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ABSTRACT

ARCHAEOLOGY AT HISTORIC NANCE FARM: DATA RECOVERY AND ANALYSIS OF A NINETEENTH-CENTURY AGRICULTURAL HOMESTEAD IN DESOTO, TEXAS

Publication No. ______

Kerry L. Boutte, MA

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2007

Supervising Professor: M. Kathryn Brown, PhD.

Excavations at the Historic Nance Farm were undertaken as part of a 2002 University of Texas at Arlington field school. The research design included questions surrounding the rotation of the house, how the material culture changed as a result of the railroad system, and whether historical data can be used to check the archaeological data. As excavations at the Historic Nance Farm were underway, hope that intact nineteenth-century deposits would be revealed were diminished. Although the intrasite stratigraphic integrity was significantly compromised, closer inspection of the artifacts
revealed patterns suggesting a narrowly defined period during which the site was first occupied. Recovered artifacts indicate an occupation range slightly later in time than expected, but observation of other available data corroborated the information obtained from the subsurface testing.

A conjunctive approach including superstructural analysis, ethnohistoric data, and comparative study of other contemporaneous archaeological sites in the vicinity illustrated that even the most disturbed sites can contribute to the history of a given region. The debate over the privileging of anthropology over history, which was once thought to be central to this thesis, has since been reviewed. There are numerous resources available to the historic archaeologist and an effective analysis of disturbed sites most greatly benefits from the utilization of all of the available data rather than the favoring of one resource over another. It was determined that a conjunctive approach for historical sites, especially those with compromised site integrity, is by far the best course of action. This thesis also raised the issue of perspective when investigating historic archaeological sites. There is difficulty in remaining objective in these endeavors, and this will be explored in this document.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Historic Nance Farm

1.1.1 Theoretical Approaches

One of the initial objectives of this thesis was to test the validity of the archaeology against the historical literature (i.e., objective archaeological sampling of the site prior to historical records review). As I proceeded with the analysis of the archaeological data, several reasons led me to realize that this was an impossible and unproductive path to take. First, in order to investigate known features, many of the excavation units were placed in specific locations based upon informant information. This method of unit placement was guided by prior knowledge of the site and therefore resulted in biased sampling. Second, numerous other excavation units were placed in vicinities near observable architectural landmarks (barn, smokehouse, etc.) in an effort to investigate features associated with these structures (e.g., middens). This intuitive placement of units was based on prior archaeological knowledge and the anticipation that we might encounter certain features associated with farm structures. Third, I realized that this was an unproductive strategy due to the knowledge that I had about historic sites in general and the pioneering way of life. I could not be completely objective in my analysis as the prior knowledge influenced my interpretations; we learn
about our cultural heritage in many ways including, history courses taught in school, stories from elderly family members, books, and modern media. This understanding made me realize that when archaeologists are working with their own culture’s history, biases are inherent. This is not necessarily a negative situation, as these biases and prior knowledge can be used to guide the excavations and analysis in productive ways. Finally, through this realization of my own biases, I gained a better understanding of the debate that has been central to historical archaeology from the beginning, namely whether historical archaeology should be part of history or anthropology (archaeology). I address this more in depth in Chapter 4 and illustrate the usefulness of a conjunctive approach. I utilized the conjunctive approach in my research and data analysis and present the results in this thesis.

Focus areas that were part of the research design included the chronology of the site, status of the occupants as observed in the archaeological record, shifts in artifact types after the arrival of the railroad, and placement of archaeological features in relation to architectural features. One important question I had hoped the archaeology would permit me to answer was in regard to the rotation of the historic house. The historic data suggested that the house was rotated, but the archaeological data obtained during subsurface testing was contrary to this and the results are presented in Chapter 5.

Within the field of historical archaeology there is a burgeoning focus on historic farms, or agricultural complexes, and their rapidly changing forms. Excavations
performed on nineteenth-century farms in north Texas, and throughout the region, are able to shed light on the material and social lives of the occupants. As Mary Beaudry has suggested of the archaeology of historic farms that “all the bits and pieces we excavate,” … are “not important except that it contributes to our understanding of the people who lived at the farms,” and furthermore “we cannot afford to privilege single-component sites over what is truly the more typical farm site – a farm was and is, really, always a dynamic work-in-progress” (Beaudry 2002:139). Most of the emphasis in historical archaeology has been placed on those sites associated with well-known figures of the American past. American farmsteads and other sites associated with more commonplace activities, however, have not been so intensively investigated. As a nineteenth-century farm, will the Nance property be able to speak of the condition and culture of the north Texas frontier? Can information be gained despite the high frequency of disturbed areas and lack of intact deposits? Nance Farm has borne the brunt of numerous construction and landscape alteration activities, but a working farm is by its nature a changing topography.

Collectively, the structures at Nance Farm are moderately protected as a state historic site (Appendices A and B), meaning that any changes made to the property buildings that were not first presented to or approved by the Texas Historical Commission could be subject to fines and/or the removal of the historic marker and Recorded Texas Historic Landmark (RTHL) status. These penalties amount to little
more than a slap on the wrist and often do little to dissuade landowners to change or alter the landscape. These consequences also do little to protect subsurface features. Because of this one must face the fact that most of the nineteenth-century information is gone with the bulldozer, but much can still be learned about the progress of north Texas from the data recovered during the 2002 field excavations. Because the changes at Nance Farm are relatively recent, archaeological study of this property might not be as exciting or glamorous as older, more intact sites. It is, however, important to realize that these recent sites are passing from view at rapid rates. Perhaps Ivor Noël Hume states it best:

“It is true that the more remote the period the more aesthetically stimulating it becomes, and it would be fine if the remains of early America could be allowed to mature in the ground until they acquire the venerable patina of great antiquity. But the truth is that they cannot. They are being torn out by urban development, highway construction, reservoir building, reforestation, and by farming and natural erosion. It is a case of now or never. It is imperative that we realize that the techniques of archaeology can be usefully applied to any period, no matter how recent, if by digging something up we can learn more than is to be found in written records.” (Noel-Hume 1970:9)

Historical sites, particularly in Texas, typically occur approximately within the first 20 centimeters below ground surface. As such, they are especially susceptible to development on the surface. It has been pointed out that these type sites are characteristically “fragile” and damaged by “erosion, agricultural activity and
construction” (Talmage and Chesler 1977:2). When speaking of prehistoric sites (a view which can also be shared in this exercise) Talmage and Chesler (1977:5) suggest that if construction and development efforts continue at the present rate, there will be few, if any, intact sites. Therefore, “archeologists must be willing to study the effects of disturbance on resources or must resign themselves to the cessation of archeological field work since no intact pristine resources will remain” (Talmage and Chesler 1977:5).

Since this site has been subject to numerous construction and reconstruction events, it may very well be able to tell us something of the development of this north Texas region. The Nance family, after whom this site is named, occupied the property during a time of much technological innovation. According to the Texas Historical Commission:

Otway Bird Nance (1805 - 1874) brought his family here from Kentucky in 1851 and bought this land through the Peters Colony in 1856 [more history of the Nance family can be found in Chapter 3]. Begun in the 1850s, this residence was later enlarged and Victorian detailing added. It originally faced north but was rotated in the early 1900s to face east. Near the farmhouse, a barn, curing shed, and an elevated water tank have been preserved. The Nance family owned this site until 1951. It was purchased by the city of DeSoto in 1975. Recorded Texas Historic Landmark 1976 (Figure 1.1).

The City of DeSoto, Texas, elaborates by saying “Over the next few years he acquired quite a bit of wealth and property in the area. He farmed and raised cattle,
sheep and horses and had 2 to 4 domestic and farm-working slaves until the end of the Civil War” (City of DeSoto: 2001-2003).

There are several structures which comprise the Nance Farm complex (see Figure 2.2) including the core dwelling, a two-story Folk Victorian with attached kitchen. During renovations in later years a hallway was added connecting the water tower and carriage house to the rest of the residence. A barn and smokehouse comprise the outbuildings and smaller structures, such as a well (on the south side of the home) and a windmill (at the gated entry on the east side of the property). Subsurface archaeological testing was performed in an effort to locate the remains of farm related structures that are no longer standing. It was hoped that such excavations would reveal features indicative of a sheep pen, chicken coop, or out kitchen.

1.1.2 Field Methods and Site Records

Fieldwork was conducted as part of the University of Texas at Arlington archaeological field school in 2002, in which students and volunteers comprised a crew led by Dr. M. Kathryn Brown. In historical archaeology depth is often recorded using
the English system. For teaching purposes, however, the Principal Investigator preferred the use of the metric system. This document represents both measurement systems. Archaeological recording included the establishment of a site datum, placement of 2 by 2 meter (6.56 by 6.56 feet) excavation units, 1 by 1 meter (3.3 by 3.3 feet) test pits, and shovel tests. Horizontal distribution of the artifacts was also utilized in the compilation of a site analysis. Rather than place shovel tests at fixed intervals, these approximately 50 x 50 centimeter (19.7 by 19.7 inches) tests were intuitively placed in areas of the property expected to contain high artifact frequencies and low traffic. A total of eight shovel tests were excavated in 20-centimeter (7.87 inch) levels. These, like the excavation units and test pits, were excavated in 10-centimeter levels and terminated 10 centimeters after encountering sterile soil. Each of these levels was recorded on a separate level form. The matrix was then screened using a ¼-inch wire mesh screen and artifacts were collected by level. These were bagged and the provenance (unit, level, date, excavator’s initials) was labeled. If features were identified they were photographed and plan mapped, and the information was entered onto feature forms.

The initial research design was to place 2 x 2 meter excavation units in those areas with highest expected yield (i.e., in the barn/chicken coop and sheep pen vicinities). Intuitive sampling was performed in areas of surface artifact scatters and known feature locations. These units were to be excavated in 10 centimeters (3.9 inches) levels and terminated no less than 10 centimeters after encountering sterile matrix. No Munsell colors were recorded as the matrix was fairly uniform.
The identification of several disturbed excavation units, and potentially dangerous utility and power lines, led to the termination of some work areas (discussed in detail below). After terminating multiple excavation units due to disturbance or potential harm, the 2 by 2 meter excavation unit strategy was abandoned in favor of 1 by 1 meter test pits. The stratigraphy of several of the 1 x1 test pits was also disturbed. This is discussed in Chapter 2. Shovel tests were placed around the estimated parameter of the property near the house and outbuildings to determine the spatial limits of the site. The shovel testing method was also used to locate nondisturbed areas near the buildings as well. Both the 1x1 meter test pits and shovel test pits proved to be more fruitful methods than the 2 x 2 meter excavation unit strategy; several interesting intact features were encountered.

1.1.3 Laboratory Methods

It was soon noted that the lack of vertical site integrity necessitated dependence upon the artifact assemblage for information regarding the site’s historical significance. As such, a series of steps were taken to ensure the accuracy and completeness of artifact analysis. All artifacts exposed during excavations were bagged by provenience and prepared for processing. All field specimen bags were crosschecked against the artifact bag log prior to the end of each day. Cultural materials exposed and recovered during field excavation were taken to the lab where artifacts were washed by hand, sorted by basic material categories, and measured. When feasible, provenance was also recorded on artifacts on the least visible surfaces of the specimens. This was performed not only as preliminary analysis, but also as an introduction to laboratory curation techniques in
partial fulfillment of the field school requirements. Subsequently, further artifact analysis was completed by the author (Chapters 5 and 6). Faunal analysis was performed by Ms. Sherry Duffy (a graduate student at the University of Texas at Arlington), and a chapter regarding her findings is included in this thesis.

With the exception of three prehistoric artifacts, the vast majority of the recovered cultural material fell within either the historic or modern (post-1950) artifact categories. Analysis was expedited by the organization of this material into typological sets specifying the material from which the artifact was manufactured. Additional divisions were created in an effort to further aid the analysis and consisted of function, type, and subtype. Portion and color were noted where applicable. For example, since we know that solarization creates an amethyst hue on glass manufactured between 1880 and 1920, color was a helpful characteristic in determining when the artifact entered the archaeological record. Portion was a useful trait particularly among the nails in that the head of the nail allowed for the relative dating of cut nails (i.e., was it a rosehead nail or a later machine cut head). Following is a sample artifact inventory form (Figure 1.2).
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>SUBTYPE</th>
<th>COLOR</th>
<th>PORTION</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.2 Artifact Analysis Form
CHAPTER 2
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND FIELD METHODOLOGY

2.1 Texas Environmental History

2.1.1 General State Environmental History

The state of Texas, the second largest in the United States, covers an area of approximately 268,600 square miles (Carpenter and Provorse 1993: 291). The land encompasses a wide range of topographic regions including the Gulf Coastal Plain to the south and southeast, the Great Plains extending toward the panhandle of the state, the Trans – Pecos on the western portion of the state, and the gently undulating North Central Plains which contain the project area (Carpenter and Provorse 1993: 291). The study area is positioned within the Prairie Margin, an ecotone which spans much of the interior of the continental United States from Canada to Texas (Bruseth et al 1987: 29). This ecotone can, in some areas, be characterized by sharp contrasts between the woodlands that border it on the east and the plains to its west, but contrasts can also be less marked and appear as a gradual transition. These border zones are often interesting areas for cultural studies because they were formed from a variety of environmental factors allowing for a variety of plant and animal species which human communities could exploit.

The climate is mostly mild, but can be very hot in the summer. Extreme temperatures have been reported with the record high for the state reaching 120°
Fahrenheit in August of 1936 and the lowest being recorded at –23° in February of 1933. Neither of these temperatures, however, was noted in the project vicinity (Bruseth et al 1987: 29). With such a topographic and climactic range, there is also a varied set of associated fauna.

2.1.2 North Texas Environmental History

The Historic Nance Farm is situated within Dallas County southeast of Fort Worth and southwest of the city of Dallas (Figure 2.1). It is positioned at 32.60983 degrees Latitude and 96.86152 degrees Longitude where soils are part of the larger drainage system of the Trinity River and its tributaries. Among these tributaries are the Duck, Fivemile, Mesquite, Mountain, Muddy, Turtle, and White Rock branches, but that which was of importance to the prehistoric and historic development of the area surrounding Nance Farm is Tenmile Creek, formerly referred to as Pleasant Run River (Galloway 1991:2). All of these waterways, however, lacked the navigability of systems to the east and south, but travel to the region increased after the construction of rail lines in the vicinity. New commodities and ideas soon followed.

Dallas County soils are described as slightly acidic clays and loams that are not typically conducive for the preservation of prehistoric period bone matter (Bruseth 1987). There is more potential to recover preserved bone in historic contests due to the shorter length of deposition, but these, too, are likely to be much weathered (Bruseth 1987; *Handbook of Texas Online*). This general vicinity also is described as part of the Blackland Prairie, a physiographic region extending from San Antonio, Texas, to the
Red River and the boundary between Texas and Oklahoma (Moir et al. 1996:24; VandenBosch et al. 2001). This physiographic region (approximately seven percent of Texas land area) would previously have been well suited to a pastoral economy with the gently undulating hills (with an elevation of 500 to 800 feet [150 to 240 meter.]) and fairly fertile soils resulting from the above-referenced drainage system. At present, however, there has been region-wide agricultural overexploitation and urban development, serving largely to deplete these soils (Green et al. 1997: 5).

The climate of the Dallas – Fort Worth area can best be described as warm and humid subtropical characterized by mild weather (average temperature of 83° in July
and 47° in January) punctuated by very hot temperatures in the summer (highest recorded temperature of 113° in 1980) and very cold intervals in the winter (lowest recorded temperature of –8° in 1899) (Bruseth 1987:3; Green et al. 1997: 5). Temperatures during much of the year are principally influenced by continental forces, but the Gulf of Mexico produces warm breezes that more or less govern weather models in the hot summer months (Bruseth 1987:3). Rainfall can be erratic but still sustain a variety of agricultural activities (Bruseth 1987:4) with most of the annual precipitation coming in the form of heavy thunderstorms. Although the growing season is reported to be between mid-March and mid-November (Bruseth 1987:3) this region is prone to dry periods.

Pecan and post oak trees are observed near water sources; cottonwood and red cedar are also present in the vicinity of DeSoto, Texas. Other flora of this physiographic region include blackjack oak, elm, plum, walnut, and willow (Moir et al. 1996:6). Since these data were based upon contemporary sources one can make inferences regarding the environmental settings and exploitative opportunities for late prehistoric, historic, and present communities (Doehner 1978; Moir et al. 1996).

Mammal species such as bison (*Bison bison*), black bear (*Ursus americanus*), gray wolf (*Canis lupus*), jaguar (*Panthera onca*), ocelot (*Leopardus pardalis*), and the pronghorn antelope (*Antilocapra americana*) were once present on the prairie margin but are no longer observed in the region. Extant fauna in the project area consist of those species which appear to thrive in an array of habitats throughout North America. These include the coyote (*Canis latrans*), eastern cottontail (*Sylvilagus floridanus*), gray
squirrel (*Sciurus carolinensis*), raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger*), Virginia opossum (*Didelphis virginiana*), and white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) among others (VandenBosch et al. 2001). Historically, the white-tailed deer was the most hunted species for subsistence purposes in the project vicinity, but the gray squirrel and the fox squirrel were also utilized (Jasinski 2006). Archaeological evidence at the Nance Farm also suggests the consumption of pig (*Sus scrofa*), rabbit (*Lepus sp.* unspecified), and possibly virginia opossum (see faunal analysis).

With diverse wildlife for consumption and wide spaces for cattle herding, North Texas seemed quite inviting for nineteenth-century American settlers looking to move west. As Mary Austin Holley stated in 1831, “… Texas is, in many respects, the most eligible part of North America. I speak of course of its natural advantages” (Hatcher 1933:143) A cultural history of the region is presented below.

### 2.2 Field Methodology and Results

This section is a discussion of the excavation methods employed during the 2002 field school season at the Nance Farm historical site. The fieldwork portion of this exercise was designed to obtain data regarding both the vertical and horizontal locations of artifacts which would contribute to the understanding of the Nance Farm from its origin as a north Texas agricultural complex to its present identity as part of a larger suburban residential environment. A total of four excavation units, 24 test pits, and eight shovel tests were intuitively placed on the property in order to uncover as much area as possible and to investigate those areas thought to possess the greatest artifact density and features. Excavation methods included the removal of matrix in 10-
centimeter levels with the exception of the eight shovel tests in which 20-centimeter levels were employed. In addition to subsurface testing, all artifacts identified on the ground surface were collected and their proveniences recorded. The site datum was established at what was considered to be at least a semi-permanent landmark on the property in order to facilitate possible unit location at a later date. The site datum was placed at the flagpole at approximately 60° off magnetic north and positioned to the southeast of the main structure (Figure 2.2). Elevations were shot using a Topcon AT-G7 Autolevel.

![Figure 2.2 Plan Map of Historic Nance Farm](image)

It was determined that it would be helpful to see if there was evidence of a cut tree line underneath the house to support the claim by a former resident of the property that the house was rotated to face east. Since the historic core portion of the structure
was raised on piers, two crew members were able to crawl underneath to look for previously cut trees (see Figure 2.3). They found that there were two tree lines of four stumps each underneath the building as well as two additional cedar stumps/logs (see Figure 2.4). It is possible that all ten trees were cut down during rotation.

![Figure 2.3 Crew Member David Flanagan Underneath the Nance Main Structure](image)

It is possible that the removal of the trees was more consistent with a larger operation such as the house being erected on the spot. It is more likely, however, that the structure was moved from an altogether different place at the turn-of-the-century. This is supported by the large number of artifacts that cluster around a late nineteenth-century date.
As described above, 2 x 2 meter excavation units (XU1-XU4), 1 x 1 meter test pits (TPs 1-24), and 50 x 50 centimeter shovel test pits (ST 1-8) were scattered throughout the property in an effort to locate intact archaeological deposits which, it was hoped, would lead to a more thorough understanding of the nineteenth-century occupation. Measurements were taken from subdatum points, placed at 5 centimeters above the highest corner of the excavation unit, test pit, or shovel test. The information below is presented according to distinct areas of the property, rather than a chronological rendering of unit placement. By using the main house as point of reference, results of the excavations are presented as either north or south of this structure and then subdivided into specific areas within each of these halves. Artifacts
mentioned in this section are reported as they were recorded in the field. It is a preliminary assessment only; a more thorough artifact analysis follows in Chapter 5.

2.3 South of the Core Dwelling

2.3.1. Chicken Coop

The first excavation unit, designated XU1, was positioned in the putative vicinity of the chicken coop northeast of the barn. The southeast and northeast quadrants of XU1 were excavated to a maximum depth of 50 centimeters below subdatum (cmbsd) where soil color ranged from tan to dark brown, and consistency throughout the levels appeared to be a mixture of clay and sand. This unit was placed in an area exhibiting both historic and modern surface material, but artifact density within the excavation unit was relatively low. A combination of nineteenth-century and modern materials was noted in the field, as was a river-worn piece of chert debitage which had, perhaps, been thermally altered. Most notably, however, eggshell was dispersed throughout both quadrants, and a sample was collected. Visual inspection of chicken eggshell obtained from my local grocer confirmed that the shell uncovered from this excavation unit was chicken shell, and suggested that XU1 was indeed in the vicinity of the former chicken coop. No postholes were observed, nor was any sort of “chicken wire” present. This excavation unit was terminated at 50 cmbsd once no additional artifacts or fauna were observed in the matrix.

In an effort to expand the area of the chicken coop, TP24 was placed to the southeast of XU1 and east of the barn. A concrete walkway separated TP24 from both of these landmarks. Once again, recovered artifacts consisted of an admixture of
twentieth-century rubbish and nineteenth-century artifacts (principally nails). Although the matrix appeared to be dark and organic, only one small bone was recovered. No features were located within the test pit and it, too, was terminated after Level 2 with little artifactual yield.

2.3.2. Barn

In an effort to identify any additional features associated with farm life (corn crib, fences, etc.), TP15 was positioned to the east of the barn and yielded little other than modern wire nails, although a few cut nails were identified as well. This test pit was terminated upon encountering a metal pipe running north-south in Level 2.

To determine what sort of items might have been stored and subsequently swept out of the barn, TP16 was placed in the vicinity of the barn approximately four meters south of XU1. The matrix of this test pit was sandy, which allowed for smooth screening, but proved to be somewhat hard-packed and difficult to excavate. Water added to the matrix did little to alleviate the problem. The majority of artifacts recovered were of modern date and excavation ceased upon reaching 30 cm bsd.

TP20 was placed as an extension of the terminated TP15, near the barn. Positioned with an east-west orientation, there was an assortment of modern artifact types, but few dated to the historic period. There were no cultural features identified during the excavation of this test pit. TP20, like its nearest counterpart (TP15), did not yield much material culture and was terminated at 20 cm bsd.

Situated east of the barn on the south side of the water tower, TP21 was excavated with the hope that intact cultural deposits might lie within. There were,
however, no cultural features to be found within this test pit, and stratigraphic integrity was compromised. Historic artifacts, mainly cut nails, were observed to be amongst twentieth-century rubbish, including a fair amount of plastic and Styrofoam.

To investigate the penned area of the barn, ST4 was excavated in two 20-centimeter levels. The soil of the first of these levels was found to be a combination of loose sand and gravel fill containing artifacts of historic and modern affiliation. The second arbitrary level, however, revealed no traces of the glass, bone, shell, or cut nails observed in the above level. This shovel test also revealed a lack of research potential in this area.

ST6 was placed within the barn itself to find artifacts that could definitively date the barn as well as to see what artifacts might have fallen through the cracks of the floor. Methods included the removal of a 29 x 120 centimeter board, and an area approximately 35 x 90 centimeters was excavated to a maximum depth of 20 cmbsd. The matrix was very dusty and loose and artifacts were observed in high density within the first few centimeters of the shovel test pit. In addition to a recently deposited yet partially desiccated faunal specimen which was subsequently discarded, faunal material observed in the test pit was bagged for laboratory analysis. Both modern and historic cultural material was encountered. A total of nine cut nails were collected, but 43 wire nails and 13 modern metal fixture fragments also were located. High amounts of eggshell were found as was a preserved corn cob. The presence or absence of a corn crib cannot be inferred on the basis of one corn cob. A high density of clear and colored glass (Christmas tree lighting) was also present.
2.3.3 Smokehouse

TP1 was positioned east of the smokehouse on the southern portion of the property. It was placed there to locate and identify artifacts and faunal remains associated with the processing and smoking of meat at the Nance Farm. The matrix consisted of dark organic soil and a noteworthy amount of root disturbance. Despite the presence of an extensive root system, or perhaps because of it, this test unit yielded the most promising historic artifact assemblage of the entire site in that there was more potential for historic artifact concentrations nestled within the tree roots. The reaction of glass exposed to chemicals in the soil results in patination, or the iridescent layers of eroding glass. Although the rates of this decay largely depends upon the type of glass, alkalinity of the soil, and the amount of time that glass has been in the ground (Newton and Dawson 1989:275-283), moderate to high patination on recovered glass fragments, usually suggests that the artifacts could be assigned a historic date. The nails and small glass fragments tended to cluster under the central tree root and along the north wall of the unit. The soil of this test pit became finer and easier to screen as depth increased, but excavators noted a marked decrease in overall artifact density in levels five and six. The unit was terminated prior to initiating the seventh level.

In this relatively productive area east of the smokehouse, TP8 was placed at the western wall of TP1. This was done to expand the excavated area and to increase the sample size of historic artifacts, fauna, and other materials associated with the smokehouse. Although we didn’t locate any materials that indicated use of the smokehouse, there were numerous examples of construction materials, such as historic
and modern nails possibly indicating the repair and reuse of wooden beams on the smokehouse. This hypothesis, however, is discussed in Chapter 6. Understandably, given the placement of this test pit in relation to TPs 1 and 8, the matrix was highly organic with a large amount of tree root disturbance. Within the root system, a large number of historic nails were recovered as were other artifacts of historic affiliation. Historic and modern nails were identified within the same levels, but unlike other test pits at the Nance Farm with obvious compromised stratigraphic integrity, this admixture could be attributed to root disturbance. Interestingly, barbed wire also was noted, but no features were identified. TP8 was excavated to a maximum depth of 40 cmbsd prior to closing.

Placed adjacent to the south wall of TP1 was TP14. It was found to contain an artifact assemblage consistent with that of TPs 1 and 8. An east-west oriented pipe was observed in Level 2 of this 1 by 1 meter test pit, but excavations continued around it. The test pit also was terminated at an approximate depth of 40 cmbsd.

TP2 was situated behind the smokehouse on the southernmost portion of the property. Positioned outside of a concrete footing, the objective of this test pit placement was to determine what sort, if any, smokehouse associated artifacts (i.e. hooks, modified or damaged faunal remains, etc.) and features might be identified. As the test unit was placed on a slope, there was also the possibility that artifacts would cluster at the bottom producing a general (albeit blended) assemblage of historic material once used at this location. There were slight amounts of historic material retrieved from TP2, but cultural material was principally restricted to modern refuse.
This artifact assortment was indicative of more or less contemporary refuse disposal in the least visually obstructive manner on the least visible portion of the property. The soil was medium brown in color and the texture was hard-packed and interspersed with concrete building rubble. It soon became apparent that the fill in this region was too dense to excavate through and there would be little prospect of identifying intact cultural features. Excavations were therefore halted.

2.3.4 Creek Bank

TP4 was placed near the creek bank to investigate if there was a prehistoric component to the site and also to see if the historic component extended all the way to the creek. It was, perhaps, the most difficult of any excavation on site. It was located southwest of the barn and close to the creek. The entire test unit was plagued by compacted matrix and hard limestone which had to be loosened by rock hammer in order to facilitate matrix removal. The artifact assemblage was an odd assortment of glass, unidentifiable metal, and miscellaneous parts of farm machinery, identified in direct association with cut and wire nails. Excavation was extended to Level 7 in the anticipation that historic data might be gained beyond the modern levels, but still proved to be an arduous task. Excavation of this unit was abandoned.

2.3.5 Adjacent to the Core Dwelling

TP5 was placed just behind the back door of the main house to locate artifacts that might have been swept out of the back of the main dwelling. There were some historic materials recovered, but the majority of artifacts encountered were primarily associated with modern roofing activity. Beginning in Level 4, a fine-grained, mustard-
colored, ash-like intrusion was observed. This substance, interpreted as lime, was positioned in the southwest corner of the test pit. Although no artifacts were located within the feature, two wire nails were found on the perimeter of this semi-circular feature. Further examination of this intrusion led to the determination that this was a twentieth-century feature, probably occurring at the same time roof construction/repairs were conducted. Charcoal also was dispersed throughout the test pit. As this test pit yielded little information regarding the site’s nineteenth-century architectural history or to better insight into the Nance family or daily frontier life, excavation at TP5 ended.

Although plastic siding was noted in the first portion of ST5, positioned near the water tower, the dark organic matrix filled with burnt wood, bone, nails (wire), and glass appeared promising. It was possible that this first level would lend information regarding the building of the structural addition connecting the dogtrot core dwelling to the water tower. The second level of this shovel test pit was less promising, as a water pipe was identified at approximately 35 cmbsd. ST5 was then terminated. It is now suggested that artifacts recovered from Level 1 might be displaced, but due to the modern nature of the debris, it is also possible that they were deposited after the placement of the water pipe. None of these artifacts are diagnostic, and an accurate terminus post quem for twentieth-century building refurbishment could not be assigned.

ST7 was found to contain a degree of depositional integrity not common at Nance Farm. It was placed just south of the contemporary front door of the original dogtrot structure, and the first 20 - centimeter level was composed of a dark clayey soil with an admixture of historic and modern materials. The second level, however,
contained a slighter density of artifacts, but these were principally historic. In fact, only one of the ten recovered artifacts (a wire nail) could be definitively assigned a date post-1890. The third level contained only one artifact, a cut nail. The decreasing artifact concentration and the increasing occurrence of historic material as one proceeds down the vertical sequence point to the reliability of the artifactual data of this shovel test. Unfortunately, there were no associated features or temporally diagnostic artifacts suggestive of a particular event at the property.

2.3.6 Southernmost Edge of the Property

ST1 was excavated in the vicinity of the modern fence line forming the southernmost modern property line. It contained little else but items that would be associated with modern fence construction. The first 40 cmbsd were noted to contain a light gravel fill with modern debris such as surface level plastic trash and concrete from the modern posts. The remaining excavated 20 cmbsd was composed of a sterile light brown loose matrix. ST1 was terminated at the completion of this level and upon revealing that this region of the property possessed very little archaeological research potential.

2.4 North of the Core Dwelling

2.4.1 Sheep Pen

The third excavation unit, XU3, was placed on the far northwest corner of the property. It was predicted that investigation of this area would yield evidence of the sheep pen based on the testimony of an informant. The northeast and southwest quadrants were excavated, and the matrix in the first few levels consisted primarily of
fill and miscellaneous mechanical parts. Historic artifact density became higher as excavation progressed. Within Level 5 of the northeast quadrant, excavation revealed a post hole. This feature was noted approximately 50 cmbsd and was identified to be 11 centimeters north/south and 14 centimeters east/west. Upon discovery of this posthole at such depth and the general lack of artifacts surrounding it, the decision was made to further excavate only that area immediately surrounding the feature. Decomposing wood was noted at the bottom of this post mold. This posthole, combined with the barbed wire identified in the previous Level 4, suggested that a fence of some sort extended in part through XU3. The defined and regular shape of the mold places construction of the alleged fence to after the mid-nineteenth century as the posthole digger was not invented until that time. Because this was the only posthole to be found in the vicinity, the fenceline orientation cannot be stated with any certainty. Other than the suggestion by an informant that this was the area of the sheep pen, there was no further evidence to suggest that this was an enclosure. Sterile soil led to the excavation unit being terminated at approximately 60 cmbsd.

2.4.2 Near the Core Dwelling

The second excavation unit placed at the site was XU2, to the north of the house. It was extended an additional 0.5 meters from the southeast quadrant because of the presence of a power line running throughout at a north/south orientation in the eastern portion of the unit. XU2 was found to have a thick (30 centimeter) level of gravel fill situated immediately beneath a thin layer of grass. Beneath this gravel, three more levels of the fill were removed by pick ax and shovel. This matrix was not
screened, but rather hand sorted. Level 4 consisted of a dark brown clayey matrix with a single piece of bone as well as one large thermally altered/damaged limestone fragment (possibly from the out-kitchen area just to the south). Levels within XU2 produced little other cultural material, and the excavation unit was soon terminated. This area has been interpreted as the car park or driveway in use when the site served as a community center for the City of DeSoto.

A fourth excavation unit (XU4) was placed slightly northwest of the water tower by approximately two to three meters. The objective of this unit was to locate the remains of the original out-kitchen outside of the concrete footing surrounding the fountain area. The northeast and southwest quadrants were excavated only slightly as very thick gravel was encountered in both levels, and an electrical wire was found in the first level of the northeast quadrant. Cultural materials identified in the field were modern in date.

In an effort to locate the previous kitchen, TP3 was placed directly to the north of the present chimney and revealed, not surprisingly, numerous bits of red brick. A sample of these fragments was collected, but most of these were discarded in the field. Almost immediately after beginning to excavate this test pit, faunal material, ceramic, and cut nails were encountered. There was a marked decrease in artifact density after Level 3, and the test pit was terminated soon thereafter.

Upon observing the relative success of TP3, TP6 was placed immediately south of it. A combination of historic and modern material was recovered from this test pit
including ceramic sherds, red brick, green glass, and nails. A large amount of faunal material also was recovered indicating that a possible food preparation area was nearby.

To further add to the information gained from the adjoining TP3 and TP6, TP12 was placed tangential to the southern boundary of TP6. The matrix within the excavation levels was described as dark, moist, and organic. Artifacts included a combination of historic and modern materials with an assemblage comprised of ceramics, nails, wire, glass, and bone fragments. Charred wood and evidence of a burning episode also were present. This is not surprising when one considers the placement of these three test pits in the vicinity of the fireplace. An electrical wire was observed at 32 cmbsd leading to the determination that this was, in fact, a disturbed context and recovered artifacts likely had been displaced.

TP7 was opened at the immediate northeast corner of the original dogtrot structure. Soil could best be described as a dark organic clayey matrix in which modern painted wood fragments were observed. There were no features identified in this test pit. The majority of artifacts were modern, and excavators observed that many of these cultural materials were seemingly unused wire nails.

ST2 was excavated on the northern portion of the property near the fountain located in the north - central portion of the modern addition linking the dogtrot structure to the water tower. ST2 was less than productive, with the majority of the collected material dating to the mid-twentieth to late-twentieth century. In addition, the presence of a single piece of lithic debitage could suggest that this soil was displaced or brought from an altogether different source. It is more likely, however, that this artifact was
collected from the creek area, and any attempt to determine the original source would prove futile.

TP22 was established on the north central perimeter of the front porch (east facing side of the structure). Soil matrix is best described as compact clay mottled with well-fertilized soil with a distinct odor. No cultural features were observed in the first level. A large amount of bone was recovered, as were miscellaneous fragments of modern debris. Historic material also was noted, although in smaller quantities. Excavation of Level 2 led to the discovery of a pipe which appeared historic in date. Pipe placement obviously contributed to the jumbled nature of the artifact assemblage derived from this test pit. The final 16 to 20 cmbsd were classified as gravel fill, and the unit was then terminated.

2.4.3 Out-kitchen

In a further attempt to locate the remains of an out-kitchen, an additional test pit was placed north of the main house. TP11, located at the northwest corner of the original dogtrot structure and northeast of the present fountain, yielded little more than modern building materials within the first 10-centimeter level. Excavation of Level 2, however, began to produce a substantial quantity of fire cracked rock interspersed with faunal remains. Level 3 exhibited many of the same qualities as the prior level, but the density of fire-cracked rock was noticeably lower. This feature did not extend beyond 22 cmbsd. Thick glass shards and cut nails also were present indicating a possible former structure. Although there was a high historic artifact assemblage (relative to other excavation focus areas in the vicinity), it should be noted that modern roofing
nails also were identified during excavations. If this feature was once part of the out
kitchen, then one could speculate that the destruction of this outbuilding could have
taken place during which time activities, which may be associated with the maintenance
of the original house or with the building of the later addition to the structure. More test
pits were opened in an effort to obtain more data.

TP13 was excavated to determine if the fire-cracked rock feature extended in a
westward direction. Like the four other excavation areas opened in this vicinity, bone
was found dispersed throughout the heat-damaged rock, supporting the assumption
that this was once the out-kitchen. The faunal assemblage was primarily comprised of
mammal bone (see Chapter 5), but a small amount of eggshell also was recovered.
Other materials recovered included ceramic, glass, and metal. Fire cracked rock
diminished in frequency in Level 3 and was altogether absent from Level 4. TP13 was
excavated to a depth of 40 cmbsd prior to completion.

Positioned north of and adjacent to TP11, TP18 was excavated in order to
uncover more of the previously mentioned fire-cracked rock feature, which is thought
to be the remains of the former out-kitchen. Unlike the adjacent test pit to the south, the
feature was observed immediately below the grass line. A combination of bone, glass,
and cut and wire nails were found throughout. The feature extended to a maximum
depth of 17 cmbsd beyond which soil matrix became organic with dark color and a
loose, moist texture. TP18 was terminated upon completion of Level 3.

In this area of the out-kitchen, TP19 was excavated to determine the
northernmost border of this feature. It was observed that this feature extended beyond
the north wall of this test pit and continued to a depth of at least 30 cmbsd. No additional test pits were opened north of TP19, and excavation was stopped at the completion of Level 3.

TP23 was the westernmost excavation pit to be investigated in the area now thought to be the remains of the former out-kitchen. On the north side of the modern addition to the house and still northeast of the fountain (albeit only slightly), this test pit also yielded substantial amounts of fire-cracked rock and bone. The soil throughout the feature was observed to be hard-packed clay despite its location within the feature. Artifacts recovered from this feature were both historic and modern in date and could allow for a date during which the out-kitchen could have been destroyed.

2.4.4 Eastern Fenceline

TP9 was positioned northeast of the main building. This was done in an attempt to locate post molds possibly associated with a fence which was presumed to have run parallel to the east side of the original dogtrot structure. Many roots were observed within the dark brown clay soil, but no features were identified. With the exception of pig teeth, materials collected were much like those of nearly every other excavation unit on site, representing both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but predominately the latter. TP9 was terminated at a maximum depth of 30 cmbsd.

In order to exhaust all search areas at the Nance Farm, TP10 was placed adjacent to and west of TP9. The test pit was characterized by a dark brown to black organic clay soil which enveloped a combination of historic and modern cultural
materials. There was no evidence of post molds or other cultural features, and TP10 was excavated to a level of 30 cmbsd prior to termination.

TP17 was placed due north of TP9. Forming the north wall of TP9, this test unit was found to be composed of a dark, dense clay with substantial root disturbance increasing with depth. Excavations were conducted in order to recover any indication of a fence line as well as possibly discovering more pig bone. Neither expectation was realized. Artifacts consisted of historic and modern types and no features were located. Excavation of TP17 ceased at 30 cmbsd.

2.4.5 Windmill

ST8 was positioned on the easternmost edge of the property and also the modern gateway to the grounds. It was excavated to a maximum depth of 40 cmbsd and consisted of a light to medium brown clayey matrix. Recovered artifacts were primarily modern in nature with clear window glass comprising the majority of the assemblage. In addition to the modern material, however, a total of four cut nails also were collected.

2.5 Conclusion of Field Results

Analysis of the excavation has indicated that this site has experienced continuous occupation since its foundation. The smokehouse vicinity appears to possess the most intact cultural deposits, somehow having been spared destruction by the placement of two swimming pools and other modern activity. As has been discussed, the area behind the smokehouse is an exception to this notion, but people do discard refuse in the least visible areas of a property. In this case it is behind a building on the western edge of the property.
A discussion of the nail types and other associated artifacts recovered from the smokehouse vicinity will be presented in Chapter 6. Significant root disturbance in these excavation units have somewhat disturbed the cultural material; therefore it is not possible to perform seriation analysis on the nails. The material does show changes in types of nails used on the farm through time, however.

It was disappointing that the barn area was not more productive. Those test pits placed nearby were disturbed with pipes and modern debris. The structure was and is a storage facility with possible evidence of past chicken feed stocks (corn was recovered from ST6). The large quantity of eggshell might also indicate that at some time chickens were housed in the barn rather than the more temporary coop structure. The presence of equipment, hardware, and stored personal effects of the owners at the time of excavation, as well as the glass fragments of undetermined date noted in ST6 suggests, as do the artifacts from the rest of the site, continuous use and reuse. Deposited objects within the barn transitioned from being predominantly of agrarian function to those that would find in a residential storage area (i.e., attic or garage).

With the exception of the out-kitchen area, little was to be learned north of the core structure. It is this out-kitchen region which will be discussed in further detail in a Chapter 6. The archaeological evidence from these excavations shed light on both the dietary preferences of the inhabitants and the architectural changes in the main dwelling.

Most of the land north of the main house was virtually destroyed by the placement of a carpark. This was understood fairly early during excavations, but as has
been discussed above, expectations for the sheep pen vicinity on the far northwestern border of the grounds and the fenceline suspected to have run northeast/southeast of the main house were never realized. Fragments of rusted barbed wire in the sheep pen vicinity were located around a single post mold feature. This feature was the only indication of enclosure-related function, but it is impossible to specify the reason for this feature. The majority of artifacts recovered in this area were related to farm or vehicular mechanics. One would hardly expect that the main purpose of this fence would be to contain machinery, but there is little indication of other farm-related activity except for what was disclosed by a former occupant. Prior to our excavation, this informant recounted his memories of the location of architectural features on the property. It was his recollection that this area on the northwestern fringe of the site was the sheep pen locale. Since the intuitive sampling method was used at the site, excavation units were placed at this location in hopes of finding a structural feature.

The failure to identify a fenceline east of the main structure does not indicate that there was not one present. Sampling distribution could have been a factor, or the contemporary U-shaped driveway might overlay a portion of it. Whatever the case, time constraints prevented the pursuit of this historic boundary. It would have been interesting to have identified the original border of the property, but it now has been concluded that as the eastern portion of the site forms the front yard of the contemporary dwelling (and therefore subject to much modern activity), there was little overall research potential for this portion of the site.
3.1 Texas Prehistoric Cultural History

3.1.1 Prehistoric Cultures

Categorizing prehistoric groups in Texas into distinct cultures is not easily done. This is because it is often unknown whether a group or tribe is a discrete entity or part of a larger, yet loosely organized, confederacy. To complicate this task, a number of the names were assigned by European settlers. French, Spanish, and English explorers all interpreted, or “heard,” group and place names differently. Some of these names were then passed down in the history books not as variants of the same name, but were believed to represent separate peoples. Thus, many of the designations suggest people who never really existed (Klos 2001). There can be little debate, however, that there was a sizable contingent of prehistoric Native Americans in what is now the state of Texas.

Prior to the arrival of European settlers and early pioneers, Texas had a long prehistory of native hunters and gatherers. Some of these semi-nomadic communities transitioned into settlements of small-scale agriculturalists inhabiting parts of the region known today as the state of Texas. Their interaction with the new Euro-American settlers was inevitable and occasionally strained.
Although there is not a wealth of information regarding the chronology of prehistoric cultures in the vicinity of Nance Farm and north-central Texas as a region, the data that are available points to the following framework (Green et al. 1997:11; Moir et al. 1996:13). Archaeological surveys and data collected primarily from diagnostic projectile points recovered from surface survey and disturbed contexts indicate that there was Paleo-Indian occupation between ca. 12,000 and 6000 BC. This was followed by an Archaic Period occupation between 6000 and 200 BC with an Early Ceramic culture lasting until AD 700. Some would include the latter culture within the Archaic Period (see Green et al. 1997:11), but it is more likely that after an aceramic period exceeding 6000 years, the arrival of ceramic traditions would indicate a cultural shift rather than the introduction of a new technology (Moir et al. 1996:13). This chapter, therefore, recognizes the former dates of ca. 200 BC to AD 700 for a separate ceramic culture. The Late Prehistoric period dates to between ca. AD 700 and 1600 and then the Protohistoric period at AD 1600 until 1800, although some scholars would place the Late Prehistoric Period between AD 700 and 1700 (Moir et al. 1996:13).

There are some reports of a New World Paleo-Indian period extending to earlier than 10,000 years ago (Bahn 1993:114-115; Bahn and Muller-Beck 1991: 10-11; and Gruhn and Bryan 1991: 342-348), and there are some accounts of prehistoric groups in Texas dating to more than 12,000 years ago, but these have largely remained unsubstantiated (Fagan 1995:80, Lynch 1990:12-36). There is more agreement among scholars, however, that there was a component of the Clovis culture in Texas sometime prior to 10,900 years ago. According to Paul Martin’s model that illustrates localized
megafaunal extinctions and the southward migration of Clovis hunters who followed these herds, Clovis people could be found in north Texas between 11,500 and 11,150 years ago (Martin 1984: 354-403). The model shows a possible localized extinction of megafauna occurring in southern Texas and northern Mexico at around 11,150 years ago resulting in a dwindling north Texas population as the herds and hunters moved southward (Martin 1984:354-403).

Like the previous culture, Archaic peoples were also highly mobile with a presumed dependency on hunting (albeit on smaller animals like deer) and foraging-based subsistence economies (McGregor 1987: 15; Moir et al. 1996: 12; Green et al. 1997: 12). The earliest portions of this period are characterized by a continuation of the “high residential mobility and low population densities” (Moir et al. 1996:12) whereas the latter years of the Archaic period suggest a transitional movement toward sedentism (at least on a seasonal basis) and experimentation with food storage as exhibited by the presence of crude ceramic wares (Green et al. 1997: 12; McGregor 1987:15).

The Ceramic Period for the Dallas-Fort Worth vicinity has not been very well documented. Perhaps this is due to the way the region has developed in such a relatively short span of time. Ceramic materials were reported for sites a bit further to the east and were represented by grog-tempered and bone-tempered types as well as sandy paste wares (Moir et al. 1996:14). Hunting and gathering are still presumed to be the principal subsistence strategies, but with perhaps more emphasis on seasonal encampments.

The Late Prehistoric Period, although still showing a reliance upon hunted and foraged resources, indicates an even greater trend toward sedentism and food storage.
At Joe Pool Lake, for example, Peter and McGregor (1988) have identified evidence for structures, roasting pits, and corn cupules. Grog-tempered ceramics and Alba projectile points were also noted (Green et al. 1997:12).

Like a number of the above periods, the Protohistoric Period for north central Texas has been poorly reported. There is little doubt that this is largely because at the time of colonization and settlement by European groups, individuals were more likely to favor the displacement, exploitation, or eradication of indigenous communities than to report their lifeways. Nevertheless there are some surviving accounts, mostly from early Spanish explorers, regarding Native Americans far south of Nance Farm. What follows is a brief presentation of some of these cultures with particular focus given to the protohistoric interaction between the European and American-born white settlers and the indigenous populations.

Great Plains groups, such as the Apache and Navaho, gradually made their way southward to Texas in the pre-horse years between 1300 and 1700 AD (Brandon 1961:355). In 1782, the Apache allied with the Tonkawa, a fierce and allegedly cannibalistic (no doubt an exaggerated and defamatory description fabricated by European explorers) culture of south Texas. This Apache-Tonkawa council was created for the purpose of expelling the encroaching Spanish. This alliance failed in its purpose, and the Spanish were able to capture and assassinate a Tonkawa chief several years later, thereby putting an end to this council (Brandon 1961:356). The Spanish were able to take hold in southern and southeastern Texas, and the Apache were pushed farther west. After the establishment of colonies and settlements, the Apache were now in far
western Texas with the Lipan Apache located in the area west of Del Rio, Texas, and the Mescalero Apache in the region of El Paso, Texas and eastern New Mexico. There might still have been a perceived need for protection of cattle herds in particular, however, as the establishment of Fort Worth in 1849 might indicate.

During the latter portion of the seventeenth century, Spanish explorers and missionaries encountered the Caddo nation on the northeastern fringe of the Spanish territory. Although loosely confederated in thirty distinct groups, these Caddo, a largely agricultural group, shared a common language and political structure (Brandon 1961: 264; Fehrenbach 1983:11).

Perttula (2001) states that, because of pressure from the United States government, and with the boundaries of the Caddo reservation defined in 1874, various Caddo families assembled together in order to survive. Ethnologist John Wesley Powell (1891:60-61) observed that the Wichita, Pawnee, Arikara, and Kitsai languages of the American Plains were similar to the Caddo of the Southern Plains. He then formally grouped these five languages into one family and named the family for the Caddo of the South and Central Plains, as this is where these five languages were first observed during historic times (Powell 1891: 58-62). It has since been observed, however, that the various Caddo tribes coalesced into the Hasinai Confederacy after their numbers were drastically reduced due to European borne diseases (Hickerson 1997: 35; Perttula 1992:77). The joining of these Caddo groups also served as protection against the easterly migration of the Apache, with whom the newly formed Hasinai conflicted (Hickerson 1997: 38).
DeSoto, Texas is situated in the path of the southerly Wichita migration and the Kisai southeastern migration. Desoto is positioned well within the sphere of influence by the Southern Caddo. In fact, the above-mentioned Hasinai Confederation extended as far west as the Trinity River and the Caddoan Mounds State Historic Site only lies roughly 241 kilometers (150 miles) to the southeast of DeSoto. The Southern Caddo, are found in northeastern Texas and northwestern Louisiana. They were largely an agricultural group who had little desire to follow bison herds on a northward migration (Brandon 1961: 263-264; Fehrenbach 1983: 11-12), and they were mound builders several centuries prior to European arrivals. Once establishing agricultural communities, or widely spaced agricultural hamlets (Brandon 1961: 263-264; Fehrenbach 1983: 11-2) they did not engage in active conflict with the settlers as did the Comanche of far west Texas. The Comanche were a group with whom European and American settlers in north-central and western Texas blamed for cattle and horse raids, as well as numerous other aggressive acts. Because of this, Caddo relations with the European settlers were more cordial and, therefore, more conducive to exposure to European-transmitted illnesses (Brandon 1961: 263-264; Fehrenbach 1983:11-12; Hickerson 1997).
The Caddo are unique in that they were able to withstand many of the European conversion and assimilation attempts yet used colonial policies to their advantage (Brandon 1961: 263-264; Fehrenbach 1983: 11-2). For example, they allied with the Spanish principally for trade, but when the Caddo grew weary of their new neighbors’ failure to deliver promised goods, (e.g., firearms), the Caddo had them legally expelled from Caddo land (Perttula 2001). Those inhabitants of the “Caddo heartland,” that area roughly south of the Arkansas River and contained within the Neches, Ouachita, Red, and Sabine Rivers and their tributaries, were able to maintain their hold on the land for centuries. It is thought that this Caddo group has occupied this vicinity for at least 1000 years, perhaps longer, and some Caddo are still residing in portions of eastern Texas.
Once the United States began to push its borders westward, displaced Native American groups were relocating to Mexican territory and coming into contact with those indigenous people already in the area. Further conflating the situation was the influx of white settlers after Texas independence. The 1830s brought about the Anglo migration and was now “impinging on the settled Texas Indians: the remnants of the Caddoans, now a border tribe, the Wichitas, Tonkawas” as well as the “Cherokees, Kickapoos, and others who had been pushed into Texas by being driven out of the United States” (Fehrenbach 1983:252). By forcing various cultures to come into contact with one another, enmity increased, resulting in warfare, and the spread of European diseases was accelerated. John Ewers (Ewers 1997:82-102) has recognized over thirty separate illnesses of epidemic proportions occurring between 1528 and 1890. These were mostly cholera and smallpox, and are believed to have killed over 95 percent of Native Americans in Texas (Ewers 1997:102). Markets, missions, and other places of close contact are also suggested to have contributed to the spread of these infections.

3.1.2 Previously Studied Prehistoric Sites in North Texas

Although the evidence for a prehistoric occupation at Nance Farm is scarce, the data can be supplemented by examining prehistoric sites also located in north Texas. For instance, a fair number of prehistoric sites in nearby Delta and Hopkins Counties were identified as a result of cultural resources investigations occurring prior to the construction of a reservoir at Cooper Lake (McGregor et al. 1996). This investigation reported a total of 43 prehistoric sites, of which four (Sites 41DT80, 41DT124, 41HP78, and 41HP137) were the foci of “large scale excavations” (McGregor et al. 1996:163).
The National Register of Historic Places evaluatory testing of these sites was performed in order to determine what if any mitigative actions should be undertaken prior to the then proposed development project (McGregor et al. 1996:163-164). Investigations, which included pedestrian survey, systematic shovel testing at designated intervals, and evaluatory testing of selected sites, were supplemented by “limited backhoe trenching in the modern floodplain” (McGregor et al. 1996:429). This resulted in the finding that this area of north Texas (roughly 90 miles from DeSoto) was well-trafficked prior to the Euro-American encroachment. The testing of these sites indicated that communities of Paleo-Indian or Early Archaic affiliation were present, and that the sequence continued through the contact period, as is demonstrated by the presence of a glass trade bead collected from Site 41DT111 (not included in the evaluatory testing) (McGregor et al. 1996:429).

An example of the sites studied during the Cooper Lake Reservoir Project is the Thomas Site, or Site 41DT80. It was determined to have a small pre-ceramic or aceramic level, but the majority of the cultural materials could be attributed to ceramic manufacturing cultures, particularly the Caddo. The noted ceramics were of the Alto focus (within the Gibson aspect) thereby suggesting that this occupation level should be assigned an Early Caddoan date (McGregor et al. 1996:171). The lithic artifact assemblage included points such as darts (Yarbrough-like, assorted varieties of Gary points, and large and small blades), projectile points, as well as finished bifaces (gouges, awls, knives, gravers, scrapers, and endscrapers); bone tools were also recovered. (McGregor et al. 1996: 165-269). Upon observing post-holes and pit features
with fire-cracked rock (FCR), in addition to the presence of human interments, researchers reported that site intensification could be inferred from the stratigraphy (McGregor et al. 1996:165-269).

3.2 Permanent European Settlement in North Texas

Permanent American settlements were first observed in this north-central portion of Texas beginning in the latter part of the first half of the nineteenth century. Texas fought for and gained independence from Mexico in 1836, and it remained an independent entity for only ten years (Moir 1987:6; Moir et al. 1996:17; Richardson et al. 1981:125). The administration of Sam Houston, the first president of Texas, was marked by poor relations with the Native American groups on the northern sections of the state, including north-central Texas. The Texas Rangers were assembled to help suppress the raiding parties of Comanche and Kiowa. They succeeded in reducing the number of raids, but did not eliminate them completely (Richardson et al. 1981:128). Compounding this problem were those bands of unscrupulous settlers who would outfit themselves as Native Americans in order to raid or steal what they wanted. These men caused blame to be placed on the Comanche or Kiowa, and the relations between Native American and settlers grew more strained (Hatcher 1933: 6).

In Ellen Bowen Holland’s account (Hatcher 1933:5) of growing up in a north Texas frontier community, she recounts her grandmother’s tales of early houses made principally from logs and some dressed lumber, which was “a luxury item.” According to Holland, their furniture “was still growing in their forest” (Hatcher 1933:5). Life was not easy for these settlers. It has been said that the potential of productive harvests
offered by the Texas springtime often did not come to pass. The long and dry summers were harsh on crops, and Holland (Hatcher 1933:50) recalls how her father's farming efforts were often thwarted by the climatic conditions and that the “delicate green leaves of the early spring, which gave such promise, were after all only a deception” (Hatcher 1933:50). Various livestock were raised to supplement both diet and income. Drawings by a visiting family member illustrate what steps were used in the processing of pork at the Bowen Farm (Figure 3.2), and these were likely similar to pork smoking activities at Nance Farm.

Figure 3.2 Pork Processing on the Frontier (Hatcher 1933)
Many settlers originally allowed their livestock to have free range of the land, but after barbed wire (invented in 1874 and available locally soon thereafter) was used to delineate property boundaries, animal husbandry was hindered. These barbed fences or pens forced the farmers to seek or create water supplies within the property confines for cattle that were no longer able to roam freely in search of such sources (Hatcher 1933:50-51). At this time windmills were especially important in dry periods, and it is possible that the windmill at Nance Farm was erected in this post-barbed wire era of property demarcation. Socially the Dallas area was rough as well. There was mention of men riding through the streets of Dallas shooting “two revolvers to right and left” for no apparent reason other than a show of aggressiveness (Hatcher 1933:32). Town inhabitants would retreat into their homes until the display was over.

3.3 Nineteenth-Century Political Climate

3.3.1 The Antebellum Years

Slavery was an institution that some believe was at the crux of the push for Texas independence (see Richardson et al. 1981:92-95). In 1831 Mary Austin Holley could see that the way Texas policy makers handled the issue of slavery would have far reaching repercussions. It was her opinion that

The existing constitution and laws totally prohibit the worst of evils. Should this wise policy be abandoned and Texas become, what Louisiana now is, the receptacle of the redundant and jail-delivered slaves of other countries, all its energies would be paralysed [sic], and whatever oppressions may hereafter arise either from abroad or at home, must be endured, for the country would require a prop to lean upon, and from necessity, would be forever dependent (Hatcher 1933:145).
Policies regarding slavery were of paramount importance to both policy makers and settlers. During the nineteenth century, the southern states of America exhibited a dichotomous division in which the primary difference surrounded the practice of slavery. These two divisions were the Upper South and the Lower South. The states of the Upper South formed a sociopolitical region where slavery was not an acceptable policy, whereas the states of the Lower (or Deep) South promoted this institution. One can also observe regional differences in the types of economic commodities produced (surely this contributed to the slavery debate), architectural styles, and food procurement foci of the two Souths. This region is best defined as “areas whose landscapes share similar characteristics (Cabak and Inkrot 1997:5; Kovacik and Winberry 1987: 207). Also, according to Cabak and Inkrot (1997:5), regions can be characterized by reference to “politics (i.e., the Confederate states), economy (former cotton and tobacco states), and culture (i.e., a culture where people speak with a drawl, drink sweetened ice tea, and enjoy pork barbeque)” (Cabak and Inkrot 1997:5).

One can view the majority of Texas as a microcosm, a reflection of what was occurring in the rest of the nation’s South. Jordan states that

It was found that the state of Texas, by 1860, was divided like the South as a whole, into two clearly defined areas, one of which was typically lower southern in its economy, the other of which bore the unmistakable imprint of the Upper South. The recognition of this fundamental division is a major aid to the understanding of the geography of nineteenth-century Texas (Jordan 1967:667).

Just as the United States expressed regional distinction amongst the Upper and Lower South, so did the state of Texas. These disparities could at times be contentious, but
oftentimes settlers elected to stay out of politics for fear or bringing war to their own doorsteps.

In general, pre-Republic Texas was opposed to slavery, an opinion brought about partly because of the official anti-slavery policy of the Mexican government. Jordan (1967:670) states that although the anti-slavery stance was never truly enforced, slaveholders who moved into Texas would have risked the forfeiture of their slaves, thus slowing the flood of lower southern pioneers into Texas under Mexican domination. After the Texas Revolution, anti-slavery policies were relaxed and a large-scale movement of Lower Southerners in search of cheap land occurred in the years following 1836.

The majority of these new settlers were from Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and, of course, neighboring Louisiana. By the 1850 census, the Upper South accounted for 37 percent and the Lower South, specifically the Gulf South, comprised 35 percent of immigrant Anglo-Americans (Jordan 1967:670). By 1860, the number of Lower Southern immigrants jumped to 39 percent, while their representation in the Upper South dropped to 36 percent (Jordan 1967:670). Only 10 to 19 percent of the population of Dallas County were slaves, and approximately 20 to 29 percent of Dallas County voters were in favor of secession (Jordan 1967:670; Jordan 1969: 102-103).

Perhaps after the short-lived Texas independence, these residents were hesitant to strike out against the security of the Union, or, as has been suggested, settlers were concerned about the effects of possible warfare on Texas soil and were not eager to
engage in such activities (Galloway 1991:10). In spring of 1861, however, Texas passed secession ordinances and was separated from the Union (Galloway 1991:10).

3.3.2 The Post-War Years

Cabak and Inkrot (1997:20) say that by the 1950s, north Texas farms had all but completely moved away from the traditional agricultural methods employed during the previous century. In the immediate post-war years, the railroad opening of the nation’s interior resulted in rapid technological change. For example, conditions and technology were drastically different, almost exponentially so, in the 1960s than they were in the latter portion of the nineteenth century. As Holland states at the close of her memoirs, her experiences were “from Victoria to the splitting of the atom… quite a journey, and already the coming generation has almost nothing in common with the early years of it” (Hatcher 1933:162). Such as observed at other sites in the region (Jurney et al. 1988; Moir and Jurney 1987; and Raab 1982), Nance Farm experienced a period of stasis regarding traditional agricultural methods until the virtual explosion of technological advances near the end of the 1800s. This movement toward more industrial and mechanized operations near the middle of the twentieth century shaped the property today.

As farming techniques became increasingly mechanized, a homogenizing effect on the regional diversity of agricultural communities in Texas and throughout the country ensued (Buenger and Calvert 1991:310-345). Within the United States, the Western Frontier, the Eastern Coastal Tidewater, the Mississippi Delta, the Deep South, and the Northern Plains all initially differed in the manner by which inhabitants
cultivated and lived off the land. As the nineteenth century saw the standardization and widespread availability of technological equipment for use in an agricultural setting, these regional units began to appear more like portions of a unified whole rather than semi-isolated, disparate entities. “Artifacts recovered from farmsteads should in turn reflect the transformation that occurred within these households and illustrate the rural counterpart of the culture of capitalism and modernization that thoroughly permeates contemporary life” (Cabak and Inkrot 1997:19).

3.4 Previous Archaeological Investigations of Historic Sites in North Texas

Sites similar in date to the historic Nance Farm have been excavated in north Texas. A number of these properties discussed below were identified within Freestone and Navarro Counties, but are useful to this study despite their location south of Dallas County. Occupation dates for many of these farms cluster between the late 1890s and early 1900s, much like Nance Farm. Therefore, the comparable data can be of use in this thesis. These farmsteads were investigated with varying degrees of success.

Prior to the construction of the Richland/Chambers reservoir, excavations were conducted at 38 historic farmsteads, most of which were previously occupied by tenant farmers and former slaves (Moir et al 1987). These excavations occurred between the years 1980 and 1984. As most of these historic sites were likely associated with tenant farmers involved with the local cotton economy or with industrial sites connected with cotton ginning, sawmills of the bottomland forests, or brick manufacturing (Moir et al 1987: v), many of these sites were not directly relevant to the present chapter. Therefore, only Sites 41FT138 and Site 41NV235, which are similar to this study, are
discussed below. In addition, those sites whose artifact assemblage indicate that they were occupied at the same time as Nance Farm are also discussed.

Excavations were conducted at a small farmstead assigned the trinomial 41FT138 (Moir et al. 1987:75). Excavations were initially halted after testing revealed poor site integrity. Excavation was resumed in the 1981 field season, and artifacts suggested a possible date ca. 1870-1940. This was a longer occupation range than initially thought for this property and, since there were few other farmsteads identified within this portion of the reservoir project area, more intensive excavation was recommended. Subsequent excavations, however, failed to produce additional material to support the earlier date of 1870 and testing was again halted upon the identification of components no earlier than 1890 in “substantially eroded and altered soil profiles” (Moir et al. 1987:75). There were no architectural remains identified nor were any architectural features observed during subsurface testing (Moir et al. 1987:75).

More than half of the artifacts recovered during the excavation of 41FT138 consisted of glass shards and ceramic sherds. Moir states that of the glass assemblage, twentieth-century bottle glass predominated, but manganese solarized glass, liquor, medicine, and soda bottles were also inventoried (Moir et al. 1987: 79). The ceramic table wares represented were principally whiteware, and included decalcomania, or overglazed, as well as undecorated, and ivory tinted vessels; some porcelain vessels also were identified. The utilitarian and storage vessels were stoneware. Artifacts associated with architectural activity included wire and cut nails with the former outnumbering the latter 15 to 1 according to Moir et al. (1987:79). Window glass was present but not in
large enough amounts to be considered an adequate sample for dating the site. This artifact assemblage indicated occupants of modest means.

The Joseph Burleson Plantation, Site 41NV235, was also excavated in 1983 by Southern Methodist University as part of the Richland/Chambers Reservoir Project. Originally constructed in 1855, the site is roughly contemporaneous with Nance Farm. Artifacts recovered from archaeological testing spanned the period from the 1850s to 1910. Bottle glass was observed to occur nearly twice as often as ceramic vessels. This is interesting because a similar scenario was observed at Nance Farm, where containers constructed of glass outnumbered ceramic vessels.

3.5 DeSoto, Texas and Historic Nance Farm

The nineteenth century did see a movement of peoples into the vicinity for settlement after Texas was granted statehood. Nance Farm lies in Desoto, Texas, which is within the confines of the land parcels originally awarded to Peter’s colonists William Caldwell, Z. Heath, T. Rhodes, and C. Parks, but it was colonist Carlos Wise who was the original grantee. He was awarded a patent for 390 acres to Otway B. Nance on May 5, 1868 (Texas General Land Office).

The namesake for Nance Farm, Otway Bird Nance, was born in James City County, Virginia on July 21, 1805. His parents were Zachariah and Elizabeth Nance, and this was the second marriage for both his mother and father. Zachariah Nance, born May 5, 1760, was “greatly burdened with flesh...“his weight was about 244 pounds” (according to his daughter Parthena Nance). He fought in the Revolutionary War at the “Storming of Stony Point” before marrying his first wife, Jane Wilkins, in 1785. Jane
Wilkins Nance died the day after delivering her seventh child in 1800. Two years later Zachariah married Elizabeth Morris, born 1771 or very early 1772. Elizabeth Morris Nance was said to have been born into some wealth and “hated debt with a perfect hatred.” She was “industrious,” as well as being “a good manager” (P. Nance 1895). Together Zachariah and Elizabeth also had seven children. Parthena reports that her brother, Otway Bird Nance, moved to Cass County, Illinois in the latter part of 1839 and resided there until he moved his family to Dallas County, Texas in late 1851. This is confirmed by O.B. Nance’s nephew David Carey Nance (Galloway 1991:1). O.B. Nance’s brother, Allan Q. Nance, also moved to North Texas a year later and resided at an adjacent property (hereafter referred to as Heath Branch). Little is known of O.B. Nance’s children, but more is known about his nephew David Carey Nance, who published an autobiography.

Although both men kept their livestock separated to reduce the spread of infectious diseases, both farms combined “blossomed into a neat checkerboard of green pastures, cultivated fields, hog and cow lots, orchards, and vegetable gardens” (Galloway 1991:2); chickens also were kept (Galloway 1991:4). Plowing, planting, and shearing were necessary activities at Heath Branch (Galloway 1991:4), and one would suspect that it was so on O. B. Nance’s farm as well. The presence of the smoke shed would indicate that the curing of pork also took place at Nance Farm.

All was not moonlight and roses on this new frontier, however. David Nance discussed the amount of time and effort involved in keeping the sheep. Although he would accompany the sheep on their grazing, he could not entirely protect them from
predators such as wolves and snakes (Galloway 1991:4). According to Annie Nance Morris (Galloway 1991:138), “Killing snakes became one of young Dave’s primary chores, and killing four or five a day was not unusual. Normally he used sticks and stones for this purpose, but one giant rattlesnake – said to be “as big around as a stove pipe” and “having fifteen rattles and a button” – had to be killed with a shotgun.” Foxes, opossums, raccoons, and snakes were also threats to the smaller animals like chickens (Galloway 1991:4).

There is some confusion as to O.B. Nance’s stance on slavery. The 1860 census indicates that he had slaves, but he also might have been against the institution in later years. Neither he nor his brother Allan Q. Nance voted for or against secession (Galloway 1991:10), and this stirred up suspicions with pro-secession neighbors. According to David Nance, Allan Q. Nance refused to use slaves on his farm and resigned from a vigilance committee assembled to search for pro-abolitionist individuals responsible for a series of fires. He quit his post due to the indiscriminate beating of slave suspects during the investigation. Because of this, as well as the fact that neither brother voted for or against secession, a rumor was soon circulated that both Allan Q. and Otway B. Nance were in league with the abolitionists (Galloway 1991).

The Nance family owned this property until the 1950s at which time it passed into other private ownership. It was purchased by the City of DeSoto in 1975, but subsequently passed back into private ownership in the latter part of that decade. It has remained so ever since. The property achieved Recorded Texas Historic Landmark status in 1976 (Appendices A and B).
The town of DeSoto grew up around the Johnson’s company store owned by S. E. Judah. It was originally a harness shop but developed into a general store after Judah’s son acquired the business. By 1884, other than rural farmsteads, the town consisted of only the general store, the post office, and a cotton gin. Five years later the cotton gin quit operations, and the post office was closed in 1906. The population was reduced during this time from 120 persons to 41. The demographics began to change as Dallas became more developed. Largely a commuter town, DeSoto had a population of 300 in 1950 and steadily increased thereafter. The 2000 census reports that 37,646 people now reside within the DeSoto city limits. In 1970 improvements to water and sewage systems were undertaken (Nall 2006), and some of the underground pipes discovered during excavation of Nance Farm no doubt date to this period.
CHAPTER 4

HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY, THEORY, AND PRESERVATION

4.1 Introduction

One of the purposes of this thesis was to compare the historical data to the archaeological data. By utilizing such an approach the dichotomous nature of the discipline of historical archaeology could be more fully investigated (a background of this debate is presented below). Such a method, however, was not entirely possible due to the fact that entering the field season, each and every member of the crew had internalized ideas regarding the layout of a historic farm landscape. Combined with informant discussions, a completely objective approach to the site prior to historical review, therefore, was not possible.

4.2 Theoretical Approaches to the Data

4.2.1 History or Anthropology

According to Sanford and Neumann (2001) there are two distinct types of archaeological training one might receive in the United States. The first, Old World archaeology, is an approach with methods founded in courses taught in university classics, art history, and history departments. The focus is on historical inquiry in which “archaeology is used as a method to fill in unrecorded details about otherwise known peoples, places, or events” (Sanford and Neumann 2001:21). The second type, New World archaeology, is allied most closely with the anthropological discipline and
“functions more as diachronic ethnography or cultural geography” (Sanford and Neumann 2001:21).

In the early stages of the discipline, authors typically sided with either history or anthropology, such as in the early view where the historian “observes archaeology as basically providing only data,” but “the anthropologists see archaeology as an equal partner with traditional history in creating more replete histories or cultural reconstructions” (Schuyler 1978:1). One of the most notable members of the historian camp, Ivor Noel-Hume has suggested that anthropologically trained archaeologists are little more than data collectors and the responsibility for creating accurate reconstructions lies with the historian. He states,

> digging can be readily learned by anyone, the only prerequisite being the possession of simple common sense- the ability to reason… The excavator is, in theory, simply a technician who has mastered the art of taking the ground apart in such a way that it will give up its secrets. (Noel-Hume 1969)

Nearly a decade later, J. C. Harrington continued the staunchly historian tradition seeing little value in anthropological contributions. He states that “in spite of the strong anthropological flavor of its formative stage…the discipline properly belongs to American history. Furthermore, “the future development of special curricula along this line in universities should be in the history departments.” (Schuyler 1978: 6)

Not all scholars agreed with this opinion, however. A number of practitioners found value in the use of anthropology in the theoretical development of this emerging subfield of archaeology. Forebears such as Robert Schuyler pointed out that as historic
archaeology began to distance itself from restoration endeavors, the field would become not only a productive, but an “integral” aspect of anthropology (Schuyler 1978:30).

Echoing the above statement, John Cotter (Schuyler 1978:19) discussed the unique perspective of anthropologists. Anthropological theory allows for an understanding of the human condition, a perception which looks beyond the tangible characteristics of historical documents (in whose research archaeologists must also be proficient) and artifacts and extracts intangible information, such as political or spiritual motivation. In short, the anthropologist can observe very human intentions and motivations that underlie, and oftentimes belie, artifacts and documents of the historic era. It is this training “that exceeds the scope of the historian, architect or engineer” (Schuyler 1978: 19).

If the archaeological record were to be observed strictly with a historically trained eye, utilizing the written record as a guiding force, then it would be very complicated to lend voice to unspoken, underrepresented peoples. The material culture is, in many instances, the only articulation available to cultures or segments of populations long since silent. Researching ethnographic studies can add flesh to dry bones and symbolic meaning to discarded objects. For example, a grandiorite sculpture of a seated Egyptian scribe was recently on display at a local museum. In the lap of this person was a scroll whose message (which revealed him to be an intercessory between the gods and the people) was worn from generations of devotees who, in suppliant petition, placed hands on this script. Volumes are known about the life and history of various pharaohs and their associated offices, but what of the common folk? Which is
the more telling of the latter group, the script on this sculpture or the representative use wear? This concept in American History is illustrated by the National Trust:

The mansion on the hill was an important part of American life, but so were the worker’s houses, transportation system, factory, churches, and all else that made up the town. The plantation house is understandable only with the slave quarters, the dependencies and the fields (King et al. 1977:1; Mulloy 1976: Appendix 23).

While researching this thesis, it became apparent to me that this subject is much more than one of anthropological or historical perspective. If historical archaeology is to survive as a viable discipline, it must move beyond the cataloguing phase it acquired in its early development (Weatherington 1978:18). This is a notion that did not escape some of the first scholars of the preservation movement. Although in the minority, individuals such as Hosmer (1965:302; King et al. 1977:1), observed that the trend toward fragmentation in American preservation efforts is disconcerting. One solution would be to utilize a theory which is encompassed by a number of influences and sources, a sort of theoretical syncretism. Theoretical frameworks useful to historical archaeology can also include economics (both historical and modern) and sociology.

At a meeting for the Society for Historical Archaeology Kathleen Deagan most aptly pointed to what method should be employed for historical archaeological pursuits.

… we must recognize the fact that we are not dealing with an extension of the pre-1500 world in North America, but rather with a very complex global system that cannot always be effectively studied within the traditional confines of a single discipline (Deagan 1988:9).

She further reasons that
Historical archaeology’s obvious niche as a modern, synthetic field of inquiry is in the study of the processes and interrelationships by which human social and economic organization developed and evolved in the modern world (Deagan 1988:8).

To fully comprehend that “organization,” theories must be developed accordingly. In short, the discipline cannot exist in a theoretical vacuum.

The era that gave rise to this field is unique in that there is a focus on the interdependent nature of human societies. This approach, perhaps, is reminiscent of economic theory’s influence in academe in general. As historical archaeological pursuits, especially in the early stages of the discipline, were and are often concerned with issues of colonialism, slavery and, frequently, the economically marginal or disenfranchised, economic theory has much insight to offer. This theoretical vantage point is beneficial when dealing with underrepresented groups or situations for which there is not always sufficient documentation (Deagan 1988:9).

4.2.2 The Conjunctive Approach

Charles Orser and Brian Fagan observe that the end result, were there one, of the dichotomous anthropology versus history argument is not as important as the discussions which were spawned from the debate. They suggested that the discourse “raised a false issue by attempting to draw too fine a line between two closely related fields,” but “it forced historical archaeologists to consider seriously the theoretical foundations of their field” (Orser and Fagan 1995: 35).

Theories have ranged from purely historical or anthropological to microlevel historical ethnographies and macrolevel ethnographic histories. Developing a theory
that pleases all, however, is difficult if not impossible. Theoretical undertakings are perhaps project-sensitive. What is obvious, however, is that to attempt to observe archaeological data within a preconceived rigid theoretical framework does a great disservice to both the artifacts and the people who produced them. An interdisciplinary approach is the only way to do justice to the data gleaned from contemporary historic archaeological research projects.

It is not surprising that, with dichotomous origins and subsequently different foci, American history and American archaeology have utilized divergent approaches in the interpretation of similar events of the American past. It is now becoming apparent to a variety of scholars that a conjunctive approach is the most reliable means of decoding the mysteries buried within the layers of earth, paper, or microfiche. This approach was first outlined by Walter W. Taylor in 1948 who responded to the question of whether archaeology was anthropology or history by saying emphatically that it is neither. He states that archaeology is “an autonomous discipline” consisting of “a method and a set of specialized techniques for the gathering or ‘production’ of cultural information” (Taylor 1948:44). It is a “conceptual scheme” whose suggested steps include: 1) stating the research issue or problem; 2) data collection (including archaeological, geological, meteorological, and biological data) and subsequent analysis; 3) discussion of pertinent local chronology; 4) historiography; 5) comparative (ethnological) analysis of the cultural and chronological components; and 6) the analysis of culture and its relational interdependence on nature (Taylor 1948: 152-202). The conjunctive approach employed in the study of Nance Farm also included architectural analysis.
The value of historical/archival research is not disputed, but the real contribution of this discipline lies in its ability to use all available resources to understand more comprehensively the human element, be it spiritual or material. What is the purpose of having the written records if they cannot be viewed within the context of community or individual personalities? Likewise, if surviving documents can allow for a more complete analysis of artifactual evidence, why not employ them? Historical archaeology is unique in its application of methods which are a “melding of the historiography of classical archaeology and the diachronic ethnography of anthropological archaeology” (Sanford and Neumann 2001:21). Currently, historical archaeological pursuits take this conjunctive approach to data analysis, meaning that all information sources at the disposal of the research teams are utilized.

4.3 Lessons Learned

This thesis was intended to have been an exercise in comparing the archaeological and historical data derived from a historical period site, and to use the latter to check the former. As research and analysis was underway, however, it was soon determined that this approach was not possible. I soon realized that I could not isolate the archaeology due to the prior knowledge gained from informants nor could I ignore my own preconceived ideas regarding how a farm should appear. This understanding, however, helped to place the debate between the historicalist perspective and the anthropologist perspective into better view.

The discrepancy between the historic marker in front of the Nance Farm and preliminary research into the Nance family history initially raised the issue of which
source, archaeology or history, should be given primacy, a subject with which the American branch of historical archaeology has struggled. This is an understandable quandary as the field was born out of the historic restoration efforts (particularly in the mid-Atlantic region, of pre-Bicentennial celebration America), but is even more understandable when one realizes that studying our own culture can be problematic because of our preconceived ideas. Both sets of scholars attempt to find objective ways to view our past, but neither can attain true objectivity.

Historical archaeological sites, particularly those of the nineteenth century frontier, are part of our collective heritage. From very early on we see images and hear stories about this period. Stories told by elderly family members are probably the most common catalyst to these internalized images of the past. Go into any bookstore and pick up a children’s book on farm life, and the images will likely be of farm houses and barns. In grammar school history and literature classes we learn about the nineteenth century from the early settlers in the West to the beginning of the Industrial Age. These ideas are reinforced throughout our school careers. Hollywood gives us the John Waynes and the Clint Eastwoods and allows for our school-inspired cowboy heroes to spring to life in front of our eyes.

The fact that we store this information and are often unaware that we are allowing it to guide our research can be both good and bad. In our excavations at Nance Farm, it is useful in that we placed excavation units in those areas that were likely to yield the most information. In retrospect and given the disturbed nature of the Nance Farm, it is difficult to see how random placement of excavation units could have
presented a more coherent picture of nineteenth-century life. These internalized ideas, however, can be a stumbling block for researchers if we overlook, or choose not to see, patterns that are contrary to our prior knowledge.

We internalize these images and knowledge and can never fully escape them to be completely objective in historical archaeological pursuits. The excavation units at Nance Farm were not randomly, but rather intuitively placed based upon those ideas of farm layout. We know from our own history what we can expect to find behind a smokehouse or a barn. We suspected that a livestock enclosure existed in the back portion of the property behind the main dwelling. This was, of course, a notion that was also guided by the information recollected by a Nance descendant. Before we ever entered the property, before the research questions were posited, we knew that it would be unusual for a nineteenth–century structure to not have an out-kitchen. Therefore, we had an idea as to where to place excavation units in order to uncover features related to such a structure.

Our culture made the landscape predictable. Perhaps the testing of the archaeological record with historical data may have been possible if the architectural features had not been preserved and present. If there were not extant structures on the site to guide our placement of excavation units, these test areas might have been placed more systematically using a grid outline rather than intuition. But there were structures, and we did use them as guides. Site 41FT138 (discussed in Chapter 3) is an example of such a site on which this methodological approach would have been more fruitful. Here, there were no standing structures, only the subsurface cultural material. These
excavations yielded artifacts allowing for a *terminus post quem* to be assigned, and this date could be verified or refuted using the available archival data sets. With no visible buildings there was no bias in determining where to conduct subsurface testing.

Archaeologists investigating sites are, for the most part, historians or anthropologically trained archaeologists. Two different approaches can lead to two different sets of questions being asked. As one scholar put it, archaeologists “… stand on the threshold between a poorly recollected past and a dimly perceived future” (Cleland 1988:17). I would maintain that for historic farm sites, the past is not quite so poorly recollected. Such images of farm life are internalized from an early age and are brought into the field with us and can be used to guide the methodology. The matter of whether our biases are beneficial or detrimental to our work is not discussed in these pages. What is important to note is that historical archaeologists should be aware that such biases exist. It is only after accepting that we are not completely objective, and that our analytical approaches are guided by our notions of how a historic site (in this case a farm site) should appear, that our analysis should proceed. Research questions should not only address how we view the data, but also, how should we preserve the data.

### 4.4 Suggested Directions

This Nance Farm project is particularly useful in discussing questions related to preservation issues. For example, what can we gain from theoretical discussions of the primacy of this, that, or the other discipline if the places and sites we wish to understand are slipping away in front of our eyes? How have the extant laws governing private, state, and federal property helped to preserve these sites and how have they failed them?
Was it beneficial to the preservation of the property that Nance Farm was once a community center, or was this a period that resulted in irreparable damage to the historicity of the site? These are questions that archaeologists, preservationists, and other stewards of the past must ask at the project level.

Understandably, federal- and state-level statutes have limited jurisdiction when it comes to privately owned land. Therefore, the level of protection afforded these private properties is often minimal at best. When individuals petition to have their properties become state or federally recognized historic landmarks, however, that scope of authority is somewhat increased. Nance Farm became a Registered Texas Historic Landmark on the basis of its superstructural composition. Consequently, any activities that would adversely affect the subsurface integrity of the site were not covered under protective regulations. What follows is a brief discussion of some historic preservation laws and their application to sites of archaeological or historic interest. Fortunately Nance Farm has benefited from the preservation interests of its private owners, at least at the superstructural level.

4.4.1 Current Trends in Archaeological Stewardship

Recently Dan Potter (2006:7) presented the results of a survey which investigated the number of destroyed or damaged sites in several states. His survey determined that Arkansas reported 87 percent of its recorded sites as damaged or destroyed. States in the Midwest (Iowa and Wisconsin) reported 80 percent of the prehistoric effigy mounds as severely damaged, and Southwestern states (unspecified) reported a 60 to 90 percent destruction rate for sites (Potter 2006:7). Areas that were
previously rural are becoming developed at an exponential rate and looting and vandalism are unfortunately still common activities. As state archaeology departments and historical commissions find themselves with more sites (and countless unrecorded sites) than money to maintain them, local individuals and communities are becoming important assets in the identification and preservation of these cultural resources. The state of Texas is at the forefront of this new trend.

The Texas Historical Commission (THC) oversees much of the public archaeology for the 254 Texas counties. Understandably, the THC cannot protect all of these sites. Therefore, the Texas Archeological Stewardship Network (TASN) was created in 1984. Since then other states (including Alabama, Arizona, California, Florida, Kentucky, Michigan, New Mexico, Utah, and Virginia (National Park Service 2006) have sponsored programs modeled after the TASN (Texas Historical Commission, n.d.).

The TASN volunteers are charged with an assortment of duties. In addition to site recording, surveying, and participating in salvage excavations, these stewards monitor existing sites for disturbance, vandalism, or disrepair. According to recruitment literature for this “all-volunteer ‘army,’” volunteers will monitor archeological site preserves, conservation easement sites, State Archaeological Landmarks, National Register (of Historic Places) sites and sites on public lands that are protected by law. Any observed disturbances or threats of disturbance are reported to the proper authorities. Sites on private land are monitored only with permission of the landowner. [Emphasis in original pamphlet](Texas Historical Commission 2006)
The ten-person volunteer group of 1984 is now 108 members strong.

In Potter’s above-referenced survey, a group of THC led stewards re-evaluated a total of 401 sites to assess the level and, perhaps, cause of damage to existing archaeological sites in Texas. These workers determined that sites were disturbed for a variety of reasons (Table 4.1). Because of the efforts of these stewards numerous Section 106 properties were brought to the attention of regulating agencies and were subjected to mitigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Damage</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm/Ranch</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Damage to Archaeological Sites (Adapted From Potter 2006)

It is interesting to note that Nance Farm has been disturbed by a number of these phenomena, including farm/ranch, public works, and both recreational, and residential activities. Because Nance Farm is privately owned, however, there is little that the THC or its stewards can do without the permission of the landowner. Additions such as swimming pools and parking areas, although improving the aesthetics and accessibility of the property, were at times short-lived. One of the swimming pools on the property has now been backfilled and the parking lot is covered by only a shallow
layer of topsoil, but the damage to subsurface deposits is irreparable. It is fortunate, however, that this property came under the ownership of individuals (or municipalities, such as the City of DeSoto) who took an interest in the heritage of this farmstead, at least where the standing structures are concerned. Other properties have not been so fortunate, but state and federal agencies often find themselves powerless to protect such sites.

In response to issues such as these, Kentucky enacted the “Kentucky Landowner Registry” (Henderson 1991:1-14) in 1987. This registry has three major functions, namely 1) “to provide low-level site protection,” 2) “to provide opportunities for regular and systematic monitoring of significant sites,” and 3) “to provide opportunities to educate participating landowners about the importance and preservation of their sites” (Henderson 1991:10). By educating the landowner about the importance of the site located on his or her property, the individual is more likely to take an interest in the preservation of such a site. Personal communication between the state agency and the landowner are paramount to the success of such a program.

A similar situation in which landowners have an increased interest in the preservation and maintenance of the cultural resources positioned on their property has occurred in Louisiana as an unintentional result of the Ancient Mounds Heritage Area and Trail program. As of 2004, 37 historic markers have been placed along the trail that spans much of Louisiana, with most of the mounds clustering in the northeastern part of the state. Although the mounds are on private property, the markers and
viewing areas are along public roadsides. This project was created by the Louisiana Division of Archaeology (LADOA) through funds by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD); the mounds occur on private property, so none of these funds were offered to landowners for upkeep or preservation.

An interesting side effect of this trail is that landowners, realizing that visitors are viewing “their mounds” from a distance, are taking more active approaches to the preservation of these sites. For example, one property owner gave permission for archaeologists to map the platform mound on his land. The top of the mound was recorded, but brush was so dense that the rest of the mound would have to remain unmapped. The owner requested he be given a year to clear the brush, and the LADOA agreed. Approximately eighteen months later, the mound site was not only clear, but transformed “into a park-like setting” (Saunders et al. 2006: 27-28). His efforts encouraged his neighbor to do the same. Because these two landowners took an interest in how their properties and the resources on them are perceived by visitors, what was formerly a single shrub-shrouded platform mound is now a complex visible for over half a mile (Saunders et al. 2006:27-28). Stewardship pride is increasing as a result of the heritage and trail program.

Development and urban sprawl are occurring at an unprecedented pace, and cultural resources are often compromised as a result. There is neither time nor money to record or preserve many of the sites standing in the way of “progress.” Rather than
debate the nuances of the discipline, historical archaeologists should find new directions in which to focus their energies. Devising creative methods, such as those presented above, to encourage agencies, individuals, and institutions alike to take an interest in heritage preservation is paramount. There is no longer time for a line to be drawn between theory and practice. This need to preserve cultural resources is not new, but the pace of development warrants that the problem be addressed with increased urgency. It is possible that archaeological stewardship is this new direction.
CHAPTER 5
ARTIFACTS RECOVERED DURING EXCAVATIONS
OF NANCE FARM

5.1 Introduction

Upon completion of fieldwork and architectural study, artifact analysis was performed in order to determine what, if any, patterns would emerge from the data collected during subsurface testing. The only archaeological evidence which might indicate a prehistoric presence on the Nance Farm was three lithic debitage specimens (one core, one primary flake, and one secondary flake). All of these samples were water worn and were likely gathered from the creek bed positioned to the rear of the property. None of the three were temporally diagnostic nor do they point to a particular prehistoric culture at the site.

Historic artifacts were first divided into broad categories. The first, the materials category, included a variety of media which were asphalt, brick, botanicals, ceramic, concrete, fabric, faunal, fired rock, glass, lead, limestone/mortar, metal, non-heat-treated rock and stone, other synthetic, paint, paper, plastic, roofing slate, Styrofoam, tar, unidentified, and wax. Many of these categories were modern in nature and would not be helpful in determining the mid to late nineteenth-century activities that were part of the research design of the project. Analysis, therefore, focused on artifacts composed
of ceramic, metal, and glass media. Spreadsheets detailing these artifact categories are presented in Appendix C.

The materials category was followed by a classification division so to specify what realm (architectural, domestic, etc.) a given artifact might have served in its use life. Function of the artifact was then used to further subdivide the classes of artifacts. The type of artifact within the category (i.e., nail, bolt, wire, etc.) was the next division and was followed by subtype when applicable (as in cut or wire nails) (Table 5.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION OF ARTIFACT</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>OTHER DESIGNATIONS AS NEEDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>PANE GLASS</td>
<td></td>
<td>NUMBER OF SPECIMENS REPRESENTED WITH THIS PROVENANCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Example of Artifact Classification System

Other designations were used when necessary to further clarify the analytical scheme. Artifact color was an important division for the ceramic (surface decoration and paste color) and glass media (such as an amethyst hue due to sunlight exposure), but understandably not so important for the metal medium. What portion of the artifact was represented comprised the next category and was particularly useful in discussion. Rim, base, and body portions were recorded for the ceramic sherds and nail head, point, and shaft portions were logged for the metal categories. Bottle lip, or bottle finish, shards among glass specimens could also be useful, but body shards were diagnostic only if there were identifiable embossing or labeling. The finish shard is the term given for the top of the bottle to which the closure or topper was affixed. Originating during the practice of mouth-blowing manufacture, the term derived from the practice of
“finishing the lip” (Lindsey 2006). Artifact count was the next category and was followed by special comments which included information such as surface decoration on ceramic sherds and the amount of patina present on glass. By first separating artifacts into these workable categories and then entering the data into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet this information could be more easily sorted into workable units from which patterns could become more easily discernable.

Numerous factors, such as differential access to ceramic vessels due to transportation or economic causes, can account for discrepancies between when the ceramic item was manufactured and when it was actually utilized. Heirlooming can also account for this. One should bear in mind the concept of terminus post quem, or time after which an artifact could have been deposited (South 1972:71-116; Worthy 1982:350). For instance, if ceramic sherds from the Cook Pottery Company have historically documented inclusive manufacture dates of 1892 to 1900 (Worthy 1982:351), then it is reasonable that the vessel could have been deposited any time after 1892, but not before. Therefore, a terminus post quem of 1892 could be assigned. As few artifacts are deposited just after manufacture or purchase, 1892 is the earliest that the object can enter the archaeological record, but it is more probable that some measure of time will pass prior to deposition. Time lag is a term used by archaeologists to describe this space of time.

Time lag observed in the archaeological record can be accounted for by realizing that artifacts have lifespans (use life), and an artifact’s “use life” is expressed as that amount of time between when the item was produced and when it was discarded.
These lifespans, however, will undoubtedly vary by artifact media. For example, a ceramic vessel will not be deposited immediately after purchase. Rather, it can continue to be reused until it breaks. Vessel durability can be a factor as well. Glass bottles, however, can be thought of as more disposable, especially during the nineteenth-century. This may be due to differences in discard patterns for ceramic and glass items.

It has been suggested that discard patterns vary due to values placed on the material items directly related to the processes involved in manufacture. Worthy (1982:350-352) states that “this temporal disparity may be explained by the fact that ceramics themselves are “products,” whereas bottles are merely “containers” for products and would therefore stand a greater chance of being discarded when the contents were exhausted” (Worthy 1982:350-352). This is an observation that can certainly apply to Nance Farm. The overall artifact assemblage and architectural style indicates a turn–of–the century or slightly later date range, and if one follows the above theory, the ceramic and glass vessels could have been deposited at roughly the same time frame. Ceramic vessels, although manufactured at an earlier date than the glass containers were likely deposited around the same time because they were considered “products,” and the period between manufacture and deposition of ceramic vessels was longer than their glass counterparts. Glass containers would have been discarded sooner because they were viewed merely as “containers.”
5.2 Ceramics

Although the type-variety method can be employed for historic ceramics, the bulk of information regarding this method is acquired from Mesoamerican and Southwestern United States contexts. This system of analyzing large amounts of ceramic data facilitates both intrasite analysis and intersite comparative study (Rice 1976:538). Terms used in this analytical system include ware, and of course, type and variety. Ware refers to that “classificatory unit …which deals with the technological attributes of pottery relating to paste composition and surface finish (Rice 1976:538) and can include attributes regarding “paste texture, kind of temper, paste hardness (rarely used), porosity and color” (Sabloff and Smith 1969:278). Although Sabloff and Smith state that paste hardness is seldom used, the authors are referring to ceramics constructed prior to the post-colonial period. European and American historic ceramicists most definitely use hardness and fineness of vitrification in the determination of ceramic wares.

The importance of using paste hardness and vitrification in the analysis of European ceramics is evident when comparing earthenwares to stoneware. Earthenwares (both coarse and refined) differ strongly from stoneware in that earthenware is less vitrified and therefore more porous than stoneware. Such qualities are visible to the naked eye as well as to the touch. A watertight glaze is necessary when the ceramic vessel is more porous. Vessel hardness and properties of vitrification are important in historic ceramic analysis. Hardness and vitrification were considered in the analysis of the Nance Farm ceramics.
A second term used in the type-variety method is the “type,” and it refers to vessel qualities related to decoration and vessel form (Sabloff and Smith 1969:278). Decoration can vary from region to region and by individual potter. Techniques used by potters allow for the tracing of culture change and are particularly useful in seeing the ethnographic in the archaeological. As Krieger states, “it may be said that, ideally, an archaeological type should represent a unit of cultural practice equivalent to the ‘culture trait’ of ethnography” (Krieger 1944:28) and that the purpose of a type classification should be in the identification of “patterns of behavior or technology which can be acquired by one human being from another, and thus serve as tools for the retracing of cultural developments and interactions” (Krieger 1944:28).

Variety is a smaller unit of the type. Minor variations and differences can be included within a type. When intrasite analysis illustrates the repetition of the same variations, these differences could become a type unto themselves. This is because modifications made to surface decoration could indicate the personal preferences and talents of the potter or, as more ceramics exhibiting the same traits might illustrate, these changes could be indicative of a type change (Sabloff and Smith 1976:278).

In the analysis of ceramics recovered from Nance Farm, and in historic sites in general, ware and type are the most useful terms enlisted in the type-variety method. As is exhibited in the following analysis ware refers to the more mechanical traits (vitrification, etc.) while type discusses the more external properties (salt glazed, Albany slipped, etc.). For the purpose of this thesis Variety is not listed as a category unto itself and is discussed in the additional comments section.
At Nance Farm a total of 143 ceramic sherds were recovered. Of these, 27 sherds (18.9% of collected ceramics) were modern in affiliation and related to interior building materials, such as ceramic bathroom and kitchen tile, and 11 (7.7%) were non-diagnostic. Planters were also represented by two specimens (1.4%). Containers used for domestic purposes, i.e. food preparation and consumption, comprised the remaining 103 (72%) of ceramic sherds.

Containers used for food preparation, food storage, or table use comprised over 70% of the identified ceramic groups. Percentages for this section are based upon individual classifications. For example, the number of decorated ceramics is divided by the total number of domestic containers rather than by the overall number of ceramic sherds. This was done in order to isolate which ceramics were particularly diagnostic, that is which ceramics were most telling of a particular vessel form, style, manufacture date, and sometimes distributor. For instance a ceramic sherd could be simply identified as pearlware, but a sherd with a blue shell rim and characteristic cobalt pooling in crevasses is diagnostic of a shell-edged pearlware. Similarly a maker’s mark is certainly diagnostic because it allows the researcher to pinpoint who constructed the vessel and more narrowly define time and place of origination as well. Decorated domestic ceramics versus undecorated domestic ceramic containers can often allow for a researcher to observe more narrowly defined temporal information (Krieger 1944:28). This is frequently true of prehistoric as well as historic ceramics.

The majority (n=87 or 85.3%) of the total 102 domestic ceramic sherds were undecorated vessels (see Table 5.2), and these included bisque (n=1), ironstone (n=13),
North American stoneware (n=14), porcelain (n=9), Rockingham (n=3), whiteware (n=46), and yellow ware (n=1) sherds. Only ten ceramic sherds (8.8 % of containers) were decorated with forms ranging from North American stoneware (of which one Albany Slip sherd was identified), ironstone (n=3), porcelain (n=4), and whiteware (n=1). Surface treatment on six sherds was undetermined due to eroded glazes or burning. The total percentage of ceramic sherds with unspecified surface treatment was 5.9% of the 102 sherds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDECORATED DOMESTIC CONTAINER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISQUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRONSTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH AMERICAN STONEWARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORCELAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKINGHAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITEWARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOWWARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECORATED TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDETERMINED DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDETERMINED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECORATED DOMESTIC CONTAINER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTH AMERICAN STONEWARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRONSTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORCELAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITEWARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECORATED TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 Recovered Ceramics

5.2.1 Undecorated Ceramic Containers

As discussed above, domestic vessels were the predominant ceramic form observed at Nance Farm, and 85.4 % of these were undecorated. One should be aware,
however, that it is possible, especially for body and base sherds, that one part of a container could show designs and motifs whereas others might not (Worthy 1982: 342). It is as Worthy (1982:342) states, “the number of undecorated sherds may not be an accurate representation of undecorated vessels, as many plain sherds come form undecorated portions of decorated vessels” (Worthy 1982: 342).

The first category of ceramic sherds recovered from Nance Farm to be discussed is bisque. A single bisque vessel sherd was identified, but other than the vitrified quality observable in this ware, there were few other distinguishing characteristics of which to speak. Although this ware was not generally produced in north Texas, it is a relatively late ceramic ware that would have likely traveled to the region after the railroad began bringing goods to the area. Bisque is typically thought of as a Victorian era ware and a late nineteenth-century or turn-of-the-century date would not be uncommon for a vessel manufactured of this material (Bivins 1972:185).

Sherds from the next category, ironstone, were also present at Nance Farm in undecorated form. Of the 13 undecorated sherds, all were white. Ironstones have a manufacture date range of 1815 to after 1900 (SMU ceramic database) and were made in both England and America. This ware is intermediate between earthenware and porcelain with a peak date range circa 1850 and like many English and American ceramics, was considered an inexpensive alternative to other imported ceramics (Noel-Hume 1970:130-131; SMU ceramic database; South 1977:211). This timeframe coincides with the bulk of other artifactual data as well as the architectural elements of the main structure dating to the turn of the century.
A total of nine ironstone samples were body sherds, one was a rim sherd, and three were base sherds. Most were of medium density, but one (TP17, Level 1) was very thick and weighty indicative of a storage vessel or other utilitarian ware. Conversely, a sherd from XU-1-NE, Quad Level 3 was very delicate in nature suggesting a type of tea ware.

North Americans Stonewares were also represented among the undecorated sherds. Stoneware vessels are highly vitrified because they are fired at temperatures exceeding 1200° Celsius (Worthy 1982:335) and, when made properly, these vessels are often impervious to liquids. Glazes are sometimes employed to augment strength (Worthy 1982:335), and vessel forms are typically dense in nature and utilitarian in function (Noel-Hume 1970:101; Worthy 1982:337).

A common glaze that is observed on ceramics recovered from north Texas archaeological contexts is salt glaze. In fact, it was the most frequently utilized glaze on nineteenth-century ceramic vessels (Lebo 1987:130). It was performed by the vaporization in the kiln of ordinary table salt that could have been applied up to four times during the firing process (Lebo 1987:130). According to Lebo (1987:139) salt glazed ceramics on 18 north Texas farmsteads were “most frequent at sites initially occupied prior to 1880.” Because these salt glazed stoneware vessels were sturdy, they were less likely to have a short use life and could have been deposited relatively late. Although not the most common type of ceramic at Nance Farm, two were identified in Level 1 with the remainder located in lower levels.
It has been suggested that because of limited transportation options and, therefore, limited sources of acquiring commodities, north Texas was a market that was especially open to the local manufacture of ceramic vessels (Lebo 1987:121). Utilitarian stoneware vessels began to be manufactured in this area around 1839 when skilled potters began to immigrate to this region from other portions of the American south, such as North and South Carolina and Georgia (Lebo 1987:139). Lebo states that local construction of stonewares continued into the early 1900s, but “by the 1890s industrialized potteries in the Midwest began making inroads, shipping wares into Missouri, Arkansas, and Texas” (Lebo 1987:139-140). It was also suggested that during the early 1900s, other non-ceramic storage vessel forms made ceramic utilitarian wares all but obsolete. Containers manufactured from glass and metal began to be mass-produced and were, therefore, less expensive than ceramic vessels made by individual potters. Also “canning, pickling, and refrigeration” further reduced the need for the heavy and somewhat cumbersome stoneware containers (Lebo 1987:139:142). This is significant in the analysis of artifacts from Nance Farm, because there was a far higher number of machine-produced and molded glass vessels and metal containers than ceramic storage containers.

Of the 14 North American Stoneware samples observed, one half consisted of at least one olive surface (either internal or external, Figure 5.1), five of which were salt glazed. The remaining ceramic sherds included buff colored exteriors in which surfaces were either salt glazed or exposed (Figure 5.2). Internal surface pastes of these 14 ceramic examples ranged in color from buff to gray.
Of the nine undecorated porcelain sherds represented, seven were body sherds, and two were rim sherds. Porcelains are highly vitrified ceramic wares that were composed of kaolin clay that was fired at extreme temperatures (1300° Celsius to 1450° Celsius), a practice that eliminates any distinction between the paste of the ware and the applied glaze (Ramsay 1976:155; SMU ceramic database; Worthy 1982:337). This level of vitrification prevents stains from adhering to the paste (Worthy 1982:337) making them much preferred tableware and teaware vessels. Chinese export ceramics, produced specifically for American and European markets, were produced as early as the mid – seventeenth century whereas American and English potters did not begin production of porcelain until the mid-eighteenth century and later (SMU ceramic database). The principle difference between the Chinese export and American or English varieties of
porcelain is that the latter is composed of a softer paste than the former (SMU ceramic database). Another difference is that decorative techniques on the latter ceramics often consist of transfer printed designs, an English invention (SMU ceramic database).

There were also three Rockingham Ware sherds that were collectively referred to during the field season as the “bean pot.” Rockingham is a refined earthenware that traditionally possesses a mottled affect caused by the dipping of an already clear glazed yellow ware ceramic vessel into an additional manganese glaze. With this example, however, the vessel was not initially dipped in the clear glaze, but was directly dipped in the manganese allowing for a uniform dark reddish brown surface color. This technique was manufactured in both England and North America during the middle portion of the nineteenth century and continues in the present (Claney 2004:31-55; SMU database). Rockingham ware was, to a large degree, imported from England during much of the 1800s and during the early post-bellum years, but by the 1880s the manufacture and distribution of Rockingham ware was principally a domestic industry (Claney 2004:65). The Rockingham examples collected from the Nance Farm excavations were likely part of the same vessel as they were identified in the same unit and level (TP5, Level 3), and two of the three sherds refit together. Other datable artifact in TP5, Level 3 included solarized glass (terminus post quem 1880, see below) and a fair number (n=30) of wire nails (terminus post quem 1890). Cut nails were present but in fewer number (n=2). Other than a single piece of modern floor tile, the level is devoid of modern material. If the stratigraphy is to be trusted, and it appears it can be, this stratigraphic level dates to after 1880.
There were 47 undecorated whiteware ceramic sherds analyzed in this assemblage. All of these were body sherds with the exception of one base (TP4) and five rim (TP8, Level 2; TP9, Level 1; TP10, Level 1; ST6, Level 1) sherds. The two rim sherds recovered from ST6 were, in fact, from two separate vessels. Whitewares were produced beginning circa 1810 in England (Stell 2001) and in 1820 in the United States as an attempt to make an inexpensive alternative to porcelains prior to the more efficient production and therefore widespread distribution (and therefore cheaper prices) of these porcelains. These whiteware were manufactured until roughly 1900.

Yellow ware was also present in the Nance Farm assemblage. Although yellow wares were first manufactured in 1840 and continues to be produced today, it reached a peak in popularity from 1870 to 1900. This time period is consistent with the metal and glass artifacts recovered from Nance Farm as well as the data obtained from architectural analysis. The paste of the ware is dark buff to yellow and the clear lead glaze enhances the surface to make a distinct yellow color (Gallo 1985; SMU ceramic database). A single yellow ware sherd (aside from the above discussed Rockingham Ware sample) was identified. It was collected from the upper level of ST6 and was a salt glazed body sherd.

5.2.2 Decorated Ceramic Containers

At Nance Farm, decorated North American Stonewares were represented by only one Albany Slipped sherd (TP4, Level 3). North American Stonewares began to be manufactured around 1825, and these wares continued to be produced well into the twentieth century (SMU ceramic database). Some stoneware vessels exhibit
“characteristic finger ridges on the interior surfaces” (Worthy 1982:337). Decoration was not always applied, but when it was, it was typically a simple geometric design stenciled in cobalt or manganese (SMU ceramic database). The sherd from the Nance Farm sample was decorated with a slightly raised manganese stripe giving the surface decoration an olive yellow hue.

There were three ironstone sherds present in the assemblage. The first ironstone sherd (TP6, Level 2) displayed the Flowing Colours decorative technique. This is a technique that was begun circa 1840 and continued during the early to mid portions of the twentieth – century. Most commonly associated with transfer printed ceramics, but also known on some hand painted specimens, dye (commonly blue or purple) was applied liberally to ceramic surfaces so that the pigment would run onto the glaze causing a blurred image (Miller 1980:29; SMU ceramic database). The deep purple of this decoration gives the sherds a peak date range between the 1840s and 1870s consistent with other artifacts from the site.

The second example of ironstone (TP11, Level 2) exhibited a maker’s mark upon its base reading “NSTO…AMES…E.” This mark was determined to be from the James Edwards and Sons Company operating out of the Dale Hall Factory (Figures 5.3 and 5.4). This mark indicates that this ceramic was manufactured in Burlsem, Staffordshire, England sometime between 1852 and 1882.
The final ironstone sherd was edge decorated with slight molding and a simple flowing blue rim (TP15, Level 2; Figure 5.5). The fact that these are from Level 2 could indicate that this level dates to the initial occupation of the site. Given the idea of time lag, it would be reasonable to assume that these ceramics date to the latter (rather than the middle) portion of the nineteenth century and would also coincide with the other recovered artifacts from the site. It is possible that unlike most Flowing Colours wares, this edge decoration could have been hand painted with the paint intentionally applied so as to “run” when glazed (SMU ceramic data base). The popularity date range for this type, however, can also be more narrowly restricted to the thirty years between 1840 and 1870.
A total of four decorated porcelain sherds were recovered from the 2002 excavations. The decoration of two of these (TP4) was a simple pink surface which is a type of Fiesta Ware produced originally from 1951 to 1959 and reintroduced in 1986 before being discontinued in 2005 (Homer Laughlin China Co. 2006). Another porcelain sherd (TP8, Level 2) exhibits the popular transfer printing decorative technique. Transfer printing with cobalt blue was performed on English ceramics as early as the mid eighteenth-century, but designs in the purple hue, such as is displayed by the sherd recovered from Nance Farm, were not employed on porcelain until the mid nineteenth century. The image is of a pastoral scene and appears to include a barn-like structure. It could be surmised that, given this imagery (albeit romanticized), it is possible that this porcelain was of American and not English manufacture. The final porcelain specimen (TP12, Level 3) was a simple white sherd with a small bit of green decoration. These recovered ceramics from Nance Farm span a time frame from the mid nineteenth-century to present.

The final decorated ceramic ware to be discussed is a single white ware sherd collected from TP23, Level 2 (Figure 5.6). This sherd was sponge decorated, a technique originating in Scotland. This ware, popular from 1840 to 1875, is typically
observed in the forms of bowls and tea wares (SMU ceramic database). Color was applied using a natural sponge, and this example contains both red and green colors on the same vessel. It should also be noted that sponge decorated wares were among some of the inexpensive table sets on the market, and that the primary overseas buyers for sponge ware were from Canada, principally in the Quebec region. It is possible that this ware filtered down to the Texas region via Canada. It is interesting to speculate whether the Nance family first acquired this vessel while in Illinois or Kentucky and brought it down to Texas as they migrated or if it was simply purchased while already in the DeSoto vicinity.

![Figure 5.6 Green and Red Sponge Decorated Sherd](image)

**Figure 5.6 Green and Red Sponge Decorated Sherd**

### 5.2.3. Ceramic Analysis

There are numerous models regarding the usage of ceramic wares in determining socio-economic status of the people who used these items. For instance, Joan Few (1988) suggests that technological advances in ceramic manufacturing led to a uniformity in ceramic types and that changes in sociopolitical climates, such as the construction of canals on various waterways, contributed to the widespread distribution of raw materials to the potters and ceramic wares to consumers. Furthermore, high tariffs on Chinese manufactured porcelain served to encourage customers to purchase
the British form of the ware, which thrived under “favorable treaties with the continent” (Few 1988:246) leading to the “English domination of the world ceramic tableware trade” (Miller 1980:1).

With this new uniformity, it has been suggested that the conventional dating system for historic period ceramics based on paste and ware type might benefit from an additional ranking scheme based on decoration. George Miller (1980:1-3) has derived such a method. He suggests that in order to determine social status of the occupants of a historic property, one must observe the cost of the represented commodities. In his example, Miller determines that, given the new similarities in ware pastes, the purchase price of ceramic objects would have been determined by surface decoration and has assigned four categories based upon these factors (Few 1988:246; Miller 1980:1). Miller’s ranking system suggests that undecorated white ceramics, Category One, would have been the least expensive and would have included common, white earthen, and stone china. These objects included the more delicate ceramics for table use, the slightly sturdier meal preparation and storage vessels, and chamber pots (Few 1988: 246-7, 251; Miller 1980:1-3). It should be considered, however, that this decorative type could be misidentified if one has only vessel body sherds by which to base analysis.

There exists the potential that a minimal decorated ceramic sherd, included in the next category, might be overlooked. Minimal decorative sherds forming the next expensive category, Category Two, contained banded, common cable (also referred to as finger-trailed slip), mocha, shell edged, and sponge – decorated surface ornamentation. Manufacture of this embellishment did not require an extensive amount
of skill or training so the price of this ceramic category was increased from the previous division, but not by much (Few 1988: 247, 251-252; Miller 1980:1).

Hand painted wares comprise Category Three and require that the artist be able to reproduce a particular image in an acceptable prearranged form in order to emulate mass production. Domestically manufactured hand-painted ceramics were restricted primarily to basic geometric, stylized decoration, or simple floral motifs (Few 1988: 247 and 252-253; Miller 1980:1). American hand-painted ceramics did not exhibit the advanced artistic skill of the more complex hand-painted vessels of Europe which often included Chinese landscapes or pastoral scenes (Few 1988:247, 252-253; Miller 1980:1). Hand painted ceramics were less expensive than the more ornate transfer printed ceramics of Category Four. Transfer printed ceramics were initially created by English potters in an attempt to produce elaborately decorated ceramics (Blue Willow being the most popular) in a shorter amount of time. Decoration was achieved by engraving the desired motif on a copper plate and then using tissue paper to convey that image to the vessel prior to firing (Few 1988:247, 252-253; Gaston 1983:158; SMU ceramic database). When this decorated ware first became available for purchase it was almost five times more expensive than the undecorated white wares of Category One. Although the price dropped as time passed, transfer printed ceramic vessels still commanded a worth nearly double that of the undecorated Category One ceramics in the nineteenth century.

As useful as Miller's categories seem, in an unmodified form this scheme is not entirely applicable to the North American frontier of the nineteenth century. It
necessarily presumes that all people in all areas of the new nation enjoyed the same resource availability, when in fact, until the railroad opened the interior of the country, there was a great disparity in differential access to goods and services. Few (1988) suggests a classification system for use in socioeconomic analysis, a system derived from the artifact analysis of five historic period archaeological sites located in central and east – central Texas. Her final plan encompasses both surface decoration and ceramic paste types. This plan has the four categories posited by Miller (1980), but was expanded to include porcelain as a fifth category, colored ceramics, as a sixth, and stonewares as the seventh category. Do note that categories Five and Seven were based on paste type, whereas category Six was identified not by decoration, but by the employed glaze possessing a unique hue. This scheme became useful in the analysis of Nance Farm, and it became apparent that a variety of these categories were present in the collected assemblage. The presence of lesser quality wares, or lower categories, does not necessarily indicate a lower socio-economic position, but rather the fact that the variation in ceramic categories would suggest that the occupants of Nance Farm had access to a number of different wares. This could be due to the increased accessibility of ceramic resources because of improved transportation, but also could indicate that the Nance Family had financial resources at their disposal that allowed for a greater selection of goods and services.

Popularity dates for ceramics collected from the Historic Nance Farm seem to cluster primarily around 1870 to 1900. Although the presence of a small number of wares representing earlier production dates could be attributed to heirlooming, the
majority of the collected ceramic sherds indicate post – railroad era consumerism. This is particularly true for ceramic wares such as the porcelains and bisque, as well as the more delicate tablewares. These ceramics also cover a variety of socio-economic sets including the relatively inexpensive to pricier types. Well - made porcelain contrasts with the lesser quality spongewares which could suggest access to goods based upon wealth of the inhabitants. It is, however, more likely that the diverse ceramic spectrum is principally due to how well the vicinity was supplied by potters from the eastern portion of the United States. As with the above mentioned ceramic dates, the arrival of the railroad companies ushered in a new era of goods and services to the region. The low to high-end ceramic vessels probably indicates not a fluctuation in status, but rather speaks to the relative wealth of the Nance family. These ceramic sherds point to the diversity of ware types available once the railroad came to the region. A person of means could be assumed to now have access to a variety of different ceramic wares, and the multiplicity of ceramic commodities in one’s home might be more indicative of status than originally believed. In other words, a combination of ware types of differing economic brackets is more telling of status than the possession of one particular ware that could be present as a result of heirlooming.

5.3 Recovered Glass

5.3.1. Overview

A total of 732 glass artifacts (see Table 5.4) were recovered from the excavations at Nance Farm, and these included domestic containers (n=387 or 52.9% of the glass assemblage) and glass associated with architectural elements which equaled
345 (47.1%). Domestic containers and architectural glass were relatively equal in their occurrences at Nance Farm. The latter category included window glass (n=163) and electrical lighting (n=182). A relatively high number of electrical lighting shards (n=138) were identified in a single excavation unit (ST5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENT</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 Glass recovered from Nance Farm

In the analysis glass shards were divided into two large categories, those used for domestic purposes such as containers, and those used for architectural reasons like window glass. Most of the domestic shards were containers composed of curved glass therefore color or surface decoration and patina became the primary diagnostic characteristics.

5.3.2. Glass Containers

A variety of colors were represented in the 372 domestic glass containers including 15 shards of milk glass. The glass colors are discussed below. Patina was present on 17.9% of the glass containers (n=69), and amounts ranged from light to heavy with very heavy patina noted on only 11 (2.9%) of the total container shards.

These 372 container shards included 4 bases of which two were brown, one was clear, and one was light blue. The vast majority of the shards were container body sherds equaled 350 in number including three amethyst, 49 aqua, four blue, 57 brown,
204 clear, 21 green, nine light blue, three olive, and one red. There were eight finish shards including three brown (one of which has the metal cap affixed; Figure 5.7), three clear, and two green samples. As stated above, the finish shard is the term given for the top of the bottle to which the closure or topper was affixed. A single clear bottle lip, one green neck with base, and one clear rim were all identified. Also noted were four clear shards which fit together to form a complete machine molded bottle with threaded finish upon which a screw top metal cap was affixed.

Figure 5.7 Brown Bottle Fragment with Metal Cap Affixed

Most of the containers were derived from undetermined stemware or bottles due to the absence of any particular markings or attributes. Although there is no doubt that there is an abundance of bottle glass present at the site, only a small portion could be definitively assigned to a soda bottle classification. There were 11 Dr Pepper samples, seven 7-up shards, and one soda bottle of undetermined type. This analysis was based primarily upon familiar soda bottleneck forms accompanied by threaded finishes (although independently, neither trait would necessarily lead to a determination of this classification) and the presence of paper soda labels with enough fragments of script to discern portions of brand names. It was not until the 1950s that paper labels depicting the product’s name replaced embossing (Dr Pepper Museum 2006).
As stated above, there were three amethyst shards present in the glass assemblage. These artifacts are more aptly described as solarized, a condition caused by the effects of solar radiation on some glass artifacts. Between the years 1880 and 1920 glass was often manufactured with manganese. Although, this manganese does not initially color the glass, when exposed to the sun, an amethyst hue results (Heller 2004 Personal Communication). Colors can range from a nearly imperceptible shade of amethyst to one that is very deep in color. As there existed a relatively tight production range, the presence of these three glass shards indicates a similar temporal frame.

Milk glass also was observed among the recovered domestic container shards. Although settlers at Jamestown constructed milk glass beads for trade with indigenous population as early as 1609, the popularity of milk glass especially increased during the nineteenth century when it was used as an inexpensive substitute for porcelain. Milk glass was particularly popular in the United States and England by the mid-nineteenth century with a popularity maximum between the years of 1895 –1910 (Newbound and Newbound 1995:7). At Nance Farm there were 15 in number or only 3.9 % of the containers. A likely turn of the century date range for milk glass is consistent with the other artifact types identified at the site.

A total of two shards of glass were from non-container glass articles. These were silver painted glass artifacts which were likely once part of a mirror. These mirror fragments were some of the few personal articles recovered from the excavations at Nance Farm.
5.3.3. Architectural Glass

Of the 345 glass shards associated with architectural elements, 182 were portions of light bulbs. Only 42 of these light bulb shards were colored, and these were similar to Christmas tree lighting. The remainder of these glass artifacts were clear light bulb glass. These are possibly from one light bulb.

A total of 163 shards of architectural glass were window pane glass. The majority (n=119) was clear glass, but some (n=44) exhibited a soft aqua hue that is not uncommon among nineteenth-century window glass. These artifacts were recovered from every excavated portion of the site, and shards were observed on the surface as well but not collected. The bulk of these shards are located in Levels 1 and 2 with a marked decrease in the lower levels.

Window glass can be a misleading artifact type in that large amounts of the flat glass can enter the archaeological record in a single episode (Moir 1987:75). On a site like Nance Farm that has been continuously occupied and that is known to have undergone extensive restoration, it would be surprising if there were not copious amounts of pane glass observable in surface and subsurface contexts. The fact that glass was dispersed throughout the site vicinity does not allow for the analysis of specific architectural foci on the property.

5.4 Metal Artifacts

5.4.1. Overview

A variety of metal artifacts were recovered from the 2002 excavations at the Nance Farm. These included nails composed of both iron and steel, metal personal
items such as buttons and ammunition casings, domestic container portions, farm equipment and machinery, among others. A large number of metal artifacts were nondiagnostic and did not allow for identification.

5.4.2. Nails

Nails are the predominant artifact type for this property (n=987), but on later historic sites this can be problematic, particularly on the frontier. Quite unexpectedly, there was a higher number of historic cut nails than wire nails, which have a terminus post quem of 1890. Of the nails collected, three were wrought, 594 were cut, and 390 were wire. The total 1,322 metal artifacts, including miscellaneous, architectural, nonarchitectural, and personal items were categorized into smaller units in order to determine portion, number, and size of metal artifacts (with special attention paid to cut and wire nails). Unless otherwise stated, nails are composed of iron.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 WROUGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594 CUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390 WIRE</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 Majority of Nails to Other Metal Artifacts recovered from Nance Farm

Wrought nails date earlier than cut nails and, given the early date of manufacture, it is not unusual that they are uncommon at the site. One might recall that in the architecture chapter early structures, such as the barn, were found to be held in place by wooden pegs and reinforced by the nature of the mortise and tenon seam technique. It is possible that this architectural construction method was used primarily for outbuildings. If this were the case one would expect to see at least a number slightly
larger than the three wrought iron nails (TP14, TP15, and TP20) clustering around the core dwelling. It would appear that the bulk of woodwork utilizing iron fasteners took place after machine cut nails became more available. Questions surround the origin of these three nails. It is likely that these were recycled from an earlier source (i.e., carriage, etc.) and might have been in use before the Nance’s owned the property or might even have come to North Texas with them at a later date. Nails were actually quite expensive and were often brought with pioneering families when they traveled. In fact, wrought nails were recycled from older buildings and reused. Some historic buildings were known to have wrought nails, cut nails, and wire nails all used in the construction.

In 1791 Sam Briggs Sr. and his son, Sam Briggs, Jr., applied for the first U.S. patent for a cut nail machine. Wrought nails, however, still were the predominant nail form throughout the United States. This was particularly true on southern plantations where these materials were forged by slaves. By 1816 cut nails surpassed wrought nails both in production and purchase pushing wrought nails into specialty markets (Edwards and Wells 1993:16-17). Machine cut nails comprise the largest part of the Nance Farm metal assemblage (Figure 5.8). They were present from virtually every excavated test pit, unit, and shovel test placed around the site. It was observed that 108 cut nails were collected from Levels 1, 293 were from Levels 2, 110 from Levels 3, 51 were from Levels 4, 10 were from Levels 5, one from Level 6, and a single specimen from Level 7. These data are listed in Appendix 3. The remaining 20 cut nails were collected from an undetermined provenance (surface contexts or found in backfill).
Do note that the bulk of the cut nails (n=511) were located within the first three levels, with the majority of this number present in Levels 2. Although there is some historic and modern period admixture, the historic artifacts throughout Nance Farm can be found in greatest concentration in Level 2. As such, Level 2 can be interpreted as a transition zone likely dating to the post-1890 turn-of-the-century. This is especially visible when discussing historic nails near the smokehouse in Chapter 6.

By 1892 nearly 50 percent of manufactured nails were wire, and by 1900 the cut nail industry had declined dramatically. By the second decade of the twentieth century only eight percent of nails being made were cut nails (Edwards and Wells 1993:18). Wire nails (n=390) were represented at the Historic Nance Farm, and these were also fairly well dispersed throughout the site. Of these, 177 were from Levels 1, 144 were from Levels 2, 47 were from Levels 3, 11 were from Levels 4, seven were from Levels 5, and two were from Level 7. This overlap could also indicate that wire nails were becoming more commercially available and being used in increasing number. Also, two were from an undetermined provenance (see above). Unlike the cut nails, which were
observed in the first three levels clustering principally in Level 2, wire nails were located primarily in the upper two levels with a more or less even distribution within each of these 10 centimeter levels. This could also indicate a post-1890 transition in the types of nail forms being utilized at the site. The nationwide decline of the cut nail industry around the end of the nineteenth-century is observable in the stratigraphy at Nance Farm.

At Nance Farm there were more cut nails than wire nails collected. Also there is an overlap in excavation levels rather than artifacts being coterminous because of site disturbance. Cut nails extend deeper into the soil and are intermixed with wire nails with any reasonable amount beginning in Levels 2. This would indicate that at the site, Levels 2 could be observed as transitional with an assigned date of circa 1890. Although disturbed, Level 2 does not exhibit the degree of compromised site integrity as Level 1. It also appears that the intuitive sampling method was successful in locating areas of Nance Farm with some measure of stratigraphic integrity to allow for interpretation.

5.4.3. Other Metal

In addition to the above discussed architectural hardware, there were 36 artifacts associated with fence construction. Of this number, 11 were portions of barbed wire, six were fence staples, and 19 were fence wire that did not include the barb itself. Barbed wire was collected from TP5 (n=4), TP8 (n=5), XU3NE (n=1), and XU3SW (n=1) and appears to be somewhat evenly distributed throughout the levels. The fence staples were TP14 (n=2), TP16 (n=1), XU1SW (n=2), and XU3NE (n=1). These were only found in
the uppermost Levels 1 and 2. The remaining wire was located in TP8 (n=5), TP12 (n=2), TP15 (n=4), TP20 (n=2), TP24 (n=1), XU2EXT (n=1), XU3NE (n=3), and XU3SW (n=1). Not surprisingly, this wire resembled the barbed wire in vertical distribution.

Without post holes or molds, any inference on fence orientation remains as speculation. It is possible that these artifacts were indeed part of a fence, but it is also possible that the wire might have been reused as in the construction of temporary structures like chicken coops. The only excavated part of the site which yielded such a subsurface feature was XU3NE. The presence of this stain combined with barbed wire, fence wire, and fence staples indicates a possible fence or fence line enclosure like what would be used for penning sheep.

A total of 12 domestic metal container portions were retrieved during this data recovery effort. Bottle caps comprised 33.3% of these containers and were found in TP9 (n=1), TP23 (n=1), and XU3SW (n=2). All were located in Level 1 with the exception of a single bottle cap recovered from XU3SW that was identified in Level 2. Most of these 12 artifacts indicate little more than a twentieth century presence at this site. The most diagnostic of this grouping are two of the metal bottle caps. Both were collected from XU3SW and were part of soda pop bottles. Written on one of the caps (Level 1) was "7-UP THE UNCOLA," a slogan begun in 1967. The other (Level 2) displays "TWIST OFF DR. PEPPER," a logo used in the 1960s until at the latest 1977 when the slogan changed. From this it could be surmised that there was a component of this excavation unit that dates at least between 1960 and 1977, a comfortable range for any
renovations which might have been utilized prior to or during the Bicentennial American celebration discussed in the architectural history chapter. A single metal cap of undetermined origin was found in TP17 (8.3%), and only four pull tabs (33.3%) were noted (one each for TP22 and XU3NE, and two in ST7). All were recovered from Level 1 except for a single pull tab from XU3NE (Level 2). Tobacco cans were 25% percent of the metal vessels, and these were observed in XU3NE (n=2) and XU3SW (n=1).

TPs 5 and 6 contained nails that would have been employed in shoeing horses. A total of 8 were identified from TP5, and only 3 were found from TP6. All of these clustered in Level 2. One might have expected this number to have been higher on a farm site such as this, but this number is not distressingly low, given the level of soil tilling on the site as well as the mobile nature of roaming horses.

There were ten buttons which were classified as personal items. Seven of these fasteners were metal and were recovered from TPs 5, 13, 19, and ST7. Each contained one button, while TP21 yielded three metal buttons. Most were plain metal with no diagnostic features. The buttons recovered from TP13 and ST7 exhibited rear eye fasteners. The latter was covered in cloth while the former had no decoration. The metal of these buttons is much like that found on modern denim jeans and not particularly temporally diagnostic. Three of the buttons were manufactured from shell and were collected from TPs 6 and 18 as well as XU3NE. Shell buttons were manufactured post 1850 and continue to be manufactured today. The shell button from XU3NE has 4 holes with which to adhere to clothing and also dates to post 1850.
Ammunition casings were also recovered from subsurface contexts. These included a .22 caliber bullet (TP8) and a casing of unspecified caliber (TP13). Both were recovered from Levels 3. The casing is composed of plastic with a metal head and is therefore determined to be of modern origin.

5.5 Other Architectural Material Culture

A number of artifact classifications are better discussed in terms of their broad construction associations rather than independently as in the above mentioned artifact assemblages. These include asphalt, brick, concrete, fabric, mortar, paint, rock, slate, synthetic products, and tar. These categories can be further divided into materials used in the construction or decoration of domestic dwellings as well as for the building and maintenance of exterior spaces, like walkways or automotive parking areas. The following is a description of these divisions.

Of the 258 miscellaneous construction artifacts, the majority (n=220 or 85.3 %) were associated with the domestic structure. These artifacts included 149 brick samples, eight pieces of mortar, 44 pieces of paint, 11 rock/stone pieces (as in those associated with a detached kitchen hearth), three samples of roofing slate, and eight small pieces of roofing tar. These artifacts were fairly diffuse throughout the vertical sequence with no apparent clustering.

5.6 Identified Fauna

5.6.1 Overview

Prior to commencing any investigation of faunal based subsistence as it can be observed in the archaeological record, it is necessary to initially sort the archaeofauna
into two categories. The first category includes those specimens deposited by cultural means, such as refuse disposal. The other category is comprised of those remains that were deposited by natural forces (Klein and Cruz-Uribe 1984:3-4; Leyman 1994:7). It is important to differentiate between the two categories because bones of animals, such as rodents and other scavengers, can be deposited in the ground possibly skewing the faunal record and their burrows can sometimes be mistaken for features. This analysis included both categories, and it determined that both wild and domestic mammals were consumed at Nance Farm and deposited by human activity. Small intrusive animals also were noted in the assemblage, but these found their way into the archaeological record by natural means, like the aforementioned burrowing.

The bulk of faunal material was recovered from the northern portion of the property, and a large amount of this assemblage was located within the fire cracked rock/stone feature assumed to be the remnants of the out kitchen discussed in the Field Methods and Results section above. Analysis of faunal remains from Nance Farm was performed by Ms. Sherry Duffy, and the following discussion reflects her findings.

A total of 367 specimens were indeterminate, of which only seven measured greater than 40 millimeters in length, while 45 measured between 20 and 40 millimeter in size. The remaining 315 faunal remains were either less than 20 mm in length or too fragmented to gain an accurate assessment. Of this number, only 86 were recovered from excavation plots positioned within the southern half of the house. The rest were located to the north.
It was determined that the majority of identifiable bone (only 24.7 percent of the overall collection) primarily represented mammal specimens with two exceptions, which were classified as *Aves* sp. unspecified (Duffy 2002 manuscript on file at the University of Texas at Arlington). Identified mammal species included domestic pig (*Sus scrofa*), white tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), cottontail (*Sylvilagus floridanus*), opossum (*Didelphis marsupialis*), unidentified rabbit (presumably *Lepus* sp. unspecified), and an indeterminate rodent species.

As noted, excavation of the northern part of the property led to the recovery of more faunal specimens than its southern counterpart. Although XU 3 and TPs 3, 6, 7, 10-13, 17-19, 22, and ST7 all contained faunal remains, TPs 11, 13, 19, and 22 were especially productive. Excavation of TP11 revealed a rabbit femur, a deer metapodial, and pig ribs, femur, scapula, and astragulus. Particularly of note were the pig scapula, which exhibited signs of butchering, and the pig femur, which appeared to be that of a juvenile. Positioned contiguous to TP11, TP13 yielded a distal articular end of a rabbit femur, a nearly complete vertebra, and a fragmentary radius. The pig remains recovered included two epiphyses and portions of ribs and scapula(e). The analysis suggests that this scapula, like that located in TP11 to the east, might have been butchered. Neither scapula showed any puncture or hanging marks indicative of smoking. TP19 revealed a number of faunal remains, however, the majority of these were too fragmented to be diagnostic. Of the 108 specimens recovered from TP22, only four could be definitively identified. The remainder of faunal specimens were noted to have been less than 20 mm in length and nondiagnostic. Based upon the analysis, two of these bones were
butchered pig tibia shafts and two bones (a calcaneus and phalanx) belonged to an opossum, which may have been intrusive.

Although it is necessary to maintain some degree of caution given the overall disturbed condition of the site, the animals represented in this assemblage (except perhaps the opossum and the rodent) are believed to be indicative of food types consumed at the Nance Farm prior to the destruction of the out-kitchen. Although, since opossum was sometimes consumed by early Texas settlers, it cannot be ruled out as food source. Individuals on the frontier, especially in the years clustering around the Civil War, consumed more game animals than people do today. Perhaps because of this, Texans were in a better position to acquire meat products than were their neighbors as close as Louisiana and Mississippi, who, because of meat shortages due to the war, were “reduced to eating animals than a few years earlier would have been consider little better than vermin” (Varhola 1999:84).

One might have expected to excavate more deer specimens on a north Texas frontier site, but only two specimens were recovered. The analysis suggests, however, this could be due to sampling bias (Duffy 2002). If cow or sheep were being raised at this farm as is suspected, there is no evidence to indicate that these domestic animals were butchered or consumed on site. It could be that these livestock were more valuable as commodities from which other products (milk, wool, etc.) were derived.

5.7 Conclusions from Artifact Assemblage

The artifacts from Nance Farm are similar to other late nineteenth – century sites (particularly Site 41NV235 discussed in Chapter 3) in that the glass far outnumbers
ceramics in the assemblage. This indicates a preference for more disposable containers as can be observed at late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century sites. The amounts of cut nails and wire nails, and the fact that there is not a great disparity in number or distribution of these types indicates a transitional period in technology. A late nineteenth – century temporal affiliation also coincides with the architectural detailing which was made available via the railroad (discussed in Chapter 7). Although the subsurface integrity of the site is significantly compromised, the material culture from the site indicates such a temporal frame. Even disturbed sites reveal information about the earliest activities occurring on the property. If Nance Farm contained artifacts (creamware, rosehead nails, etc.) that would point to an earlier time frame, these should have been present in the assemblage, but they are not. Modern cultural material, such as metal bottle caps and pull tabs, were mostly identified in the first 10 cmbsd with a few located in Level 2. Subsurface excavations revealed that the bulk of modern material were found in the upper stratigraphic levels and there was still enough integrity to allow for interpretation.
CHAPTER 6
ARTIFACTS BY SPECIFIC SITE VICINITY

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter two areas of the site will be discussed in depth. These are the smokehouse vicinity positioned to the southwest of the core portion of the house, and the former location of the out kitchen to the immediate northwest of the structure’s core. In each of these areas focus will be principally on three artifact types: ceramic wares, glass shards, and metal hardware associated with these architectural features.

6.2 Smokehouse

6.2.1 Archaeological Investigations and Artifacts

The first of these areas to be investigated, the smokehouse region, exhibited the most intact historical deposits on site and will, therefore, yield the most information regarding late nineteenth-century occupation. Four test pits were placed in the vicinity of the smokehouse, located south/southwest of the Nance residence. These were positioned with the intention of recovering data which would allow for a better understanding of the methods employed for the “at home” production of smoked meats, the period of use of this structure, and the animals consumed. Pig scapulae exhibiting puncture marks from hanging hooks were especially anticipated, but hopes for finding these hooks or pig scapulae showing signs of suspension from such hardware were not realized. Indeed, artifacts recovered from the smokehouse test pits were similar to
artifacts dispersed throughout the rest of the site. Density appears to be the only difference. It appears that this region revealed more historic material than any other area of the site.

Three test pits were located to the northeast of the smokehouse and one was positioned behind it. These revealed glass, ceramics (more ceramic specimens were found here than anywhere else on the property), and some modern debris. The most common artifacts recovered, however, were cut and wire nails. For the purpose of this research the terms “historic” and “modern” will not be used while classifying these artifacts. Rather, “cut” and “wire” will be utilized. What follows is a discussion on the individual test pits positioned in the smokehouse vicinity.

TP1 was situated under a small shade tree approximately 3 meters northeast of the smokehouse. Significant root activity was present, but not so much that the 1 by 1 meter test excavation unit had to be terminated. The test pit was excavated in four ten-centimeter levels, from which artifacts were collected including ceramic sherds, botanical specimens, yarn/fabric, glass shards, and metal fragments. The ceramic sherds were primarily whiteware, but a single North American stoneware sherd was also found. Botanical specimens collected consisted of a nut and charcoal fragments, which were more than likely part of the natural environment. Both of these samples are typical of the organic material in this area and are considered of little interpretive importance. Two pieces of yarn, of the green shag carpet variety popular in the 1970s, was present in this test pit. They are thought to be part of the former interior carpeting of the main residential structure. A combination of glass derived from architectural and domestic
forms was observed. Colors represented were clear, green, aqua, and brown with over half of the glass shards exhibiting signs of patina. The metal artifacts are all construction related, and all were building hardware consisting primarily of cut nails (n=42) with wire nails (n=7) and nails whose form was nondiagnostic (n=8) making up the rest of the artifact type.

The largest concentration of artifacts of this smokehouse area occurs in TP8, which is the excavation unit situated closest to the smokehouse. In fact, if one were to move just one meter east from the structure to either TP1 or TP14, there is a marked decrease in overall artifact density. With a total of 129 artifacts, materials represented were ceramic, charcoal, glass, and metal. Only 17 ceramic sherds, 2 pieces of charcoal, and 26 glass shards were present in this excavation test pit. Three ceramic types were observed in this excavation unit and included whiteware, porcelain, and North American stoneware. All of the sherds are undecorated with the exception of a transfer printed porcelain ware whose motif is a pastoral scene depicting a barnlike structure. Mulberry was a surface treatment color that reached its popularity peak in the mid-nineteenth century. One of the North American stoneware sherds possesses the characteristic orange peel texture of salt glazes. The other was too badly burned to determine what the original glaze might have been. With the exception of 22 nondiagnostic iron fragments and one .22 caliber shell casing, the vast majority of metal artifacts in this test pit were metal objects used during construction or fencing. Cut nails (n=48) accounted for over half of this number, but wire nails (n=23) were also noted. Fencing metal was identified and included both the wire and the barbed portions of a
fence. Fencing hardware was found in Levels 2 and 3, and there appears to be no correlation with a particular nail form, as both cut and wire nails were found in all excavated levels.

The artifact assemblage of TP14 was composed of 87 artifacts constructed of materials such as brick, ceramic, bone, glass, metal, and plastic. Two pieces of brick were also noted, but it does not appear as if they were original to this structure. Functional vessels manufactured from ceramic (n=9), plastic (n=1), and glass (n=21) were collected. The glass shards were primarily clear (n=17) in color, but aqua (n=1) and brown (n=3) shards were also noted. TP14 also revealed 49 metal artifacts with 32 identified as cut nails, 8 being wire, and 2 reported nondiagnostic ferrous objects.

TP2 was positioned directly behind the structure with the majority of its area on a steep incline. Considering the location of the unit behind the smokehouse, it was hoped that the slope was indicative of artifact accumulation, perhaps the result of years of dumped refuse. Pecan shells and wild onions were the only ecofacts. As these were situated only in the first 10 – centimeter level, these were excluded in any interpretation. The test pit, however, was composed mainly of fill, but a few artifacts could be used in the construction of a site history. These included ceramic sherds (n=6), glass shards (n=11), and a single modern metal bolt.

Most of the artifacts recovered from this test pit were modern in appearance, with the questionable exception of one whiteware sherd decorated with a brown floral motif discussed below. In the upper levels, ceramics were restricted to modern tile with a faux marble appearance, a type that would be used for bathrooms or swimming pools.
The bathroom has been subject to renovation throughout the history of the property, but when one considers the location of the sherds behind the smokehouse, it is reasonable to suggest that the tile could have been from the first swimming pool constructed on the south side of the property. Level 3, however, produced one very small piece of brown transfer printed ware with what looked to be a floral motif. Although the ceramic displays a patterned design, the sherd is too small to be conclusively diagnostic. Its depositional association with later period artifacts also calls into question the date of this single sherd. TP2 was otherwise void of any ceramic tableware.

6.2.2 Analysis of Smokehouse

The number of wire nails relative to cut nails (See Figure 6.1, Table 6.1) suggests that the smokehouse was constructed at an early date during the use of the site, a time during which nail manufacturing technology allowed for the mass production of cut nails. The high frequency of cut nails also shows that these were most likely the nails used in the original manufacture of the smokehouse and that various forms of wire nails were used during repair work in subsequent years. One cannot completely rule out the possibility of compromised site integrity, but the diffuse nature of the wire nails throughout the vertical sequence could quite adequately be explained by the large amount of root disturbance in these three excavation pits. TPs 1, 8, and 14 were placed in an area of large root systems. The relative protection of these roots could quite possibly be the reason why more intact deposits were recovered here than anywhere else on the site. Although this seems counterintuitive, the presence of the tree and its close proximity to the historic smokehouse made this an unlikely location for modern
disturbance (which in turn protected the area). Ironically where the tree roots undoubtedly caused some stratigraphic disturbance, they also protected this area of the site from development activities such as bulldozing.

![Cut and Wire Nails Near the Smokehouse](image)

**Figure 6.1 Cut and Wire Nails from the Smokehouse Vicinity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Pit</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Wire</th>
<th>Nondiagnostic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>170</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.1 Cut and Wire Nails from Test Pits 1, 8, and 14**

The presence of multiple nail forms testifies to the continued utilization of the smokehouse through time. When this project began, a research hypothesis tested was that one would expect to find larger, sturdier nails in and near the outbuildings, places where aesthetics might not have been as important as in the main house. Observed nail lengths have an upward range of seven centimeters, but many were broken so that length could not be determined. Even the specimens with broken shafts, however,
average 2.5 centimeters, and original length was likely to be from four to five centimeters. Placed within the larger category of wire nails are nails used in flooring and finishing, as well as brads. A number of these slighter nails were observed in test pits and excavation units placed in the vicinities of the smokehouse, barn, chicken coop, sheep shed, and front fence line, areas which, if the hypothesis were true, should have revealed a considerable number of nails.

An example of such reuse can be observed in the cut nails versus wire nails scenario from TP1. In this test pit excavators found 42 cut nails, over half of which were recovered from Levels 2-4 of the excavation unit. The wire nails were much less common. The question necessarily arises, were the “aberrant” nails being taken from pieces of discarded wood, or were larger pieces of previously used wood (nails and all) being recycled. A pile of previously used wood located behind the barn exhibited both types of nails.

Cut nails were observed in all of the excavated levels of these three test pits, but the largest numbers occurred in Levels 2-4 (Table 6.2). Wire nails were present albeit in smaller numbers in the first four levels, but were mostly observed in the upper 20 cm bd (Table 6.3). Nondiagnostic nails were also recorded and were only observed in the first three levels (Table 6.4). The large number of cut nails relative to the wire nails (especially in the lower levels) indicates that cut nails were the predominant nail form utilized during construction, suggesting a pre-1890 construction date. Of particular note is the blending of cut and wire nails in Level 2. Still exhibiting a high level of cut nails relative to wire nails, this level (10 to 20 cm bsd) could be a transition zone, a period
after 1890 when wire nails were available, but there was still a preference for cut nails in architectural work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>TP1 Nails</th>
<th>TP8 Nails</th>
<th>TP14 Nails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 Cut Nails by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>TP1 Nails</th>
<th>TP8 Nails</th>
<th>TP14 Nails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3 Wire Nails by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>TP1 Nails</th>
<th>TP8 Nails</th>
<th>TP14 Nails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4 Nondiagnostic Nails by Level

Excavations in TP1 revealed twelve sherds, with mostly whiteware and stoneware represented. Whiteware has an East Coast range of 1820-1900, but with an adjusted date for Louisiana and East Texas yielding a terminus post quem of 1860.
(Lamb et al. 1983; South 1977). It is likely that Nance Farm would produce dates roughly contemporaneous with those of its immediate eastern neighbors.

It has already been noted that TP8 revealed the most artifacts from this test pit cluster. Containing the greatest overall artifact concentration, TP 8 contained undecorated whiteware (Figure 6.2), porcelain body sherds (Figure 6.3), and stoneware (one showing signs of fire warping). Another sherd, only slightly larger, has a purple transfer print of a pastoral scene, though it is also too small to note the particulars. Transfer printed wares are observed in the archaeological record as early as 1751 on the East Coast to the present, but as stated earlier purple or mulberry colors were manufactured in America during the mid nineteenth-century (Lamb et al. 1983; Miller 1991:9; South 1977; Sussman 1979:10). This would have a later date for the Texas frontier.

![Figure 6.2 Sample of Undecorated Whiteware](image)
Accounting for time lag, manufacturing, normal life, heirlooming, recycling, and disposal, it would seem likely that the smokehouse could have been built in the mid-nineteenth century, but all that can be stated with any certainty is that there were some repairs performed after the late 1890s when wire nails became commercially available. This perhaps coincides with the movement of the core dwelling around the turn of the century.

6.3 Out-kitchen

6.3.1. Overview

Excavation on the northwest portion of the house revealed a large feature of fire-cracked rock believed to be the remains of the out-kitchen, a structure that was razed in order to suit changing tastes dictated by technological advances. The location of the former out-kitchen was revealed through the excavation of Feature 3 contained within TPs 11, 13, 18, and 19. Fire-cracked rock (not collected) and some associated artifacts were present within this feature. Some artifacts dating to the mid-twentieth century were present, including a spent tube of antenna lubricant, but could be explained as part of the destruction episode or the construction of the new kitchen addition.
TPs 11, 13, 18, and 19 were excavated in order to uncover much of the fire-cracked rock feature. In this area of the former out-kitchen a total of 209 artifacts were recovered (Table 6.5). Of these, 164 were composed of metal. The majority of the specimens were metal artifacts and included 115 cut nails and 26 wire nails. The remaining artifacts were either nondiagnostic or dated to the mid-twentieth century or later. These artifacts were fairly well dispersed throughout the sequence, but the large number of identifiable cut nails compared to wire nails suggests that this former structure was erected prior to 1890.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5 Artifacts Recovered from the Out-kitchen Vicinity

Ceramic artifacts in this area are ironstone, North American stoneware, porcelain, and whiteware. These were all identified in the second and third stratigraphic levels. Only eight pieces of wood were located amongst the fire-cracked rock and were also noticed between 10 and 30 cmbsd. The window glass was present only in the second and third levels as well. Unfortunately, there are wire antenna lubricant, modern ammunition casings, and various industrial machinery accoutrements in the same levels as the historic artifacts. It is possible that this modern refuse made its way into the archaeological record during the demolition of the out-kitchen or the addition of the
new kitchen. Fortunately, however, there were also faunal remains which aided in the interpretation of the out-kitchen. Whereas the smokehouse area of the property provided a more detailed look at late nineteenth-century artifacts, the northern half of the site was more significantly disrupted.

6.4 Conclusions

Although some artifacts predate 1890, the majority date to the turn of the century or later. The post-railroad era seems to be a time of great change at Nance Farm, and it was probably at this time that the house was moved. In addition to the previously discussed treeline underneath the main structure, the relative lack of artifacts that date to the mid- to late-nineteenth century suggests that this house was not original to this location. It is true that there has been much activity to disrupt the subsurface landscape on the property, but such disruption is not selective about the artifact types it would affect. If the construction of swimming pools, parking lots, and structural additions were to eliminate artifacts from a site it would not have done away only with those that predate 1890; artifacts of all periods would have been lost. The fact that there are artifacts that cluster around 1890 (and very few that occur prior to that date) suggests that occupation of this site did not begin in earnest until after this date. This supports the idea that the house was not rotated, but moved from one location to where it presently sits.
CHAPTER 7
ARCHITECTURAL ANALYSIS

7.1 Introduction

To understand a historic archaeological site properly, one must study the entirety of the available resources. Not to be overlooked is the architecture of a site, whether it consists of above-ground structures or subsurface remains. Folk Historian Henry Glassie states that just as history can be segmented into meaningful temporal units, architectural components also have interpretive value (Glassie 1999:231). Structures are best understood if components are broken down into basic parts (pens, fenestration, etc.). If a structure is in constant use, these parts can also chronicle the structure through time. The architecture at Nance Farm can be used to gain a fuller understanding of the property’s history.

It is not uncommon for historic archaeological sites to contain aboveground structures, and these buildings should be analyzed as carefully as subsurface artifacts. It is as Fred B. Kniffen states “…housing is surely the most obvious feature of man’s occupation on earth” (Kniffen 1990:36). Glassie has stated that studying a structure can be likened to studying a book with the subsequent findings leading to “a more human study” (Glassie 1999:231; Orser et al. 1995:153). Through observation of architecture it is possible to deduce information related to “refinement of house typing, detection of evolution of form through time, diffusion in space, relation to site, meaningful
individual variation, mixing, coordination with social distinction, [and] psychological factors in individual and group preferences” (Kniffen 1990:37).

I agree with Charles Orser, Jr. and Brian Fagan (1995:153-154) that for the majority of historical archaeology research projects completed by American universities and colleges, it is not always feasible (with respect to time and money) to complete studies according to the highly detailed Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) standards. This is not to say that field records made by archaeologists are inadequate, rather that such information is less precise than what the HABS studies for National Historic Preservation Projects calls for. This was the case at Nance Farm.

At Nance Farm that aspect of the material culture which is most telling of the history of the site is the extant architecture within the confines of the property. This chapter will focus on the buildings, both the core residence and the outbuildings (consisting of the smokehouse and the barn). As previously discussed, subsurface testing revealed that the property had been drastically altered in the recent past. The surface of the property also has been extensively renovated, but, fortunately, vestiges of nineteenth-century occupation are still observable in the existing edifices, rendering the dwelling at Nance Farm a sort of three-dimensional palimpsest.

In this chapter, the architectural analysis of Nance Farm benefits not only from the data gathered during the field school session and photographs taken from that season, but also from information obtained from the Texas Historical Commission regarding the architectural forms and styles recorded during the 1976 Bicentennial celebration of the
It should be noted that one aspect of this thesis is an exercise in comparing the artifacts to the historical record. Architectural features figured prominently in the analysis of Nance Farm and as indicators of change in the project vicinity. Where possible, the analysis of the architecture was based upon data gathered by the researcher or other individuals affiliated with the archaeological project. When field notes were unclear or incomplete, photographs were consulted. It was determined, however, that information about the interior foundation and interior construction hardware was lacking. It was at times such as this that information acquired from the Texas Historical Commission was consulted. In this chapter, architectural data specific to Nance Farm should be assumed to have derived from the fieldwork of 2002. Information obtained from the Texas Historical Commission is cited as such. Architectural analyses regarding the changing shapes and styles of the Nance Farm structures are those of this author.

7.2 Vernacular Architecture

Prior to a discussion of the architectural analysis, background information of vernacular architecture must be reviewed. According to Dell Upton the term “vernacular architecture” was one first used in the late nineteenth-century by scholars of architectural forms attempting to conduct architectural data collection of pre-industrial, rural, and traditional structures (Upton 1998:262; see also Isham and Brown 1895, 1900). Upton further states that vernacular forms, primarily residential in nature, were “apparently the houses of yeoman farmers and… seemed not to have been ‘consciously’
designed or affected by the intellectual and artistic currents of the Renaissance” (Upton 1998:262). This category was later expanded to include other (and more patterned as well as standardized) architectural forms such as commercial buildings and middle-class residential dwellings.

James Deetz describes vernacular architecture as “folk building, done without the benefit of formal plans” (1978:93). This same concept is described by McAlester and McAlester as folk architecture, “designed without a conscious attempt to mimic current fashion” (McAlester and McAlester 1990:5). Every individual carries with him/her a certain mental template or design which is a composite of various observed forms (for more see Deetz 1978 and 1997; Orser, Jr, and Fagan 1995:190-194). The term mental template is often used by scholars when tracking the diffusion of artifacts. For example, an individual, as a child or apprentice, learns by observance or formal training a method of producing a given item. The individual relocates but takes this blueprint, or mental template, with him/her to the new location, inadvertently exposing a new set of individuals to this knowledge. This ensures the continuance of the manufacturing tradition, although it can be altered by the incorporation of the ideas and techniques of the new locale.

Many vernacular styles are similar in design and diffuse throughout wide regions of the country due to mobile populations during the nation’s expansive history. For example, Glassie (1999:291) notes that one can observe a similarity in the design and layout of southern Midwestern farms. Typically these farmhouses are painted a glossy white with modest ornamentation on the porch façade. Also the outbuildings
consist of a painted red barn (sometimes weathered gray) with other, smaller buildings such as a corn crib and poultry/swine houses. Of course, builders often were restricted to create certain forms because of the availability of raw materials (see below).

Upton criticizes the current use of this descriptor as a sort of object oriented umbrella term. Indiscriminate use of the phrase “vernacular architecture” has led to the use of the term as a catch-all of architectural styles that are not obviously part of a specific architectural movement associated with the upper-class or avant-garde (Upton 1998:263). Upton goes on to assert that the term “vernacular architecture” has perhaps outgrown its usefulness. The term should return to being a procedural endeavor rather than a collection of categories imposed upon the built environment (Upton 1998:264), in other words, “vernacular architecture” needs to revert to its original form. To support this notion he looks to previous scholars, including Isham and Brown, Lyon, Mercer, and Nutting, who most embodied Upton’s vision for this subdiscipline of architectural study (Upton 1998: 265-267; see also Dulaney 1968; Isham and Brown 1895, 1900).

Numerous architectural scholars and historians utilize the object-oriented approach, asking such necessary questions as what are the measurements of the walls, the angle of the roof slope, the date of construction, etc. Upton asserts that this particular aspect of vernacular architectural studies will be needed so long as architectural analyses are being conducted (1998:277). Observation of vernacular architecture, however, can involve not only the placement of the chimney or various outbuildings; they can also comprise the anthropology of space. Information regarding social structure is observable within the physical structures. It is just a matter of asking
appropriate questions. Questions can include: what needs could have been met by the addition of rooms, stories, or wings? what is the social purpose of a given structure’s size? how are changes in these social purposes manifest in a building’s physical make-up? what of the size of individual rooms (comparison of bedrooms or sitting areas)? of outbuildings? what areas of the property are enclosed/fenced and why? which portions are blocked for agricultural/husbandry purposes and which are indicative of other restricted-access reasons? By asking these questions a more nuanced picture of the residents of a given property can become available.

7.3 Nance Farm

7.3.1 Core Dwelling

Likely initially begun as a single-pen, one-story log cabin, the earliest building on site was a small rectangular unit. McAlester and McAlester (1990:84) suggest that these types of buildings functioned primarily as sleeping quarters. The structure met the basic shelter needs until something less meager could be constructed. Because of this, it is unlikely that this simple dwelling was embellished through decorative elements such as full façade porches or framed additions. Due to the costs associated with horse and wagon transport in areas far from navigable waterways, such ornamentation was not always feasible on one unit folk structures.
One can use contemporary reports to get an idea of the nature and cost of early frontier structures. As Holland discusses in her personal narrative, many houses were quickly erected (by hands untrained in carpentry) in order to expeditiously provide shelter to other family members. She described a relative’s home as containing a single room lean-to that would have cost little more than $80 to construct, with an additional $40 for the rock chimney (Hatcher 1933:6)

Although the core structure has been the subject of extensive exterior modification, single-pen structures like the original dwelling are still present among the extant outbuildings on the property. The barn and the curing shed have much the same appearance, albeit smaller, of a single-pen nineteenth-century dwelling. The petition narrative submitted to and validated by the Texas Historical Commission indicates that within the barn, cedar studs affixed to adjacent members via a mortise-and-tenon seam and are joined by wooden pegs (Murphy et al. 1976:3). The architectural structure discussed in Murphy et al. (1976) would indicate a relatively early construction date. Murphy et al. (1976) suggest a date of ca. 1850 for this outbuilding. I further suggest that a date range of 1850-1890 can be assigned. Large quantities of iron construction hardware were not available until the railroad era, and once such items were in ready
supply, these materials would most likely be used on the core dwellings before they were used on the outbuildings. After 1890, the cheaper wire nails (compared to the heavier cut nails) would more than likely have become the construction hardware of choice. The artifacts recovered from Nance Farm indicate a fairly even distribution of cut and wire nails. Structures on the property, particularly the outbuildings, show a combination of these two nail forms, suggesting that the later wire nails were used in repair work after 1890.

Single-pen, one-story and, occasionally, two-story homes enjoyed popularity from the earliest colonial period in North America, but as frontier families became more settled, the need for additional space became paramount in the construction of these homes. McAlester and McAlester note the difficulties involved in expanding such an architectural form. They state “the strength of the structure depends on the four corner joints,” and in order to maintain the stability of the overall structure expansion was achieved by having additional units attached to these single-pen frames to create multiple-pen homes (McAlester and McAlester: 1990: 84-85).

The emergent multi-pen structure of the Nance Farm was in the dogtrot style, in which two single pens were separated by an open breezeway (Glassie 1999:336; Jordan 1967; Jordan 2003:20; Kniffen 1990:42; McAlester and McAlester: 1990:75-85) (Figure 7.2). It is possible that at Nance Farm, where the one-pen building evolved into a dogtrot, the adaptive nature of the dogtrot not only provided shelter for a larger family, but the open air space also could serve as storage areas for agricultural equipment, meeting or waiting areas, or places to escape the afternoon heat (for both the
human and nonhuman occupants of the farmstead). As Glassie (1990:336) aptly describes, it is a good form for hot weather because it “sucks the exterior into the interior.”

Figure 7.2 Dogtrot Structure from Hale County, Alabama (McAlester and McAlester 1990:84)

In strict terms the dogtrot is considered to have emerged during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The structural form is observed to be two pens joined together by an open breezeway and comprised of one, one and a half, or two stories. Often end chimneys are present. In the case of Nance Farm, only one chimney was identified, and it was an exterior chimney on the north face of the structure. Occasionally the breezeway of a dogtrot was enclosed in later years, making it hard to distinguish from hall and parlor or central passage/center hall forms when viewed from the exterior. For example, the hall and parlor is typically viewed as a two-unit structure separated by a passageway. The difference between the dogtrot and hall and parlor forms is the size of the rooms. Where a dogtrot (enclosed or otherwise) has two rooms of more or less equal size, the hall and parlor exhibits two rooms of varying size (a bedroom and sitting room, for instance). If a dogtrot is enclosed, distinguishing it from a hall and parlor can be problematic if viewing the structure only from the outside.
There is some debate as to the diffusionist path by which these dogtrot structures arrived in north Texas. Kniffen states that there is no clear indication of how the dogtrot reached the south (Kniffen 1990:42), but some scholars disagree. It has been suggested (Jordan 1980:154-180; Jordan 1989:71-83; Jordan and Kaups 1987) that colonists of Savo-Karelian (Swedish-Finnish) origin possessed the mental template resulting in the creation of simple yet adaptive dogtrot homes. Although Jordan and Kaups (1987, see also Jordan 1980:154-180 and Jordan 1989:71-83) do not discount the similarities and parallels between the two-pen dogtrots of the North American frontier and of those buildings erected by the Scottish, Irish, and English colonists of the Chesapeake and the Mid-Atlantic Tidewater regions, the authors maintain that those dogtrots of the Midland tradition (as observed in north Texas) are more like those found in New Sweden (those portions of Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania along the Delaware River). They state “the context of the Savo-Karelian open-passage double-pen structure was virtually identical to that of the Midland American dogtrot” (Jordan and Kaups 1987:70). This architectural tradition expanded westward along with the Savo-Karelian settlers.

Another thought regarding the evolution of the dogtrot from a single-pen structure to its simple multi-pen form is that this architectural type emerged on the frontier as a result of independent invention based upon raw materials and tool supplies. Wright (1958) finds that once the former single-room building was erected, “the corner-timbering of a log single-pen resisted the lengthwise addition of logs” (Wright 1958:109). Expansion of such an arrangement meant the construction of additional pens which are connected by a single roof. Thus was created the dogtrot.
As noted above, the single-pen frame limited expansion, but the dogtrot was less restrictive and could allow more surface area atop which an additional story could be placed. This excess space was utilized to accommodate larger families, but structural expansion might also be indicative of increased affluence of property owners. Comments made by nineteenth-century travelers and settlers in Texas regarding dogtrot homes ranged from “houses of ‘vain’ people” to “the better sort” of log dwellings” (Jordan and Kaups 1987:66).

It has been observed that early attempts to utilize and navigate the Trinity River effectively proved less than fruitful, but some Dallas-area businessmen acquired rail service from two groups, the Houston and Texas Central (1872) and the Texas and Pacific (1873). This resulted in “making Dallas one of the first rail crossroads in Texas” (Handbook of Texas Online 1997-2002). With the burgeoning railroad system, mid- to late-nineteenth century diffusion of aesthetic styles and functional forms arrived in the project region. Materials were now brought to areas that were situated away from major rivers and were, therefore, previously restricted to local raw materials in building construction. The fact that the walls of the core structure are constructed of local cedar leads one to infer that there was no lack of local woods to be employed in building, but the railroad now allowed for other construction materials to be acquired at affordable prices. Construction hardware, principally nails, could now be purchased at lower prices.

Furthermore, as ideas spread throughout the country’s interior via rail travel (especially between the years 1850 and 1890), these designs largely altered construction
templates. Where the pre-railroad region had to work within the functional restrictions of local materials (although, as stated, this was less of a problem in the north Texas region than in other areas) the post-railroad styles included cosmetic embellishment on building façades.

At post-railroad era Nance Farm, the core dwelling was later expanded to include a second story. With the Houston and Texas Central and the Texas and Pacific Railroads supplying materials and ideas, it is not surprising that the resultant appearance of the Nance Farm main house would look like a number of other National architectural forms now seen throughout the country’s interior. It was likely during this period that the Nance house took the shape of a two-story I-house, two rooms tall, two rooms wide and one room deep. The dogtrot was an earlier form constructed out of material necessity. The I-house, however, is the later two-story form borne from the spread of ideas via the steam engine when the form “became distributed beyond its area of traditional dominance” (McAlester and McAlester 1990:90). Examples of the I-house form can be observed from North and South Carolina westward.

After the construction of the second story, Victorian gingerbread accents were added to the exterior posts of both the upper and lower porches. The symmetrical shape of the core building, the spindlework trim on the porch, and the brackets under the eaves indicate a Folk Victorian style (1870-ca. 1910) (Figures 7.3 and 7.4). Folk Victorian style structures are similar to the Queen Anne Victorian buildings but tend to be less ornate and not as expensive to construct as the latter architectural style. The
carpenter design of the Folk Victorian style could be expected of a relatively affluent family in a rural north Texas setting.

It was around this time that specialized carpentry tools allowing for the large-scale production of this spindlework appeared. As a result, folk houses throughout the country began to be accented by these mass-produced façade supplements now readily available via rail travel. This notion could be restated as “old forms were gussied up with flashy ornaments” (Glassie 1999:280). According to McAlester and McAlester (1990:310), the Folk Victorian style was replaced by Craftsman, Colonial Revival, and other forms after approximately 1910. Therefore the Victorian accents of the Nance Farm structure predate the first decade of the twentieth century.

7.3.2 The Barn

As discussed previously, the barn is thought to be one of, if not the, oldest historic standing structures in north Texas (see Figure 7.5). It is a large painted red form whose appearance is much like that of frame structures known throughout the country. The Nance Farm petition narrative (for inclusion to the list of Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks maintained by the Texas Historical Commission) indicates that within the
barn, cedar studs are affixed to adjacent members via a mortise and tenon seam and are joined by wooden pegs (Murphy et al. 1976:3). The architectural structure discussed in Murphy et al. (1976) would indicate a relatively early construction date (ca. 1850) for the barn. These architectural features indicate that metal construction hardware was not easily accessible, at least not in such numbers that these items would have been utilized in the construction or maintenance of an outbuilding. It is likely then that this barn was constructed prior to the 1872 arrival of the railroad to the region, and this thesis is in harmony with the findings of Murphy et al. 1976.

Figure 7.5 Nance Farm Barn

7.3.3 The Chicken Coop

Chicken houses were one of the most common outbuilding forms on plantations and farmlands of the Upland South principally because of the dependence on the chicken as a source of meat and eggs for both personal consumption and trade. Unfortunately these were also among the least durable structures on a farmstead. These structures were of make shift construction which did not follow strict architectural guidelines; rather, these were typically manufactured from metal scraps, recycled wood,
and other friable materials left over from previous building activities. These structures “defy architectural classification” (Cabak and Inkrot 1997: 118) and are “small, non-descript buildings often converted from an earlier, and quite different, use” (Cabak and Inkrot 1997: 118; Noble and Cleek 1995:136).

The intuitive placement of a 2 x 2 meter excavation unit in the vicinity of the chicken coop at Nance Farm was based upon ethnohistoric data gathered from an O.B. Nance descendant, as well as upon information obtained from the current landowner. Because of the fragile and oftentimes haphazard construction of chicken coops, it is not surprising that no post holes, which would have allowed for the recording of this structure’s dimensions, were identified.

7.3.4 Detached Kitchen

It was common for families of the nineteenth century (and before) to construct detached kitchens. Photographs of the house show that the present kitchen, although connected, stands apart from the house as if it was supplementary to the adjacent building and indeed it is (Figure 7.6). Kitchens were removed from principal structures in an effort to decrease the risk of fire, the unpleasantness of cooking odors, or the discomfort caused by heat, but one interesting opinion on the placement of detached kitchens is that they can be used as social indicators (Vlach 1993). Vlach (1993) suggests that the removal of the kitchen from the primary residence serves to illustrate and further reinforce the dichotomy and social and economic differences between “slaves and slaveholders or the server and served” (Cabak and Inkrot 1997: 125). Although this is an interesting theory, one wonders if the functional explanations (heat,
fire hazard, etc.) were not the original reasons for detached kitchens and that social placement was secondary. Excavations at Nance Farm did not reveal any artifacts that specifically suggest a slave or domestic servant presence.

One could also question why households without slaves or servants also would make use of detached kitchens. Although the discomfort caused by meal preparation, especially in the summer months, necessitated a kitchen positioned away from the core dwelling, it more than likely reinforced the social separation of groups in those areas where such a division already existed. It is possible that gender roles were reinforced through the architecture. Questions to ask of these frontier properties may include whether women were more associated with the out-kitchen while the men were more associated with the smokehouse. Artifacts that may be used as gender identifiers, however, are uniform in their gender neutrality throughout Nance Farm. It is, therefore, not possible to view gender-specific vicinities at Nance Farm.

![Figure 7.6 Nance Farm Kitchen in 1976 (Texas Historical Commission 1976)](image)

Figure 7.6 Nance Farm Kitchen in 1976 (Texas Historical Commission 1976)
7.35 Smokehouse

Similar to many smokehouses of the period, the one at Nance Farm is a simple one-story front-gabled structure (Figure 7.7). The structure has been painted red to match the barn as opposed to white in the image from 1976. A combination of both cut and wire nails indicate a construction date prior to 1890 with subsequent maintenance occurring after 1890. As mentioned above, after 1890, wire nails were cheaper than the heavier cut nails and would have been used when repairing structures built prior to 1890.

Figure 7.7 Nance Farm Smokehouse (Texas Historical Commission 1976)

7.3.6 The Water Tower and Connecting Addition

The water tower (see Figures 7.8 and 7.9) was also once separated from the house, but is now connected by a long and relatively recent addition. A photograph taken in 1976 shows the corrugated metal collection tank in a state of disrepair. Another photograph taken in 2002 shows that this reservoir is altogether absent. During investigation of the interior of the property, examination of the water tower’s internal structure led to the determination (based on the cut nails and posts) that this is the site of
a pre-1890 water tower. This water presumably was used by the occupants of the farmstead for a variety of purposes.

![Figure 7.8 Water Tower in 1976](Texas Historical Commission 1976)

The addition connecting the main structure to the water tower appears to be more recent. Yet it is still present pre-1976, as it is depicted in the narrative to the Texas Historical Commission. Although today this portion of the house has been renovated so as to better blend with aesthetic of the original core structure, the Nance Farm petition narrative describes the geometrical, nearly square, fishscale pattern of the walls and the

![Figure 7.9 Water Tower in 2002]
large fixed windows. This photograph also shows that even the paint differs from the rest of the starkly white painted structure.

7.3.7 Windmill

According to the Handbook of Texas Online, electricity arrived in Dallas vicinity around 1882, and it is possible that the windmill currently on the property might have been constructed after this date. Although windmills are known throughout the Texas region for maintaining a supply of potable water, the distance from the cistern would render this windmill (if it is indeed in its original location) ineffective. There also is a creek and well positioned adjacent to the house, which would allow for the acquisition of fresh water. As such, it is more likely that the windmill was used to generate electricity, suggesting a *terminus post quem* of 1882 for its construction.

7.4 Summary and Conclusions

Founded in the mid-nineteenth century, Nance Farm has been continuously occupied and has been extensively altered over time. Today the core building is a two-story, three-unit, side-gabled building with an exterior chimney located at the northernmost unit of the building. Moving around the side of the building one notices a long one-story addition connecting the core area and carriage house to a water tower. The roof is of moderate slope on both the two-story portion as well as the addition, while the roof of the water tower slopes more steeply.

Since such an addition is uncommon in nineteenth-century homes, I have concluded that this portion of the dwelling was created in the twentieth century. As nineteenth-century kitchens were for the most part detached, this addition would have
been erected after the out-kitchen was destroyed. Further suggestive of a later date for the building’s addition is the fact that the two-story former dogtrot portion of the structure is on piers while the addition is not. In addition, the treeline that was removed also indicates that this building was not merely rotated but moved entirely. We learn from David Carey Nance’s biography that his Uncle Otway’s ox team and hands could be employed for moving structures. D. Nance states that “Father pried up a little house and put wheels under it, and borrowed Uncle Otwa’s (sic) ox team and hands. Then they hitched twenty oxen to the house in two teams and hauled it across the branch…” (Galloway 1991:3).

According to a newspaper article from “Today” Midlothian, Texas dated January 19, 1995, Jeff and Laura Robnett, the third family to live on the property, enlarged the structure from 2,700 square feet of usable interior space to 3,900 square feet. This included a 1,000 square foot expansion of office space and 200 feet of hallway. Photographs from the 1976 petition narrative show that the addition was present, but must have later been expanded by the Robnetts prior to the publication of the 1995 news article.

The Texas State Historical Marker says that this house once faced north, but, at the turn of the century, it was rotated to face east. This differs from a contemporary account which states that all early cabins faced south: “The dwelling house faced due south, all the houses did, and, where clocks were lacking, one could open the front door and watch the shadow creep across the floor, and when it was due level with the side walls, it was twelve o’clock, at which time dinner was everywhere eaten” (Hatcher
1933:43-44). The archaeological evidence suggests that the Nance structure was not just rotated, however, but altogether displaced from a previous location about 1900.
CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

Historical archaeologists are privileged to have at their disposal a variety of data sets with which to aid in analyses and assessments of cultural resources. The conjunctive approach stresses the utilization of these sources in order to more fully understand an archaeological site. Historic documents and archival sources can help put into context the information obtained from subsurface testing, while the artifacts and ethnohistoric sources allow for a more human picture to emerge. The analysis of architectural features is an important component in historical archaeology as well. The conjunctive approach allows the researcher to use various sources (historical documents, personal accounts, architectural history, ethnohistoric data, etc.) to create a model of landscape use by the early settlers and to test this model using archaeology.

The most overlooked information sources, however, are the internalized ideas and pictures that each of us carries into the field regarding historic farm landscapes. Historic farms typically have similar layouts. This layout almost always consists of a main dwelling with detached auxiliary structures. Other features typically found at historic farms include enclosures for livestock, and in some cases, special quarters for servants or slaves. In our culture, many individuals have first-hand knowledge of rural farms, while others have such images taught to them through stories or television. As historical archaeologists, we carry this information with us into the field. It is to our
benefit to acknowledge that, understand that we cannot completely escape our biases, and use this information to our advantage.

The historic sources state that the Nance Farm was erected in the mid-nineteenth century and the core structure was rotated to face east. The historic and archaeological evidence suggest that the residential structure was built during this period, but beyond this, the archaeological and historical data conflict. The artifacts, particularly the nails, cluster around the turn of the century. The railroad and company store made items accessible to residents during this time and the Nances seem to have taken advantage of these newly available resources. Very few recovered artifacts at Nance Farm predate 1880. If the site were occupied prior to this date, artifacts representative of the pre-railroad era should still have been present despite the degree of subsurface disturbance. Although the site was highly disturbed, excavation data and artifact analysis does suggest a clustering of historic artifacts in Levels 2 and 3, with some intact contexts in the lower levels as well. It is unlikely that all of the pre-1890 artifacts (were there any) were lost to development, but those post-1890 artifacts survived albeit mixed with later periods.

Throughout the site, Level 2 shows an admixture of artifacts that date around 1890 with artifacts of the modern period. The artifacts dating to the turn of the century, however, outnumber the artifacts of later years. The archaeology suggests that the bulk of activity, and probably the beginning of occupation at the site, occurred around the turn of the century. This is particularly visible in the smokehouse vicinity where proximity to the auxiliary structure as well as trees allowed for its protection during
times of development, thus preserving the stratigraphic deposits. Level 2 is interpreted as a transition zone in which we can view the trend from frontier period material culture to that of post-railroad consumerism. The architecture of the main structure corroborates a turn-of-the-century date of occupation. The alteration of the house as a Folk Victorian structure would have taken place between the years 1870 and 1910 when such façade ornamentation would have been available.

The archaeological investigations suggest that the house was likely moved altogether and not simply rotated. This conclusion is supported by the knowledge that Otway Bird Nance possessed the skill and resources to move structures. If he could be enlisted to help his brother move a structure “across the branch at the crossing near the field gate in the pasture west and around to the top of the hill between the branches which till then had always been a wilderness with high grass and buffalo trails” (Galloway 1991:3), he could certainly move his own house. The investigations under the house support the suggestion that the house was moved. Rows of tree stumps under the main structure suggest that these trees were cut down prior to placing the house in this new location rather than just turning the structure to face a new direction. As Historic Nance Farm is now surrounded by a housing subdivision, it is not likely that the original 1851 location of the Nance house will be located.

Personal accounts and informant interviews can prove to be very useful when creating a research design for historic sites, especially in situations where intuitive placement will be used. For example, the area of the sheep pen at Nance Farm was disclosed by a former resident of the farm. Excavations in this area uncovered a
posthole which, presumably was related to the feature. Although no other evidence of a livestock enclosure was uncovered in this area, and admittedly, a single posthole is not necessarily clear evidence of a sheep pen, the archaeological data combined with the personal account does provide a better understanding of the landscape.

The research strategy at Nance Farm utilized intuitively placed excavation units, test pits, and shovel tests based upon our preconceived ideas of rural agricultural landscapes. Our histories provided the blueprint by which we performed subsurface testing behind the smokehouse, near the barn, the out-kitchen, and suspected sheep enclosure. If there were not extant structures on the site to guide our placement of excavation units, a research strategy utilizing a random sampling method may have proved useful. There were structures, though, and we did utilize them for intuitive unit placement. The research strategy used unfortunately did not facilitate the independent testing of the historic record by the archaeology. Instead, the historic record, informant information, and architectural features were used as a model of the use of space at the site, which we tested through archaeological investigations.

Problems concerning the preservation of cultural resources became a focus during excavations and while conducting research for this thesis. One could spend quite some time bemoaning the lack of stratigraphic integrity at Nance Farm, and would be quite justified in doing so. What should be taken into account, though, is that without the interest of a few parties even the architectural history might have been lost. The core dwelling could easily have been destroyed and a newer, more contemporary structure erected. The property could have fallen into disrepair as have so many of its
contemporaries in north Texas. That is what makes this property significant. It is one of the last surviving structures whose story can still be read through its architecture. Without stewardship, it too could have been lost. Restoration efforts while the structure was under private ownership and subsequent nomination of Nance Farm as a Recorded Texas Historical Landmark in 1976 has encouraged the maintenance of the above-ground structures. Development is occurring with increasing rapidity, and available funds for the study of cultural resources are decreasing at a distressing rate. We desperately need innovative means of stewardship to preserve our cultural history. If these sites are lost, then we will be left with only historical sources and our cultural images, which will eventually fade from our memories without the preservation of the sites themselves.
APPENDIX A

COPY OF RECORDED TEXAS LANDMARK MARKER TEXT
NANCE FARM
OTWAY RIRD NANCE (1808-1874) BROUGHT HIS FAMILY HERE FROM KENTUCKY IN 1851 AND BOUGHT THIS LAND THROUGH THE PETERS COLONY IN 1856. BEGUN IN THE 1850s, THIS RESIDENCE WAS LATER ENLARGED AND VICTORIAN DETAILING ADDED. IT ORIGINALLY FACED NORTH BUT WAS ROTATED IN THE EARLY 1900s TO FACE EAST. NEAR THE FARMHOUSE, A BARN, CURING SHED, AND AN ELEVATED WATER TANK HAVE BEEN PRESERVED. THE NANCE FAMILY OWNED THIS SITE UNTIL 1931. IT WAS PURCHASED BY THE CITY OF DESOTO IN 1975.

RECORDED TEXAS HISTORIC LANDMARK - 1975

1/2 inch lettering
3/8 inch lettering
1/4 inch lettering
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8-23-76
APPENDIX B

APPLICATION FOR TEXAS LANDMARK STATUS
APPLICATION FORM FOR OFFICIAL TEXAS HISTORICAL MARKER
(Revised 1979)
TEXAS HISTORICAL COMMISSION
P. O. Box 12276, Austin, Texas 78711

Dallas

1. Name of marker

2. City or name of city

3. Marker site (street address or highway number)

4. City or name of city

5. 100 feet due west

6. CITY OF DESOTO

7. City of DeSoto

8. Mrs. Reuben Adams (see letter of transmittal 6-15-75)

9. Jack Murphy

10. Surface to which marker will be attached (i.e., wood, brick, stucco over stone) if not on post.

ORDER FORM
Please consult the marker catalog for specifications of the markers, paperweights, and signs available. Check the
items desired below. Then mail this application and narrative history, together with a check made payable to the
Texas Historical Foundation, to the address above. No applications will be accepted unless payment is included.

HISTORICAL MARKERS

- 24" x 30" subject marker with post $175
- 24" x 30" subject marker without post $145
- 18" x 24" subject marker with post $170
- 18" x 24" subject marker without post $120
- 18" x 14" glass marker (comes with mounting bar) $65

MARKER REPLICA PAPERWEIGHT

This item should be ordered at the same time marker is ordered. Indicate quantity desired. Allow six months from
completion of marker for receipt of paperweight.

1.3 x 4" replica paperweight with replica of marker inside $50

SCOTCHLITE HIGHWAY DIRECTIONAL SIGNS

Please indicate quantity desired:
- 18" x 27" Historical Route sign (in back-and-white) $10
- 18" x 27" Historical Route sign (in color) $15
- 18" x 27" Historical Route sign (in black-and-white) $10
- 18" x 27" Historical Route sign (in green-and-white) $10
- 18" x 27" Historical Route sign (in red-and-white) $10
- 18" x 27" Historical Route sign (in white-and-black) $10
- 18" x 27" Historical Route sign (in white-and-green) $10
- 18" x 27" Historical Route sign (in white-and-red) $10
- 18" x 27" Historical Route sign (in white-and-white) $10
- 18" x 27" Historical Route sign (in yellow-and-black) $10
- 18" x 27" Historical Route sign (in yellow-and-green) $10
- 18" x 27" Historical Route sign (in yellow-and-red) $10
- 18" x 27" Historical Route sign (in yellow-and-white) $10
APPENDIX C

CERAMIC, GLASS, AND METAL ARTIFACTS COLLECTED FROM LEVEL 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>SUBTYPE</th>
<th>COLOR</th>
<th>PORTION</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>WHITEWARE</td>
<td>WHITE BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>STONEWARE</td>
<td>OLIVE BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>DENSE, GRAY PASTE WITH DARK BLACK INCLUSIONS AND VERY VITRIFIED OLIVE EXTERIOR THAT APPEARS FIRED (PORTIONS ARE DARKER THAN OTHERS); EXTERIOR ALSO APPEARS TO HAVE BEEN HAND BRUSHED. INTERIOR SURFACE IS GROOVED AND LOOKS WHEEL THROWN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>PORCELAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>PORCELAIN</td>
<td>WHITE BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>PORCELAIN</td>
<td>WHITE RM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXTERIOR DECORATED WITH BLUE FLOWING COLORS PATTERN EVEN ON THE RM EDGE. INTERIOR IS WHITE. POSSIBLE TEA CUP JUDGING FROM THE DELICATE SIZE; DECORATION IS MOTTLED - POSSIBLE FLORAL MOTIF OBSERVABLE FROM THE SMALL SAMPLE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>STONEWARE</td>
<td>OLIVE BASE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>BUFF BODY WITH OLIVE INTERIOR SURFACE WITH CONCENTRIC RAISED RINGS. OUTER PORTION (THAT WHICH IS SALTS GLAZED IS GRAY/GREEN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>WHITEWARE</td>
<td>PURPLE HANDLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>FLOWING COLOURS TRANSFER WARE WITH A DEEP PURPLE PEAK DATE 1840S TO 1870S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>WHITEWARE</td>
<td>WHITE BODY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>WHITEWARE</td>
<td>WHITE RM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>PORCELAIN</td>
<td>WHITE BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFER DECORATED WITH PURPLE SCENE. IT APPEARS TO BE A PASTORAL SCENE WITH A BARN-LIKE STRUCTURE DEPICTED. THIS COLOUR FOR TRANSFER WARES WAS POPULAR IN THE MID-NINETEENTH CENTURY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>IRONSTONE</td>
<td>WHITE BODY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;NO TO &quot;AMES&quot;,&quot;F James Edwards and Sons operating out of Dale Hall Factory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>IRONSTONE</td>
<td>WHITE BASE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SHERDS APPEAR BURNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>IRONSTONE</td>
<td>WHITE RM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>FIXED BLUE EDGE DECORATED WITH MOLDED BODY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>IRONSTONE</td>
<td>WHITE RM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNDECORATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>IRONSTONE</td>
<td>WHITE BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNDECORATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>PORCELAIN</td>
<td>WHITE BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNDECORATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>STONEWARE</td>
<td>BUFF BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SALT GLAZED WITH RAISED RIDGES (DRAW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>WHITEWARE</td>
<td>WHITE BODY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>PORCELAIN</td>
<td>WHITE BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>STONEWARE</td>
<td>GRAY BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>WITHEWARE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>PORCELAIN</td>
<td>WHITE RM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>TILE</td>
<td></td>
<td>WHITE EDGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>WITHEWARE</td>
<td>VARIOUS RM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPONGE PAINTED GREEN AND MULBERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>COURSE EARTHENWARE</td>
<td>BUFF</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>THERE IS NO GLAZE, BUT EXTERIOR IS MORE WATER TIGHT THAN THE INTERIOR. SHERD IS THICK AND COULD BE A POSSIBLE FLOWER POT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>COURSE AND POROUS, FOUR WERE REFIT INTO TWO PIECES WHILE THE FIFTH FORMS A THIRD PIECE. POSSIBLE HANDLE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XU1NE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>NONDIAGNOSTIC</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WHITE PASTE, NO GLAZE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT</td>
<td>LEVEL</td>
<td>MATERIAL</td>
<td>CLASSIFICATION</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>SUBTYPE</td>
<td>COLOR</td>
<td>PORTION</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>AQUA</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>MODERATE PATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>LIGHT TO MODERATE PATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>AQUA</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>ONE HAS PORTION OF PAPER DR. PEPPER LABEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>OLIVE</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>LIGHT BLUE</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>AQUA</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 HEAVY PATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO PATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>LIGHT TO MODERATE PATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>MILK GLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>OLIVE</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>LIGHT BLUE</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO PATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>LIGHT TO MODERATE PATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO PATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>AQUA</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>MODERATE TO HEAVY PATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>LIGHT BLUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>LIGHT BLUE</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 WINE GLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>PURPLE</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>LIGHTLY SOLARIZED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>AQUA</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>LIGHT TO MODERATE PATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 HEAVY PATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>LIGHT BLUE</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>LIGHT TO MODERATE PATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>MODERATE TO HEAVY PATINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>INCLUDING SEVEN WINE GLASS AND ONE BOTTLE GLASS FRAGMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>FLAT</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>FLAT</td>
<td>AQUA</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>FLAT</td>
<td>AQUA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ONE HAS &quot;BA&quot; EMBOSSED ON IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>AQUA</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>FLAT</td>
<td>AQUA</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MODERATE TO HEAVY PATINA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>DRINKING GLASS/TUMBLER</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MODERATE TO HEAVY PATINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>LIGHT BLUE</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MODERATE TO HEAVY PATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>FLAT</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MODERATE TO HEAVY PATINA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>FLAT</td>
<td>AQUA</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>FLAT</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LIGHT TO MODERATE PATINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XU3NE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>MILK GLASS</td>
<td>LIGHT GREEN</td>
<td>RIM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XU3NE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XU3NE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XU3SW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>FLAT</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XU3SW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>FLAT</td>
<td>AQUA</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XU3SW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>AQUA</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MODERATE TO HEAVY PATINA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XU3SW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XU3SW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>DOMESTIC CONTAINER</td>
<td>CURVED</td>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>BODY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT</td>
<td>LEVEL</td>
<td>MATERIAL</td>
<td>CLASSIFICATION</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>SUBTYPE</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>NONDIAGNOSTIC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ONE IS CLENCHED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>HUSBANDRY</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>HORSESHOE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>HUSBANDRY</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>HORSESHOE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ONE IS CLENCHED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>THREE ARE CLENCHED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>ONE IS CLENCHED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>INCLUDING ONE SMALL TACK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ONE IS CLENCHED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ONE IS CLENCHED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>VARIOUS LENGTHS AND WIDTHS. ONE IS CLENCHED.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XU1NE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XU1SW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XU3NE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I have been doing archaeology professionally for three years now (hence the delinquent delivery of this paper) and have recently moved from the private sector to a government agency. Yes, archaeologists are employable. I bounce between preferring prehistoric and historic periods, but will take a Phase 3 excavation over a pipeline corridor survey any day, regardless of temporal affiliation. Living in New Orleans and seeing first-hand how quickly erased are the visible traces of our cultural heritage, I am committed to doing my part to preserve that heritage now more than ever.
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