

27 July 1983

I think you want to keep in mind a reader who knows nothing about the site - there are times when you write from an intimate knowledge of it and while I know what you are talking about, I'm not sure that someone who has no knowledge of the site could follow your line of reasoning. One place where this is really clear is in your discussion of the Harris matrix system - see what Fraser Neimann wrote in his methods section as another example. You might want to include more graphics and you could ask Joe to use his present site map with its topographic notations in this report. You also need a map showing where the site is located in the city and I'll get that for you.

You also want to be able to summarize each paragraph in one sentence - if you can't do that, then you have 2 or more paragraphs lumped together.

Most of my comments are limited to the archaeology section, but some others include:

Introduction -

line 2 - site number is AP-23

I had responsibility for the archaeology at the site, not Mark who was only there because of the public outreach program funded by the Md. Committee for the humanities. It's always difficult to write about the division of labor in Annapolis - see my draft on pp. for another way.

The smokehouse had material in its builder's trench that clearly showed a later construction date than for the tavern. Also, brick smokehouses are more characteristic of late 18th and early 19th century eras than of the 1740-50 period.

page 2 - I've changed the wording here because not all the artifacts were cleaned by the summer's end. We did cataloging and conservation during 1982-83. The artifacts were returned to Historic Annapolis during the spring of 1983 and presently await labelling by University of Maryland personnel before further analytical work can be done.

You have to spell that out - some people might wonder why no analytical work has been done and why you're not able to do it - since you don't have the artifacts its impossible and Mark demanded that he be allowed to label and cross-mend them, so, of course, I didn't do any of it here. Cassandra feels that a lot of it will cross-mend - and we've also noted the smaller size of the sherds when compared with Calvert. This may mean they were part of the sheet refuse and lay around the yard for sometime rather than being placed into trash deposits initially.

page 3 - I've corrected some of the stuff at the top to reflect what Paul Pearson plans to do at the site.

I'd call the feature an oval, brick-laid, well-like shaft since no one has found any oval wells and it was probably a cistern, but maybe not. Joe & Bob will work their way towards it next month. More than an afternoon was spent on it.

One way around points in your paper where you know insufficient work was done is to provide a reason why - this one was opened at the very end of the fieldseason and the bank wasn't going to give us much time on it - I think we had less than a week. The fact it seemed to be associated with the 19th century when we were more concerned with the 18th was also a factor. If there is a good reason why something wasn't done, your reader isn't going to belabor issues like those.

Page 4 - you should cite Nancy Baker's report which includes all Russell Wright's data. If you haven't seen a copy and if you intend to do more work on this manuscript, we'll see if we can't loan you a copy.

Objectives - these were a bit different and broader than you state although the ones you write about also were of concern. I'll get you something that tells you more about what Mark and I planned overall. The impact of construction was paramount to Historic Annapolis and you should emphasize that.

Field methods - see Fraser's section.

The checkerboard strategy is based on the idea that one can read the profiles of unexcavated squares and get a good idea of what is in them too. For example, if square XX hadn't been excavated (we did that to follow out the mortar feature), one could still construct a section across the yard by using the east walls of G and X and the W wall of square R. I think I've said this better in the section on Reynolds Tavern in a paper I've been writing - I've attached that draft for you to see.

You need to expand on Harris.

Page 9 - we did keep samples of architectural materials whenever they were present in squares in mass quantities - otherwise they were also kept. Don't make it sound like we threw them away without much consideration.

If you decide to revise this, you may want to use it sometime to help you get a job with someone else or even a teaching job. Many students do their best with field reports and then, when the reports are professionally typed (which HA will do) and bound with all illustrations, they provide examples of the student's professional qualifications and experience and are circulated to prospective employers. You did a good job at Reynolds Tavern and you don't need to apologize for anything - but you do need to slant your writing a bit differently to make it clear that the work was done carefully and professionally with reasons for almost every task undertaken.

History - page 12 - Nancy Baker says that the import duty on hats was changed and it became profitable to sell them again. That is why he went back to being a hatter. I only found that out in June myself. You might want to send her (Mrs. Robt. Baker, Merrimack Trail, Amherst, N.H.) the history section for comment.

Archaeology section

I'm being picky here, but Joe and Bob have to be able to follow in your footsteps and so I've read it more critically than I think I otherwise might. Overall you've done a good job with this, so please don't let these comments make you think otherwise.

Page 20 - you should have a map of the site that shows the 20th century disturbance. It can be a sketch map like you've made of the square locations.

I think you should also make a list of squares with their NW2 designations. This would make it easier for someone to know where on the site something happened.

Stratigraphy - better wording - delete "though not based on transited elevations" and simply say it appeared.....

Also, given the depth of the subsoil (32" in Square TT) on the western edge of the site and what we now know of another site across West St (No. 22), it appears that the topography sloped downward to the west as well. Annapolis had a ridge/gully pattern only now most of the gullies are filled.

What gets confusing about your stratigraphy section is that you have organized the material around the features. So I think you should incorporate the feature discussions into the data you present on each square. Or else just do an overall discussion of the site stratigraphy not mentioning the areas and lump the area discussions with the features. You also need to use a feature number whenever you talk about the cobblestone drive-road (its too wide for a walkway) or the mortar, etc.

Page 21

Do you mean a light red brown or a dark red brown - are there any slides of it? By now, we've looked at enough sites in Annapolis to know what the natural soil is like. It goes from top-soil to a reddish brown and gradually gets more yellow and sandier but I shouldn't think we hit the undisturbed soil in square H at that level. Also - you are trying to say something in this sentence (lines 2-4) that isn't quite clear. What is the implication of the red brown soil? I have photos that show large brick bats and in large quantities in that square. Weren't many of the oyster shells whole in the fill layer and fragmented in the adjacent medium brown soil? In other words, did the feature have an associated crushed oyster shell ground-covering along its western side? Give the dimensions of some of the sand lenses - weren't they patterned? - didn't they suggest a bedding for flagstones? - there was no cultural material associated with them and they were quite close to the surface and definately post-dated the cobblestones.

The modern trench in squares T and U was for the wiring for the security system (I think) and it also appeared in square A. Does it have a feature number?

You need a profile in your discussion of the mortar feature. I know that you weren't on the site when some of that work was done and that Annie did it. If there aren't good notes, let us know and we'll get in touch with her and ask her what she remembers. It ~~should~~ sounds as though

Archaeology section continued (2)

you hit some interface in those squares that defined the limit of the mortar feature and also changes in the ground cover associated with it unless the disturbance from the utility trenches mucked things up. This also would be a good place to discuss the extent of the mortar feature and Douglas' cores.

Also - give profiles of the north walls of G, XX, R, X, UU, and the south profile of R or attach them because I think they'd help us understand what happened there more clearly.

What about AAA - what did they find out in that square?

Page 22

Treat Square Y separately - its too far away from C & M to have much relationship to what goes on in them. I think Square Y was relatively sterile also - I checked the artifact sheets and there was almost nothing but faunal remains & shell - a few sherds of creamware and pearlware, a pipe bowl and slate pencil. This is very different from Square C. ✓

Square C contained a dense concentration of artifacts in the fill just above the oyster shell and also a good layer just beneath it. It was a very productive square although simple in terms of its stratigraphy. ✓ Note that square M was not excavated to the same depth as Square C, and that the red brown soil appeared almost a foot higher than in C-- do the notes reveal whether it was augered?

Squares A....MM

You should note that Square K was extensively disturbed down to 14" and tell if it was augered. I think it would be informative to discuss the lay-out of the flagstones in these squares and also insert the information on the trash deposits beneath A and elsewhere here. Again, ✓ let us know if you don't have the information and if we need to get it from Annie Mullins. It may be that you can't really do a good summary of these squares without going over the artifact sheets and without finishing all the square summaries.

I think the square summaries should give the excavator's names - that way we can double check their notes for additional detail if there are any questions - questions may arise in the future as Joe & Bob do more work and this would help them immensely. ✓

Square RR should go in this section as well. ✓

Squares Q, P, KK, W....

Note that these were opened (as well as J, GG, HH) to define the extent of the cobblestones and that the presence of the magnolia tree (and Paul Pearson's concern for it) prevented complete excavation of the area and we don't know if the others had similar stratigraphic sequences. ✓ One square was disturbed by Orr's tests and removal of cobblestones. Square W was taken down to 12" and there was no evidence of any cobblestones - it may not have been taken far enough (again, it was done at the end by Annie who was simply looking for the continuation of the cobblestones).

Archaeology section continued (3)

Either Square EE or FF, however, was taken down quite deep and showed no cobbles at all. ✓

I think if you inserted the Harris numbers for some of the layers that you feel were spread across the entire yard, it would be easier. For example, the dark brown layer in Square P and also the cobbles - if identified by numbers - would be readily identifiable to any reader as those you located in squares F & U. Some assessment of similarities in layers across the site would be helpful and well as some discussion of discontinuities. ✓

If you look at the site, you encountered sterile soil at 24" DBS in P, U, G, XX, X & Q. *also in A*

It was much higher in C (c. 18"), possibly higher towards the house in F & D (c. 12"). It was lower behind the smokehouse (32 ?). We don't know where it is in squares HH, GG, J, RR, or K without the summaries. Do we know for DD, JJ or MM?

Page 23 - give the source for your quote of someone's comments about the use of shell as a base for walkways. Give the feature numbers of the trashpit. Put the info on square AAA (and also tell what the artifacts showed vis a vis dates) with the stuff on the mortar feature and with the stuff on Squares G, X, etc. ✓

Page 24 - Be more specific - give the square numbers/co-ordinates - I'm not convinced the sequence in the middle of the yard near the tree is fully a result of late 19th/20th century construction although some of it is. *← it isn't
look at
EE -
also K*

Page 25

What made you think the brick wall was once two courses thick? Something probably did as that is not the sort of information one generates independently. ✓
A sketch or a reference to a photo would help here.

Orr's photos show that the structure could not have corresponded to the staircase since it descended directly from Franklin St. I had the photo in Warren's book blown up and nothing shows although something certainly does appear there in his book - I also had the Saxe print blown up and again the 'structure' disappears. There are lots of drains all over Williamsburg and we've got them at Paca Garden and at Calvert. ✓

Note the cobbles must have brought in from further away. The cobbles predate the smokehouse since the smokehouse and its builder's trench cut through the cobble feature - there is no articulation of cobbles with the wall of the smokehouse nor is the cobble feature lined up with the smokehouse in any way. ✓

Trash Pit I

There was some late 18th century disturbance of the trashpit - note that the layers were hard to distinguish - give descriptions of their color and consistency. ✓
Did we ever reach the bottom of the pit? Do you have a sketch of it?

Page 27 - we've found a similar mortar feature at Calvert - what makes you think it is later than the cobblestones? I thought Annie said it was early from the test she did in AA and also in UU, ZZ, YY. What do Marty Dudek and Sandy Wilson say in their notes? No creamwares or pearlwares show in the artifact sheets for ZZ. ✓

Archaeology section continued (4)

It is probably the ephemeral remains of an outbuilding and some approx. dimensions ✓
can be gleaned by analyzing the auger tests.

Page 27 - trash pit 2

What were the key materials that made you date the trashpit to the 3rd quarter ✓
of the 18th century?

It is truly odd that the cobbles were removed and replaced with less evidence
than one would expect of the disturbance. I think the line was the white one ✓
that connected the security system and, if so, that may be one reason for
it would have been HA staff who did it or oversaw its installation. I don't
believe construction at the bank would leave such minimal evidence -

Oval well - better wording might be well-like. Note we didn't excavate it ✓
fully - given examples of the artifacts - refer to pictures and/or drawings.