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Abstract

RESURRECTING OLD PATTONIA: UNCOVERING THE LIFEWAYS OF A 19TH CENTURY SHIPPING PORT COMMUNITY

Zachary M. Overfield, M.A.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2013

Supervising Professor: Naomi E. Cleghorn

An East Texas steamboat landing community, known as Pattonia, operated from 1843 to the late 19th century. Here I attempt to identify what socioeconomic stratification and consumerism on the landscape meant for the daily lives of Pattonia’s past occupants. In order to address this question, I interpret the architectural features that once stood at Pattonia and their spatial organization. Additionally, I conduct a ceramic analysis of two household assemblages with unknown occupants in order to determine their relative socioeconomic status and reconstruct the social landscape of Pattonia. These methods enable a greater understanding of the unique historical and social significance of Pattonia. The Pattonia landscape was a place of struggle and perseverance, and was ultimately abandoned as it failed to endure beyond its entrepreneurial foundations.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The founding of Pattonia is best known in Deep East Texas through folklore and oral histories. Folklore tells the tale of two brothers, Moses and Robert Patton, who brought riverboat cotton trade to the Nacogdoches region (Bill Patton 2013, pers. comm.). The brothers employed a labor force to clear out the Angelina River in order to make it navigable for flat bottomed vessels (Sterne 1969). They then established a steamboat port, named Pattonia, or Patton’s Landing, on the banks of the Angelina (Figure 1.1). Families lived there and mercantile businesses operated at the landing from 1843 through the late 1800’s, and possibly early 20th century, until Pattonia was abandoned. Currently the site resides on private property roughly 13 miles southeast of Nacogdoches and has no formal archaeological site designation (as per the request of the current land owners).

One motivation for this research is to temper the mythologizing of the past by providing an interpretation of Pattonia that discusses 19th century consumerism in East Texas, incorporating perspectives of class and ethnicity. The sparse historiography that does exist for this town primarily discusses the Patton brothers, burgeoning steamboat trade, and how the landing relates to these developments. Historian Lois Blount (1967) built upon the folk understanding of Pattonia by examining archival resources and piecing back together the socioeconomic significance of this steamboat landing town. Another author (Block 1976, 1995) mentions the Patton brothers within a broader discussion of East Texas steamboat shipping.

This research will explore the question: What does socioeconomic stratification and consumerism on the landscape mean for the daily lives of Pattonia’s past occupants? Most likely, this antebellum community would have had a large disparity in socioeconomic status because of
the innate structure of a cotton enterprise. The status of the workers and enslaved people of Pattonia is of interest, as well as the socioeconomic situation of the elites, women, and children. However, not all categories of interest will be answered through this investigation. This research is limited by the sparse amount of historical documents and the extent of archaeological evidence. I can only address the categories that are revealed through the archaeological record.

By determining something of the built environment, I further elucidate part of the answer to the question of socioeconomic stratification and consumerism. No historical evidence has been recovered revealing the exact layout of Pattonia; therefore, archaeological investigation is the only viable strategy for recovering an understanding of the spatial organization of the site. Ceramic analysis is the second avenue of inquiry that aids in investigating consumerism and socioeconomic stratification. By combining knowledge of the built environment and material culture, such as ceramics, this research will reconstruct something of the daily lives of the people of Pattonia, a subject not fully understood before the most recent excavations.

This work will interpret what types of houses were built on the landscape of Pattonia and how the community was spatially organized. This is done with an analysis of the identified architectural artifacts, assisted by visualization software. Then I conduct an analysis of the material culture with a primary emphasis on ceramics in order to discuss consumerism at Pattonia. The discussion will also incorporate an interpretation of the domestic glass artifacts, as well as other cultural materials. Finally, the relevance of these two lines of investigation for the daily lives of individuals at Pattonia will be discussed. All interpretations are aided and supplemented by archival resources, including newspapers and legal documents. Through these methods, I document the spatial organization of the socially heterogeneous Pattonia, and how the people of Pattonia constructed their social lives through the consumerism of a 19th century
steamboat landing community.

Chapter 2 serves as a research overview. It will explicitly outline the major research questions that drive this work. It also details the extent of archival and archaeological materials related to the site that remain. It concludes by discussing the value of historical archaeological research. Chapter 3 describes the environmental setting. Chapter 4 covers the prehistoric and historical background of the region, first discussing the cultural history of Native Americans in the area and then providing a brief synopsis of Nacogdoches county history, post-European contact. Chapter 4 concludes with an overview of the historical background of Pattonia. Chapter 5 discusses the methods employed for this research: survey, excavation, archival research, oral history, spatial analysis, and ceramic and glass analysis. Chapter 6 addresses the spatial organization of Pattonia and the social landscape. Chapter 7 examines consumerism at Pattonia and how individuals at the site chose to express themselves within the context of the emerging industrial capitalist economy. Chapter 8 discusses how the spatial organization, social landscape, and consumerism of Pattonia are interrelated and how these topics may have impacted people’s lives within the community. Chapter 9 concludes this thesis.
Figure 1.1. Map of Texas (1845) with Pattonia marked by a red circle (Burr 1845).
Chapter 2
Research Overview

Historical archaeologists have grappled with the discipline’s primary purpose since its beginnings in the early twentieth century (Orser 2001). This was due to confusion over the anthropological nature of historical archaeology, that is, whether or not historical archaeology was an anthropological pursuit at all. Hume (1969) famously stated that historical archaeology was only the “handmaiden” of history. However, the majority of historical archaeologists today understand the unique situation of the discipline, which is at the intersection of archaeology, history, and sociocultural anthropology.

Orser (2001) argues that contemporary historical archaeologists tend to relate to at least one of three general disciplinary pursuits. Some historical archaeologists take a critical perspective toward modern historical developments, such as the rise of industrial capitalism. Others seek to understand the impact globalization has had in multiple localities on cultural developments. Another realm of inquiry is the investigation of a site for the site’s own sake, in order to gain further knowledge, unknowable through strictly archival resources (Orser 2001). However, as Orser (2001) acknowledges, these realms are frequently blurred and historical archaeologists do not need to, nor should they, confine their study to one of these three broad categories.

This research draws upon all three lines of inquiry. The impact of industrial capitalism on the cultural developments of Pattonia is considered. It is also the purpose of this research to understand the site of Pattonia and the past uses of its landscape, as well as the spatial organization of the excavated structures. The main framework adopted within this work is an anthropological archaeology of consumerism (D. Miller 1995; Mullins 2011; Spencer-Wood
This framework involves understanding how humans socialize and express themselves through the material culture they consume.

Historical archaeology has the potential to represent groups lost or purposefully ignored in the historical record (Wolf 1982). The existing historiography of Pattonia (e.g. Block 1976; Blount 1967) focuses primarily on the accomplishment of the European American brothers. However this community existed within a diverse social landscape that reflected the social heterogeneity of the entire region. African American slaves, freedmen, Spaniards, Mexican Americans, Native Americans, poor whites, and the gentry would have interacted within this space. Leone (1995: 251), states:

These people have not been left out of mainline presentations of the past by mistake. Rather, it is the politics of class that accounts for the absence of immigrants, children, women, slaves, and free African Americans in the models of social behavior that are created through historical narratives. This politics not only suppresses the exploited themselves, but their histories as well.

I agree with Leone (1995) that historical archaeology’s power and relevance resides with its ability to give voice to those groups that have traditionally been silenced. Shackel (2003) also discusses the exclusionary potentialities of historical writings. He argues that analyzing landscapes of conflict, either physically or symbolically violent, allows for interpretations that more fully unveil the social complexity of the past and how it impacts the present. It is important to emphasize that while the past may be commemorated in such a way that provides mythical remembrances (Shackel 2003), the past was and is real and was acted out by real people. While this may seem obvious, often the past is romanticized and devoid of the gritty substance that makes human interaction so complex. According to Shackel (2003), this is done for exclusive access to the past, patriotism, and to produce an agreeable heritage. Historian Daniel Walker Howe (2007) argues that history should be written from both the bottom up and the top down.
Historiography should include both the common people and the elites or well-known historical figures. Focusing on one specific socioeconomic group or class does not appropriately capture history as it happened. This research will examine multiple socioeconomic groups present at Pattonia without an intentional preference to either the elites or lower classes.

The relative dearth of knowledge concerning Pattonia increases the importance of archaeological investigation. Previously, the only evidence of the daily lives and built environment of the site was oral history and folklore. Archaeology enables the physical examination of the remnants of consumerism that existed within the community. With the excavations at Pattonia a more complete understanding of the nature of this landscape is possible.

2.1 Research Questions

This research is driven by three questions:

1) What, if any, social differentiation is evident on the landscape?
2) What were the effects of global market access on Pattonia consumerism? How was this expressed and by whom?
3) What does socioeconomic stratification and consumerism on the landscape mean for the daily lives of Pattonia’s past occupants?
Chapter 3
Site Environment and Geology

Pattonia is located within the Angelina River Basin, sixteen miles southeast of the City of Nacogdoches on the border between Nacogdoches and Angelina County (Figure 3.1). The site is located near the confluence of the Angelina River and Attoyac Bayou. Pattonia is on private property currently owned by the Sutton family. The site sits perched atop a sloping hill 190 feet above sea-level. Pattonia is bounded by two seasonal creeks, each running south into the Angelina River. Today the Angelina River flows into the Sam Rayburn Reservoir.

Nacogdoches County is predominantly covered by loblolly pine, shortleaf pine, sweetgum, and southern red oak (United States Department of Agriculture 1980). During the occupation of Pattonia, the natural landscape would probably have been clearer. Occupants would have felled trees for their homes and cleared areas for farms, providing a clearer view of incoming steamboats on the Angelina River to the south and any incoming guests by carriage to the north. The large fauna in this area include white-tail deer, eastern fox squirrel, eastern gray squirrel, beaver, muskrat, otter, long-tailed weasel, skunk, raccoon, opossum, red fox, gray fox, coyote, bobcat, armadillo, cottontail rabbit, jackrabbit, northern bobwhite, and eastern turkey (Hall 2005). This is only a partial list, but includes many game and fur-bearing animals that are indigenous to East Texas and represents potential quarry for people living in this region.

The primary geological formations in Nacogdoches County are Weches, Queen City, and the Sparta sandstone formations (Aniekwensi 2010; Corbin 2010). The East Texas outcrops date to the Eocene epoch (Aniekwensi 2010). Outcroppings of the Weches formation are exposed on the banks of the Angelina River. It is from these outcrops that the occupants of Pattonia quarried the sandstone for the foundations of their houses. This construction method and material is
common in other 19th century East Texas historic homes (Corbin 2010).

Figure 3.1. Detail of Map of Nacogdoches County (1881) with Pattonia marked by a black circle (Beaumont 1881).

Shovel testing across the landscape identified primarily brown soils (Munsell soil color 10YR 5/3). The United States Department of Agriculture (1980) describes the soil near the Angelina River Basin in Nacogdoches County as a clayey loam with a high acidic content. The shovel test pits reveal that the physical environment is primarily characterized by an A horizon averaging 40 centimeters of sandy loam with a clayey loam-clay level beneath the sandier soils. The Pattonia cultural component sits above the clayey loam stratum. Soil deposition becomes shallower the further west from Pattonia one goes, where the Angelina bends in a southeastern direction.
Chapter 4

Historical Background

4.1 Before Pattonia: Prehistory and American Indians

While the research questions driving the work at Pattonia focused on the 19th century shipping port community, excavations uncovered the \textit{longue durée} of the human occupation of Texas. Excavations at Pattonia uncovered Archaic projectile points, scrapers, and debitage. We also recovered Woodland/Caddoan pottery above the banks of the Angelina River. The cultural chronology of the East Texas area will be briefly outlined in this subsection.

Extensive prehistoric, protohistoric, and historic archaeological research has been carried out in East Texas and Western Louisiana focusing on the American Indians in the region (Gregory 2004; Perttula 1992, 2004; Wyckoff and Williams 1974). Humans have occupied East Texas since 12,000 years before present (B.P.) (Bousman et al. 2004). The Paleoindian period lasted until 8,000 years B.P. (Perttula 2004). The Paleoindian period in Texas and across North America was characterized by the manufacturing of lanceolate dart points made from high quality silicate material. The entirety of the Archaic period lasted until 2,000 years B.P., followed by the Woodland period, which lasted until \textit{c.} 1200 years B.P. (Perttula 2004). The Archaic period is characterized by a transition to arrow points. The Woodland Period in East Texas is identified primarily by the emergence of a coarse ceramic tradition, thought to be the precursor to the Caddoan pottery tradition (Perttula 2004). The next stage in the East Texas archaeological sequence is the early prehistoric Caddo, which continues into the historic period, until the Caddo are removed from their homeland in 1859 (Pertulla 2004, 2012). The Caddo manufactured a coarse reddish brown, red, or black earthenware pottery with a variety of design techniques and motifs; such as, incised, engraved, and incised-applique, just to name a few
Further archaeological analysis of the prehistoric material culture found at Pattonia is outside the purview of this study. These artifacts are curated at the Anthropology/Archaeology Laboratory of Stephen F. Austin State University in Nacogdoches, Texas.

4.2 Nacogdoches County

East Texas, specifically the Nacogdoches County area, was a source of much unrest during the years leading up to the Texas Revolution (Campbell 2003; McReynolds 1978). The Fredonian Rebellion (December 1826 – January 1827) was an early unsuccessful attempt to separate Texas from Mexican rule (McReynolds 1978). Eventually, Texas won its war for independence from Mexico in 1836 and formed the Republic of Texas. Nacogdoches County assumed its present day boundaries in 1846, a mere fraction of its original size as a Spanish District and Mexican Department (McReynolds 1978). Finally Texas received what a majority of its European American settlers wanted all along; the United States annexed Texas and it became a state in 1846 (Campbell 2003; McReynolds 1978).

McReynolds (1978) states that by the 1840s, European American cultural practices had become more widespread than Mexican practices. When the Republic came to an end, Texas was primarily comprised of farming communities sustained by the emerging cotton economy (Holbrook 1970; McReynolds 1978). The slave trade contributed to this economy’s viability (Campbell 1991). Culturally, Texas east of the Trinity River has more in common with the Deep South than it does with the Southwest (Campbell 2003; Evans 1952). Thus Pattonia, located well to the east of the Trinity in Deep East Texas, shared many attributes with the antebellum South, such as being a small cog in the larger cotton producing machine. Deep East Texas is a subregion of East Texas surrounding the Angelina River Basin, the source of the Neches River, and the
beginning of the Sabine (see Perttula 2004: 7, Figure 1.1).

4.3 Steamboat Shipping

The steamboat-shipping era was a landmark period in the development of the Western United States (Kane 2001). Throughout the majority of the 19th century, steamboats were the primary form of transportation in Texas because there were few railroads well into the second half of this period (Woodward 1972). This was especially true in East Texas, where the most important means of transportation was along the marginal waterways of the Sabine, Neches, and Angelina rivers (Holbrook 1970; Woodward 1972). Oxen drew wagons loaded with cotton and other staples to river ports that would connect with trade routes leading to either Galveston or New Orleans (Holbrook 1970). In the early years of Pattonia (1844-1846), trade with the port of Galveston was encouraged over that of New Orleans because of tariffs placed on international goods (Blount 1967). However, after Texas achieved statehood the East Texas region frequently traded with New Orleans (Holbrook 1970).

4.4 Pattonia

Robert and Moses Patton founded Pattonia in order to capitalize on the emergence of steamboat shipping in the East Texas and Louisiana regions (Blount 1967). The Pattons immigrated to Texas from Georgia on April 22, 1835 (Blake 1957-1962). The brothers soon garnered experience shipping with flat bottomed keel boats (Blount 1967). Shipping trade routes along the Sabine and Neches rivers connected with both New Orleans and Galveston, but Nacogdoches County (on the Angelina River) did not have convenient access to these markets (Holbrook 1970). In order for the Pattons to realize their ambitions, they had to make the Angelina River more readily navigable. Robert Patton led the efforts to clear out logs and debris from the Angelina. A San Augustine newspaper, The Journal and Advertiser (1841), conveyed
the area's exceedingly high ambitions, "Nacogdoches will be a seaport town, nearly, that is, if they have the Angelina cleared out this summer, which they are sure to do--navigation will be at their door." This optimism conveys the community's desire to enter the emerging national and international markets due to the success of the cotton economy and the rise of industrial capitalism. After the Angelina was successfully cleared, the brothers founded Robert S. Patton and Company, which operated a mercantile store at the landing (Blount 1967).

Historical newspapers indicate that the establishment of Pattonia was met with many challenges. These include initial funding for the clearing of the Angelina River, the work effort needed to clear the river, and the subsequent droughts that occurred after the founding of the community. These droughts made river travel impossible. In December of 1837, the First Congress of the Republic of Texas passed an act allowing for the use of funds for the clearing of local rivers and streams; however, there is no record of the Texas government executing these plans (Blount 1967). Newspapers show Moses Patton led a meeting in Nacogdoches years later to raise money for the clearing of the Angelina River (Nacogdoches Chronicle 1852). Less than half of the money needed to clear the river was raised at this meeting, but Moses successfully collected the remaining amount through private donations. Shortly after the successful clearing of the river, drought impacted the operations of Pattonia causing steamboat traffic to cease from 1847 to 1848 (Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register 1847, 1848).

These initial difficulties set the stage for a vulnerable community. From the beginning, Pattonia was situated on an unreliable river and subject to seasonal fluctuations in rainfall. The Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register (Thursday, December 9, 1847) reveals an ironic hubris characteristic of 19th century industrial innovation:
The Angelina has its sources in the elevated, undulating region North and West of Nacogdoches, and is fed chiefly by perennial springs. It is therefore less liable to sudden changes and its current is more uniform and regular than that of the rivers that rise in the prairie regions. We understand that this stream [is] generally navigable nine months in the year and even in the driest seasons the water never ceases to flow in its channel.

This proved not to be the case, as the following year the water level was too low for river traffic. The Angelina River turned out to be a far more unpredictable water channel than this newspaper had promised. Pattonia was founded with the notions of transforming Nacogdoches into a river port town. This desire and reliance on the emerging global industrial capitalist economy made Pattonia susceptible to abandonment.

Pattonia relied heavily on the cotton economy to support its mercantile operations. Cotton was the main export of Pattonia and this business brought in consumer goods such as ceramics, textiles, patent medicines, and construction material like nails and tools. The Southern Cotton Economy (SCE) was directly impacted as a result of the Civil War and the consequent abolition of slavery. American slavery was the foundation of the cotton industry and burgeoning industrial capitalism. "The unimaginably long and destructive American struggle, the world's first 'raw materials crisis,' was midwife to the emergence of new global networks of labor, capital, and state power," (Beckert 2004: 1406). American cotton was completely removed from the international markets from 1861-1865, a period that Beckert (2004) defines as the Cotton Famine. During this time Asian, African, and South American cotton markets emerged. The impact on the SCE is evident between the years 1862-1872. The SCE was unable to regain market share after the Civil War until 1873, due to the influx of new international cotton suppliers (Beckert 2004; Wright 1974). The competition between US and Indian cotton exports within the British economy can be seen in Figure 4.1 (Wright 1974).
Figure 4.1. British cotton imports illustrating competition between USA and India (Wright 1974). Timeline also shows major events that would have impacted Pattonia.

Pattonia provides a local example of these social disruptions caused by the Cotton Famine and the restructuring of the Global Cotton Market. Contemporary newspapers showed that during the Civil War no steamboats traveled along the East Texas rivers (Galveston Tri-Weekly News 1870). During the war, the Confederate military commandeered the majority of East Texas steamboats (Block 1978). The estate of Robert Patton indicates that one of the vessels he owned was used by the Confederate army. East Texas cotton shipments dropped from 20,000 bales in 1860 to 6,000 in 1866 (Block 1978; Figure 4.2). The decade long suffering of the SCE made Pattonia vulnerable to other perturbations.
Quintana was a 19th century port town located in Brazos County on the Gulf of Mexico, and provides a useful comparative for understanding the effects of the Civil War on a port settlement in Texas. Quintana’s occupants engaged in many of the same activities as Pattonia, but on a larger scale. Extensive archaeological excavation and historical research has been undertaken over the last several decades on this site. Freeman (1998: 5) writes, "Brazoria County and its coastal towns had been hard hit by the ‘storms’ of the Civil War, which hampered shipping, disrupted the plantation-based economic system, and resulted in a depletion of labor on rural landholdings.” Like Pattonia, the Quintana economy was disrupted and irreparably damaged during the Civil War for many of the same reasons. However, Quintana may have endured longer due to its position on the coast and a greater access to resources.

The conjuncture of the depressed SCE coupled with the log jamming along the Angelina River and the emergence of the railroad at the end of the century forced the abandonment of Pattonia. During the late 19th century emerging northern industries, including a high frequency
of cotton mills, suppressed the expansion of Texas textile production (Dugas 1955). The last time Pattonia appears in the newspaper was 1887, but Moses Patton had already abandoned the town a few years earlier (*The Nacogdoches News* 1887). In 1873 Patton moved to a farm at Oak Ridge and he operated a mercantile in Nacogdoches (Block 1976; Blount 1967). It is plausible that Patton felt it was no longer economically viable to maintain Pattonia. Moses Patton had maintained a presence at the community since its conception, but if any attempt was made at transforming the economic foundation of Pattonia, it was not successful. Instead of maintaining a farm at Pattonia, Moses relocated to a different farm (Block 1976). After Moses left, a relative by the name of June Harris operated the store (*The Nacogdoches News* 1887). This frontier community, however, was too dependent on the incoming and outgoing trade to be self-sustaining. Instead of transforming Pattonia and prolonging its occupation, the people of Pattonia abandoned the site.
Chapter 5
Methodology

Archaeological investigation into Pattonia (Figure 5.1) began in the spring of 2010 under the direction of Dr. Leslie Cecil in preparation for the Stephen F. Austin State University Archaeological Field School at Pattonia. During this first field season I was an undergraduate student on the project. After a pedestrian survey was conducted in the Spring of 2012, the second field season began at the beginning of June, 2012. For the 2012 field season I acted as co-principal investigator on the project with the field school director, Dr. Cecil. Several research methods were employed to investigate the site of Pattonia such as pedestrian survey, excavation, archival research, oral history, ceramic and glass artifact analysis, and landscape archaeology. The synthesis of these avenues of inquiry results in a more thorough understanding of the past than a purely archaeological or historical investigation.

Figure 5.1 Pattonia landscape.
5.1 2010 Field Season

During the 2010 field season we established Datum One at House I, within the tree line and near the area of excavation (Figure 5.2). This datum was composed of cement and rebar. A Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) global positioning system (GPS) coordinate was recorded for Datum 1 using a Trimble Juno handheld at 347880.18 N and 352652.10 E within the 15N UTM zone. Using a total station, Dr. Cecil determined the placement of the 10 meter by 10 meter grid, which was then set with stakes and line in one meter by one meter units. We excavated roughly 40 percent of the grid (Figure 5.3). Lot numbers were then assigned by unit to each level of excavation. Ten individuals total worked on this project. Workers excavated in ten centimeter arbitrary levels and dry sifted all excavated sediment through one quarter inch screen. Excavators piece-plotted artifacts roughly the size of a quarter and larger when found in situ. Each student excavated four units down to 20 centimeters, and several students excavated a couple of their units down to 30 centimeters. Overall 7.7 cubic meters of earth was excavated. The entire field season focused on this one household and lasted for six weeks. On the last week of the project all artifacts were washed and dried. We identified several different artifact categories, such as ceramics, glass, and nails.
Figure 5.2. Map illustrating both seasons of excavation.

Figure 5.3. 2010 House I 10 m x 10 m excavation grid. Each unit within the grid is 1 meter by 1 meter. White squares were not excavated.
5.2 2012 Pedestrian Survey

Dr. Cecil and I, along with two volunteers, completed a pedestrian survey on March 24, 2012. We used a metal detector to aid with the survey. Walking parallel to one another we attempted to canvass the majority of the landscape. We covered the area visible on Figure 5.2. This survey identified surface finds that included handmade bricks and foundation pier fragments. It was during this survey that we identified House II and House III. We used these surface finds and metal detector readings to determine where the 2012 excavations would take place.

5.3 2012 Field Season

Excavations for the second field season began June 2, 2012 and continued for six weeks. Three clearing excavations were planned along with a shovel testing program in order to obtain a representative sample of human activity across the landscape. By carrying out clearing excavations at multiple locations, we can effectively compare the archaeological assemblages associated with multiple structures. We carried out the first open excavation at what we designated as House III. In close proximity to the House III excavation, we recorded another datum point, labeled Datum 2, at UTM coordinates 3478943.91 N, and 352650.2 E. A 10 meter by 10 meter grid was established with the total station (Figure 5.3). Only an L-shaped selection of the grid was actually marked off with stakes and line due to a large tree stump, making excavation in the approximate center of the grid unmanageable for the goals of the project. A total of 58 one meter by one meter units were demarcated with line and stakes.
Figure 5.4. Grid illustrating 2012 House III excavation area. Excavation units measured one meter by one meter. White squares were not excavated. The dark blue unit was excavated down 30 centimeters below surface in order to more thoroughly excavate a fireplace feature.

We excavated House III for three weeks and recovered a substantial quantity of artifacts and architectural remains as compared to the relative dearth of materials at House I during the 2010 season. Again, students excavated in ten centimeter arbitrary levels and each new level for each unit was assigned a new lot number. Soil was sifted through one quarter inch screen. Every unit started was excavated through level two, while the hearth feature was excavated through level three. In total, students excavated nearly nine cubic meters of earth.

Excavation continued at House III contemporaneously with a shovel testing program across the western portion of Pattonia. Students conducted shovel tests in two person teams with four people total. These teams rotated daily and three people were pulled from the clearing.
excavation to perform shovel tests. One student worked with me, while the other two worked together. The first shovel test transect line (TR1) was established approximately 15 meters south of the open excavation at House III. Shovel test transect lines were spaced roughly 15 meters apart and each shovel test within a transect line was approximately ten meters apart. We completed a total of seven transects in addition to random testing around House III and boundary testing around the mercantile. One of the seven transects was north of House III and another was on the eastern side of the road at the southern end. All shovel tests were dug either to a depth of 80 centimeters or until reaching the B Horizon, which was usually at 40 centimeters, although many tests went deeper than 40 centimeters. The B Horizon consisted of a strongly compacted dark red clay (2.5 YR 4/8). Excavators conducted a total of 62 shovel tests.

At the start of the fourth week of the field school, the clearing excavations were moved to two new locations. These two sites were at the southern end of the road. The first site was chosen for its close proximity to the road and its relatively sparse floral covering. However, after laying a five meter by five meter grid, the site was soon determined to be archaeologically sterile. Resources were redirected to the other new location. This other clearing excavation site would come to be tentatively called the mercantile on the basis of a variety of commercial products recovered, such as pharmaceutical bottles, various machine-cut and wire nails of different sizes, overall buttons, and the small quantity of domestic artifacts. We established another five by five meter grid at the mercantile and continued excavating in ten centimeter levels within one by one meter units (Figure 5.4). Excavation continued at this site until the end of the season, which was the first week of July.
Figure 5.5. Mercantile excavation 5 meter by 5 meter grid. Units within grid were 1 meter by 1 meter. All gray units were excavated down 20 centimeters below surface. White units were not excavated.

5.4 Archival Research

Archival research was an integral aspect of this project. Even though Pattonia’s documentary record is limited compared to other historic sites, existing records helped flesh out the lifeways of the occupants. Archival research was predominantly carried out at the East Texas Research Center (ETRC) at Stephen F. Austin State University and in the Special Collections at the University of Texas Arlington (UTA). Digital archival collections also greatly aided this work. Maps found on-line at the Portal of Texas History (hosted by the University of North Texas, http://texashistory.unt.edu/), and maps on-line in the digital archives of the UTA Special Collections were both used to interpret Pattonia (http://www.uta.edu/library/spco/). The Portal of Texas History also provided access to historical newspapers. Archival research at the UTA
Special Collections provided access to the Robert Bruce Blake Collection, which is an archival history of Nacogdoches County. The Robert Bruce Blake Collection contains a few of Moses Patton’s letters. The collections at the ETRC also provided access to Louis Blount’s papers, which included unpublished data and notes directly related to Patonia and the Patton family. I also combed through several different historical local newspapers at the ETRC and in available digital archives. Historical newspapers provided chronological information about the site and the founding brothers.

In addition to maps, the census, and newspapers, Aldolphus Sterne’s diary mentions the activities at Patonia several times (Sterne 1969). Sterne had an investment in the land at Patonia and owned the land surrounding the site. There also exists a bill of lading signed by Moses Patton at Patonia and a court record, now kept at Millard’s Crossing. Millard’s Crossing is a historical recreation village on the north side of Nacogdoches. Several historical structures from the East Texas area have been relocated to this site for preservation. Millard’s Crossing also acts as a facility for archival research and a repository for historical documents. These historical materials complement the archaeological data.

5.5 Oral History

I conducted an oral history with Bill Patton, who is the great grandson of Moses Patton. The goal of this interview was to understand the oral history that had been passed down to Patton and learn new details about the site and help interpret the archaeological remains. The one hour long interview was conducted with Patton and I asked several prepared questions, but also listened to him tell the story of Patonia. This oral history is recognized as a vital and worthwhile resource for understanding the complex landscape of Patonia.
5.6 Spatial Analysis

Two computer programs aided the analysis and interpretation of spatial organization of Pattonia: Golden Surfer® and Google Earth®. These programs allowed for different levels of analysis that enabled the reconstruction of the physical landscape of Pattonia. I used Google Earth® to produce a spatially accurate map of the structure locations. This allows for the illustration of the layout of the community and what this might mean for the social landscape and hierarchical organization of the space. I used Surfer® to construct individual artifact distribution maps of each of the clearing excavations. These maps also illustrate the dimensions of the structures as they are reconstructed archaeologically. The spatial distribution and concentration of artifact types (such as foundation pier fragments and nails) allows for the interpretation of the orientation of the structures as well as the activities present at each house lot.

5.7 Ceramic Analysis

I used the historical ceramics in this analysis to suggest social class differences of the inhabitants of House I and House III by comparing their ceramic assemblages (Overfield 2013). First I looked at the heterogeneity of the ceramic assemblages and then I focused on the value of the ceramics. Similar studies have been conducted by other historical archaeologists (McBride and McBride 1987; Spencer-Wood 1987; Spencer-Wood and Heberling 1987; Wall 1999). Spencer-Wood and Heberling (1987) demonstrate that 19th century refined earthenwares successfully indicate the socioeconomic status of households when examined within the context of occupation and house type. Many of these socioeconomic analyses are based on George Miller’s work with historical refined earthenwares. Miller (1980, 1991) argues for the applicability of what he calls ceramic indices, which he developed based on the actual values of “cream-colored” white bodied ceramics when they were first marketed for consumption. Miller
(1980, 1991) bases these indices on decoration style, arguing that decoration has more to do with value than ware. The size and form of vessel also influences cost, altering the index values (Miller 1980, 1991). Due to Majewski and O’Brien’s (1987) recommendations for the usage of historical ceramics in archaeological interpretation and Klein’s (1991) critique of the three primary methodologies used by historical archaeologists to interpret ceramics, I examined both wares and decorative techniques.

All ceramics from both the 2010 and 2012 field seasons were analyzed as a part of this research (n= 450). I macroscopically examined these ceramics at Stephen F. Austin State University’s Anthropology and Archaeology Laboratory. When necessary a stereoscopic microscope was used to more accurately identify and analyze the ceramic assemblages. The ceramics were categorized by both a ware and decorative technique identification system.

In order to assess the heterogeneity of the ceramic assemblages, I first normalized the raw ceramic frequencies from House I, III, and the mercantile by the amount of earth excavated at each context. This operation involves simply dividing the raw counts by the cubic meters of earth excavated at the entire house. The results will be outlined in the ceramic analysis section of Chapter 6. These results are compared to illustrate the heterogeneity of the ceramic assemblages from House I and House III. Additionally, Miller’s (1980, 1991) ceramic index values are used to quantify the relative intrasite consumption patterns of Pattonia. The Miller ceramic indices are calculated by scaling undecorated cream-colored refined white earthenwares by their prices during a given year (e.g., 1850). Miller (1980, 1991) generates indices for three different vessel forms: cups, bowls, and plates. He (1980, 1991) assigns the most basic ceramic decoration type, undecorated white-bodied refined earthenwares, a ceramic index value of one and then scales the index values up relative to their increase in cost so that transfer-printed plates have an index
value of 2.11. However, these indices do not provide a method for dealing with assemblages fractured to the extent that the majority of vessel forms are not identifiable. McBride and McBride (1987) employ a modified average ceramic index value to analyze highly fragmented refined earthenwares. They average together the ceramic indices of the cups, bowls, and plates in order to account for the high degree of fragmentation within their assemblage. I employ their method herein, in order to discuss the relative ceramic values of House I, III, and the mercantile.

5.8 Methodological Synthesis

The methods outlined above complement each other by providing a means by which to more completely reconstruct the past lifeways of Pattonia. Suggesting the socioeconomic stratification and consumer patterns that reflect the daily lives of Pattonia’s past occupants can be addressed through the combination of understanding the spatial organization and socioeconomic structure of Pattonia, understood through ceramic analysis and other contextual evidence. Reconstructing the layout of the community goes beyond simply knowing the spatial placement of the different structures. It also involves deconstructing whether or not the organization of the community reflects purposeful action or inaction, whether conscious or unconscious, in the design of the social landscape. Is the layout of Pattonia a random consequence of settlement, or a purposeful design in order to reinforce a social hierarchy? Most likely the layout of Pattonia was influenced by the commercial aspects of its inhabitants. It is through the reconstruction of the built environment that one can begin to explore the social landscape. The ceramic analysis and other artifactual information comprise an important line of evidence toward the goal of social landscape reconstruction. It is through the understanding of both the socioeconomic statuses of the households and reconstructing the spatial organization that something Pattonia’s social landscape may be better understood.
Chapter 6

Results I: Spatial Analysis and Artifact Distribution

This chapter reconstructs Pattonia’s spatial organization and built environment. With the use of visualization software, it is possible to infer the approximate dimensions of the structures on the landscape and the behavioral patterns that created the assemblages. Using Surfer® software, I reconstruct the layout of three excavation sites at Pattonia in order to determine what type of house structures are present and the possible dimensions of the houses. This reconstruction more than enhances the academic knowledge of 19th century built environments; it contributes to the wider discussion of socioeconomic status in the American South. The size and type of a residence in the United States has been demonstrated to be one of the strongest indicators of social status, and this applies in 18th and 19th century archaeological contexts (Spencer-Wood 1987).

The spatial organization of two households (designated House I and House III) and a mercantile store are analyzed. The mercantile was both a store and the home of Susan and Moses Patton (Bill Patton 2013, pers. comm.). This dual role resulted in a unique and complex archaeological assemblage. The structures at House I and House III differ markedly from one another. This chapter will show that the dimensions of the dwellings at House I and House III correspond closely with the average types of 19th century East Texas houses (Evans 1952). These house types indicate varying levels of economic standing and social status (McReynolds 1978). I argue in this chapter that House I was a small single room domestic structure, potentially a “single pen,” that housed individuals of lower socioeconomic status (laborers), while House III was a large domestic structure, perhaps a “saddlebag,” occupied by a family of middle to high socioeconomic status. The possibility remains that House I could have been half of a saddlebag,
but we could not test to the west of our clearing excavation due to thick brush.

6.1 The Patonia Landscape

Houses at Patonia were built along one main road that divided the community in half. House III would have been the first structure one saw upon entering the site by carriage or wagon (Figure 6.1). As the road runs south, the remaining houses appear on either side of the path, some smaller than others. At the end of this road, near the landing, the mercantile sat prominently atop a hill, with a view overlooking the Angelina River and the steamboats coming and going from the port. The landscape would have been dominated by this capitalistic enterprise, as it was the sole reason for the existence of this community. Susan Patton had several children to attend to and would have made purchasing decisions for the domestic sphere of the family’s daily lives (Wall 1991). Moses would have captained steamboats to Sabine Pass, and perhaps down to Galveston, in addition to maintaining the operations of the store at Patonia. Slaves, owned by Moses, would have worked at the dock loading cotton and unloading merchandise, and most likely working the Patton’s farm (Blount 1967). Merchants, clerks, planters, and socialites would have entered and exited the landscape for business and pleasure. House I was built a short distance south of House III and it will be shown that this was a modest space with little material wealth. The houses and their spatial organization represent the underlying social interactions and hierarchy present on the landscape.
6.2 Architectural History of East Texas

East Texas architecture over the 18th and early 19th centuries progressed from frontier homes to more complex styles (Evans 1952; McReynolds 1978). The earliest European houses built in this period in East Texas were influenced by both Spanish and American Indian construction style (McReynolds 1978). This early type was called a palisade (McReynolds 1978). The more complex types include: half-timbered, stone and adobe, log cabin, and frame houses (Connor 1949; Evans 1952; McReynolds 1978). Taking into account the time period and geographic location of Pattonia, historical documents, the only scholarly paper (e.g. Blount 1967), and the archaeological excavations, one would expect the rural style “East Texas Type” house to be present at this site, such as the single-pen, the double-pen, and the saddlebag house (Figure 6.2). There also may have been frame houses, buildings associated with the port, and slave or tenant quarters. Evans (1952) attributes the style of the East Texas house to the
influences of immigrants from the United States, particularly from the mountainous regions of Kentucky and Tennessee as well as the Deep South (Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi). This corresponds with census records, indicating that individuals from these regions may have lived at Pattonia (Bureau of Census Records 1850, 1860, 1870).

Based on the artifact distribution patterns of the open excavations at Pattonia there was a saddlebag house present at House III, and something approximating a single-pen house at House I (Figure 6.2). A saddlebag house is a common type of vernacular domestic structure built during this period in the East Texas region (Connor 1949; Evans 1952; McReynolds 1978). Evans (1952) describes the saddlebag as two stand-alone rooms connected by a wall with a fireplace with openings to both rooms. The single-pen is originally a single room structure. Frequently porches were constructed around East Texas log houses, sometimes on both sides (Evans 1952). Sometimes homebuilders would add wood paneling to a log house to give it the appearance of being a of frame construction (Evans 1952; McReynolds 1978). The more affluent families built frame houses, often in the Greek Revival style, as this was popular at the time (Evans 1952; McReynolds 1978). Families in East Texas built their houses on foundation piers from a local source of stone (Evans 1952; McReynolds 1978). The people living at Pattonia used sandstone, specifically “ironstone,” for their foundation piers. Ironstone foundation piers were excavated at all clearing excavations, with more complete piers at House I and III. A few fragments show evidence of human modification as the result of being cut from a larger source (most likely from the outcropping at the river bank) or being shaped for use within the foundation pier.
Figure 6.2. Schematic of three generalized types of East Texas frontier houses based on descriptions by Connor (1949), Evans (1952), and McReynolds (1978) Newton (1971, 1972).

6.3 House I

The building at House I was a small domestic structure that, based on the architectural, archaeological, and documentary evidence, housed individuals of a relatively lower socioeconomic status. The excavations at House I uncovered the partial remains of several ironstone foundation piers that supported the structure (Figure 6.3). We also identified the location of the hearth based on an ash lens in the soil, brick concentrations, a piece of mortar with a right angle, and fragments of ironstone used in the construction of the chimney and the foundation of the fireplace. The foundation pier fragments form relatively straight lines, evocative of walls. This hearth is located along the western wall roughly six meters north of the southern excavation border and six meters east of the western border. Its remnants are in line with four foundation pier fragments.
Using Surfer® contour maps to visually represent high volume artifact categories, specifically nails, window pane glass, and ceramics, a clearer picture of the nature of this structure emerges. Figure 6.4 displays levels one and two aggregated concentrations of both short and long nails. These nails are square head machine cut nails dating between 1835 AD and 1890 AD (Adams 2002). Analyzing the spatial positioning of nails reveals the general area where occupants dropped nails while building the structure and where the nails fell while the structure decomposed (Schiffer 1983). The assumption must be made that little care was given to clean up after the construction or destruction of the house because during construction nails would be lost in the ground and under the house, and post-destruction there would be no need to tidy the yard. The fact that the majority of the nails are located within the surrounding foundation pier fragments supports this hypothesis. One of the areas with the largest quantity of nails is the hearth, perhaps due to deposition directly into the hearth as a convenient place of discard. This is
supported by the observation that the greatest frequencies within several artifact categories are found within the hearth. In addition to the nails, this discard pattern is consistent with window pane glass and ceramic distribution. Another hypothesis is that these nails were swept under the structure during occupation.

![Figure 6.4: House I nail distributions.](image)

Figures 6.5 and 6.6 illustrate the spatial distribution of the window pane glass and ceramics. A comparison of Figures 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6 demonstrates that the concentrations of these artifact categories are primarily in the same areas, such as along the foundation pier fragments and near the excavation unit of the hearth. The window pane glass could have been deposited throughout the life of the household, being broken intermittently, or deposited during destruction and deterioration of the former structure. However, the probability of glass being left in the yard during occupation may be low. Deteriorating structures would collapse inward and floors would decompose into the ground, this could account for the window pane glass being present within
the confines of the foundation piers. If the structures were disassembled, the glass may have been broken and left there. The ceramics are primarily concentrated near the southeast foundation pier fragments and near the hearth unit. Their deposition near the hearth unit coincides with the nail and glass spatial distributions.

Figure 6.5. House I window pane glass distributions.
Discrete artifacts are also grouped near the hearth unit. These include one metal can lid and three brass carriage knobs (Lyons 2008). The carriage knobs measure 36 millimeters long and 15 millimeters wide, weighing eight grams (Figure 6.7). Another knob was identified roughly a meter east of these three and two more near the northeast foundation pier fragments (six total). These knobs are interesting because of their decorative nature. The knobs would have been fastened on the sides of a carriage for decoration, seemingly not serving any utilitarian function. The deposition of intact carriage knobs indicates hardware for some sort of carriage or wagon repair happening in an undetected activity area around the household. Located near Moses Patton on the 1850 census was a wagoner named N. A. Newton, a 40 year old male from South Carolina. A wagoner could be expected to have a few unused carriage knobs lying around their house.
Newton lived in a household of European immigrants at Pattonia. The head of the household is listed as Frederick Vaught, 26, from Germany. Frederick was a miller with a real property (land and house holdings) value of $530 (United State Bureau of the Census 1850). For comparison, Moses Patton’s real property value in 1850 was $8888. The third member of this household was Lewis Wais, 43, from Poland. N.A. Newton does not show up in the Texas census after 1850. Does the presence of unused carriage knobs indicate that these three European immigrant men lived at House I for a time? It is impossible to say for sure, but perhaps these knobs are an indication of the lower socioeconomic position of the occupants of House I. Newton and Wais possessed no property of their own and Vaught’s property wealth was only six percent of Moses Patton’s.

In the southeast corner of the grid (Figure 6.6) we excavated a midden. The systematic
excavation of this deposit recovered a three sided file (Figure 6.8) and a spoon (Figure 6.9). A strong concentration of nails, glass, and ceramics, along with the discrete artifacts support the hypothesis that this area was a midden or privy.

Figure 6.8. Three-sided file.
With the relative dearth of ceramics found at House I, the utilitarian nature of most artifacts, the evidence of potential wagon work, and the complete lack of any other obvious indicators of high socioeconomic status, I would support the interpretation that House I was a household of lower socioeconomic means and standing. This hypothesis is further bolstered by the historical evidence from the 1850 census, the metal file, ceramic pipe bowl fragment, and carriage knobs. Socioeconomic status of House I will be further explored through the ceramics in Chapter 7.

6.4 House I Structure Interpretation

By analyzing the position of the foundation pier fragments in context with the nails, window pane glass, ceramics, and other historical architectural information, Figure 6.3 illustrates one possible interpretation of the original main room of House I (Evans 1952). The distance
between Pier Fragment A and Pier Fragment B is approximately five meters (16 feet). This is the exact width of the primary room of a single-pen frontier house as described by Newton (1971), a historian who extensively studied the folk house structures of Western Louisiana and East Texas. The distance between Pier Fragment B and Pier Fragment C is roughly seven meters (22 feet). Newton (1971) lists the length of the primary room as five meters, also. This difference in length is most likely attributable to the length of the porch being added onto the front of the house.

There were two symmetrical holes to the west of the porch that could be part of a railing for a step down. The ground was compact and different from the surrounding area in the location where occupants may have been going up and down the steps. Most houses of this period and region had porches on the front and back walls (Evans 1952). The interpretation of House I as a single-pen East Texas Type house is further supported by the location of the chimney. The chimney is set on the western wall as evidenced by Figure 6.3. Evans (1952) indicates that it was most common for the chimney to be located on the left wall when looking at the front of the structure and any subsequent additions to the house would be added on the right. It is clear from archaeological investigation that this structure does not continue to the east. I interpret the south wall as the location of the front door because it is the south side that faces the river and may have had a porch. Occupants would want to face the river to allow the breeze to blow through their homes and in order to observe water traffic containing incoming and outgoing shipments critical for the market operations at the site. The archaeological evidence indicates that this house was a small structure, most likely a single-pen, and when one includes the historical and other contextual information the interpretation of a lower socioeconomic household begins to coalesce.

6.5 House III

House III is a larger structure than House I and has a higher quantity of artifacts, with a
more complex spatial distribution (Figure 6.11). This section will show House III was most likely a saddlebag house, with at least two and a half rooms. The occupants of House III were of a higher socioeconomic status than those of House I. These interpretations will be supported by the architectural, artifactual, and historical data.

Figure 6.10. House III.

Like House I, the foundation of House III was constructed with sandstone ("ironstone") piers. We recorded over two dozen foundation pier fragments (n=27), all of which encompass or are in line with a hearth feature (Figure 6.10). The hearth excavation unit was located nearly eight meters north and three meters east of the southwest corner of the excavation. The hearth was initially identified by random shovel testing across the site. When the shovel test detected a large in situ sandstone boulder (35 cm tall) with a handmade brick, the unit was systematically excavated. Underneath the ironstone boulder were additional handmade bricks and other artifacts. We also detected an ash lens within the same feature.
Several artifact categories contribute to the interpretation of the structure. A strong concentration of nails is present in the northwest corner in close proximity to multiple ironstone (foundation pier) fragments. The window pane glass accumulated along the northern border of the excavation area (Figure 6.11), breaking during the course of occupation or during dismantling. The strongest concentration of ceramics occurs at almost the same location as the nails (Figure 6.12). The ceramic concentration overlaps with the ironstone fragments grouped in the indicated area (Figure 6.13). Taken together, these artifact categories show the results of the depositional processes occurring at House III.

Figure 6.11. House III window pane glass concentrations.
Figure 6.12. House III nail concentrations.

Figure 6.13. House III ceramic concentrations.
A number of discrete artifacts were recovered at House III. In the same high nail and ceramic concentration area (Figure 6.13) there was ammunition, utensils, a metal can lid, and a button. Within the hearth excavation unit, excavators identified fragments of fauna (n=2), a button, and a miniature smoothing iron (Figure 6.14). Taken together these artifacts are indicative of the domestic activities. Occupants may have deposited the metal can lid and faunal remains during the preparation of a meal. The miniature smoothing iron would have been heated in the fireplace and used on delicate textiles such as, lace. Beyond function, these discrete artifacts can provide windows into the daily lives of the occupants of House III and at Pattonia in general.

Figure 6.14. Miniature smoothing iron without handle.
A grouping of seven suid teeth was documented at the center of the northern excavation border (circled on Figure 6.13), while another suid tooth was recovered in a separate location. At least one of these teeth clearly exhibited burning, indicative of cooking and consumption (Figure 6.15). Including teeth, only twelve faunal fragments of unidentifiable medium sized mammals were recorded at House III, most likely due to the highly acidic East Texas soil, which is not conducive to preservation. However, the recovered teeth provide some indication of the consumption habits of the household occupants. The presence of suid teeth may indicate pig farming or the consumption of feral pigs, because there was no nearby meat market.

Figure 6.15. Suidae molar exhibiting burning.
Just north of the teeth, excavators uncovered a jet rosary bead and necklace chain fragment. The bead is hand drilled and faceted on all sides (Figure 6.16). It is almost ten millimeters at the greatest width and weighs less than a tenth of a gram. Every side is uneven, exhibiting the handmade nature of the artifact. The organic nature of the bead is evident under magnification. Jet (lignite) is a highly valued material frequently used for rosaries due to its perceived metaphysical properties (Lele 2006; McEwan 2001). The rosary is most closely associated with Catholicism and perhaps one family that occupied this home were practicing Catholics. I interpret the necklace fragment as being a part of the same rosary that the bead was, given their very close proximity. This small piece of rosary had an intimate relationship with the religious observer. Connected by prayer and touch, the rosary cannot be said without the rosary beads and the beads have no purpose without the rosary prayer. Both must be conducted through the observer (Lele 2006). This entanglement speaks to the personal identity of the past actor.
6.6 House III Structure Interpretation

Figure 6.17 displays the brick fragment concentrations, chimney, and wall structure interpretations. The brick fragment concentration clearly follows the line of ironstone fragments. The contextual association of the *in situ* ironstone boulder and handmade bricks with groupings of artifacts, the spatial positioning of the ironstone fragments, and the concentration of brick fragments, supports the interpretation that these materials represent a chimney fall, which is the archaeological pattern resulting from a toppled chimney (Singleton 1985). The central location of the fireplace indicates that this house may have been at least a two and a half room house, such as, a saddlebag (Figure 6.2). The saddlebag is the only type of East Texas house to have a central fireplace (Evans 1952). There would be a primary room and a room across the hall, plus the half room in the attic resulting from the gabling of the roof (Evans 1952). Foundation Pier A to Foundation Pier B (length) measures 14.25 meters, while Foundation Pier C to Foundation Pier D (width) measures five meters. While the width is appropriate for a typical double-pen, the length is larger than what Newton (1971) considers average, which is 10 meters. If this interpretation is accurate, then this domestic structure was of an extraordinary size. The difference in length is most likely attributable to the presence of a porch. All of the evidence taken together provides an interpretation of House III as a large saddlebag house with occupants of a high socioeconomic status.
In the 19th century a larger structure stood atop a hill overlooking the Angelina River. Due to the nature and variability of the material culture recovered from this site, and in accordance with oral history we know this site was the location of the R. S. Patton and Company mercantile store. According to a bill of lading signed by Moses Patton, mercantile operations began in 1843 (Millard’s Crossing 1843). They continued until the late 19th century, which this archaeological research revealed. A few different mercantile ventures operated out of the same building and its operation endured until the abandonment of the site at the close of the nineteenth century.

Due to the loading and unloading of cotton and merchandise, the mercantile store assemblage recovered during the 2012 excavations may be the result of nearly forty-seven years of discard behavior. The same spatial reconstruction that was done for House I and House III...
cannot be done for the mercantile because *in situ* foundation piers forming distinctive patterns were not identified. This may be due to different construction techniques for large buildings or because we did not identify the boundaries of the building. Perhaps the mercantile was not built on foundation piers. However, a wealth of late 19th century material culture was recovered, giving an idea of what the merchants of Patonia were importing and where it was coming from at the end of this time period.

The exact construction methods of the mercantile remain unclear, but various artifact categories indicate that the mercantile archaeological assemblage dates to the end of the 19th century. Most of the nails at the mercantile were wire, which were not common until the end of the nineteenth century. This enables a rough dating of the site (Adams 2002). The distribution of the nails can be seen in Figure 6.18. While ironstone was present at this location, it is not clear if it was related to the foundations of the mercantile or due to the close proximity to the river bank, from which the ironstone would have been harvested. The ironstone occurs naturally and outcroppings are evident to this day. Two concentrations of window pane glass are evident, thus confirming that the mercantile had windows, which would make sense given that the Pattons lived on the second floor of the store (Figure 6.19; Bill Patton 2013, pers. comm.). The first floor possibly had windows as well. A relatively small number of ceramics were found at the mercantile (n= 60). These ceramics were concentrated in the northeast corner of the excavation (Figure 6.20).
Figure 6.18. Mercantile nail concentrations.

Figure 6.19. Mercantile window pane glass concentrations.
Figure 6.2. Mercantile ceramic concentrations.

Bottle glass was ubiquitous across the entire excavation area (Figure 6.21). Shards of medicinal bottles were the most prevalent type of bottle glass. Two of these bottles were recovered nearly intact: Dr. Tichenor’s Antiseptic bottle (Figure 6.22) and a National Remedy Company New York bottle (Figure 6.23). Another medicinal bottle brand identified was Dr. Bell’s Pine-Tar-Honey from Paducah, Kentucky. These types of medicines usually contained primarily alcohol and perfumes, and had limited medicinal qualities (Wilkie 1996). This particular Dr. Tichenor’s Antiseptic bottle dates to between 1885 and 1890, conclusively indicating the mercantile assemblage’s late date (Lindsey 2013). The National Remedy Company New York bottle also dates to this time period (Lindsey 2013). The greatest concentrations of bottle glass occur in the northwest and southwest corners of the excavation. The nearly intact bottles were found in the southwest corner. The two nearly intact bottles were found in the same unit nearly on top one another. It is possible that this bottle glass concentration was an
abandoned crate of medicinal elixirs, or the result of an accumulation of empty bottles. It is nearly certain that these two bottles were deposited together, probably along with many others. Many shards of glass exhibit lettering, some of them clearly Dr. Tichenor’s. Perhaps this order made it to Pattonia after the mercantile stopped operating, or no one came to purchase any goods from Pattonia from 1885 onward. It’s also possible that this merchandise just did not sell.

Figure 6.21. Mercantile bottle glass concentrations.
Figure 6.22. Dr. Tichenor’s Antiseptic medicinal bottle.

Figure 6.23. National Remedy Company New York medicinal bottle.
6.8 Shovel Testing Program

The shovel testing program carried out across a large portion of the site enabled a more thorough understanding of the site by providing a wide-reaching sample of possible occupation locations. As stated above (section 5.3), the shovel testing program primarily surveyed the western half of the site between House III and the mercantile (Figure 5.2). This also involved sampling within the House III limits, north of House III, and boundary testing of the mercantile. A total of 234 historical artifacts were recovered from the shovel tests. These included a few artifact types that were absent from the remainder of the site, such as a gunflint and a fishing hook. Additionally, excavators recovered English ceramics, machine-cut and wire nails, and historical glass.

One of the more significant finds of the shovel testing program was the confirmation of the suspected location of House II. Located 94 meters south of House III, a large foundation pier designated the position of this structure. While time and resource constraints did not permit the clearing excavation of House II, shovel testing allowed the research team to confirm the presence of this additional structure. Machine-cut nails (n=15) and refined white-bodied earthenwares found in nearby test pits may be associated with this structure. Only six meters northwest of House II, one test yielded 78 of the total historical artifacts recovered. This dense accumulation of artifacts suggests a midden, potentially associated with House II. The gunflint was also found in this test pit. Based on its honey color, I identified this artifact as a French gunflint. French gunflints had a characteristic golden yellow color, while the English variety was distinctly very dark green to nearly black (Hume 1969). Further excavation in this area would be worthwhile.

We also excavated a possible well feature during the shovel testing program (Figure 6.24). This area was identified as the potential location of a historical well due to a striking
unnatural depression on the landscape. Surprisingly, we did not uncover a large archaeological deposit. However, we recovered one clear glass shard at 90 centimeters below surface (cmbs), one whiteware sherd at 115 cmbs, and a 19th century Remington 12 gauge shotgun brass at 120 cmbs, well below any other historical artifacts excavated across the entire site. This test pit was terminated at 160 cmbs. Additionally, we dug a 25 cm wide and 1 m long trench extending out west from the test pit (Figure 6.25). Within this trench we found two machine-cut nails at 55 cmbs. The test was terminated at 60 cmbs. It is also important to note that the soil deposition at this test was unique in comparison to all other tests conducted. The soil was a loose sandy loam until 155 cmbs, when the clay content increased slightly causing the soil to become more compact and break into chunks. We did not reach a B horizon. Considering all of the evidence, I think it is highly probable that there was a void at this location in the late 19th century, enabling the deposit of the shotgun brass at 120 cmbs. Whether or not it was a well is unclear, but a hole of this depth might indicate this likelihood.

![Figure 6.24 Shovel test of potential well.](image)
We excavated shovel test pits around the excavation area of the mercantile in an attempt to determine the boundary of the deposition. However, this was not successful as the excavation concluded without determining the full extent of the mercantile. The shovel testing north of House III detected a small quantity of historical artifacts of the same types documented at the house.

6.9 Results Summary

Overall, the combination of systematic testing and clearing excavations succeeded in documenting the built environment of the site and locating unknown features. Our research revealed House III as a relatively large frontier structure, with occupants of potentially higher socioeconomic status, while House I was a much smaller structure. The excavations also located
another household to investigate in the future (House II). The mercantile proved to be the largest structure on the landscape, which makes sense as it held all of the mercantile goods entering and exiting Pattonia. The mercantile embodies the purpose of Pattonia, commerce. This cotton trade provided the means for consumer goods to enter Pattonia and provided excellent market access for those with the means and desire to purchase new mass produced products from many different parts of the nation and world. However, the spatial organization and excavation results alone do not fully communicate the socioeconomic hierarchy present on the Pattonia landscape. The question, “What does socioeconomic stratification and consumerism on the landscape mean for the daily lives of Pattonia’s past occupants?” needs further elucidation through an exploration of consumerism through an analysis of the ceramic artifacts.
Chapter 7

Results II: Pattonia Consumerism through Ceramic Analysis

In this section I will provide a background for 19th century consumerism. Next, I describe the ceramic assemblages for each context. This is followed by an inter-assemblage ceramic analysis that primarily compares House I and House III.

7.1 19th Century Consumerism

As mentioned in the introduction, this thesis adopts a consumerism framework of historical archaeology. Mullins (2011, 134) defines this approach by arguing:

Consumption as a conceptual framework...could encompass any archaeological scholarship that examines how people socialize material goods. This conceptual framework embraces the agency of consumers and recognizes that goods assume meaning in a tension between structural and localized processes that cannot be described as being either wholly deterministic or disconnected from consumer symbolism.

Historical archaeologists use both the terms consumerism and consumption in the literature. For the sake of clarity, this research will use consumerism, except when directly stated by a different author. Mullins (2011) takes an approach that examines local interactions within a world system, but without a hierarchical domination of the core over the periphery or the global over local engagements. Within these local settings Mullins (2011) recognizes the role of individuals and the agency they assert in formulating their own social world.

Daniel Miller (1995) proposes an anthropology of consumption as a unifying framework for anthropologists working in diverse fields. In a similar vein, Majewski and Schiffer (2009) argue that an anthropology of consumerism would negate the need for arbitrary chronological barriers between prehistorians and historians or between sub-disciplines. Many historical archaeologists have approached the anthropology of consumerism by analyzing ceramics as a proxy for socioeconomic class (e.g., McBride and McBride 1987; Spencer-Wood 1987a, 1987b;
Spencer-Wood and Heberling 1987; Sweitz 2012). One of the more recent demonstrations of the legitimacy of anthropological examinations of consumer goods is Mullin’s (2011) in-depth work on American consumerism. Spencer-Wood (1987a) specifically demonstrated how ceramics may be used as a proxy for socioeconomic class. She demonstrated how status based on ceramic analysis compares similarly to status reconstructed from the documentary record. This must be done situated within the particular historical context of the site, taking into consideration employment, dwelling size, and market access as mediated by ethnicity and gender (Mullins 2012; Spencer-Wood 1987a; Sweitz 2012).

Since Pattonia was a river port village resting on the banks of the Angelina River, the occupants of the site had direct market access. This enabled the individuals of Pattonia to participate in the emerging international markets, which were brought to Pattonia by way of the cotton trade. The cotton trade preceding the Civil War ushered in global capitalism and with it the access to mass produced goods (Beckert 2004; Spencer-Wood 1987). Consumerism on the Pattonia landscape means a daily life much in accordance with the emerging consumer culture and fashions of the time. This is illustrated by the presence of a large variety of decorative and utilitarian goods across the landscape. By understanding consumerism at Pattonia, I attempt to reconstruct the socioeconomic differentiation present at the site and further develop what the lived realities of the Pattonia occupants were like.

Consumerism by the middle and lower classes during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries consisted primarily of food expenditures and secondarily of furnishings (LeeDecker 1991). The upper class possessed the ability to “buy in” to their proper social position through the purchasing of the “proper” material goods (Trunzo 2012). This period also sees the transformation of a mercantilistic economy into a capitalistic economy (Spencer-Wood 1987).
The new burgeoning global market economy created a “cultural subsystem,” which can be seen through the acquiring of British ceramics (Spencer-Wood and Heberling 1987). Households purchased ceramics for both utilitarian and social reasons, reflecting Binford’s (1962) technomic, socio-technic, and possibly ideo-technic artifact classes. Actors utilized ceramics to convey class (costly signaling) or projected desired class associations (emulation) through their use as social display and as prestige objects (Bell 2002; Galle 2010). Most importantly, individuals’ and households’ material goods, including ceramics, reflect the historically situated contexts of their lives, and at the same time they are influenced by larger world-systems which work to constrain individual agency (Mullins 2011). While the Antebellum period ushered in major improvements in communications and transportation, the Victorian Era saw the rise of the participation of women in the public sphere (Howe 2007; Mullins 2011; Wall 1991, 1999). Increased participation in the public sphere was the impetus for the development of notions of domesticity and the need to craft an image that reflected one’s position in life. The acquisition and display of ceramics was a critical component of this newly emerging cult of domesticity (Wall 1991, 1999).

7.2 Ceramic Analysis

Ceramics were recovered from all three major excavated structures at Pattonia. Comparing the ceramics from House I and House III provides a relative assessment of the socioeconomic status of the households. These houses represent the accumulation and differential discard of goods within the yards of each respective household. The discarded material culture reflects the purchasing decisions of individuals within the household and possibly their relatives and acquaintances. Wall (1991, 1999) found that from the mid-nineteenth century and onward that women represented the primary purchasers of a household. Wall (1991, 1999) was one of the earliest historical archaeologists to examine this dimension of ceramic
acquisition. Wall (1991, 1999) researched women of difference social classes in New York. She found that contrary to expectations, women of a lower social class did not attempt to express themselves in the same way as upper class women, but they each expressed their station uniquely. Because Pattonia began during this time and endured through the majority of the Victorian Era until the end of the nineteenth century, one can surmise that the ceramic assemblages at the different households primarily reflect the tastes and decisions of the women of Pattonia. However, I will show that in some contexts, the ceramic assemblage reflects alternative historical situations. Ultimately, these tastes and decisions would have been constrained by a household’s socioeconomic status and class; therefore, the ceramic assemblages should also reflect relative social positions.

7.3 Methodology

I present the total artifact counts by ware (Table 7.1) and decoration category (Table 7.2), as well as a macroscopic analysis. An inter-assemblage ceramic comparison between the three contexts allows one to rank these households hierarchically by socioeconomic status. I interpret the meaning of the assemblages’ mean ceramic dates for the overall socioeconomic success of Pattonia. Raw ceramic sherd counts are normalized to enable an empirical comparison between structures. Finally, a modification of Miller’s ceramic index (explained below) is used to test the validity of the normalized comparison.

The ceramic counts are normalized by dividing them by the amount of soil excavated in cubic meters (House I: 7.7 m$^3$; House III: 8.8 m$^3$; mercantile: 4.6 m$^3$). The normalized counts for both ware and decorative categories are then converted to a percentage of the total ceramic sherd concentration within each respective assemblage. In addition to normalization, I scale the raw ceramic sherd counts using a modified version of Miller’s (1980, 1991) ceramic index. The
modified version I employ is based on McBride and McBride’s (1987) methodology, which is adapted for highly fragmented assemblages like Pattonia’s. However, McBride and McBride (1987) used Miller’s (1980) first published values, which were later updated in Miller (1991). To calculate ceramic indices for Pattonia, I average Miller’s (1991) 1846 indices for plates, cups, and bowls for each level of decorative technique. The exact computations will be outlined further into this section. Pattonia’s ceramics are then qualitatively compared to the ceramics from two other historical sites in Nacogdoches County, the Sterne-Hoya house and the Acosta-Durst-Taylor site. Finally, the glass artifacts from Pattonia are analyzed along with index artifacts that illuminate the consumption habits and social milieu of the site.

It is important to consider the biases that are inherent in archaeological work and even more important to consider those related to ceramic analysis. These include differential deposition and destruction, errors in identification due to inexperience, and the percentage of the site that was excavated. Differential deposition and destruction creates bias in the archaeological record, which is why it is critical to normalize the data. What the occupants of the site decide to throw away, or what breaks and how it breaks determines what is recovered by the archaeologist (Schiffer 1967). Differential destruction distorts what survives the depositional processes long enough to be recovered by archaeologists (Schiffer 1967, 1985). Ceramics may fracture into multiple sherds at a site and may be counted as multiple vessels and/or different decorative categories by the archaeologist. While these biases may never be completely accounted for, I have attempted to address these issues as satisfactorily as possible by using multiple lines of evidence to support my arguments and by normalizing the ceramic data in two ways: 1) converting raw ceramic counts into ceramics per cubic meter (m³) and 2) by employing Miller’s Ceramic Indices to compare with the ceramic concentration results. First, it is necessary to
describe each ceramic assemblage in order to understand these more fully when they are compared.

7.4 House I

Table 7.1. Sherd Count by Ware: House I, III, and Mercantile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>HIII</th>
<th>Mercantile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tin-enameled unrefined coarse earthenware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified refined earthenware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annularware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White granite ware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherd Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A variety of refined earthenwares are present at House I, along with a small quantity of one type of unrefined coarse earthenware. The coarse earthenware has been identified as *faience brune* Rouen Plain Type, which is a utilitarian French colonial pottery dating to the late eighteenth century and early 19th century (Avery et al. 2007; Olin et al. 2002; Waselkov and Wathall 2002). This type is listed in Table 7.1 as tin-enameled unrefined coarse earthenware.
Table 7.2. Sherd Count by Decoration: House I, III, and Mercantile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration</th>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>HIII</th>
<th>Mercantile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-printed</td>
<td>All colors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted</td>
<td>Floral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Borderlined or banded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shell edge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sponge or spatter (dipped or annular)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded surface only</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ceramics</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We excavated a relatively low number of ceramic sherds at House I (n=33). The majority of these ceramics were English refined semi-vitreous earthenwares (n=26). Other than undecorated (n=17), transfer-printed is the primary decorative technique seen at House I (n=7) (Table 7.2). The next highest decorative technique represented within the assemblage is sponge or spatter painted (n=3). One hand-painted floral and one shell edge decorated sherd were also identified. One blue transfer-printed pattern was identified as “Triumphal Car” (Figure 7.1), which depicts a Classical scene (Samford 1997). This pattern was manufactured in Glasgow, Scotland ca. 1842 through 1870 (Hughes and Hughes 1968). Classical transfer-printed patterns were most popular amongst American consumers between 1827 and 1847 (Samford 1997). Classical motifs were popular due to the increased interest in simple and streamlined architecture, invoking Grecian and Roman views (Samford 1997). Another pattern identified was “Agricultural Vase,” which was manufactured by Ridgway & Morley between 1842 and 1844 and Francis Morley & Co. between 1845 and 1858 (Collard 1983). “Agricultural Vase” depicts a composite Canadian background based upon a famous engraver’s, William Barlett, work, titled Canadian Scenery (Collard 1983). An urn prominently featured in the central portion of the
‘Agricultural Vase’ scene suggests that this pattern also belonged to the Classical movement (Figure 7.2). Overall House I had a relatively meager ceramic assemblage.

Figure 7.1. Triumphal Car pattern ceramic sherd. House I.
Figure 7.2. Agricultural vase pattern transfer-printed sherd. House I.

7.5 House III

Table 7.3. Production Dates of Transfer-Printed Colors: House III. Dates taken from Samford (1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean beginning production date</th>
<th>Mean end production date</th>
<th>Range of production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue (light, medium, dark)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>1784-1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1785-1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1818-1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>1818-1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1814-1867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

House III exhibited the greatest quantity of artifacts overall and of historical ceramics.
specifically (Table 7.1). The most common ceramic wares are whitewares and pearlwares
(n=259). These wares account for 82 percent of the total assemblage. As expected, most of the
ceramics are undecorated (n=165). The decorative technique most represented is transfer-printed
(n=89). Blue is the most prevalent color of the transfer-printed sherds (n=36), followed by red
(n=21) (Table 7.3). The quantity of blue decorated refined earthenwares is expected, because it
was the first color used to decorate mass produced English ceramics (Majewski and O’Brien
1987; Samford 1997). It remained the most popular even when other colors become available in
the mid-19th century (Samford 1997).

The high quantity of red printed vessels is notable because they have a mean beginning
production date of 1829 and a mean end production date of 1842, yet the terminus post quem is
1880. These dates match quite well with the dates known for Patonia through documentary
sources. Ceramics dating to the earlier occupation of Patonia sync with what is known of the
rise and fall of Patton’s fortunes, which were intimately tied up with the prosperity of steamboat
shipping. The most prosperous period of steamboat trade was 1850-1860 (Block 1995; Blount
1967; Kane 1991). Several sherds exhibit polychrome clobbering, (a technique that involves
hand-painting over transfer-printed vessels). This technique began after 1840, indicating the
acquisition of the latest ceramics at Patonia (Samford 1997).

Makers’ marks were present on two of the transfer-printed sherds. One mark was that of
the Davenport Company, while the other was Ridgway and Morley (Godden 1991). Davenport
operated from 1794 to 1887. As noted earlier, Ridgway and Morley pottery was also present at
House I, meaning this pottery was present at both locations. The Ridgway and Morley mark was
only in use from 1842-1844, making the terminus post quem for the arrival of this pottery on the
site 1843, the first documented year of Patonia’s operation. Perhaps this pottery represents one
of the first shipments of goods to Pattonia. Another partial maker’s mark, missing the actual name of the maker, bears the British Coat of Arms, which was a very common maker’s mark motif spanning nineteenth century and into the twentieth (Godden 1991).

Pattern marks were present on two sherds. One purple specimen reads “WILLOW” and the other is unidentifiable, but appears on the sherd with the Davenport maker’s mark. Willow is one of the first patterns printed on refined earthenwares (Majewski and O’Brien 1987; Samford 1997), and belongs to the style of patterns referred to as Chinoiserie (Samford 1997). Chinoiserie patterns were most popular from 1816 to 1836 and were based on Chinese porcelain decorative styles (Samford 1997: 8). Other pattern styles identified at House III included American Historical Views and Floral. The manufacture of American Historical Views ended by 1850, but it was most popular earlier in the 19th century (Samford 1997). Floral designs reached the height of their popularity in the mid-19th century (Samford 1997).

In addition to general pattern designs, I identified two specific transfer-printed patterns: “Canova” and “Asiatic Plants.” Asiatic Plants is classified in the Chinoiserie design type and dates to the mid-19th century (Blake and Freeman 1998). The Canova pattern was one of the most popular transfer-printed designs (Samford 1997). An archaeological example of this pattern from House III is shown in Figure 7.3 and 7.4. The recurrence of the same pattern type on different vessels illustrates that this household possessed matched serving sets. Both green and red sherds of the Canova pattern were identified.
Figure 7.3. Canova pattern ceramic sherds from House III. Body motif of plate (center), rim motif (right and left).
Figure 7.4. Canova pattern mark on a plate sherd. Basal view.

Table 7.4. Stoneware Glazes: House III illustrating the frequency of different types of glazes and the minimum number of vessels (MNV).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glaze</th>
<th>Sherd count</th>
<th>MNV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkaline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

House III also has the highest proportion of stoneware (Table 7.1). 19th century American stonewares are utilitarian vessels (Greer 1999). Stoneware was used to make mugs, bottles, pitchers, churns, and large storage vessels (Greer 1999; Koverman 2009). Five percent of the House III assemblage is composed of stoneware. There are at least ten stoneware vessels at
House III (Table 7.4). The stoneware at Pattonia ranges from a light gray to a dark brown and is glazed with two different techniques, salt glaze and alkaline glaze. The majority of the stoneware is salt glazed (Table 7.4). Stoneware at House III further illustrates the domestic nature of the activities that occurred at this location. These light gray to dark brown stonewares depict a local Texas stoneware tradition (Greer 1999).

Georgians and South Carolinians migrated southwest in droves from the early to mid-19th century (Koverman 2009). The Pattons were among this group of emigrants (Blake 1957-1962). Many of these individuals brought the craft of stoneware pottery with them (Koverman 2009). By mid-century, stoneware potters manufactured their goods across the new state of Texas (Greer 1999; Koverman 2009; Lebo 1992). The stoneware at Pattonia reflects a tradition of American folk pottery. The vessels at Pattonia most likely came from regional potters. The possibility exists that they came into site through the mercantile in addition to local wares, but they most likely came from Nacogdoches. Lebo (1992) showed that North Central Texas households procured stoneware that originated at multiple local kiln sites. Based on her findings, it is hypothesized that the same was true for Pattonia.

7.6 Mercantile

A total of 60 ceramic sherds were identified at the mercantile, the majority of which were whitewares (n=23). Table 7.7 shows the sherd counts for each ware category. We recovered a total of eight hard paste porcelain sherds at the mercantile. Determining the region of manufacture for 19th century hard paste porcelain is difficult because it was manufactured in several different countries, with little to distinguish the ceramics (Majewski and O’Brien 1987: 127). The transfer-printed ceramics in the mercantile assemblage exhibit only floral pattern designs. The majority of the ceramics are undecorated (Table 7.2). Only one piece of stoneware
was recovered from this site.

The mercantile site was the only location where porcelain was identified. This makes the mercantile ceramic assemblage distinctly different from the households and raises a few questions. Do the ceramics represent what was being sold at the mercantile at the end of Pattonia’s occupation? Are these ceramics the remnants of those owned by Moses and Susan Patton when they lived at the mercantile? At this point it is unclear what association to the Pattons these ceramics had for the family. This will probably be the case unless further excavations near the site locate features with clear stratigraphy; such as, a midden or privy containing domestic artifacts in close association with the mercantile.

7.7 Inter-assemblage Comparative Analysis

Table 7.5. Pattonia Mean Ceramic Dates with low and high confidence intervals calculated using the R statistics package. Script taken from Peeples (2011). Mean ceramic dates calculated according to South (1977).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Mean Ceramic Date</th>
<th>95% confidence low</th>
<th>95% confidence high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House I</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House III</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercantile</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A staple of historical archaeological analysis is the calculation of mean ceramic dates (MCD). Stanley South (1977) developed mean ceramic dates as a method of dating historical sites. While South (1977) has shown that MCD correlates fairly accurately with the documented age of a site, it is important to note that what it actually estimates is the average age of the ceramics at a site. I think this quality of the MCD actually assists in the understanding of the duration of ceramics within a household after acquisition. It is known through documentary records, oral history, and other categories of artifacts (e.g. glass, buttons, and nails) that Pattonia
was occupied from 1843 to at least 1890. The MCD of House I is 1847, House III is 1850, and the Mercantile is 1852 (Table 7.5). A ceramic assemblage with a MCD closer to the early occupation of the site correlates with the understood economic prosperity of Pattonia during this period, having flourished during the heyday of steamboat trade and then declined due to the effects of the Civil War and the economic improbability of continued trade on the Angelina River (Blount 1967; Holbrook 1970). The economic trajectory of Pattonia parallels the larger currents of the Antebellum and postbellum South (Beckert 2004; Temin 1976; Wright 1974). I argue that the majority of the ceramics at Pattonia were purchased during the Antebellum period and that the decimation of the Civil War on the Patton family and the fortunes of Pattonia and its citizens are reflected in the ceramic assemblages. This is clearly illustrated by the lack of porcelain across the landscape at any location other than the mercantile assemblage, which has the latest mean ceramic date. Porcelain either came to Pattonia too late for those living at House I or House III to purchase it before they moved away or they simply could not afford the finer ceramics.

The three Pattonia ceramic assemblages represent different levels of economic prosperity and likely represent different socioeconomic statuses (classes). As demonstrated in the previous chapter, House I was more diminutive than House III and exhibits artifacts indicative of tradesmen. Additionally, House I has a smaller concentration of ceramics than House III (Figure 7.5). In every ware category, except pearlware and tin-enamedeled unrefined earthenware (*faience brune*), there is a higher concentration of ceramics at House III compared to House I (Figure 7.6). In every decoration category, except sponge or spatter, shell edge, and undecorated, there is a higher concentration of ceramics at House III compared to House I (Figure 7.7). These two observations are significant because in each circumstance, both with wares and decoration, the
categories of House I that have higher concentrations than House III are the older or less valuable categories. In the ware categories both pearlware and *faience brune* would be the oldest of the ceramic wares present at Pattonia (Majewski and O’Brien 1987). The sponge or spatter, shell edge, and undecorated are the three least valuable decorative categories present on the landscape (Majewski and O’Brien 1987). Based on these ceramic concentrations, I argue that House I represents occupants of lower socioeconomic position, presumably of the lower class. House III, with its relatively high concentrations of varied and heterogeneous ceramics, represents a household of median to high socioeconomic position, potentially of the middle or upper class.

Figure 7.5. Total ceramic concentrations. This graph illustrates the difference in concentrations of ceramics at each context as a percentage of the total concentration of the site.
Figure 7.6. Inter-assemblage ceramic ware comparison. Values represent the percentage of each ware type present in ceramics per cubic meter (c/m3). Ware types are stacked in order of value, with the most expensive variety (porcelain) at the top. Creamware is included because it is a common ware for early 19th century sites.
Figure 7.7. Inter-assemblage ceramic decoration comparison. Values represent the percentage of each kind of decoration present in ceramics per cubic meter. Decoration categories are stacked in order of value, with the most expensive variety (transfer-printed) at the top.
While the earthenware *faience brune* Rouen Plain Type pottery is present at each site, this ware represents 19 percent of the House I assemblage. The ubiquitous presence of this ware across Pattonia, which dates from the early eighteenth century until the beginning of the 19th century stands out from the rest of the ceramic wares, which date to the mid-nineteenth century. It is an undecorated utilitarian pottery. The likelihood that ceramics of this age were being sold at Pattonia is incredibly low because they predate the founding of the community. Most likely these vessels endured the trials of time (at least for a while) and were brought to the site during the early founding of Pattonia. One sherd illustrating the utilitarian nature of Rouen Plain is a basal sherd most likely from a chamber pot (Figure 7.9). I describe these ceramics as “heirloom” pieces, most likely passed down or gifted within or between families (Hume 1969). The place with the largest concentration of these heirloom ceramics may indicate a greater dependence on gifted pottery or the inability to acquire a sufficient amount of newer and more fashionable goods.
Between Houses I and III there is an 18 percent difference in whiteware concentration. This illustrates a difference in quantity of English refined earthenwares present at each site, suggesting very different purchasing capabilities of the occupants. The presence of white granite ware at House III and the complete absence of this type at House I is also telling. White granite ware becomes prevalent among rural households during the second half of the 19th century (Majewski and O’Brien 1987: 122). Often referred to as ironstone, today many archaeologists designate it white granite ware because of the confusion with other emic terms used by 19th century potteries, such as “stone china” to refer to ironstone (Miller 1991). White granite ware is a semi-vitreous ware originally manufactured by the English to imitate Chinese hard paste porcelain (Miller 1991). This ware type was considered of equal value to transfer-printed whiteware (Miller 1991). While there is no true hard paste porcelain at House III, the presence of
white granite ware is conspicuous when compared to the absence of this type at House I. Perhaps with the inability to purchase porcelain, either due to lack of access or lack of financial means, the occupants of House III substituted white granite ware for the authentic article.

The only location with porcelain is the mercantile. As discussed in the previous chapter, the mercantile assemblage dates to the late nineteenth century. Porcelain was found at other historic sites in Nacogdoches County, such as the Sterne-Hoya House and the Acosta-Durst-Taylor House. These sites have longer occupation periods than Pattonia, extending well into the 20th century (Corbin 2010). Identification of the porcelain was aided by a qualitative comparison of the Pattonia collection against both the Sterne-Hoya and Acosta-Durst-Taylor collections. Porcelain is present at numerous historical sites and its absence from House III is interesting, because one would expect to find this type at homes of higher socioeconomic status. The presence of porcelain at the mercantile in late 19th century contexts raises a question about when porcelain was introduced to the Pattonia landscape because porcelain acquisition does not seem to be a problem at most households in the literature, including slave and tenant cabins like those at the Levi Jordan Plantation outside Brazoria, Texas (Brown and Cooper 1990). However, if the porcelain at Pattonia is attributable to the Patton family, then its presence at the mercantile (Moses and Susan Patton’s home) makes sense because the Pattons would have held a high social status on the landscape as the founding family of the community, and it would be expected that they owned porcelain.
Table 7.6. Modified Miller’s Ceramic Index. Cost levels created by combining decoration types into hierarchical levels based on McBride and McBride (1987).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Levels</th>
<th>House I</th>
<th></th>
<th>House III</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Indexed Counts</td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Indexed Counts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level I: Undecorated</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II: Minimally Decorated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III: Hand-painted floral motif</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV: Transfer-printed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>217.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level V: White granite ware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Average Value</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To further test the hypothesis of socioeconomic hierarchy between House I, House III, and the mercantile, and test the previous methods of using ceramic concentrations, I apply Miller’s ceramic indices (Table 7.6). As detailed in Chapter Five, I have modified Miller’s Ceramic Index after McBride and McBride (1987). This takes the average of Miller’s indices for plates, bowls, and cups of each cost level, in order to account for highly fragmented assemblages, where meaningful vessel counts are not attainable. Table 7.6 supports the interpretation made based on the ceramic concentrations. The ceramic average value for House III (1.52) is greater than House I (1.39). The ceramic average value is a summation and average of the Miller index values for different ceramic forms. Based solely on ceramics, House III’s occupants represent a higher socioeconomic status than House I; however, one cannot satisfactorily discuss such complex relations by solely focusing on the ceramic artifacts. The
results of the spatial analysis in the previous chapter bolster the results of the ceramic analysis so that when they are taken together the socioeconomic landscape of Pattonia becomes clearer.
Chapter 8

Discussion

8.1 Social Differentiation on the Landscape

The analysis has shown that there were differences in domestic structures and quality of material culture at Pattonia. These differences indicate a socioeconomically heterogeneous community. The households at House I and House III depict two different ways of living at Pattonia. One involves fine ceramics and expansive living spaces, while the other involves low quality pottery and tight quarters. Based upon both the built environment and material culture, the occupants of House III clearly had greater wealth than those of House I. The spatial analysis and artifact distributions attempted to reconstruct the domestic dwellings of two households and found the dimensions of House III to most likely have been greater than House I. If dwelling size is one of the strongest indicators of wealth, it would seem that the inhabitants of House III possessed a higher socioeconomic status. The ceramic analysis illustrated a greater heterogeneity and value of ceramics at House III as opposed to House I. Historical archaeologists have frequently used ceramics as a proxy for material wealth. The ceramic analysis here correlates with the reconstruction of the built environment to provide a robust evaluation of social differentiation on the landscape.

The mercantile served a dual purpose as both commercial enterprise and home (Bill Patton 2013, pers. comm.). As the home of Moses Patton and his family, the large dimension of this structure may have contributed to the degree of social differentiation on the landscape; however, not much, if any, clear evidence of the domestic lives of the Patton’s was identified. As noted in the previous chapter, if the porcelain belonged to the Pattons and was not intended for sale, then this household was the only one that possessed these fine ceramics. This is what the
current evidence indicates, but this could change with further excavation at other houses. Taking together all evidence presented for House I, House III, and the mercantile, this research confirmed that social differentiation was present on the landscape and can be interpreted archaeologically.

8.2 Effects of Global Market Access on Pattonia Consumerism

Pattonia was a commercial endeavor whose founders had grand expectations of developing a bustling and socially relevant community. Goods such as fine English ceramics, personal adornments, and utilitarian objects entered the community by cart and river boat. This was possible due to the new developments in transportation and communication. When goods arrived by river boat in Nacogdoches County those of financial means at Pattonia received the first opportunity to examine and purchase the newest goods. Occupants of the river port community would have had differential access to these goods depending on their social status. The households of House I and House III occupy different positions on both the natural landscape and cultural landscape of Pattonia. House III was built near the entrance to the community, while House I is placed further in from the entrance, physically separated from House III by the road. The occupants of House III enjoyed a comfortable life as evidenced by the size of their domestic space and material culture, such as European earthenwares and a fine rosary of jet. As the wealth and social standing of a household’s occupants expands, so does the occupants’ house. This is seen in House III, but not House I, which was not able to expand beyond the original single-pen structure. House III, however, was able to grow and develop into a saddlebag.

8.3 Socioeconomic Stratification, Consumerism, and Daily Life

Socioeconomic stratification and consumerism at Pattonia means that daily life was much
in accordance with other 19th century communities. Patonia was a diverse place populated by
free and enslaved peoples of different ethnicities, genders, and religions. While the achievements
of the Patton brothers are most certainly important, the daily lives actually lived at Patonia
reveals much more about American culture during the 19th century.

Based upon the reconstructed socioeconomic status of Houses I and III, and taking into
account the other contextual data, it would seem that House I and House III sheltered occupants
of different occupations. In Chapter Six, I discussed the possibility of House I having housed
immigrant craftsmen. This is a plausible explanation, but it also might be the case that House I
housed African American slaves and later tenant workers at one time or another. It is possible
that House I represents the location of the slave and tenant quarters. It is known that the Pattons
were slave owners, but it is unknown if other white occupants of Patonia owned slaves.
However, reconstructing specific African American lifeways in the archaeological record is a
difficult task (Orser 2008).

I would argue, based on the documentary record, built environment, spatial organization,
ceramics, and other contextual artifacts that House I most likely represents the immigrant
craftsmen found on the census. The decorative carriage knobs provide a “signpost to the past”
that points in the direction of the immigrant wagoner and other craftsmen that briefly lived near
the Pattons in 1850 (Census Bureau Records 1850; Hume 1969). European immigrants living at
Patonia would coincide with the economic prosperity of Patonia, due to the attractiveness of a
growing community. However, they would not stay long as the troubles of Patonia caused
Robert Patton to sell his interest and resulted in the failure to sell enough house lots to sustain the
community indefinitely.

While House III was occupied, the family dwelling there was relatively successful. The
family of House III acquired popular ceramic patterns and colors (Canova, Willow, blue, red). They may have also been Catholic, due to the presence of a jet rosary bead and associated jewelry. How they made a living is unknown. Perhaps, they farmed like the majority of families of the time period (McReynolds 1978). They may have been involved with the commercial activities of the port. The answer to this question is unknowable for now. What is known, is where they built their home. Through archaeological excavation we have relocated the place where these individuals lived their lives during the 19th century.

The longest enduring piece of cultural landscape was the mercantile store. The mercantile sold supposedly medicinal elixirs, overalls, nails, hardware, milk glass containers, and decorative vases. According to the oral history with Bill Patton (2013), social activities at the mercantile and the Patton’s home were the main draw for those coming to Pattonia from Nacogdoches. Patton spoke of his relative Susan Ella Day, daughter of Robert Patton, and how she would tell him stories as a child. She described the mercantile as being a large structure with two stories and a porch and balcony. Socialites from Nacogdoches would come to Pattonia for the weekend for large dances. The men would camp around the mercantile, so as not to jeopardize the reputations of the young women. Music would be played while the party carried on all weekend. It is possible that archaeological evidence for these specific activities remains buried. Archaeologically we know that this mercantile was operating into the late 19th century, after Moses Patton abandoned Pattonia. These operations must have been carried out by June Harris.

8.4 Perspectives on Social Status and Religion at Pattonia

So far the discussion has relied upon the assumption that the cumulative wealth and the domestic dwelling size can be used to discuss relative socioeconomic status. The utility and validity of this method has been demonstrated in multiple studies (Spencer-Wood 1987a, Sweitz
2012). However, there are some drawbacks. While it has been shown that social groups during the 19th century used ceramics as a form of social display, certain social groups may not have valued ceramics to the same degree as married women (Wall 1991). The occupants of House I, may have been tradesmen who temporarily lived at Pattonia. They are not found in Nacogdoches County on the subsequent 1860 and 1870 censuses. It may be that these skilled craftsmen may not have used ceramics to display social standing. However, gender does not exclude the use of ceramics as signs of social standing. British officers during the 19th century possessed expensive ceramics while stationed at isolated frontier forts (Cromwell 2013). The possibility remains that House I may not have used ceramics in this way. Accepting, momentarily, that the occupants of House I did not act in this manner, they would still be considered a lower social class, because during the mid-nineteenth century the merchant class emerged as the dominant social class over tradesmen (Howe 2007).

It is certain that the tradesmen were not the lowest socioeconomic group. The enslaved African Americans would fall into this category, but material culture directly related to this group was not definitively identified. This may be due to several factors, perhaps our excavation program did not include the area where the slave quarters were located. Alternatively, we did recover cultural materials related to the activities of enslaved peoples, but were unable to identify them as such. Finally, the architectural and artifactual remains of their activities were not permanent enough to persist until the time of excavation. If the quarters of enslaved African Americans or other low status groups were not built on foundation piers, then we probably would not be able to detect these structures. The durability of the built environment negatively impacts the ability of archaeologists’ to more accurately reconstruct the social landscape.

Another aspect of social class that is left out of an economic perspective is religion.
During the Spanish and Mexican controlled periods of Texas, families were required to espouse views concurrent with the Roman Catholic Church (McReynolds 1978). Many European American families practiced Catholicism in name only (Campbell 2003). The majority of European American families in Texas were Protestant (McReynolds 1978). By the 1830’s, protestant churches began operating in Nacogdoches County with little regard for the laws of the Mexican government (Davis 2004, McReynolds 1978). Few families were able to attend a physical church in isolated regions of Nacogdoches County like Pattonia (McReynolds 1978). It is unlikely that a church was associated with this community, and no evidence to the contrary was detected archaeologically. Families would attend camp meetings where people would travel for miles to congregate for the weekend to worship and socialize (McReynolds 1978). These camp meetings seem very similar to what Bill Patton (2013) described as large social gatherings taking place at Pattonia. While he did not describe these meetings as spiritual in nature, their social component and the fact that families stayed over the weekend matches the description of a camp meeting as described by McReynolds (1978: 204).

The rosary bead and associated chain may indicate that there was a Catholic presence at Pattonia. Since the majority of European Americans in Nacogdoches County in the 1840’s practiced a form of Protestantism, the family living here may have been of Spanish or Mexican heritage. Certainly, this may not be the case, but the ethnicity aspect of social class may be explored through this artifact. The possibility exists that the practicing Catholics at this household were of French or other European ancestry. Being Catholic and of Spanish or Mexican heritage in Pattonia may have reduced a families social standing. Mexican and Mexican Americans experienced prejudiced treatment during and after the Texas Revolution (Davis 2004). However, this prejudice may not have been due to their religion exclusively. “In the
Anglo period, however, most families probably did not attend church regularly, and paid little or no attention to religion in establishing social status,” (McReynolds 1978: 207). Although their ethnicity may have subjected them to unfair treatment.

The rosary at House III would have entered into the archaeological record potentially through discard after having been broken, or this bead and chain were lost through the floorboards of the dining area (Figure 6.18). This artifact would have been imbued with symbolic importance and the loss of this rosary may have impacted the owner on a spiritual level. If many families gave little thought to religion as McReynolds (1978) indicates, then the occupants of House III may have been the exception.

By considering alternatives to the more straight forward exploration of socioeconomic status through an analysis of the built environment and ceramic assemblages, a more contextually rich discussion is possible. Together these approaches attempt to interpret the past lived realities of the occupants of Pattonia. However, this reconstruction is limited by research design, implementation constraints, the biased nature of the archaeological record, and human error. Future excavations at this site and other related sites may reveal more about social differentiation and the social display aspects of material culture.
Chapter 9

Conclusion

Archaeological excavations at Pattonia have increased our knowledge of the spatial organization and material culture of this 19th century port community. Beyond these immediate observations, this research has explored socioeconomic stratification and consumerism at Pattonia. This was achieved through both empirical quantitative and qualitative methods, using visualization software (Surfer®), mean ceramic dates, ceramic concentrations, and ceramic indices, in order to provide a robust scaffolding for resurrecting the past lifeways of the occupants of Pattonia. By establishing a firm empirical footing, the interpretations of the cultural landscape are more valid.

Using visualization software, I interpreted the distribution of excavated artifacts of Pattonia. This analysis contributed to an initial understanding of the socioeconomic statuses of the occupants. House I was most likely a small dwelling, such as a single-pen, while House III was a larger structure. Based on the artifact concentrations and architectural remains, House III was most likely a saddlebag house. It has been shown that the mercantile assemblage dates to the later occupation of Pattonia, selling a wide variety of material culture. The Pattons lived in the second story of the mercantile and their material contributions may be subsumed within this assemblage, but that has not been determined. Reconstructing the different contexts of the site allowed for a multifaceted approach to interpretation.

In order to further assess socioeconomic stratification and consumerism at Pattonia, I analyzed the ceramic assemblages. The conclusions drawn from the ceramic assemblages further supported the spatial organization results. The ceramics from House III were higher in quantity, density, and value than House I. The dimensions of the domestic structures at House I and III
coupled with the ceramic assemblages and other artifacts illustrate a stark contrast between the two locations.

The methods employed throughout this research were vital for the understanding of Pattonia. Archival research provided critical information for the interpretation of the archaeological data. Oral history enabled the confirmation of the location of the mercantile and increased the detail of the Pattonia narrative. Archaeological clearing excavation allowed for the understanding of the spatial organization of Pattonia and the direct comparison between contexts. The shovel testing program enabled a wide sampling of the site, providing further information about activities on the Pattonia landscape. The visual interpretation of Pattonia using Surfer® increased the understanding of domestic lifeways in the community. Ceramic analysis and comparison acted as a proxy for understanding the socioeconomic stratification present at the site. When these multiple lines of evidence are used together a greater understanding of Pattonia is possible.

The socioeconomic stratification and consumerism at Pattonia meant that daily life was much in accordance with other 19th century landscapes. Pattonia was a diverse place populated by free and enslaved peoples of different ethnicities, genders, and religions. While the achievements of the Patton brothers are most certainly important, the daily lives actually lived at Pattonia reveal much more about American culture during the 19th century.

Pattonia warrants further excavation and archaeological research. House II remains largely a mystery and could be directly compared to House I and III in order to broaden the understanding of life at this 19th century river port. Additionally, I would recommend further delineating the mercantile in order to determine the extent of the structure. Also further testing and excavation could detect assemblages clearly related to the Patton family. Additional testing
on the eastern side of the site in the central area would help to complete the understanding of the spatial organization of the built environment if any more structures were detected. The Pattonia landscape was a place of struggle and perseverance, which was ultimately abandoned as it failed to endure beyond its commercial foundations.
Appendix A

Bill Patton 2013 Interview
Bill Patton Interview (Abridged)

February 19, 2013

This interview begins with a discussion about the steps that were cut into the sandstone banks of the Angelina at the Pattonia port. These steps were not seen during either the 2010 or 2012 excavation, most likely due to the water levels of the Angelina River.

Overfield: We were hoping to see (the step) when we did the field school. We had always heard about the steps, but we hadn’t got a chance to see them at all.

Patton: I know we took some pictures. That was probably about 1966 we were there.

Cecil: Okay

Patton: Lois Blount got to see it.

Cecil: Well that’s fantastic.

Patton: And she claims she stood there and she said, “This is it.” The excitement on her face…

Cecil: That’s great.

Overfield: I’ve seen a couple maps where it’s labeled Platonia with an “L” before…

Patton: Platonia...yeah...

Overfield: They had it labeled over to the right (east) over here, but it’s actually more to the west than it is on those maps, right?

Patton: Right.
Overfield: We took GPS coordinates when we were out there. I have it in a GIS database, but I have noticed though on some of the older maps...

Patton: Oh yeah, they were inaccurate.

Overfield: ...that it’s a little off.

Patton: But there’s no question that’s where it is. It’s the only description that fits.

Overfield: Oh yeah...oh yeah...we have quite a bit of artifacts now too.

Patton: I wanted to come see. Do you have them in a...?

Overfield: They’re in a repository. They’re all in plastic bags and we can go see them today, if you have time today. We can go today after our conversation.

Patton: I can’t today I have another meeting.

Overfield: Okay, that’s fine.

Patton: I would love to some time.

Cecil: Yeah, just let us know and we’ll, if you’re (Overfield) not around, I’ll be around. Just give me a call or send an email and we’ll bring out the artifacts.

Patton: Well thanks, I appreciate it very much. I may bring couple, a son, of cousins with me or something.

Overfield: Oh, cool.

Cecil: And I’d want to tell the Suttons too, because the Suttons have always wanted to look at the artifacts to. So if we could have you guys there at the same time that would be great.
Cecil: We’ll do the best we can.

Overfield: I’ll be back the first week of March. March 3rd through the 8th. I’d have to double check my calendar.

Patton: That might be good. We can check then and see. There are no plans to particularly display it or anything?

Cecil: Right now, no. I think the place to do it is the visitor center with the mural and all the other Pattonia stuff down there. We can always have it at SFA, we have a cabinet up there.

Patton: But you did find some stuff?

Overfield: Oh yeah, that’s what I’m writing my Master’s thesis on, actually.

Cecil: We found the mercantile store.

Patton: You did find it.

Overfield: Pretty much the exact location of it.

Patton: To the right up on the main hill on the main part?

Cecil: Yeah

Overfield: If you’re looking at the river?

Patton: Yeah

Overfield: Yep

Cecil: Yeah

Patton: That’s right where we said it was.
Cecil: That’s where it was.

Overfield: Oh, cool.

Cecil: That’s where it was.

Overfield: How did you know it was there, just from oral history?

Patton: Yes, in fact sometime at the Rotary Club I had made this note: recollections of house parties at Pattonia Mrs. Ella Hallderman, Cousin Ella. Two stories, porches, men camped on grounds, women stayed in living quarters upstairs in the store. Which does not fit with the concept that’s down at the visitor’s center.

Overfield: So it’s two stories? I didn’t know that.

Patton: The store was downstairs and the family lived upstairs.

Overfield: Moses Patton’s family lived at the store? We excavated this household this past field school and it’s located more North. I don’t know when the last time you were up there was, it’s probably been a long time.

Patton: Last year.

Overfield: Oh okay, you know when you enter through the trees and the road is right there? Okay just maybe ten meters from where you enter that space right to the right there’s a deer stand there now. Last year we excavated a household with quite a large wealth of goods. It’s real close to the opening.

Patton: The one I saw last year...?
Cecil: There’s two...The house that you saw is smaller, but the bigger house we excavated last year. The wealth we excavated last year was higher than the house. Do you have any idea who was living there? Any recollection?

Patton: His children were still living with them. I suspect that was probably the people who worked there. There were slave quarters, there were all sorts of quarters there associated with it.

Patton: Where was the mercantile establishment? That’s where Moses lived.

Cecil: You wouldn’t have a slave quarters that was very large?

Patton: No I wouldn’t imagine. I know at one time they were trying to sell lots there.

Overfield: No land plats have been found as far as I’ve read.

Patton: That’s right. I don’t know of any. I’m trying to remember if my father-in-law ever showed me a plat of the lots. I vaguely remember talking to him about one summer they had his son and a cousin survey the lake there and tried to sell some plots. He said, “They tried to sell lots here 100 years ago and were unsuccessful and that’s still the case.”

Overfield: The mercantile must have been much larger than we thought. Moses and Robert Patton were well off for their time?

Patton: For the time maybe, but I don’t think particularly. They were not. They were not wealthy like Sterne and people like that. I know their steamboat they bought, when it capsized. When they lost it, apparently they never bought another one. They always leased one.

Overfield: Robert Patton bought Old Ben.

Patton: Robert Patton was more successful than Moses. Robert moved on to the other river. He was on the Sabine.
Cecil: Did your ancestors ever say anything about when they left, did they dismantle their houses after they left?

Patton: They probably took the rocks from the chimney and used them for the house in Oak Ridge.

Overfield: I guess (Robert Patton) decided that the Sabine was a more fruitful effort than the Angelina.

Patton: He was more successful with his boats than Moses.

Cecil: Do you know which port they were shipping their cotton down to?

Patton: They were shipping to Galveston and New Orleans.

Overfield: Can you say one more time for me exactly how you’re related to Moses and Robert.

Patton: Moses was my great-grandfather and Robert was my great-uncle.

Overfield: So I guess you were hearing stories about Pattonia your entire life then?

Patton: There was not as much attention paid to it as I grew up. We had got away from it. The family was all here in town. The Pattons were friends, but I heard very little talk of the early days.

Overfield: Do you have any other of Cousin Ella’s anecdotes?

Patton: I was so bored to go listen to her stories on Sundays. We had to go visit Cousin Ella in those days we had to and I was like eight or ten and I didn’t want to go. I do recall that when things would get interesting. The thing I recall clearest is the house parties they would have at Pattonia on weekends and everyone and all the social people would drive to Pattonia on the
weekends and the ladies would stay upstairs in the living quarters and the men would set up tents outside and camp all around and they would move the bales of cotton they had stored downstairs and dance and she recalled coming downstairs and watching them dance.

Overfield: How long would they camp out there?

Patton: They would come for the weekend, so I guess two or three days.

Overfield: Can you speak to the impact of the Civil War on the Patton family and on Pattonia? I know it was pretty disastrous.

Patton: That’s probably the best description of it. As the children left to go to war there was no one left really probably to help run the store and everyone was leaving the area. Nacogdoches itself was practically a ghost town other than for the refugees. Melrose I understand there were many refugees. I’ve heard they even heard the cannons from the Battle of Mansfield. The cannons were heard in Melrose. I’m not sure how many of the boys died in the Civil War.

Overfield: I think it’s two. I would have to check my notes for their names, but I know at least two died in the Civil War.

Patton: It just split the families apart. Continuity broke then.

Overfield: I know from my research that steamboat traffic would’ve been non-existent then.

Patton: It was probably dangerous to try to operate a boat.

Overfield: The Confederacy turned Old Ben into a cotton-clad warship.

Patton: Took all the boats. I guess there was very little private commerce during the war.
Overfield: The 1850 census lists Moses Patton as a boatman, while the 1870 census lists him as a farmer. Which do you think he would’ve wanted to be known as?

Patton: I think he would’ve wanted to be known as a boatman. I think that was his life’s work. I think he became a farmer just to survive.

Overfield: Why the move to Oak Ridge? Why not farm out in that area?

Patton: He didn’t actually have much land around Pattonia. He was using Rusk’s land and Houston’s land.

Overfield: What do you know about their participation in the Texas Revolution?

Patton: Not a great deal. Some of things I hear I think were inaccurate. That Moses was supposedly gone to New Orleans to get money that Moses had been sent to New Orleans to get money during the Battle of San Jacinto. But I don’t think that’s accurate. I think that’s a story that my father had or something.

Cecil: Where did they come from?

Patton: Georgia. Actually the Pattons were settled in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Then came down through North Carolina, South Carolina, because during the Revolutionary War we have a Captain Patton who’s buried in North Carolina. Then they came to Georgia and Georgia is where they learned to run riverboats.

Overfield: We found a 1917 penny there, but that seems like someone was just out there during that time.

Patton: There may have been still some residents there. Somebody may still have been living in one of these houses there that they found.
Overfield: The last mention of the mercantile in the newspaper was 1887 by June Harris. There was an ad in the newspaper that he would be bringing fish into Nacogdoches soon. Also, I came across something just yesterday that Pattonia became known as a good fishing spot. Have you ever heard that?

Patton: Probably so, because there was a deep spot in the river. One of Moses’ grandchildren, Cousin Webb, was a super fisherman. He spent his life fishing the Angelina River.

Overfield: We actually have a fishhook.

Patton: Sounds like maybe Cousin Webb was out there.

Cecil: Did you ever come across any pictures? Or Pattonia or the houses?

Patton: No...

Overfield: What does Pattonia mean to you?

Patton: It exemplifies my roots here in Nacogdoches. Because this is where the world began for me and for my family. It’s where the Pattons finally came into their own.
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