Chapter 5: Description and analysis of the remains

Introduction: Features and stratigraphy

As noted several times in the physical and historical description of the park, the southern half of the area, south of the transverse road immediately in front of City Hall (approximately from Murray Street south), was occupied by the U.S. Post Office building from 1870 to 1938. Its large footprint and deep subsurface construction completely destroyed any trace of the former deposits in that part of the park. Thus, it falls outside the bounds of this discussion, and there will be no consideration of its stratigraphy or lack of it here. The following observations all refer to excavation and monitoring operations in the northern half of the park. The description of the excavation and stratigraphy of non-feature operations and units has been given above (Chapter 2, pp. 19 to 81). The stratigraphy of the features, as defined by Parsons ES, is treated below. The information in this section comes from the Day Book kept by the Parsons ES site supervisors (Julie Abell-Horn and Sean Fritzell), the narrative reports submitted to the NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission by Petar Glumac, the Project Director, and the Unit/Trench Records kept by the excavators (denoted by initials only).

As an example of the information available from these sources, we can summarize the test operations on the western side of the park. Parsons ES excavated two series of test pits parallel to Broadway, running north to south. One series (TU 1-32) ran along the interior curb line separating the park from the pavement on the east side of Broadway. These units were 2 x 2 feet shovel tests at 10 foot intervals beginning from the intersection of Broadway and Chambers Street in the northwesternmost corner of the park and running to the western park entrance at Murray Street. All of these test pits encountered modern fill in the first approximately 6 inches of topsoil. Under this twentieth-century fill, most of the test units encountered either slightly earlier (nineteenth century) fill or red mottled subsoil. While some eighteenth-century material is noted in the field notes from the lower strata (“Stratum B” or “C”, depending on the topsoil depth), all except for those artifacts found in pits (and labeled as features) are from
disturbed contexts. This westernmost edge of the park had obviously been disturbed by
the foundation trenches for the modern curb lines. The second series of tests ran along
the line of a drain (DL1) dug through the entire length of the northern half of the park.
This line began 30 feet south of the first curbside test unit and 57 feet east of the curb,
running at an angle northwest for 150 feet until it reached a point 38 feet from the curb, at
which point it turned directly north and ran parallel to Broadway up to Chambers Street.
The test pits labeled DL1-1 through DL1-42 were initially set at ten foot intervals and
measured 3 x 3 feet, dug to at least the impact depth of 36 inches (above, pp. 1-46 to1-
47). In a few cases (for instance, DL1-21) where possibly significant features were
delineated in the test pits, adjacent tests (such as DL1-21A) were dug to determine the
extent of the deposit. In this and a few other cases, the test pits were excavated or cored
to below the 36 inch limit in an attempt to determine how deep the resources actually
went.

The Parsons ES Unit/Trench Records for each of the test pits in these series provide a
good deal of detail about the stratification of the west side of the park. Each stratum of
each test pit is described in terms of the composition of the matrix (loam, silty sand, clay,
rubble, etc.), its color (usually in both descriptive color terms and Munsell Soil Chart
readings), a brief description of artifacts and non-artifactual material contained in the
stratum, and a description and brief interpretation of the context. Profiles and, where
considered important, plans are appended to the records. Strata (denoted by letters) are
defined in terms of the matrix, and usually are changed when some observable change in
the matrix is noted. Strata need not necessarily be vertically superimposed; horizontally-
distributed differences in the soil matrix are also denoted as separate strata. Strata may
be arbitrarily divided into different (usually six inch) levels, given separate numbers (so,
A1, A2). Top and bottom depths are given for each level, usually apparently measured
from an arbitrary subsidiary datum (described in several cases as a nail on top of one of
each test pit’s corner stakes), which, given the lacunae in the data, has not been possible
to tie into a site datum. Thus, while we know the stratum or level thickness within each
test pit, we cannot connect the absolute height or depth of the strata in the various units
with each other. Since the surface of the current park is essentially flat in this area, this is
not a serious disability. However, it makes it impossible to draw a synoptic profile across the site, which would be useful to illustrate and underscore the general stratigraphy.

In general, the stratigraphy of the DL1 test trenches reveal a topsoil layer of four to seven inches thick, usually described as darker loam (Munsell color 10YR2/ to 10YR4/ range), underlain by [“Stratum B”] soil characterized as “silty sand”, “sandy silt”, “silty loam” or some variant wording which indicates that the matrix was somewhat finer than the topsoil and slightly different in color (Munsell 7.5YR range). This matrix contained artifacts (18th and 19th century ceramics, clay pipe fragments, glass, and bone) and was characterized in the notes as “fill” or “demolition episode”. Although the thickness of this layer varied from eight to twenty inches, it was generally thicker in the northern part of the DL1 series than in the south, perhaps indicative of more intense use of the western side of the park as one proceeded northwards. Except in those cases where pit features were found in the test units (as in DL1-21 and DL1-32), the third layer (usually denoted as “Stratum C”) continued from the bottom of the former stratum to the 36 inch depth of the bottom of the impact zone.

The information gained from the stratigraphy and excavation of the western part of the park generally confirms that already known from the documents. This part of the Common was the first built on in 1663, as the site of the windmills; no trace of these structures were identified. Certainly, some of the demolition rubble found in the third stratum, in particular in those test pits in the middle of the northwestern series (DL1-9 to DL1-16), may relate to the demolition of the Bridewell in 1838 (coins from 1832 and 1825 were found in the “demolition layer” of DL1-14 and DL1-15). Further monitoring during the drain line excavation exposed a stone pier and heavy rubble noted as Feature 61 (see above, p. 53) between DL1-9 and DL1-12 (Fig. 2-1). While it is not possible to determine the orientation or what part of the structure this pier and associated rubble represent, illustrations and maps indicate that the building was oriented east-west (see fig. 3-25 [view of Bridewell]). The location of the rubble corresponds well with the postulated location of the structure (cf. Hunter Research 1993).
The stratigraphy of the far northern edge of the park, along Chambers Street, can best be judged from the test units (TU 34-42) and trenches (Trench 1, 1A and 2) excavated to investigate the locations of the curb and fence to be replaced along the southern line of the Chambers Street sidewalk and the new pneumatic bollards (Trenches PB-1 and PB-2) to be set into deep pits east and west of Tweed Courthouse. The test units along Chambers Street east of Tweed Courthouse were 2 feet square by 18 inches deep. Nineteenth-century ceramics and artifacts and demolition rubble were found in all test units.

Trench 1 was 105 feet from east to west, parallel to the Chambers St sidewalk, extending 2.5 feet south from the south sidewalk curb, marked in 5’ intervals, to be excavated down to 18 inches (see p. 20). Under the first stratum of topsoil and the builder’s trench for the sidewalk curbstone, Stratum B was composed of red sandy soil in the southern two-thirds of the test units. This is presumably the matrix containing the human burials found in T1-25-30’ and T1-20-25’. The PES Day Book (entry for February 11, 1999) notes that both of these apparently date to the 19th century, since the former has a 1850’s coin found beneath it, while the latter rests above a penny from the 1840’s. The chronological inference is debatable; in T1-25-30, the coin was found in Stratum C, a “mottled soil” sandwiched between the red sandy soil of Stratum B and the identical, if cleaner, red sand of Stratum D in the southwest part of the test unit. The notes do not indicate whether in fact the matrix into which the burial was dug was Stratum B or D. Nor are they clear as to whether Stratum C actually underlies the burial. There is no profile, and the plan view seems to indicate that Stratum C is horizontally, rather than vertically, distinguished from Stratum B. It is thus quite possible that the lens of Stratum C (and the 1852 coin) is later than the burial and the context is later. No coin is noted in the unit record for T1-20-25. Logically, it appears unlikely that either of these burials would date to the mid-19th century, when City Hall Park had already assumed its role as a center for civic, or at least public, activities and had long lost those institutions (the Bridewell, the Almshouses, the Gaol) with which burials might be associated. By 1800, the Broadway/Chambers Street corner was occupied by the Health Office, the Second Almshouse had been standing to the east of it since 1797, further to the east (nearer the corner of present-day Chambers
and Center Street) stood the Engine House of Protection Engine 22, constructed in 1808 (Dunshee 1952:191), and later (in 1817) the Rotunda was built slightly to the east of the Engine House. The 1825 Standsbury painting (Fig. 5-1) gives a view of Chambers Street in which the New York Institution (American Museum) is very prominent among the structures crowded into the north end of the park. The probability of burials being interred along Chambers Street after the beginning of the nineteenth century is very low indeed. More likely they are among the few remains of the second Almshouse Burial Ground left undisturbed by 19th century construction, whose fellows were found in the Chambers Street streetbed and sidewalk during the reconstruction of Tweed Courthouse (Hartgen 2005).

Fig. 5-1: City Hall Park, 1825; New York Institution at left
Trash Features Analysis

Twenty-six of the features excavated by PES were characterized as trash features (Fig. 5-2).

Fig. 5-2: City Hall Park Features
As described in the excavation reports and notes, these were primarily pits of varying sizes, shapes and depths in which the fill was composed of ceramic sherds, glass, bones and shells, architectural fragments such as brick nails and plaster (in secondary context) and other miscellaneous items (buttons and button blanks, personal items). The contexts and condition of the artifacts are interpreted as reflecting refuse disposal, rather than any use-related context (Schiffer 1982).

1 The majority of the data presented and synthesized is taken from the forthcoming doctoral dissertation by Alyssa Loorya through the Department of Anthropology at the CUNY Graduate Center.
There was an *a priori* assumption by the excavators (and carried over into the early stages of the analysis) that the trash features were associated with those structures closest to them during the historic period but, this may not necessarily be the case. The size of the northern half of CHP (approximately two hundred forty by five hundred eighty (420 x 580) feet, less than two short city blocks long and one block wide, makes it possible that refuse from any of the structures might have been deposited in almost any available spot within the area. Even the possibility of fences which demarcated the surroundings of one structure from another does not vitiate this argument. It is possible, without additional documentary or archaeological evidence to the contrary, that refuse was deposited wherever on the Common there was an open pit or hole, or that shared trash dumps were the norm among the eighteenth-century institutions. There is also the possibility, raised by both the faunal data (Hambrecht, below) and the presence of kiln furniture in many of the trash features, that there is a certain amount of industrial waste being dumped in the Common. Although both the tanneries and the ceramic workshops and kilns were located further to the north, nearer the Collect pond (Fig. 5-3), some of their wasters and bone refuse may have found its way into the CHP assemblage. This pattern was seen at the African Burial Ground site. Also, by the mid-eighteenth century there were houses both to the east and west of the Common. Some of their domestic trash might also have been dumped into the open dumps on the Common.

*Fig. 5-3: Grim Plan, depicting 1742-44 (drawn 1813)*
Thus, a facile association of trash feature with structure and occupants may be misleading on a number of counts.

Differences in the assemblages from the various trash features might be thought to be temporal rather than (or as well as) reflective of the different populations occupying the structures or disposing of refuse. Within the precision possible by the dating methods, temporal distinctions in eighteenth century ceramics, pipe stem dating, and other methods indicate that almost all of the features are contemporaneous, with a mid- to late eighteenth century date\(^2\). It almost looks as if most of the trash features were open during the same period of time, or that our dating methods are not sensitive enough to distinguish temporal differences on a scale that is useful. Demonstrably seventeenth century artifacts are rare to nonexistent, probably testifying to the uninhabited state of the Common and its surroundings at that time. Nineteenth century artifacts are found primarily in the mixed fill of the topsoil layer in secondary contexts or associated with architectural features clearly connected with City Hall (such as cisterns, privies and drainage features). By the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century, if that late, CHP was apparently no longer a place to actively dump refuse.

Thus, we have several possible ways in which to look at the deposition of material from secure contexts at CHP. The first (model 1) is to consider the entire assemblage as a single unit. The main assumptions in this case are that refuse disposal on the Common was random with respect to time and location of deposit. All trash pits were open at approximately the same time (or at least are temporally indistinguishable) and there is an equal chance of any individual object being deposited in any one of them. The second is to consider each feature as individual and its contents as unique. This would assume that either (model 2a) each was open for deposition (and used as a dump for all structures on the Common) at a specific time before being closed and deposition moving to the next open context, or (model 2b) although there were several (perhaps all) contexts open at the same time, each was used by an exclusive group of people. Slightly modified (by

\(^2\)The Mean Ceramic Dates for deposits in various feature clusters around the park range from 1744 to 1794. These dates are not supported by pipestem dating from the same features. This problem is discussed at length in Loorya’s forthcoming Ph.D. dissertation.
assuming that several trash features may have been used by inhabitants of the same structure), this is basically the model that connects each trash feature with a structure on the eighteenth century Common to which it was closest. Significant differences of status, ethnicity, consumer preferences, or buying power among the groups using these trash features exclusively would lead to significant (non-random) differences in the material deposited. This as yet unproven, usually implicit assumption, is widespread in archaeology, especially historic archaeology.

The artifacts from the trash deposit feature contexts can be considered in each of the above manners. First, we can look at the artifacts from the site as a whole, as though they comprised a single assemblage (model 1, above). In fact, on at least three levels, they do: they are all from CHP, they are all from trash deposits, and they are all (roughly) contemporaneous. We can characterize this assemblage by type and function, material, techniques and motifs. This is our null hypothesis: where the artifacts were deposited, with what others they were associated, near what structures, is all not significant. This does not need to be tested separately; it is the default explanation if the other models are shown to be untenable.

If the second model (model 2a) is closer to the reality of the depositional history of these features, there should be observable typological and percentage differences among them, explicable as reflecting gradual temporal change from one to another as the contexts were closed and others opened. In other words, we should be able to seriate the features in a reasonable fashion. As noted above, because of the imprecision of the date ranges for the artifact types and the short span of time involved (at most a century), this may be difficult to test. This model assumes that the rough contemporaneity posited above can be subdivided through typological change observed in chronologically sensitive types, but that the artifacts are still deposited in a random fashion as far as location is concerned, and that the percentages of types recovered from these contexts are representative of the population from which they were drawn. Both of these are assumptions of this model rather than observed facts.

---

3 For example, the fill in privies and cisterns relates only to the family or families who lived in that house. “Research questions” about these inhabitants are framed in terms of these significant differences.

4 The statistical tests of these models are found in the forthcoming dissertation of Alyssa Loorya.
Finally, we can investigate the third possibility adumbrated above (model 2b), that is, that there is a demonstrable difference among the assemblages from different features and that there is a relationship between one or more of the features and the structure or structures located closest to them. A group of features in close proximity to each other may have served a single structure, either contemporaneously or diachronically. There may have been physical barriers to free access to the features from other parts of the Common, such as fences which enclosed the structures, or one might presume (invoking a principle of least effort) that the occupants of a structure would choose to deposit their refuse closer to their structure rather than walking to another dump farther away. Again, demonstrating that the feature assemblages are distinct does not explain what this distinction signifies. Interpretation is another step.

In fact, the analyses presented in this chapter (in feature-by-feature form) seem to indicate that neither model 2a nor 2b is tenable based on the available data. The ceramic types, the pipes, and the other datable artifacts do not seriate well (see page 435 for mean ceramic dates and Chart 5-2 for pipestem dates from the features). The association with individual structures on the Common is not provable by the contents or the typology of the finds in the trash deposits. All datable closed deposits stem from the period between about 1750 and 1810, the period when historic documents such as the Common Council Minutes attest to the most intensive use of the Common. This is the time period which includes the construction and the flourit of the Almshouse, the Gaol, the Bridewell and the Barracks. It is also the time when the city was growing around both the east and west sides of the Common, with increased nearby occupation possibly connected with increased dumping on the Common periphery, and the most extensive use of the Barracks. If anything, the analysis of the trash features given in this chapter leads us to the conclusion that all of the above models are insufficient to explain the complex deposition of trash in the Common at this period. The primary fact that emerges is the dominance of the trash features in the northeast part of the excavated area, that is, (from south to north) Features 92, 91, 82 90, 156, 163, 87/88/89. These contain the vast majority of total artifacts found in trash contexts. It is possible that if the intervening areas between these features were excavated that they would be seen to be in reality one massive dump; certainly this seems true stratigraphically for Features 87, 87/88, 88 and
89 (see below). It is not inconceivable that this northeastern area was the major trash
dump for the Common (as well as at least some of the surrounding habitations and
businesses, given the occurrence of ceramic wasters and kiln furniture and possibly bones
and refuse from the nearby tanneries), possibly incorporating the refuse and privies from
the Barracks. It is interesting that, given the intensity of occupation on the Common
during this roughly 50-75 year period, that no privies were found in the excavations.

Thus, these observations lead to a new interpretation of the trash features. As opposed to
any of the models, the analysis of the trash features seems to indicate that the primary
dump during this period was used by all (as in model 1), but that smaller secondary
dumps may have been used as well (as in models 2a and 2b). It is also possible that
Feature 55, which differs from the other trash deposits in terms of the amount and
percentage of faunal material and ceramic types, is not a trash midden but rather sheet
deposit (see below).

To support these observations and conclusions, the features are presented in this chapter
The Site as a Whole:

As previously stated, the trash deposit features contained approximately 48,000 artifacts, approximately 36% of all artifacts on the site, exclusive of bone. A categorical analysis demonstrates that more than half of all artifacts recovered from the site are Food Related artifacts; this includes all artifacts related to food storage, preparation and consumption. The second largest category is Architectural materials. As noted in PES’ preliminary report (PES 1999), with the exception of glass and nails all (other) architectural materials were sampled. Personal Artifacts and Tools and Equipment are fairly evenly represented.

![Trash Deposit Features Percent Contributions by Category](image)

*Fig. 5-4*

Of the Food Related artifacts, 7578 are ceramics, ranging from partially complete vessels to small sherds, 9049 are glass and the remaining 351 are of other materials such as bone handled utensils or iron cooking pots. In total the Food Related artifacts can be divided in terms of functional classes as follows: 35% consumption and serving, 63% storage and preparation and 2% unclassifiable. The majority of preparation and storage materials are alcohol related bottles.
Removing bottles from the analysis and focusing on the ceramic wares significantly alters these percentages, demonstrating the large number of alcohol bottles in the collection. In terms of functional classes, 75% of the ceramic artifacts can be classed as consumption and serving, while 21% are for storage and food preparation.

Looking more closely as ceramic wares it can be stated that the trash deposit features as a whole contain 70% earthenwares, 25% stonewares and only 5% porcelain.
A breakdown of earthenwares provides the following analysis: 47% creamware, 12% pearlware, 9% tin-enamled, 8% Staffordshire type slipware, 7% American Redware and 7% Redware. Other types are represented by 3% or less.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earthenwares types</th>
<th>Percent Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Redware</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Slipware</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astbury</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderware</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Tin-Enamed</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackfield</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese Mottled</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slipware</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire Slipware</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin-Enamelled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorktown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total 12,537 pieces of glass were inventoried, of which 9049 (72%) were fragments of alcohol bottles and 3006 (24%) were window glass (Fig. 5-8). Medicinal bottles, drinking glasses, and fragments of lamp chimneys made up the remainder of the assemblage.

Fig. 5-7

Fig. 5-8
The majority of glass remains are alcohol related bottles and bottle fragments as illustrated in the following two charts (Figs. 5-9 and 5-10).
The majority of these bottles (66%) come from feature group 87-88-99. Window glass is more evenly distributed among the feature groups (Fig. 5-11).

![Window Glass Percent Contribution by Feature Group](image)

**Fig. 5-11**

The trash deposit features contain a large amount of shell (Fig. 5-12). While this will be discussed along with the faunal analysis it is still of interest to note that shell remains are near equal to the food related category.

![Trash Deposit Features Percent Contribution by Category (w/ shell)](image)

**Fig. 5-12**
The shell assemblage consists of 75% clam and 25% oyster (Fig. 5-13). The majority of the features are dominated by clam. The two exceptions are Feature group 50-64-65-74 and Feature 84 which contain 87% and 77% oyster respectively.

![Shell Comparison - Total Features](image)

**Fig. 5-13**

Dating of the features, and in turn the site, has been problematic due to a lack of any artifacts that may provide an absolute date. However it is clear that the features all date to the mid to late eighteenth century and few to the turn of the nineteenth century. Ceramics have been used to provide a date range for the features. Avoiding the inherent problems of using South’s Mean Ceramic Date formula we have used beginning and end use dates for ceramic wares. The date range produced for individual features using these dates can be seen in the percent contribution analysis of ceramic shards.

The percent contribution analysis, defined by Brian Seidel of URS Corp., is technically a probability distribution that predicts cumulative probability graphs. The method used to create this analysis is found in Bartovics (1982). The percent contribution indicates the probability of a randomly selected sherd from a particular provenience being manufactured in a given year.

The formula used is:
P=S/(N*D)

Where:

- $P$ = probability contribution for one year
- $N$ = total number of datable sherds in the provenience
- $S$ = number of sherds of the ware type
- $D$ = range of manufacture in years

$P$ is determined for each ware type with a unique date range. The value is then entered into each year of manufacture for that ware type. Each year’s Cumulative Probability is determined by adding all the values of $P$ for each ware type manufactured in that year. This Cumulative % value is then graphed for the range of years.

Example: using a simple 10 sherd collection (showing only 5 years in the table).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware</th>
<th>Begin</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>1797</th>
<th>1798</th>
<th>1799</th>
<th>1800</th>
<th>1801</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware, Plain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.8108%</td>
<td>0.8108%</td>
<td>0.8108%</td>
<td>0.8108%</td>
<td>0.8108%</td>
<td>0.8108%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware, Painted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.2903%</td>
<td>0.0000%</td>
<td>0.0000%</td>
<td>0.0000%</td>
<td>1.2903%</td>
<td>1.2903%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware, Shell Edge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.4286%</td>
<td>0.0000%</td>
<td>0.0000%</td>
<td>0.0000%</td>
<td>0.0000%</td>
<td>0.0000%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8108%</td>
<td>0.8108%</td>
<td>0.8108%</td>
<td>2.1011%</td>
<td>2.1011%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chart 5-1*

*Fig. 5-14*
Figure 5-14 shows a cumulative chance of: 100% for 1794-1840, 96% for 1800-1840, 82% for 1800-1830, and 39% for 1820-1830.

Using an example from CHP the modeling for Feature 55 shows a cumulative chance of: 100% for 1660-1870 representing the total range of ceramic wares in Feature 55; 67% for 1700-1800; 30% for 1760-1790.

Pipes are another dateable artifact that has been looked at. To calculate dates from the smoking pipe assemblage two methods were used, Binford (1962) and Harrison (1954, 1978). Though Binford remains the preferred method (Dallal, personal comm. 2006), Harrison did attempt to add greater detail and accuracy to the pipe dating methodology. After both dates were calculated the standard deviation was run to highlight variation or consistency in the methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Pipes – Binford</th>
<th>Pipes – Harrison</th>
<th>Standard Deviation of Pipe Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>1750.115</td>
<td>1738.225</td>
<td>8.407499628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F30</td>
<td>1754.48</td>
<td>1752.74</td>
<td>1.230365799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F50</td>
<td>3 or fewer samples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F55</td>
<td>1759.68</td>
<td>1760.755</td>
<td>0.76013979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F58</td>
<td>1758.92</td>
<td>1759.58</td>
<td>0.466690476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The largest sampling of pipes comes from Feature 91 and/or Feature Group 82-91-92.

Feature 91 contains a total of 605 pipe remnants and has a Binford date of 1751 and a Harrison date of 1739 with a standard deviation of 8.51. This suggests some degree of
variation between the two methods. The second largest assemblage comes from Feature 88 with a sample size of 485. This feature has a Binford date of 1758 and a Harrison date of 1759 with a standard deviation of .346. Throughout the majority of Features the standard deviations are relatively low with some anomalies. The range is .26 to 8.59 and the relative consistency of the dates can be seen in Chart 5-2. With the exception of Feature 91 the features that produced the greatest deviation all had a relatively small sample size (less than 70).

![Graph of Pipestem dates by feature](image)

*Fig. 5-17: Graph of Pipestem dates by feature*

Another artifact category that has been looked is architectural. According to PES’ field notes only window glass and nails were saved in all instances. All other architectural materials (e.g. brick) were sampled. Approximately 52% of all window glass and nails come from the northeast portion of the site, from Feature Group 87-88-99, Feature 84 and Feature 163 though the percentages are somewhat evenly split among the feature groupings.
Among the nails, 79% are square cut, 20% were unidentifiable due to corrosion and 1% of all nails were round. This is consistent with an eighteenth century date for the site.
Nails Percent Contribution by Feature Group

Fig. 5-20
Features Analysis (Model 2a and Model 2B)

Features will be described in numerical order, either individually or according to feature groups, where appropriate, or both. Based on stratigraphic analysis, where available, and PES’ field notes certain determinations were able to be made about the site composition.

Several of the trash deposit features appear to be clustered together within specific areas of the site (see Fig. 5-22). The clustering is highlighted in PES’ field notes in which they describe Features 50, 64, 65 and 74 as a “series of overlapping pits”. Feature 84 was a nine by four foot area that contained a series of intersecting pits. In the midst of these pits, architectural feature 89 was identified. Based on in field analysis the intersecting pits of Feature 84 were determined to be a single feature. Features 91 and 92 were in close proximity to one another, separated by an area of sandy fill. This fill was a redeposited pit for an iron fence post that was no longer extant. With further excavation it was determined that Features 91 and 92 were a single refuse pit. Features 87, 87/88, 88 and 99 are also identified as being a single trash deposit feature that was excavated in separate episodes. Feature 87 was uncovered and identified as a large refuse pit that began twelve inches below surface. In a separate episode immediately south and separated by a sandy fill layer, another refuse pit, designated Feature 88, was uncovered. As the two features were excavated a number of different soil types were identified as well as a third feature, designated Feature 99. This area was fully excavated extending ninety-four inches at its deepest point. Continued excavation and ensuing stratigraphic analysis has determined
that Features 87, 87/88, 88 and 99 all represented a single larger refuse pit. Feature 88 was the largest feature excavated and the inclusion of Features 87, 87/88 and 99 indicates that this was a significant trash deposit for the site.

Analysis reveals a complex stratigraphy at CHP due to changing uses and development of the area. Observations by excavators and stratigraphic analysis indicate a less complex configuration prior to the construction of City Hall and Tweed Courthouse. Construction impacts have given the appearance of several smaller distinct features that were, in actuality, part of larger single features.

Analysis of the site map indicates that Features 156 and 163 are also in the immediate vicinity of Features 87/88/99 and given further excavation could have been revealed to be part of the single larger trash deposit. However, without further evidence or documentation they will be treated separately in the analysis.
The feature groups are as follows: Features 87-88-99 includes Features 87, 87_88, 88 and 99; Features 82-91-92; Features 50-64-65-74. In some of the analysis Feature 55; Feature 84 and Feature 163 are compared with the above named feature groups as they comprise the largest assemblages. The remaining features are occasionally lumped together as they represent all but 12% of the total trash deposit assemblage.
As previously stated the following analysis and discussion is either by individual feature, according to feature groups, where appropriate, or both. Individual feature inventories are provided on the included CD. Cross-references to the field notes detailing excavation are provided at the beginning of each section. A summary of the features by area is given at the end of this chapter.

Feature 11

Feature 11 was excavated as part of TU-C2 in seven distinct levels. The feature contained a significant amount of construction debris and is relatively small containing a total of 330 artifacts.
Feature 30

Feature 30 was uncovered approximately eighteen inches below surface during backhoe monitoring for Trench 3. This was an irregularly shaped feature that contained two strata. The first stratum, level 1, was sampled but not fully excavated. The second stratum, located twenty-one inches below the top of the first stratum, was not excavated but clearly continued and extended to the west. The approximate measurements of the
trench were three and a half feet from east to west and two and half feet from north to south.

**Feature 30 Artifact Category Percent Contribution**

![Pie chart showing artifact category distribution.](image)

**Fig. 5-27**

**Feature 30 - Food Related Artifacts**

![Pie chart showing food-related artifact distribution.](image)

**Fig. 5-28**

Feature Group 50-64-65-74
Features 50, 64, 65 and 74 were excavated in conjunction with one another. All were trash pits of similar soil depositions located horizontally across unit *drain line 2*. Feature 74 was located in the southern area of *drain line 2*. Only a portion of the feature was located within the excavation trench; the remainder of the feature was located to the west. The circular feature located within the excavated area was three feet in diameter. Excavated in two levels, the feature exhibited a high artifact density with a significant presence of faunal elements.
Like the majority of features or feature groups on site this assemblage is not dominated by food related artifacts. Instead architectural elements account for almost half the assemblage. The food related artifacts are overwhelmingly consumption and serving based and even following removal.
Amongst ceramic wares, earthenware is dominant. However, unlike the majority of the site where creamwares are dominant, pearlwares account for 56% of this assemblage.
Feature 55

Feature 55 is one of the largest trash deposit assemblages, consisting of a total of 7,920 artifacts excluding bones. It is a trash pit feature located on the southern edge of Island 11, which lies in the southeast corner of the site. The midden was assigned a mixed New Gaol/First Almshouse association by PES as suggested by its location, which is almost directly between the two structures.

---

5 This analysis of Feature 55 is excerpted, with minor editing, from a report by Diane George. The entire report appears below (Chapter 6).
Fig. 5-35: Location of Feature 55

Documentation for Feature 55 is exceedingly sparse to non-existent. Field notes record its initial discovery on April 8, 1999, during unspecified monitoring. “Triage recovery” was conducted on April 9, with only “scanty documentation due to [the] speed of excavation.” The only descriptive notation regarding the feature concerns its contents, which are labeled “18th century.” The large amount of “clam shell and butchered bones” is also noted.

The artifact distribution for Feature 55 is represented in Figure 5-36. The largest category is food-related artifacts, comprising 41% of the assemblage. Architectural artifacts, the third largest, account for 31%. Unidentifiable metal and other items account for 14% and personal items 11%, with tools and equipment, furnishings, communication, floral all constituting less than 3% each.
Approximately half of the identifiable food related artifacts are for consumption and serving and half for storage, although this figure drops slightly when unidentifiable items are included in the total. Specifically, 43% of the artifacts belong in the consumption/serving category and 40% in the preparation and storage category, while 16.5% are unidentifiable (Fig. 5-37). Thus, the assemblage is divided essentially evenly between table and kitchen wares. A greater disparity exists in these percentages when liquor bottles are removed from the group (Fig. 5-38). In this case, consumption and serving increases to 48.9% while storage decreases to 33%.
Of the total food-related artifacts, 890 are ceramic and 159 are glass. Of the latter category, 82.4% is liquor bottle glass and 17.6% is table glass. Of the entire food-related assemblage, however, 12.5% is liquor bottle glass, while this item makes up only 1.7% of the entire feature. Although liquor was used by the midden’s depositors, it was not pervasive.

Figure 5-39 provides an overview of the different ceramic ware types present in the Feature 55 assemblage. The majority of the ceramics in this assemblage, 56.3%, are imported. The
percentage is much higher for earthenware, at 81.8% imported as compared to 23.1% of stoneware (Fig. 5-39). This may be due largely to the presence of the local stoneware potters, as discussed above. In fact, North American stoneware is the most numerous ceramic type, at 33.8% of the total food-related ceramics, or 35.1% of all ceramic. The next largest category, Staffordshire slipware, is less than half the size of this stoneware group, at 13.8% of the total. Creamware is almost as numerous as slipware, with 117 pieces, or 13.1% of the total ceramic. Every other ceramic type is represented by less than one hundred sherds, and only two of these B white salt-glazed stoneware (78) and redware (72) B include more than 50 sherds (Fig. 5-41). All of the kitchenware is coarse ceramic (291 sherds). While the majority of the tableware is refined (263 sherds) there is still a large number of coarse tableware pieces (123).

---

6 One hundred percent of personal ceramics (chamber pots) in this feature are North American stoneware. There are only 17 pieces of personal ceramic, and, unless stated, the ceramic analysis here covers food-related ceramic.
In addition to North American stoneware, the other predominant coarse tableware is Staffordshire slipware, while white salt-glazed stoneware and creamware make up the bulk of the refined table ceramic. It appears, then, that coarse and refined wares were
Fig. 5-42: Selected stoneware from Feature 55
Fig. 5-43: Selected stoneware from Feature 55
Fig. 5-44: Selected earthenwares from Feature 55
Fig. 5-45: Selected ceramics from Feature 55 for dining. There are at least three-dozen damaged or imperfect pieces of North American stoneware. This is reinforced by the presence of a number of unusual stoneware pieces, shallow bowls or deep plates, probably from Crolius and Remmy (Fig. 5-42). Further,
although there are a number of similar pieces, no discernable sets are present, which also suggests need and affordability, not display, were the main dictates of ceramic purchases in these institutions.

Fig. 5-46: Painted porcelain and pearlware from Feature 55
There is a surprisingly large amount of Chinese porcelain. Forty pieces were found which does not represent a large percentage of the ceramics, but neither is it insignificant at 4.4% of the total. There are also over a dozen pieces of handpainted pearlware, several pieces of scratch-blue stoneware and creamware tea items.

The third largest category in Feature 55 is architectural. Baugher and Lenik found “a tremendous amount” of architectural debris in their Almshouse excavation. (1997:17). The building was demolished intentionally in 1797, which would have created a large amount of debris. The records of the Common Council indicate that the building was brick, with mortar, brownstone and lime components. (Burrows and Wallace 1999:156). The F55 assemblage consists mainly of brick, at 38.4% of the category. Square nails are the second most numerous artifacts, comprising 24.9% of the architectural group. Window glass is 16.1%, plaster 7.9% and mortar 6.2%. There is also a small collection, 5.6%, of unidentifiable stone. The rest of the category consists of a lock and a hinge, 4 pieces of an iron pipe and 2 pieces of tin-glazed earthenware tile. As mentioned, there is also a large amount of unidentifiable metal: 303 pieces, all but 4 of which are iron. It is likely that nails make up a large portion of this category.

Fig. 5-47: Metal, Feature 55

The vast majority of personal items are pipes, which comprise 79.3% of this category. Smoking itself is not an indicator of class, as pipes and tobacco were readily available to all economic strata (Baugher 2001:191). The quality of the artifacts, however, does seem to indicate a lower-class assemblage, or, at least, not an upper-class one. Most of the pipes are
plain. Only 8 of the 230 pieces have incised or molded decoration: 5 with rouletting on the bowl rims and three with floral molding. Three other bowls have the Gouda shield on both sides of the foot, showing their Dutch origin. Two of these pipes also bear an ‘S’ which means “slegh’t” or ordinary, probably indicating they were not smoked by upper-class individuals. There is one bowl with an ‘L,’ but the meaning of this letter is unknown. One additional pipe has an eye-shaped mark on its foot. Pipe stems are divided almost evenly between the first and second halves of the 18th century, with 51% dating from 1750 to 1800 and 48% from 1720 to 1750. While these methods are not precise, they do tell us generally that most deposition in this midden probably occurred in the later portion of the 18th century.

All other groups within the personal category each account for less than 7% of the total. Four of these categories make up greater than 1% of the total: toilet articles (chamber pots and one lice comb), clothing (buttons and a few buckles), medicine (bottles) and unclassifiable items. Broken down by object, chamber pots make up 5.9% of the category, buttons 3.8% and buckles and medicine bottles 1.4% each. There are 5 copper,
2 brass, 2 bone and 2 bone and brass buttons, with molding on one copper and one bone and brass item. The shoe-buckles are copper, brass or lead, and 2 have fairly intricate designs. The assemblage also includes a small piece of a brass ruler, a bone lice comb, a plain ring and an iron knife or razor blade (Fig. 5-49). While not extravagant, this group does include a few items that are more than mere utilitarian objects, particularly the two molded buckles. As with the finer ceramic, the meaning of these items is not understood, but they undoubtedly add complexity to the individuals who inhabited these structures.

The majority of the tools and equipment category is fuel, at 58.7%. This class includes clinker (10), anthracite and bituminous coal (18) and charcoal (16). Twelve pieces of an iron pipe (16.0%) and 9 pieces of unidentifiable iron (12.0%) are the next largest group. Five pieces of kiln furniture, used in pottery manufacturing, were recovered. This constitutes 6.7% of the category. The collection also includes one lead chain link and two items probably associated with productive activities: a straight pin (sewing) and a button blank. The pin is copper with a rounded head and is embedded in a clump of rusty iron. Two pieces (2.7%) of what is probably gun flint were uncovered. These pieces are a suggestion that middens were not exclusive and the disparate groups that shared this space interacted in the minutiae of their daily lives.

The furnishing category, which comprises 0.05% of F55, contains two types of objects: 3 pieces of lamp chimney glass and one piece of molded tin furniture hardware. The floral and communications category each consist of one item: a shell from a nut and a piece of paper.
Feature 58

Feature 58 was excavated as part of the *drain line 1* testing. It was a shallow, basin shaped trash pit that due to time constraints was not excavated to a sterile layer. No manual excavation occurred and the artifact materials represent a screened sample from the feature. It was noted in the field that the feature contained a significant amount of butchered bone compared to artifact remains which led to the conclusion that feature 58 was a bone disposal midden. The location of feature 58 would have placed it in the immediate location of the British barracks on the western side of the property and north of the Bridewell.

The artifacts from this feature were predominantly food related which represent 50% of the assemblage. Architectural artifacts comprise the second largest category at 31%. Overall, feature 58 is a relatively small assemblage containing 398 artifacts.

Of the food-related artifacts 76% are for consumption and serving while 22% are for preparation and storage.

![Feature 58 Artifact Category Percent Contribution](image)
Fig. 5-51
With respect to ceramic wares earthenware is dominant with 49% Pearlware, 27% Creamware and 9% Redware. Most of the pottery, especially the earthenware, dates between 1780 and 1840. Within the glass category bottles make up a significant portion of the category. Aside from alcohol bottles remnants of medicinal bottles were also present.

Fig. 5-52
Architectural remains included small shards of window glass, as well as brick and nails, both square-cut and round-cut. One particularly interesting artifact was a possible knife handle with a mother-of-pearl inlay.

Feature 60

Feature 60 was a shallow basin trash deposit uncovered as part of the drain line 1 excavation. This feature was similar to and in direct line with Feature 58. Its location places it within the compound created by the British barracks on the western side of the property. It should be noted that features 58 and 60 could have potentially been part of a single sheet deposit.

This feature was exceptionally small containing only 13 artifact pieces. Food related artifacts account for 47 percent. The food category consists of 3 pieces of pearlware (two join), one piece of whiteware, one piece of creamware (base marked on the exterior: H.P. L8C) and one piece of American Stoneware. Except for the piece of American
Stoneware (post 1730), all the pottery dates fit into a date range from 1775-1840 (Fig. 5-54).

The tools and equipment category is represented by three pieces of charcoal, and two pieces of square-cut nails constitute the Architectural artifacts. Faunal artifacts form 23%, and Tools and Equipment and Architectural artifacts each for 15% of the total.

![Pie chart showing artifact categories]

**Fig. 5-54**

Feature 71

Feature 71 was initially described by PES in the Feature Log as “an artifact concentration, south of Island 10.” Minimal information is available about the excavation of Feature 71 and with one exception (the Feature Log), all sources discuss or represent F71 in conjunction with F70 (e.g. the Bag Inventory Sheet lists Bag 1089 as relating to Feature “70-71,” a Feature Record refers to backhoe excavation of “features 70 & 71”). Apparently F70 and 71, and possibly F72, were excavated at the same time as

---

7 Analysis of Feature 71 is excerpted from a report by Diane George (complete report in Chapter 6).
a single unit. However for our purposes it is referred to as Feature 71. This feature is located in the midst of the group of other, related, trash middens including F85/86, F87, F99, F156, F163 and the largest midden, F88.

Feature 71 consists of a total of 1075 artifacts. The largest category is food related artifacts, which make up 33% of the total, unclassifiable materials, mostly iron, are 25% and architectural artifacts are 22%. Personal artifacts are also fairly well represented with 13% of the total. There is one communication item in the assemblage, a slate pencil, which constitutes less than 0.1% of the assemblage.

![F71 Percent Contribution by Category](image)

*Fig. 5-55*

The dominance of food-related artifacts leads to the conclusion that this was another midden for disposal of dining/kitchen garbage. The food preparation and storage category is somewhat larger than the consumption and serving category. The majority of the food preparation and storage category is composed of liquor bottles.

---

8 Features 70 and 72 are not listed in the Summary of Trash Pit Features.
Creamware is the most common ware type, making up slightly over one-quarter (26.5%) of the total. Staffordshire slipware and tin-glazed earthenware (14.2% each), white-salt glazed stoneware (12.4%) and North American stoneware (11.5%) are also well-represented. Redware constitutes 8.8% of the total food-related ceramic, while pearlware, Chinese porcelain and buff-bodied stoneware each account for less than 4%. One sherd of agateware was also identified in the assemblage.

_Fig. 5-57: Feature 70 ceramics_
Two interesting vessels were recovered from this feature. One is a debased scratch-blue mug with elaborate molding including a medallion bearing the initials “GR.” (Fig. 5-59) The initials stand for “George Rey,” or King George III, and were common on debased scratch-blue vessels such as this one (Dinnel and Chaney 2005; Richardson 2005). The other vessel of note is a tin-glazed earthenware punch bowl, decorated with a handpainted cobalt blue fish and manganese splashing (Fig. 5-60).
This is an English tin-enamed ware produced in the eighteenth century and found in other British military contexts (Miller & Stone 1970:40). The punch bowl form suggests that some form of entertaining was going on, an activity that almost certainly may have been associated with officers.

Feature 71 contains a large percentage of liquor bottles, which is consistent with the placement of British soldiers as its primary users.
When placed in their own category, liquor bottles constitute 12% of the assemblage, the fourth largest group after faunal, unidentifiable iron and architectural remains (Fig. 5-60). Of the food-related artifacts, they make up slightly more than 53%, over half of this category, and approximately 97% of food-related glass. These proportions are smaller than what was found in Feature 88, the largest Second Barracks midden, where liquor bottles constitute approximately 73% of the total food-related items. Regardless, it is clear that the Feature 71 midden was used by a group of people who consumed a large amount of alcohol. While not definitively British soldiers, this would be wholly consistent with findings at other eighteenth century British military sites.

The known architectural category consists wholly of building components, mostly square nails (38.1%) and window glass (30%) along with some brick (13.8%). The rest of the group is made up of round nails, mortar, sandstone, plaster, slate and one ceramic tile, each of which comprise less than 5% of the assemblage. The ceramic tile is modern, and the round nails nineteenth century or later. The small number of nineteenth century artifacts makes it unlikely that this is a mixed deposit, rather it is likely that some disturbance occurred.

Personal artifacts make up 13% of the Feature 71 assemblage (Fig. 5-61). These items consist mainly of the remains of one or a few chamber pots and clay smoking pipes.
Pipes constitute 72.3% of the personal artifacts and sherds from chamber pot(s) 22.3%. Five additional items complete this category: two brass shoe buckles, two pieces of a glass medicine or perfume bottles and one modern plastic cigarette holder.

Finally, the tools and equipment category, 7% of F71, is almost wholly fuel or fuel by-products, with one piece of flint. Coal makes up 41.5% of this group, and clinker or slag 56.6%.

![Feature 71 Personal Artifacts](image)

*Fig. 5-62*

Dating for this feature suggests an 18th century formation. The mean ceramic date is c.1754, which places the feature in the second half of the 18th century. Two-thirds of the pipe stems which were able to be accurately sized date to this time period: specifically, 1750-1800. The few ceramic pieces with later dates, mainly the pearlware, could indicate that the midden was formed partially by those individuals using the Barracks after the War ended.

Feature 82

Feature 82 was a midden deposit located within drain line 3(see above, p. 86). Though the entire length of the feature was not excavated a segment of the feature was excavated to the full depth of the feature. The bottom of the feature contained large, fist-sized, cobbles. The feature was immediately north of Feature 91 and has been determined to be part of feature group 82-91-92.
Feature 84

Feature 84 was a large trash feature located north of the upper barracks in the northeastern corner of the park. Feature 84 was recognized during mechanical excavation and it was suspected by the archaeologists that the feature was actually a series of smaller pits but it was excavated as a single pit. Overall the feature contained three strata. Stratum A contained a high density of artifacts including kiln furniture and locally made stoneware vessels. This stratum cut into two earlier strata, Stratum B on the south and Stratum C on the north.

As with the majority of the features, Food Related artifacts dominate the Feature 84 assemblage, followed by architectural materials. These architectural materials include nails, bricks, mortar, plaster, window glass, and other identified building material.

---

The analysis of Feature 84 is excerpted, with minor editing, from a report by Jennifer Borishansky.
The majority of the Food related items uncovered are consumption and serving related (59%) and the remainder are for preparation and storage (41%).

Among the Food Related artifacts were several liquor bottles comprised largely of round hand blown green glass bottles.

Of the ceramic wares recovered, 54% of the material is stoneware, and of the stoneware, 75% is American-made gray salt-glaze stoneware produced by the Crolius and Remmey
Almost 100% of the gray salt-glaze stoneware is waster material deposited from the nearby Crolius and Remmey potteries.

Redware was largely coarse America wares such as American slipware and black glazed redware. Tin-glazed earthenwares and other coarse wares are found in higher percentage than the more refined earthenwares such as creamware or Staffordshire style slipwares. Expensive imported Chinese porcelain makes up only 6% of the total ceramics.
Distinct military objects are relatively absent from the assemblage and from the site in general. Only three objects were identified in Feature 84, two gun flints and a lead musket ball. However, these cannot be definitively ascribed to the military occupants of the common.

Fig. 5-68: Ceramics from Feature 84
Features 85 and 86 were two associated features. Feature 85 was a pit feature located within Feature 86. It appears that Feature 86 existed prior to Feature 85. Feature 86 was a larger trash pit feature that surrounded feature 85 and contained several strata. The distinction of two features, noted after excavation dictates that the features be combined as Feature 85/86, as they were excavated as a single feature in three levels. Stratum A was noted a being the “predominant” stratum by PES. The midden is situated just behind the second barracks and dates to the eighteenth century.
Feature 85/86 consists of 170 total artifacts. The largest portion of artifacts are found within the Food Related category. The second largest is unclassifiable due to poor preservation of this feature.

There are 46 food related artifacts. Of this, 9 are glass, all of which are liquor bottles, and the remaining pieces are ceramic. The majority of the items are consumption and serving based, but they are only a slightly higher percentage that preparation and storage artifacts. Of the total food-related items, 19.6% are liquor bottles and 67.6% of the food-related ceramics.
Overall, 67.6% of the ceramic assemblage, or 25 sherds, are coarse earthenwares, and 32.4%, or 12 sherds, are refined. When tableware is considered as a subgroup, more of a balance exists between the two types of ceramic. Of the 25 tableware sherds, 13 (52%) are coarse and 12 (48%) refined. The refined tablewares (consumption and serving) consist mainly of creamware with sherds from 1 or possibly 2 porcelain teacups and 2 white salt-glazed stoneware plates. Kitchenware (preparation and storage) exhibits a different pattern: of the 11 sherds in this category, 100% are coarse. This is characteristic of kitchen assemblages.

The ceramics display a similar tableware/kitchenware dichotomy in terms of their origins. Overall, 13 sherds, or 35.1%, are imported ceramics while 24, or 64.9%, are of domestic origin. Of the kitchenwares, however, only one piece, a brown frenchen stoneware jar, is imported.
Fig. 5-72: Feature 85/86, imported stoneware, glass, and creamware

The third largest category in the feature 85/86 assemblage is architectural, which, at 32 items constitutes 20% of the assemblage. There are also 15 pieces of unidentified iron, which, with one exception, are likely nails. Of the 32 known architectural items, 62.5%, or 15, are brick though as noted in PES’ field notes brick was sampled. The percentage is therefore lower than the actual amount of brick present in the feature. The other items represented in this category are square nails, at 5 or 20.8%, and window glass, at 4 sherds, or 16.7%.

Tools and equipment comprise 9% of the feature 85/86 assemblage. These items include 2 pieces of bituminous coal and 4 pieces of charcoal for 54.5% of the tools category, and 5 items related to pottery manufacture, for 45.5% of these artifacts. Four of these latter items are kiln wasters and one is a spool, a piece of kiln furniture used in the ceramic firing process.
The feature contains 8 personal items, or 7% of the total number of artifacts. Only two types of personal artifacts are represented in this feature: clay pipes and chamber pots. Three sherds of a redware chamber pot, all from the same piece, were recovered from the midden, along with 5 clay pipe pieces, all stems. Six pieces of an unidentified substance, possibly some type of hardened resin or unvulcanized rubber and a piece of lighting glass and a copper coin complete the assemblage. The coin, which appears to be unidentifiable, was noted by PES as a Roman coin.

The artifacts from Features 85/86 date almost exclusively to the 18th century. The mean ceramic date is c.1763. The broader 18th century time frame is consistent with dates from the few pipe stems that are contained in the assemblage: three dating from 1720 to 1750 and one from 1750 to 1800. While the validity of later pipe stem dates is questionable (see Binford 1962), they are generally considered accurate for the early- to mid-18th century and can provide a general time-frame, particularly when combined with other data. In this case, the stems and mean ceramic date together strongly suggest a mid to late 18th century context.

Due to the small number of artifacts, it seems clear that this midden was used for a very short period of time and appears to be a kitchen/dining midden. It is also possible that the pit was dug for another purpose then later used for trash disposal although but it clearly too shallow to have been a privy or cistern.

Features 87-88-99

Feature 87 was a trash midden feature with five clearly defined strata as observed in the post excavation profile. However, the feature was excavated in a single episode. Feature 87/88 is a continuation of Feature 87 as it impacted upon Feature 88. The three stata of

10 Two of these pieces mend, so only 4 pipes are actually represented.
Feature 87/88 were excavated in a single episode. Feature 88 is the largest feature uncovered during excavation and it accounts for 33% of all trash deposit artifacts.

During excavation Features 71, 85, 86, 87, 99, 156, 161, and 163 were all identified as midden features concentrated between and just to the east of Islands 9, 10, and 11 (see Fig. 5-69). In total, these features, including Feature 88, are presumed to be a part of a larger midden area encompassing a portion of the northeastern corner of CHP. Stratigraphic analysis and an attempted reconstruction of PES field notes only allow for the definitive association between Features 87, 87_88, 88 and 99 and are treated as such in the overall analysis.

However, because of the sheer enormity of Feature 88, compared to the remaining features, it demands individual discussion. 

PES identified Feature 88 as a “trash heap” Seven levels were distinguished in the stratigraphy post-excavation, eleven were. The feature was completely excavated except

---

11 The analysis for Feature 88 is excerpted, with some editing, from a report by Elizabeth Martin.
for one stratum, stratum H. This was left unexcavated due to disturbance from the construction of the nearby MTA elevator.

Fig. 5-74: Feature 88 in the course of excavation

The glass and ceramics found within Feature 88 are similar to many other British soldier contexts in North America and Canada during the mid to late 18th century. (Feister 1984; Miller 1970; Smith 1983; Sussman 1978)

There are a total of 16,527 artifacts in the Feature 88 assemblage. The artifacts in the assemblage fall into ten functional categories – architectural, clothing, communication, faunal, floral, food related, furnishings, personal, tools and equipment, and unclassifiable.
The Food Related category accounts for 61% of the assemblage. A functional analysis within this category reveals that preparation and storage account for 81% of all food related wares. This can be explained by the fact that this category includes liquor bottles which account for a large portion of the materials. The glass bottles excavated from Feature 88 are predominantly alcohol bottles, although there are some soda water bottles. The rum, wine, and case bottles represent almost the entire preparation and storage category.

Fig. 5-76
Unrefined stoneware and earthenware vessels comprise the second and third largest class of artifacts within the Preparation and Storage category. These include jugs and jars of North American Gray Stoneware originating from the Crolius and Remmey factory discussed in the previous section. American Manganese Mottled Redware also makes up a substantial proportion of the assemblage.

Consumption and serving wares contain 19% of the assemblage. Within this there are many classes of artifacts including bone-handled cutlery, refined earthenwares, glass tablewares, porcelains, and stonewares.

![F88 Food Consumption & Serving Totals](image)

*Fig. 5-77*

Earthenware makes up 80% of the artifacts used in Food Consumption and Serving. More specifically, creamware characterizes almost half of the total ceramics present. Other major types present are White Salt-Glazed Stoneware, English and French Tin-Glazed wares, American slipped redwares and Staffordshire Slipwares signaling a significant participation in the late 18th century material culture economy. Staffordshire Slipwares decorated with the Dotware pattern are found throughout Feature 88 and hand-painted underglaze and over-glaze polychrome enamel Chinese Export Porcelains are present as well. The majority of the dinnerwares appear to be molded Creamwares, mainly in the Royal Pattern and the Feather Edge) and White Salt-Glazed Stonewares.
Red and buff-bodied earthenware were also found along with some Porcelain. Jackfield teaware is found in mentionable numbers as well. (Feister 1984:128-9) Much the same can be said for Feature 88’s ceramic assemblage. There are French Faience teawares as well as a Red Stoneware dish.

When examined together the food related artifacts in Feature 88 make up almost half of the total (7722), while faunal remains composed of marine shells such as oyster, clam, and whelk, make up the second largest category. In this study the mammal and fish bones have been counted and analyzed independently of the rest and so are not included in this analysis. According to Borishansky (2003a) the faunal remains were predominately mammal. In total, these faunal remains should be understood to be the remains of the number of meals, presumably eaten by the soldiers stationed in the Second Barracks.

Ultimately, the total assemblage is made up of more than just food related items. The food related category, the largest category (61%), equals approximately 70% of the total
Feature 88. This supports the idea that Feature 88 is a midden feature possibly used daily by several people as a disposal place for food-stuffs and other garbage disposal.

The remaining functional categories and somewhat evenly distributed, 15% belonging to Architectural, 10% to Tools and Equipment and Personal accounts for 9% of the assemblage excavated from Feature 88. Within the Personal category 73% are clay smoking pipes, 17% are medicine bottles, 8% are clothing related items – mainly bone and copper buttons, and 2% are chamber pots. The architectural materials include fifteen sub-categories of which brick, square-cut iron nails, and window glass make up the largest portions. Window glass makes up the largest category at 51%. The Tools and Equipment category is predominately made up of fuel, specifically different forms of coal (anthracite, bituminous, and charcoal) and fuel byproducts such as clinker. These materials account for 85% of the artifacts in the Tools and Equipment category while the remaining 15% is dominated by iron artifact remnants. As noted elsewhere on the site, military items are near absent.

When Feature 88 is combined with the other features in group 87-88-99 it becomes even more dominating over the total assemblage accounting for 41% of all trash deposit materials or 19103 artifacts.

Fig. 5-79
As a feature group the categorical composition is 58% food related, 18% architectural; 12% tools and equipment and 5% personal. Unclassifiable materials accounted for 7% in this feature group.

The food related remains are dominated by preparation and storage related wares due to the significant number of liquor bottle remains. Over 6000 of the approximately 9000 bottle remains come from feature group 87-88-99. Removing bottle remains for the analysis of consumption and serving versus preparation and storage wares dramatically alters the results.
A closer look at the ceramic wares reveals a dominance of earthenwares which comprise 76% of the assemblage. Stoneware and Porcelain account for the remainder at 21% and 3% respectively.
Fig. 5-83

The earthenwares contain a wide variety of types including significant numbers of creamwares. At 56% creamware clearly dominates the earthenware assemblage. However, there is also a significant amount of American Redware and tin-enamedeled wares.
Fig. 5-85: Feature 88, selected stoneware
Fig. 5-87: Feature 88, selected ceramics
Fig. 5-88: Feature 88, selected ceramics
Fig. 5-89: Feature 88, selected ceramics and glass
Fig. 5-89: Feature 88, selected small finds
Fig. 5-90: Feature 88, selected ceramics
Feature 90

Feature 90 was a shallow bowl shaped depression that was part of a larger sheet deposit. In addition to a significant artifact deposit the feature also contained gravel and cobbles which were noted but not collected. The location of the feature placed it north and slightly west of the New Gaol and south of the eastern side of the British barracks. The feature was sampled and only contains 81 artifacts.

Feature Group 82-91-92

Feature 91 was classified during excavation as a dense concentration of large mammal bone and shell as well as containing a significant artifact density. The feature was not excavated to a sterile layer. Locationally, feature 91 was alongside the New Gaol between features 82 and 92 and determined to be part of a larger feature than included both 82 and 92. Feature 92 was a refuse pit that was initially recognized as a surface scatter and artifact concentration during backhoe excavation. Once identified the feature was manually excavated. This feature contained a dense layer of oyster shell interspersed with animal bone and artifacts.

As a feature group 82-91-92 represents 10% of the total collection. Individually Feature 91 is a sizable assemblage ranking fourth among all individual features. The feature group contains 4513 artifacts in its total assemblage. As is standard for the trash deposit assemblages, food related artifacts account for more than half the assemblage with architectural artifacts ranking second. Personal artifacts rank third at 16%.
Fig. 5-92

Of the food related artifacts, 70% are consumption and serving and 29 % preparation and storage. Reflecting the overall pattern, removal of liquor bottles from that analysis causes an increase in consumption and serving wares with a proportionate decrease in preparation and storage wares.
This feature group contains a larger amount of creamwares proportionate to other earthenwares that any other feature grouping on site.
Feature 104

Feature 104 was a refuse pit that was manually excavated and 100% screened. It was located south of the western end of the New Gaol and excavated in two levels. The feature contains 509 artifacts, most of which (70% or 364 pieces) are shells. The 13% ceramic wares total 67 sherds and the 5% bottle glass totals 17 fragments.
Among the ceramic wares 68% are pearlwares lending a slightly later date to this assemblage compared with others from the site. The mean ceramic date for the assemblage is 1792 and a date for smoking pipes was not calculated due to a limited sample.
Feature 123

Feature 123 was a pit feature that was noted in PES field notes as a fairly small feature that was not easily recognizable in the profile.

Overall the feature contains 191 artifacts with 55% being food-related, 32% architectural and 9% tools and equipment. Of the food-related artifacts 76% are related to consumption and serving.
An analysis of ceramic wares shows a relatively even distribution of types. The ceramic assemblage for Feature 123 has a mean ceramic date of 1752.
Fig. 5-102: Feature 123, selected ceramics
Feature 156

Feature 156 is located in the vicinity of feature group 87-88-99. While significantly smaller than the feature group or even nearby Feature 163 its overall composition is similar as demonstrated in the following charts.

![Feature 156 Artifact Category Percent Contribution](image1)

**Fig. 5-103**

![Feature 156 Food Related Comparison](image2)

**Fig. 5-104**
Feature 161

Feature 161 was impacted by backhoe excavation and manually excavated following its discovery. Artifacts were consistent throughout the feature and contained in a single stratum.

Out of the 1026 artifacts, 38.5% were architectural, 32.5% food related, 13.5% personal, 6.5% unclassifiable, 5.8% faunal, 2.4% tools and equipment related, 0.2% associated with communication, and 0.1% was floral.

The architectural category was dominated by window glass (330 pieces), and square-cut nails (52 pieces). Other architectural artifacts were brick (7 pieces), mortar (2 pieces), roof-tile (2 pieces), and lead hinge(s) (2 pieces).

---

12 This Feature 161 analysis is excerpted, with minor editing, from a report by Ramona Harrison.
There were 239 alcohol bottles in the food related category.
Earthenware made up 16.5% and consisted of Creamware (51%), and American Slipware: (5.6 %), and glazed Redware (5.6%). The rest were Clouded Earthenware, various types of slipped earthenware, and one piece of Pearlware (1.4%). The 26 pieces of Stoneware (mainly 17 pieces of white salt-glaze stoneware) made up 6 % of the ceramic assemblage.
The Personal Artifacts can be divided into pipes (133 pieces), buttons (4 pieces), and one bead. Some of the pipes had marks on them and five could be typed as Dutch, through the Gouda shield. Three pipes/remains were English, either through their shape or the design of the arms mark.

The four buttons were made from gold, metal, glass, and bone. Inventory #1022 was made from metal and had a floral inlay under glass. Inventory# 1016 was a glass bead, #1017 a copper coin, and # 1018 a coffin handle made from metal. The one example of floral artifacts was one half of a walnut shell. Shells (classed as faunal) were both clam and oyster.

Tools and Equipment was mainly represented by coal, clinker, and one button blank (#780). It should also be mentioned that there was a piece of paper in the assemblage, Inventory# 777, which was catalogued as unclassifiable.

The Creamware date range is fairly wide: between 1726 and 1820, therefore the 18th century is our best estimate. The assemblage has a mean ceramic date of 1771. The alcohol bottles were hand blown and have pre-1840 date.
Out of 133 pipe remains, 105 or 79% were stems and could be dated. The range from 1750 to 1800 had the highest representation.

**Feature 163**

Feature 163 was a circular trash midden deposit that was excavated in a single level. Excavators noted a high density of artifacts and it is the third largest trash deposit assemblage from the site representing 14% of all artifacts. It is also the third largest contributor to total artifacts when analyzed by feature group. Feature 55 is the second largest trash deposit assemblage representing 16% of all artifacts.

Feature 163 contains 3098 artifacts, 51% or which are food related. If shell based faunal materials are counted the total number of artifacts increases to 6804 accounting for more than half the assemblage. As is typical for the site architectural, tools and equipment and personal artifacts rank second thru fourth.
Feature 163 has a similar composition to Feature 88 and Feature group 87-88-99. The food related items are overwhelmingly represented by preparation and storage items (86%), the majority of which are liquor bottles. Removing bottles from the analysis significantly alters the resulting in 62% consumption and serving and 34% preparation and storage.
Three quarters of the ceramic wares are earthenware and the remaining 25% are stonewares. An analysis of the earthenwares shows a somewhat even representation of creamware and American made redwares, 38 and 30% respectively.
Feature 174

Feature 174 was a pit feature that was identified in the east profile of the *drain line 1* excavation. A relatively small feature there is a total of 278 artifacts, 67% (188 pieces) of which are food related. Unlike other trash deposit assemblages on site architectural artifacts are poorly represented and tools and equipment contains no artifacts. The second largest artifact category is personal which is completely represented (100%) by smoking pipes.
There is a complete absence of liquor bottles in this assemblage and the food related artifacts reflect this containing 86 percent consumption and serving wares and only 14% preparation and storage based wares.

Fig. 5-117
Feature 182

This is a small feature that contains only 82 artifacts. The majority of these are ceramic which totals 54 pieces (76%). Approximately half of these are stonewares. Smoking pipes analysis provided dates of 1761 (Binford) and 1762 (Harrison). The mean ceramic date was calculated to be 1726 resulting in a significant deviation between the numbers.
B. Architectural and Burial Features

The following section is in two parts. The first discusses the architectural features followed by the burial features.

Notes and drawings relative to the architectural features were inconsistent and at times sporadic. As a result this section provides a descriptive overview of each feature as culled from available PES data only. Artifacts in association with the architectural features were minimal. The data are given in tabular form after the overview (Table X).

A full analysis of burial features was undertaken by the Smithsonian Institution. Their final report is available at the LPC (London 2003). In this section, only a brief overview of their work is discussed.

Part 1: Architectural Analysis:

The following map places the architectural features in context within the site and the placement of historical structures. The map is a modification of a PES map that had been adapted from a Hunter 1994 map.
There is an inconsistency between the features labeled on PES’ Architectural Features map and listing of architectural features we were provided and available notes. Feature 18 was identified within the field notes but it does not appear in either PES’ listing or on the map. Field notes for Features 89 and 102 were not found.

The following is a table of the architectural features provided by PES (2000b:Table 1).

---

13 Feature 89 was uncovered within Feature 84, as per field notes for Feature 84, and believed to be part of the foundation wall for the rotunda.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6, 10</td>
<td>Stone walls</td>
<td>Dispensary?</td>
<td>North edge of Island #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Brick wall</td>
<td>Second Almshouse?</td>
<td>Northwest corner of Tweed Courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Cobblestone surface/walkway</td>
<td>Bridewell?</td>
<td>Southeast part of Island #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Domed cistern</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>Southeast edge of Island #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44, 57</td>
<td>Stone catch basin and associated drain line</td>
<td>First Almshouse?</td>
<td>South side of Island #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Brick drain</td>
<td>First Almshouse?</td>
<td>South side of Island #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Large stone conduit</td>
<td>City Hall?</td>
<td>Southwest side of Island #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Brick-lined box</td>
<td>City Hall?</td>
<td>North side of City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Brick walkway</td>
<td>Bridewell?</td>
<td>Between Islands #11 and #13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Dry-laid stone foundation</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>North edge of Island #13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Mortared stone foundation</td>
<td>Bridewell</td>
<td>West part of Island #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Stone foundation</td>
<td>City Hall East Privy</td>
<td>East side of Island #11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Brick runner/pathway liner</td>
<td>City Hall Park</td>
<td>East edge of Island #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Brick manhole</td>
<td>City Hall Park</td>
<td>South of Island #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Stone foundation</td>
<td>New Gaol/Hall of Records</td>
<td>East of Island #11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Rounded stone foundation</td>
<td>Rotunda</td>
<td>East edge of Island #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Stone shaft/well or cistern?</td>
<td>First Almshouse?</td>
<td>North of Feature 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Domed cistern</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>West side of City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Rounded stone wall?</td>
<td>Second Almshouse?</td>
<td>Northeast side of Tweed Courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Brick herringbone-pattern surface/walkway?</td>
<td>City Hall Park</td>
<td>West side of Island #13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Brick foundation elements</td>
<td>Second Almshouse</td>
<td>East of Tweed Courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Domed cistern</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>East side of City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Rounded brick wall/fountain</td>
<td>City Hall Park</td>
<td>North part of Island #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Domed cistern</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>Southeast side of City Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Features 6 and 10**

PES’ field notes for Features 6 and 10 (which by association also includes Feature 9) is “a retrospectively written record”. The notes speak of a robber trench but there is no discussion of definition or as to what led to this determination. Feature 6 is described as the disturbed foundation of a north-south running wall. The remaining foundation, measuring thirty (30) inches long and twenty-four (24) inches wide and eleven (11) inches high, was constructed of unmortared stone blocks which cut into a sandy stratum. Feature 10 is described as a near identical wall that runs parallel to Feature 6. The one
The difference between the walls is that Feature 10 is a mortared wall. The stone used to construct the walls is identified in PES’ field notes as quartzite and granite. Both features seem to cut into Feature 9 which was identified as a foundation trench for the two walls with a post-hole at near center.

It is our contention that Feature 9 is not a foundation trench but cuts into Features 6 and 10. The walls that comprise Features 6 and 10 are likely from two distinct structures. The width of Feature 9 is more appropriate to a separation between two structures.

The artifacts among the three features are similar in type, mostly square-cut nails, window and bottle glass and ceramic shards. Feature 6 contained a lead musket ball and one pipe stem was among the artifacts from Feature 9. The ceramic wares provide a general date of early nineteenth century for the features. Among the ceramics were creamware (1762-1820); American salt-glazed stoneware; Staffordshire type (1670-1795) edgeware (1795-1840) and transfer-printed pearlware (1800-1840).

PES’ had preliminarily associated these features with the nineteenth century Dispensary. This is unlikely as the features are located on the western side of the property while the
Dispensary was located on the eastern side of the property. If there was a specific reason for making an association between these features and the Dispensary PES did not state it in their notes. Using a location equals association approach map analysis would place these features in closest proximity to the Second Almshouse. Though the features are not in the immediate vicinity of the Second Almshouse it is possible that they formed part of a small structure used by the Almshouse but such an association would be pure conjecture. It can be stated however, that these features date to the early nineteenth century though their function remains undecided.

The stones of the Feature 6 wall were un-mortared large angular blocks with smaller stones in the interstices. The Feature 10 stones were mortared but largely disturbed. Artifacts included shell, bone, ceramic, and bottle and window glass.
Feature 17

Feature 17 is identified in PES’ field notes as a brick path possibly associated with the Second Almshouse. The feature was found in excavation units PB1-4, PB1-6 and PB1-9. However, it was not uncovered in PB1-5 though there was a fair amount of brick and mortar debris. It is possible the area was disturbed during one of the many construction episodes that occurred in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Map analysis places Feature 17 to the northwest of the second Almshouse so an association is a possibility. Excavation revealed that at some point the original brick path was paved over with flagstone, perhaps after the Second Almshouse was no longer serving in its original function.
Feature 17 was excavated in three different units, each containing two levels. Artifacts from all units and levels are consistent. There are no distinguishing types between levels. The most common artifact type, aside from building materials was creamware including shards in the Royal pattern which dates to (1762-1820); American salt-glazed stoneware, Staffordshire type; porcelain and some pearlware. The pearlware shards have the most recent date, 1795-1825 for hand-painted polychrome and 1795–1890 for the Annular patterned ware. Brick samples date to the late eighteenth to early nineteenth century.

The material analysis provides a date consistent with the occupation and use of the Second Almshouse. The absence of any later objects and the presence of earlier ware types lend support to this feature having some direct association with the Second Almshouse as opposed to one of the organizations that occupied the building after 1812.

**Feature 18**

Feature 18, described as a post-hole or possible hitching post was uncovered adjacent to Feature 17. Little information was available for Feature 18 and it was not identified on PES’ architectural features map. Artifacts from this context are identical to those from Feature 17 suggesting the two features were contemporaneous.
**Feature 37**
Feature 37 was a cobblestone walkway composed of various sized cobbles. The feature was located south of the Bridewell. Artifacts recovered include bone, brick, nail, ceramic and shell.

**Feature 40**
Discovered near the southern edge of Island 3 this feature was a large brick domed cistern. Only a small section of the cistern but PES extrapolated that the original diameter would have been 12.8 feet. No artifacts were recovered due to time and construction constraints.

**Features 44 and 57**
This feature is a dry laid stone catch basin that was associated with an inlet drain line. The basin was capped with three long tabular stones. The basin extended to a dept of eighty-two inches where decaying wood was found. No artifacts were recovered. Feature 57 is the drainage line that runs into Feature 44.

**Feature 46**
Feature 46 was identified one foot four inches below surface on the southern side of Island 7 during backhoe monitoring. The feature was capped with cut stone which was removed to reveal a brick lined drain that PES noted is possibly associated with the First Almshouse. The sides of the drain line were composed of five courses of brick. Further excavation revealed that the drain line turned toward City Hall.

*Fig. 5-123: The pipe mentioned in the field notes is not referenced in the drawings.*

Feature 46 had a fair number of artifacts including brick and other building materials, glass, ceramic, pipe stem and bone.
The artifacts from Feature 46 were collected from three contexts, overburden, artifacts found within the drain interior and from what was believed to be part of a builder’s trench (which may have been part of Feature 93). There were 29 artifacts recovered from the builder’s trench context. Most were building materials including brick, charcoal and clinker and copper nails. None of the artifacts were clearly dateable except for a late nineteenth or early twentieth century glass bottle shard. The one brick sample taken was that of a late nineteenth century brick.

From the overburden context approximately 100 artifacts were recovered. In addition to the building materials was a two piece metal button, three pipe stems that have a 5/64 measurement, some liquor bottle shards, a medicinal vial, two medicinal bottles, five buttons, made of porcelain, bone and wood and several shards of lamp glass. Dateable ceramic wares in the assemblage included whiteware (post-1815) and ironstone (post-1840). Two artifacts of note in this assemblage are a bottle of Phalohs Magic Hair Dye No. 2, with the address 197 Broadway and, an animal tooth with a small hole drilled through its center, possibly for adornment.

Artifacts recovered from the drain interior included building materials and coal and clinker. Among the building materials were twenty-five small copper nails. Other artifacts included a copper eyehook, copper pins, five buttons including one bone and two shell buttons, pipe stems measuring 4/64 and 5/64, various types of bottle glass, lamp glass, a flowerpot and a slate pencil. Dateable ceramic wares included one shard of transfer-print pearlware (1800-1840) and whiteware (post-1815). One artifact of note is a bakelite disk labeled “Sam’l Gardiner Jr Patented No. V. 29136”. A search of the United States Patent Office web site identified patent No. 29136 as having been issued July 1860.

PES’ in field assessment of these features associated them with the First Almshouse. Artifact analysis dates these features to the nineteenth century. It is our determination that these features were associated with City Hall.
Feature 51
Feature 51 is a three foot diameter cut stone and brick mortared pipe of unknown origin that curved into City Hall. No artifacts were recovered and field notes were minimal.

Feature 52
This feature was a capped red sandstone and brick lined box. The Feature measured to be 2.3 by 2.3 feet. It was located adjacent to the windows and catchments of City Hall. Artifacts included a pipe stem, nail and ceramic.

Feature 56
This was a brick walkway located between Islands 11 and 13. There were no field notes for this feature and the day log only notes its location. No artifacts were listed in the inventory as being associated with this feature.

Feature 59
Feature 59 is a dry laid stone wall found along the northeastern corner of Island 13. The wall was composed of two courses of large cobbles, some flat schist-like stones and brick. The feature, which runs in a north south direction, did not have many artifacts associated with it. Among the 79 artifacts were bone, glass (liquor bottle (4 pieces) and window glass (2 pieces), ceramic, shell and a brick sample taken from the wall. Almost half the materials are shell (39 pieces), mainly clam. Of the dateable artifacts there were 4 pipe stems which measure 4/64 giving it a date range of 1750 – 1800. The ceramic remains mostly consist of creamware, which generally dates between 1762 and 1820. There were also two shards of tin-enameled pottery but the most recent pottery type was two shards of pearlware which has a use date range of 1775-1840.
Feature 61

This feature was located in the vicinity of the Bridewell and may have been part of the Bridewell foundation wall. Consistent with historical data about the Bridewell construction (see MCC) the wall was of mortared stone with associated rubble. There were no artifacts recovered other than an unidentified corroded metal object and bone fragments.

Feature 63

Feature 63 was uncovered at the completion of excavation unit DL3-2 when excavators noticed stones in the northeast corner of the three by three foot (3’x3’) unit. This was twenty-two inches below surface. Probing indicated that the stones continued below the final excavation depth and it was decided to continue excavating.

Additional excavation revealed a dense layer of architectural debris. The stones formed part of a substantial load bearing wall according to PES field notes. Artifacts excavated in association with the feature include a bone button blank (found inside the wall), pipe stems and several dateable ceramic shards including creamware and pearlware. The most recent ceramic ware present was a piece of red transfer-printed pearlware that dates from 1825–1840. PES’ initial field association of this feature labeled it as being the City Hall East privy and the artifacts date within that range. There is no indication within the field
notes of the presence or absence of night soil and there is no other documentation to support, or refute, this association. Further, it would be highly uncommon for a privy to contain a load bearing wall as privies tend to be shaft features.

**Feature 66**
This feature was a brick structure, presumably a wall, located at the eastern edge of Island 3. A builder’s trench was identified around the feature. Artifacts included bottle and window glass, bone and pearlware.

**Feature 69**
This feature identified by PES as a nineteenth century brick manhole or drain that was located south of Island 10. The feature had a stone outer lining and a middle layer of stone extended beyond the five foot depth excavated. It measured approximately forty-seven by forty-five (47”x45”) inches. The soil on the exterior of the feature is described as being disturbed fill that contained a high density of construction debris. According to PES’ notes this unit was not sifted and as a result was only sampled (PES 1999). Three artifacts were saved for analysis, the base of a rum or wine bottle and 2 shards of a manganese mottled redware that dates from 1680 to 1750. Without brick samples we cannot confirm PES’ nineteenth century date. However, artifact analysis implies an eighteenth century date. Another possible function that should be considered is that of a well.
Feature 79

Feature 79 was a thick stone foundation wall located “131’ east of City Hall.” It consisted of cut mortared schist. Excavation uncovered the corner of the foundation and a portion of the wall had been cut into for a pipeline. Measurements for the wall are sparse to non-existent. Notes state that the wall was found just below surface and that the total height of the wall was approximately five feet but excavations did not extend to the base of the wall. It is unclear how that determination was made without further excavation. The feature is in the vicinity of the former location of the Gaol. Map analysis places it alongside the former structure. It is possible that this is a portion of the gaol foundation. No artifacts were found in association with the feature that could have allowed it to be dated. However, immediately adjacent to this location is a significant sheet deposit (Feature 91-92) that dates to the eighteenth century. An association between this features is highly probable.
**Feature 89**

This feature was uncovered during excavation of Feature 84. Feature 89 cut through the eastern portion of Feature 84 which was an eighteenth century deposit. Feature 89 was a rounded stone foundation that PES’ believed to be part of the Rotunda foundation wall. Map analysis does place the foundation in the appropriate vicinity for the Rotunda however no artifacts intrusive to Feature 84, that may have been directly associated with the foundation wall were uncovered.

![Fig. 5-126](image)

*Fig. 5-126: A planimetric view of Features 84 and 89.*

The wall was constructed of large mortared stones (approximately nineteen to twenty inches each) in three courses. The height of the wall was twenty-three inches. According to field notes the interior of the wall was filled with rubble that was not excavated. Feature 89 was within Feature 84, a significant trash deposit that existed above Feature 89 and below the exterior of the stone wall. Artifact analysis from Feature 84 provided a mid-eighteenth century date for the feature. The most recent dateable object from Feature 84 is a handful of creamware shards decorated with a clouded glaze (1740-1770).
It wasn’t until after the excavation of Feature 84 was completed that PES noted that the feature was a series of distinct overlapping pits instead of a single episode deposit. The quagmire is that if PES’ assumption that this foundation is remnant of the Rotunda there should be an intrusion of nineteenth century materials in the strata above Feature 89; there is none. Additionally, there is no stratigraphic evidence available to make a determination whether Feature 89 clearly cuts into Feature 84. The possibility exists that Feature 89 is not the remnant of the Rotunda foundation and may be contemporaneous to or earlier than Feature 84.

**Feature 95**

Field notes refer to this as a “Cut stone alignment” that may have been either a shaft feature or a structure. The feature 46 drain line leads out of this alignment on a downward slope. Artifacts included brick, glass, ceramic and nails.

**Feature 96**

This was a domed cistern with a center stone box, presumably for a pump mechanism. It was located near the western side of City Hall. The diameter of the cistern was measured to be sixteen (16) inches. No artifacts were recovered.

**Features 97-98 and 100 (98 & 100 not on map)**

Feature 97 is Stratum C of Trench PB2-1. The levels above the feature contained few artifacts which included a disarticulated human metatarsal. Stratum C was a mottled sandy layer that contained a mortared stone wall with a lead pipe extending from the wall and a small area of disarticulated human remains. The wall, which was in poor condition, was believed to be associated with the Second Almshouse. A second feature, labeled Feature 98, was uncovered running into Feature 97 along the southern end of the excavation unit. Feature 98 was a disturbed stone wall of a type similar to Feature 97. A third feature, Feature 100, consisted of a single course of mortared limestone that was cut into by Feature 98. The limestone were arrange like flagstones.
A map analysis places this feature within the vicinity of the Second Almshouse, which was constructed in 1797. Only 12 artifacts were recovered from the feature level including an 18th century brick, iron, ceramic and shell. Among the artifacts were two pearlware shards dating from 1775 – 1840. The artifact analysis does not contradict an association with the Second Almshouse but it does not firmly prove it either. No samples were taken of the stone wall that may have aided in further dating of the feature.

**Feature 101**

This feature was located during backhoe monitoring on the west side of Island 13. At approximately nineteen inches below surface a 20th century fill deposit was uncovered along with a brick formation. Excavation revealed a herringbone patterned brick walkway bordered with stones. Beneath the bricks was a compacted red sand layer. The brick samples taken from the feature are all eighteenth century bricks. Other artifacts include building materials such as window glass and square-cut nails and a single bone button blank. Datable ceramic wares from this feature include creamware (1762-1820),
pearlware (1775-1840) and white salt-glazed stoneware (1720-1805). The material analysis dates this feature to the nineteenth century. Reuse of bricks was not uncommon and the path was likely installed during the landscaping of the park just prior to or during the construction of City Hall.

**Feature 102**

Feature 102 is an architectural structure labeled as “brick foundation elements” associated with the Second Almshouse by PES. The structure is composed of brick, mortar and stone and for reasons unstated divided into six elements by the excavators. Element 1 is described as an “L”-shaped brick wall that is five courses high; Element 2 is described as a single course brick floor; Element 3 is described as a brick wall that cuts Element 1 at the east but is two inches lower that Element 1; Element 4 is a “U”-shaped brick element that encloses most of Element 5; Element 5 is a two course brick floor and; Element 6 is a thin section of a brick wall that may have been part of Element 2. The area containing these brick elements was surrounded by large stone slabs.

The field notes, while detailed, are not very illustrative. The planimetric drawing of the feature provides a better understanding of this feature which appears to be a single structure. Brick samples taken from this feature date to the nineteenth century. Other artifacts included a variety of building materials including square-cut nails and window glass, bottle glass, the bone handle of a dining utensil and a variety of ceramic wares. Dateable types among the ceramic wares include green and blue edgeware (1795-1840); American slipware; overglaze hand painted polychrome pearlware (1775-1810); porcelain and blue transfer-print pearlware (1800-1840). The artifact analysis firmly dates this feature to the nineteenth century. Map analysis places the feature on the interior of Second Almshouse.
While analysis clearly supports an association with the Second Almshouse there are questions concerning the location of the feature. It is equally possible this feature formed part of the Second Almshouse structure which was in a U-shaped plan and constructed of brick or that the maps (all based on Hunter 1994) are erroneous in their placement of the Second Almshouse.

**Feature 120**

This feature is a brick domed cistern with a center stone box that was uncovered during backhoe monitoring of asphalt removal. It was located thirty-four (34) feet south and twelve and a half feet east of the northeast corner of City Hall. The cistern was filled with hard-packed stone laden rubble. Only one artifact was recovered from Feature 120, a corroded cooper alloy coin that is approximately the size of a present day quarter. Further conservation is required to definitively date the coin. Based upon the description of the cistern, it is similar to other known nineteenth century context cisterns.

**Feature 164**
This feature was the remnants of a circular wall that PES dates to the turn of the nineteenth century. It was located in the midst of Island 1. No artifacts were recovered.

Feature 170
This was another cistern feature located near the southeast side of City Hall. The top of the feature was constructed of red granite and its interior depth was measured to eleven (11) feet. No artifacts were collected.
### TABLE 5-3: ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES IN NEW YORK CITY HALL PARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Number and Type</th>
<th>Unit Record Sheet Dates</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Applicable Strata and Strata Differences</th>
<th>Artifacts and Dates Found</th>
<th>Bag IDs and Numbers</th>
<th>Additional Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F6 &amp; F10 – In T1, TU75-80 and 70-75. A set of parallel stone walls. Made up mostly of quartzite and granite.</td>
<td>2-4-99, 2-9-99, 2-10-99 &amp; 2-19-99</td>
<td>7 of 11</td>
<td>A1 – Sandy loam, 10yr3/1 &amp; A2 – 10yr4/3. B – Coarse sand, 7.5yr5/6. C – Bottom, 10yr5/6. F10 has extensive pockets of fine grained silt, 10yr4/1 with its lower level soil being mostly silty sand with small pebbles, 10yr5/2.</td>
<td>2-9-99 &amp; 2-20-99: Shell, bone ceramic, bottle &amp; window glass, brick, iron, stones, coal, mortar, quartzite, blocks, iron, bolt, slag, charcoal, pebbles, wood &amp; block pieces</td>
<td>T1, TU75-80 * T1, TU70-75, Strata A, B &amp; C Bag Numbers: T1-75-80: 318,319 T1-75-80: 321, 322,</td>
<td>F6 &amp; F10 both seem to cut into F9 which is a Foundation Trench for these two walls. The notes also indicate that a Robber Trench is truncated by the foundation for the two walls. The two walls run N-S for entire width of trench. Their length is 30” and width is 24”. The maximum width of the Robber Trench is 26”. The Surviving height of the foundation if 11”. The stones of F6 are not mortared. They are large angular blocks with smaller stones in the interstices. One square stone has a pattern of grooving which may be either decorative or the result of quarrying. F10 stones were mortared but none of it intact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Date &amp; Duration</td>
<td>Description &amp; Context</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F22 – Opinion of Archaeologist that this is part of F17.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 – Reddish brown sand – 5yr4/4 with broken pieces of rock and marble mixed in. 2-24-99: marble, iron rod w/brick attached, bitumen and bone fragments.</td>
<td>626, 627 PB1-6: 620</td>
<td>Designation as a Hitching Post is the best guess of the archaeologist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F18 – Possibly the remnant of a Hitching Post</td>
<td>2-17 &amp; 19-99 4 of 12</td>
<td>Stratum A2 above and below. Made up of a very dark grayish brown course sand – 10yr3/2. 2-17-99: shell, brick rusty nail, ceramic. PB1-4, Level 2 Bag #</td>
<td>Encountered the cobblestone walkway at approximately 36 or 37 inches below grade. The cobbles were various sizes of small, medium and large. The walkway definitely expands further along into the E, W and S walls of trench.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F37 – In DL1-35.</td>
<td>3-19-99, 3-23-99 &amp; 3-24-99 2 of 8</td>
<td>D – Yellow-brown, fine sand or decomposed mortar, 10yr5/4. 3-2399: Bone, brick, nail, ceramic, shell. DL1-35-D1- Encountered the cobblestone walkway at approximately 36 or 37 inches below grade. The cobbles were various sizes of small, medium and large. The walkway definitely expands further along into the E, W and S walls of trench.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F40 – CB3. Found a large brick domed cistern at the far end of DL!1. Just the SW wedge of the cistern.</td>
<td>3-24-99 1 of 1</td>
<td>Soil types not recorded. Closest trench to it, DL1-35, has Stratum A as very dark gray, sandy loam, 10yr3/1. No artifacts taken. CB3- but can only find the Feature Report page not the trench record.</td>
<td>Feature discovered near the southern edge of Island #3. A plan view was drawn. Extrapolated that the original diameter would have been around 12.8 feet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F44 – Dry laid Stone Catch Basin and Associated Inlet Drain Line. Found on the South side of Island #4</td>
<td>3-26-99 &amp; 5-8-99 2 of 3</td>
<td>Strata A1 &amp; A2 are the interior soils of the basin. A1 – Course red sand 7.5yr5/6 mixed with clayey loam 10yr4/5 distributed in lenses. One foot 3-26-99: Decaying wood at the bottom 82 inches down. No artifacts taken.</td>
<td>Encountered feature at 21 inches below grade of asphalt walkway. Some stones have been shaped to match the basin’s interior which is slightly oval. Measures 5’6” long and 5’ wide. Basin capped with three long tabular stones along the long dimension of oval. Two tabular stones had also been placed in the western</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F57 – Drainage Line that runs into F44 Catch basin. Runs E-W. Composed of tabular building stones, mortar &amp; baulk. Slopes downward into the basin from the east.</td>
<td>4-8-99 &amp; 4-11-99</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
<td>4-99 &amp; 4-11-99; Mortar and brick sample. Bone, part of glass bottle, wooden toothbrush ceramic, nails, glass and shell.</td>
<td>F57 – part of the interior wall enclosing a rectangular cavity which appears to be a water drain. Cavity extended 18 inches beyond the basin’s interior surface where it was blocked by a large piece of schist or granite.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-99 &amp; 4-11-99: Mortar and brick sample. Bone, part of glass bottle, wooden toothbrush ceramic, nails, glass and shell.</td>
<td>K &amp; L K – A reddish brown soil, 5yr4/3. The stratum of the trench floor. L – Was a sandy clay, 7.5yr4/4. The soils underlying the drain line were a coarse reddish brown sand, 5yr4/4 and a dark yellowish brown clay, 10yr4/6.</td>
<td>3-39-99: pipe stem, an engraved piece, iron nails, bone, shell, brick, ceramic, metal and charcoal.</td>
<td>H4- F46- Drain line located on the Southside of Island #7. Believed to end somewhere in the middle of the island. It turned and headed toward City Hall Perhaps near the H-Pole. This drain line slants downward from the N to the S. The sides were 5 brick courses high and the bottom was 3 courses wide. Feature record unclear in its measurements but it is definitely 5 brick courses high and 3 wide. Brick dimensions are 7/10x5/10x2/10. A 1861 rubber disc was found inside F46 implying that the feature was no longer in use around this time. In addition it was found that the brick lining later changed to mortar lined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F51</td>
<td>A 3 foot diameter cut stone, brick and mortar pipe of unknown origin that curves into City Hall.</td>
<td>4-7-99</td>
<td>2 of 3</td>
<td>Strata not recorded.</td>
<td>4-7-99: No artifacts taken.</td>
<td>No artifacts taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F52</td>
<td>A capped red sandstone and brick lined box.</td>
<td>4-7-99</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
<td>Strata not recorded.</td>
<td>4-7-99: pipe stem, nail, ceramic and an object the Feature Record does not identify.</td>
<td>F52- Feature measures 2.3 feet x 2.3 feet with an excavated depth to 3 feet from its top. It adjacent to the windows and catchment of City Hall. Perhaps it was a builder’s trench to utilities beneath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F56</td>
<td>A Brick walkway perhaps associated with Bridewell.</td>
<td>Strata not recorded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F59</td>
<td>A dry laid stone wall that runs N-S.</td>
<td>4-12-99 &amp; 4-13-99</td>
<td>2 of 3</td>
<td>A1 – Within the wall was a dark yellowish brown, silty loam 10yr4/4. A2 – Outside on either side of the wall was a red sterile sand. No Munsell recorded.</td>
<td>A1 – shell, bone, ceramic. A2 – ceramic, bone, rusted metal. Brick sample from wall.</td>
<td>F59- Bag #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Strata/Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F61 – Mortared stone wall/foundation.</td>
<td>3-4-99</td>
<td>Strata not recorded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F61 – Mortared stone wall/foundation.</td>
<td>3-4-99</td>
<td>No artifacts recorded. Date taken from when DL1-11 was first started.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F61 – Mortared stone wall/foundation.</td>
<td>3-4-99</td>
<td>No artifacts taken except for: A highly corroded metal object and bone fragments. See Bags CHP-DL1-11-B524 (1 &amp; 2 of 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West could be seen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F63 – In DL3-2, A substantial load bearing wall in the NE corner of unit.</td>
<td>4-7-99</td>
<td>A, B3, C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F63 – In DL3-2, A substantial load bearing wall in the NE corner of unit.</td>
<td>4-7-99</td>
<td>Stratum A was very dark brown topsoil, 10yr2/2. B through C are demolition fill and consists of very dark gray silty loam 7.5yr3/1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F63 – In DL3-2, A substantial load bearing wall in the NE corner of unit.</td>
<td>4-7-99</td>
<td>B – ceramic, glass, nails, metal, pipe stem fragments, shell red brick fragments, bone C – ceramic, bottle &amp; window glass fragments, bone, shell, nails, mortar, kaolin pipe stem fragments, and slag.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F63 – In DL3-2, A substantial load bearing wall in the NE corner of unit.</td>
<td>4-7-99</td>
<td>DL3-2-ChP-B1119-DL3-2 ChP-B1120-DL3-2 ChP-B1121-DL3-2 ChP-B1123-DL3-2 ChP-B1122-DL3-2 Other – ChP-F63-B1145 (DL3-2N &amp; 3S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F63 – In DL3-2, A substantial load bearing wall in the NE corner of unit.</td>
<td>4-14-99 – 4-17-99, 4-19-99, 4-19-99</td>
<td>A, D, E &amp; F Stratum A above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F63 – In DL3-2, A substantial load bearing wall in the NE corner of unit.</td>
<td>4-14-99 – 4-17-99, 4-19-99, 4-19-99</td>
<td>B – Water smoothed schist stones, bottle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F63 – In DL3-2, A substantial load bearing wall in the NE corner of unit.</td>
<td>4-14-99 – 4-17-99, 4-19-99, 4-19-99</td>
<td>DL3-2N, A, B, C, D &amp; E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F63 – In DL3-2, A substantial load bearing wall in the NE corner of unit.</td>
<td>4-14-99 – 4-17-99, 4-19-99, 4-19-99</td>
<td>Feature located in the Eastern part of Island #11 beginning at 22 inches below grade. The bottom had not been reached at 50 inches below grade. In addition the bags for these strata contained: B – glazed red brick fragment, coal, clinker C – slate, plaster, granite, clinker This artifact was found within the wall.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
opened to pursue the extent of the wall found in DL3-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-21-99,</td>
<td>F63 was black loam 10yr2/1 B East – Brownish red sand, no Munsell. B West – Mottled sandy loam, 7.5yr2.5/2. C West – Very dark brown silty loam, 7.5yr2.5/3. C East – Brown sand, 7.5yr4/3. D – Very dark brown silty loam fill, 7.5yr4/4 changing to dark brown 10yr3/3. F – No Munsell recorded for the top of Stratum F which was 50 inches below Stratum A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-27-99</td>
<td>glass, butched bone, shell, ceramics, pipe stems, rusted nails, mortar, and brick fragments. Various pencil leads, ½ of a button C – All of the above plus a blob top for beer bottle, slag, and a negative for button making. D – All of the above plus: bolts, sewer pipe fragment, wall plaster, pipe bowl. E – butchered animal rib, bone button, charcoal, window glass, bone fragments. Schist &amp; slate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHP-B1126-DL3-2N CHP-B1127-DL3-2N CHP-B1128-DL3-2N CHP-B1129-DL3-2N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bottom had not been reached at 50 inches below grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The artifacts that were collected in the different strata around this Feature were not included in the labeling of the bags. Consequently the bags for these artifacts lack strata designations. In addition there were other artifacts collected that were not included on the Unit/Trench/Feature Record sheets. They are: B – a fruit pit, metal, pieces, coal, sandstone, a die, typewriter keys, clinker, C – copper thimble,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bag 1126 (1 &amp; 2 of 2) is supposedly Stratum B. Bag 1127 is supposedly Stratum C. Bags 1128 &amp; 1129 are supposedly Stratum D. Based on the Trench Records the content of the bags do not exactly match.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Date(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F69 – At N530 E505 &amp; N535 E505</td>
<td>7-8-99 &amp; 7-9-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F79 – Stone foundation of two walls perpendicular to each other</td>
<td>4-4-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F95 – In H4 trench. Found a cut stone alignment that</td>
<td>4-27-99 – 4-30-99, 5-4-99 &amp; 5-6-99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
could either be a shaft feature or a structure.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Drawing</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F96 – Brick domed cistern with center stone box, located near the Westside of City Hall.</td>
<td>5-7-99</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
<td>None Recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F97 – In PB2-1 trench.</td>
<td>5-7-99, 5-11-99, 5-13-99</td>
<td>7 of 14 (Several drawing)</td>
<td>D is a very sandy silt, 5yr5/4 which overlays F97.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-14-99, 5-17-99, 5-18-99</td>
<td>H is a sandy silt, 10yr5/3 which seems to cover both horizontal faces of the F97 wall.</td>
<td>shell, brick, slate fragments, mortar, stone chips &amp; gravels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-11-99 – 5-12-99</td>
<td>Stratum A though not excavated was noted to be mottled clay with silty sand, 10yr4/3. Stratum B was dark brown marble fragments 7.5yr4/4.</td>
<td>Bone fragments, marble, bottle glass, ceramic, brick, nails, mortar, cinder, bone button template and brick from Herring bone patterned surface.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-28-99 – 2 of 3</td>
<td>None Recorded.</td>
<td>One quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F101 – In H8-A trench. A Herring Bone pattern walkway or surface.

F102 – Refer to attached page.

F120 – Brick 5-28-99 – 2 of 3 None Recorded. One quarter F120 -- Center of the Stone box was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Description</th>
<th>Date Found</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domed Cistern with center stone box.</td>
<td>5-29-99 &amp; 6-1-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Located 34 feet South and 12.5 feet East of the NE corner of City Hall. Found during asphalt pathway removal on East side of City Hall. General description is the same as that for F96 with these exceptions: The top of the box was found 9 inches below the current asphalt pathway surface. The box measures 32 inches square and was scored at the top. The height of the box was 12 inches. An E-W line of mortared bricks runs from the center of the box. Their function is unknown. When photographed these bricks had been dislodged by the backhoe and therefore looked curved not straight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F164 - Remnant circular wall of a fountain that was in place during the turn of the century. North part of Island #1.</td>
<td>6-29-99</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>Not recorded.</td>
<td>None taken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
318

1 inch thick. Wall found when the landscapers were grading the NW corner of park near B roadway and Chambers streets. Mapping coordinates: 14 feet 4 inches South of north granite curb, 29 feet East of Western granite curb. Interior radius of fountain was 12 feet.

| F170 – Cistern near the Southeast side of City Hall | 7-9-99 but record sheet says 7-9-98. | 1 of 1 | None recorded. | No artifacts taken. | Not Applicable. | The top aperture is a square made of red granite, 24 inches x 24 inches. Interior depth was 11 feet from top of aperture. Interior diameter was 15 feet. Mapping coordinates 5 feet South from edge of unit or 6 feet from the center to the SE corner of City Hall. |
Part 2: Burial Features\textsuperscript{14}:

Among the many historic uses of part of the City Hall Park property was that of a burial ground. While the Almshouse had two formally identified burial areas a larger area is said to have been used for burials for prisoners, including American prisoners of war during the Revolution (see Lucey, this volume). Additionally, the African Burial Ground lay immediately to the north of CHP.

The first official record of the Almshouse burial ground is found in 1757, when the Common Council voted to cause “a small piece of Ground to the Eastward of and adjoining to the fence of the said Work House, of the Length of two Boards, to be Inclosed and fenced in, for a Buriall place for the poor belonging to the said work House” (MCC VI:85-6). This cemetery was in use until 1785, when a larger parcel of land in the vicinity of where Tweed Courthouse now stands was designated as the new cemetery for the dead of the Almshouse and the Bridewell (MCC I:158).

The first Almshouse cemetery was uncovered during the renovation of City Hall Park in 1998-1999. Following guidelines established by the Landmarks Preservation Commission, primary context burials were not to be disinterred, but, were protected in place either through project redesign or specially-constructed protective coverings. As a result the primary burials were only partially analyzed. This long-standing policy was developed through community consultation and while it has meant that some anthropological analyses were curtailed, it was felt to be more respectful of the dead and the descendent communities.

The part of the cemetery which fell within the impact zone was excavated, and at least twenty-eight graves were found and left \textit{in situ}, after being photographed and documented. The incomplete and fragmentary remains found in secondary context within the park were disinterred and analyzed by a team directed in the field by Marilyn London

\textsuperscript{14} The information from this section is taken from the London 2004 report. References are not provided throughout since this is the sole source of information. The entire report has been appended below as Appendix B. Other information is referenced as required.
and supervised by Dr. Douglas Owsley of the Smithsonian Institution. In addition to the burials found within the Almshouse cemetery, an estimated fifty to two hundred fifty additional individuals were found within CHP (London, this volume.). These are represented by one or a few bones in secondary context. In at least four cases these were found densely deposited enough to be identified as “ossuaries” by the excavators. The analysis of the burial features was undertaken in two stages. The first stage analyzed the skeletal remains either on-site or at the Smithsonian Institution. The second stage focused on an analysis of the associated artifact remains at the Brooklyn College archaeological laboratory. This chapter addresses the artifact analysis associated with the burial features

Excavation

To quote the PES Preliminary Report (2000a:10):

The majority of the remaining cultural features found within the park were human burials. Burial features were grouped into two categories: those in primary deposition, and those in secondary deposition. Primary interments were found in several locations throughout the park. Three burials were found along the north side of Island #1, adjacent to the Chambers Street sidewalk. The remainder of the primary interments were located to the south and east of Tweed Courthouse, in an area thought to be the First Almshouse burial ground and vicinity. Secondary interments, which consisted of partially articulated and non-articulated human remains from one or more individuals, were found in the same general locations as the primary interments, and additionally within fill strata on Island #1, Island #11, and the northernmost part of the pathway at the northeast corner of Tweed Courthouse. The secondary interments are thought to stem from later earthmoving activities in the park, particularly those associated with the construction of Tweed Courthouse and landscaping during the 1860s and 1870s. Excavation for the basement of Tweed Courthouse may have impacted additional burials associated with the First Almshouse. Since the majority of the secondary interments were found overlying and adjacent to the primary interments in the First Almshouse burial ground, it is likely that the location of this cemetery was known through most of the 19th century, and the disturbed burials intentionally were reinterred overtop of the existing graves.
Throughout the course of fieldwork at CHP seventy-six burial features were excavated and documented. This represents more than one-third or forty-one percent of all features located. According to PES nomenclature any excavation unit to contain human bone fragments, regardless of number or degree of fragmentation or disturbance, was considered a burial feature. There are also two features, identified as burial features that did not contain any human remains but rather appeared to suggest a burial shaft. All bone materials were assessed on site by a physical anthropologist who determined whether or not they were human remains. Due to excavation limitations of the construction schedule some human remains were identified during mechanical monitoring or were left partially excavated.

Material analysis occurred separately from the skeletal analysis. Several of the burial features contained associated material remains. However, it should be noted that in most instances the material remains were found in the same archaeological context as the human skeletal remains, as opposed to being directly associated with the skeletal remains. The majority of the skeletal deposits come from secondary or disturbed contexts, which is reflected in the material analysis. Any materials uncovered that were directly associated with a primary burial were left in situ with the burial. Thus, only the topmost artifacts (as opposed to those beneath the burials or associated with lower [stacked] burials) were included in the archaeological record of City Hall Park. In these cases, it is the bones themselves that provide the most information.

Feature Analysis

As mentioned above, all primary burials were left in situ as were any directly associated artifact materials. Thus, any primary context materials were unavailable for analysis. Reference and/or description of any such materials are spotty to non-existent in PES’ field notes. Many of the burial features are in a secondary or disturbed context, having been disturbed and re-deposited over the course of time. Finally, a number of the burial features are from monitored contexts rather than archaeologically excavated contexts and
the materials recovered represent a sampling of the unit. Chart X provides an overview of each of the burial features and its context.

What follows is a feature by feature description of the excavation and analysis of features identified by PES as burial features. In compiling this section PES field notes and Marilyn London’s report were relied upon. Note that feature numbers were assigned sequentially in the field, regardless of feature type (e.g., trash feature, architectural feature, or burial). Thus, the first burial feature encountered by the excavation team was Feature 8, the next one was Feature 12, and so on. Features with intervening numbers were not burials.

**Feature 8**
This feature consisted of fragmentary human remains discovered throughout previously disturbed units of Trench 1. Unit 25-30 was extended southwards to determine the orientation of an articulated partial skeleton located within the unit. The burial is that of an adult who was interred with the head oriented south. The lower part of the skeleton was truncated by a modern builder’s trench for the curbstone adjacent to Chambers Street. Some skeletal elements had been re-deposited in the builder’s trench. No artifacts were recovered from this feature.

![Fig. 5-131](image-url)
**Feature 12**

Feature 12 is a second articulated skeleton located within Trench 1 Unit 25-30. This second individual was located approximately eleven inches (11”) below the surface. The burial, a young adult male, was exposed from the shoulders to the pelvic area and had been interred on a north-south orientation with the head positioned at the south. The body was supine with the hands folded across the pelvis. While there was no evidence of a grave shaft there was distinct staining that extended one to two inches (1” – 2”) into the area surrounding the skeleton. Some of the lower post-cranial elements were disturbed by a builder’s trench to the north that truncated the burial. The remains were left *in situ*. No grave shaft, grave goods or clothing remains were identified. No artifacts were recovered from this feature.

![Feature 12 Image](image)

**Feature 13**

Feature 13, located in Trench 1 Unit 15-20 and 20-25, was a modern pit that contained stone slabs. A single skeletal element, the tooth of a 4 to 5 year old child, was recovered from the feature. Artifacts recovered from this feature clearly demonstrated modern
disturbance. Only eight artifacts were collected, among these a plastic pen and a 1991 nickel (five cent coin).

**Feature 45**

![Feature 45 Image]

This feature, located in Trench 1A 30-35, contained disarticulated human bones that were recovered during screening. Within two feet of the modern day ground surface a partially intact adult cranium and mandible were found leading to a primary context burial. This individual was supine with the head oriented south. The cranium to rib section was exposed but, the remainder remained beneath the sidewalk to the north. “Small rocks were found in the space between the teeth, but it is unclear whether these were secondary
to the burial or part of the original interment” (London 2004). There was no observed soil change in the unit and no artifacts were recovered. The burial was left in situ.

**Feature 53**

This feature, located on Island 7, was excavated in an arbitrary eighty by thirty inch (80” x 30”) area surrounding a bone concentration that had been revealed during backhoe monitoring. It was located along the asphalt drive east of Tweed Courthouse. Though earlier test pits in the area did not uncover any human remains, both human and non-human bones were found in the east wall of the trench on Island 9 during construction excavation. The bones were located beneath the roots of a former tree and were mixed and oriented in various directions. No complete skeleton was found in this feature.

Due to construction constraints, not all the remains were recovered. The materials that were recovered were removed to the lab and sorted into cranial and postcranial elements. Old shovel cuts and other damage were evident on several of the remains suggesting the remains had been removed from their original burial contexts and re-deposited in this secondary pit. There was also copper staining on many of the cranial elements suggesting they had been shrouded when first interred. According to London’s analysis “the greatest number of individuals is represented by femora; there are 14+ adults, a subadult male (probably 15-19), a 2 to 4 year old, and an infant (newborn to 6 months). Combining the information from cranial and postcranial remains, [gives] the minimum number of 22 individuals (18 adults and 4 immature)” (London, this volume).

Artifacts from this feature were recovered in three separate episodes, referred to here as episodes A through C. (A collection episode may be defined as an assemblage which was grouped together under the same bag number [or inventory number] by PES. These numbers were not changed consistently; often they changed each day, but sometimes went over a few days. The episodes are not necessarily vertically or horizontally separated, but represent [if anything] minimally, assemblages from the same feature which were collected or excavated at different times).
Episode A recovered a total of seventy-six (76) artifacts from Stratum B, Level 1. One third of these were pottery shards that included all common types. Among the dateable types were Mocha decorated pearlware, blue transfer-printed pearlware and brown transfer-printed whiteware. Other artifacts included seventeen square cut iron nails, eleven window glass shards, bottle shards and a pipe stem dated 1700-1750. Two other distinct artifacts were the remnants of a purple glass toiletry bottle for some type of hair product, embossed with the word “HAIR”, and a slate pencil.

The second collection episode, Episode B, recovered one hundred ninety-one (191) artifacts from Stratum C, Level 1 which appears to be a disturbed layer. Fifty-one (51) of these were square cut iron nails. Other building related items included brick and window glass. Among the fifteen shells collected several exhibited evidence of disease. Pipe stems recovered dated from 1680-1720 as well as 1750-1800. Food related items included bottle glass and pottery shards. Among the pottery types recovered were porcelain, blue transfer-printed pearlware, brown transfer-printed whiteware, mocha decorated pearlware and stoneware. Modern disturbance to this stratum is evidenced by the presence of a 1905 Indian Head copper penny as well as copper penny of current mint. The exact date could not be determined on this later coin.

The last collection episode has no identifying provenience, except a feature number. A total of eighty-eight (88) artifacts were recovered during this collection episode. Among the artifacts collected are several square cut iron nails (19), brick fragments, clam and oyster shells and window glass. Only one bottle shard was recovered, one pipe stem dated 1750-1800, a bone button blank, a bone button and two oval shaped copper buttons. Among the twenty-nine pottery shards recovered were porcelain, Staffordshire slipware, American slipware, stoneware, pearlware and whiteware.

Overall this area appears to have been disturbed not only by the tree that once stood in the area but by twentieth century landscape work, as evidenced by the 1905 penny. While it is possible that lower strata were disturbed only by the tree growth there is no evidence to support this. Nor is there information available which, if any of these artifact
collection episodes were associated with the deposit of human remains. In other words, it is not possible to be certain whether these artifacts are from within the grave fill, within a disturbed grave shaft, or from a later disturbance.

**Feature 67**
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Feature 67 was identified in Trench C (Island 9). At least ten individuals were identified from the human remains recovered. The soil in which the human remains were recovered appears to be original to the grave, however the burials themselves appear to be redeposited. Some bones were left in the south wall of the trench and the grave also appears to extend into Feature 77.

One hundred forty-five (45) artifacts were recovered from this feature. Of this fifty-five (55), or approximately one-third, were square cut iron nails. Samples of various building materials were also present including brick, slate, plaster and window glass. Of the six pipe stems recovered five dated 1700-1750, one dated 1750-1800. Pottery types included porcelain, tin-enameled earthenware, salt-glazed stoneware and pearlware. One piece of stoneware kiln furniture was also recovered. Some of the rarer artifacts from this unit include two lead musket balls; eight pieces of at least two bone button blanks; four bone
buttons; an unidentified copper coin that is larger than a present-day quarter, a metal finial and a copper cufflink.

**Feature 68**

Located at the north wall of Island 9 Trench B this feature contained a large concentration of disarticulated fragmented human bone. The feature was uncovered during backhoe monitoring and was not excavated stratigraphically, according to PES’ notes. There were no intact human skeletal elements. According to field notes there was a distinct lack of stratigraphic differentiation.

Only ten artifacts were recovered from this feature but it is not clear if artifacts were sampled or collected in total. Only one dateable item was present among the artifacts, a shard of blue transfer-printed pearlware (1800–1840). Feature 68 is one of several examples of re-deposited materials on site which include disturbed burials in either a secondary or even tertiary context.

![Fig. 5-135: Skeletal concentration in Feature 68.](image)

**Feature 70-71**
This feature, located just beneath the asphalt south of Island 10, was discovered during backhoe monitoring. Feature 71 is identified as a trash deposit feature. A discussion of the artifacts can be found above (page xx). At least three individuals were represented among the remains recovered; an adult male aged 35 to 50 years; a newborn; and a child approximately one year old at the time of death.

**Feature 72\(^{15}\)**

This feature was discovered during backhoe monitoring while removing the asphalt south of Island 10 at unit N540 E505. When the monitor noticed bone in the back dirt excavation was halted and the archaeological team sifted through the back dirt. According to PES’ field notes there was a significant amount of human remains. Materials were recovered or separated into two contexts but there is no notation among PES notes as to the distinction. The smaller of the collection episodes consists of eleven (11) artifacts, two (2) square cut iron nails, one of which PES identified as a coffin nail.

---

\(^{15}\) Human remains from this feature were combined with those from Feature 113 to create Feature 126.
and nine (9) unidentified pieces of iron. Presumably these were in direct association with the burial.

The larger deposit consisted of three hundred sixty-two (362) artifacts. This included sixty (60) square cut iron nails constituting 16% of the assemblage. Various building materials were present including a slate tile, mortar and concrete sample and twenty-nine (29) shards of window glass. Twenty-one (21) dateable pipe stems were recovered, eleven measured 4/64 (1750-1800), eight measured 5/64 (1720-1750), and one each measured 6/64 (1680-1720) and 7/64 (1650-1680). Also present were liquor bottle and drinking glass shards. Pottery shards represented 41% of the assemblage (151 shards). Among the types present were North American salt-glazed stoneware, English stoneware, Westerwald stoneware (1620-1775), Staffordshire (1670-1795), dot, diaper, basket patterned white salt-glazed stoneware (1740-1775), black basalt (1750-1845), flow blue transfer-printed pearlware, mocha decorated pearlware and whiteware (beginning 1815). Unique items include a carved bone chess piece (a rook), a button blank and a slate pencil. One clearly intrusive artifact that is indicative of the disturbed nature of this deposit is a plastic cigarette filter/holder.

Overall this feature shows clear disturbance in its inclusion of fragmented human remains and an artifact deposit that has a nineteenth century date. It appears that several burials were disturbed during 19th-century construction episodes and the skeletal remains were scattered throughout the site, being mixed with various artifact contexts.

**Feature 73**
This feature was an eastern extension of Feature 72. It was not hand excavated but the back dirt, excavated by backhoe, was “sorted” thru. This feature, located just beneath the asphalt south of Island 10 and east of Feature 72, contained the fragmented remains of three individuals. Artifacts were recovered in five distinct episodes but not all collection units note a provenience. For the sake of clarity they will be referred to here as Episodes A thru E.

Episode A recovered one hundred thirteen (113) artifacts. Among the artifacts were various building materials, shell, pipe stems and pottery shards. Of the six pipe stems recovered two dated 1750-1800 and four dated 1720-1750. The thirty-seven (37) pottery shards included green edgeware, white salt-glazed stoneware (1720-1805) and blue transfer-printed pearlware (1800-1840). A terminus post quem date range was provided by a copper Indian Head penny. While the date could not be seen on the coin, Indian Head pennies were minted from 1859-1909.

Episode B consisted of two-hundred eleven (211) artifacts. Of those sixty-two (62), or 29%, were shell, both clam and oyster. Building materials in the form of brick, nails and iron consisted of 28%. Pottery shards included green edgeware, blue transfer-printed

---

16 PES’ notes use the word ‘sorted’ as opposed to sifted. It is not clear if the author of the notes intended the words to have the same meaning.
pearlware and locally made stonewares. There was no clear evidence of disturbance in this episode.

Episode C was noted as “level 1” despite the fact that episodes A and B were collected earlier. It is presumable that Episode C (i.e. level 1) represents a different stratum. This episode recovered forty-eight (48) artifacts including building materials, liquor bottle shards, pipe stems dating 1720-1800 and pottery shards. Among the pottery shards were creamware (1762-1820) and salt-glazed stoneware.

Episode D is identified as “level 2” and contained four hundred fifty three (453) artifacts. Of the artifacts collected 28% were building materials including forty-six square cut iron nails and sixty-four pieces of window glass. Food related items constituted 38% of the collection, the majority of which were pottery shards (151 pieces). Among the pottery was green edgeware (1775-1840), scratch blue stoneware (1744-1775), mocha decorated pearlware, Staffordshire, white salt-glazed stoneware (1720-1805) and brown transfer-printed whiteware (1815-1915).

Episode E is identified as “level 3” and contained seven artifacts. The only datable artifact was a single shard of blue transfer-printed pearlware (1800-1840).

The artifact analysis provides an early to mid nineteenth century date. Feature 73 appears to be a primary artifact scatter that occurred during nineteenth century construction on site. The disturbed human remains were likely deposited from other areas. However, PES’ field notes do not clarify if the human remains were recovered in a single context or throughout the six distinct artifact collection episodes. It is also not specified if these were recovered according to differing stratigraphic layers or arbitrarily assigned levels. Without that information a more definitive conclusion is impossible.

**Feature 76**

This feature is a possible builder's trench, on the north side of Feature 63 (a stone wall discussed in Chapter VI) in DL3-3 south, levels 1-2. A fragmented distal left femur and
one hand phalanx were recovered. The skeletal elements were that of an adult of unknown sex.

Artifacts from this feature were collected from five arbitrarily assigned levels. Unfortunately there was no stratigraphic information available to determine the relationship among these levels. Each level is discussed in turn.

Level 1 recovered thirty-seven (37) artifacts including a button blank, seven pottery shards including creamware and white salt glazed stoneware, 8 nails, a medicine bottle shard, shell and brick fragments.

Level 2 contained thirty-three (33) artifacts including architectural materials such as brick and mortar fragments, one slate tile fragment and six nails. Other artifacts included a nineteenth century pipe stem, a button blank, the stem from a wine glass and pottery shards including pearlware and whiteware.

Level 3 contained twenty-six (26) artifacts including brick and mortar fragments, nails and window glass. Other items included a button blank, a pipe stem dated 1750-1800 and pearlware shards.

Level 4 recovered forty-five (45) artifacts including architectural materials such as brick and mortar fragments, ceramic tile, nails and window glass. Also among the artifacts are clam and oyster shell, bottle glass, a button blank and pottery shards. Pottery types include stoneware, porcelain, pearlware and whiteware.

Level 5 contained forty-four (44) artifacts including six square-cut iron nails and a button blank. Pottery types recovered included whiteware, pearlware, white salt-glazed stoneware.

The skeletal elements recovered in this feature were clearly out of context and represent earlier disturbance to burials on site and the redeposition of single skeletal elements.
Based upon field notes and the artifact analysis, this feature likely represents the remnants of a nineteenth century builder’s trench.

**Feature 77**
PES’ field notes state that the human remains in this feature were uncovered at thirty-two to thirty-five inches (32”-35”) below datum in the north wall of Island 9 Trench C. Datum is cited as being “asphalt” which may, or may not, be the then current ground surface. It was noted that some of the human remains appeared to be in the correct anatomical positions but the majority were disturbed. At least three individuals were represented including an infant.

The field notes state that wood was present along the eastern edge of the unit suggesting a coffin. Only a small number of artifacts were collected, twenty (20) in total. Most were building materials such as nails (14) and window glass (5). The only non-building material artifact was a shard of pearlware (1775-1840).

While the human remains in this feature were clearly disturbed there is no clear evidence of the re-deposition of these remains. It is possible they were disturbed in their primary context in this location.

**Feature 78**
This feature, located in DL-4, Catch Basin 5, contained fragmentary human remains and few artifacts intermixed. Among the artifacts was a pipe bowl stamped “TD” identifying it as a Thomas Dorney pipe that dates to the nineteenth century. There are minimal field notes for this feature but it appears that all materials are re-deposited.

**Feature 85**
This feature contained a single human skeletal element, an adult right rib. Feature was located in a pit or post-hole that was within Feature 86. Features 85 and 86 are identified
as trash deposit features. The skeletal element is clearly out of context and a discussion of the artifacts from these features can be found in Chapter V.

**Feature 86**
This feature surrounded Feature 85 (see above). Five skeletal elements of an elderly adult were recovered.

**Feature 98**
This feature was comprised of stone rubble, possibly a wall in PB2-1. Two skeletal elements were recovered. The artifacts associated with this feature are also listed as being part of Feature 87/88. A discussion of these artifacts can be found in Section V.

**Feature 100**
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Located in PB2-1 south of Feature 97, Feature 100 contained a single course of two large mortared limestone flagstones. The feature largely consisted of rubble and building materials believed to be the remnants of a stone wall. Several human skeletal elements,
including adult hand and foot bones, were recovered within this matrix. Further
description of this feature and the associated artifact remains can be found in Section VI.

**Feature 103**
Both human and non-human bones were recovered from Feature 103. This feature was
identified during backhoe monitoring and located at the southeast corner of Tweed Courthouse approximately eighteen inches (18”) below the newly laid curb (London 2004). Field notes are minimal for this feature. Among the artifacts recovered were
pottery shards, pipe stems and a sample of a copper alloy (in association with the bones).

**Feature 105**
This feature was located during backhoe monitoring. According to PES’ notes manual
evacuation did not occur due to construction constraints but the back dirt was screened.

The artifacts from feature 105 were collected in five distinct contexts though not all have
a clearly defined provenience. For the sake of clarity they are presented as Episodes A thru E.

Episode A, identified as stratum A, level 1 contained fifty-one (51) artifacts. Among them were fourteen (14) pieces of late-nineteenth century brick, pottery shards including polychrome banded pearlware (1775-1840) and black glazed redware, two pipe stems and two twentieth century ceramic tiles.

Episode B identified as stratum A, level 2 contained twenty-one (21) artifacts. These were building materials, though no nails, pottery and shell. A shard of twentieth century ceramic tile was present.

Episode C contained twelve (12) artifacts including six square iron nails, a piece of cloth and a brown glazed ceramic tile. No provenience was provided for this collection episode.
Episode D is identified as stratum A, level 1-2 contained thirty-eight (38) artifacts. As with the previous levels of stratum A this too contained a shard of twentieth century ceramic tile.

Episode E is identified as stratum A, level 3 and contained eleven (11) artifacts including two shards of English slipware, window glass, plaster and brick.

Based on the artifact analysis this feature is disturbed containing twentieth century materials. Among the human remains was a primary burial that was re-interred after analysis.

**Feature 106**
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This feature was identified during monitoring of backhoe excavation. Artifacts were collected as a single episode recovering one hundred fifty-one (151) artifacts. While some nineteenth century materials were found there are several twentieth century items that highlight the disturbed context. Among the twentieth century materials were six (6) unidentified plastic items and twentieth century ceramic tile. Based upon the salmon
pink color of the tile it dates from mid-century. Human remains within this feature consisted of a cranium recovered between twenty to thirty-one inches (20”-31”) below datum, however the datum point was not cited in the notes.

The following burial features were located in the “Triangle Area” in the east-central edge of the northern part of the park (see Fig. 5-176). Their location, unlike other features which are described in terms of the site topography (“islands” or “drain lines”, for example), is denoted by coordinate position in a grid of 5 foot square units unique to this part of the site.

**Feature 107**
This feature is located in unit N550 E505, level 1 (pipe trench). Only one damaged adult foot bone is present. Sex is unknown. There were no field notes for this feature.

Among the eleven artifacts recovered from this feature none were dateable. Artifacts included bottle and widow glass and stoneware and porcelain ceramic shards.

**Feature 108**
This feature contained a single skeletal element. It was located in the south wall of unit N550 E505, level 1. There were no field notes for this feature.
Thirty-nine (39) artifacts were recovered from Feature 108, mainly liquor bottle and pottery shards. Among the pottery types were white salt-glazed stoneware (1720-1805), creamware (1762-1820) and transfer-printed pearlware (1800-1840). Other artifacts include pipe stems dating the nineteenth century, a coffin nail and unidentified iron fragments.

Clearly the single skeletal element recovered from this feature is out of context. It is likely that the element came from another disturbed burial elsewhere on the site and the artifacts represent an early nineteenth century artifact scatter.

**Feature 109**

This feature, located in a pipe trench in the south wall of unit N550 E505 and continues into N550 E500, contained the remains of several individuals. The feature was recorded in conjunction with Feature 117 but the notes are incomplete. It appears that the infant bones uncovered in this area were re-designated as Feature 117. However, according to the London report, the human remains were removed in a large block of soil so as not to impede construction (London 2004).
A total of thirty-one (31) artifacts were recovered including mails, brick and iron fragments and four shards of bottle glass. Among the ten ceramic shards were stoneware and tin-enamed earthenware. Two pipe stems dating to the nineteenth century were recovered.
Feature 109 appears to be a primary interment that was disturbed during later excavation activities. The temporal relationship between Features 109 and 117 is undetermined.

**Feature 110**
Remains from this feature, located in the northeast corner of unit N550 E505, were assigned to Feature 117. There were no field notes for this feature.

Seven artifacts were recovered from two contexts within Feature 110. These included two stoneware shards, a nail and window glass. There was not enough data to determine any significant distinction between the two contexts.

**Feature 111**
This feature, located in unit N540 E505 contained the remains of an adult male aged 35+ years at the time of death. It abuts Feature 73 and contains a mixed context assemblage including burnt animal bone. The human remains from this feature are clearly out of context.

**Feature 112**
This feature contained a secondary context burial that was found above Feature 118 in unit N545 E495. The disarticulated remains represent two individuals; a 50+ year old male and an adult female. Green staining on the ribs suggests at least one of the individuals was shrouded when buried. There were no field notes for this feature. The only artifacts recovered were two nails and nine pieces of unidentified iron.

**Feature 113**

This feature was a concentration of fragmentary human remains located in the northwest corner of N530 E495. It was found to connect with Feature 72. Both features were combined and renamed as a single unit, Feature 126. (See Feature 72 for further discussion.)

![Image of Feature 113](image.jpg)

*Fig. 5-143*

Only one artifact bag (#1783) was listed for this feature. However, it was not located among the artifacts transferred to Brooklyn College.

**Feature 114**
This feature was located in the northeast corner of N535 E495. It contained the remains of two individuals, an adult male age 50+ at the time of death and an elderly male. The left femur of one of the individuals exhibited probe holes. This is indicative of excavation disturbance and a secondary context (London 2004). Among the few artifacts were nails, shell, bottle glass and pottery shards. Among the ceramics were creamware (1762-1820), stoneware and blue-transfer-printed pearlware (1775-1840).

This feature was found to lie atop Feature 142 and is a mixed context deposit.

**Feature 115**

The human remains recovered from this feature were those of a child aged 1.5 to 2 years in a secondary context (London 2004). According to PES’ field notes the remains were found in a primary context in N540 E490 on an east-west orientation with the head positioned west. There was not enough detail among the field notes to determine whether the burial was of a primary or secondary context. Evidence suggests a coffin that was possibly tapered at the feet and coffin handles were found west of the feature. The skeleton was exposed at sixteen inches (16”) below datum, which was cited as “curb”.
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Artifacts from this feature were collected in two apparently arbitrarily designated levels. Level 1 contained eighteen (18) artifacts including pottery types such as green edgeware and Nottingham stoneware, brick and one lead musket ball. A small bag containing small particles was labeled “shroud pin fragment” by PES, another bag is labeled “possible human hair” but has not been definitively identified as such. The feature’s second excavation level contained sixteen artifacts, mostly unidentified iron. Pottery shards in this level include Staffordshire slipware.

**Feature 116**

This feature was located in the southeast corner of unit N540 E490. According to London, the secondary context remains were embedded in a dark clayey soil (London 2004). No analysis was conducted on this individual and the burial was left *in situ*. No artifacts were recovered from this feature.

**Feature 117**

Feature 117, located within a previously excavated pipe trench, contained a partial and disarticulated infant skeleton aged newborn to six months at the time of death. Green staining indicative of a shroud pin was present on one of the skeletal elements. The cranium of the infant was damaged during an earlier excavation episode. According to field notes, the infant burial was located within Feature 109.

“The feature, located in unit N550/E500, was removed in a block and excavated by the physical anthropologist in a lab setting. It was originally assigned to Feature 109, because it was within a pipe trench in that feature, and then to Feature 110, but was finally determined to be a separate feature.” (London 2004).

Artifacts from Feature 117 were collected as two separate contexts. The first contains twenty-four artifacts including six pieces of mica schist, brick, plaster, bottle glass shards and pottery. There were no dateable items among the artifacts. The second context
collected ten (10) square cut iron nails. The provenience for this context is noted as “level 1”.

The partial and disarticulated condition of the burial indicates that it was disturbed by the excavation of the pipe trench at some time prior to the current excavations. The old damage to the cranium is a further indication of this disturbance. It cannot be determined whether the remains were in primary context before the disturbance.

**Feature 118**

The burial designated Feature 118 was located in the south wall of unit N545 E495. It was identified within a box outline in the soil\(^\text{17}\) above Features 146 and 150. This was a primary burial in which the head of the deceased was oriented to the northwest. The skeleton is supine, with the head dropped to the right (approximately south). A coffin nail or other hardware was observed at the left shoulder. Wood found lying atop the left side of the skeleton is possibly indicative of a lid collapse. There were also indications of disturbance at the lower end of the skeleton which was truncated by a later trench.

\(^{17}\) Some of the field notes indicate a more precise location at N537.6/E488.8 (London, 2004).
Analysis determined the individual to have been an adult male aged 20 to 35 years at the time of death. The analysis also noted unusual wear on the lower second incisor and canine, suggesting habitual use of the teeth as a tool or with a pipe.

Field notes indicate the observation of another smaller skeleton below this individual. A tooth of an older individual was recovered during screening.

Artifacts from feature 118 were very fragmentary and largely unidentifiable. They were collected in four episodes or contexts referred to here as Episodes A thru D, sequenced according to bag number, lowest to highest and by excavation date. According to field notes the artifacts were collected solely from disturbed contexts.

Episode A is identified as “level 2” and contained eight artifacts. Only one item was dateable, a shard of blue painted pearlware.
Episode B is identified as “level 1” and is presumably a different stratum than Episode A. This unit contained forty-five (45) artifacts. Dateable pottery included creamware (1762-1820) and a shard of red transfer-printed pearlware (1775-1840). Other artifacts included nails, a wood sample, shell and a small bag with soil laden fragments identified by PES as “possible pin head”

Episode C is identified as Feature 118/150. There is no further information for this unit. There was only one artifact, a square cut iron nail.

Episode D is identified as Level 1 and is presumed to be the third stratum. However, no defining stratigraphic information was available. The unit contained four artifacts, three pieces of wood and one square cut iron nail.

The location and context of Feature 118 demonstrated the high density of burials in this area. The density of burials clouded the relationship between burials in the area. The head of this burial lay only four inches from the coffin line of Feature 127. According to PES’ notes the soil and artifacts from the area of Feature 118 are also associated with Feature 150 with no further explanation. The relationship between Features 118 and 150 is described as “ambiguous and arbitrary”. Notes also state that the depositional nature of Feature 150 is unclear.

**Feature 119**

This feature is the secondary context burial of an elderly male. No location is given for this feature other than an association with Feature 115. The skeletal elements were located outside of the “box” located with Feature 115. A single skeletal element of another immature individual was also located in this feature. Only four artifacts were recovered, an oyster shell, one nail, an iron fragment and one shard of bottle glass.

**Feature 121**
Field notes for this feature are sparse. Located on the east side of unit N530 E495 and continuing into N525 E495, Feature 121 contained scattered human remains representing three individuals. The dimensions of the feature were fourteen by twelve inches (14” x 12”). The individuals are an adult male aged 45+ years at the time of death; a child aged approximately 2 years; and a fetus (London 2004).

The artifacts were collected from five different contexts referred to as Episodes A thru E for the sake of clarity.

Episode A was identified as Level 1. It contained thirteen (13) artifacts including three square cut iron nails, a brick fragment and bottle shard. Of the pottery recovered the only dateable type was five shards of black glazed redware (1700-1830). Episode B, identified as Level 2 contains eight (8) artifacts, none of which were dateable.

Episode C had no associated provenience listed. This unit contained two types of dateable pottery including pearlware (1775-1840) and scratch blue stoneware (1744-1783). Six copper buttons, associated with wood and human bone, were also recovered.

Episode B is identified as “level 2” and contained eight artifacts including a shard of American slipware and black glazed redware.

Episode C, containing thirteen (13) artifacts, is identified as “level 1”, presumably a new stratum. Among the artifacts are black glazed redware, and a square cut iron coffin nail.
Based upon the minimal information available it seems that this feature is a secondary or tertiary deposit. It is unclear whether the artifact collection represents all artifacts excavated or a sample.

**Feature 122**
Feature 122 was a primary context partial burial located in the northern half of unit N545 E495. The individual, an adult male, was identified within a box stain with associated nails. The deceased was interred in an east-west orientation with the head situated to the west. The skeleton was supine with the hands likely placed across the abdomen at burial. Earlier construction episodes truncated the burial below the femurs and above the clavicle.

The only artifacts associated with this feature were seven square cut iron coffin nails.

**Feature 124**

“This feature contained the secondary remains of an individual found within the wood line box of Feature 109 in the south center of unit N550/E500. The individual is preadolescent” (London, this volume). According to PES’ field notes this feature contained a “partial infant burial within Feature 109”. However, other notes indicate that the infant burial was redesignated Feature 117, not Feature 124. See Image XX.
Notes for feature 124 are minimal. The only other information contained in the notes, other than the above quote, is that there was a box line surrounding the burial.

The one associated artifact bag was not found among those transferred to Brooklyn College.

**Feature 125**
Feature 125 was located outside of Feature 109 in the southwest corner of unit N550 E500. This was a secondary context burial that contained the remains of at least two adult individuals. Field notes describe the feature as a mass of jumbled foot bones (PES 199).
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*Fig. 5-148*
The feature had thirty (30) associated artifacts, twenty (20) of which were square cut iron nails. Other artifacts included two shards of slipware and five shards of creamware (1762-1820).

**Feature 126**
This feature was the new designation for the combined Features 72 and 113. The combination was based on the appearance of an arm bone and vertebral column that straddled the two features. Skeletal remains were located near the surface in compact,
concrete-like soil. At least six individuals were identified in the Feature. According to London, “some of the remains were possibly intact burials, but were not recognized as such due to the condition of the bones” (London 2004).

Fig. 5-149

Though the boundaries of Feature 72, 113 and 126 are clearly defined in the field drawings (see Fig. 5-142) all artifacts were collected under the Feature 126 label. Thus it is impossible to determine which artifacts originated within Feature 72 or 113. Artifacts for Feature 126 were collected in three separate episodes, only one of which has a clearly identified provenience. Episode A, identified as “level 1” contained sixteen (16) artifacts including ten (10) square cut iron nails. The only dateable artifact was a pipe stem dating 1750-1800.

Episodes B and C did not have any identified provenience other than feature 126. Episode B recovered eight (8) artifacts including one shard of creamware (1762-1820) and a pipe stem dating 1750-1800. Episode C consisted of twenty square cut iron nails.
The nails were divided into two bags, with nine nails in one bag and eleven nails in the other. Both bags were labeled “nails from burial”, likely two distinct burials.

Based upon PES field notes and the London report there were at least six individuals located in this feature. London believed that some were primary articulated partial human skeletons but they were not recognized as such in the field due to poor preservation. None of the three artifact collection episodes is noted as being associated with any articulated remains.

Feature 126 was one of a series of three stacked burials uncovered in this location. Feature 126 was closest to the surface, the other two burials were designated at Feature 136 and Feature 141. Due to disturbance in the area it was difficult to clearly identify the boundaries and sequence of the three burials. All three burials were in a north-south orientation and in extreme close proximity to one another, within one to three feet (1’ – 3’). One, if not all were interred within a coffin as represented by wood lines and stains observed in the soil.
Feature 127

Fig. 5-150
Feature 127 contained the primary context burial of a 35 to 50 year old female. The skeleton was found within the wood lines of a box in the southwest corner of unit N545 E495. This feature lies in an area that contained a high density of burials. Six other primary burials were uncovered within a five foot range of Feature 127.
Excavation determined that the coffin had a hexagonal shape. There was some earlier disturbance to the burial which was left *in situ*.

A total of forty-one (41) artifacts were recovered from Feature 127. Among them were nails, brick fragments, wood fragments and shell. The only dateable artifacts were one pipe stem dating to the nineteenth century and one creamware shard (1762-1820).

**Feature 128**

Feature 128 contains a primary context burial that was located at the bottom of an electrical trench. The individual, a 35+ year old female, was interred in a north-south orientation and a distinct soil change immediately surrounding the bones may have been indicative of flesh decomposition (London 2002).

There were twenty-one (21) artifacts recovered from this feature, three were square cut iron nails and five were iron coffin nails, also square cut. Other artifacts included two clam shells, on share of bottle glass and three pottery shards. None of the pottery types were dateable.

Throughout this feature there was no evidence of a burial shaft or coffin. The lower portion of the skeleton was not exposed as it lay beneath the asphalt. The burial was left *in situ*.

**Feature 129**

This feature contains the fragmentary remains of two individuals. There were no field notes other than one plan view for this feature.
Artifacts were collected in a single episode and are identified as being from “level 1”. A total of fifty-six (56) artifacts were collected. Among the artifacts are five coffin nails, a small piece of flint, one clay marble, window glass shards liquor bottle shard and one pipe stem dated 1700-1750. Half of the assemblage, twenty-seven (27) artifacts, is pottery shards. Among the types present are American salt-glazed stoneware, creamware, blue hand-painted pearlware, Chinese import porcelain and white salt-glazed stoneware.

Without accompanying field notes a determination of the integrity of this feature and the associated remains would be pure speculation.

**Feature 130**

This feature, located in unit N530 E495 consisted of a box outline with associated cranial fragments and contained the primary interment of a child aged 2.5 to 3.5 years. The box outline measured three feet by one foot (3’x1’) in an east west orientation. The skeleton
was near complete with the head oriented to the west. A green staining on several of the bones is likely indicative of decomposed shroud pins. Few artifacts were recovered from this feature but those there were include ten (10) square cut iron nails that were found beneath the child’s skull along the edge of the box outline. Analysis suggests that the child was shrouded and placed in a coffin for burial. No dateable artifacts were recovered and the burial was left *in situ*.

**Feature 131**

Located in WF-1, Feature 131 consists of a box outline and a human skull. An earring was found at the center of the unit, at thirty-four inches (34”) below surface. This feature was re-designated as part of Feature 133. Feature 131 was reassigned to the midden deposit adjacent to and above the burial/box outline. It is unclear whether this deposit was fill for the burial or deposited at a later time. See Feature 133 for further discussion.
A total of four hundred forty-eight artifacts (448) were recovered from Feature 131. Of this one hundred forty-five (145), approximately one-third, were ceramic shards. Among the pottery types were white salt-glazed stoneware, scratch blue stoneware, locally made stonewares, Nottingham stoneware, Staffordshire slipware, creamware, painted pearlware and transfer-printed flow blue pearlware (1780-1830). Twenty pieces of pipe stem were recovered. Among the pipe stems was one dating from 1700-1750 and six dating 1750-1800. Also among the collection is a single piece of kiln furniture, window glass, fifty-two shards of bottle glass and architectural items such as brick and metal fragments, as well as slate tile.
The artifacts collection also clearly evidences modern disturbance including pieces of cellophane, a plastic pudding container with a foil cover and a cigarette filter. Considering this, it is clear that the skeletal remains associated with this feature are clearly disturbed. However, there is not enough data to determine if they were disturbed in their original context of a redeposit.

Feature 132
This feature contained the secondary deposit of two skulls and several post-cranial elements from a 30+ year old female and another unidentified individual. The feature was located southeast of Tweed Courthouse, immediately adjacent to Island 9 Trench C (Feature 67). There were no field notes for this feature.

Feature 133
This feature, located in the WF-1 (water fountain 1) area, contained two burials, one atop another. Both were primary interments with articulated skeletal remains. It was found beneath Feature 131, a midden feature. (See notes about re-assignment of feature numbers above.) The first burial was that of a male aged 22 to 25 years at the time of death. The second burial was that of a female.

A gold earring was among the eight artifacts recovered. The excavator believed the earring to be directly associated with the female skeleton but the osteologist stated that it was a poor association. Without detailed information regarding the location of the earring in relation to the skeleton it is impossible to definitely associate it with the burial.
Copper stains at the right wrist of the upper burial are believed to be remnant of a cufflink or sleeve garter. There was similar evidence along the left side of the skeleton.

Feature 133
WF-1

Fig. 5-158

The remaining seven artifacts were all square cut iron nails. No dateable artifacts were recovered.

Feature 134
The feature was located near Feature 67. The lower skeletal elements were located within a box outline. It was the field determination that this was a primary context burial and it was left in situ.
Only two artifacts were recovered from this context, a creamware shard and one shard of drinking glass.

**Feature 135**

This feature was located in unit N525 E495, four feet (4’) from Feature 130, and exhibited a box outline that contained the remains of a six to seven year old child of undetermined gender. The skull was found crushed in the center of the box in a loose ashy soil. Evidence of shroud pins was observed on the skull and the humerus.
Artifacts associated with this feature were collected in two episodes but the relation of the collection episodes to the skeletal remains is not defined in PES’ field notes. Notes also mention that a mammal claw (possibly a bear) was found beneath the skull (PES 1999). However this was not among the artifacts recovered.

The artifacts in the first collection episode consisted of only three oyster shells and one buckeye seed. The second collection episode recovered sixty-four (64) artifacts including eighteen (18) square cut iron nails believed to be coffin nails. Their placement within the trench is not noted. Other artifacts included five pipes stems that date from 1720-1750 and 1750-1800 and a stoneware wedge associated with pottery manufacture. Among the pottery types are Whieldon creamware (1740-1770) and pearlware (1775-1840). It is noted that the pipe stems were found interspersed among the skeleton.

There is no evidence that this is anything other than a primary interment. A date for the interment could possibly be determined if the relationship between the second collection
episode and the skeletal remains were noted. Without that information we can only assume a late eighteenth- to early nineteenth century date. The lower half of the burial was unexcavated as Feature 140 ran above it. The burial was left *in situ*.

**Feature 136**

This feature was located in stratum B of unit N530 E490 and is contiguous with feature 126. It was determined to contain four individuals including a primary interment and three other disturbed or redeposited burials. Lines of a hexagonal shaped coffin were visible in some areas of the feature.

![Feature 136](image)

*Fig. 5-161*

The primary interment was that of a female aged 45 to 50 years at the time of death. Green staining on one of the bones suggests a copper shroud pin. The remaining individuals were comprised of incomplete skeletal elements. The individuals are identified as an adult of unknown age or sex; a child aged 1 to 2 years; and a late adolescent.
A total of twenty-seven (27) artifacts were recovered and include one pipe stem dated 1720 – 1750, liquor bottle shards and pottery shards. Among the pottery types are purple painted tin-enamel ware, pearlware and black slipped redware. Separately bagged and inventoried are thirty-two (32) square cut iron nails “from burial” and eleven (11) square cut iron nails “from coffin”.

While Feature 36 does contain a primary interment the deposition context of the three other individuals is unclear. The other features in closest proximity to Feature 136 are; Feature 126 at two inches (2”) to the east; Feature 141 at one inch (1”) to the west and touching Feature 139 at the southwest. Feature 139 is a secondary deposit located between the skull and scapula of Feature 136. There is nothing within the field notes to suggest that the disturbed skeletal remains were re-deposited along with the artifacts after the primary interment or if those individuals were already present at the time of the primary interment.
Feature 136 is the middle burial in a series of three stacked burials that includes Features 126, 136 and 141. Disturbance along the east side coffin line of Feature 136 suggests that it may be older that Feature 126 which is the burial at the highest elevation (i.e. closest to surface). Feature 141 is at the lowest elevation. No shaft lines were found in direct relation to Feature 136.

The location of the secondarily deposited remains (Feature 139) in this feature, against the skull and scapula, suggest that Feature 139 lies beneath Feature 136. The lower half of Feature 136 contains another secondary deposit of human remains. These consist of lower post-cranial skeletal elements while Feature 139 contained cranial elements. However, it was the determination of the forensic scientist on site that Feature 139 was not related to these other disturbed remains.

**Feature 137**

Feature 137 was discovered in the northwest quarter of excavation unit WF-2. It contained the remains of at least one adult male (represented by a skull and postcranial remains) and at least 24 sub-adults. According to London, “the remains were not recovered as discrete individuals; the bones were commingled within the pit, requiring sorting in the laboratory. The remains were reconstructed into individuals as accurately as possible, using information on dental and skeletal development” (London, 2004).
According to PES’ field notes Feature 137 was combined with Feature 138.

**Feature 138**

Feature 138 was determined to be part of Feature 137 when excavated, as there was no discontinuity between the two. However "Feature 137" is used as the designation for all remains found in both features.
No artifacts were recovered as part of this feature.

**Feature 139**

Feature 139 was a primary burial located beneath Feature 136 in unit N530 E490. The burial is that of an adult female approximately 30 years of age. According to London some of the skeletal elements indicate illness or nutritional stress (London 2004).

London’s final assessment differs from the on-site assessment, as discussed above with Feature 136. This analysis concurs with London’s final assessment.

**Feature 140**

Feature 140 was the primary burial of an adult male located in unit N520 E495. The skeletal remains were disturbed and a partial vertebra from an infant was also present. Cranial elements (skull and clavicle) were disturbed by late nineteenth to early twentieth century grading. The feature appeared as a mixed mass with gravel and asphalt. Artifacts from the feature were collected in six separate episodes. Due to lack of provenience of some of the episodes they are referred to as Episodes A thru F for clarity.
Episode A, identified as “level 1” contained fifty-five (55) artifacts. Among the artifacts were square cut iron nails, shell, an iron spike brick mortar and bottle glass. Dateable artifacts include two pipe stems dated to 1750-1800 and sixteen pottery shards including Staffordshire slipware (1670-1795) and pearlware (1775-1840).

Episode B, which had no identified provenience other than feature 140, is a similar assemblage of sixty-five artifacts. It includes brick, nineteen square cut iron nails, shell, window and bottle glass and one copper button. Dateable items include five pipe stems that date from 1750 to 1800 and two that date from 1720 to 1750, and pottery types such as pearlware and white salt glazed stoneware (1720-1805)

Episode C was the unit directly associated with the skeleton. It was a smaller assemblage containing fifteen (15) square cut iron nails and one square piece of quartz that measures the approximate size of a bead but contains no visible hole for threading.
Episode D is identified as being “level 2” and included nineteen artifacts. Dateable artifacts included one pipe stem dated 1720 – 1750 and pottery shards including pearlware and green edgeware (1775-1840).

Episode E also has no provenience and contained six artifacts including one dateable shard, a pearlware.

Episode F contained only one artifact, a coffin nail embedded in wood. There was no provenience for this episode.

While there has clearly been disturbance to the burial uncovered in this feature there is no evidence to suggest that it is anything other than a primary deposit.

**Feature 141**

This feature, located in unit N535 E490 and west of Feature 136 contained three individuals. The first individual is a primary interment of a male older than 35 years at the time of death. This burial was left *in situ*. The other two individuals are represented by disarticulated and incomplete remains. One is a female aged 40 to 45 years at the time of death and the other an infant aged 3 to 9 months. The field notes do not clarify if the disarticulated remains were disturbed by the primary interment or they were re-deposited after that time.
Upon excavation the relation between Feature 141 and Feature 126 and 136 became clearer. The burials appear to be stepped with Feature 141 being the lowest, therefore the oldest, and Feature 126 being the highest and most recent. Each burial was placed slightly more north than the previous burial. It was also clear that there had not been any major disturbance to any of the burials by the others though the artifacts from the three features are not clearly sequenced.
Artifacts were collected in five separate contexts, all with an identified provenience. However, for the sake of discussion they are referred to as Episodes A thru E.

Episode A was collected from stratum 1 and consisted of eight artifacts. Dateable artifacts were a pipe stem dated 1750 – 1800 and two shards of pearlware (1775-1840). Episode B was collected from stratum 2 and consisted of six artifacts, none dateable. Episode C was collected from stratum 3 and only contained three square cut iron nails. Episode D contained the largest number of artifacts, twenty-four, and was collected from stratum 4. Among the artifacts were five square cut iron nails, a pipe stem dated 1750 – 1800, liquor bottle shards, a copper button and eleven pottery shards. Dateable types among the pottery are blue painted pearlware and white salt glazed stoneware (1720-1805).

Episode E is identified as being the burial level. Artifacts from this level consist of four square cut iron nails noted as “nails from burial”.

Fig. 5-167

Artifacts were collected in five separate contexts, all with an identified provenience. However, for the sake of discussion they are referred to as Episodes A thru E.

Episode A was collected from stratum 1 and consisted of eight artifacts. Dateable artifacts were a pipe stem dated 1750 – 1800 and two shards of pearlware (1775-1840). Episode B was collected from stratum 2 and consisted of six artifacts, none dateable. Episode C was collected from stratum 3 and only contained three square cut iron nails. Episode D contained the largest number of artifacts, twenty-four, and was collected from stratum 4. Among the artifacts were five square cut iron nails, a pipe stem dated 1750 – 1800, liquor bottle shards, a copper button and eleven pottery shards. Dateable types among the pottery are blue painted pearlware and white salt glazed stoneware (1720-1805).

Episode E is identified as being the burial level. Artifacts from this level consist of four square cut iron nails noted as “nails from burial”.
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Based upon the analysis it appears that the incomplete skeletal fragments representing two individuals as well as the artifact remains were intrusive upon the primary interment. The artifacts located in the above strata date to the early to mid nineteenth century. This implies a pre- or turn of the nineteenth century date for the primary interment.

**Feature 142**

This feature was initially recorded as part of Feature 114 but excavation revealed two distinct soil/artifact matrices. Feature 142 was located in the southeast corner of unit N540 E495 and east of Feature 114. This was a fill deposit with a significant amount of building debris. Disarticulated human remains were mixed within the debris. Among these were the partial remains of an adult male aged 40+ years at the time of death.

According to PES’ field notes though Features 114 and 142 were excavated and recorded as separate units all artifacts were bagged with Feature 114. The only explanation for this is the following; “F-114 was found superimposed upon an 1-1 ½” of soil from F-142 – F-142 being the matrix underlying F-114. Due to the dense presence of bone within the matrix of 114, in addition to the presence of bone along the interface between114 and 142, it was decided to bag all of the material with F-114 – the interpretation being that F-114 was shoveled onto F-142 and the heavier material, i.e. the bottle glass, settled along the interface of these two strata – thus, lying on the matrix of F-142, but belongs with the deposition of F-114”.

As a result it is impossible to distinguish which artifacts are associated with either Feature 114 or Feature 142. However, it is apparent that these two features represent a disturbed context as based upon the significant amount of late nineteenth and early twentieth century building debris uncovered within the feature.

**Feature 143**

Feature 143 was located in unit N520 E495. Skeletal remains though disarticulated and incomplete suggest a male less than 35 years of age at the time of death. The artifacts
from this feature consist of nails, window glass, pottery shards and a copper coffin handle. Dateable items among the artifacts are a pipe stem dated 1720–1750 and shards of creamware (1762-1820).

**Fig. 5-168**

While this burial is clearly disturbed there is no evidence this it is not, or was not, a primary interment. The artifact analysis provides a late eighteenth to early nineteenth century date.

According to PES’ field notes Feature 143 was eight inches (8”) above Feature 144 and there was no discernible difference in the soil matrix. Both features were recorded as a single unit on the burial forms.

**Feature 144**

Located in unit N520 E495 Stratum C, Feature 144 contains a partial primary interment as well as a single element from an infant of less than 6 months. The primary interment, which was left *in situ*, is that of male 30 years of age, or older, at the time of death. The
deceased was interred with his head oriented west. Traces of coffin lines were evident and the skeleton was damaged.

Artifacts from this feature were collected in seven separate episodes but few contain provenience information. For the sake of clarity they are referred to as Episodes A thru G.
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**Fig. 5-169**

Episode A has no identified provenience and consists of eight square cut iron nails. Episode B also has no identified provenience and consists of nine artifacts; six square cut iron nails, one shard of scratch blue stoneware (1744-1783), one shard of pearlware (1775-1840) and one pipe stem dated 1750–1800.

Episode C is identified as “level 2” and is associated with the burial shaft. It contains nine artifacts, five square cut iron nails and one shard of pearlware. The remaining of the artifacts were unidentifiable. Episode D also has an identified provenience of “level 2”. This collection episode recovered six square cut iron nails labeled “coffin nails” by PES.
Episode E has no identified provenience and contained a range of artifacts including square cut iron nails, shell (including one snail shell), bottle and window glass, two single-hole bone buttons and one pipe stem dated 1750 – 1800. Among the ten pottery shards recovered were dateable types such as pearlware and blue painted tin-enamedled ware.

Episodes F and G had no provenience. F consisted one piece of unidentified iron and G consisted of eight square cut iron nails noted as “coffin nails” by PES.
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*Fig. 5-170*

The artifact analysis evidences some disturbance during the nineteenth century.

**Feature 145**

Feature 145 was located in unit N515 E480. It consisted of an adult skull and box outline with clear north-south boundaries and three square cut iron nails. The burial was impacted by an earlier pipe trench that ran east west through the burial.
According to PES’ field notes Feature 145 was combined with Feature 158. Only three artifacts were recovered from Feature 145, three coffin nails. The burial was left in situ.

**Feature 146**

This feature, located in unit N545 E500, contained the remains of at least four individuals in a single grave shaft. Nails and a wood line suggest overlapping primary interments. Feature 146 intrudes into Feature 118.

According to field notes all artifacts were recovered from the levels above the burial. This was done in two collection episodes, presumably from two different strata.

The first episode recovered nineteen (19) artifacts including nails, brick, lamp glass and two pottery shards. One shard is creamware dated 1762-1820. The second episode is larger containing one hundred sixty-five (165) artifacts. Some of the artifacts had notes with them. One nail and one shard of yellowware are noted as “removal of deteriorating
tibias Top/Highest Level”. An earthenware shard is noted as “found near cranium/vertebral column”. Two oysters and one unidentified wood fragment are noted “Found near cranium/vertebral column”.

The remaining artifacts from this context included two pipe stems, dated 1700-1800, clam and oyster shell, bottle glass brick, bottle glass and a piece of kiln furniture, a wedge, associated with pottery manufacture. A total of nine coffin nails were recovered and forty-three (43) shards of pottery. Among the pottery types recovered were Jackfield (1745-1790), white salt-glazed stoneware, Staffordshire slipware, flow blue transfer-printed pearlware, creamware (1762-1820) and North American salt-glazed stoneware.

The artifact analysis demonstrates a closed context late eighteenth to early nineteenth century deposit above the burials. According to the notes associated with the artifacts it would appear that the trash deposit in this area began soon after the last burial had occurred. The burials were left in situ.
**Feature 147**

This feature was located directly beneath a cobble path that ran through the unit, a test trench adjacent to ET-2/0-5 (electrician’s trench). Artifacts from this feature were minimal and included square cut iron nails and two pottery shards. Once shard, a blue painted pearlware dated (post 1815).
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*Fig. 5-173*

The skeletal remains were that of an adult of undetermined sex or age. The burial was disturbed, as demonstrated by the disarticulated skeletal elements but it remains unclear whether or not this was a primary interment or a secondary re-deposition.

**Feature 148**

Feature 148, located in unit N520 E490, was a concentration of human bones that were associated with Feature 140. The remains from Feature 148 represent a second individual (London 2004).
No artifacts were collected in association with Feature 148.

**Feature 150**

This feature was located in the baulk between units N540 E493 to N545 E495 and above Feature 118. The feature contained a concentration of disarticulated and disturbed human bone in poor condition.
Artifacts from this feature included unidentified wood, iron nails, brick fragments, pipe stems and pottery shards. The pipe stems dated 1750-1800. Of the seven pottery shards recovered dateable types included white salt-glazed stoneware, Staffordshire and red painted pearlware.

**Feature 151**

Feature 151 was initially a stone filled trench in unit N535 E490. However various sets of notes record Feature 151 in several units including N 525 E 475, N530 E485 and N515 E465. All three units note the presence of human remains. In N535 E490 Feature 151 is described as building stones that cut across the bottom of Feature 141. In N515 E465 it is described as a diagonal pipe trench that runs through several units.

According to London’s report the remains from Feature 151, unit N535 E490 are that of a male age 35 or older at the time of death. There is no mention of additional individuals or human remains from other units.

There were five distinct artifact collection episodes for Feature 151 but not all included provenience information. As such, the episodes are referred to as A thru E for the sake of clarity.

Episode A is identified as N520 E470 and contained forty-three (43) artifacts. Among these were seven square-cut iron nails and two square-cut iron spikes, window and bottle glass and five pipe stems dating to the nineteenth century. Among the fourteen (14) pottery shards recovered were blue transfer-printed pearlware (1800-1840) and whiteware (post 1815).

Episode B, identified as Stratum I, Level 1 with no coordinates contained one hundred sixteen (116) artifacts. Architectural materials in the collection include twenty three (23) square-cut iron nails, mortar and brick fragments and window glass shards. A total of forty-two (42) ceramic shards were recovered including North American salt-glazed stoneware, Chinese import porcelain, white salt-glazed stoneware and transfer-print and
clouded decorated pearlware (1800-1840). Other objects included two eighteenth century pipe stems, a button blank and a copper coin, date undetermined.

Episode C is identified as Stratum I, Level 2 and contained forty-six (46) artifacts. Architectural materials included thirteen (131) square-cut iron nails, brick and plaster fragments and window glass. Food related artifacts include bottle glass and pottery shards. Among the pottery types are Jackfield, salt-glazed stoneware, pearlware (1800-1840) and whiteware (post 1815). Two eighteenth century pipe stems were also recovered.

Episode D is identified only as Level 2. This episode recovered forty-two artifacts including square-cut iron nails, window and bottle glass and pottery shards. Among the pottery types were creamware (1762-1805), transfer-printed pearlware (1800-1840), whiteware (post 1815) and ironstone. Seven pipe stems, including an eighteenth century Peter Dorni stem, were recovered. However, the pottery shards provide a firm nineteenth century date for this collection episode.

Episode E is identified only as Stratum B and contained a single artifact, a blue painted pearlware shard.

The varying disconnected units that have been labeled as Feature 151 and the limited amount of associated field notes make it difficult to come to any conclusion with regard to this feature.

**Feature 155**

The human remains of Feature 155 were found in unit N550 E495. There were two identified individuals including the partial skeleton of an “immature individual aged late fetal to newborn” (London, 2004). A non-human rib was found along with these remains. A second individual is that of an adult male. This partial skeleton, truncated at the knees, was surrounded by box outlines with associated nails. This suggests a primary burial that was disturbed multiple times. Notes for this feature were minimal.
Artifacts associated with this feature were collected in two episodes. The first, level 1, recovered sixty-three (63) artifacts including shell, building components such as nail and window glass and food related items such as pottery and bottle glass. Among the pottery types recovered were creamware and pearlware.

The second artifact collection episode was associated with level 2 and consisted of eighteen (18) artifacts. More than half the artifacts were pottery shards, both creamware and stonewares.

There was no notation as to which level the human remains were discovered in, whether they were associated with one of the artifact collection episodes and in their own unique provenience.

**Feature 157**

This feature contained a deposit of human remains that stretch across several units. However, PES notes designate its location as unit N550 E495 where the majority of the
remains were located. A well defined wooden box and nail line were observed during excavation. The head of the burial was south, facing north. One of the units that this feature stretches into is N545 E500, however, there was no direct relation or interaction between this feature and Feature 146.

Only nine artifacts were recovered in association with this feature. The only dateable item was a shard of creamware (1762-1820).

**Feature 158**

Located in unit N520 E475 this feature was initially excavated as part of Feature 145. Feature 158 is a primary burial that was located beneath the disturbed secondary context burial excavated in Feature 145. The coffin appears to have been pushed up onto its side against the western wall. The skeleton was lying on its left side due to this disturbance.

![Feature 158 excavation site](image)

*Fig. 5-177*

Feature 158 was associated with a box outlined and nails. The interred is a child age 1.5 to 2.5 years at the time of death. Gender was not determined. Four shroud pins, in direct association with the burial, were visible. A third burial (Feature 159) was observed, but
not excavated, below this burial. The remains uncovered with Feature 158 were left *in situ*.

A total of forty-five (45) artifacts were recovered from this feature. Among them are twenty-four (24) coffin nails and a sample of coffin wood. Other artifacts include bottle glass and ceramic shards. Pottery types include stoneware and creamware (1762-1820).

**Feature 159**

Feature 159 contained an adult skull found below Features 158 and 145. It was the third burial in same location and identified while cleaning the floor of Feature 158. According to field notes there may have been a faint box line associated with it. The only artifacts recovered were five square cut iron nails. The skull had a shroud pin resting on it and was in good condition. It was left *in situ*.

In total unit N520 E475 contained three stacked burials. The two lower burials were in a clear primary context. This is another clear example of crowded conditions within the Almshouse burial ground. Stacking of burials was also seen at the ABG.

Only six artifacts, all square cut iron nails, were recovered.

**Feature 160**

This feature contained a concentration of fragmentary disarticulated human remains. It was located in PB2-4, near Tweed Courthouse at Chambers Street. According to analysis at least two individuals are represented in these remains. One individual was a male aged 35 to 40 years at the time of death. It was noted that several of the bone had cut marks consistent with that of a trowel or shovel from reburial (London, 2004). The second individual was an adolescent. There were no associated artifacts.
Feature 167 was a primary burial located in unit N525 E490. Excavation uncovered the outline of a small box that had eight square cut iron nails associated with it. Within the box outline were infant/child bones that were left *in situ*. The only artifacts collected were the nails and three wood fragments believed to be from the coffin.
Feature 168

Fig. 5-179

This feature was a primary burial of an adult located in unit N530 E485. Excavation revealed the outline of a box and associated nails. The artifacts collected did not include the nails but did include one liquor bottle shard, three window glass shards, one piece of wood and one shard of pearlware pottery. The burial itself was only represented by a skull and mandible. Though in its primary burial location, the burial itself has been disturbed. Based upon the associated artifact intrusion it would appear that disturbance occurred at some time during the nineteenth century.

Feature 169

The feature, located in the western section of N530 E500, contained a truncated burial that may have some relation to Feature 121 (London, 2004). Excavators identified a possible box outline with associated nails. Only twelve (12) artifacts were recovered from this feature including two square cut iron nails. The only dateable artifacts recovered were two shards of creamware (1762-1820).
Feature 172
PES’ field notes describe Feature 172 as a “classic burial base/shaft”. It was discovered during “floor cleaning” and left unexcavated. There were no human remains associated with this feature even though PES cites it as a burial feature. No information on this feature is presented in the London report.

A total of twenty-six (26) artifacts were recovered including four iron nails, one pipe stem dated 1720-1750, bottle glass and fifteen pottery shards. The majority of the pottery is American salt-glazed stoneware but also includes black glazed redware and English slipware. A shard of brown transfer-printed whiteware is dated to (1815-1915).

Feature 173
This feature contained a concentration of human bone that represented an adult male older than 40 years at the time of death (London, 2004). Previous excavation damage to the bones indicates that it was a secondary context burial.

Among the nine artifacts recovered were a pipe stem dated 1720-1750, slipware pottery shards and one brass button.

Feature 175
A minimal number of artifacts were recovered from this feature located in N520 E450. They are one nail, one oyster and two bottle shards. This feature is not included in the London report and there are minimal field notes available from PES. According to those notes this feature contained a box outline to the northwest Feature 128.

**Feature 176**

This feature was not included or discussed in the London report though PES’ field notes state the feature included bone fragments and glass associated with a box line. The author of the field notes hypothesizes that any remains may have been discarded during earlier construction episodes.
Fig. 5-182

Nineteen artifacts were recovered from this feature. They include two square cut iron nails, a piece of bone/tooth worn as an amulet, seven shards of American salt-glazed stoneware and one creamware shard.

Without further evidence or information one can only hypothesize whether or not this was once a burial.

**Feature 177**

According to PES’ field notes Feature 177 appeared to be a shaft for a coffin as determined by soil discoloration. Notes also state that there was no wood line or alignment of associated nails, nor were there any human remains uncovered. A total of thirty-eight (38) artifacts were recovered including brick, plaster, two iron nails and twenty-two pottery shards. Dateable types among the pottery include creamware (1762-1805), cauliflower ware, white slat-glazed stoneware and blue painted pearlware (1775-1820).
There is not enough information or evidence to suggest that this truly was a burial feature.

**Feature 179**

Feature 179 was located in units N520 E440 and N515 E440. According to PES’ field notes it contained a rectangular shaft along the eastern edge of the unit in a north-south orientation. Along the southern edge artifacts indicative of coffin remains were uncovered including nails and a possible wood line. Bone fragments in this unit were identified either as animal or too fragmentary for identification.

Artifacts from this feature were collected in a single episode that recovered one hundred twenty-four (124) artifacts. Among the artifacts were pipe stems dating 1700-1800, clam and oyster shell, nine coffin nails, liquor bottle shards, window glass shards, brick and pottery. A total of thirty-eight pottery shards were recovered. Among the dateable types were pearlware, white salt-glazed stoneware (1720-1805), North American salt-glazed stoneware and creamware. Unique artifacts in the assemblage were flint flakes ordebitage and a copper buckle.
There is no evidence to suggest that these artifacts do not come from a primary context. Based upon the analysis and notes stating that all bone remains were either animal or too fragmentary to be identified it is difficult to consider this a burial feature. It is the determination of this report that Feature 179 is a primary context sheet deposit dating to the late eighteenth to early nineteenth century.

**Feature 181**

PES’ field notes describe this feature as a possible burial shaft containing animal bone but no human bone. However, the London report discusses Feature 181 as “located in unit N515/E465, Level 1, contains the partial remains of two individuals. The first individual is an older adult, sex unknown, represented by a nearly complete right femur. The second individual is represented by the shaft of a left femur, and is determined to be about 10 years old at death based on measurements of that bone.” (London 2004). The discrepancy is unexplained.

No artifacts were recovered from this feature.
**Features Summary**

The following chart identifies primary and secondary context features as well as single element or out of context and undetermined burial features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Primary (intact)</th>
<th>Primary (impacted/disturbed)</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Single Element/Out of Context</th>
<th>Undetermined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Skeletal Analysis

The detailed account of the skeletal analysis can be found in New York City Hall park: Analysis of Partial, Scattered, and Incomplete Human Skeletal Remains Recovered during the 1999 Renovation of the Park by Marilyn R. London (2004).

Conclusions

The condition of the interments within City Hall Park reflects the significant amount of development and long term use of the site. A majority of the burial features were of re-deposited secondary contexts or fragmented burials that had been impacted during nineteenth and early twentieth century construction works. The material analysis supports the wide ranging disturbances observed during excavation. Several features contained mixed context artifact assemblages or materials dated considerably later than the known period of burials within the site.

Of the burial features exposed 25 were of primary context, 26 were of secondary context re-deposited burials and 8 contained single elements. All but 7 of the primary context burials were disturbed or impacted in some manner over the course of time. All of the burials are believed to be associated with the First Almshouse (1739-1797) and it appears that the cemetery was in use from 1757 to 1785 (Lucey, this volume). The excavated remains represent a minimum number of forty-seven (47) individuals and a maximum number of two hundred fifty-six (256) individuals. The population includes men and women ranging in age from fetal/newborn to elderly. Though ancestry data was largely incomplete, where available, evidence was overwhelmingly in favor of European descent. Many of the skeletal elements show traces of lives spent in hard work, poorly healed fractures and pathologies caused by illness or poor nutrition. Arthritis was the most commonly observed pathology. All evidence suggests a population consistent with the Almshouse.

It seems from the archaeological evidence that the poor were accorded some standard of burial treatment during the eighteenth century. Evidence of the type of funerary services
that accompanied the burials does not exist. However, evidence suggests that all the burials were shrouded, adults and children alike. Many of the cranial elements, as well as other elements, exhibited copper staining, remnant of decomposed shroud pins. Shroud pins were both observed and recovered in association with several of the burials. Evidence further suggests that the shrouded bodies were often buried in a coffin in a supine position. There is some variation in the orientation of the interments. The most common orientation was head to the west, facing east followed by south facing north. The reason for this variation is unclear but it may possibly reflect a shift in burial practices. There was limited evidence of any
grave goods. Only two burials seem to have been interred with any form of jewelry. One burial, a male, contained evidence of copper cufflinks and, the burial of one female with an associated gold earring. There was no evidence of grave markers and several of the graves cut into others.

Fig. 5-185

The burials in the Triangle Area (Figs. 5-184, 185) are believed to be the First Almshouse Cemetery. Burials in this area were densely situated sometimes with less that six inches between graves. In more than one instance burials were stacked. Given the limited size of the Almshouse cemetery, approximately eighty by one hundred twenty feet (80’ x 120’) and the high mortality rate that was likely among this population stacking and reuse of graves is a logical expectation.

It is possible that some of the re-deposited remains in the park are the result of charnelling rather than construction disturbances. Charnelling is the practice of removing the bones from the grave after decomposition of the flesh. This practice is known from early modern times in London and Paris (Harding 2002:64-65) and there was a Charnel
House in Trinity Churchyard, which is not far from City Hall Park, where the bones from the graves opened for reuse were stored (Pascalis 1823:150). This seems a likely explanation for some of the larger deposits of disarticulated bones.

The location and identification of several primary burials within City Hall Park demonstrated the necessity of archaeology. Despite major construction works over two centuries intact burials, and archaeological deposits, remained. This was not due to any preservation minded concern or respect for the dead; it was due to pure chance. Traces of New York City’s complex past remain beneath the City surface. Documentary analysis suggests that many more burials may still be present beneath the Park surface.

Fig. 5-186