		Fe	10	h	r	p	
66	1		Fe	6	m	rs	f	
66	1		Fe	7	m	rs	f	
66	2		Fe	4	m	u	р	
66	1		Fe	5	m	u	р	
66	1		Fe	4	m	u	f	clentched
66	1		Fe	4	m	hl	f	
66	1		Fe	6	m	hl	f	
66	1		Fe	5	m	u	р	bent at end
66	2		Fe	4	m	rs	br	
66	1		Fe	4	m	r	br	
68	1		Fe	10	m	rs	rs	
68	1		Fe	8	h	r	р	
70	1		Fe	6	m	rs	rs	
chimney rubble	1		Fe	20	h	t	rs	Flat T head?
chimney rubble	1		Fe	20	h	r	р	
chimney rubble	1		Fe	16	m	rs	rs	
chimney rubble	3		Fe	12	h	r	rs	
chimney rubble	5		Fe	10	h	r	rs	
chimney rubble	2		Fe	9	h	r	rs	
chimney rubble	3		Fe	8	h	r	rs	T head?
chimney rubble	1		Fe	5	h	r	rs	T head?
chimney rubble	1		Fe	4	h	r	rs	

44PY339 Misc Finds

C #	Mat'l	What Is It?	Date	Description	Pic	Conservation
18	porcelain	Doll arm				
34	copper	bullet casing		rim		
C #	#	Function	SIZE (L x W)	MATERIAL	COLOR	PP
1	1	PP	6 cm/2.75 cm	Greenstone	Leached of gree	CLOVIS
18	1	PP		Chalcedony	BK	PALMER
32	1	Flake		Greenstone	Leached of gree	en color

							COMMENTS
C#	#	Identity	METAL	METAL	LENGTH	WIDTH	
chimney rubble	1	wheat penny	copper				
15	1	1 Unid					
69	1	S hook	fe				
66	35	cast iron-cooking pot	fe				
65	2	bottle cap fragments	steel				
65	40	kettle	fe				
64	2	ties/clasps?	fe				
57	1	hinge	fe				
57	4	un-identified pieces of tin	tin				
57	1	unid. piece	fe				
57	1	very thin small unid metal strap	fe				
50	2	brackets?	fe				
48	1	piece of lamp	ae				
42	1	metal bracket?	fe				
40	1	u	fe				
40	2	can	fe or tin				
40	7	barbed wire	fe				
39	1	cartridge case	ae		1.5 cm	1 cm	
38	1	pencil caper	ae				
28	1	door hindge	fe				
18	1	screw	fe				partial
18	2	bottle caps	steel				partial
18	1	bottle tab	steel				partial
18	1	cartridge case	ae				
18	1	pencil caper	ae				
18	1	metal loop	fe				
17	1	shoe hardware?	ae				
17	1	part of whetstone?					
21	1	Unid. Piece					
33	1	Curry Comb	Fe				
33	1	Unid. Piece	Fe				
33	1	Unid. Piece	Fe				
55	1	Horseshoe	Fe				
	1	cartridge case	ae		1.5 cm	0.5 cm	

44PY339 LITHICS

C #	#	Function	SIZE (L x W)	MATERIAL	COLOR	PP
1	1	PP	6 cm/2.75 cm	Greenstone	Leached of green color	GUILFORD
18	1	PP		Chalcedony	BK	PALMER
32	1	Flake		Greenstone	Leached of green color	

C#	COUNT	FUNCT	PRESENT	COL.	POP.	BASE	BODY	FINISH	BODY/	COMMENTS
					NAME	GEN	GEN		BOTTLE	
	5	2 bt	f	с						
	6	1 bt (milk)	r	с						
	16	1 bt	f	с						
	17	5 bt	y & r	с						piece says "BRED"
	17	4 bt	y & r	с						
	17	2 bt	У	a						
	17	1 bt	У	am						
	17	1?	?	am						
	17	1?	tube	с						
	18	17 bt & tw?	У	с						
	18	1 bt (medicinal)	r	c						
	18	1 bt	У	g						
	18	3 bt	У	a						
	18	1 bt	У	W	milkglass					
	19	1 bt	r	с						"W"
	20	8 bt	f	a						
	20	3 bt	f	с						
	20	1 bt	f	bk						
	20	1 bt	rim medicinal	с						
	21	1 bt	f	am						
	21	1 bt	f	с						
	22	2 bt	f	am						Patination evident
	22	4 bt	f	c						
	23	1 bt	f	G						
	23	2 bt	f	с						
	23	1 bt	f	pink						
	23	1 bt	f	a						
	24	3 bt	f	c						
	24	2 bt	f	a						
	24	1 bt	f	bk						
	25	6 bt	f	a						
	25	1 bt	f	c						
	27	1 bt	f-y	с						

29	1 bt	f-v	a					
30	1 bt	f-v	а					
30	1 bt	f-v	br					
31	6	f-v	с					
31	5 bt	f-v	а					
31	2 bt	f-y	a					letters/writing
31	2 j	f-r	w	milk glass				
31	1 co	f-b	w	milk glass				
32	1 j	f-r	w	milk glass				
32	2 bt	f-y	а					
32	1 bt	f-y	с					
33	1	f-n,l	cl			oval	ring/screw	plastic lid attached
33	1	f-y	br					
33	1	f-y	g					
33	1	f-b	cl					bottom
33	1	f-b	cl					forbidden
33	1	f-y	cl			oval		possible piece of label
33	1	f-y	cl					words Pint
33	7	f-y	cl					present
33	3	f-y	cl					vetical ridges design
33	11	f-y	cl					
34	2	f-y	g					flurosences
34	3	f-y	а					molded letters
34	1	f-n	с			oval	broken	
34	1	f-b	s		oval			solarized?
34	1	f-b	s		round			solarized?
34	27	f-y	с					
34	2	f-r	с					
34	1	f-b	с		oval			
34	1	f-y	с					"N" & "TO"
35	1	f-b	s					
35	1	f-m	с					
35	1	f-y	с					
35	1	f-y	а					
35	1	f-y	br					
37	2 bt	f	c/a					Patination evident

20	2 1-4	C				
38	3 bt	f	am			
38	11 bt	f	с			
38	3 mg	f	w			
39	3 bt	f	с			
40	70 jar, Mason	f	с			1 jar, probably
40	3 jar, Mason	r	с			1 jar, probably
40	2 jar, Mason	b	c			1 jar, probably
40	5 jar, Mason	f	с			1 jar, probably
40	4 bt	f	b			
41	39 bt	f	с			
41	2 bt	r	с			
41	1 bt	f	с			on this fragment (part
41	1 bt	f	a			
41	1 bt, md	r	a			
42	1 bt	f	a			
42	1 bt	f	с			
43	1 bt	f	am			emblem
43	3 bt	f	с			
46	2 bt	f	с			
47	1 bt	f	a			
47	2 bt	f	с			"N" and "A" on it
48	1 bt	f	am			
48	1 bt	f	с			
48	1 bt, medicinal	r	с			
48	1 bt	f	с			noted most likely for
48	1 bt	f	с			Letters N and T
48	1 bt	f	с			Letter C
50	2 bt, md	r & b	с			cork bottle
55	4 bt	f	с			
55	2 bt	f	с			
57	1 bt	f	a			
57	2 bt	f	am			
57	1 bt	f	bk			
57	2 bt	rim	с			
57	3 bt	f	с			Patination evident
57	4 bt	f	s			

57	3 bt	f	a				Patination evident
58	17 bt	f & r	с			body (raised	Patination evident
58	3 bt	f	а				
58	2 bt	f	b				
60	3 bt or gl	f	с				
60	2 bt	f	С				Patination evident
60	7 bt	f	а				
60	1 bt	f	а				Patination evident
60	1 bt	f	g				
60	1 bt	f	b				
61	9 bt	f	с				
61	1 bt	n	с				
61	1 bt	f	b				
64	3 bt	f	aq				
64	5 bt	f	br				
64	1 bt	b	am				Patination evident
64	9 bt	f	с				letter "P" on one of
65	1 bt	f	lg				
65	1 bt	f	g			 	
65	9 bt	f	С			 	
65	1 bt	b	С			 	
65	1 bt	f	am			 	
65	1 bt	f	bd			 	
65	2 bt	f	bl			 	Patination evident
65	1 bt	f	mg			 	
66	1	f-y	gp				
66	2	f-y		milk glass			
66	1	f-y	br				
66	2	f-y	am				
66	37	f-y	cl				
66	2	f-y	bp				
66	2	f-y	db				
66	3	t-y	а			 	
66	4	f-y	g				• • • • • •
66	1	f-y	С				letter "t"
66	2	f-b	C				

66	1		f-unkno	с					ring finish?
66	2		W	a			cylinder		
69	1	bt	f	с					
70	6	bt	f	с					
rubble	1	bt	f	с					Patination evident
	TABLEWA	ARE			POP.	BOWL	STEM	FINISH	
	COUNT	FUNCT		COL.	NAME	SHAPES	FORMS		
42	6	wine glass?		с					
60	3	wine glass?		с					
64	1	glass?		aq					
64	5	wine glass?		с					
65	13	wine glass?		с					
66	1			с	wine		fraground		
rubble	3	wine glass?		с					
	FLAT GLA	ASS							
	COUNT	FUNCT		COL.					
5	4	W		a					
6	5	w		с					
6	2	W		а					
17	3	W		с					
19	1	W		с					
22	. 1	W							
27	6	wi	NA	с					
28	3	wi	NA	с					
29	3	wi	NA	с					
30	2	wi	NA	с					
31	22	wi	NA	с					
32	. 13	wi	NA	с					
34	1			a					window pane?
39	3	W		С					

50	1	w		с			
55	1	w		С			
57	3	w		с			
58	6	w		с			
60	5	w		c/a			
64	2	w		с			
65	4	w		с			
66	31	wi	NA	a			
69	3	w		с			

C#	WADE	CLIEDD	PARIS	MININ	DEC	DEC	FORM	TECU	COL	COI	CLAZE
C#	WARE	#	I KESEINI	IVIINV	1	2	PORIVI	ILCII	1	2	GLAZE
14	n	"			1	2			1	-	
11	P	1							VV TA7		
14	VV	1							vv		
17	w	1	r	1			р		w		
17	p/w	1	У								
17	w	1	r		scalloped edge		р		w		
17	T 4.7	1	r		imitation shell				147	0	
17	VV	1	1		transfer print				VV	0	
17	w	1	r		golden						
					hand-painted						
17	W	1	r		floral		р		W		
17	W	4	y & r		plain						
17	pw	1	v		print?						
17	W	1	y		1				b		one side
									_		
18	w	4	у								
			-		transter print						
18	W	1	r		golden						
18	w	1	r								
18	р	1	У		hint of red pain						
18	р	1	r		gold band						
19	w	3							w		both sides
19	sw	1	У					wt	b		both sides
20	w	1	v		transfer print floral						both sides
20	w	2	f		plain						both sides

C#	WARE	SHERD	PARTS	MNV	DEC	DEC	FORM	TECH	COL	COL	GLAZE
		#			1	2			1	2	
20	rw	1	f		plain				0		both sides
21	w	3	У								both sides
22	w	1	у						w		evident on one side
23	w	1	У						w		glaze on one side
24	р	1	r?						w		
33	ab	1	f-y	1	sl		со	wheel thrown			
33	ww	1	f-y	1	polychrome			press molded	white	orange	
34	ww	2	f-y	1				press molded	white		
34	ww	1	f-r	1				press molded	white		
34	ww	1	f-y	1				press molded	white		
34	rr	1	f-y	1							
34	ww	1	f-y	1				press molded	white		
34	р	1	f-y	1	-			press molded	white		
34	р	1	f-y	1	transfer print			press molded	blue		

_			PARTS								
C#	WARE	SHERD	PRESENT	MNV	DEC	DEC	FORM	TECH	COL	COL	GLAZE
		#			1	2			1	2	
			6						1		
35	WW	1	t-y	1				press molded	white		
35	pw	2	f-y	1	transfer print		d	press molded	blue		
35	WW	1	f-y	1	anualar ware-mo	cha		press molded	orange	black	
35	ww	1	f-y	1	anualar ware-mo	cha		press molded	orange		
35	pw	1	f-r	1			р	press molded	white		
35	ag	1	f-r	1	salt-glaze		со	wheel thrown	grey		
35	pipe	1	bowl	1	partial vertical gr	oves			white		
28	347	1	f		transter print						
28	VV TAZ	1	f		(Willow):						both sides
30	vv		' I		plain						boursides
39	w	2	f		plain						
0.5					Liquid Gold						
39	р	1	f		pattern?						
41	w	1	f		Plain						
41	w	1	f		Striped				y, w, b		both sides
									<i>.</i>		
42	w	1	r		plain				w		both sides
43	w	1	f		plain				w		both sides
45	w	1	f		plain						
46	w	1	f		plain				w		both sides
48	sw	1	handle					wt			exterior orange glaze
48	w	1	f		plain						both sides

			PARTS								
C #	WARE	SHERD	PRESENT	MNV	DEC	DEC	FORM	TECH	COL	COL	GLAZE
		#			1	2			1	2	
			•								
50	р	2	cup base		plain				W		
54		1			Shell edge						
54	W	1	1		(green)				_		
55	w	2	У								both sides
55	p or w	1	b								
55	n	1	v						w		
00	٢		,								glaze exterior/slip
55	sw	1	r						b		interior?
56	Lor we	1	V						347		both sides
50	101 W3	1	y								5001 51005
50	W	1	у								
57	mg	5	f & b								
	0				transfer print						
57	W	1	r		black	hand painted flowers					
57	р	1	f								
57	p	1	f								
57	w	1	f								oreen olaze
01		1	· · ·								green gluze
57	w	1	f								white glaze both sides
									_		
58	mg	7	f & b								
58	р	1	f		web pattern						
58	р	1	plate rim								
					transfer print						
58	W	6	У		gold						
					1		1		1	1	

			PARIS								
C #	WARE	SHERD	PRESENT	MNV	DEC	DEC	FORM	TECH	COL	COL	GLAZE
		#			1	2			1	2	
60	w	1	f		plain						both sides
60	w	1	r		plain						both sides
61	w	1	f		plain						both sides
64	w	1	f		plain				w		both sides
64	w	1	f						у, о		both sides
65	w	1	plate rim		shell edge (blue)						both sides
65	w	1	f		plain						both sides
					F						
66	ws	1	f-y		blue incised lines			whell thrown	white	blue	
66	р	1	f-y		incised lines	letters	со	press molded	white	green (pair	it)
66	p	1	f-y		incised lines		со	press molded	white		
66	р	1	f-y		incised lines		со	press molded	white		

RIM	COMMENTS
INFO	
molded floral design	
	Burnt
molded fluted edge	
	Burnt

RIM	COMMENTS
INFO	
	imitation porcelain?
	undecorated
slight scallop	undecorated
	burnt-discoloration
	burnt-discoloration
	burnt-discoloration-glaze on one side.
	undecorated-glaze on one side
	undecorate

RIM	COMMENTS					
INFO						

RIM	COMMENTS				
INFO					
	more modern imitation porcelain?				
	more modern imitation porcelain?				

RIM	COMMENTS				
INFO					
	slight scallop				
	parian				
	parian				
	parian				

44PY339 Buttons

C#	Function	Material1	# Pieces	Size	Covering	Shank	Join	Shape_ horizontal_	Shape_ horizontal_ front	Shape_ vertical	Dec.
								Dack	iront		
19	Clothing	Brass	1	1.5 cm	none	self	n/a	round	round	round	none
34		g	1			sew through		round	round	round	none

C#	#	Part		Comment
1	1	u	Bone	evidence of butchering; possibly used as a tool
33	1	vertebrae	Bone	
34	1	shoulder-scapula	bone	
35	1	shaft	bone	
40	1	Cranial	Bone	
41	1	u	Bone	
42	1	Cranial	Bone	
64	1	u	Bone	
66	7		bone	

44PY339 Barn Wall Artifacts

Number	Count	Material	Color	What is it	Comments?
1	1	Glass	Purple	Marble	
2	1	Glass	Clear	Bottle	
3	4	Glass	Aqua	Bottle	melted fragments
3	3	Iron	n/a	Nails	1 8d machine cut, 1 partial wire, 1 partial machine cut
3	1	Milk glass	white	cosmetic jar?	
4	1	Steel	n/a	Unidentified	
5	7	American Stoneware	black/white with gold band	pickle jar/crock	
5	1	porcelain	white	plate base	
6	1	American Stoneware	gray	pickle jar/crock	evidence of handle
6	1	porcelain	white	unidentified fragment	
6	1	glass	clear	bottle?	
7	1	American Stoneware	black/white	pickle jar/crock	
8	1	whiteware	white	plate base	
9	1	porcelain	white	unidentified fragment	