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INTRODUCTION

The Shiplap House, 18AP30, located at 18 Pinkney Street, Annapolis, Maryland, was built ca. 1716. Located within the Historic District of Annapolis, Maryland (see Figures 2, 3, & 4 for site location within the Annapolis Historic District), the Shiplap House lies in immediate proximity to features of local and national importance. Due to its potential as a significant archaeological site, the Shiplap property was selected as one of the locations to be investigated during the 1985 summer Field School in Urban Archaeology, a course offered by the University of Maryland, College Park, under the direction of Dr. Mark P. Leone.

The 1985 excavation was the third time that archaeological investigations have been conducted at Shiplap House (see Figure 7, site map for the 1985 investigations). While details of the results of previous investigations will be presented in greater detail below, it should be noted that the current study was undertaken because it was thought that the north yard area, used as a driveway by the property’s owners, Mr. and Mrs. Jackson, deserved more extensive investigation.

Excavation began on 28 June 1985 and continued throughout the summer until August 21, 1985. One site director, a site supervisor, and a crew of from 8-10 field assistants (both paid crew and volunteers) comprised the daily complement of workers on site. Archaeological remains recovered within the study area were located, identified, and evaluated for potential significance. Funding for this project was provided by the Historic Annapolis Foundation.

Project History

Since 1981, members of the "Archaeology in Annapolis" a joint project of Historic Annapolis Foundation (a private, non-profit, historic preservation organization established in 1952) and the University of Maryland, College Park, have participated in the testing and/or large-scale excavation of some two dozen archaeological sites within the Historic District of Annapolis, Maryland. The work at many of our sites is carried out with the inclusion of a public program, varying in its particulars from site to site, but incorporating archaeologists trained as interpreters engaging visitors and passersby in a dialogue about archaeology, Annapolis, and the past. Prior to 1986, archaeologists had given tours to more than 32,000 visitors. We were particularly interested in addressing the relationship between the Shiplap site
and the social and economic development of 18th-century Annapolis. Two archaeologists were usually available to present tours of the site to interested visitors.

The outcome of early project planning sessions was the formulation of a research design whereby the excavation of sites occupied by individuals running the gamut of social classes was to produce a "slice of life" combining social history and archaeology to produce an understanding of Annapolis' transformation from a preindustrial village to a modern city.

In characterizing the extent of the work carried out thus far by the "Archaeology in Annapolis" project, one notes:

To date, something on the order of 28 sites has been explored archaeologically in Annapolis. Sites excavated reflect this levelling approach and include the residences of two colonial governors, the Calvert House and the William Paca House and garden; the home and garden of the Carroll mansion; the home and workplace of an 18th-century tavern keeper, innkeeper, and haberdasher; the domicile and workplace of an 18th-century artisan, that of an ironmonger, and that of a printer; an 18th-century warehouse; and the home of freed blacks (Ernst 1988: 3-4).

Four key issues broached by the Project are the following: landscape and the evolution of the town plan, the economic development of crafts and businesses, the structuring and restructuring of wealth and society, and the increasing segmentation and fragmentation of Annapolis society as reflected in material culture.

While comparatively less is known regarding the history of the early 18th century than is known regarding the history and events of the latter half of that century, it was determined that the Shiplap House, integrally related to harbor activities (see Historical Background section below) and occupied early in the 18th century, held great potential for offering insight into the economy and commercial development of early 18th-century Annapolis as well as for revealing information concerning the adoption of a new personal discipline as reflected in changes in patterning of the material culture of the period (cf. Shackel 1987).

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING/PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Physiography and Topography

Shiplap House is located on a plot of land that slopes down to the north shore near the mouth of Spa Creek where it empties into the Severn River. This property is bounded on the
Figure 1. Maryland Archaeological Research Zones
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north by Duke of Gloucester Street near its intersection with Compromise Street and on the
south by Spa Creek in the city of Annapolis, Anne Arundel County, Maryland. This project
area is located on the western shore of the Atlantic Coastal Plain Province, within Maryland
Research Unit 7 which is the Gunpowder-Middle-Back-Patapsco-Magothy-Severn-Rhode-West
Drainages (figure 1). The topography of the western shore of the Atlantic coastal plain province
is characterized as gently rolling uplands.

Climate

Anne Arundel County presently has a temperate mid-continental climate. Rainfall is
moderate, but the city’s location and the surrounding bodies of water (i.e. the Chesapeake Bay
and its tributaries) provide humidity. Snowfall is also moderate. Mean temperatures for the
Annapolis area include a low of 34°F in January and a high of 79°F in July (Fassig 1917:181,
Steponaitis 1980:3-4).

Vegetation and Fauna

Between 25,000 B.C. to 15,000 B.C. the Chesapeake area forests consisted of spruce,
pine, some fir, and birch trees. By 10,000 B.C. the forests had become dominated by oak-
hickory, representing a more varied and thus more exploitable environment (Maryland Dept. of
Natural Resources). Modern vegetation in the county includes oak, chestnut, and hickory forests
in the upland areas of the coastal plain and evergreen forests in the lowland coastal plain (Braun
1967:245). Faunal species dominant in the coastal plain include deer, small mammals, such as
rabbit, squirrel, and fox, and birds, such as turkey and water fowl (Shelford 1963).

Geology and Soils

The substrata soils in the Chesapeake area are formed from unconsolidated sedimentary
deposits of sand, silt, clay, and gravel which overlie crystalline bedrock. Though the
topographic relief in the area is not diverse, the sediment deposits vary greatly in depth, texture,
and degree of permeability (Brush, et. al. 1977:7). Much of the soil within the project area has
been artificially deposited by human activity. The natural soils in the project area arc of the
Monmouth Series; sandy loam with a 0-2% gradient, formed from unconsolidated beds of fine
textured sediments. The soil is deep, strongly acidic, well drained, olive colored, and tends to
be highly erodible. The soil profile is made up of 40-70% glauconite (green sand) at any point.
(Kirby and Matthews 1973).
Past and Present Land Use Patterns

During the prehistoric period, the land may have been utilized by Native Americans of the area. From the early eighteenth century to the present, the land has been used as a yard and garden related to residential/commercial buildings.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

PREHISTORIC BACKGROUND

Paleoindian Period

The Paleoindian phase (13,000-7,000 B.C.) is not well documented in the northeastern United States, though evidence from the region suggests that humans have lived here for 10,000-20,000 years. In the west, the most widespread complex is the Llano or Clovis, typified by fluted points, scrapers, and blades. These artifacts are often found in association with extinct megafauna of the Pleistocene, suggesting a way of life centering on big game hunting (Humphrey and Chambers 1977: 7-9).

In the east, however, finds showing evidence of Paleoindians are usually isolated fluted points (Steponaitis 1980: 63). There are, however, several sites in the east that reveal evidence supporting Paleoindian occupation of the region. Two important surface sites are the Williamson site in Dinwiddie County, Virginia and the Shoop site in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. The artifacts uncovered include fluted points, blades, scrapers, and wedges, which are similar between the two sites and similar to the Clovis complex in the west. Two deeply-stratified eastern sites include the Shawnee Minisink site in the Delaware Water Gap (Gardner and McNett 1975) and the Thunderbird site in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. Both of these sites yielded radiocarbon dates that were contemporaneous with the Clovis complex in the west (Humphrey and Chambers 1977: 8-9).

Steponaitis notes that while the eastern Paleo complex is similar to the western Clovis complexes, eastern artifacts have never been found in direct association with Pleistocene megafauna (1980: 63-64). Humphrey and Chambers state that the eastern evidence is "... complicated by significant variation among artifacts both in minor detail and major form" (1977: 9). Thus, the lifeways of the big game hunters of the west cannot be transferred to the east.

Instead, evidence suggests that the Paleoindians of the east had a much more diversified subsistence strategy. This is because of several factors, identified by both Steponaitis (1980)
and Humphrey and Chambers (1977). As evidence in support of this, one notes that:

While big game hunters in the Great Plains and Southwest were ranging over thousands of square miles of essentially open grassland, their Eastern cousins were faced with the great variety of ecological niches in the first coniferous, then deciduous forests which covered the land . . . and human groups living in the forest must have depended increasingly on locally available plants, small game, reptiles, and shell fish . . . . This regional and seasonal variation in food and resources would understandably result in considerable variation in cultural adaptive strategies and their material manifestations (Humphrey and Chambers 1977: 9).

Steponaitis notes that Paleoindian base camps identified by diverse artifact assemblies, non-random distribution of lithic debris, activity areas, and post holes and molds, are found in riverine areas. Further, she observes that quarry sites were identified by a lack of tools and the presence of large amounts ofdebitage and cryptocrystalline rock source (Steponaitis 1980: 66). This indicates that eastern Paleoindians were not following migrating animals but were occupying sites on a seasonal basis.

Investigations of Paleoindian sites have been hindered, as many sites were inundated as a result of the rise in sea level known to have occurred at the end of the Pleistocene.

Archaic Period

The end of the Pleistocene saw many environmental changes, including the inundation of some riverine environments, a change from mixed coniferous forests to northern hardwoods, and the transition to a more temperate climate. The Archaic period is one of cultural adaptation to these changes and is further divided into subphases, known generally as the Early Archaic, Middle Archaic, and Late Archaic.

The Early Archaic (7,5000-6,000 B.C.) is characterized by the appearance of two artifact traditions, the corner notched tradition (7,5000-6,800 B.C.) and the bifurcate tradition (6,800-6,000 B.C.). The corner notched tradition is based on the change from fluted points to corner notched points, reflecting a different hafting technique and utilization. The general artifact assemblages of Paleo and Archaic peoples are very similar, thus prompting some to infer that the difference between the two peoples was based upon which game they hunted (Steponaitis 1980: 69-70).

The bifurcate tradition involved the scheduled use of a number of seasonally-available
resources. The bifurcates were made from rhyolite or quartz in the Appalachian Mountains.

Around 6,000 B.C. the climate changed from cool and dry to warm and wet. This marked the beginning of the Middle Archaic. This period is represented by several traditions, with the bifurcate tradition possibly extending into this period.

Marrow Mountain points were part of a tradition extending from 5,000-4,200 B.C. These points were made of rhyolite and black chert, with associated assemblages of scrapers, large bifaces, choppers, hammers, atlatl weights, and axes. These peoples occupied inland swamps with transient camps on second- and third-order streams (Steponaitis 1980: 76-77).

Another tradition was characterized by Guilford lanceolate points made of quartzite. The Guilford assemblages were generally the same as the Marrow Mountain assemblages, with the exception of the absence of scrapers in the former. The increase in the number of points indicates either an intensification of use in the area, or an increase in population (Steponaitis 1986).

The Late Archaic saw a change to a warm and dry climate and the beginning of an oak-hickory forest. During this time period (4,000-1,000 B.C.), there were several traditions in existence. Two distinctive traditions were the Piedmont tradition with long-stemmed points, and the Laurentian tradition, rare in this area. Also appearing for the first time is the broad spear which indicated utilization of new resources, possibly estuary resources (Steponaitis 1980: 80-81). Steatite or soapstone vessels for storage originated during this era. As Humphrey and Chambers (1977: 11) note, the native Americans were then relying heavily on fishing and mollusk collecting. These are all indications of an increasingly-sedentary way of life.

**Woodland Period**

Transition from the Archaic to the Woodland period is marked by the appearance of woodworking tools, such as axes and celts, and cordage-impressed pottery. Both types of artifacts reflect a more sedentary lifeway.

The Woodland period (1,000 B.C.-European contact [A.D. 1,500]) is also divided into three phases: Early, Middle, and Late. During the Early Woodland phase, the introduction of cultigens into the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys from Mexico resulted in changes in both of those areas. However, in parts of the northeast the Archaic way of life continued until European contact (Humphrey and Chambers 1977: 17). As for changes occurring during the Woodland
period, we are reminded that:

Pottery is the clearest indicator of change in this early Woodland period. Changes in the frequency and distribution of Accokeek, Pope’s Creek, and Mockley wares . . . indicate that shifts in food procurement strategies were taking place although all . . . predate the use of agricultural products (Handsman and McNett 1973 in Humphrey and Chambers 1977: 17-18).

No other major changes in cultural patterns, however, were noted for that time period.

Around A.D. 1,000-1,200, cultivated legumes were introduced into the area. This coincided with the development of improved strains of maize. These developments produced significant changes in the population structure of the area (Humphrey and Chambers 1977: 17-19). Thus, when European explorers and colonists arrived in the Chesapeake they found sedentary populations relying on an intensified and integrated utilization of natural and cultivated resources.

Potential Prehistoric Sensitivity

Several aboriginal sites and components of aboriginal sites have been recorded within the city of Annapolis (18AP04, 18AP05, 18AP46, and 18AP47). Only one of these, the Sands House (18AP47), is located within the current bounds of the Historic District. Because of the Shiplap House’s immediate proximity to natural water resources, there existed the probability that prehistoric remains might well be recovered from the project area.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Growth of Colonial Annapolis

The state of Maryland was established as a proprietary colony in 1629, upon the granting of land by Charles I to George Calvert, the First Lord Baltimore. The colony’s original capital, founded at St. Mary’s City, was first settled in 1634. Early in its history, the colony developed an economy based largely on the export of tobacco.

Early urban development was somewhat slow as a result of a dispersed settlement pattern necessitated by the tobacco economy. Most Marylanders were engaged in raising tobacco on either large, plantations with some processing capabilities, or on smaller farms. The large plantations maintained their own dock facilities for the sale and transport of the harvested weed, and the smaller, less self-reliant farms would likely have found it necessary to rely on their
larger counterparts for the processing and shipping of the crop (Middleton 1984: 105-147).

After England’s "Glorious Revolution" of 1689, Maryland became a royal colony under the sovereignty of William and Mary. Not long afterward, Sir Francis Nicholson was appointed Governor, replacing Sir Lionel Copley, and the state’s capital was removed to Annapolis from St. Mary’s. In his laying out of the city plan in the second capital, Nicholson overlaid a Baroque design on the earlier core previously designed and surveyed by Charles Beard. It is believed that Nicholson deliberately made use of a Baroque design for his city plan with the express purpose of establishing in the city’s landscape a constant reminder of the populace’s subservience to the hierarchies of church and state (Leone and Shackel 1986; Leone, Ernst, Kryder-Reid, and Shackel 1989; Reps 1978: 117-140). A recent article by Henry Miller reaches similar interpretations for the Baroque town plan at Maryland’s first capital city at St. Mary’s City (Miller 1988).

The economy of colonial Annapolis may be explained as having passed through the following three phases of growth (cf. Papenfuse 1975). The first period, 1694-1715, is characterized by the seasonal wax and wane of the town’s population, dependant upon whether the General Assembly was in session or recess. The second phase of the town’s growth occurred during the period 1715-1763. At this point in time, the city exhibited an increase in its number of permanent residents as a result of bureaucratic growth and the expansion of small industries. And finally, the 1763-1784 era is known as the town’s "Golden Age." It is during this latest phase that many of the fine Georgian mansions and formal gardens for which the town is known today were built/laid out. At the same point that one notes an increase in the conspicuous consumption among the more prominent members of society, alluded to above, there is also a concomitant decline in small industries such as shipbuilding and tannery (Papenfuse 1975: 6).

With the onset of the 19th century, Annapolis’ age of grandeur was drawn to a close. At this latter date, Annapolis’ role as social and economic hub of the Chesapeake was discontinued and the town’s former glory was overshadowed by the port of Baltimore in its ascendancy to prominence on the Chesapeake. Through the course of the 19th and much of the 20th centuries, Annapolis functioned as a small port town, relying on local trade (unlike its earlier days of participation in a global economy).
Figure 2. Project Area located on Detail of U.S.G.S. Quad Map of Annapolis
Figure 3. Reproduction of the 1718 Stoddart Map of Annapolis
Figure 4. Detail of Sanborn Map
Starting in the late 1950s, Annapolis underwent a revitalization as the result of a major infusion of historic preservation effort and a return of businesses to the town. Currently, much of the town’s economic base rests on the rewards reaped from tourism.

**History of the Shiplap Property**

It is very difficult, if not impossible, to establish a precise date for the construction of the Shiplap House because surviving documents are unclear and incomplete. It is possible, however, to draw inferences regarding the house’s construction having occurred in the mid-to-late seventeen teens from deeds, leases, and two court cases, all predating 1720 (Warren n.d.). Collectively, these materials suggest that Edward Smith, a lawyer and an innkeeper, lived in the house some time before 1715.

The earliest surviving documentation of the Shiplap property, lying within lot number 88 on the 1718 Stoddert Survey of Annapolis (see Figure 3), is a record of Stoddert’s resurvey for William Bladen in 1718. Benjamin Tasker, a respected and highly-placed member of the provincial government, became owner of the property soon thereafter. Tasker leased lot number 88 to Edward Smith in 1723 for 77 years, but the wording of the deed indicated that Smith had been living on the property on an informal, undocumented basis previously (Baker 1977: 2).

Edward Smith first appeared in Annapolis records in 1714 as a witness in a case before the Circuit Court, and again in 1715/1716 when he applied for a license as an innkeeper. When Smith first applied for the license, he stated that he was a "...good candidate for the license for he has purchased a house within the city of Annapolis very Commodious for a house of Entertainment and which has already served to that Use" (Baker 1977: 2). Smith owned other property in Annapolis, specifically designated for the use of tradespeople, but references do not indicate that such property was improved upon by the addition of a dwelling (Baker 1977: 1). It is for these reasons, (1) the likelihood of Smith’s pre-1723 occupation of the Shiplap property and (2) the 1715/1716 claim to ownership of a house in Annapolis for which no other candidate exists, that the ca. 1716 date commonly assigned the house receives support.

Smith died in 1723 and left the estate to his wife, Mary, who died in the following year. The Smith’s estate sold the lease to Robert Gordon, a merchant, on 13 April 1724, and on 25 November 1725 a public sale was held to settle the Smith’s estate. Edward Coyle,
administrator, leased the lot on Pinkney Street to Joshua George, an attorney. The dimensions of this property included the same metes and bounds as recorded on the 1718 Stoddert survey with the exception of a piece of land reserved for Tasker in 1723 on which to build a prise house (Russo 1985).

Joshua George leased the remainder of the Tasker/Smith lease, along with the buildings and improvements, to Capt. William Rogers on 10 October 1726. William Rogers, in turn, mortgaged his unexpired term of the lease to Charles Brown and Michael Coulter on 24 March 1734. Later still, in 1748, Brown and Coulter leased the lot to a shipwright and merchant by the name of Ashbury Sutton. Sutton, a major entrepreneur in the shipping industry of Annapolis in the 1730s and 1740s, was son-in-law to Horatio Middleton. Together with Middleton and his grandsons, Sutton and his relatives were involved in many aspects of shipping, shipbuilding, seafaring, coastal mercantile ventures, bay charter trade, piloting, ferry keeping, sailmaking, ropemaking, ship chandlery, and retail dry goods. They also owned a private wharf and warehouse (Baker 1977).

On July 27, 1748, Ashbury Sutton placed an ad in the Maryland Gazette, stating that the land was to be sold by public venue, together with a 52 year lease. (Maryland Gazette 1748). John Raitt, a merchant, purchased the leases and he and his heirs occupied the land until 1817 (Baker 1977). In that year Nathaniel Hammond, heir to the Raitt estate, as well as lot # 88, sold the land to Andrew Slicer. Slicer willed the property to his daughter, Elizabeth Goldsborough, who in turn sold it to Francis Stockett on January 13, 1877 (McWilliams and Papenfuse, 1971).

Francis B. Mayer, an artist, bought 18 Pinkney Street from Francis Stockett on January 27, 1877; the sale of the property was part of the settlement of Equity #526, SH 10:120, Gutman & Kaufman v. estate of Elizabeth Wilson. Francis Mayer bequeathed his property to his wife, Ellen, in 1899, and she willed the property to her daughter, Mary Sylvester in 1918 (McWilliams and Papenfuse 1971).

On May 31, 1921, Mary and John Sylvester sold the property and house to Fannie Schlenter who used it as a tenement through most of the 1950's, holding as many as 26 residents at one time. Fannie Schlenter sold the property to Historic Annapolis Inc. (H.A.I.) on March 31, 1958. H.A.I. restored the building to its original form while using it as their central headquarters.
Figure 5. Floorplan of Shiplap House
Plate 1. Historic Photograph of Shiplap House
Plate 2. Modern Photograph of addition to house (taken facing southeast).

Plate 3. Modern Photograph of Shiplap House (taken facing northwest).
Mr. and Mrs. Donald Jackson purchased the Shiplap House from H.A.I. on December 29, 1980, (McWilliams and Papenfuse 1971) and later sold it back to H.A.I. The Shiplap House is currently the property of Historic Annapolis Foundation.

Previous Investigations

The following is a summary of previous investigations. During 1959, Henry Wright and A. St. Clair Wright excavated several trenches in and around Shiplap House. There is documentation of where these excavated areas were located (Figure 6). They excavated along all sides of the house, including the areas directly adjacent to the outside walls, several units in the interior of the house, and the entire area beneath the addition. There is no unit-by-unit provenience for the artifacts. The handwritten notes and free-hand drawings (not to scale) are difficult to interpret. The fieldnotes for this excavation are included as Appendix V of this report.

The artifacts recovered include tin-glazed earthenware, coarse gravel-tempered earthenware, grey-bodied stoneware, slip-decorated earthenware, Chinese export porcelain, kaolin pipe fragments, dark green wine bottle and case bottle fragments, and some bone. Dates for the ceramics range from early eighteenth century to mid-nineteenth century.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The archaeological research planned at Shiplap House was a preliminary attempt by Archaeology in Annapolis to understand if a new order of behavior, which developed in the 1700's in Anglo-America, could be found in the archaeological record. This new order has been characterized by material expressions based on order, balance, symmetry, segmentation, standardization and individuality. According to Deetz (1977), this was an unconscious way of viewing the world. This was called "the Georgian mind-set".

Prior to this new way of behavior, colonial life styles were reflected in material expressions which were unbalanced, asymmetrical, unstandardized, and communal. Most early American dwellings consisted of one or two rooms where all of the functions of daily life were carried out. People tended to share one mug or trencher, and often ate without the use of eating utensils (Braudel 1979; 205-206).

During the 18th century, life became more individualized as objects such as matched sets of dishes became common household items. This allowed people to eat from their own
Figure 6. Site Map of the 1959 Excavation
individual place settings, which in turn created the separation of people within, as well as between groups. Houses were beginning to be built with symmetry, balance, and segmentation in mind. Instead of one large room, houses were being divided into functionally specific rooms; a room to eat in, one for sleeping, another for entertaining, etc. (Deetz 1977).

One of our goals was to extend Deetz’s work and apply these ideas to an examination of how they can be found archaeologically. By doing this, we can test our hypothesis that Deetz’s Georgian mind-set can be related to the establishment of a new economic system called capitalism. Along with being a specific way of handling wealth and production, capitalism is a catalyst that resulted in the creation of many different art forms and styles. Leone and Shackel (1984) define the term 'Georgian order' as, "a way of handling wealth and of organizing the world in such a way that much of the social order coincides with making and holding a profit."

Therefore, we feel that connections between capitalism and material culture, especially those that are preserved as archaeological remains are appropriate indicators in studying this phenomenon. The floor plan and facade of the exterior of the Shiplap House have some early elements of balance and symmetry. It has a central hallway dividing the floor plan into halves. One of the rooms is further subdivided into two rooms, and there is an additional wing. At present we do not know exactly when the wing was added (Figure 5).

Since the Shiplap House appears to contain some of the early elements of Deetz’s Georgian mind-set, we thought that it would be an ideal place to carry out our research. We believe that the advent of these ideas, which create and reinforce these characteristics, were stimulated by the penetration of the ideas of capitalism and could be detected in the archaeological record. An advantage of using this analysis at the Shiplap House existed because it was occupied during most of the 1700’s when these ideas were first being developed in the colonies. Because of varying backgrounds of the people who occupied this dwelling, we hoped to determine if different occupational or socioeconomic groups accepted or rejected these ideas at different rates and times. The data from this site could provide further analysis of the spread of the ideas of capitalism within Annapolis, we argued. This research was to be an extension of an ongoing analysis being undertaken in this project (Leone and Shackel 1987, 1988, Tubby 1986, Shackel 1986, 1987).

Our second research goal was to examine the development of the Nicholson Town Plan.
It has been documented elsewhere (Hopkins 1986a, 1986b) that the city Plan of Annapolis has changed gradually since it was first laid out in 1695. It is believed that these changes on Pinkney Street can be detected archaeologically and can further contribute to our understanding of the Nicholson Town Plan. By excavating along and under the curb and sidewalk, we hoped to find earlier widths or boundaries of the street and the yard’s relation to it.

Our third goal, from excavations in the north yard, was to discern if the wing was original to the house or an extension, and when it was constructed. By examining the material culture, adjacent to the house and in the builder’s trenches, we were hoping to establish a date of construction of this wing and to compare it to the rest of the structure.

RESULTS AND INTERPRETATIONS

METHODOLOGY

A grid consisting of 5 x 5 ft. squares was laid over the site and labelled 1 through 378. Only two test units, placed on the sidewalk, were outside this grid. The grid was laid parallel to the northern most wall of the house extension. Any 2.5ft. x 5ft. unit within the grid was designated by the grid number followed by an indication of the half that was excavated (i.e. 250E1/2).

All units were excavated according to stratigraphic layers, and if any layer was thicker that 0.5ft., it was arbitrarily ended, then continued as the next designated level. All layers were labelled alphabetically with upper case letters (i.e. A,B,C…), and all layers within a feature were labelled in lower case letters (i.e. a,b,c…). Each feature was designated by the upper case letter F followed by a number (i.e. F-1, F-2…).

Before excavation began, the oyster shell driveway, a recent addition to the stratigraphy in the 1980’s, was removed. This facilitated the process of reaching the soil to be excavated.

Excavations were conducted by shovel skimming and trowelling. All soil, except the oyster shell driveway, was screened through a 1/4 in. mesh screen. All artifacts were saved, washed and labelled and catalogued at the University of Maryland, College Park, laboratory. All artifacts are currently being stored at the storage facility located in Crownsville, Maryland.

DESCRIPTION OF UNITS AND FEATURES

Following is a general unit by unit description of the excavations at the Shiplap House,
Figure 7. Site Map of 1985 Excavation
Most of the original stratigraphic layers at this site had been graded to subsoil prior to our excavations. What had been deposited over this area were several layers of modern fill consisting of a mix of artifacts, with rubble and coal.

Unit 84S1.5 was located behind the shed and was chosen for excavation because it was thought to be an area of the site which was not altered in any way, and had been a "dump" area. This unit had what appeared to be undisturbed layers dating to the 19th century. No earlier contexts were found. Features 30 and 46 were found in this unit.

Feature 30, which was a circular stain and was first discovered in layer D, consisted of a 10YR 3/3 dark brown and a 10YR 3/4 dark yellowish brown sandy loam. It was excavated to an average depth of 4.00 ft. b.d. It had a mean ceramic date of 1809 (n=13) with a T.P.Q. of 1820 (whiteware).

Feature 46 was a dark semicircular stain in the north wall. It was a 10YR 4/6 dark yellowish brown sandy loam and was 2.5 ft. wide. It was uncovered at an average depth of 3.99 ft. b.d. and was removed to an average depth of 5.63 ft. b.d. This feature had a mean ceramic date of 1795 (n=27), and aluminum foil for a T.P.Q., thus indicating that it was probably disturbed.

Unit 85N1.5 was behind the shed, south and adjacent to Unit 84S1.5 and had what appeared to be undisturbed stratigraphy in layers dating to the 19th century.

Feature 29 was found in the south portion of Unit 85N1.5. It was a circular brown stain, 8 ft. wide and had a 10YR 3/4 dark yellowish brown silty loam. It was excavated from an average depth of 3.85 ft. b.d., to an average depth of 5.55 ft. b.d.

Feature 30 was a deep rectangular pit located in the north wall of Unit 85N1.5. It consisted of a 10YR 3/3 dark brown sandy loam.

Unit 169 was opened to test the area near the sidewalk which was adjacent to the east window of the kitchen of the house. In testing this area, it was anticipated that refuse thrown from the window could be detected, and that patterns could be recognized which would lead to information concerning the various uses of the addition to the house. The second reason that this unit was excavated was to attempt to locate the trench dug by Henry Wright in 1958. By locating and re-excavating this trench, we had hoped to get a quick and easy understanding of the stratigraphy at the site, however this did not prove to be the case, as the land appeared to
Feature 4 was a sewer drainpipe and an iron water pipe plus a trench appearing in the center of the unit. It was found in layer A, and was 4.5 ft. across E/W and 1.5 ft. N/S. It contained one piece of whit salt glazed stoneware.

Feature 8 was a small semi-circular stain in the NW section of the unit and was found while removing layer F. It was brown sandy loam. No datable artifacts were recovered from this feature.

Feature 10 was a trench for the pipe (F-4), which ran in a N/S direction, and was uncovered at an average depth of 1.05 ft. b.d. but was not excavated. Excavation was discontinued when sterile subsoil was reached in the rest of the unit.

Unit 221 was located to the south of and adjacent to the shed. The soil appeared to have been previously graded to subsoil (Figure 11).

Feature 15 was a coal and ash deposit in the SW section of the unit. It was excavated from an average depth of 1.20 ft. to 1.56 ft. b.d., and two pieces of whiteware were recovered along with a plastic toy wheel for a T.P.Q.

Feature 17 was a pipe trench running in a N/S direction in the east part of the unit and was 1 ft. wide. It was uncovered at 1.10 ft. b.d. and consisted of modern glass and nails. The soil was not screened and no Munsell reading was taken.

Feature 21 was a wood plank running in a N/S direction in the center of the unit and was .4 ft. wide. It was excavated from an average depth of 1.40 ft. to 1.77 ft. b.d.

Feature 23 was a concrete slab that covered most of the unit in the SW section, approximately 2.8 ft. wide.

Feature 24 was a root disturbance and was excavated to an average depth of 2.00 ft. b.d.

Feature 25 was a dark semicircular stain 5 ft. in diameter located in the NW corner of the unit. It consisted of a 10YR 4/3 brown/dark brown sandy loam, which was caused by root disturbance, and had no datable artifacts.

Unit 223 was located to the north of the steps in front of the door leading to the kitchen. The expectation of collecting debris which may have been tossed out led to have been graded to subsoil (Figure 12).

Layer B at an average depth of 1.10 ft. b.d., was circular in shape
and about .25 ft. in diameter. It was made up of coal and clinker concentrations in the north section of the unit, and was a 7.5YR 4/4 dark brown soil. It was excavated to an average depth of 1.36 ft. b.d., and contained creamware, pearlware, and whiteware.

Feature 3, an ash layer, was found in the NW section of the unit. It was found at an elevation of 1.38 ft. b.d. and excavated to 1.62 ft. b.d. and consisted of a 10YR 3/3 dark brown soil, containing one sherd of whiteware.

Feature 9 was a 10YR 4/4 dark yellowish brown clayish sand. It was a trench for a sewer pipe which ran in a N-S direction, and was in the center of the unit. This feature contained one shard of undecorated pearlware and was excavated from an average depth of 1.85 ft. to 1.88 ft. b.d.

**Unit 245** was located to the west of the shed and to the east of the fence which bordered the street. It appeared that the soil in this unit was graded to subsoil (Figure 13).

Feature 22 was possibly part of a privy in the western portion of the unit, and consisted of a 10YR 4/4 dark yellowish brown sandy clay which was excavated from an average depth of 1.50 ft. to 2.60 ft. b.d. No datable artifacts were recovered.

Feature 31, located in the NW corner of this unit, was a semi-circular stain, 1.5 ft. in diameter, and was composed of a 10YR 3/3 dark brown sandy loam. It was found at 1.0 ft. b.d. and excavated to an average depth of 1.48 ft. b.d. It contained creamware, pearlware, and transfer printed pearlware.

Feature 42, a small dark stain in the SE corner of the unit, was 1.0 ft. wide, and consisted of a 10YR 3/4 dark yellowish brown sandy loam with shell and charcoal. It was found at an average depth of 1.62 ft. b.d. and excavated to an average depth of 2.38 ft. b.d.; one sherd of tin glazed earthenware was recovered.

Feature 43a, a possible post mold, located in the south part of the unit, consisted of a 10YR 3/3 dark brown sandy loam, and was excavated from a average depth of 1.39 ft. to 2.89 ft. b.d.

Feature 43b, a possible post hole, consisted of a 10YR 3/4 dark yellowish brown sandy loam, which was excavated to an average depth of 3.01 ft. b.d. Neither 43a or 43b yielded any datable artifacts.

Feature 45, a circular stain in the s.e. part of the unit, consisted of a 10YR 3/3 dark
brown sandy loam which was excavated from an average depth of 0.5 ft. to 2.77 ft. b.d. This feature contained a range of artifacts including tin glazed earthenware, Nottingham, Westerwald, white saltglazed stoneware, creamware, and pearlware.

Feature 47, a dark stain in the s.w. corner of the unit, was a possible post mold and was siltier than the rest of the unit. It consisted of a 10YR 3/4 dark yellowish brown silty loam, with no datable artifacts.

Feature 48, a dark rectangular stain, appeared to be a pile of fill within Feature 45, and consisted of a 7.5YR 4/6 strong brown sandy loam; it yielded no artifacts. It was excavated from an average depth of 2.60 ft. to 3.54 ft. b.d.

**Unit 271** was located to the west of the shed. It was opened primarily to see if Feature 22 (possibly part of a privy, found in Units 245 and 272) extended into this unit. All of the stratigraphy appeared to be graded to subsoil (Figure 14).

Feature 28 was a trench for a sewer pipe or drainage trench. It was located in the center of the unit and ran e-w across the whole unit; it was 1.5 ft. wide and consisted of a 10YR 3/4 dark yellowish brown sandy loam. It was excavated from an average depth of 1.60 ft. b.d. and contained creamware, pearlware, tinglazed earthenware, and whiteware.

**Unit 272** was adjacent to and south of Unit 271, and west of the shed. All of the soil appeared to have been graded to subsoil (Figure 15).

Feature 6 and 6.1 were posthole and mold, which appeared in the west portion of the unit as well as in Unit 299. They consisted of a 10YR 3/4 dark yellow brown and a 10YR 4/4 dark yellow brown, respectively. For a more thorough description see Unit 299.

Feature 11, located in the east portion of the unit consisted of a 10YR 3/2 very dark grayish brown, from which no datable artifacts were removed.

Feature 14, located in the west wall of the unit, intruded into Feature 6. It was not located during excavation. It consisted of a 7.5YR 3/2 dark brown and a 10YR 3/3 dark brown silty clay and contained one piece of tin glazed earthenware.

Feature 16 was a 10YR 4/4 dark yellow brown sandy loam. It was a shallow pit of trash, which was excavated from an average depth of 1.54 ft. to 1.62 ft. b.d., containing tinglazed earthenware and creamware.

Feature 22 was a possible privy in the n.e. section of the unit, and was a continuation
of Feature 22 found in Units 271 and 245. It consisted of a 10YR 4/4 dark yellow brown sandy loam. It was excavated from an average depth of 1.63 ft. to 2.06 ft. b.d. It contained North Devon gravel tempered earthenware, tinglazed earthenware, Westerwald, and creamware.

Feature 26 was a postmold and hole in the s.w. portion of the unit, and consisted of a 10YR 3/4 dark yellow brown silty clay containing a piece of whiteware. It was excavated from an average depth of 1.74 ft. to 2.09 ft. b.d.

Unit 273 was located to the south and adjacent to Unit 272 and to the west of the shed. All of the soil in this unit appeared to have been graded to subsoil (Figure 16).

Feature 34, a possible postmold, was located in the n.e. part of the unit. It consisted of a 10YR 4/4 dark yellowish brown sandy loam and was excavated to a depth of 2.16 ft. b.d. No datable artifacts were recovered.

Feature 36, in the s.e. part of the unit, is a possible post hole, consisting of a 10YR 3/4 dark yellowish brown sandy loam and was excavated to an average depth of 1.92 ft. b.d., containing a piece of tinglazed earthenware.

Feature 37, a possible post hole, with a metal rod protruding from it, consisted of a 10YR 3/4 dark yellowish brown sandy loam and was excavated to an average depth of 2.68 ft. b.d. No datable artifacts were recovered from this feature.

Unit 299 was located to the east of the fence, to the north of the house, and to the west of the shed. Few pre-20th century artifacts were found in the stratigraphic layers as it was graded to subsoil (Figures 17 & 18).

Feature 2 was first discovered at the start of excavation and was a rectangular stone, found in the center of the unit and was thought to be a boundary marker. The stains around feature 2 had the same designation and were excavated according to stratigraphic layers. This resulted in the designation of F 2 and F 2.1. Feature 2.1 began at 1.77 ft. b.d., and was probably a trash pit. A range of ceramic types including tin-glazed earthenware, Westerwald, creamware, pearlware, and whiteware were recovered from this feature. It was excavated to an average depth of 3.25 ft. b.d.

Feature 6 was a post mold which appeared in layer F. It was located in the east wall of the unit and continued into unit 272. It was 1.0 ft. long and 0.6 ft. wide. It was composed of a 10YR 3/6 dark yellowish brown, and was found at an average depth of 1.77 ft. b.d. and
excavated to an average depth of 1.96 ft. b.d. F-6.1 was the post hole, and consisted of a 7.5YR 4/6 strong brown sandy loam with shell and charcoal. This feature was excavated to an average depth of 2.45 ft. b.d. Both features yielded no datable artifacts.

Feature 7 was a rodent burrow in the s.w. part of the unit that consisted of a 7.5YR 4/6 strong brown sandy loam with shell and charcoal. It was excavated from an average depth of 1.90 ft. to 2.05 ft. b.d. It contained no datable artifacts.

Feature 32 was a post hole located in the west section of the unit. It was composed of a 10YR 3/3 dark brown sandy loam with charcoal and shell and was excavated from an average depth of 2.80 ft. to 3.78 ft. b.d. It contained white salt-glazed stoneware, creamware, and pearlware.

Feature 33 was a post hole and was to the north of F-32. It was a 10YR 4/3 brown to dark brown sandy loamy clay with coal and shell. It was excavated from an average depth of 2.63 ft. to 2.71 ft. b.d. No datable artifacts were recovered.

Feature 38, a pit beneath F-2, in the n.w. section of the unit, consisted of a 10YR 4/6 sandy loam. It was found at an average depth of 4.75 ft. b.d. It had artifacts ranging from North Devon gravel-tempered earthenware, white salt-glazed stoneware, creamware, pearlware, to whiteware.

Feature 40 was a post hole to the east of F-32 and consisted of a 10YR 4/4 dark yellowish brown sandy loam. It was excavated from an average depth of 2.72 ft. to 3.40 ft. b.d. Two sherds of creamware were recovered.

Feature 44 was a post hole located to the south of F-40. It consisted of a 10YR 4/3 brown to dark brown sandy loam and was excavated from an average depth of 3.56 ft. to 4.21 ft. b.d. No datable artifacts were recovered.

Unit 300 was located to the south of and adjacent to Unit 299, and east of the fence. This area of the site was highly disturbed, and the unit’s soil appeared to have been graded to subsoil (Figure 19).

Feature 13a, which was a trench running in an e-w direction across the unit, consisted of a 10YR 4/6 dark yellowish brown sandy clay with shell. It was excavated to an average depth of from 1.97 ft. to 3.50 ft. b.d. It contained tin glazed earthenware, Chinese porcelain, and white salt glazed stoneware.
Feature 18, which was found within Feature 13, consisted of a 7.5YR 4/6 strong brown sandy loam. It was located in the eastern section of Feature 13. A single piece of Chinese porcelain was found in this feature.

Feature 19 was a post hole and mold located in the center of F-13. It was a 7.5YR 4/6 strong brown sandy loam. It contained tin glazed earthenware, white salt glazed stoneware, and scratch blue stoneware.

Feature 20a, a possible post hole and mold, located in the center of F-13, consisted of a 10YR 4/6 dark yellowish brown sandy loam. Feature 20b, a post hole and mold, consisted of a 10YR 3/2 very dark grayish brown sandy loam. Neither feature yielded datable artifacts.

Feature 27, a post hole and mold consisted of a 7.5YR 4/6 strong brown sandy loam. It was excavated to a depth of 2.01 ft. b.d. No datable artifacts were recovered.

Unit 333-1 was located off grid, in line with the sidewalk, west of the fence and south of the driveway. This unit contained undisturbed early stratigraphic layers (Figure 20).

Feature 39 was the builder’s trench to the street curb. It was located in the west part of the unit. It contained creamware, pearlware, and whiteware and was excavated to a depth of 2.80 ft. b.d.

Feature 41 was a trench related to the wall and fence and was located in the east part of the unit. It consisted of a 10YR 3/3 dark brown sandy loam with brick and shell and contained clouded ware, creamware, and pearlware. It was excavated from an average depth of 2.63 ft. to 3.05 ft. b.d. These excavations uncovered a slope from the house to Pinkney Street which was eventually filled and leveled to create the base of the sidewalk.

Unit 334-1 was opened up off grid on the sidewalk. It was south of Unit 333-1, and west of the wall and fence. This unit also contained undisturbed stratigraphic layers (Figure 21).

Feature 39, (also found in Unit 333-1) was the trench related to the street curb. It was left unexcavated because it was a modern feature.

Feature 41, found in layer A of this unit was a builder’s trench to the wall and fence, located in the east part of the unit. It consisted of a 10YR 3/3 dark brown sandy loam and was excavated from a depth of 2.76 ft. to 3.24 ft. b.d. Artifacts included clouded ware, Chinese porcelain, creamware, whiteware, and ironstone. Excavations uncovered a slope from the house to Pinkney Street which had been filled in and leveled off to create the base of the sidewalk.
SUMMARY OF RESEARCH RESULTS

The entire site of our 1985 excavations of the Shiplap House was disturbed in some way either by grading or by installation of modern trenches. Even Units 84 and 85 behind the shed were disturbed. The stratigraphic layers had no identifiable chronological order. Most contained a mixture of cultural material.

Unfortunately, we did not encounter the test trench that Henry Wright excavated in 1959. This was probably due to the grading of the yard, as well as excavation of Feature 4 (sewer pipe), and Feature 28 (utility line to garage).

The two units that were excavated behind the shed (84S1.5 and 85N1.5) seemed to have been filled in during the first quarter of the 19th century. This was inferred from the reverse stratigraphy found in the units. This was demonstrated particularly in Unit 84S1.5 where the lower stratigraphy contained more recent cultural material than the upper stratigraphy.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Given the research goals set out prior to the excavation, none were fulfilled. The mixed cultural context of the site disallowed any thorough analysis through which we could apply Deetz's work. This was quite unexpected and disappointing. Second, the disturbed stratigraphy did not allow an understanding of the town plan. The fact that the area behind the shed, represented by units 84 and 85, was probably filled in during the first quarter of the 19th century may help in understanding Nicholson's town plan, but only in connection with the filling process across the rest of the city of Annapolis. And third, the disturbed nature of the area around the addition did not allow us to date the addition to the house.
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APPENDIX I

Profile Drawings of Units
1. Rubble
2. A black (10yr 2/1) Si Lo.
3. A dark brown (10yr 3/3) fill layer.
4. A dark yellowish brown (10yr 3/6) Si Cl.
8. A yellowish brown (10yr 4/6) Lo.
9. A redish brown (7.5yr 4/6) Sa Lo.

Figure 8. West wall profile of Units N1/2 85 and S1/2 84.
1. A dark brown loamy (10yr 3/3) sand, with shell.
2. A rubble layer.
3. A dark brown (10yr 3/3) sandy loam.
4. A yellowish brown (7.5yr 4/6) sandy loam.
5. A yellowish brown (10yr 4/6) sandy clay loam.

Figure 9. East and south wall profiles of Unit N1/2 85.
UNIT 169

NORTH WALL

1. An oyster shell layer.
2. A weak red (2.5yr 4/2) mixed with a dark yellowish brown (10yr 4/4) Lo.
3. A dark brown (10yr 3/3) Si Lo, with patches of oyster shell.
5. An oyster shell deposit.
6. A reddish brown (7.5yr 4/6) Si-sterile soil.

WEST WALL

1. An oyster shell layer.
2. A very dark grayish brown (10yr 3/2) Lo, with oyster shell.

Figure 10. North and west wall profiles of Unit 169.
1. Oyster shell layer.
2. A dark brown (10yr 3/3) Lo.
3. A dark brown (10yr 3/3) Lo.
5. A strong brown (7.5yr 4/6) Lo.
6. A dark yellowish brown (10yr 3/6) Lo.

Figure 11. East and west wall profiles of Unit 221.
UNIT 223

NORTH WALL

1. Crushed oyster shell.
2. A dark brown (10yr 4/3) C1 Lo.
3. A black (10yr 2/1) matrix with coal clinker.
5. A coal deposit.
6. A strong brown (7.5yr 4/6) sandy clay-subsoil.

EAST WALL

1. Oyster shell.
2. Pea gravel.
3. A brown/dark brown (10yr 4/3) Si Lo.
4. A dark brown (10yr 3/3) Lo, with brick and shell fragments.
5. A Strong brown (10yr 4/6) Lo, mixed with a brown/dark brown (10yr 4/3) Lo.
6. A brown/dark brown (10yr 4/3) Cl Si Lo, with some pea gravel.

Figure 12. North and east wall profiles of Unit 223.
UNIT W1/2 245

EAST WALL

1. An oyster shell layer
2. A very dark grayish brown (10yr 3/2) Lo.
3. A dark yellowish brown (10yr 4/6) Lo.
5. Feature 45a, a yellowish brown (10yr 5/6) Lo.
6. Feature 45b, a dark yellowish brown (10yr 4/6) Lo.
7. Feature 45c, a strong brown (7.5yr 4/6) Lo.
8. Feature 48, a strong brown (7.5yr 4/6) Lo.

SOUTH WALL

1. Oyster shell.
2. A very dark grayish brown (10yr 3/2) Lo.
3. Feature 42, a dark yellowish brown (10yr 3/4) Lo.
5. Feature 45a, a yellowish brown (10yr 5/6) Lo.
6. Feature 45b, a dark yellowish brown (1 yr 4/6) Lo.
7. Feature 45c, a strong brown (7.5yr 4/6) Lo.
8. Feature 48a, a strong brown (10yr 4/6) Lo.

Figure 13. East and south wall profiles of Unit W1/2 245.
UNIT 271

NORTH WALL

1. Oyster shell layer.
2. A very dark grayish brown (10yr 3/2) Sa Lo.
3. A dark brown (7.5yr 4/4) Lo.
4. A dark brown (7.5yr 4/4)
5. A dark brown (7.5yr 4/4)Si Lo.
6. A dark brown (7.5yr 4/4) Cl Lo.

WEST WALL

1. Oyster shell layer.
2. Oyster shell layer continuation.
4. A dark yellowish brown (10yr 4/6) Sa Lo.
5. A very dark grayish brown (10yr 3/2) Si Lo.
6. A strong brown (7.5yr 5/8) Sa Lo.

Figure 14. North and west wall profiles of Unit 271.
1. A crushed oyster shell layer.
2. A very dark gray (10yr 3/1) Sa Lo.
3. A dark yellowish brown (10yr 4/6) Sa Cl Lo.
4. A strong brown (7.5yr 4/6) Sa Lo.

Figure 15. East wall profile of Unit 272.
UNIT 273

SOUTH WALL

1. An oyster shell layer.
2. A dark brown (10yr 3/3) Lo.
3. A brown/dark brown (10yr 4/3) Lo.
4. A dark grayish brown (10yr 4/2) Lo.
5. A strong brown (7.5yr 4/6) Lo.

EAST WALL

1. A crushed oyster shell layer.
2. A very dark grayish brown (10yr 3/2) Sa Lo.
3. A dark yellowish brown (10yr 4/6) Lo.
4. A dark grayish brown (10yr 4/2) Lo, with charcoal.
5. A strong brown (7.5yr 4/6) Lo.

Figure 16. South and east wall profiles of Unit 273.
UNIT 299

NORTH WALL

1. Oyster shell.
2. Pea gravel, sand, and brick.
3. Oyster shell.
4. A dark grayish brown (10yr 4/2) Si Sa, with shell and pea gravel.
5. An ash and pea gravel level, with a very dark gray (10yr 3/1) Lo matrix.
6. A dark brown (10yr 4/3) Lo with charcoal, shell and brick.
7. A dark brown (7.5yr 4/4) Cl with brick, shell, and charcoal.
9. A brown (7.5yr 4/2) Lo, with charcoal, brick and shell.
10. A reddish brown (5yr 4/4) Sa Lo, with shell.
11. A strong brown (7.5yr 5/6) Sa Lo-Sterile soil.

Figure 17. North wall profile of Unit 299.
1. Oyster shell.
2. Pea gravel.
3. A very dark gray (7.5yr 3/3) ash layer.
4. A dark brown (10yr 4/3) Si Lo.
5. A dark brown (10yr 3/3) Sa Lo.
6. A dark grayish brown (10yr 4/2) Sa Lo, with shell and charcoal.
7. A brown/dark brown (7.5yr 4/4) Sa Cl, with shell and brick.
8. A brown (7.5yr 3/4) Sa Lo, with shell, brick, and charcoal.
10. A dark yellowish brown (10yr 3/6) Sa Lo, with shell, brick, and charcoal.
11. A very dark grayish brown (10yr 3/2) Sa Lo, with charcoal, shell, brick.
12. A brown/dark brown (7.5yr 4/4) Lo Sa, with charcoal and shell.

Figure 18. West wall profile of Unit 299.
UNIT 300

SOUTH WALL

1. Oyster shell.
2. A dark gray (10yr 4/4) Lo.
3. A dark brown (10yr 4/3) Lo.
4. A strong brown (7.5yr 4/6) Lo-sterile soil.

WEST WALL

1. A dark brown (10yr 3/3) Lo.
2. A black (10yr 2/1) Lo.
3. A dark yellowish brown (10yr 3/4) Lo. with shell fragments.
5. A brown/dark brown (7.5yr 4/4) Lo.

Figure 19. South and west wall profiles of Unit 300.
UNIT 333-1

NORTH WALL

1. Cement
2. Gray pebble layer
3. A yellow brown (10yr 5/6) Sa Lo.
4. A clay (10yr 4/6) and sand (7.5yr 4/6) Lo.
5. A dark yellowish brown (10yr 4/4) Lo.
6. A strong brown (7.5yr 4/6) Lo.

EAST WALL

1. A dark brown (7.5yr 3/4) loam with brick, charcoal and shell.
2. Mortar-sterile
3. A brown/dark brown (7.5yr 4/4) Lo.
4. A strong brown (7.5yr 4/6) Lo.
5. Cement.

Figure 20. North and east wall profiles of Unit 333-1.
UNIT 334-1

EAST WALL

1. A dark grayish brown (10yr 4/2) Lo.
2. A very dark grayish brown (10yr 3/2) Lo.
3. A dark brown (7.5yr 3/4) Lo.
4. A brown/dark brown (7.5yr 4/4) Lo.

SOUTH WALL

1. A thin gray layer.
3. A strong brown (7.5yr 4/4) Lo, with mortar and shell.
4. A brown/dark brown (7.5yr 4/4) Lo, with brick and oyster shell.
5. A dark yellowish brown (10yr 4/6) Lo-Sterile soil.

Figure 21. East and south wall profiles of Unit 334-1.
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Staff Archaeologist - Historic Annapolis, Inc., Annapolis, Maryland

EDUCATION:
Ph.D. Anthropology - State University of New York at Buffalo.
Dissertation Topic: A Historical Archaeology of Personal Discipline.

M.A. Anthropology - State University of New York at Buffalo.
February 1984.
Master's Project: Patterning at the Nicoll House, Suffolk County, New York.


RESEARCH INTERESTS:
1. Historical Archaeology of the Eastern United States.
2. Symbolic Archaeology.
3. Ethnoarchaeology.
4. Ethnohistory.
5. Capitalism in Early and Colonial America.
6. The Development of a Social Hierarchy in a Developing Complex Society.
EXCAVATION AND SURVEY EXPERIENCE:

February 1986 - present: Archaeology in Annapolis (A Collaboration between the University of Maryland and Historic Annapolis Inc.) - Staff Archaeologist. Responsible for the supervision of all archaeological field operations on a daily basis. This includes the direction of up to 15 staff members and 30 volunteers, proposal/budget preparation, field supervision and the supervision and editing of final reports. Also responsible for the supervision of the Victualling Warehouse and College Park laboratories. Dr. Mark P. Leone: Principal Investigator.


October 1985: Archaeology in Annapolis: Assistant Site Director for a cultural resource survey on Church Circle, Annapolis, MD. A late 17th - 20th - century churchyard. Dr. Mark P. Leone: Principal Investigator.

June - August 1985: Archaeology in Annapolis: Assistant Site Director for the Shiplap House Site. An 18th - 20th-century habitation site. Supervised four field assistants and trained field school students and volunteers. A public program site. Annapolis, Md. Dr. Mark P. Leone: Principal Investigator.

April - May 1985: Archaeology In Annapolis: Field Assistant/Assistant Supervisor for the State House Inn Site. An 18th - 20th-century habitation site. A public program site, Annapolis, Md. Dr. Mark P. Leone: Principal Investigator.


June - August 1984: Nicoll Archaeological Project, Town of Islip, New York. Project Director. Trained and supervised ten Suffolk County Community College students in an approved field school during the month of June. Supervised and trained members of the Suffolk County Youth Conservation Corp. and students in an enrichment program from Sachem High School during the months of July and August.
May 1984: SUNY-Buffalo Archaeological Survey: Crew Chief for a
cultural resource survey in North Tonawanda, New York. Dr. Ben
Nelson: Principal Investigator.

May 1984: SUNY-Buffalo Archaeological Survey: Crew Chief for a
cultural resource survey in the Town of Lancaster, New York (PIN
5512.19). Dr. Ben Nelson: Principal Investigator.

April 1984: SUNY-Buffalo Archaeological Survey: Field Assistant
for a cultural resource survey in the Town of Poland, New York.
Dr. Ben Nelson: Principal Investigator.

February 1984: SUNY-Buffalo Archaeological Survey: Crew Chief
for a cultural resource survey in Dayton, New York. Dr. Ben Nelson:
Principal Investigator.

December 1983: New York State Museum: Field Assistant on a Survey
and excavation of the Groveland Shaker Community in Sonyea, New
York. Mr. Phil Lord: Principal Investigator.

June - August 1983: Nicoll Archaeological Project, Town of
Islip, New York: Project Director. Supervised and trained ten
students from Suffolk County Community College in an approved
field school during the month of June. In July and August I also
provided archaeological training for eight Youth Conservation
Corps. workers.


January 1983: Town of Islip, Laboratory work and data analysis.

June - August 1982: Nicoll Archaeological Project, Town of
Islip, New York: Project Director. Contracted to locate the
William Nicoll Homestead, the founding family of the Town of
Islip in 1683. Supervised and trained a crew of eight field
assistants. Duties included: extensive library research, surface
survey, shovel testing, cataloging artifacts, map
drawing, excavation, report writing and public relations.

May - November 1981: SUNY-Buffalo Archaeological Survey: Field
Assistant. Survey and excavation of the Ranger and Duffy Sites.
Principal Investigator: Dr. Mark Aldenderfer. Field Directors:
Dr. Frank Schieppati and David Kiefer.

October - November 1980: SUNY-Buffalo Archaeological Survey:
Field Assistant. Excavation of the Miller Site in Boston Valley,
New York. Principal Investigator: Dr. Mark Aldenderfer. Field
Director: Fran Pickin.

June - August 1979: Summer field school student sponsored by Northwestern University. Excavation of the Elizabeth Burial Mounds. Directors: Dr. Stuart Struvever and Dr. Jane Buikstra.

1978: Adult Field School sponsored by the Center for American Archaeology (formerly known as The Foundation for Illinois Archaeology). Director: Dr. Stuart Struever.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

Fall 1987 - Spring 1988 - Lecturer at University of Maryland, College Park. Instructor for a course titled: Chesapeake - An Archaeology of Maryland (an introduction to the ecology, prehistory and historical archaeology of the Chesapeake/Tidewater region).

Fall 1987 - Instructor for: Introduction to Anthropology: Physical and Archaeology.

- I also guided three independent study projects during the fall semester.

Fall 1986 - Instructor at Anne Arundel County Community College for a course titled Artifacts in American Culture with Barbara Little and Parker Potter.

Spring 1986 - Teaching Assistant for Millard Fillmore Academic at the State University of New York at Buffalo. Instructor for: Historical Archaeology of New York State. (An Introduction to Theory and Method in Historical Archaeology.)

Fall 1984 - Teaching Assistant for Millard Fillmore Academic College at State University of New York at Buffalo. Instructor for: Exploring the Unknown: Introduction to Archaeology.

Summer 1983 & 1984 - Adjunct Instructor at Suffolk County Community College. Instructor for Introduction to Field Work in Anthropology.
TEACHING HONORS:
Spring 1986: Nominated for Excellence in Teaching for a Graduate Teaching Assistant.

COMPUTER EXPERIENCE:
Acting Budget Master (Spring semester 1985)
Responsible for the creation and money allocation of computer accounts for faculty, students and staff belonging to the Departments of Anthropology and Linguistics at the State University of New York at Buffalo.

Knowledge of: Pascal, BMDP, Minitab, and an assortment of programs used on personal computers.

MUSEUM EXHIBIT DISPLAYS:
"The Toothbrush in Western Civilization" with Dr. Mark P. Leone
- A display of toothbrushes which demonstrates the changing attitudes of a non standardized, communal Medieval life to one which was increasingly standardized and socially segmented.
- On display at the tour office adjacent to the State Capital in Annapolis, Maryland.

MUSEUM EXHIBIT CONSULTANT:
"Tableware and Daily Life" by Christine Hoepfner
- a display of tableware which demonstrate the changing attitudes in daily life and dining etiquette of colonial Anglo - Americans.
- on display at the Tobacco Prise Historic Building.

"Tea and Workers" by Christine Hoepfner
- a display of teaware which demonstrate the increasing routinized behavior as reflected in the tea ceremony and everyday life.
- on display at the Victualling Warehouse Museum.
"The Nicoll Family"
- a display of artifacts providing an interpretation of the everyday life of the Nicolls, a prominent 18th and 19th-century family on Long Island.
- displayed at the Town of Islip Museum.

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS:

American Anthropological Association
Society for American Archaeology
Society for Historical Archaeology
Council for Northeastern Historical Archaeology
Anthropological Society of Washington
American Studies Association
Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Suffolk County Archaeological Association
Pi Alpha Sigma Honor Society
Alpha Kappa Delta - International Sociological Honor Society

PUBLICATIONS:

Mark P. Leone and Paul A. Shackel

Mark P. Leone, Parker B. Potter Jr, and Paul A. Shackel.
1987 Toward A Critical Archaeology. CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY Vol 28(3).

Shackel, Paul A.
Shackel, Paul A.
1986 "Mean Ceramic Dating and Its Applicability to the Nicoll House," LONG ISLAND ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROJECT NEWSLETTER. Edited by Laurie Schroeder, Stephanie Rippel-Erikson, and Edward Johannemann. Published by the Suffolk County Organization for the Promotion of Education.

Shackel, Paul A.
1985 "Quantitative Patterning at the Site Level: A Case Study in Historical Archaeology." AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY. Vol. 5 (1).

Shackel, Paul A.
1984 "Archaeology and History: A Case Study with the William Nicoll Homestead." LONG ISLAND FORUM. October.

Shackel, Paul A.
1983 "Archaeological Dig at the Nicoll Homestead." LONG ISLAND FORUM. July.

IN PRESS:

Mark P. Leone and Paul A. Shackel

Mark P. Leone and Paul A. Shackel

IN PREPARATION:


An Edited volume derived from the proceedings of the symposium "The Meanings of Consumption: Ongoing Research in Historical Archaeology" which was presented at the 1987 Society for American Archaeology Meetings, Toronto Canada. Presently being considered by Basil Blackwell Press.
PROFESSIONAL PAPERS:

Shackel, Paul A. and Barbara J. Little

Shackel, Paul A.

Shackel, Paul A. and Barbara J. Little

Shackel, Paul A.

Shackel, Paul A.

Shackel, Paul A.

Shackel, Paul A.

Shackel, Paul A.
SYMPOSIA CHAIRMANSHIPS:


TECHNICAL PAPERS EDITED:

Williams, Eileen

Roulette, Billy Ray
1986 Excavations at Hancocks Resolution, 18AN169, Anne Arundel County, Maryland. Archaeology In Annapolis. On File at Historic Annapolis, Inc., Annapolis, MD.

Williams, Eileen
1986 Excavations at 178 Prince George St, 18AP38, Annapolis Md. Archaeology In Annapolis. On File at Historic Annapolis, Inc. Annapolis, MD.

Secreto, Patricia and Eileen Williams
1986 Excavations at the Shiplap House, 18AP30, 18 Pinkney St, Annapolis, MD. Archaeology In Annapolis. On File at Historic Annapolis, Inc., Annapolis, MD.

Hopkins, Joseph W and Eileen Williams

In Preparation

Shackel, Paul A. and Eileen Williams
Excavations in St. Anne's Churchyard, 18AP43, Church Circle, Annapolis, MD. Archaeology In Annapolis. On File at Historic Annapolis, Inc., Annapolis, MD.
TECHNICAL PAPERS:

Mark P. Leone and Paul A. Shackel
1986 Archaeology of Town Planning in Annapolis, Maryland. Final Report to the National Geographic Society. NGS Grant Number 3116-85.

Shackel, Paul A.
1986 Archaeological Testing at the 193 Main St. Site, 18 AP 44, Annapolis, MD. Report of the Archaeology In Annapolis Project. University of Maryland, College Park and Historic Annapolis Inc.


CONTRIBUTIONS TO TECHNICAL PAPERS:

Butterbaugh, Kirk W.

GRANTS, AWARDS, CONTRACTS

$ 1,300 Testing in the St. Anne's church yard. May 1987 (From St. Anne's Church and administered through Historic Annapolis, Inc.).

$ 7,659 Phase I for the proposed site of construction of the Marriott Annapolis, College Creek, Annapolis, MD. May, 1987. (Administered through Historic Annapolis, Inc.).

$ 2,485 Literature Search for the Gotts Court Area, Annapolis, Maryland. May, 1987. (Administered through Historic Annapolis, Inc.).

ACTIVITIES:

President - Anthropology Graduate Association; 1984 - 1985.

LECTURES:

August 1, 1987 "Archaeology In Annapolis," presented with Barbara J. Little at 'Tidewater Archaeology Days' in St. Mary's City, Maryland.

June 5, 1987 "Sampling Strategies in Archaeology." Presented to the University of Maryland, College Park Field School in Urban Archaeology, Annapolis, Maryland. Dr. Mark P. Leone, Director.

May 12, 1987 "The Importance of Archaeology at Church Circle, Annapolis, Maryland." Presented to the Vestry Committee of St. Anne's Church, Annapolis, Maryland.

March 31, 1987

March 23, 1987
"The Enlightenment in Historical Archaeology." Presented to the History Honor Society, Notre Dame College, Baltimore, MD.

March 5, 1987
"A Symbolic Interpretation in Historical Archaeology." Presented to Dr. Mark Leone's Introduction to Archaeology Class, University of Maryland, College Park.

February 27, 1987
"Current Research in Annapolis." Presented to the Anne Arundel County Archaeological Assn., Annapolis, MD.

October, 25, 1986
"Graduate Training in Anthropology." Presented at Dr. Margaret Nelson's Graduate Seminar Class, Department of Anthropology, State University of New York at Buffalo, Amherst, NY.

November, 6 1985
"The Development of Segmentation and Standardization in Society." Presented to Dr. Mark Leone's Intro. to Anthropology Class. University of Maryland, College Park.

October, 15, 1985
"An Introduction to Historical Archaeology." Presented to St. Martins Elementary School, Annapolis, MD.
September 9, 1985
"Historical Archaeology: A Multidisciplinary Approach."
Presented to Suffolk County Communitite College, Selden, NY.

July 7, 1984
"An Introduction to Historical Archaeology and the Nicoll Project." Presented to Sachem High School, Lake Ronkonkoma, NY.

July, 12, 1983
"Progress on the Nicoll Excavation." Presented to the The Long Island Archaeological Project, State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY.

June 22, 1983

June 14, 1983
"The Nicoll Excavation." Presented to The Long Island Archaeological Project. State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY.
Appendix IV
Artifact Inventory
Appendix V

Fieldnotes: 1959 Excavation
copies of Existing Field Notes on
Excavations around the Slicer-Shiplap House,
Primarily the work of A.St.C. Wright
ca. 1958
Foundations are laid in 2" of yellow sand - (2 1/2"")

sand
oyster shells
had sandy soil - sterile
3 stones in pit nr B AAc. variety
2 5 ft. squares dug on either side of front door.

East side:
- Soil very hard with plaster rubble and oyster shells - very few artifacts
- Dug out 8". 
- Along foundation wall - East side soil so hard could only be dug with pick - plaster rubble still present.
- Remains can reach two sides - squares were dug 1/2" out from 1/2" along foundation.

West side:
- Dug 6" on line with steps. Interesting will find found at 6' - 7' near steps.
- Sand and sandy soil as back yard.

Suggestion: considerable steps exist from front of house to street. Perhaps more in 1860 - debris from house and yard could have fallen down steps.
25" from foundation

3 bulk below drop of foundation

3 1/2" x 13 1/2" x 1

Located between two rocks - X

Lying against foundation and on ground supporting beam.
pipe cache 30 ft from wall

[Diagram with dimensions and notes:
- C1
- 1011
- 3411
- Sand layer
- Rein steel & clay
- Column soft layers
- Sandy]