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Introduction

In May and June of 2004, the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC) summer archaeological field school carried out systematic testing at the Doak House Museum, an extant antebellum structure in Greeneville, Tennessee. This testing program was predicated on the previous summer’s research, which resulted in the discovery of significant archaeological remains in the project area (Honerkamp 2003, 2004). Located on the campus of Tusculum College (Figure 1), the house was built about 1830 by the Reverend Samuel W. Doak, the founder of the College. Doak was a minister, educator and successful planter and landowner who apparently did not possess slaves. His large brick two-story house has been continuously occupied by family descendents until its transformation into a museum in the 1970s. Current plans call for construction of an expanded parking lot and considerable upgrading of utilities, necessitating the archaeological survey and testing program.

Figure 1. Project Vicinity Map. (from 1961 USGS Greeneville, TENN 181 – NE Quadrangle)

Based on the results of the previous season’s fieldwork, two areas were identified that warranted additional testing in 2004: a possible root cellar was uncovered approximately six meters south of the center of the main house, and a brick foundation and robber’s trench was noted five meters west of the present academy. Hence, the 2004 field season was devoted primarily to exploring the structure, function, and temporal affiliation of these undocumented features. In addition, a series of backhoe test trenches were excavated in the Museum’s gravel parking lot as part of an unsuccessful attempt to establish the footprint of the extensive barn that
once occupied the site to the northwest of the main house. Figure 2 provides a plan view of the 2004 excavations. As was the case during the previous summer, the field school was incorporated into the educational program of the Doak House Museum, with interpretive tours given to visiting school groups. With a crew of seven students and two student supervisors under the author’s direction, a total of 16 days were devoted to fieldwork and artifact cleaning and classification during the project, followed by approximately 10 weeks of artifact analysis and report preparation using a student (60 hours) enrolled in a summer independent studies class.

Figure 2. Plan of Excavations, Doak Site.
Previous Research

The documentary background for the site and the results of the 2003 survey and testing are described in Honerkamp 2003, from which the following summary is derived. A total of 29 survey units, each measuring ½ m square, were excavated to sterile, accounting for 7.25 square meters of the site area. As shown in Figure 2, they were concentrated primarily around the main house, academy, and the “front yard” area between the two buildings. Besides providing a sense of the general stratigraphy at the site, the survey identified several areas of archaeological potential based on artifact densities and/or the presence of features. These areas were investigated further through the excavation of a series of test units, most of which measured 1 x 2 meters. A total of 12 square meters of area was opened with these screened tests; a small unscreened unit was also dug on the northwest corner of the ell in order to reveal the foundation. In addition, 5 trenches of various sizes were dug through a combination of backhoe trenching and hand labor; just over 110 square meters of the site area was investigated in this manner. The trenches were placed so as to intercept the foundations to the ell attached to the main house and to locate traces of former roads and fence lines. While the work in the ell proved successful, no subsurface signatures of roads were identified in Trenches 3 and 5, possibly as a consequence of either (1) extensive, long-term plowing that has occurred over much of the site, obscuring evidence of a road, or (2) the archaeologists were looking in all the wrong places. This second possibility stems from the fact that 19th century houses are sometimes located quite close to roads, and the 2003 test trenches may simply have been located too far south to intercept a hypothesized road if it ran directly in front (south) of the house. A backhoe trench to the east or west of the main house and within a meter of the east-west line of the south wall will have to be dug in order to test this “near-road” hypothesis.

The fence line search proved more productive than the road search in 2003. While attempting to intercept a road, a line of postholes running north-south were identified in Trench 5; three postholes were noted in the south end of Trench 3, one of which corresponds to an extant post shown in Figure 3 below; and numerous postholes were discovered in Trench 4. This latter trench was located along the east-west line of the academy’s north wall, as shown in Figure 2. Photographs that almost certainly date to the late Victorian period indicated a fence line extended along this orientation (see Figure 9 in Honerkamp 2003), and it was hoped that this “late” fence would parallel an earlier one. Several postholes were identified that probably correspond to the fence line shown on the right of Figure 3, although no companion “early” fence line was observed. More importantly, part of a brick foundation and an associated builder-robber’s trench were revealed. Since no other structures are documented for this location west of the academy, this discovery was completely unexpected. The robber’s trench that the foundation segment was situated in was aligned to the north wall of the present academy, although the precise stratigraphic relationship of the trench and the academy foundation was obscured by a modern concrete pad under the academy’s northeast corner. At any rate, this close alignment between a present structure and a former structure suggested they were related and possibly conjoined at one time.

A 1 x 2 m square test pit designated as Unit 2 was excavated and screened to sterile approximately 9 meters west of the academy. It produced a large amount of brick and mortar demolition rubble, along with ceramics that suggested disposal from the first half of the 19th century; a mean ceramic date (MCD) of 1830 was calculated for this unit on the 28 sherds (out of the total 89) that were found. This was significantly earlier than the 1842.6 MCD generated
The outline of a possible door or window can be seen on the west end wall. Facing southeast.

from a midden deposit encountered in a 1 x 2 m unit located 5 m from the back door (south) of the extant academy. As pointed out in the 2003 report (p. 15):

With only 24 sherds (15.6%) used to calculate the MCD, it can hardly be argued that the 1842.6 date derived for this unit is beyond reproach. But it at least reflects a relatively later occupation/disposal period than do the ceramics in Unit 2. This is exactly what would be expected if there were indeed two academy structures, with Unit 4 located near the later one.

This dating information raises a strong possibility that there may have been an earlier academy—or some other structure, such as a dormitory—and that the extant academy was built directly adjacent to the earlier building. When George Collins, Director of the Tusculum College Department of Museum Program and Studies, identified a possible door in the Victorian-era photograph (shown in Figure 3) of the west wall of the present academy, this suggested a possible entranceway between the two structures.

In an attempt to locate the southwest corner of the early structure, a 1 x 1 m test unit was placed at the intersection of a line extending along the south wall of the extant academy and on a north-south line at a right angle to the foundation trench where a possible builder-robber’s trench was noted in the Trench 4 south profile. However, no evidence of a corner to the earlier building was seen. Fieldwork during 2004 was aimed at determining the arrangement, function, and date of the early brick foundation, and if possible, to determine the relationship between the contiguous extant and extinct structures.

Other test units were excavated in 2003 as a result of high artifact densities and/or the presence of features in adjacent survey tests. The most significant result of this phase of the research occurred in Unit 5, located about 6 meters south of the main house and midway between the two doors. Survey Unit 190N 215E revealed a midden deposit extending to 15 cm below
surface, and a deep feature on the south wall of the unit. The feature was composed of brick and mortar demolition fill and little else, which certainly qualified as a puzzling discovery in this location. The 1 x 2 m Test Unit 5 was dug adjacent to the survey unit in order to investigate the rubble-filled feature, designated as Feature 1. When the excavation of the test unit was concluded, the uneven bottom of this pit was approximately 110 cm below surface. Besides extensive amounts of brick and mortar demolition rubble, several limestone foundation stone fragments were encountered. The artifact assemblage was quite limited below the plow zone, that is, below 20 cm from the surface, consisting of two transfer printed whiteware sherds, 4 fragments of patinated window glass, and 114 cut nails. The horizontal extent of the feature was unknown, since no edges were seen in the unit. It was interpreted as a portion of a root cellar from an earlier structure, probably a house, that was demolished or burned (some isolated charcoal deposits were included in the feature fill). The presumed structure associated with Feature 1 must have been earlier than the main house due to its position directly in front of the mansion. Needless to say, further excavation of this enigmatic feature was a high priority for the 2004 field school.

Fieldwork in 2004

The 2004 fieldwork program was more focused than the discovery-level survey and testing that preceded it during the previous field season. In the most recent effort, most of the resources allotted for fieldwork were spent excavating test units, with only 5 survey units dug and a limited amount of trenching undertaken. After re-establishing the metric grid system from the previous field season, the locations of Trench 4 and Test Unit 5 were identified by surface slumping. These areas were shovel shinned until the outlines of the previous excavations were clearly discerned, allowing 2 x 2 m units to be located adjacent to them. Recovery techniques were comparable to the 2003 season, with screening of all fills using ½ inch mesh; artifact collections from trenches were not screened. A permanent datum was established and vertical measurements in all test units were taken using an optical transit.

Five test units (TU) measuring 2 x 2 m each (20 m² total area) and labeled 9 through 13 were excavated to sterile; their locations are shown in Figure 3. TU 9 was adjacent and south of TU 5 from the previous field session and was dug in the hope of defining the edge of Feature 1, the presumed cellar pit. TU 10 through 13 were all concentrated on confirming the presence of a brick foundation structure adjacent to the academy. Based on the results from these units, four ½ m survey units were excavated at 5 m intervals west of the test units (a single survey unit was placed near the southwest corner of the main house to “fill in” our survey interval from the previous year). Finally, three trenches (c. 22.8 m²) were dug in the barn area in an effort to locate limestone foundations. In addition, an area in the gravel parking lot surface measuring approximately 4 x 6 m was scraped with the blade of a backhoe but not excavated. As indicated below, no likely candidates for barn foundation elements were identified in the trenches, although barn-related artifacts were recovered.

Features in the test units and Trench 4 were mapped and photographed. Instead of a hand-drawn map of the plan of excavations (as reproduced in Honerkamp 2003:27), a total station was used to record the unit locations, buildings, and contours shown in Figure 2. The current map should be considered the more accurate of the two.
Laboratory Analysis

Most of the artifacts recovered during the 2004 season were cleaned and rough sorted in the field. Classification, data entry, and analysis was undertaken at the UTC Institute of Archaeology during the summer and fall of 2004. The author was ably assisted in this phase by Mark Shearer and Corrine Vitek. After first recording provenience information, artifact categories, and artifact frequencies on note cards, this information was entered into a multi-worksheet Excel file to create an inventory of the nearly 5000 artifacts that were recovered. Individual artifacts that possessed illustrative value and/or future interpretive potential were removed from the Field Specimen (FS) bags to be photographed in a digital format. All artifacts recovered from the site have been returned to the Doak Museum.

Since the 2004 season was devoted primarily to testing rather than survey and backhoe trenching, a larger portion of the site was subject to systematic screening than in 2003. This resulted in a hefty number of personal items that are illustrated below. Especially striking are the 14 buttons that were recovered, all but one of which are associated with the academy. This locale was also the source of the slate pencils and pipe fragments. As discussed later, the presence of so many personal items may well indicate a residential function for this portion of the site, as opposed to an educational (schoolhouse) purpose.

Illustrated artifacts are presented below as functional groups, regardless of provenience. Reference will be made throughout the remainder of the report to these five figures.

Figure 4. Ceramics Artifacts.
Top, left: hand-painted polychrome pearlware, FS 108; finger painted pearlware, FS 90. Bottom, left: mended lead glazed earthenware bowl base, FS 98; maker’s mark (FS 91) reads “TRADEMARK ROYAL 
SEMI . PORCELAIN JOHN MADDOCK & SONS ENGLAND”.
Figure 5. Bone Artifacts.

Top, left to right: five hole buttons, FS 90, 111; four-hole button, FS 109; button halves, FS 123 (striated), 100. Bottom: broken lice comb, FS 95; engraved fork handle, FS 90.

Figure 6. Miscellaneous Buttons.

Top, left to right: brass button, FS 90; copper button, FS 123, four-hole copper button, FS 107; two-hole pewter button, FS 109. Middle: four-hole porcelain button, FS 107; two-hole Vulcanite (rubber) button, FS 117. Bottom: four-hole shell buttons, FS 109; four-hole faceted shell button, FS 114.
Figure 7. Slate Pencils and Smoking Pipes.
Top, left to right: Slate pencils, FS 100, 117, 127. Bottom: stub stem pipe fragment, FS 109; glazed stub stem pipe fragment, FS 90; White clay pipe bowl fragment, FS 102.

Figure 8. Partial Projectile Points.
Top left: probable Hamilton point, FS 98; probable Madison point base, FS 128. Bottom left: possible Greenbriar point, FS 98; unidentified point, FS 102.
Testing Results: The Main House Area

TU 9. After identifying the outline of TU 5 from the previous field season, the northwest corner of TU 9 was measured in 1.30 m south of 190N 215E. This left about 30 cm between the 2 x 2 m test and the earlier 1 x 2 m unit; the grid coordinates for TU 9 are 186.70N 215E. Once the sod was removed, excavation occurred in 10 cm levels, with all fill screened using ¼ inch mesh. Due to the nature of the fill in this unit, composed exclusively of clay, brick and mortar rubble, and large limestone fragments, the excavation and screening proceeded slowly and was labor intensive, requiring the use of pickaxes to loosen the compacted rubble (see Figures 9 and 10). The uneven floor bottomed out at 1.13 m below surface in the southeast corner.

Figure 9. TU 9 Floor and South Profile.
A PVC utility pipe extends north-south across the unit. Scale = 50 cm.

Artifacts recovered in the top two levels (extending about 20 cm below surface) as well as a shallow ditch-witch trench for a PVC utility line (Feature 10) included 8 wire nails along with 75 cut or square nails. According to Adams (2002), wire nails begin to be commonly used in the mid-1880s, which establishes a terminus post quem for this disturbed context. Also supporting this general date is the presence of coal and clinker in the top two levels but only charcoal in the lower levels. Coal is a hallmark fuel for domestic heating and even cooking in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, although it was also used earlier. In addition, 4 pieces of plastic were gleaned from the top level. None of the 68 ceramic artifacts, composed of 5 lead glazed earthenware sherds, 8 plain pearlware, 4 blue transfer printed pearlware, and 51 whiteware plain (23) and decorated (28) sherds provide a later terminus post quem than the wire nails. Four of the lead glazed earthenware sherds formed the lip of a small bowl and are illustrated in Figure 4.
Interestingly, the bottom seven levels were devoid of ceramics, and as with the adjacent 1x 2 (Honerkamp 2003:17), scant historic artifacts were associated with the lower part of the fill. The total artifact count for TU 9 was 1255, but a whopping 539 were flint artifacts, including 5 utilized flakes, a partial Greenbriar and a partial Hamilton points (Figure 8), a partial quartz scraper, and the remainder being debitage. These artifacts are clearly prehistoric in origin, and when added to the 235 flint fragments found in the 1 x 2, they present a remarkably high frequency, suggesting the presence of a tool manufacture/modification site that had been disturbed and redeposited with the historic fill. The quartz scraper is surely associated with the Archaic, as is the possible Greenbriar point, while the Hamilton is now firmly established in the Late Woodland (Cambron and Hulse 1990:58, 64). The flint artifacts were scattered throughout the 9 excavated levels of TU 9, although the majority (87%) came from Levels 2 and 3.

Another artifact type that can probably be excluded from the historic category are the 303 small mammal bones that were noted, almost all of which were below 20 cm. Due to their small size, they are almost surely a commensal species, such as rat. Cut and square nails comprised the majority (79) of the total artifacts in the lower zones, with only 6 glass fragments being recovered, 1 of which was window glass. A single bone button was recovered from the lowest level of Feature 1 (Figure 5, FS 111), as were three small undated iron buckle fragments from Level 4.

The presence of mostly architectural-associated artifacts (nails) and the marked absence of domestic artifacts (ceramics and vessel glass) from the Feature 1 fill once again underscores how “clean” this fill is. Table 1 indicates a seemingly high total and per-meter frequency of artifacts recovered from the unit, but the vast majority of these are either probable rat bones or are from the upper disturbed contexts. If bones are excluded, there were only 72 artifacts per m². This strongly suggests that the feature was intentionally abandoned, and that it was not used as a refuse disposal area after abandonment until it was filled. Using South’s (1977) Mean Ceramic Date (MCD) formula on the 39 applicable upper-level ceramics, a date of 1839.5 was calculated, which was considerably later than the 1826 MCD found on ceramics in the 1 x 2. When plain whiteware sherds are used in the calculation—a type that is notoriously inexact when used in an MCD formula because it is virtually indistinguishable from ironstone and therefore possesses a late midpoint date—the MCD is 1845.6 This is considerably later than the MCD estimate for the 1 x 2 due to the fact that plain whiteware sherds were excluded from the 2003 MCD calculations. That the disturbed upper levels of the unit would produce a “late” MCD should not come as a surprise according to the Law of Superposition, not to mention the occurrence of wire nails and plastic, but this MCD disparity seems be a pretty effective illustration of the drawbacks of small sample sizes.

Once Feature 1 was filled with demolition materials, however, this area was used for Brunswick-style refuse disposal (South 1977), as indicated by all the ceramics and most of the glass that was confined to Levels 1 and 2. Alternatively, the upper part of the basement may have been filled with soils from another part of the site that already contained secondary refuse, as well as the lithic assemblage mentioned above.

Although it was expected that the edge of the Feature 1 floor would be encountered in TU 9, such was not the case. Instead, the feature extended an unknown distance beyond the limits of the 2 x 2. This indicates that the north-south dimension of Feature 1 is in excess of 3.30 m; the east–west dimension is still unknown, and is in excess of 2 meters. The brick and mortar rubble marks the presence of a brick structure, and the limestone indicates that at least some foundation elements mirrored the architectural components of the main house. It should also be noted that
21 fragments of glazed brick were found in the unit, indicating the presence of a fireplace. As was also recorded in the earlier 1 x 2 m test, the floor of the feature was uneven and sloped down to the south and east.

Table 1. Test Unit (2 x 2 m) Combined Artifact Frequencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Unit</th>
<th>Ceramics</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Nails</th>
<th>Brick, Mortar</th>
<th>Coal</th>
<th>Lithics</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
<th>Totals*</th>
<th>Per m²*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>152.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>172.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>229.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>156.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals and per m² excludes brick, coal, lithics.

Figure 10. South Profile of TU 9.
The limestone fragment in the left corner is natural and not associated with the cellar fill. Scales = 50 cm.

A rather undulating clay floor is also present in the basement of the Doak House today. For Feature 1, this characteristic is illustrated in the photograph reproduced as Figure 9, which was taken at about 78 cm below surface (1.20 BD). Sterile clay occurs at the bottom left and center of the photograph, while the rubble fill, complete with hefty limestone foundation stone fragments, are clearly visible. So also is a substantial charcoal deposit in the bottom of the north and east
profiles, along with scattered flecks of charcoal in the east profile. After excavating to sterile, none of the profiles, including the south profile illustrated in Figure 10, presented a clear lens of charcoal, so it is doubtful that the structure associated with this possible cellar burned down. Additional testing will be required to find an edge—any edge—to this enigmatic discovery. Unfortunately, the south wall of the unit collapsed during backfilling with heavy machinery, so that area should be excluded from hand excavation in the future, although it is a likely candidate for an exploratory trench.

In summary, the excavation of Feature 1 in TU 9 established that the dimensions of this possible cellar exceeds 3.3 x 2 x 1 m, and that the cellar fill is devoid artifacts that would establish a modern origin. The hypothesis generated in 2003 still stands: Feature 1 represents the substantial cellar of a brick structure that was demolished and filled in, and it predates the main house. More testing is needed to confirm or deny these suggestions.

**Testing Results: The Early Academy**

Fieldwork at the west end of the extant academy was initiated by carefully hand excavating Trench 4 down to the plastic sheeting that had been placed on the trench floor during 2003. This eventually exposed several postholes that earlier had been identified but not excavated due to time constraints; they are discussed in the next section. It also revealed the partial wall foundation defined as Feature 1, and the right angle brick foundation connected to it designated as Feature 2. The parallel builders/robbers trench associated with Feature 1, labeled as Feature 3, was also revealed.

**TU 10**. This 2 x 2 m unit was placed south of Feature 1 and 2, leaving a 30 cm baulk between the edge of Trench 4 and the test unit. After screening the first level, which extended about 11 cm below surface, several courses of brick were discovered adjacent to the north wall of the unit. Excavation of the next level an additional 5 cm revealed the nature of the brick feature: it was the foundation of a double fireplace connected to Feature 2. By coincidence, the 2 x 2 m unit just barely encompassed the remains of the complete fireplace foundation, as illustrated in Figure 11. The east firewall/hearth area on the right was designated as Feature 11, with Feature 12 assigned to its counterpart on the west. The two firewalls were basically mirror images of each other, thanks to the addition of a course of stretchers along the west edge of Feature 2, which is composed of headers. It is obvious that Feature 2 is indeed a room partition wall, and that two interior back-to-back fireplaces were located in the structure. A single story frame or possible brick structure is suggested by the relatively modest foundation elements.

As shown in Figure 11, rubble from what appears to be a brick wall section appears on the northeastern edge of TU 10. Designated as Feature 13, it may represent the collapse of part of the central partition wall. Four plain whiteware and a porcelain sherd were the only temporally diagnostic artifacts associated with this deposit. Window glass (19) and clear round- (4) and flat-section glass (1), all of it patinated, was also recovered, as were 12 cut nails. A single clinker fragment and several fragments of charcoal were also noted, although the chimneys themselves were clean, with no in situ charcoal present. Once the rubble was removed, a shallow area of dark fill was mapped that may have been associated with Feature 14 in Trench 4 (labeled as Feature 13 in Figure 12). It was devoid of artifacts. Measurements taken from the map of the double chimney (Figure 12) show that the back hearth walls were 75-80 cm wide, or about 2.5
feet. The cheek walls extended c. 45 cm (17.5 inches) from the back walls. The approximate centers of the fireboxes were 2.17 m (a little over 7 feet) from the center of Feature 1 to the north, suggesting that evidence of a companion wall to the south would be located at that same distance, assuming a symmetrical layout; this would produce a building that was about 15 feet wide on the exterior. All the bricks shown in Figures 11 and 12 are bottom courses, and their datums were all within a couple of centimeters of each other. However, Features 1 and 2 in Trench 4 are 10 cm (or about 1 course of bricks) deeper than the brick features in TU 10. The transition from “low” to “high” footing apparently takes place in our 30-cm-wide baulk, which could not be excavated due to time constraints. Doing so in a future excavation is recommended, as this inconsistent depth for the bottom courses is certainly an architectural oddity. A tentative explanation that can be offered is that the exterior foundations were more deeply buried than the interior features for added stability, although a spread-foot foundation would seem to be a more customary answer to the stability challenge.

While 54 sherds were found in TU 10, the majority (23) were plain whiteware. When combined with the other applicable types, an MCD of 1852 was generated from 28 sherds, or 7 years later than the MCD from TU 9. Since the academy is documented as occurring later than the main house and is certainly later than a house predating the present mansion, this later date
Figure 12. Features in Trench 4 and Units 10 and 11.

Features 1, 2, 11, and 12 are all brick foundations to the early academy walls and double fireplace. Feature 18 is a builder’s trench for the academy south wall, while Feature 19 represents a robber’s trench within it. Feature 17 is a relatively recent posthole/postmold, one of a line of east-west postholes associated with a fence.
is roughly consistent with the documented history of the site. Overall artifact frequencies appear in Table 1. An unusual discovery in Zone 2 was a fragment of a broken bone lice brush (Figure 5). As will be noted below, this is one of several personal items directly associated with the early academy.

TU 11. Located directly adjacent and to the south of TU 10, this 2 x 2 m square was opened in order to intersect the projected south companion wall for Feature 1. After 10 cm of soil was removed, the faint outline of a possible builder’s trench (Feature 18) was discerned in the south half of the unit. The removal of approximately 5 cm of Level 2 allowed this feature to be photographed and mapped (Figure 13). As predicted, from the north edge of Feature 1 (corresponding to the north wall foundation) to the south edge of Feature 18 (believed to have contained the south wall foundation before being robbed) the distance was 15 feet (4.62 m; see Figure 12). As with the north wall, the foundation bricks were robbed from the south wall, and a distinction between the builder’s and robber’s trenches was observed. This distinction was also the case, though not as obvious, with the north wall builder/robber trench associated with Feature 1 in Trench 4 (Honerkamp 2003: Figure 23, p. 33).

Figure 13. South Academy Wall Builder/Robber Trenches in Unit 11.

The south edge of the double chimney is to the left; the Feature 2 foundation is discontinuous due to robbing or plowing. Facing east; scales = 50 cm.

In Figure 13 the robber’s trench signature consists of the linear orange mottled fill within the darker builder’s trench fill around it. Note that two remnant bricks from Feature 2 are on the
exact edge of the robber’s trench. The relationship between Features 18 and 19 can be more clearly distinguished after the latter was excavated, as seen in Figure 14. Since Feature 19 tracks the exact location of the former south wall, the presence of the builder’s trench on the north indicates that this wall was probably built up from the building interior, with the foundations flush to the Feature 18 south edge. Also emerging in the Figure 14 photograph are at least 8 faint “ghosts” of the footprints for individual foundation bricks, located in the eastern half of Feature 19. As with the bricks in Feature 1, they were laid in a north-south orientation. Unlike the Feature 1 bricks, they were not deeper than the chimney and partition wall foundations. Thus, in terms of vertical proveniences, the north and south walls were asymmetric, and the notion that the north wall was laid deeper than the partition wall for the sake of stability is not a particularly viable explanation. The uneven depths of the north and south walls remain an architectural anomaly, and a mystery.

The 1851.3 MCD for this unit was taken from 58 of the 101 sherds that were recovered, and it compares favorably with the 1852 date derived from the adjacent unit. The two units are not exactly mirror images of each other: TU 11 includes some “exterior” artifacts, while TU 10 was completely within the structure’s walls. Heavy plowing in this area has rendered this distinction largely superfluous, however. As with TU 10, no coal or coal clinker was noted, only charcoal (Table 1). A partial stemmed, corner notched flint projectile point accompanied the 13 debitage fragments that were recovered. Its temporal affiliation is unknown. A single

Figure 14. Feature 19 Robber's Trench in Unit 11.

After being reaming the robber’s trench to sterile, the extent of the builder's trench (Feature 18) in which it resides is obvious. Facing east; 50cm scales.
A fragment of cellophane was recovered from Zone 1 and is obviously intrusive, along with a partial .22 slug found in Zone 2. More significant than the occurrence of these small intrusive items is the fact that *none* of the 109 nails associated with this unit were wire types. This indicates that these architectural-related items, and by implication the structure they were a part of, are all most likely confined to the 19th century.

A somewhat unusual item associated with Zone 2 was the discovery of a white clay pipe bowl fragment (Figure 7, bottom right). Although white clay pipes are more commonly associated with the 18th century, Noel Hume illustrates one variety that was common from 1820-1860 (1974: 303). Remarkably, the “Miscellaneous” category in Table 1 includes 26 eggshell fragments! That such fragile items would be preserved at all is certainly unexpected, particularly since 11 are associated with Feature 18, which is believed to possess an antebellum date.

Unfortunately, no sherds that would establish a *terminus post quem* for the filling of this feature (and by association, the accompanying brick wall) were part of the artifact assemblage. Besides eggshell, the complete list of feature artifacts include: 8 window glass; 9 cut nails; an iron wire fragment; 8 brick and mortar fragments; 2 charcoal fragments; 2 shell fragments (!), probably from river mussels; one half of a bone button and a cast brass button (Figures 5 and 6); and a small unidentified bone fragment. Many of these items were recovered from the upper part of the feature and may have been “smeared” into the top of the feature, and therefore are intrusive. However, at least some of these artifacts were already around when Feature 18 was filled—a clean builder’s trench fill would be expected if it was created prior to any refuse deposition. The recovery of the bone and brass buttons are especially intriguing for this provenience. An additional partial bone button was found in Level 1 (Figure 5), as was a slate pencil (Figure 7), which is infinitely appropriate for a school building.

Feature 19, the robber’s trench appearing within the Feature 18 builder’s trench, did contain artifacts that can be used to establish a *terminus post quem* for the feature’s filling. The four sherds of hand painted polychrome pearlware (Figure 4, top left), with a beginning manufacturing date of 1795, are not particularly informative, but a single sherd of hand painted polychrome whiteware indicates that the bricks were removed and the resultant trench filled sometime after 1820 (Noel Hume 1970; Price 1979). This is consistent with a suspected post-1830 construction date for the academy, and a later still demolition date. So too is the MCD of 1851, which is believed to correspond to the mid-occupation span in this location. Apparently broken ceramics were present by the time of the structure’s demise, but not as it was being built. Also screened from the feature fill were 8 fragments of patinated window glass, 7 cut nails, 9 brick and mortar fragments, 6 charcoal fragments, 11 small eggshell pieces, and a single small mammal bone.

What stands out in the overall artifact profile for this unit, however, is the high frequency of patinated window glass (387), which is more than four times as numerous as in the adjacent unit (*n=79*). This suggests that a window or windows were present on the south but not the north side of the structure, assuming the glass fragments were the result of primary rather than secondary depositional processes (Schiffer 1976). Other artifact classes for TU 11 are roughly double of what was recovered in TU 10. Due to the occurrence of heavy plowing, it is not possible to tell if these relatively and absolutely higher frequencies are due to primary (in place) or secondary (transported from elsewhere) deposition. The nearly identical MCDs suggest that deposition occurred at the same time in the two units, whatever the process(es) involved.
TU 12. This 2 x 2 meter unit was situated 2 to 4 meters due west of TU 11 (Figure 2). The purpose of this leapfrog approach was to try to reveal the west wall to the structure, and ideally, its southwest corner. “Skipping” a square also ensured that a portion of the early academy’s archaeological record would remain intact for future research. Since the center of the double chimney was c. 14-15 ft from the present academy west wall, TU 12 was strategically placed so as to intersect a foundation that was the equivalent distance to the west of the chimney. Driving this field strategy, of course, was the assumption that the old academy was rectangular in form. Although they probably shared part of a north-south wall, the two academies were not the same dimensions. The extant academy is c. 20.5 ft (6.3 m) north-south, while wall trenches for the original academy have established it as 15 ft wide. Since the north walls of both academies were clearly aligned, and old photos of the extant academy show evidence of a west wall central doorway, the old and current academies were probably connected. If their roofs were at the same height, both buildings would have presented a continuous façade from the main house viewscape, while the south façade would have been discontinuous but invisible from the main house.

After sod removal, Level 1 in TU 12 extended 11 centimeters. Despite careful troweling of the entire floor to enhance feature visibility, the expected foundation and/or builder’s trench was not seen. Level 2 was excavated an additional 10 centimeters through alternate shovel troweling and troweling. Even though this depth was the equivalent to the bottom of Feature 18 in TU 11—and a sterile zone was making an appearance in the northwest quadrant of the unit—no indication of a wall trench could be detected. What could be defined at the bottom of this level were five equidistant plow scars oriented roughly east-west. Indirect support for a plowing hypothesis was the presence of a horseshoe fragment in Level 1. Fearing that heavy plowing may have been responsible for the loss of visibility for the expected wall trench, Level 3 was excavated to sterile (about 8 more centimeters), but without discovering any sign of a feature. Finally, out of desperation, the north and east walls were excavated approximately 5 cm into sterile and the corresponding profiles were carefully cleaned and inspected. All was in vain: no trace of a wall trench was seen in either profile. While the TU 12 north wall profile was thought to just barely encompass the location of a north-south wall trench for the first academy, there should have been no difficulty at all encountering the east-west extension of Features 18 and/or 19. The failure to do so suggested the implausible (and disconcerting) possibility that the early academy was asymmetric due to an abbreviated west side, with the end wall extending through the unexcavated 2 x 2 unit that had been leapfrogged. A more likely explanation was that plowing had obscured or destroyed the presence of would-be features.

Despite the disappointing results in discovering the anticipated feature, TU 12 possessed unusually high artifact frequencies (Table 1). In addition, an MCD of 1845.8 was generated from 155 (65% of the total 240) applicable sherds, which is notably earlier than the MCDs for TU 10 and TU 11. While no coal or clinker was recovered, 8 wire nails did appear in the unit, scattered in all three levels. This is what might be expected in a heavily-plowed context. As with TU 11, a significant portion of the TU 12 ceramic assemblage was composed of coarse lead glazed earthenware (23% and 26%, respectively), and 173 square-sectioned nails were found. Another similar aspect in the two artifact profiles is seen in the huge number of patinated window glass fragments (454). Assuming primary deposition, this again argues for the presence of a window in this area of the early academy, and perhaps also the presence of accident-prone residents. Of particular note was the occurrence of several personal items. These included 6 buttons (2 shell, 1 bone, 1 copper/brass, 1 porcelain, 1 pewter; see Figures 5 and 6), and a stub-stemmed clay pipe
bowl fragment (Figure 7). The 2003 program also generated three similar pipe fragments from the academy vicinity. Pfeiffer (1981) indicates this type of pipe was used with an inserted reed stem and dates from the 1840s to 1900. The 53 lithic artifacts consisted of debitage fragments only, and they increased in frequency with depth: 8, 18, and 27 were found in Levels 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

**TU 13.** The final 2 x 2 unit was placed 2 m north of TU 12, but also 1 meter west, as seen in Figure 2. A slightly greater depth of extant wall trenches had been observed in the northern test units and in Trench 4, so it was hoped that a slightly deeper wall trench might be present in the TU 13 vicinity, and that the disruptive reach of the plow had not obscured a lower portion of the feature. This unit location encompassed a 1.30 x 0.65 m portion of TU 2, excavated during the previous field session; it appeared in the northeastern section of TU 13. Once this obvious feature was defined and mapped, the fill associated with it was not screened, as it was assumed to be

![Image](image_url)

**Figure 15.** The First Academy West Wall Foundation, TU 13.

Orange mottled fill from the builder/robber trench extends from the foundation bricks (Feature 22) in the north wall of the unit south to the bottom of the photograph. Fill from TU 2 appears on the right. Facing north; scales = 50 cm.
sterile. The rest of the unit was taken down in 10 cm levels, eventually extending to just over 25 cm in the southwest corner. Thankfully, two bricks oriented east-west were discovered on the north central wall of TU 13, as was a companion builder-robber trench (a clear distinction between the two trenches was not visible). TU 2, the 1 x 2 m unit excavated in 2003, missed these features by about 12 centimeters. Designated as Feature 22 (the brick foundation) and Feature 23 (the robber’s trench), these features are the remains of the west wall of the early academy and are illustrated in Figure 15. At this level of definition, Feature 23 extended only two centimeters before sterile was encountered. Plowing apparently obliterated Feature 23 in TU 12, but the deeper topsoil in this adjacent unit preserved a portion of it in TU 13. As expected, this wall section is 15 feet from the center of the double chimney. The Feature 23 fill contained a single sherd of whiteware, which is not particularly helpful for establishing a _terminus post quem_ on the razing of the first academy structure (1820 or later).

The artifact profile presented in Table 1 indicates that this unit contains a high frequency of architectural items in the form of window glass (299) and square nails (140), although 18 wire nails that post-date the first academy were also recovered from Levels 1 and 2. These frequencies indicate that an end window or windows occurred in the early structure. A faceted shell button and another slate pencil were also recovered from this unit (Figures 6 and 7); no coal or clinker fragments were recovered. The 63 lithic fragments were all classified as debitage.

An unusual item derived from Level 2 was the vulcanite button shown in Figure 6. As indicated in the most commonly cited web site [http://www.plastiquarian.com/vulcanit.htm](http://www.plastiquarian.com/vulcanit.htm) dealing with this type of artifact, the button provides a probable _terminus post quem_ of 1851, when the process was patented in the US. According to this source, vulcanite was originally made from natural rubber and was usually black in color; it was used to make combs, buttons, cases, jewelry, fountain pens, pipe stems, etc. It was also widely used as an electrical insulator and for chemically resistant linings. Of course, such a diminutive artifact could easily be intrusive, particularly in a plowed context.

From a total of 142 sherds, 99 (69.7%) were applicable for the MCD calculation, which produced the earliest date of any of the academy-related units: 1843.4. On a somewhat small sample (54 sherds), the MCD for Unit 2 was recalculated by including the whiteware sherds, and the 1842.5 result was consistent with the TU 13 MCD. It thus seems apparent that the eastern half of the first academy was occupied at a later date than the western half, assuming primary deposition of ceramics. The differences in ceramic frequencies for the two rooms—155 (east) and 342—suggest a difference in room functions, with activities associated with food consumption being more common in the west room area. The breakdown of coarse lead glazed earthenwares may also support this assertion: 38 sherds are associated with the east room, while 87 were found in the west room. Such wares are often associated with food storage and preparation, as opposed to the serving function of the refined pearlwares, whitewares, and porcelain types. The possibility exists, however, that the academy lead glazed earthenwares simply functioned as less elegant serving vessels, particularly as bowls: many of the sherds were thin-walled and glazed on both the exterior and interior. What is clear is that more than just classroom instruction occurred in both of the rooms.

When calculated together, ceramics from all four test units in the early academy yielded an MCD of 1846.5. When the MCD for Unit 4 was recalculated to include whiteware, an expected later date of 1852.4 was derived from 123 sherds. The two samples are not exactly comparable, as TU 4 represents secondary refuse that was deposited outside a south-facing door.
of the present academy, but the later temporal placement of the ceramic assemblage is certainly consistent with the occupation sequence proposed here.

The combined unit 1846.5 MCD represents a mean occupation date that is 11 years after the presumed initial construction date of 1835 for the first academy, according to oral history. If this represents an approximate mid-date of occupation, the end date for the occupation would be 1857. However, there is really no way to determine the actual abandonment date of the structure without establishing a terminus post quem from artifacts or documents, and this has not been possible.

Summary: The Early Academy. Architectural evidence consisting of brick foundations and foundation builder and robber trenches indicates that the early academy was a 15 by 30 ft structure with a central double chimney. It was probably a single story frame structure, and based on its north and east wall alignments, it appears at one time to have been connected to the present academy. For some inscrutable reason the north wall foundation was constructed at a lower depth than the chimney and the south and west walls. The two academies differed in the types of foundations they possessed (stone versus brick), and probably in the chimney construction material as well. A large number of ceramic artifacts are associated with the early structure interior, indicating that behavior associated with food consumption occurred there. Of the two rooms that were tested, the western room contained earlier ceramic assemblages, as measured by the MCD formula. Numerous buttons, a bone handled fork (see Trench 4 discussion below), two slate pencils and two pipe bowl fragments are all personal items that were found. When these artifacts and the substantial ceramic assemblage are combined with the three bone buttons, three pipe bowl fragments, a broken bone handle to a knife, and an iron knife tang, and the slate pencils that were found in the vicinity of the two academies during 2003, it is apparent that a variety of activities occurred there. If either academy was used for educational purposes, that would certainly not preclude food consumption. The presence of ceramics, clothing-associated artifacts, and pipes simultaneously present the possibility that the academies may have served a residential function as student dorms. A combination of educational and residential uses is also feasible. Determining which of these scenarios is the most plausible is tricky due to the ambiguous nature of the artifact assemblages and the lack of stratified deposits. In all probability only the fortuitous discovery of documentary data can ever lead to a firm conclusion concerning this question.

Survey Trenches

Trench 4. As noted above, a portion of Trench 4 was re-excavated in order to reveal the crucial north wall of the early academy, and to expose some of the postholes that could not be excavated during 2003. A 4-m-long section of the original trench was widened from 1.0 to 1.2 m to provide additional working room for mapping and reaming of features. None of the trench fill, either re-excavated or original, was screened, but a surface collection (FS 90 and 129) was made that consisted of any artifacts noted during the course of the fieldwork.

Besides the brick wall foundation (Features 1 and 2), the features exposed in Trench 4 consisted of a dark stain of unknown function (Feature 14 in Figure 12) that also appeared on the north wall of TU 10, and postholes that are probably the archaeological manifestations of some of the fence posts illustrated in Figure 3 (see also Figure 9, p. 26 of the 2003 report). Feature 14 was mapped but not excavated. The three postholes that were excavated were
Figure 16. Feature 17 Posthole in Trench 4.

The postmold-versus-posthole relationship is apparent from the different fill colors. Facing east, scale = 50 cm.

Figure 17. Profile of Feature 21 Posthole/Postmold.

A fragment of slate appears at the bottom of the feature, which has a slightly sloping bottom. The hole-mold distinction was only discerned in profile. The west end of Feature 1 appears above (east) of Feature 21, while the already-excavated Feature 20 posthole is seen below (west of) it. Facing east, scale = 50 cm.
labeled Features 17, 20 and 21. All three possessed slightly sloping walls, with flat bottoms for Features 17 and 20 and a slightly sloping bottom for Feature 21 (see Figures 16 and 17). They were clearly modern in origin, based on their intrusion into the early academy builder’s trench and the fact that they extended from the surface. Each contained a good deal of brick and mortar rubble, indicating that were created after demolition of the early academy had occurred. A clear distinction was made between the Feature 17 posthole and postmold, as shown in Figures 12 and 16, and they were excavated separately. Artifacts consisted only of a square nail and 7 fragments of patinated window glass. The bottom of Feature 20 was 20 cm lower than the other two postholes (Figure 12), and this variability in depth suggesting that there was a multiple series of posts set at different times. Feature 20 contained a single sherd of hand painted whiteware, a window glass fragment, a cut nail, and a U-shaped fence nail. Feature 21 contained only a single sherd of plain whiteware, 3 window glass fragments, and 4 cut nail fragments. Based on these relatively uninformative artifact associations, it was not considered to clear Trench 4 to its 2003 extent in order to excavate additional postholes.

Despite the lack of systematic artifact collection in Trench 4, an interesting assortment of personal items was recovered, including a bone button, brass button, and partial decorative glass button (Figures 5 and 6); a decorated bone handled fork (Figure 5); and a clay pipe fragment (Figure 7). All are in close proximity of the original academy but provide little clarity for what the primary function of the structure was, be it education, residence, or both. Perhaps the most intriguing of all artifacts recovered from Trench 4 consists of three brick fragments, two of which are illustrated in Figure 18. Collected while backfilling the trench, these concave and convex decorative bricks perfectly match the eve treatment of the main house. If these specimens are in primary context, their discovery suggests two important possibilities. First, to have decorative brick eves, one must have associated brick walls to support them; a frame structure will not suffice. Second, this elaborate cornice treatment suggests that the
double chimney structure that we are pleased to label the original academy was a formal type of building that echoed the precedent architectural motifs established with the main house. Such formality is more in keeping with an educational rather than student housing function for the early academy, at least initially. Admittedly, this is a good deal of gossamer conjecture to be spinning out of three brick fragments, but the presence of these artifacts require some sort of explanation, and both points are at least plausible.

Trench 6. As shown in Figure 2, this trench was located in the vicinity of the substantial stone foundation barn that was situated west of the main house. A flash flood had exposed part of a substantial limestone foundation, designated as Feature 24, on the east edge of the gravel parking lot (Figure 19). This was believed to correspond to the south wall of the barn. Since the exact size and location of the massive barn were unknown, a 75 cm-wide trench was dug north from Feature 24 using a Tusculum-provided backhoe. Starting on the north edge of the foundation, the trench extended north for 16.75 m in an effort to encounter a parallel foundation that corresponded to the barn’s north wall. Several hefty naturally-occurring limestone outcroppings were noted, but other than artifacts, nothing that was associated with architectural elements from the barn was exposed.

![Figure 19. Barn Limestone Foundation Elements (Feature 24). Facing south, scale = 50 cm.](image)

The same negative assessment resulted from two trenches dug at a right angle to Trench 6 (Figure 2). At 13.80 m north from Feature 24, Trench 7 was dug west from Trench 6. It extended 6.45 m and was 1.40 m wide. Trench 8, measuring 2.6 m x 1 m, was centered 10.80 m north of Feature 24, and also extended to the west of Trench 6. Neither of these east-west trenches revealed any structural features. It can only be suggested that the majority of the foundation elements were reused when the barn was demolished after the 1950s. The unscreened artifact assemblage from these trenches included 23 fragments of decorated and undecorated whiteware, a single sherd of banded pearlware, 12 pieces of miscellaneous glass (including 7 window glass), 118 nails (90 were wire types), and, appropriately, two horseshoe fragments and a file.
Survey Units

The five survey units that were excavated and screened each measured ½ m². Combined artifact frequencies derived from the units are presented in Table 2. SU 190N 200E was placed near the southwest corner of the main house to even out the survey coverage from the previous year. In addition to 2 lead glazed earthenware, 3 plain pearlware, and three whiteware sherds, this test yielded the base from a whiteware/ironstone plate that bears a maker’s mark reading:

TRADEMARK
ROYAL SEMI PORCELAIN
JOHN MADDOCK & SONS
ENGLAND

It is illustrated in Figure 4. According to the “Handbook of Old Pottery and Porcelain Marks,” this mark dates to 1891 or later (Thorn 1947:48).

Table 2. Combined Artifact Frequencies for Survey Units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Ceramics</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Nails</th>
<th>Brick/Mortar</th>
<th>Coal/</th>
<th>Lithics</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Totals*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>190N 200E</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153N 195E</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153N 190E</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153N 185E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153N 180E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T=138*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals ≠ brick, coal, and lithic categories

Based on the positive results from the four test units, a series of four survey units were excavated at 5 m intervals west of TU 13 in order to search for evidence of another structure. The artifact frequencies from the latter units shows a reduction in selected artifact groups (ceramics, glass, nails and bone) as the distance from the early academy increases, with a dramatic falloff at 153N 185E. However, this same survey unit produced the highest frequency of brick and mortar fragments. In addition, this was the only survey test that produced any indication of the presence of a structure: in the floor of the survey unit, at 27 cm below surface, two brickbats were found. That these bricks would be located 15 meters west of the early academy foundation suggest the presence of an additional structure occurring in this vicinity. This discovery was literally made on the last day of fieldwork, thus preventing any further investigation. Additional testing using 2 x 2 m units will be required to determine the nature and extent of this possible structural evidence.

Artifacts associated with the academy survey tests include an iron spoon fragment of unknown date and yet another slate pencil (Figure 7), both from 153N 190E, and a basal
fragment from a flint projectile point (Figure 8). The point base appears to be a Madison type, which dates to the Middle Mississippian period (Cambron and Hulse 1990:84).

**Summary and Recommendations**

Systematic testing during the 2004 field season resulted in the discovery of interpretable remains of a brick foundation directly adjacent to and west of the present academy. Architectural evidence consisting of foundations and the builder/robber trenches that foundations once appeared in have given us a clear idea of the footprint size and location of what was probably the initial or “early” academy. Artifact analysis indicates that the undocumented structure predates the present academy. Conflicting data suggests either a frame or brick single story building, but what is known is that the early academy measured 15 by 30 ft and possessed a central brick double chimney. Foundation footings were more deeply set on for the north wall than on the other three walls, and this odd arrangement constitutes an enduring architectural enigma. Even though the later academy differs from its earlier counterpart in terms of foundation materials and the size of the structures, they may well have been physically connected through a shared doorway. Based on the somewhat ambiguous artifact assemblages associated with it, the exact function of the early academy is unclear; it may have served as a schoolhouse, a student dormitory, or both. Survey tests indicate that another undocumented structure may be located about 15 m west of the early academy. Further testing to determine if this is the case are recommended for the future, and construction activities in this area should be avoided if at all possible.

Our investigation adjacent to the front of the main house did not achieve the same degree of clarity as the academy excavations. Despite the careful excavation of a 2 x 2 m unit over a meter deep, the size and layout of the suspected basement that was investigated in Unit 9 was not established. However, the probable early date of the basement was confirmed. While this intriguing feature contains scant artifacts, they all point to an early depositional event: the demolition of a brick structure. If this is indeed the case, this hypothesized undocumented structure almost certainly predates the main house adjacent to it. Future testing is clearly called for to determine the size and function of this feature. Besides additional hand-excavated test units, careful backhoe trenching from the southern (collapsed) edge of Unit 9 is recommended.

Test trenches to determine the location and size of the barn west of the main house were unproductive. Surprisingly, no architectural elements other than the limestone foundations already present in the gravel parking lot were discovered after excavation of 25 linear meters of backhoe trenches. Horseshoe fragments and a file provide the only faint signatures of the documented presence and function of this massive structure.

Besides the structural evidence that was revealed at the site, the excavations generated an impressive artifact collection, with much of it possessing an antebellum association. Many personal items, such as the wide assortment of buttons, eating utensils, slate pencils, a bone comb, and fragments of smoking pipes provide a fascinating glimpse into the material culture of the site’s early inhabitants. These artifacts also offer an opportunity for enhancing already-existing displays and for developing new exhibits associated with the Doak House Museum’s interpretive programs.

As was the case with the initial fieldwork, the 2004 field season at the Doak Site produced an equal ratio of surprises, challenges, and coherent, interpretable archaeological
remains. As soon as closure is achieved on one research question, a multiplicity of others are generated. The fragmentary nature of the above- and below-ground lines of evidence that are available to historical archaeologists means that some of these questions may never be fully answered, but additional fieldwork will hopefully at least improve upon the present ratio.
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