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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Phase 1A archaeological documentary study and Phase 1B archaeological testing of part of the Dyckman Farmhouse Park, a National Register of Historic Places site and New York City Landmark, were conducted in relation to a project which includes the placement of a new telephone line in the rear yard. This archaeological report is being conducted to comply with environmental review regulations and meets the standards of both the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission and the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation.

The property was part of the large Dyckman family holdings in northern Manhattan. The farmhouse was built in 1783 by William Dyckman and was almost continuously owned by members of the Dyckman family until the late-nineteenth century. The house and park were purchased back by Dyckman descendants beginning in 1915 and donated to New York City.

This report concluded that the property contains the potential for the recovery of material from both the Pre-Contact and Historic periods of use. However, the archaeological testing conducted for this project did not reveal any potentially significant findings. Nevertheless, it was recommended additional research be undertaken prior to conducting any further below ground work in the Dyckman Farmhouse Park.
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INTRODUCTION

The City of New York Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and the Historic House Trust of New York City (HHT) are implementing a program of improvements at Dyckman Farmhouse Museum and Park located at Broadway and 204th Street in Manhattan, listed on the National Register of Historic Places and a New York City Landmark (Figure 1). The building is the last remaining Dutch Colonial farmhouse in Manhattan. It was built by William Dyckman in 1783/84 and was owned by his descendants for almost one hundred years. After about forty years in other hands, Dyckman descendants began buying the property back in 1915. They renovated the house and grounds and donated the property to the City in 1916 to be used as a museum and park.

This archaeological documentary study and testing report is being conducted to comply with environmental review regulations. Below ground project impacts are trenches to place new phone and electrical lines. Figure 2 is the schematic plan provided by New Age Electrical Contractors.

The trench needed for the installation of the new lines goes from the rear of the house, north of the back stairs, west to the eastern line of the brick walkway and then north adjacent to that walk crossing to the north side of the walk and running west, parallel to the walk to a point in line with the western end of the reconstructed Hessian Hut. In a bit of a deviation from the schematic, the trench then forks with one segment extending north to the hut and the other southwest, diagonally to the corner of the property fence. The trench is eighteen inches deep and twelve inches wide. Its length cannot be determined from the schematic plan, but was later measured in the field to total just over one hundred feet.

This report will present the documentary research and the findings of archaeological testing conducted for the Dyckman House project. The work has been done in accordance with the guidelines of both the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission and the New York State Office of Parks Recreation and Historic Preservation. This report was prepared by Linda Stone, RPA for New Age Electrical Contractors. The archaeological fieldwork described in this report was conducted by Ms. Stone and the contractors trenching was done by Jeff Seigal. The fieldwork was conducted on June 25 and 30, 2003. The author would like to acknowledge the assistance of Steve Wasserman of New Age Electrical Contractors for facilitating the project and to Laura Chmielewski, curator of Dyckman House, Nahn Tseng of HHT and Gabriella Ward of DPR for providing some of the research materials used in the preparation of this report.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This archaeological study was prepared using documentary, cartographic, and archival sources. The research included a survey of standard repositories of information including the New York Public Library, the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC), the Manhattan Borough President’s Topographic Bureau, the New-York Historical Society, and the Municipal Archives.

The primary relevant works are the 1991 Historic Structures Report (HSR) by Dassler et al., Reginald Pelham Bolton’s *Washington Heights Manhattan: Its Eventful Past* (1924) and, to a lesser extent, Dean and Welch’s *The Dyckman House Park and Museum, New York City 1783-1916* (1917). Other more relevant materials may exist at the New-York Historical Society, however it’s library was closed for renovation during the research for this report. However the NYHS catalog is available on-line and the librarians were quite helpful in identifying potentially useful materials over the telephone. Additionally they provided a copy of Bolton’s Military Map (discussed below). Other potentially relevant materials include Reginald Pelham Bolton’s papers, his personal memoirs, scraps and sketches as well as his archaeological and historical map of 193rd to 218th Streets from Tenth Avenue to the Hudson River.

As part of the evaluation of historic archaeological potential, a variety of information sources were used to collect data on the history of the project area and to document previous site disturbances. As part of the evaluation of potential pre-contact site resources three factors were considered: 1) known archaeological sites in the vicinity of the project area, 2) project area topography and 3) proximity to fresh water. Identification of known pre-contact archaeological resources was done using documentation by Bolton (1924, 1937) and later summarized by Parker (1922), and through review of reports on file with the author and at the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC). Identification and evaluation of project area topography and proximity to fresh water, current as well as historic, was made through pedestrian survey, analysis of current and historic topographic data and historic research.

This report combines its presentation of the local history with the general history of the project vicinity in order to provide a context for events, places and people which have potential significance to the project area. The Dyckman land holdings were vast and included much property in northern Manhattan, most of it outside of the current park (about 400 acres at its largest) (Dean and Welch 1917; 21, Romer 1981: 72). This report is on the project parcel only, when describing property transfers it does not necessarily refer to Dyckman lands outside of this. A summary of the chain of title is included as Appendix A.
PROJECT AREA TOPOGRAPHY

The most current topographic survey of Dyckman Farmhouse Park was done in 1936 (see Figure 3). It depicts the property in a fair amount of detail and includes the plantings as well as the outbuildings. The Hessian Hut is labeled “Log Cabin” and the smokehouse as “1 Story Stone”. Although the grade of Broadway was lowered substantially in 1892, the house was always “situated on a rise of land which looked southeastward over the wide-spread apple orchards towards the Harlem River” (Dean and Welch 1917: 31). At some point in time, the southeastern part of the project area was also graded, likely at the time the southern wing of the house was built (Hardy et al. 1989: 4). However no specific data on the amount of change was found. “The rear wall of the house rests on a continuous ledge which shows as a huge boulder in the basement” (Heintzman 1975: #7).
PRE-CONTACT PERIOD

As presented in the methodology section of this report, three factors were considered in the evaluation of pre-contact archaeological potential; 1) known archaeological sites in the vicinity of the project area, 2) project area topography and 3) proximity to fresh water. The reasons these indicators are useful in predicting locations of unknown sites has to do with their relationship to subsistence and settlement patterns during prehistory. Ecological factors such as distance to fresh water, elevation, slope, and soils are generally used as predictors of past animal habitats. If it can be demonstrated that past environmental conditions were conducive to exploitation by game animals, birds and fish then it can be inferred that human population may have in turn exploited these resources. Furthermore, if evidence of prehistoric human activity can be found near the project area, this assertion can be strengthened.

Hunter-gatherers first arrived in the New York region from the west toward the end of the last ice age, over 12,000 years ago, marking the beginning of the Paleo-Indian cultural period. The ice sheet was rapidly melting and the environment was changing. Food resources were not yet stabilized to seasonal cycles and resource predictability and density were both low. About 10,000 years ago the Paleo-Indian period came to an end. The advent of the Archaic Period was marked by a change in foraging strategy precipitated by the warming climate. The economic strategy of the Archaic period was becoming more diverse as more varieties of flora and fauna were becoming established in the warming climate of the northeast. There is a belief that the Early Archaic people were beginning to establish territories and a "restricted wandering" foraging behavior (Snow 1980:171). The transition from the Early Archaic to the Middle Archaic is not as sharp. Dincauze and Mulholland (1977) believe:

the Middle Archaic subsistence and settlement patterns appear to represent the expansion and increase of a successful resident population. Sites proliferate along obvious communication routes and in the richest habitats; territorial ranges are established, and the resource base is broadened. (Dincauze and Mulholland 1977:454)

Very little archaeological data exists for the earliest pre-contact cultural periods in the New York City area, the Paleo-Indian through Middle Archaic periods prior to about 5,000 years ago. Staten Island is one locus of what little information exists. One possible explanation is that these early sites were buried under water as the sea level rose. Funk (1991) summarizes what little is known of these periods.

In the case of the Port Mobil site, located on the western shore of Staten Island near the Arthur Kill, evidence suggests that Paleo-Indians lived at the site when sea level was considerably lower than at present and the Arthur Kill was an upland creek (Kraft 1977). Similarly, Early Archaic sites on Staten Island close to the present shore lines and
elevated slightly above sea level, such as Ward's Point, Hollowell, and Old Place (Ritchie and Funk 1971), would have been inland and upland locations at the time of occupation. No Paleo-Indian sites, as such, are known along the Lower Hudson north of Staten Island. (Funk 1991:51).

The amount of data on the pre-contact population of the Late Archaic increases dramatically. This large increase in archaeological evidence is one of the factors that separate the Late Archaic from the previous periods. It also indicates that adaptations must have been such as to allow for the increase in the number of recorded sites. The environment had essentially stabilized during the Late Archaic, with conditions much the same as today's. The pre-contact cultural periods defined after the Archaic are generally marked by the introduction of innovations in pottery and vessel type and changes in artifact assemblages, rather than by changes in the environment.

The Transitional Phase, 1500 - 1000 B.C., is marked by the introduction of steatite vessels into the artifact assemblage as well as the prevalent use of certain projectile point types. The Woodland Period of prehistory. 1000 B.C. to about A.D. 1600, like the Archaic, is divided into early, middle and late sequences. These Woodland Period divisions are defined based on changes in the style and type of pottery and projectile points found at archaeological sites. With the use of pottery for cooking and storing food resources, the people of the Woodland Period were able to become increasingly sedentary, relying less on seasonal movement to exploit available resources. Ultimately, this led to the development of cultigens during the Late Woodland period, about A.D. 1000.

The Late Woodland period ended at the time of European contact in the early seventeenth century. From this time through the early to mid-eighteenth century is identified as the Contact period. Native American archaeological sites have been identified as contemporaneous with European sites. The influence of European contact can be seen in the artifact assemblages from the Native American sites of this time. Many pre-contact archaeological sites were occupied during multiple periods.

Known pre-contact sites in the northern part of Manhattan are numerous, many excavated by Bolton and his colleagues around the turn of the 20th century. "This general region was highly favorable for aboriginal occupation, having both fertile soil for raising maize and waters that provided sea food. Its high rock cliffs permitted fortified positions, while the many waterways made it possible for journeys to the surrounding countries" (Parker 1922: 626). A creek formerly located just a "few hundred yards" from the Dyckman house was reportedly a "favorite fishing ground" (Dean and Welch 1917: 15). Figure 4 is a section of Bolton’s Map of Washington Heights in Indian Possession before 1600 showing a number of...
site locations that he has depicted as triangular shaped symbols. Many streams are also depicted, including two near what is now Dyckman House Park.

Parker identifies a number of site types in the Washington Heights and Inwood areas, including camps, villages, rock shelters, shell heaps and traces of occupation. The closest to the Dyckman House is a village site at Seaman Avenue and Isham Street, about two blocks to the northeast (Parker 1922: 627-30). Bolton describes finding “fireplaces high on the rocky ridge that ran from 204th Street to Isham Street” (Bolton 1924: 42, 182). He also describes another village about two blocks away, to the southwest, “situated along Seaman Avenue, between Academy and 204th Streets, probably was known as Shorakapkok and bears evidence of long continued occupancy”, including stone tools, food remains and human and dog burials which were removed in 1907 when the area was graded (Bolton 1924: 46-7). Figure 4 also shows Shorakapkok, locating it along the western side of northern Manhattan. Bolton emphasis the “extent of waste materials left by the native occupants, consisting of the shells of oysters, with accumulations of wood ashes and carbonized food, composing a bed from one to three feet in thickness, spread over acres of the surface of the glen and through the contiguous woodland” (Bolton 1937: 10-11). Additionally, a cave was also excavated in the area (Bolton 1975: 83).

At the time of contact, the area was known as Muscoota (Bolton 1924: 25, 51). Muscoota is depicted on Figure 4 along the eastern side of northern Manhattan. Two “Indian cemeteries” were located near the Dyckman house, one used by Isaac Michael Dyckman “as the burial-ground for Negro servants. Of these there were many on the farm, some of them the descendants of slaves, most of them in part of Indian stock” (Dean and Welch 1917: 16). The location of the “Negro burying ground” was mapped by Bolton at the northern end of Sherman Avenue, within what is now the rail yard (Bolton 1924: Map VI). Figure 5 is a section of Bolton’s map of the Military Camp on the Dyckman Farm. It shows the locations of several “Indian burials” to the west of the Dyckman House, west of Seaman Avenue and south of 204th Street. It also depicts the locations of shell pits, in addition to the many Revolutionary War features (discussed below). It also depicts the locations of shell pits, in addition to the many Revolutionary War features.
SITE HISTORY

Seventeenth Century

Jan Dyckman and Jan Nagel owned a large part of upper Manhattan, including the project area, beginning in 1677, which they farmed. They continued to acquire property through time (Bolton 1924: 173-4). Ten years after the death of Nagel in 1689, Jan Dyckman married Nagel’s widow Rebecca, thus ensuring the property rights to their descendants. The area was generally called Round Meadow or “Ronde-vly” and was comprised of “rolling meadow and marsh lands between Inwood hill and the Harlem River, extending north from Sherman Creek, to 211th Street, together with strips of woodland across Inwood hill” (Bolton 1924: 25, 37, 186). The 1691 division of common land held by the Dyckman and Nagel families specified the area including the current Dyckman House Park (Dassler et al. 1991: 34).

One of the oldest roads in the borough is King’s Way or King’s Highway. It was along the current course of Broadway for much of its distance. After the construction of King’s Bridge in 1693, the road was often called King’s Bridge Road or Kingsbridge Road, and was sometimes referred to as the Post Road (Bolton 1924: 59-60). King’s Bridge was a toll bridge and the collection of the toll did not please the farmers in the area. Jacob Dyckman led a protest that culminated in the 1758 erection of the Free Bridge, Farmer’s Bridge or Dyckman’s Bridge, located at 225th Street (Bolton 1924:60, 188). The family spent the next 45 years trying to recoup some of the moneys he spent on the effort with satisfaction being reached in 1803, well after the bridge had been destroyed during the Revolution (Stokes 1915: IV: 771, 1643).

Eighteenth Century

In 1719, after the death of Jan Dyckman, his substantial land holdings were divided between the Dyckman and Nagel children. Subsequently, the land was bought out by Jacobus Dyckman and his stepbrother Jan Nagel, Jr (Bolton 1924: 186). The home where Jan Dyckman lived, as did his son Jacobus, was located near 210th Street and the Harlem River. Archaeological excavations were conducted there by Calver and Bolton (Bolton 1924: 187).

Parts of the King’s Way were regulated in 1707. Mile markers along the road were numbered. The number 13 marker was erected in 1769 at the corner of Kingsbridge Road and where 204th Street is now
(originally known as Hawthorne Street) (Stokes 1915: III: 960). This marker can be seen adjacent to the Dyckman House on Figure 6, as well as on other historic maps.

After Jacobus Dyckman's death in 1772, his son William inherited the property in 1774. William built a new home for himself nearby, around 208th Street and Tenth Avenue. Shortly thereafter the northern part of Manhattan became a locus of action during the Revolutionary War. William and his family took leave of their home to Peekskill.

The defense of New York was centered in the area of Dyckman's farm. Round Hill was also known as Laurel Hill and it was a main point of defense for northern Manhattan from the beginning of the War. However 2000 British soldiers were more than a match for the patriots. The British, along with the Hessians, took the area on November 16, 1776. Figure 7 depicts the battle. What is now the Dyckman Park was then between the areas of the first and second attacks, marked A and B of Figure 7. The site was along the slope of the marked "Hessian Fleches", a fair distance from the road. The Hessians and British subsequently built numerous defensive works, including Fort George (Panamerican 2003: 3-13). King's Way was a main thoroughfare and an easy route to move troops and supplies. The section to become Broadway in that vicinity was not laid out until after the Revolution.

A large encampment was built from about where 204th Street is now located south along Payson Avenue to about Academy Street, within close proximity (about 450 feet) to where the Dyckman farmhouse now stands (Bolton 1918b, 1924: 183). The camp was likely built by the Americans in 1776, an order to do so being given in the general orders of the day of September 24 for "barracks and huts... to be built this side of King's Bridge" (Stokes 1915: V: 1027). It was later used and enlarged by the British and Hessian troops. In 1778, it was used by the Seventeenth Foot Regiment of the British Army (Bolton 1914: 7, 1918a: 92). It consisted of winter quarters dug into the hillside as well as tents, archaeological remains of which were first discovered by William Calver in 1890 while he was searching for Native American material (Bolton 1916: 143, 1918a: 92). Extensive remains of the camp were revealed in 1901 when Prescott Avenue was graded. It consisted of at least fifty quarters uncovered in excavations led by Calver and Bolton (Bolton 1917: 11). Apparently additional huts were identified and not excavated. Bolton estimates the need for "upwards of one hundred and twenty dug-outs...necessary to accommodate two regiments composed of approximately twelve hundred men" (Bolton 1918a: 96). The materials were reportedly taken from "ruined houses and barns" (Bolton 1918a: 132). The excavations revealed a variety of identifiable military buttons, proving the use of the camp by many different groups. These include the Seventeenth Foot Regiment, Tenth, Fourteenth, Twenty-third, Twenty-eighth, Fifty-second, Fifty-fourth,
Seventy-first Regiment and Ninth Massachusetts Regiment. Bolton continues to describe the research done to confirm some of these troops actually occupied the camp (Bolton 1918a: 131, 133, 17).

Reginald Pelham Bolton, in his capacity as secretary of the New-York Historical Society’s Committee on Field Exploration, published a series of three articles on the excavations of the “military hut-camp” in the Society’s quarterly bulletin (1918a). Figure 5 is the northern section of the detail excavation plan showing the relationship of the excavations to 204th Street and Seaman Avenue. In addition to the military huts, a number of features from pre-contact time are also depicted. These include a large shell concentration near the spring at the northern (right) side of the plan. There are also a number of shell pits, “Indian” burials, a fire pit and a dog burial. One of the officer’s huts, number 34 on Figure 5, was excavated by the New-York Historical Society’s Field Exploration Committee led by Bolton. The foundation dismantled and then reconstructed in the rear yard of the project parcel.

The entire extent of the camp site was determined to be about “two hundred feet in width and eight hundred feet in length, from Academy Street to 204th Street, along the steep side of the easterly part of Inwood Hill, approximately between the present Prescott Avenue and Seaman Avenue” (Bolton 1918a: 89). The site was within the apple and pear orchard planted by William Dyckman after the Revolution (Bolton 1918a: 89). It is located only 450 feet from the Dyckman House. The arrow on the lower right of the original drawing is labeled as such (see Figure 5).

The Dyckman family were known as patriots during the Revolution and this cost William his new home which the British burned (Bolton 1924: 189-91). Not only was his home destroyed, but also outbuildings were used and the orchards and other trees cut and timber used by the armies. William Dyckman returned to find his property destroyed and littered with burned lumber and rubbish, some of which had been found in pits. Bolton reports the Dyckman farm hands cleaned and filled the pits with apple and pear trees (Bolton 1918a: 89, 1924: 193, Dassler et al. 1991: App.Z). In addition to the destruction, the War brought an improved King’s Bridge Road, soon renamed Broadway.

The distance along King’s Bridge Road to King’s Bridge was shortened, going directly through the Dyckman farm. Figure 8 shows the old and present courses of Broadway. It was on this new section of the road that William set to the task of building a new home. Figure 5 depicts the area to the west-southwest of the property. The spring at the corner of what is now Seaman Avenue and 204th Street must have been part of the reason for choosing the house location (Dassler et al. 1991: 24). The house was
built on a rocky ledge of bedrock overlooking Broadway in 1783/84. Sadly, William lived but a few years to enjoy the home. William was apparently sickly in his later years and his will was drawn under the assumption he would die before his mother. Therefore there was some confusion upon his death in 1787, about who technically owned the property, because William ultimately outlived his mother. The matter was eventually resolved in 1795 when William’s son Jacobus was deeded the property (Dassler et al. 1991:17-26).

Nineteenth Century

Jacobus Dyckman died in 1832 and his property was passed to his sons Isaac and Michael. “The growth of traffic along the Post Road, particularly in the transit of cattle, made the farm a favorite resting place for the herds, the drivers of which so crowded the accommodations on the old homestead that the family were compelled to move out and seek quieter surroundings” (Bolton 1924:192). Dassler et al. were not able to find any documentation of the use of the project area during that time (1991: 29). It is assumed a number of tenants occupied the house in the absence of the Dyckman family and that it was used as a hotel for a time (Dassler et al. 1991: 30). It is also reported that the bedrock outcrop in the basement was used to keep the harvest cool (Hardy et al. 1989: 4).

The earliest view of the house is a drawing dated around 1835 by Arnul F. Bandel, identified as the foreman of the farm (see report cover). Among other features, it shows the north wing of the house, a section that was not original to the structure and was later removed. The construction style of the wing indicates it is an addition to the original house and was likely built around 1830 (Dassler et al. 1991: 41, Heintzelman 1975: #7). Dean and Welch state it was built to create extra room for servants. The HSR discusses the evolution of the structure of the house in some detail and there is no need to repeat that information here. Plates 1 – 3 are a number of views of the house where the north wing is quite visible.

During the 1840s and 1850s the Dyckman farm was used for grazing animals while farmers took them to and from New York City. The Commissioner’s Map of 1860 labels the house as “Kellerhouse” possibly the name of tenants at that time. Figure 9 depicts the Kellerhouse and shows its location within the current park boundary. Also included within this boundary is one outbuilding. Outside of the project area, Figure 9 shows the course of Broadway at that time as well as the laying out of other streets in the

---

1 The actual date of construction is reported as either 1783 or 1784 in the various composite sources used. For example Dassler et al. gives the date of 1784 in the HSR (1991: 24, App.Y) and Heintzelman provides a date of 1783 in the NRHP nomination form (1975: #7) as do Dean and Welch (1917: 34).
vicinity. This plan of streets was not concluded, as evidenced by the current course of 204th Street adjacent to the project parcel.

The house became a hotel in the early 1860s. Swift leased the property and ran the hotel for a while (Dassler et al. 1991: App.Z). The Historic Structure Report discusses the “exceptional” Blackwell Map of 1860-1865 for its detail regarding the Dyckman property at that time (Dassler et al. 1991: 29-30). The map, housed at the Borough President’s Topographic Bureau, is comprised of 21 sheets as well as notes and sketches. Unfortunately, this map is no longer available for research. It has been identified as in need of conservation since 1995. Laura Engler of the Topographic Bureau was not able to find the associated notes and sketches. If they are still housed in the Borough President’s office, they are not stored with the actual map sheets nor are they listed in the index. Nevertheless, some of the data from the Blackwell Map can be taken from the photocopies included in the HSR, as well as descriptions in the text.

The Blackwell map photocopies show a number of the outbuildings present at the time. These include the well, hog pen, barn, shed and corncrib, as well as other unidentified outbuildings (Dassler et al. 1991: 67). However it is not possible to identify labels of all of these farm related structures on the photocopy (see Figure 10). In the original HSR, the label of the farmhouse is more clearly seen as “Swift Hotel”. The outbuilding to the north of the house is the “shed” and the smaller building to the north of the shed is the “corn crib”. Unfortunately, none of the other writing on this photocopy is legible. The shed may also be seen in Plate 4 to the right of the house. Figure 11 depicts the wider view in the Blackwell Map. It shows the orchards across Kingsbridge Road from the farmhouse and down slope. The parterre garden is to the south of the house.

Michael Dyckman died in 1854, leaving the property to his brother Isaac. Isaac continued to increase the size of the Dyckman property. He deeded land on Broadway near Academy Street to New York City to be used to build a public school, P.S. 52 (see Figure 9) (Romer 1981: 72). Figure 12 is an 1867 view of the buildings in the vicinity of Dyckman House. The public school can be seen to the south of the house, on the east side of Kings Bridge Road (Broadway). Figure 12 shows structures within the current park boundary as depicted on the Blackwell Map as well as many additional outbuildings outside of the park.

Because neither Isaac nor Michael were married, when Isaac died in 1868, his nephew James Frederick Smith inherited the property. Upon this inheritance, Smith changed his name to Isaac Michael Dyckman in honor of his two uncles. This was when the Dyckman land holdings had reached over 400 acres (Romer 1981: 72). However Isaac Michael didn’t occupy the house on 204th Street after his uncle’s
death, he lived in their other house, near 225th Street, until his marriage in 1867 (Dassler et al. 1991: 28, Heintzelman 1975: #8). As one of the executors of his uncle’s estate, Isaac Michael was responsible for selling the property in 1871, thus ending the long family ownership of the project area. Isaac Dyckman’s estate, including the project parcel, was put up for auction by Benjamin Fairchild. It was at that time the property was divided into lots.

Dassler et al. quote Dean and Welch as noting the rear porch was “destroyed about 1880” (1991: 46). This can also be seen on Plate 3. By the year 1892, Kingsbridge Road (Broadway) was lowered by about fifteen feet in front of Dyckman House. Plates 5 and 4 depict the condition of the house both before and after the road was lowered, respectively. On May 28, 1894, 204th Street was officially opened (Topo Bureau card file). It was originally called Hawthorne Street (Bolton 1914: 5). The new street configuration is shown on Figure 13. It depicts the farmhouse and shed still standing within the area of the current park. The map also shows two of the outbuildings would be destroyed by the construction of Hawthorne Street (now 204th Street). The corncrib seen on Figures 10 – 12 is no longer standing by 1893.

Bolton, along with William Calver, apparently conducted excavations in the rear of the Dyckman House. They report finding a pint-size rum bottle in “back of the Dyckman dwelling on 204th Street, with military objects nearby:” (Calver and Bolton 1950: 261). Although these findings appear to be from excavations conducted within the current project area, no other record of this possible work was found. It is hoped the New-York Historical Society collection contains such documentation. It is not clear if the artifacts were found during a systematic archaeological excavation or excavations done during the reconstruction of the Hessian Hut or if they were surface finds. Plate 6 is a photo of Bolton during the hut reconstruction. It looks as though the hut was dug into the slope in the way Bolton described the military camp construction.

Twentieth Century

By 1900 Hawthorne Street was established and the block had been subdivided, although it appears the current lot numbers were not finalized at that time: The current Lot 35 is depicted as Lot 36 and it does not conform to the current park boundary in the western end of that lot. Additionally Lots 33 and 34 are actually both 25 feet wide rather than different sized as depicted on Figure 14. Also of note, in 1900 the shed is no longer standing.
Upper Manhattan was not immune to the developments of the modern New York City. By 1911, the IRT subway was extended up to Inwood (Rubinson & Winter 1988: 20). The property was recorded as changing hands numerous times throughout the late-nineteenth century and into the early twentieth century. By 1913, the lots within the block had been established (see Figure 15). Although the rear porch had been destroyed by 1880, it was not depicted on detailed maps until 1913.

In 1915, the daughters of Isaac Michael Dyckman purchased back the old Dyckman Farmhouse. The sisters, Fannie Welch and Mary Dean donated the property to the City of New York (Bolton 1924: 193). Their husbands were responsible for its transformation. Mr. Welch took on the restoration of the house and grounds and Mr. Dean the creation of the museum (Dean and Welch 1917: 12). The actual deeds for the various lots that now make up the Dyckman Park were dated 1916, for the main portion that includes the farmhouse, 1917 for the northern lots (Nos. 33 and 34), and 1944 for Lot 40.

Plate 7 is a photograph from the 1920s of the house and park taken from Broadway. The change in its appearance was dramatic. This can be seen by comparing Plates 4 and 7. Plate 8 depicts the rear of the house after restoration. This view can be compared with Plate 6, although they were taken from opposite angles. Figure 16 shows the project area as of 1935. In the twenty plus years since the 1913 map the development of the block included both the demolition of most of the older buildings and construction of new ones. Figure 17 depicts the park details in 1935. It shows the restored house, the Hessian Hut, smokehouse, well pump, the three stairways at the Broadway and 204th Street corners of the property, and the two stairways built along the slope on either side of the hut. It also shows a garden in Lot 40, not yet part of the Dyckman Farmhouse Park.

The Dean and Welch restoration was undertaken with the idea of recreating the pre-1800 home and grounds, although the land was substantially less. They built the stone retaining wall and steps that are extant. They attempted to reconstruct the brick walkways in the yard, as best they could. Some remains of the original paths still existed during the reconstruction and Dean and Welch reused materials as much as possible. They rebuilt the rear porch and reconstructed the stone smokehouse from original photos. Both the porch and the smokehouse can be seen on Figures 16 and 17 and the porch in Plate 8. “An excavation was undertaken to discover the original well and a well curb or rim was reconstructed”. When Bolton was asked to reconstruct one of the Hessian officer huts from the nearby military camp excavations, he used stones and bricks from the camp site. Lumber was reused from a Long Island barn and other materials were salvaged or purchased (Dassler et al. 1991: 68-71, Dean and Welch 1917: 12-13). The parterre garden was designed based on the original Dyckman garden, however that garden had
been located to the south of the current property. Gravel walks and boxwood hedges were used, as is evidenced today. During this reconstruction, the north wing of the house was removed and the sitting area constructed in its vicinity.

Plantings were again renovated in 1935-36. The final lot was purchased in 1944 at the southwest corner of the property. It was incorporated into the existing property by extending the stone wall and the entrance at the northeast corner was closed off in 1953 and the scheme is pretty much as currently exists (see Figure 3 and 18). Additional plantings were also done in 1961, as was renovation of the brick walkways and gravel path in the parterre garden. Although some changes were made, “the grounds of the Dyckman House Museum were laid out during the 1915 restoration by Alexander Welch” (Dassler et al. 1991: 73, 82).
ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

Pre-Contact Period
Archaeological remains from the Pre-Contact period have been found in relative abundance in upper Manhattan, particularly in the vicinity of Dyckman House Park. A fresh water spring and two streams were in close proximity to the project area in the early historic periods. The soils were then considered quite fertile and the rocky promontories considered good vantage points. All these factors combined would indicate the possibility of encountering Pre-Contact archaeological material in the Dyckman House Park, however the actual park grounds have been historically disturbed to some extent. Plate 6 depicts the disturbances from the construction of the Hessian Hut. Plate 8 shows the grading done to the south and east of the hut to construct the parterre garden and lawn as well as the steps. An arbor is shown at the northwest corner of the house (to the left of the photo) and a fence in the area to the south. Below ground disturbances from the arbor and fence would be minimal, not affecting archaeological potential. However the grading would have had more affect, as would have location of possible excavations conducted by Bolton. Regardless, Pre-Contact Period archaeological potential within the park should be considered moderate.

Historic Period
Knowing where in the rear yard of the park the Bolton excavations were conducted would be extremely useful in determining archaeological potential in the remainder of the property. Historic structural remains of the former north wing as well as a number of outbuildings could be found in the park. Figure 10 depicts the north wing, shed and corncrib, as well as a possible small structure to the southwest of the corn crib and possible well to the west of the southern end of the house. Remains of any of these structures could be found depending on how deep their original construction was. None of them are in areas were substantial below ground work has been previously done.
FIELD TESTING

The scope of work for archaeological testing is attached as Appendix B. Archaeological work done for this project involved two field techniques; shovel testing and construction trench monitoring. Shovel testing was used as the primary testing method. Monitoring was done in two areas to provide further data. Figure 19 depicts the conduit trench and the locations of the shovel tests and monitored segments.

Shovel Testing
A total of 5 shovel tests were placed at roughly twenty-five-foot intervals, or less, along the path of the planned trench (see Figure 19). All soils excavated from the shovel tests were screened through ¼ inch mesh for the recovery of artifacts. Soils, stratigraphy and artifact inclusions were recorded on forms. The stratigraphy of each test is included as Appendix C. Shovel Test 1 was placed within the garden adjacent to the back porch. The loamy soil was directly underlain by decaying marble bedrock. A two-inch diameter electrical pipe was uncovered in Shovel Tests 2 and 3, buried between one and one and a half feet below the ground surface. The new phone line will follow westward in the path of this electrical line, within its previously disturbed trench. Shovel Test 4 was placed within the walkway near the western end of the impact area. The walkway is gravel at that point and a second, earlier gravel walkway was beneath it. That was underlain by an ash deposit to over a foot below the ground surface. That was then underlain by a brown sandy silt that contained some fragmented cultural material which was sampled. The same basal strata was identified in Shovel Test 5. The fragmentary nature of the artifacts is one indication the material was not part of an in situ feature deposit.

Trenching
The contractor's excavations were monitored in two areas. One was in the area of the garden behind the back porch (Trench 3). Decaying marble was found along the entire fifteen-foot segment of the trench. The loam above it contained a number of ceramic sherds ranging from salt-glazed stoneware to white granite. Only segments of this short section of the trench were monitored once it was determined the crumbling rock was a geological phenomenon.

Monitoring was also conducted in the western part of the trench, southwest of the walkway, south of Shovel Test 4 (Trench 1). The stratigraphy was similar to that found in Shovel Test 5. The top foot was loamy soil and it was underlain by the brown sandy silt found in both Shovel Tests 4 and 5.
**Artifact Processing**

Each bag of artifacts recovered from shovel tests was labeled with the test number and level (i.e. 1.2). Artifacts recovered during monitoring were labeled with the trench number. Artifacts known in the field to be non-diagnostic modern materials or to be associated with known fill deposits were noted in the field and generally either sampled or not retained. They are noted in the stratigraphy summary (Appendix C). All recovered glass, ceramic, and metal artifacts and those of man-made materials were washed and rinsed in tap water and left to air dry before labeling and rebagging in clean 4-mil zip-lock bags. Bone artifacts were dry-brushed. Most artifact categories, with the main exception being metal and bone, were individually labeled with the project name abbreviation (DH) and the context number (either a shovel test or trench number). All zip bags were labeled with the same information.

All ceramic and glass artifacts are considered sherds, unless otherwise noted in the inventory (Appendix D). Ceramic identification and date ranges of manufacture for white-bodied refined earthenwares were based on style of decorations; when available, and are referred to in the inventory as “refined earthenwares”. If identifications and/or dates of manufacture were also based on ware type, such as creamware/pearlware/whiteware, then these types are used as identifiers in the inventory. The Dyckman Farmhouse Museum is the repository for all artifacts recovered during the conduct of work described in this report.
RESULTS

The findings of the shovel testing and monitoring conclusively determined bedrock exists above the depth of planned impact in the garden adjacent to the porch. This was demonstrated in both Shovel Test 1 and Trench 3. Additional trenching was also done in the section of the trench where Shovel Test 1 was located, as well as some more exploratory trenching adjacent to the porch. The section hugging the porch was the location of the earlier conduit. Artifacts recovered from this area include a variety of ceramic sherds possibly dating from the early 1700s through the present. Furthermore, the sherds were generally less than an inch or two in diameter and were likely deposited over a period of time.

Shovel Tests 2 and 3 revealed a buried electrical pipe at about a foot below ground surface. This finding was fortuitous with regard to the work at hand since it meant most of the ground disturbance was within a previously excavated trench. Shovel Test 4 was located within the gravel pathway in the rear of the yard, near the parterre garden. It revealed a buried gravel walk, likely from the original restoration in 1915/16, as well as the more recent gravel from the 1961 renovations. Artifacts found below the depth of the gravel confirm this may be the case, with many pieces manufactured no later than the early-20th century. Shovel Test 5 was within the area between the gravel walkway and the Hessian Hut. This is also the area called Trench 2. This trench was not monitored; rather, the contractor recovered a large creamware tea cup piece which was later added to the archaeological artifact inventory. The precise location of the find was not known. Trench 1 was monitored in the southwest end of the trench. No artifacts were recovered from this ten-foot long segment. As previously noted, the stratigraphy here conformed to that of Shovel Tests 4 and 5.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The documentary research indicated a relatively high potential for the recovery of material from the Pre-Contact archaeological period because of conditions and the many known sites in the vicinity of Dyckman House Park. However no remains of any were found during this phase of archaeological testing. Historic period resources would have been from either structural remains of a variety of outbuildings or from midden deposits in sections of the yard near the house and those outbuildings. However no such remains were found during the testing described in this report. It is suspected previous archaeological documentation of the rear yard of the Dyckman House may exist among the papers of Reginald Pelham Bolton at the New-York Historical Society. However these archives were closed to the public at the time of the preparation of this report. It is recommended these records be consulted prior to commencing additional below-ground impacts within the Dyckman Farmhouse Park.

In conclusion, the Dyckman House telephone line project in the areas discussed can proceed as planned without concern for further archaeological work. Because of the relatively high archaeological potential documented in this report, it is recommended any future actions be preceded by archaeological work.
Plate 1  Lithograph of the Dyckman Farmhouse on Broadway facing south, circa 1868 (Dyckman Museum collection, originally published in Valentines Manual).

Plate 2  Photograph of the Dyckman Farmhouse from Broadway facing west, circa 1904 (Dyckman Museum collection).
Plate 3  Watercolor by Grant Wright of a rear view of Dyckman Farmhouse facing east, circa 1915 (Romer 1981: 80).

Plate 4  Photograph of the Dyckman Farmhouse after Broadway was lowered, circa 1890 (Dyckman Museum collection DH1999.121).
Plate 5  Photograph of the Dyckman Farmhouse before Broadway was lowered, circa 1868-1890 (Dyckman Museum collection DH1999.120).

Plate 6  Bolton during the reconstruction of the Hessian Hut behind Dyckman Farmhouse facing northwest, circa 1915 (Dyckman Museum collection).
Plate 7  Photograph of the Dyckman Farmhouse from the corner of 204th Street and Broadway facing northwest after reconstruction, circa 1924 (Dyckman Museum collection).

Plate 8  Photograph of Dyckman Farmhouse rear yard after reconstruction facing east, circa 1916-1928 (Dyckman Museum collection).
Figure 1  Project area location within northern Manhattan.
Figure 2  Schematic site plan showing locations of planned underground work.
Figure 3  Department of Parks and Recreation 1936 topographic map of Dyckman Farmhouse Museum and Park.
Figure 4  Bolton's 1924 Map of Washington Heights in Indian Possession before 1600.
Figure 5  Part of Bolton's 1918 Map of the Military Camp on the Dyckman Farm 1776 to 1783, northern detail.
Figure 6  From Bridge's 1811 Commissioner's Map.
Figure 7  Bolton's copy of General Percy's plan of the November 16, 1776 Battle of Fort Washington.
Figure 8  Tracing of part of the Sons of the American Revolution 1902 map, showing the course of Broadway before (old) and after (present) the Revolution.
Figure 9  Part of the 1860 Preliminary Map of the Commissioners of Washington Heights detail (see HSR Figure 7).
Figure 10  Part of the 1860/65 Blackwell Map worksheet (HSR Figures 8 & 31).
Figure 11 Part of the 1860/65 Blackwell Map (see HSR Figure 28).
Figure 12 Part of Dripps 1867 Plan of New York City.
Figure 13  From the Sanborn Perris 1893 Insurance Maps of the City of New York.
Figure 14 From the Sanborn Kerris 1900 Insurance Maps of the City of New York.
Figure 15 From the Sanborn 1913 Insurance Maps of the City of New York.
Figure 16 From the Sanborn 1935 Insurance Maps of the City of New York.
Figure 17  The 1935 Department of Parks and Recreation Property Line Map.
Figure 18  The 1953 Department of Parks and Recreation Construction Plan.
Figure 19  Dyckman House trench showing shovel test and monitoring locations.
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Appendix A

CHAIN OF TITLE FOR
BLOCK 2241, LOTS 33, 34, 35, & 40
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>GRANTOR</th>
<th>GRANTEE</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td>Freeholders of New Haerlem</td>
<td>Jan Dyckman and Jan Nagel</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Dyckman/Nagel holdings</td>
<td>Jan and Rebecca Dyckman</td>
<td>Division of common land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Dyckman/Nagel heirs</td>
<td>Jacob Dyckman and Jan Nagel, Jr.</td>
<td>Buy out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Jacob Dyckman and Jan Nagel, Jr.</td>
<td>Jacob Dyckman</td>
<td>Buy out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Jacob Dyckman estate</td>
<td>William Dyckman</td>
<td>Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>William Dyckman estate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacobus Dyckman</td>
<td>Deed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Jacobus Dyckman estate</td>
<td>Isaac and Michael Dyckman</td>
<td>Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Michael Dyckman estate</td>
<td>Isaac Dyckman</td>
<td>Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Isaac Dyckman estate</td>
<td>James Frederick Smith (aka Isaac Michael Dyckman)</td>
<td>Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Isaac Dyckman estate</td>
<td>Benjamin Fairchild</td>
<td>Lots 33,34, 35 &amp; 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Clara Fairchild, et al.</td>
<td>Edward Livingston</td>
<td>Lot 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Clara Fairchild, et al.</td>
<td>Duane S. Everson</td>
<td>Lot 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Duane &amp; Mary Everson</td>
<td>Annie E. Brown</td>
<td>Lots 33, 34 &amp; 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Annie E. Brown</td>
<td>Mary A. Everson</td>
<td>½ interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Clara and Fernando Fairchild</td>
<td>Charlton W. Crane</td>
<td>Lot 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Charlton W. Crane</td>
<td>Winefred E. Judge</td>
<td>Lot 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Duane &amp; Mary Everson, heirs</td>
<td>Annie E. Brown</td>
<td>Lots 33 &amp; 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Annie E. Brown</td>
<td>J. Romaine Brown</td>
<td>Lot 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Annie E. Brown</td>
<td>John &amp; Emma Lever and William Sidway</td>
<td>Lot 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>William Sidway &amp; Emma Lever</td>
<td>Henry Ebenreiter</td>
<td>Lot 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Henry &amp; Margaret Ebenreiter</td>
<td>Albert E. Smith</td>
<td>Lot 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Max &amp; Sophie Marx</td>
<td>204th Street Corp</td>
<td>Lot 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Winefred &amp; John Judge estate</td>
<td>Mary Dean and Fannie Welch</td>
<td>Lot 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>J. Romaine &amp; Annie Brown</td>
<td>Mary Dean and Fannie Welch</td>
<td>Lot 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Clarisse Livingston</td>
<td>Mary Dean and Fannie Welch</td>
<td>Lot 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Dyckman Heirs</td>
<td>City of New York</td>
<td>Lots 33, 34 &amp; 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of New York</td>
<td>Lot 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SCOPE OF WORK FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL TESTING
IN ADVANCE OF INSTALLATION OF
A NEW TELEPHONE LINE AT DYCKMAN HOUSE
BROADWAY AT 204TH STREET (BLOCK 2241, LOT35)
New York, New York

June 23, 2003
SCOPE OF WORK FOR
ARCHAEOLOGICAL TESTING IN ADVANCE OF INSTALLATION OF
A NEW TELEPHONE LINE AT DYCKMAN HOUSE
BROADWAY AT 204TH STREET (BLOCK 2241, LOT 35)
MANHATTAN, NEW YORK

June 23, 2003

The New York City Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) is planning to install a new telephone line in the New York City Landmark Dyckman House property in Manhattan, which has the potential for affecting below ground archaeological resources. Therefore this Scope of Work addresses the archaeological potential in specific area of the planned phone line trench (see attached schematic). All activities indicated below shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission’s Guidelines for Archaeological Work in New York City (2002) and the New York Archaeological Council’s Standards for Cultural Resources Investigations and the Curation of Archaeological Collections in New York State (1993). All archeological fieldwork will be done under the direction of Linda Stone, RPA.

The planned trench for the phone line is to be eighteen inches deep and twelve inches wide. The exact length cannot be determined from the attached schematic, however it is likely between 100 and 150 feet long in total. No archaeological documentary study of the property has been completed at this time, therefore it is unclear what potential resources may be identified. Preliminary review of the LPC Designation Report and the Historic Structure Report as well as discussion with the site curator, Laura Chmielewski, indicate there is potential to identify the location of previous outbuildings. However the site curator feels the area most likely has been previously disturbed. Because of the uncertainties associated with archaeological excavation in the absence of a documentary study it seems most advisable to conduct a site visit prior to fieldwork. This is recommended for Tuesday, June 24. Provided this visit indicates what is expected, the following field strategy will be implemented.

A series of 25-foot interval shovel tests is recommended along the entire length of the planned trench. Should these tests confirm disturbance is extant throughout the length of the trench, no further archaeological field investigations will be recommended. However should there be no disturbance and no archaeological features identified, monitoring of the contractor’s trench excavations will be done. It may be possible to conduct testing and monitoring in the same day since the trench length and depth are not great.

Archaeological monitoring of the contractor’s excavations will involve the archaeologist being present during construction excavations and having the authority to temporarily halt these excavations to record potential archaeological resources should they be uncovered. The length of time needed to record such resources will be dependent on what is found. However, in this case, construction work stoppages should not exceed one hour and may only require a matter of minutes. Possible measures which could be taken include selectively screening some soils, recovering artifacts, measuring locations of potential artifacts and/or features and taking photographs. Whether or not the excavations are temporarily halted to accommodate archaeological documentation, the archaeologist will require access to the completed excavations to document the stratigraphy of the trench. This examination may take up to one hour. The archaeologist will take photographs and measurements of the trench and may also draw profiles and screen some of the soil.

Should potentially significant archaeological resources be encountered in either the shovel test pits
or the monitored trench, a plan to mitigate the impacts to the features would be made. Such recommendations would be commensurate with the significance of the find and potential for impact to the resource. This additional evaluation of archaeological resources would define their significance and extent within the planned impacts. The consultant would develop a research design and scope of work for archaeological data recovery, analysis, and curation, based upon the findings from the documentary record and archaeological field testing. Should results of this monitoring program reveal no finding of effect or impact to significant archaeological remains, then no further archaeological work would be recommended.

A brief end of field letter will be prepared upon completion of the archaeological testing described in this scope. A complete written report to the New York City Parks Department and the Landmarks Preservation Commission setting forth the results will be completed within one month of the end of fieldwork. The report shall indicate the methodologies of archaeological excavation and the results of the testing and possible monitoring. It shall also include; a record of stratigraphy within tests, a complete catalogue of artifacts recovered, and an assessment of the locations of intact archaeological resources for which data recovery, if needed, is recommended. Map(s) at a scale of at least 1" = 20' will be provided indicating results from such investigations with locations investigated and showing locations of archaeological resources should they have been identified.
Appendix C

SHOVEL TEST STRATIGRAPHY
# DYCKMAN FARMHOUSE SHOVEL TEST STRATIGRAPHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>LEV</th>
<th>DEPTH</th>
<th>MUNSELL</th>
<th>COLOR</th>
<th>TEXTURE</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DISCARDED IN FIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10YR 2/1</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 oyster shell frags, peanut, screw, concrete, 3 metal tacks, 1 faunal bone frag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>10YR 4/2</td>
<td>dark gray brown</td>
<td>clayey loam</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 clear glass, tack, 3 corroded nails, 2 oyster shell frags, 1 square shank nail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10YR 6/6</td>
<td>brownish yellow</td>
<td>mottled loam</td>
<td>excavated with level 3.5 slope down toward east, cap at base</td>
<td>1 flat glass, 1 porcelain sherd see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10YR 3/2</td>
<td>very dark gray brown</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10YR 3/3</td>
<td>dark brown</td>
<td>loamy sand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>10YR 3/1</td>
<td>very dark gray</td>
<td>loam with root mat</td>
<td>2 inch pipe found in bas of pit running in east/west direction at 1.4 feet below ground surface</td>
<td>peanuts, 1 corroded nail, peanuts, 3 glass, 15 corroded nails, 2 shell frags, 1 cow rib frag, 2 coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10YR 3/3</td>
<td>dark brown</td>
<td>slightly clayey loam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>10YR 3/1</td>
<td>very dark gray</td>
<td>soil</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 oyster frags, 1 clear glass, 1 nail, 1 faunal bone frag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>10YR 3/1</td>
<td>very dark gray</td>
<td>silty loam</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 flower pot sherd, 1 nail, 2 oyster shell, 1 clear flat glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10YR 4/4</td>
<td>dark yellowish brown</td>
<td>mottled loamy silt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10YR 5/6</td>
<td>yellowish brown</td>
<td>fine sand</td>
<td>2 inch pipe about one foot below ground surface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10YR 3/1</td>
<td>very dark gray</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td></td>
<td>slag, 1 modern glass, cinders, 1 flat glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>10YR 3/1</td>
<td>very dark gray</td>
<td>smaller gravel</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 clam frags, 2 flat glass, 6 curved glass, 5 oyster, 4 nais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10YR 3/1</td>
<td>very dark gray</td>
<td>ash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10YR 4/3</td>
<td>brown/dark brown</td>
<td>sandy silt</td>
<td>in gravel path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10YR 3/1</td>
<td>very dark gray</td>
<td>clayey loam</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 flower pot sherds, 2 flat glass, foil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>10YR 4/3</td>
<td>brown/dark brown</td>
<td>clayey sand</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 clam, 1 brick frag, 2 coal, 1 nail, 1 slate, 1 clear glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10YR 4/3</td>
<td>brown/dark brown</td>
<td>silty clay</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 coal, 1 brick frag</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

ARTIFACT INVENTORY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test #</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>refined</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>small part of red decoration</td>
<td>1828-early 20th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>earthenware</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>hand; mocha?</td>
<td>1790s-1930s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whiteware</td>
<td></td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>early 19th C.-1900+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whiteware</td>
<td></td>
<td>white</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>mends; burned</td>
<td>early 19th C.-1900+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum for Ceramic (4 records) = 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>curved</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>mends; molded</td>
<td>1867-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
<td>buckle</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>belt buckle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum for Metal (1 record) = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number of Artifacts for Test 1.1 (6 records) = 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>redware</td>
<td>red</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>manganese glaze both sides</td>
<td>1775-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>refined</td>
<td></td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>spall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>earthenware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum for Ceramic (2 records) = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>bottle</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>small piece of red/white paper label</td>
<td>late 19th C.-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum for Glass (1 record) = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
<td>nail</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>whole; square shank; 2 5/8&quot;; corroded</td>
<td>1798-c.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum for Metal (1 record) = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number of Artifacts for Test 1.2 (4 records) = 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>refined</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>blue transfer print</td>
<td>c.1780-early 20th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>earthenware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum for Ceramic (1 record) = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number of Artifacts for Test 1.4 (1 record) = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>refined</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>partial makers mark &quot;MAESTR.../&quot;MADE IN...&quot;</td>
<td>early 19th C.-1900+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>earthenware</td>
<td>handle</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum for Ceramic (2 records) = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>refined</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 brown bands underglaze interior; 1 brown band underglaze exterior</td>
<td>c.1800-1830s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>earthenware</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>mends; spalls</td>
<td>early 19th C.-1900+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whiteware</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>spall</td>
<td>early 19th C.-1900+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum for Ceramic (3 records) = 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>refined</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>whole; round shank; 2 3/4&quot;; corroded</td>
<td>c.1890-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>nail</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum for Ceramic (3 records) = 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test #</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>nail</td>
<td>whole; square shank; 2 1/2&quot;; corroded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1798-c.1890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>nail</td>
<td></td>
<td>whole; square shank; 2 3/4&quot;; corroded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1798-c.1890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>nail</td>
<td></td>
<td>whole; square shank; 3&quot;; corroded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1798-c.1890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>nail</td>
<td></td>
<td>whole; square shank; corroded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1798-c.1890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum for Metal (5 records) = 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number of Artifacts for Test 2.2 (8 records) = 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>earthenware</td>
<td>buff</td>
<td>clear glaze interior; light mustard glaze exterior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>c.1830-1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white granite</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1840s-c.1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whiteware</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>spalls</td>
<td>early 19th C.-1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum for Ceramic (3 records) = 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>redware</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>spall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>c.1750-1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stoneware</td>
<td>gray</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>mends; Albany slip</td>
<td>c.1800-early 20th C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white granite</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>mends</td>
<td>1840s-c.1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whiteware</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>early 19th C.-1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum for Ceramic (4 records) = 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>bottle</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>mends; molded; embossed &quot;TRADE&quot;</td>
<td>1867-present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bottle</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>molded, embossed &quot;...ORK&quot;</td>
<td>1867-present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum for Glass (2 records) = 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number of Artifacts for Test 4.4 (6 records) = 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>kaolin smoking pipe stem</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>spall</td>
<td>1840s-c.1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>refined earthenware</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white granite</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum for Ceramic (3 records) = 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>pearlware</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1779-1820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whiteware</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>early 19th C.-1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum for Ceramic (2 records) = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>yellowware</td>
<td>buff</td>
<td>mends; blue and white hand exterior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1830-1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test #</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>creamware</td>
<td>tea cup base</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1762-1820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>ironstone</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>early 19thC.-present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mocha</td>
<td></td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>c.1797-1890s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pearlware</td>
<td></td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1779-1820+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pearlware</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1779-1820+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>refined earthenware</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>blue transfer print both sides</td>
<td>c.1780-early 20th C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>refined earthenware</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>blue underglaze decoration</td>
<td>c.1780-1840s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>refined earthenware</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>green shell edge; scalloped</td>
<td>c.1780-early 20th C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>refined earthenware</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1770s-1840s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>salt glazed stoneware</td>
<td>lid</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1790s-1810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stoneware</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>gray</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1720s-present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white granite</td>
<td></td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1840s-c.1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white granite</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1840s-c.1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum for Ceramic (14 records) = 20
Total Number of Artifacts for Test Trench 3 (14 records) = 20
Total Artifacts Recovered = 69