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Executive Summary

PROJECT GOAL:
The goal of this Phase 1A Archaeological Documentary Study is to determine the likelihood that potential archaeological resources have survived the destructive forces of time including agricultural use, the cutting of streets, the installation of utilities, and the construction of buildings. The entire APE was to be investigated in order to identify the project area’s original topography, its precontact and historic usage and/or occupancy, past disturbance, and potential impacts.

SHPO PROJECT REVIEW NUMBER:
n/a

INVOLVED AGENCIES:
Maspeth Development, LLC

PHASE OF SURVEY:
Phase 1A Archaeological Documentary Study

LOCATION:
Maspeth, Queens County, New York

SURVEY AREA:
Block 2167, Lots 1 and 27

USGS 7.5 MINUTE QUADRANGLE MAP:
Located on the Brooklyn quadrangle.

PRECONTACT SENSITIVITY ASSESSMENT
In general, precontact sites are found near water courses, fresh water, and areas of high elevation. All three conditions were found in the immediate vicinity of the project area. The Maspeth and Newtown Creeks, located approximately 700 feet to the west, would have provided ample marine resources for the Native Americans to exploit. Multiple small freshwater ponds were also located in the vicinity (Stankowski 1977). Finally, the project site is located at the top of a tall hill, which would have allowed Native Americans a better vantage point from which to spot approaching game. Four precontact archaeological sites have been identified within a one-mile radius of the project area, three of which are habitation sites. It is for these reasons that the LPC has noted this area as having “higher than average” sensitivity for the recovery of precontact archaeological remains (Boesch 1997).
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Therefore, the Saint Saviour’s Church site is determined to have high potential for the recovery of precontact archaeological resources in the areas not disturbed during the construction of the church and its associated buildings (Figure 21).

HISTORIC SENSITIVITY ASSESSMENT

No evidence was uncovered which would suggest that the project area was important to European settlers until the mid-19th century, although it may have been used for agriculture. While it is certain that Saint Saviour’s Church was constructed in 1848, the date of construction of its rectory is uncertain. Documentary sources suggest that the land that was donated by James Maurice in the late 1840s for the establishment of the church contained a house located at the northwest corner of present-day 57th Drive and 58th Street, in the location of the present rectory building, which became the parsonage (QTBHF #138). However, several historic maps, including the 1873 Beers atlas (Figure 11) and an 1853 map of the Robert Furman property (Figure 7) do not show a structure in this location; 58th Street had not even been constructed yet and 57th Drive did not yet cross into the area.

The Beers atlas instead indicates the presence of a small structure just south of the church, much farther west than the present building. While this map does not appear to be completely accurate — it suggests that the church was angled northeast-southwest in the corner of the lot, when it actually runs fairly parallel to the cross streets on either side of it — it is possible that a different rectory structure was located in the currently unoccupied southwest quadrant of Block 2167. Therefore, it is also possible that archaeological resources relating to this structure — including foundation walls and domestic shaft features such as privies, wells, and cisterns — could be present in that area. The rectory building standing on the property today, which first appears in its current location on the 1891 Bromley atlas (Figure 13) would also most likely have domestic shaft features; especially since it was constructed in the mid- to late-19th century, before water and sewer lines appear in the area (see Chapter V).

It is difficult to determine where privies associated with the rectory could have been located because of its close proximity to 58th Street and 57th Drive, the church itself, and the steep hill to the west. It is also difficult to determine the location of the building’s original front entrance. The current address is on 58th Street. However, if the building is the one donated by Maurice in the 1840s, 58th Street would not yet have been constructed and, therefore, the front of the building would probably have faced south, where it appears to face today. Any privies would most likely have been near the western or northern sides of the building, away from the street and the front of the building but also at a distance from the church. It is also possible that St. Saviour’s church had a privy or privies for the convenience of parishioners or Sunday school students. Since the western side of the church was the original entrance, it is reasonable to surmise that any privies, if they existed, would have been situated in the original rear yard, off the church’s eastern side (Figure 21).

The renovations to the rectory that began in 2002 appear to have disturbed large sections of the ground surrounding the building. The heaviest disturbance was near the 58th Street side of the rectory building, although there was additional disturbance near 57th Road. This disturbance was consistent with building construction/renovation activities such as might have occurred during the recent construction/renovation of the rectory. Piles of dirt are visible around the exterior and it appears that some clearing had taken place prior to or during construction/renovation. In addition, building records indicate that the building had been connected to a cesspool that was emptied and filled with clean fill in 2003, at which time the building was connected to the city sewer system. However, the cesspool’s location is not given and it does not appear on building
plans provided by the Department of Buildings. Court records related to a 2004 dispute between the church and the contractor who completed the renovations indicated that “water pipes [were attached] to outside sources” as well (Queens County Supreme Court 2004). This could be an additional explanation for some of the disturbance surrounding the structure.

Additional disturbance may have been caused during the installation of a fire-suppression system in 1997. Plans provided by the QDOB suggest that utilities were installed near the southeast corner of 57th Road and 58th Street. The depth or extent of any disturbance this may have caused is not immediately apparent. Just south of that area, an early 20th century garage had once stood, which was torn down in the late-20th century.

Therefore, the Saint Saviour’s Church property is determined to have moderate to high sensitivity for the recovery of historic period archaeological resources (Figure 21). The apparently undisturbed area south of the church building and west of the rectory may contain the structural remains of a former parsonage or rectory building as well as possible domestic shaft features (i.e. privies, cisterns, and wells) associated with either the church or the rectory or both. The northeast portion of the property, while possibly partially disturbed by the installation of the fire suppression system and the construction of a garage building may also contain similar shaft resources, although it is less likely. There do not appear to have been any historic structures in the northwest corner of the property and because the church’s original entrance faced this direction, it is extremely unlikely that privies, etc. would have been located there.

POTENTIAL FOR THE RECOVERY OF HUMAN REMAINS

Although it has been suggested by community activists and preservation groups that the churchyard surrounding Saint Saviour’s Church was once used for human interments, no documentary evidence has been found to support this theory. While historic maps and atlases depict cemeteries and burial grounds associated with other churches in Queens, none depicts a graveyard on the Saint Saviour’s property. No historical documentation—including maps, local histories, photos, or deeds—was uncovered which could confirm that human burials took place on the property. No visible evidence of a cemetery, such as grave markers, was identified during a site visit to the property.

It is likely that one of several burial grounds which were once located nearby is being confused with a burial ground on the Saint Saviour’s Church property. A family burial ground associated with the Mott, Way, and Furman families was located near the northwest corner of Maspeth Avenue and the former 57th Street, now Rust Street, to the northwest of the project area (John Milner Associates 2002, Powell 1932). Another nearby church, Saint Stanislaus’ Roman Catholic Church, was constructed at Maspeth Avenue and 61st Street on top of an old Quaker burial ground (Stankowski 1977). As per Quaker tradition, none of the graves had been marked and when the new church was built, many skeletal remains were discovered. In addition, Saint Saviour’s Church is misidentified as “Saint James Protestant Episcopal Church” on several early 20th century atlases, including the 1903 Belcher-Hyde atlas (Figure 16) and the 1909 Bromley atlas (not pictured). Saint James Church is actually located approximately 2 miles northeast of Saint Saviour’s, in the Elmhurst section of Queens. That church, which was built in 1848, around the same time that Saint Saviour’s Church was constructed, is surrounded by a small cemetery with stones dating between 1805 and 1934 (Inskeep 2000).

The entrance canopy erected by the San Sung Korean Methodist Church of New York reads “catacombs,” however, the Korean characters written across it can be translated as “prayer tunnel” or “prayer cave.” It appears that prayer in an enclosed space or cave temple is a Korean
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Buddhist tradition that has been adapted by the ministry and parishioners of the San Sung Korean Methodist Church. Several neatly kept sheds are located to the rear of the property (Photograph 1) as well as a small room in the church basement, which may have been constructed as a surrogate for more traditional prayer caves, such as those seen in Figure 22. No documentary evidence of any other underground caves or tunnels was uncovered nor did the field visit produce such evidence.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Further study in the form of Phase 1B testing is recommended in order to identify any precontact and historic archaeological resources which may be present within the Saint Saviour's Church property. Such testing could confirm the presence or absence of an additional structure, such as the early rectory, located in the currently undeveloped area to the south of the church, as well as shaft features associated with the church and its related buildings. It could also determine the degree to which the area was used by Native Americans and for what purposes.
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Chapter I: Introduction

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW

AKRF, Inc. has been contracted by Maspeth Development, LLC to perform cultural resource services for a proposed development project. The site covers Block 2671, Lots 1 and 27 which is bounded by Rust Street, 57th Drive, 58th Street, and 57th Road in the Maspeth neighborhood of Queens (Figure 1). The project area, or Area of Potential Effect (APE), includes Block 2671, Lots 1 and 27 in their entirety (Figure 2).

The proposed design for the new housing project which would be built on the site has not yet been finalized. At this time, the property, which is currently occupied by the former Saint Saviour’s Church—which was the home of the San Sung Korean Methodist Church of New York between 1997 and 2005—a Sunday school, and an associated rectory building, is expected to be rezoned for residential use. The lot would be redeveloped to include a series of 2- and 3-family houses.

The following Phase lA Archaeological Documentary Study of the Saint Saviour’s Church property has been designed to satisfy the requirements of the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) and it follows the guidelines of the New York Archaeological Council (NYAC).

The study documents the history of Saint Saviour’s Church as well as its potential to yield archaeological resources including precontact remains, physical remnants of 17th and 18th century agricultural activities, and 19th and 20th century archaeological resources pertaining to the construction and use of Saint Saviour’s Church. In addition, it also documents the current conditions of the project area and previous cultural resource investigations which have taken place in the vicinity of the APE.

B. RESEARCH GOALS AND METHODOLOGY

The goal of this Phase lA Archaeological Documentary Study is to determine the likelihood that potential archaeological resources have survived the destructive forces of time and landscape manipulation including agricultural use, landfilling activities, the cutting of streets, the installation of utilities, and the construction of buildings. The entire APE was to be investigated in order to identify the project area’s original topography, its precontact and historic usage and/or occupancy, past disturbance, and potential impacts.

As part of the background research, published and unpublished resources were consulted at various information repositories, such as the Humanities and Social Sciences Branch of the New York Public Library (including the local history and map divisions), the LPC, the Long Island Division of the Queens Public Library, the Queens Borough Office of the Register of the City of New York, the Queens Department of Buildings, the Queens Topographical Bureau, and the New York City Department of Environmental Protection Bureau of Water and Sewers. Attempts were made to gain access to the church records, however, a representative from the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Long Island explained that the records, which consist of incomplete church
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registers, are not open to the public and can only be searched by an employee of the Diocese. The representative further explained that the church records would most likely not provide significant historical information and would not indicate the presence of a burial ground on the church property and would mostly provide information genealogical in nature.

File searches were conducted at the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (OPRHP), the LPC, and the New York State Museum (NYSM) to determine if precontact or historic sites had been reported within a half-mile of the project area.

The background research included a site inspection, analysis of primary sources including historic maps, deeds, census records, historic street directories, utilities installation records, land and tax photographs, and newspaper articles, as well as secondary sources such as local histories.

The background research was analyzed in order to formulate recommendations for future archaeological work and/or research.

C. PROJECT TEAM

This Phase IA Archaeological Documentary Study was managed by Diane Dallal, M.A., R.P.A. who provided oversight and editorial assistance. Elizabeth D. Meade, M.A. conducted the majority of the research and writing for this report. Additional research assistance was provided by Molly McDonald, M.A., and Elizabeth Martin, M.A. (ABD).

A site visit was made to Saint Saviour’s Church on May 30, 2006 by archaeologists Diane Dallal and Eugene Reyes. Photographs were taken of the buildings and grounds by Ms. Dallal (Photographs 1-10).
Chapter II: Environmental/Physical Setting

A. GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

The borough of Queens is found within a geographic bedrock region known as the Atlantic Coastal Plain. This has been described as "that portion of the former submerged continental shelf which has been raised above the sea without apparent deformation" (Reeds 1925: 3). In contrast to the metamorphic and sedimentary rock that makes up the majority of the New York City region, Long Island, including Queen's County, is composed of glacial till or undifferentiated sediments (New York State Office for Technology [NYSOFT] 2004).

The majority of Queens is composed of unconsolidated gravels and clays that date from 100 million years ago to the present. All of Long Island is covered with layers of outwash sand and gravel, glacial till, till moraine, kame moraine, and Barrier island deposits (NYSOFT 2004).

These deposits were left behind by massive glaciers of up to 1,000 feet thick that retreated from the area towards the end of the Pleistocene. There were four major glaciations that affected present-day New York City until roughly 12,000 years ago when the Wisconsin period—the last glacial period—came to an end. During the ice age, a glacial moraine bisected western Long Island, running in a northeast-southwest direction (Hornberger 1994). The glacial movements also brought about the creation of hundreds of sand hills, or kames, some of which were nearly one hundred feet high. These hills were amidst many small streams, rivers, and lakes that were fed by the glacial runoff. As temperatures increased, these small water courses evolved into swamps and marshlands.

The original topographic setting of Queens was quite unlike the one found there today. Two large glacial moraines—the Harbor Hill Moraine, which runs across the northern half of Long Island, and the Ronkonkoma Moraine, which is to the south—formed a dam of sorts, which trapped the glacial runoff and formed Lake Flushing, a large glacial lake that covered most of Queens and northern New York City (John Milner Associates, Inc. 2002). However, as the glacial runoff decreased most of the area's bodies of water were transformed into wetlands and marshes traversed by smaller streams and rivers. In the Maspeth area of Queens, Lake Flushing became a large wet area, Flushing Meadows, drained by the Newtown Creek—originally known as the Maspeth Kill (Figure 4)—the eastern branch of which, also known as Maspeth Creek, ran near the project area. The northwestern side of the creek was historically known as the Dutch Kills, while the southeastern portion was known as the English Kills (Riker 1852).

The project area is situated near the top of a steep hill that appears on topographic maps (Figure 12) to be approximately 30 feet above Mean Sea Level. The highest elevations are along the northern side of the block, where the church is located, and the site slopes down towards the south.

B. PALEOENVIRONMENT

Due to the extended glacial period that left the Northeast blanketed in thick ice sheets for thousands of years, the area was not inhabited by humans until approximately 11,000 years ago. As temperatures increased, a variety of flora and fauna spread through the region. At this time,
large open forests of spruce, fir, pine, and other tree species expanded across the Northeast, interspersed with open meadows and marshland. A wide variety of animal life could also be found, including large mammals such as mammoth, mastodon, caribou, musk ox, moose, as well as smaller mammals such as fox, beaver, hare, and many kinds of marine animals.

Climate changes continued to re-shape the environment of the Northeast as time progressed. As the climate grew increasingly warmer, jack pine, fir, spruce and birch trees were replaced with hardwood forests of red and white pine, oak, and beech (Ritchie 1980). By the time of the Early Archaic period, beginning approximately 10,000 BP, there was “considerable environmental diversity, with a mosaic of wetlands, oak stands, and a variety of other plant resources...[making it]...an attractive and hospitable quarter for both human and animal populations” (Cantwell and Wall 2001: 53).

Warmer temperatures forced the herds of large mammals to travel north before eventually dying out. The new surroundings attracted other animals such as rabbit, turkey, waterfowl, bear, turtles, and white-tailed deer. The expanded water courses became home to a variety of marine life, including many varieties of fish, clams, oysters, scallops, seals, and porpoises, among others (Cantwell and Wall 2001).

By 5,000 BP, sea levels were only a few meters away from their current locations (Hunter Research 1996) and the modern climate in the northeast was established by approximately 2000 BP (Louis Berger & Associates, Inc. 2001). By that time, the Native American population was flourishing in the area and had developed an intricate culture tied to the natural resources of the region (see Chapter III).

C. CURRENT CONDITIONS

Both natural forces and the actions of humans have permanently changed the geographic setting of Queens. Beginning in the mid-19th century, the area became heavily industrial. As a result, the marshlands were filled in and the nearby creeks were dredged and bulk-headed (AKRF, Inc. 1991).

Several structures currently occupy the property (Figure 21), a church building, a Sunday school with addition, and a recently renovated building that was formerly used as a rectory. In recent months, demolition on the property was halted, although the church has been stripped of the white wood clapboard siding that once characterized it (Figure 20, Photographs 1-9).

The church and Sunday school are situated on a hill that slopes sharply towards the south. Several individual frame prayer sheds were scattered about the site. They were believed to be equipment sheds at first but upon further examination, it was determined that they are small, enclosed spaces used for reflection and meditation. These prayer “caves” are presumed to be associated with the Korean Methodist Church that occupied the church property from 1997 to 2005 (See Chapter IV for further discussion).

Also in the tradition of prayer “caves,” the church basement contained a small, white, room with a window that overlooked a stone wall, possibly the base of an old chimney or foundation wall. The ground is covered with thick overgrowth in most areas and large piles of dirt surround the rectory building, presumably the results of the structure’s recent renovation. Some construction debris was observed at the base of the hill along the western edge of the property including a

---

1 They were clean and did not exhibit usage that would be associated with the storage of equipment.
large boulder with several drill holes. An old stone and concrete wall surrounds the property along 57th Road.

D. PREVIOUSLY CONDUCTED CULTURAL RESOURCE INVESTIGATIONS WITHIN ONE MILE OF THE PROJECT AREA

Several previously conducted cultural resource studies within one mile of the project area (Table II-1) indicate that the project area was situated within a region that is highly sensitive for precontact and, to a lesser extent, historic period archaeological resources. Archaeological sensitivity will be discussed in more detail in Chapters III and IV.

Table II-1
Previously Conducted Cultural Resource Investigations Within One Mile of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Columbia University Archaeological Investigations at the Onderdonck House in Ridgewood, Queens</td>
<td>Between Flushing Avenue, Onderdonck Avenue, and Troutman Street.</td>
<td>Archaeological testing uncovered a variety of historic period artifacts.</td>
<td>Happel (1975), Solecki (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1A Cultural Resources Survey, Long Island Expressway Improvement Project</td>
<td>Long Island Expressway, from Maurice Avenue to the Grand Central Parkway</td>
<td>Western portion of the project area determined to be sensitive for precontact archaeological resources.</td>
<td>Pickman (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1A Archaeological Sensitivity Report: Resource Recovery project, Maspeth site</td>
<td>In the area bounded by Maspeth and Newtown Creeks and 48th Street</td>
<td>Determined that the project area was not sensitive for precontact or historic archaeological resources.</td>
<td>Historical Perspectives, Inc. (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New York City Long Range Sludge Management Plan, Stage 1A Archaeological Assessment</td>
<td>In the area bounded by Maspeth and Newtown Creeks and 48th Street</td>
<td>Determined that the project area was not sensitive for precontact or historic archaeological resources.</td>
<td>Historical Perspectives, Inc. (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Archaeological Sensitivity Phelps Dodge Site: Long Range Sludge Management Plan, GEIS III</td>
<td>In the area bounded by 48th Street on the east, Maspeth Creek on the south, 57th Ave on the north, and 43rd Street on the west.</td>
<td>Site determined to be sensitive for precontact archaeological resources.</td>
<td>AKRF, Inc (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Harbor Freight Movement Phase 1a Archaeological Assessment; Proposed Maspeth Rail Yard</td>
<td>In the area bounded by Grand Avenue on the east, Newtown and Maspeth Creeks on the south, the Cross Island Expressway on the north, and Laurel Hill Boulevard Street on the west.</td>
<td>Site determined to be sensitive for both precontact and historic period archaeological resources, but due to extensive layers of fill present, no further work was recommended, as archaeological resources would be protected.</td>
<td>John Milner Associates, Inc. (2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: The files of OPRHP and LPC, Boesch (1997)
Chapter III: Precontact and Contact Period Resources

A. INTRODUCTION

Archaeologists have divided the time between the arrival of the first humans in northeastern North America and the arrival of Europeans more than 10,000 years later into three precontact periods: Paleo-Indian (11,000-10,000 BP), Archaic (10,000-2,700 BP), and Woodland (2,700 BP–AD 1500). These divisions are based on certain changes in environmental conditions, technological advancements, and cultural adaptations, which are observable in the archaeological record.

B. PALEO-INDIAN PERIOD (11,000-10,000 BP)

As mentioned in Chapter II, human populations did not inhabit the Northeast until the glaciers retreated some 11,000 years ago. These new occupants included Native American populations referred to as Paleo-Indians, the forbearers of the Delaware—also called the Lenape Indians—who would inhabit the land in later years.

The Paleo-Indians most likely exploited the various resources provided by their environment, described in Chapter II. It has been suggested that they did not only actively hunt the large mammals that roamed about the region (mammoths, mastodons, etc.), but they also hunted and trapped smaller animals and supplemented their diet with fish and gathered plants (Cantwell and Wall 2001).

There was a very distinct Paleo-Indian style of lithic technology, typified by fluted points. These were elaborately detailed stone points that would have been used for a variety of functions, most notably for hunting. They were often made of high-quality imported chert, but were also known to have been crafted from local materials. Other stone tools manufactured at this time included knives, scrapers, drills, and gravers. Wood, ivory, and other materials were also used for the manufacture of composite tools, such as hunting spears.

Archaeological evidence suggests that the Paleo-Indians were highly mobile hunters and gatherers. They appear to have lived in small groups of fewer than 50 individuals (Dincauze 2000) and did not maintain permanent campsites. In addition, most of the Paleo-Indian sites that have been investigated were located near water sources.

It is because of the close proximity of Paleo-Indian sites to the coastline that so few of them have been preserved in the New York City area. As the glaciers continued to melt, sea levels rose and much of what was once adjacent to the water line became submerged. Of the few Paleo-Indian sites that have been discovered in New York City, most have been found on Staten Island. One such site is that of Port Mobil, on the southwest coast of Staten Island. Like most precontact sites, this location is situated on high ground overlooking the water. Because of heavy disturbance in the area — it is currently an oil tank farm — the site has yielded nothing more than a collection of fluted points and other stone tools characteristic of the period (Ritchie 1980). Paleo-Indian artifacts were also found along the eroding shore line 500 yards south of the Port Mobil site (Ibid) and at the Cutting site in the Rossville section of Staten Island (AKRF, Inc.)
One Paleo-Indian fluted point was discovered in eastern Queens, near Little Neck Bay (Boesch 1997).

C. ARCHAIC PERIOD (10,000-2,700 BP)

The Archaic has been sub-divided into three chronological segments, based on trends identified in the archaeological record which reflect not only the ecological transformations that occurred during the Archaic, but the cultural changes as well. These have been termed the Early Archaic (10,000 -8,000 BP), the Middle Archaic (8,000 – 6,000 BP) and the Late Archaic (6,000 – 2,700 BP) (Cantwell and Wall 2001). The Late Archaic is sometimes further divided to include the Terminal Archaic period (3,000-2,700 BP) as well.

The aforementioned environmental transformations included the continued post-glacial warming trend, the expansion of hardwood forests, and a decrease in glacial runoff which resulted in the creation of lakes and smaller bodies of water. There was a subsequent migration of new animal and plant species into the area, while the herds of large mammals traveled north, eventually dying out. The new surroundings attracted smaller animals, such as rabbit, turkey, waterfowl, and white-tailed deer.

As the Archaic period progressed and the number of plant and animal species inhabiting the area increased, the size of the human population increased as well. Archaeological evidence indicates that Archaic Native American sites were usually located near water sources. The abundance of food resources which arose during this period allowed the Archaic Native Americans to occupy individual sites on a permanent or semi-permanent basis, unlike their nomadic Paleo-Indian predecessors. These individuals migrated on a seasonal basis within specific territories and consistently returned to and reoccupied the same sites.

The arrival of new food sources allowed the human population to expand their subsistence strategies, but at the same time forced them to develop different technologies that would allow such resources to be exploited. Perhaps the most important of these developments was the advent of fishing technology, which occurred during the Middle Archaic in response to an increasing dependence on the area’s marine resources. The new technology included stone hooks and net sinkers. In addition, the influx of nut- and seed-bearing foliage resulted in the development of stone mortars and pestles as well as stone axes, used to process plant material.

In order to successfully hunt the smaller game animals that had established themselves in the region, narrower spear points and knives were manufactured, along with weighted spear throwers. Domestic technology was advanced as well, with the development of a wider variety of hide scrapers and, later in the period, the origin of bowls made from steatite or soapstone. Tools continued to be crafted in part from foreign lithic materials, indicating that there was consistent trade among Archaic Native American groups from various regions in North America throughout the Archaic.

Once again, due to rising sea levels and to the rapid development of the area, few Early or Middle Archaic sites have been identified in New York City. Most of those that have been identified are located on Staten Island, including Ward’s Point, Richmond Hill, the H. F. Hollowell site, and the Old Place site. Sites such as Ward’s Point -- a domestic habitation location which due to lowered sea levels was originally inland -- tend to be deeply stratified and have yielded stone tools related to activities such as cooking, woodworking, and hide processing. The many years of constant occupation caused the artifacts to be deeply buried under newer debris deposits (Cantwell and Wall 2001). The majority of Middle Archaic sites found by
professional and avocational archaeologists consist of large shell middens, which are often found near major water courses such as the Hudson River, although stone points have also been found in such locations. These sites were in great danger of obliteration because of their proximity to the shrinking coastlines. The only known Early or Middle Archaic Native American archaeological remains uncovered in Queens were, like the Paleo-Indian resources, identified near Little Neck Bay (Boesch 1997).

Unlike the Early and Middle periods, many Late Archaic sites have been found throughout the New York City area including many in Queens. Archaic habitation sites are often found near Queens' shoreline or low-lying areas near streams and estuaries, where the Native Americans probably lived during the summer months; their cold-weather camps would have been inland (Boesch 1997). These sites represented temporary occupations, and therefore would not typically have included permanent features such as structures or burial grounds (Ibid).

In addition, many Terminal Archaic sites from all across the city have provided examples of the Orient culture, which is characterized by long fishtail stone points and soapstone bowls. There have been extremely elaborate Orient burial sites found on eastern Long Island, but none have been identified in Queens. Terminal Archaic sites in Queens are also commonly located along the shore or near water courses, with smaller sites inland (Boesch 1997).

D. WOODLAND PERIOD (2,700 BP-AD 1500)

The Woodland period represents a cultural revolution of sorts for the Northeast. During this time, Native Americans once again began to alter their way of life, focusing on a settled, agricultural lifestyle rather than one of nomadic hunting and gathering. Social rituals begin to become visible in the archaeological record and there have been many elaborate human and canine burial sites identified from this period. The first evidence of smoking has also been found—stone pipes have been uncovered at Woodland sites—and it was at this time that pottery began to be produced.

In general, there was a greater emphasis placed on composite tools during the Woodland period. While stone scrapers, knives, and hammerstones were still in use, there was an increased use of bone, shell, and wood in tool making. Furthermore, the development of bows and arrows revolutionized hunting practices. Fishing continued to be important to the local economy and wooden boats and bone hooks were often utilized (Historical Perspectives, Inc. 2005). Tools were still made from imported materials, indicating that the trade networks established earlier were still being maintained (Cantwell and Wall 2001).

Pottery was introduced into Native American society early in the Woodland period and by the time of European contact in the 1500s, well-crafted and elaborately decorated pottery was being manufactured. Like the Archaic period, the Woodland has been divided into Early, Middle, and Late sections, which are distinguished mostly based on the style of pottery which was produced at that time. Woodland pottery had simple beginnings; the first examples were coil pots with pointed bases, which were made with grit temper. These were replaced during the Middle Woodland period by shell-tempered vessels bearing a variety of stamped and imprinted decorations. As the period drew to a close, the decorative aspect of the pottery was further augmented with the addition of intricate ornamental rims (Louis Berger Group 2004).

As mentioned above, Woodland-era sites across North America indicate that there was an overall shift toward full-time agriculture and permanently settled villages. Woodland period sites in New York City, however, indicate that the Native Americans there continued to hunt and
forage on a part-time basis. This was most likely due to the incredibly diverse environmental niches that could be found across the region at this time (Cantwell and Wall 2001, Grumet 1995). Nevertheless, Woodland societies in New York were considerably more sedentary than were their predecessors and there was some farming of maize, and probably beans, squash, and tobacco. The development of pottery, increasingly complex burial sites, and the presence of domesticated dogs are all consistent with sedentary societies, which often have a close association with a particular territory or piece of land.

Woodland sites, like those of the Paleo-Indian and Archaic periods, are usually found alongside water courses. They were often occupied for long periods of time, although there was still some seasonal migration that may have left them unoccupied for brief periods throughout the year. In Queens, Early and Middle Woodland period archaeological resources have been identified near Little Neck Bay and Captain Tilly Park (Boesch 1997). Late Woodland sites, which are more common, include the Wilkins, Clearview, Aqueduct, Oakland Lake, Sanford Neck, and Baywater sites (Ibid).

**E. CONTACT PERIOD (AD 1500-1700)**

The Woodland period ended with the arrival of the first Europeans in the early 1500s. At that time, divisions of the Munsee Indians known as the Matinecock, Canarsee, and Rockaway occupied Queens (Boesch 1997). They entered the area towards the end of the Woodland period (Ibid). The area near the head of Maspeth Creek, near where the project area is situated, was occupied by a Canarsee group known as the Maspeth (also spelled Mispat, Mepat, or Matspe), meaning “bad water place,” who maintained a village there (Grumet 1981: 28). The greater area of Newtown was known to the natives as Wandewenock, meaning “the fine land between the long streams” (Armbruster 1914: 27). Newtown Creek was originally known as Mespachtches (Grumet 1981). Contact period Native American villages were described as having bark-clad wigwams and cultivated fields (Riker 1852).

Giovanni de Verazzano was the first European to view New York in 1524. However, Henry Hudson’s expedition to New York in 1609 marked the true beginning of European occupation in the area. The Dutch gained control of the area, calling it New Netherlands, although they did not establish any significant settlements in the Maspeth area. A group of English settlers, led by dissenting clergyman Francis Doughty, who had been forced out of Massachusetts for his beliefs, were granted the Maspeth area in a 1642 patent from Dutch Director-General William Kieft (Riker 1852). It has been suggested that this particular area was chosen for the first Queens settlement because its natural topography including the Newtown and Maspeth Creeks would have allowed for a quick getaway should the Native Americans choose to attack the village (Stankowski 1977). A handful of European squatters had been living on the land before Doughty arrived (Armbruster 1914).

However, as the European population grew and required more land, the relationship between the two groups soured. The Native Americans did not share the European belief that land could be owned in perpetuity by individuals – they believed that the land should be shared amongst all people – and hostile relations quickly developed between the Natives and the Dutch government. Governor Kieft ordered a series of savage attacks in 1643, and part of the Native American’s revenge included the destruction of the Maspeth settlement (Riker 1852). The warfare was

---

1 Bolton (1975) states that the Maspeth settlement was attributed to the Rockaway Indians, thought most sources indicate that it was a Canarsee settlement.
somewhat abated in 1647, when Kieft was replaced as Director-General by Peter Stuyvesant, who brought some stability to the area. However, relations between the two groups continued to be unpredictable, and minor violent incidents occurred sporadically throughout the mid-17th century.

The way of life of the Native Americans was irrevocably changed after the establishment of European colonies in the Americas. With the introduction of European culture into the indigenous society, the way of life once maintained by the Native Americans was thoroughly and rapidly altered. European guns, cloth, kettles, glass beads, and alcohol soon became incorporated into the Native American economy. The Native Americans came to suffer a great deal from the side-effects of European colonization: disease, alcoholism, and warfare. As land in other parts of New York City was sold off to the Europeans, many displaced Native Americans relocated to Staten Island (Grumet 1981: 45).

Native Americans at first maintained the village sites they had established near water sources. As their trade with European settlers intensified, they became increasingly sedentary. In 1656, the Native Americans signed a deed which granted them Doughty's original Mispat patent -- Doughty had been forced out by his associates for declaring himself the patroon and demanding rent and other fees from those who lived in Maspeth (Riker 1852) -- for use as a hunting reservation (Figure 4). However, just ten years later, the area was bought back by the English for 76 pounds, nine shillings and the majority of the Native American population left the area, although some continued to live along the shores of the Newtown (Maspeth) Creek (Ibid).

F. PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED NATIVE AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

A review of the files at the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the New York State Museum (NYSM), the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC), and various cultural resource surveys of projects in the immediate vicinity indicated that there are four known archaeological sites within a one mile radius of the project area. Most of these sites were reported or excavated by amateur and avocational archaeologists in the early 20th century and are therefore not well documented.

The most significant of these sites (Site “A” in Table III-1 and Figure 3) is an unnamed habitation site that was directly west of the project area. This site is believed to be the Mispat village, which was described earlier as having been located at the head of the creek. This site yielded a great number of Native American artifacts including stone axes and projectile points (Boesch 1997). Several sources (Parker 1922, Boesch 1997, Grumet 1981, John Milner Associates, Inc. 2002) indicate that this site was, in part, located beneath an historic-period family burial ground located on the northwest corner of Maspeth Avenue and 56th Road, which is situated outside the project area. The family was of European descent.

The LPC precontact sensitivity model also indicates that two other habitation sites were nearby, one to the northeast (Site “B” in Table III-1 and Figure 3) and one to the southeast (Site “C” in Table III-1 and Figure 3) of the project area. Neither is described in much detail, other than the fact that kaolin pipe bowls and chert artifacts were recovered from site C. The presence of kaolin (i.e. ball clay) pipe fragments suggest that this site was, at least in part, a Contact period site since it was Europeans who first introduced clay pipes to this part of the world in the 17th century, although the styles of the pipes were first copied from Native American shapes.
Finally, an Archaic- and Woodland-era site is identified in the LPC sensitivity model to the northeast of the project area (Site “D” in Table III-1 and Figure 3). However, no additional information about this site is given, so it is unclear how the site was used.

### Table III-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key to Fig 3</th>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Approximate Distance from APE</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Additional Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>NYSM: 4536*</td>
<td>.15 miles (800 feet)</td>
<td>Woodland and Contact Period</td>
<td>Habitation Site; possibly located on &quot;Old Furman Burial Plot.&quot;</td>
<td>Parker (1922)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parker: ACPGUNS13 LPC: 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>LPC: 28</td>
<td>.57 miles (3,000 feet)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Habitation Site</td>
<td>Bolton (1922) Bolton (1934)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>LPC: 46</td>
<td>.57 miles (3,000 feet)</td>
<td>Contact Period</td>
<td>Habitation site with hearth</td>
<td>Solecki (1948, 1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>LPC: 69</td>
<td>.28 miles (1,500 feet)</td>
<td>Archaic and Woodland</td>
<td>Native American artifacts found: stone tools, shell middens, and a few ceramic sherds.</td>
<td>Wisniewski (1986); Historical Perspectives, Inc. (1986)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* John Milner Associates, Inc (2002) indicates that this site is the same as NYSM site #9447 and that NYSM site #4356 is the same as the same as site B in the table above. File searches at the NYSM and LPC did not confirm this, and the above table reflects data as presented in the NYSM and LPC sensitivity models.

**Sources:**

- The files of the New York Slate Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation, The New York State Museum, and the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (Boesch 1997);

**PRECONTACT SENSITIVITY ASSESSMENT**

In general, precontact sites are found near water courses, fresh water, and areas of high elevation. All three were found in the immediate vicinity of the project area. The Maspeth and Newtown Creeks, located approximately 700 feet to the west, would have provided ample marine resources for the Native Americans to exploit. That area was also the location of multiple small freshwater ponds (Stankowski 1977). Finally, the project site is located on the slope of a tall hill, which would have allowed Native Americans a better vantage point from which to spot approaching game. Four precontact archaeological sites have been identified within a one-mile radius of the project area, three of which are habitation sites. It is for these reasons that the LPC has noted this area as having “higher than average” sensitivity for the recovery of precontact archaeological remains (Boesch 1997).

Therefore, the Saint Saviour’s Church site is determined to have high potential for the recovery of precontact archaeological resources.

*
Chapter IV: Historic Resources

A. INTRODUCTION

New York was “discovered” by Giovanni de Verrazano in 1524 and explored by Henry Hudson in 1609, thus marking the beginning of European occupation in the area. Queens quickly became the home of the European fur trade in the New World. In 1621, the States-General in the Netherlands chartered the Dutch West India Company (WIC) to consolidate Dutch activities in the New World. It was at this time that the WIC began to purchase large tracts of land from the Native Americans. The Native Americans believed that land was for hunting and planting, and did not share the European view that it could be owned in perpetuity. In exchange for furs, entrepreneurs and government officials supplied Native Americans with a wide range of goods. These included not only conventional adornments such as finger rings, glass beads and wampum, but utilitarian objects such as axes, kettles and cloth. Merchandise from around the world arrived in New Amsterdam destined for Europeans and Native Americans alike, including Italian and Dutch dishes, glass beads from Venice, combs and clay pipes from Amsterdam, and glassware from Germany (Dallal 2004).

Director-General Kieft purchased all of Queens County from the Canarsee Indians in 1639. Shortly thereafter, settlements began to be established, albeit by English citizens fleeing religious persecution rather than the Dutch. Maspeth was the first of these to be founded, in 1642. The remainder of the county was rapidly populated and “by the mid-1660s, virtually all of modern...Queens [County] lay in European hands” (Burrows and Wallace 1999: 69). Like Queens, a large English population grew all throughout New Netherlands, and soon they outnumbered the Dutch, making it easy for them to seize the colony in 1664. Although the Dutch were able to re-take the colony, now known as New York, in 1673, they traded it back in 1674 for “the far more lucrative colony of Surinam” (Cantwell and Wall 2001: 181). New York would remain under British control for the next hundred years.

During the British period, Queens experienced significant expansion. The Dongan Charter of 1683 officially recognized it as a county and further divided it into five townships: Newtown, which includes the project area, Flushing, Jamaica, Hempstead, and Oyster Bay (the land that makes up modern Nassau County was included within Queens at that time). Although Jamaica became the county seat of Queens, Newtown became more populated due to its close proximity to Manhattan.

Under British rule, Queens' open farmland and vast coastline became essential for the production of agricultural products and for harvesting of marine resources for export the city. The colony's progress was both hindered and facilitated in the mid-18th century during the French and Indian War, which concluded in 1763. Although the region experienced the economic side effects of being at war, thousands of British armed forces were stationed throughout the New York City area, bringing money to the region while at the same time increasing its population (Burrows and Wallace 1999).
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By the late 18th century, political troubles had led to a schism between American patriots and British loyalists. Despite the fact that New Yorkers in general maintained a closer allegiance to the British throne during the American Revolution, Newtown had a small patriotic militia who aided in the failed attempt to win the city for the Americans during the Battle of Long Island (Stankowski 1977). After the retreat of General Washington after that battle, Queens became important to the British during the war, as many British troops were stationed there throughout its duration. Although many Queens residents fled to Connecticut after the British took control of the city, many more stayed and vowed to remain faithful to the crown (Burrows and Wallace 1999). Throughout the war, British soldiers were stationed throughout Queens, wreaking havoc on the private citizens by burning farms and stealing from private citizens (Stankowski 1977).

Despite the loyalty of Queens County to the British, the Americans prospered and Queens soon adapted to the new American government. Land owned by British loyalists was divided into small plots and sold off. This availability of land brought about another surge in development in what are now the outer boroughs. Queens continued to grow steadily over the next few decades, fueled by events such as the opening of the Erie Canal in 1825, the end of the Civil War in 1865, and the relocation of the Long Island Railroad headquarters to Queens in 1861 (Burrows and Wallace 1999).

It was not until the mid-19th century, however, that Queens began expanding at an astonishing rate. Between 1840 and 1880, the population of Queens tripled, echoing similar increases in Manhattan and the other future boroughs. As Manhattan’s population became denser, industries were relocated to the surrounding counties, including Queens. Maspeth, in particular, became a highly industrialized part of Queens and eventually became home to industries, including those which produced a wide array of products, including chemicals, enamel, oil cloths, military uniforms, airplane propellers, anchors, clay pipes, and blown glass (Stankowski 1977).

The region’s prosperity caused Manhattan and its surrounding counties to become increasingly co-dependent, both economically and culturally. It was therefore suggested that these counties consolidate with Manhattan under the name, New York City. With only moderate resistance from some Queens residents, the county officially became a city borough on New Year’s Day, 1898. It was at this time that the distinction was made between Queens and Nassau County, as well.

As part of the consolidated city, Queens flourished throughout the 20th century. Increased mass transit connected the boroughs and intensified their union, allowing more people to live outside of Manhattan while still having access to its varied resources. As the population exploded, the area was forced to augment its development in order to accommodate the rapidly increasing population.

In fact, between 1920 and 1960, the area of Queens increased by 8 square miles, presumably through the creation of land via landfilling along the shoreline and near the wetlands of Flushing Meadows. The remainder of the 20th century saw similar growth patterns and increasing population densities throughout New York City.

B. SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

As discussed in Chapter III, Maspeth was part of a tract of land originally granted to the Reverend Francis Doughty, an Englishman. Before Doughty received this land, the English government had attempted to stop other Englishmen from settling in New Netherlands so as not to lend support to the Dutch colony (Queens Topographic Bureau History File [QTBHF] #1646). The area was later used by the Native Americans as a hunting reservation. However, repeated
conflicts with the Native Americans, which resulted in the destruction of the village more than once (Stankowski 1977), left Maspeth weakened. As the 1600s progressed, Maspeth continued to be affected by the "intensive strife" which plagued its residents, and, by mid-century, the village was not heavily populated (Riker 1852: 25).

Director-General Kieft was reportedly disappointed with Maspeth and, in an attempt to maintain a successful European settlement in that part of Queens, allowed another group of Englishmen to establish the village Middleburg, midway between Maspeth and the village of Flushing – which included the old Maspeth settlement (Historical Records Survey [HRS] 1940). Middleburg was renamed Hastings in 1662, and soon after, it was renamed, "Newtown."

Although Maspeth's reputation suffered after the Indian wars, many European settlers moved back to the settlement and established farms. The area's proximity to Maspeth Creek and several natural ponds allowed it to become the "center of water trade with New Amsterdam as well as the center for milling" (Stankowski 1977: 9). However, the population was not very large and the majority of the settlement was located near the head of Newtown Creek (Ibid).

As the entire colony of New Amsterdam grew, many roads were established to connect the outlying farms of Queens and Brooklyn to the city proper at the southern tip of Manhattan Island. Present-day 57th Avenue, a part of which is now Maspeth Avenue, was constructed as early as 1642 to allow the village of Middleburg access to the Maspeth Kills, and 58th Street, which makes up the eastern boundary of the project area, was constructed by 1656 (Stankowski 1977).

C. EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

At the beginning of the 18th century, Maspeth continued to be a farming community. Both the 1733 Popple map (Figure 5) and the 1750 Bowen map (not pictured) show the town of Newtown to the northeast of the Maspeth Creek and do not indicate that any large settlements were near the head of the creek. It should be noted that neither map depicts individual structures in their exact locations, only the locations of the larger villages are depicted. The 1784 Kitchin map (not pictured) depicts the village of Newtown closer to the head of the creek, west of the divergence of the two branches that made up Maspeth Creek and the English Kills. This puts it in approximately the location of Furman's Island (also called Smith's Island), which was a small island separated from the mainland by the Maspeth Creek, the English Kills, and the now extinct Shanty Creek, which separated the eastern side of the island from the mainland (Figure 8). While this island was the location of a settlement which was ultimately broken up by Stuyvesant because it was seen as competition for the neighboring village of Bushwick (Armbruster 1914), the village of Newtown was further east, closer to Flushing, so it appears that the Kitchin map is not also entirely reliable.

In 1733, land was purchased for the first Episcopal Church in Newtown, Saint James' Church, which was completed in 1740 (Riker 1852). For more than 20 years, the congregants shared a preacher with the inhabitants of Flushing and Jamaica, although in 1761 they lobbied for their own (Ibid). However, the small population size of Newtown allowed them to maintain a single Episcopal church for the remainder of the 18th century.

Around the same time that the Revolutionary War ended and the British evacuated the city in 1783, Maspeth began to slowly grow. The farms of those individuals who had remained fiercely loyal to the British, at the expense of other Maspeth residents, were forced out of the town (and in some cases, out of the country) and their farms were divided and sold (Stankowski 1977). At that time, much of the marshland that surrounded the nearby creeks was filled so that crops
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could be grown (John Milner Associates 2002). Maspeth had begun to establish itself as an agricultural center beginning in the mid-18th century, producing rye, barley, corn, hemp, flax, tobacco, apples, vegetables, poultry, honey, and also animal products from their herds of cattle, horses, and sheep (Stankowski 1977). Towards the end of the century, Maspeth’s most notable resident, DeWitt Clinton, purchased a 14-acre farm to the southwest of the project area several years before he became Mayor of New York City.

Because early deed records were not categorized by block and lot numbers, it is difficult to determine who owned the project area during the 18th century. However, a map produced by the Topographic Bureau of New York in 1935 (not pictured) indicates that towards the end of the century, the property on either side of the farm in which the project area was situated was owned by John Way. It is therefore possible that Way also owned the farm in between those two properties.

D. NINETEENTH CENTURY

Early 19th maps do not indicate any significant development near the project area, although the 1802 DeWitt map (not pictured) does indicate a landing near DeWitt Clinton’s residence. The previously mentioned Topographical Bureau map indicating land owners during the late 18th and early 19th centuries indicated that the 26-acre farm in which the project area was situated was granted to John VanCott in 1828. This farm was bounded by Maspeth Avenue, 58th Place (formerly VanCott Avenue), Rust Street, and approximately 58th Drive.

The VanCott farm was transferred to James Maurice, who purchased several tracts of land in the area in the early 1840’s. Maurice is shown to have owned property to the south of the Furman farm on mid-19th century maps (Figures 8 and 9), as well as a large tract of land approximately 4,000 feet northeast of the project site. However, it is not clear if he received the property east of Rust Street, where the project area is situated, at the same time. As mentioned previously, early deed records did not differentiate between block and lot and it is therefore difficult to determine a direct chain of ownership during the early 19th century. Several deeds were recorded in the 1870s which all appear to refer to Maurice’s land acquisitions northeast of the project area (Appendix B).

Maurice, after whom Maspeth’s Maurice Avenue is named, gained notoriety as a New York State Assemblyman and Congressman. He purchased a tract of land from Garrett Furman in 1840 and constructed a house there a year later (QTBHF #138). The previously mentioned map of early 19th century landowners shows that Furman had been granted the former Mott/Way farm located west of Rust Street and north of the DeWitt Clinton property in 1815. A note is made in the History Files of the Queens Topographic Bureau that Maurice built a home on the former Furman property at the northeast corner of Hill Street (now 57th Road) and Old Flushing Avenue (now Rust Street) and that he lived there until the 1880s around which time the building became a tavern (QTPHF #1446). However, historic map evidence conflicts, showing Maurice to be living southwest of the project area and, as early as 1853, depicts a hotel on the property at the northeast corner of 57th Road and Rust Street. Therefore, it is unclear if Maurice ever lived on the church property. An 1850 map of the property of Robert Furman (Figure 7) clearly indicates that Maurice owned the area surrounding the church at that time.

On an 1844 United States Coastal Survey map (Figure 6), one structure and a surrounding yard is depicted at the southeast corner of roads which appear to be the precursors of Rust Street and Maspeth Avenue. The area to the south, in the approximate vicinity of the project area, is shown to be wooded. A similar survey published in 1845 (not pictured) does not depict the structure on
the property, but it does show the area to the south to be wooded. Both maps indicate that multiple structures were located along Maspeth Avenue as well as along Flushing Avenue to the south, although neither location was as developed as Newtown, shown to the northeast.

The rising population of Maspeth led to the need for an additional Protestant Episcopal church to service the area. The creation of Saint Saviour’s Church was facilitated largely by James Maurice, John VanCott, and Judge David Jones (Stankowski 1977). The chain of ownership is difficult to determine, but James Maurice is depicted on the aforementioned 1853 map (Figure 7) as the owner of the property surrounding the church, which was also part of the former VanCott farm. The land for the church was donated by Maurice in the late 1840’s and this property also included a house on the northwest corner of 57th Drive and 58th Street, in the location of the present rectory building, which became the parsonage (QTBHF #138). However, the 1873 Beers atlas (Figure 11) indicates that the original building may have been further to the west. Although 58th Street had not yet been constructed, it is clear on this map that the building is west of where that road would eventually be located, and the map does not depict any other buildings on the property. Therefore, it is possible that the home donated by Maurice is not in the same location as the current rectory building.

The cornerstone of the church was laid in 1847 by Bishop Potter and a year later, the construction was completed at a cost of $3,500 and the church was consecrated (QTBHF #156). The church was designed by renowned architect Richard Upjohn, the English-born “leader of the American Gothic Revival” architectural movement (Morrone 2001: 321). Upjohn was selected to design Saint Saviour’s Church just a few years after he had designed Trinity Church in Lower Manhattan (Ibid). After Upjohn designed Saint Saviour’s he published a book of plans for rural churches that, like Saint Saviour’s, “translate[d] a medieval architecture of stone into wooden buildings suitable for the American frontier, adapted to new needs and available materials, without losing the qualities essential to the ecclesiological movement” and it has been suggested that those plans were based in part on his designs for Saint Saviour’s (Gough and Kopnicki 2006: internet article).

The architect who designed the rectory is unknown. That building, described as being situated amidst a “group of [farms],” was dedicated in 1850 (QTBHF #156). Maurice also donated a plot of land known as “Maurice Woods” to the diocese (QTBHF #1446). However, it appears that this land was sold, presumably by the church, at a later date and houses were constructed there (Stankowski 1977). This property may be part of Maurice’s holdings to the northeast of the project area. Deeds recorded in the later 1870s and 1890s show that a section of that land along the eastern side of Maurice Avenue known as Cedar Hill or Fontmaur was transferred from James Maurice’s estate to the Diocese of Long Island (Appendix B). This may be the property referred to as “Maurice Wood.”

The church was constructed on the top of a hill. The 1891 Bien and Vermule topographic map (Figure 12) shows that the project area was situated approximately 30 feet above sea level. Current USGS topographic maps indicate that the area is still approximately 30 miles above sea level.

Two maps dating to 1852, one by Riker (not pictured) and the other by Dripps (Figure 8) are the first to depict the church. The Dripps map also shows a building to the south of the Church building that may be the rectory. As seen in these maps, the network of roads in Maspeth had grown significantly in less than ten years since the 1844 coastal survey was completed. Greater amounts of marshland had been filled in, as well.

On the 1853 map which shows Maurice’s land holdings in the area (Figure 7), the property
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belonging to the church is depicted as an irregular trapezoid shape, smaller than the property belonging to the church property today. An additional structure is depicted along Rust Street, on this map labeled as Flushing Avenue, approximately 75 feet south of 57th Drive (formerly Second Avenue) and outside of the Maurice property boundary. The aforementioned dwelling donated to the church by Maurice and used as the original parsonage is not depicted on this map. Both the church and the parsonage appear on the 1859 Walling map (Figure 9) in addition to the other building south of 57th Drive. However, that map appears to show the church and parsonage approximately one block south of where they were actually located. This same error appears on the 1885 Colton map (not pictured), which may indicate that both maps show projected street constructions.

The Walling map correctly shows that a street grid had been laid out in the area near the southwest corner of Maspeth Avenue and Rust Street. This was the result of a large residential development constructed within the former John VanCott farm in 1852, consisting of “streets and houselots...forming a grid-pattern called a village plat...[which]...ran into the colonial highways of the era” (Stankowski 1977: 33). All of the lots for this development were sold by the time of the Civil War in the 1860’s (ibid).

During the mid-19th century, the construction of several large cemeteries in the area, including Cavalry cemetery (Catholic, established 1848) and Mount Olivet Cemetery (Protestant Episcopal, established 1850), prompted the growth of Maspeth (for more on burials, see Section G, below). The relatively large size of these cemeteries, and many others that were established in central Queens during the mid-19th century, resulted in the creation of a funeral industry in Queens. More importantly, however, railroads were constructed to make these cemeteries, and also outlying areas such as Maspeth, more accessible to people from other parts of the city. One of these new railroad lines is shows running just north of Newtown Creek on the 1859 Walling map. Once railroads connected Maspeth to Manhattan, it became possible for both people and goods to be transported back and forth, and both commuters and industries began to move into the area.

The continued development of this neighborhood is reflected in an 1866 coastal survey (Figure 10), which indicates that four buildings were located within the block bounded by Maspeth Avenue, Rust Street, 58th Street and 57th Drive (57th Road had not yet been cut through). However, the map’s small scale prevents clear identification of buildings located within the project area. In addition, this map shows that a great number of structures had been erected all along Maspeth Avenue and, to a lesser extent, along the other roads as well. Not only had Newtown grown significantly within a few decades, the Protestant Episcopal population of Queens and its surrounding counties had also grown to the point where in 1868, Long Island was made into its own diocese to accommodate the soaring number of worshipers (Historical Records Survey 1940).

The 1873 Beers atlas (Figure 11) shows that the shape of the church property had not changed since the creation of the 1853 map mentioned above. The Beers map also clearly shows a small building immediately south of the church property which is presumed to be the church’s rectory and possibly the house donated by Maurice. This map also indicates that the land surrounding the church was the property of “T. Maurice,” which may represent a typographical error. According to census records, neither Maurice’s wife nor any of his children had a name which began with the letter “T” (Appendix A). In addition, this map shows that another railroad line had been constructed, running northeast-southwest west of the project area and crossing Rust Street at approximately 58th Avenue. The steep hill that extended south from the church
building might have made it more difficult to construct a rectory building immediately south of the church. However, the current rectory building is located in an area with more even terrain.

By the time the 1891 Bromley atlas (Figure 13) was published, the current street grid had been laid out and 58th Street (on this map called High Street) and 57th Road (Hall Street) had been cut. This map is also the first to show the rectory building near the northwest corner of 57th Drive and 58th Street. It appears that the rectory building shown in the 1873 Beers map, presumably donated by Maurice, had been demolished and a new one constructed. No records were on file at the Queens Department of Buildings (QDOB) which could confirm such a construction. An 1898 USGS map of Queens (Figure 14) also shows this building to be in the northwest corner of 58th Street and 57th Drive.

E. TWENTIETH CENTURY

By the turn of the 20th century, Saint Saviour’s Church had grown to the point where it required a separate one-story Sunday school building, which first appears to the northeast of the church building on a Sanborn Insurance map from 1902 (Figure 15). The map indicates that the new school building was lit with lamps and heated with stoves. The church was also lit by lamps, but used a furnace for heat.

The 1903 Belcher-Hyde map (Figure 16) also shows the new wooden school building, although it erroneously labels the site as “St. James P.E. Church.” There was a Saint James Protestant Episcopal Church in Newtown, located at the northeast corner of Broadway and Corona Avenue in the Elmhurst section of Queens, but it was a separate entity. This error is repeated on the 1909 Bromley atlas (not pictured). Both these maps also indicate that at the beginning of the 20th century, the rectory building was separated into its own tax lot, here given the number 29 (the church property was Lot 25). In addition, these maps show that a 4-inch water pipe was installed along 58th Street, between Maspeth Avenue and 57th Drive. This water line is not depicted on the 1902 Sanborn, which shows water lines in other locations, so it is assumed that the main was installed between 1902 and 1903. It is possible that the three buildings within the project area were connected to running water at this time as well.

The 1914 Sanborn insurance map (Figure 17) does not show many significant changes within the project area. The church building must have undergone some slight renovations, as the lights were now powered by gas, the building was heated with steam, and the furnace had been replaced by a low-pressure boiler. In addition, a small one-story brick building with wood-frame siding had been constructed in the area between the Sunday school and the rectory. It is unclear what this building was used for, but a newspaper article originally printed in the Long Island Star Journal in 1975 notes that the property had a garage. This map also suggests that the Block number had been changed to 2197. No changes appear to have been made by the time the 1929 Belcher-Hyde (Figure 18) and 1936 Sanborn (not pictured) maps were published, except for the fact that the modern tax lot numbers had been assigned; the rectory is situated on Lot 27 and the remainder of the property on Lot 1.

A version of the 1914 Sanborn map that had been updated through 1953 indicates that a one-story addition had been constructed to connect the Sunday school building with the church. This building is shown on current Sanborn maps (Figure 2) to have a basement. This map also indicates that the Block number had been changed to 2671. Current maps also show that the small one-store building constructed between the Sunday school and the rectory had been removed.
Saint Saviour's Church remained relatively unchanged until 1970, when a fire set by a group of 12 year-old boys destroyed the western side of the church a few days before Christmas (Ridgewood Times 1970). According to records from the QDOB, less than thirty percent of the building was damaged, although the 40 foot clock tower in the southwest corner of the building was burned beyond repair. The building was repaired to reflect its pre-fire conditions and a replica of the chimney and clock tower were created. The church was rebuilt and rededicated in 1972 (Old Maspeth and Newtown Historical Trail 1970). However, old photographs (Figure 20) indicate that the former entrance to the church was along its western wall. Historic Sanborns indicate the presence of an overhang there (Figures 17 and 19). Photographs of the site in its present condition (Photographs 1, 2, 6, and 7) indicate that the entrance to the church was relocated to the southern side.

In 1997, declining numbers of congregants caused the Protestant Episcopal Church to sell the Saint Saviour’s property to the San Sung Methodist Church of New York, a Korean church (Appendix B). Throughout the last quarter of the 20th century, Maspeth’s ethnic diversity had increased, and a large number of Koreans had settled in the area (John Milner Associates 2002). Building records indicate that in 1997, a bathroom extension and wooden deck, kitchen equipment, and additional air conditioning unit installation was planned for the church building, although it does not appear that all that work was completed (no wood deck is visible on the site today). The rectory building was also renovated: in 2000 a fire prevention system was added and in 2002 and 2004 plumbing fixtures, an air conditioning system, and a hot water heater were installed. The renovation plans note that the entire building is situated above a cellar, which is defined by the Buildings Department as a floor level that is fifty percent or more below grade. The building plans do not indicate that the church or Sunday school buildings have basements or cellars (although Sanborn maps show that the addition between the two does have a basement), however, a basement level was observed during a site visit to the church and is presumed to be situated under the entire church building.

F. PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED HISTORIC PERIOD
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>OPRHP #</th>
<th>Approximate Distance from APE</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vander Ende-Onderdonk House</td>
<td>Between Flushing Avenue, Onderdonk Avenue, and Troutman Street</td>
<td>.85 miles (4,500 feet)</td>
<td>17th or 18th to 20th century</td>
<td>Domestic Residence</td>
<td>Happel (1975), Solecki (1983)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one historic period archaeological site was identified within one mile of the project site in the records of the OPRHP, NYSM, and LPC. The Vander Ende-Onderdonk House site is located in the area bounded by Flushing Avenue, Onderdonk Avenue, and Troutman Street, approximately .85 miles southwest of the project area. The site was excavated by several groups in the 1970s and 1980s. These groups included a team from New York University led by Stanley Wisniewski and Bert Salwen, an unidentified team in 1977, and a Columbia University team.
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directed by Ralph Solecki between 1980 and 1982. Historic artifacts and features were found, including a chimney dating between 1690 and 1710, foundation walls, pebble pathways, and cisterns (Solecki 1983). Many of the artifacts recovered from the site are indicative of Maspeth’s industrial roots (Happel 1975).

G. POTENTIAL FOR THE RECOVERY OF HUMAN REMAINS AT THE SAINT SAVIOUR’S CHURCH SITE

Although it has been suggested that the churchyard surrounding Saint Saviour’s Church was once used for human interments, no evidence has been found which would support such a theory. While historic maps and atlases depict cemeteries and burial grounds associated with other churches, none depicts a graveyard on the Saint Saviour’s property. No historical documentation—including maps, local histories, photos, or deeds—was uncovered which could confirm that human burials took place on the property. No visible evidence of a cemetery, such as grave markers, was identified during a site visit to the property.

It is likely that one of several burial grounds which were once located nearby is being confused with a burial ground on the Saint Saviour’s Church property. A family burial ground associated with the Mott, Way, and Furman families was located near the northwest corner of Maspeth Avenue and the former 57th Street, now Rust Street, to the northwest of the project area (John Milner Associates 2002, Powell 1932). The Furman property is visible on the 1852 Dripps Map (Figure 8). Thirteen graves were removed from this cemetery in 1950 and re-interred in Prospect Park cemetery in Brooklyn and the seven gravestones still standing at that time dated between 1826 and 1877 (Inskeep 2000). This indicates that this cemetery was in use during Saint Saviour’s early years. Another nearby church, Saint Stanislaus’ Roman Catholic Church, was constructed at Maspeth Avenue and 61st Street on top of an old Quaker burial ground (Stankowski 1977). As per Quaker tradition, none of the graves had been marked and when the new church was built, many skeletal remains were discovered. The close proximity of these churches to Saint Saviour’s may have caused confusion as to whether or not Saint Saviour’s had a burial ground.

In addition, Saint Saviour’s Church is misidentified as “Saint James Protestant Episcopal Church” on several early 20th century atlases, including the 1903 Belcher-Hyde atlas (Figure 16) and the 1909 Bromley atlas (not pictured). It does not appear that Saint Saviour’s was ever known as Saint James, as the church is correctly labeled on maps that pre- and post-date those previously mentioned. Saint James Church is actually located approximately 2 miles northeast of Saint Saviour’s, in the Elmhurst section of Queens. That church, which was built in 1848, around the same time that Saint Saviour’s Church was constructed, is surrounded by a small cemetery with stones dating between 1805 and 1934 (Inskeep 2000).

Although churchyard burials became increasingly common beginning in the late 17th century, an ideological revolution that swept through the northeastern United States in the early 19th century caused them to fall out of favor with the general public. In a time when public health and sanitation were not well understood, small burial grounds were thought to spread disease. The so-called “rural cemetery movement” arose from the desire to construct burial places outside city limits in large, well-ventilated park-like settings. The switch from private burial grounds to rural cemeteries was very rapid and the gradual banning of human burials in Manhattan led to the establishment of many large cemeteries in the outer boroughs, especially Queens. One such rural cemetery was Mount Olivet, a Protestant Episcopal cemetery established in 1850 approximately .66 miles east of the project area. In many cases, when rural cemeteries were constructed,
individual churches removed their smaller burial grounds to the larger cemeteries established by their religious organizations.

The entrance canopy erected by the San Sung Korean Methodist Church of New York reads “catacombs,” however, the Korean characters written across it can be translated as “prayer tunnel” or “prayer cave.” It appears that prayer in an enclosed space or cave temple is a Buddhist tradition in Korea. There were several neatly kept sheds on the rear of the property (Photograph 1) as well as a small room in the church basement, which may have been constructed as a substitute for more traditional prayer caves, such as those seen in Figure 22. It is interesting that the Methodist church adopted the tradition of prayer caves for its Christian worshipers. No documentary evidence of any other underground caves or tunnels was uncovered nor did the field visit produce such evidence.

HISTORIC SENSITIVITY ASSESSMENT

The 1873 Beers atlas (Figure 11) indicates the presence of a small structure just south of the church within the Saint Saviour’s Church property. While this map does not appear to be completely accurate in situating the church, it is possible that the original rectory was located in the currently unoccupied southwest quadrant of Block 2167. Therefore, it is also possible that any archaeological resources relating to this structure—including foundation walls and domestic shaft features such as privies, wells, and cisterns—could be present in that area. The current rectory building would also most likely have domestic shaft features; especially since it was constructed in the mid- to late-19th century, before water and sewer lines appear in the area (see Chapter V).

Privies were generally located at a distance from both the house and the street (Wheeler 2000). Privies were often filled with domestic refuse and rubbish, especially after running water and networks of sewers became common and privies were no longer necessary. They are therefore invaluable resources which can provide insight into the lives of individuals from the past. In New York City, privies have been found at a depth of up to 13 feet deep (Cantwell and Wall 2001). Cisterns and wells would not have been as distant from the home as would privies, in order to have easier access to the clean water they provided. Cisterns are usually found at depths of up to 10 feet below the ground surface while wells would be dug all the way to the water table (Ibid).

It is difficult to determine where privies associated with the rectory might have been located because of its close proximity to 58th Street and 57th Drive, the church itself, and the steep hill to the west. It is also difficult to determine the location of the building’s original front entrance. The current address is on 58th Street. However, if the building is the one donated by Maurice in the 1840’s, 58th Street would not yet have been constructed and, therefore, the front of the building would probably have faced south, where it appears to face today. Any privies would most likely have been near the western or northern sides of the building, away from the street and the front of the building but also at a distance from the church. It is also possible that St. Saviour’s church had a privy or privies for the convenience of parishioners or Sunday school students. Since the western side of the church was the original entrance, it is reasonable to surmise that any privies, if they existed, would have been situated in the original rear yard, off the church’s eastern side (Figure 21).

The renovations to the rectory that began in 2002 appear to have disturbed large sections of the ground surrounding the building. The heaviest disturbance was near the 58th Street side of the rectory building, although there was additional disturbance near 57th Road. This disturbance was consistent with building construction/renovation activities such as might have occurred during
the recent construction/renovation of the rectory. Piles of dirt are visible around the exterior and it appears that some clearing had taken place prior to or during construction/renovation. In addition, building records indicate that the building had been connected to a cesspool that was emptied and filled with clean fill in 2003, at which time the building was connected to the city sewer system. However, the cesspool’s location is not given and it does not appear on building plans provided by the Department of Buildings. Court records related to a 2004 dispute between the church and the contractor who completed the renovations indicated that “water pipes [were attached] to outside sources” as well (Queens County Supreme Court 2004). This could be an additional explanation for some of the disturbance surrounding the structure.

Additional disturbance may have been caused during the installation of a fire-suppression system in 1997. Plans provided by the QDOB suggest that utilities were installed near the southeast corner of 57th Road and 58th Street. The depth or extent of any disturbance this may have caused is not immediately apparent. Just south of that area, an early 20th century garage had once stood, which was torn down in the late-20th century.

Therefore, the Saint Saviour’s Church property is determined to have moderate to high sensitivity for the recovery of historic period archaeological resources. The apparently undisturbed area south of the church building and west of the rectory may contain the structural remains of a former parsonage or rectory building as well as possible domestic shaft features (i.e. privies, cisterns, and wells) associated with either the church or the rectory or both. The northeast portion of the property, while possibly partially disturbed by the installation of the fire suppression system and the construction of a garage building may also contain similar shaft resources. There do not appear to have been any historic structures in the northwest corner of the property and because the church’s original entrance faced this direction, it is unlikely that privies, etc. would have been located there.

*
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A. EXISTING UTILITIES

The first historic map which depicts the presence of utilities is the 1903 Belcher-Hyde atlas (Figure 16), which shows a 4-inch water main running along 58th Street. As the line is not depicted on the 1902 Sanborn map (Figure 15), which shows water lines in other areas, it is assumed that the water main was installed shortly after that date. The same line appears on the 1909 Bromley atlas (not pictured), which also depicts an additional water main running along 57th Drive. Both streets are shown as having water lines in the 1929 Belcher-Hyde atlas (Figure 18), as is 57th Road to the north of the project area. This atlas is also the first to indicate the presence of a sewer running down portions of all three roads.

Records on file at the Queens Department of Environmental Protection Bureau of Water and Sewer Operations indicate that a 6-inch clay pipe connected the church building to the 12-inch combined sewer line on 57th Road. This connection was plugged in February, 2006 in preparation for the redevelopment of the property. Demolition permits issued by the Queens Department of Buildings suggest that gas, electric, water, and sewer lines have been cut off for all of the buildings on the property. A site visit to the property confirmed this fact.

The exact location of these utility lines is unclear; however, some lines are visible under metal doors located in the basement of the church. It is assumed that all utility lines running to and from the church and Sunday school would connect to main lines within 57th Road to the north and that all lines running to and from the rectory building would be connected to main lines along 58th Street. As noted previously, the rectory building was not connected to the sewer system until 2003; the building had relied on a cesspool until that point.

B. SOIL BORINGS

To date, no soil boring program has been undertaken for this property (Scott Kushnick, Maspeth Development, LLC, personal communication, November 2006).
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A. PRECONTACT SENSITIVITY ASSESSMENT

In general, precontact sites are found near water courses, fresh water, and areas of high elevation. All three conditions were found in the immediate vicinity of the project area. The Maspeth and Newtown Creeks, located approximately 700 feet to the west, would have provided ample marine resources for the Native Americans to exploit. Multiple small freshwater ponds were also located in the vicinity (Stankowski 1977). Finally, the project site is located at the top of a tall hill which would have allowed Native Americans a better vantage point from which to spot approaching game and perhaps enemies. Four precontact archaeological sites have been identified within a one-mile radius of the project area, three of which are habitation sites. It is for these reasons that the LPC has noted this area as having “higher than average” sensitivity for the recovery of precontact archaeological remains (Boesch 1997).

Therefore, the Saint Saviour’s Church site is determined to have high potential for the recovery of precontact archaeological resources in the areas not disturbed during the construction of the church and its associated buildings (Figure 21).

B. HISTORIC SENSITIVITY ASSESSMENT

No evidence was uncovered which would suggest that the project area was important to European settlers until the mid-19th century, although it may have been used for agriculture. While it is certain that Saint Saviour’s Church was constructed in 1848, the date of construction of its rectory is uncertain. Documentary sources suggest that the land donated by James Maurice in the late 1840s for the establishment of the church contained a house located at the northwest corner of present-day 57th Drive and 58th Street. This house is in the location of the present rectory building, which later became known as the parsonage (QTBHIF #138). Several historic maps, however, including the 1873 Beers atlas (Figure 11) and an 1853 map of the Robert Furman property (Figure 7), do not show a structure in this location; 58th Street had not even been constructed yet and 57th Drive did not yet cross into the area.

The Beers atlas instead indicates the presence of a small structure just south of the church, much farther west than the present building. While this map does not appear to be completely accurate—it suggests that the church was angled northeast-southwest in the corner of the lot, when it actually runs fairly parallel to the cross streets on either side of it—it is possible that a different rectory structure was located in the currently unoccupied southwest quadrant of Block 2167. Therefore, it is also possible that archaeological resources relating to the structure depicted on the Beers atlas—including foundation walls and domestic shaft features such as privies, wells, and cisterns—could be present in that area. The rectory building standing on the property today, which first appears in its current location on the 1891 Bromley atlas (Figure 13) would also most likely have domestic shaft features; especially since it was constructed in the mid- to late-19th century, before water and sewer lines appear in the area (see Chapter V).
It is difficult to predict with any degree of accuracy, where privies associated with the rectory could have been located because of its close proximity to 58th Street and 57th Drive, the church itself, and the steep hill to the west. It is also difficult to determine the location of the rectory building’s original front entrance. The current address is on 58th Street. However, if the building is the one donated by Maurice in the 1840’s, 58th Street would not yet have been constructed and, therefore, the front of the building would probably have faced south, where it appears to face today. Any privies would most likely have been near the western or northern sides of the building, away from the street and the front of the building but also at a distance from the church. It is also possible that St. Saviour’s church had a privy or privies for the convenience of parishioners or Sunday school students. Since the western side of the church was the original entrance, it is reasonable to surmise that any privies, if they existed, would have been situated in the original rear yard, off the church’s eastern side (Figure 21).

The renovations to the rectory that began in 2002 appear to have disturbed large sections of the ground surrounding the building to some degree. The heaviest disturbance was near the 58th Street side of the rectory building, although there was additional disturbance near 57th Road. This disturbance was consistent with building construction/renovation activities such as might have occurred during the recent construction/renovation of the rectory. Piles of dirt are visible around the exterior and it appears that some clearing had taken place prior to or during construction/renovation. In addition, building records indicate that the building had been connected to a cesspool that was emptied and filled with clean fill in 2003, at which time the building was connected to the city sewer system. However, the cesspool’s location is not given and it does not appear on building plans provided by the Department of Buildings. Court records related to a 2004 dispute between the church and the contractor who completed the renovations indicated that “water pipes [were attached] to outside sources” as well (Queens County Supreme Court 2004). This could be an additional explanation for some of the disturbance surrounding the structure.

Additional disturbance may have been caused during the installation of a fire-suppression system in 1997. Plans provided by the QDOB suggest that utilities were installed near the southeast corner of 57th Road and 58th Street. The depth or extent of any disturbance this may have caused is not immediately apparent. Just south of that area, an early 20th century garage had once stood, which was torn down in the late-20th century.

Therefore, the Saint Saviour’s Church property is determined to have moderate to high sensitivity for the recovery of historic period archaeological resources (Figure 21). The apparently undisturbed area south of the church building and west of the rectory may contain the structural remains of a former parsonage or rectory building as well as possible domestic shaft features (i.e., privies, cisterns, and wells) associated with either the church or the rectory or both. The northeast portion of the property, while possibly partially disturbed by the installation of the fire suppression system and the construction of a garage building may also contain similar shaft resources, although it is less likely. There do not appear to have been any historic structures in the northwest corner of the property and because the church’s original entrance faced this direction, it is extremely unlikely that privies, etc. would have been located there.

C. POTENTIAL FOR THE RECOVERY OF HUMAN REMAINS

Although it has been suggested by community activists and preservation groups that the churchyard surrounding Saint Saviour’s Church was once used for human interments, no documentary evidence has been found to support this theory. While historic maps and atlases
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depict cemeteries and burial grounds associated with other churches in Queens, none depicts a
graveyard on the Saint Saviour’s property. No historical documentation—including maps, local
histories, photos, or deeds—was uncovered which could confirm that human burials took place
on the property. No visible evidence of a cemetery, such as grave markers, was identified during
a site visit to the property.

It is likely that one of several burial grounds which were once located nearby is being confused
with a burial ground on the Saint Saviour’s Church property. A family burial ground associated
with the Mott, Way, and Furman families was located near the northwest corner of Maspeth
Avenue and the former 57th Street, now Rust Street, to the northwest of the project area (John
Catholic Church, was constructed at Maspeth Avenue and 61st Street on top of an old Quaker
burial ground (Stankowski 1977). As per Quaker tradition, none of the graves had been marked
and when the new church was built, many skeletal remains were discovered. In addition, Saint
Saviour’s Church is misidentified as “Saint James Protestant Episcopal Church” on several early
20th century atlases, including the 1903 Belcher-Hyde atlas (Figure 16) and the 1909 Bromley
atlas (not pictured). Saint James Church is actually located approximately 2 miles northeast of
Saint Saviour’s, in the Elmhurst section of Queens. That church, which was built in 1848,
around the same time that Saint Saviour’s Church was constructed, is surrounded by a small
cemetery with stones dating between 1805 and 1934 (Inskeep 2000).

The entrance canopy erected by the San Sung Korean Methodist Church of New York reads
“catacombs,” however, the Korean characters written across it can be translated as “prayer
tunnel” or “prayer cave.” It appears that prayer in an enclosed space or cave temple is a Buddhist
tradition in Korea and it was adapted here for the Korean congregants of the Methodist church.
There were several neatly kept sheds to the rear of the property (Photograph 1) as well as a
small room in the church basement, which may have been constructed as a substitute for more
traditional prayer caves, such as those seen in Figure 22. No documentary evidence of any other
underground caves or tunnels was uncovered nor did the field visit produce such evidence.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS

Further study in the form of Phase 1B testing is recommended in order to identify any precontact
and historic archaeological resources which may be present within the Saint Saviour’s Church
property. Such testing could confirm the presence or absence of an additional structure located in
the currently undeveloped area to the south of the church and/or the presence of shaft features
associated with the church, the Sunday school and the rectory or rectories. It could also
determine the degree to which the area was used by Native Americans and for what purposes. *
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Appendices
Appendix A – Summary of Census Research for the Saint Saviour’s Church Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Date</th>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Name (Heads of Families)</th>
<th>Listed Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1790 Federal</td>
<td>Newtown, Queens</td>
<td>Robert Furman</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 free white males</td>
<td>16 and older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white female</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 slaves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820 Federal</td>
<td>New York, Ward 1</td>
<td>James Maurice</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 free white males</td>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white male</td>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white male</td>
<td>45 and older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white female</td>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white female</td>
<td>10 to under 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white female</td>
<td>45 and older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 male slave</td>
<td>Under 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 male slave</td>
<td>14 to under 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Stated, Queens</td>
<td>John VanCott</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white male</td>
<td>16 to under 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white male</td>
<td>45 and older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white male</td>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 free white females</td>
<td>10 to under 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white female</td>
<td>26 to under 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not stated, Queens</td>
<td>Garrett Furman</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white male</td>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white male</td>
<td>10 to under 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white male</td>
<td>16 to under 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 free white males</td>
<td>26 to under 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 free white females</td>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 free white females</td>
<td>10 to under 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white female</td>
<td>26 to under 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830 Federal</td>
<td>Newtown, Queens</td>
<td>John VanCott</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white male</td>
<td>20 to under 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white female</td>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 free white females</td>
<td>20 to under 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Free colored female</td>
<td>24 to under 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840 Federal</td>
<td>New York, Ward 14</td>
<td>James Maurice</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 free white males</td>
<td>20 to under 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white male</td>
<td>60 to under 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 free white females</td>
<td>15 to under 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white female</td>
<td>20 to under 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free white female</td>
<td>30 to under 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 free white females</td>
<td>50 to under 60</td>
<td>Note given.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown, Queens</td>
<td>John VanCott</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 free white male</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 free white male</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 to under 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 free white female</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 to under 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 free white female</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 to under 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 free white females</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 to under 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1850 Federal</th>
<th>Newtown, Queens</th>
<th>[55]</th>
<th>Lawyer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 free white male</td>
<td>James Maurice</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 free white male</td>
<td>Jane Maurice</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 free white female</td>
<td>William Maurice</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 free white female</td>
<td>Sarah Maurice</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 free white female</td>
<td>Mary Maurice</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 free white female</td>
<td>Margaret Maurice</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 free white females</td>
<td>Margaret Blade</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Brannagawn</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Brannagawn</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newtown, Queens</th>
<th>John VanCott</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>Farmer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia VanCott</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth VanCott</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John VanCott</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis VanCott</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia VanCott</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ester Runne</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet VanCott</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Graff</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Until 1850, the census only recorded the names of the heads of families as well as general age groups.

## Appendix B: Deeds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Liber/Page</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Sung Korean Methodist Church of NY</td>
<td>Maspeth Development LLC</td>
<td>12/25/2005</td>
<td>1, 27</td>
<td>from ACRIS available online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees of the Diocese of Long Island</td>
<td>San Sung Korean Methodist Church of NY</td>
<td>7/11/1997</td>
<td>1, 27</td>
<td>from ACRIS available online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Elizabeth, Mary Anne, and Margaret Jane Maurice, heirs of James Maurice</td>
<td>Trustees of the Estate belonging to the Diocese of Long Island</td>
<td>11/13/1901</td>
<td>not lotted</td>
<td>126/365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Elizabeth, Mary Anne, and Margaret Jane Maurice, heirs of James Maurice</td>
<td>Trustees of the Estate belonging to the Diocese of Long Island</td>
<td>1/19/1897</td>
<td>not lotted</td>
<td>1137/377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Elizabeth, Mary Anne, and Margaret Jane Maurice, heirs of James Maurice</td>
<td>Trustees of the Estate belonging to the Diocese of Long Island</td>
<td>12/28/1895</td>
<td>not lotted</td>
<td>1094/354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Maurice</td>
<td>Trustees of the Estate belonging to the Diocese of Long Island</td>
<td>6/19/1878</td>
<td>not lotted</td>
<td>534/477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard and Cornelia M. Meinikheim</td>
<td>James Maurice</td>
<td>12/18/1880</td>
<td>not lotted</td>
<td>569/441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conveys about 5 acres of land on the eastern side of Maurice Ave. to the church for $1, adjoins land James Maurice (brother) gave to the church in 1878, includes a house once called Cedar Hill now set up as a charity for the blind called Fontmaur adjoining (L1137/P379).” (L1094/P354) There is a map of the property of Joseph Van Mater referenced here.

Conveys the property called Cedar Hill now known as Fontmaur from the eastern side of Maurice Ave. in the center of the brook and "adjoining the land of James Way, now deceased" and then running south along the eastern side of Maurice Ave. 155’8” to the north line "of a contemplated street then easterly at right angles with said Maurice Ave. along the northerly line of the said contemplated street, 387’ to a point distant 265’ north of the northerly line of the street." (L534/P477) There is a map of the property of Joseph Van Mater referenced here.

Conveys about 5 acres of James Way’s, deceased (Cornelia’s father); bordered land Maurice already owned and had given to the church. This property is described as on the west side of Maurice Ave.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lotted</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul J. Fish</td>
<td>James Maurice</td>
<td>9/22/1874</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>448/171</td>
<td>Quit claim of inheritance on the property to the east of Maurice Ave, then called the Turnpike Rd. The property is said to be on a map of James Homer Maxwell's property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Maurice</td>
<td>James Maurice</td>
<td>12/31/1872</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>397/421</td>
<td>Sells the rights to a lane running southeast from Maspeth Ave. along James Maurice's property from 1871 (see below) for $1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate M. De Bevoise</td>
<td>James Maurice</td>
<td>12/20/1871</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>363/108</td>
<td>Kate M. sold the property of her deceased husband as guardian to his heir Adrienne (infant) for $17,136. It contained &quot;all those certain lots, pieces and parcels of situate lying and being near Maspeth in the town of Newtown, Queens County on the easterly side of the highway leading from Dutch Kills to Fresh Pond and on both sides of the New Highway leading from Maspeth to the village of Newtown containing together 21 and 42/100 acres of land according to the survey thereof made by Oscar Darling civil engineer and surveyor the premises here by granted and conveyed being intended to include all the land lying easterly of the said Highway leading from Dutch Kills to Fresh Pond Road.&quot; (L363/P111)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

Sources:
Appendix C: Historic Directories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Directory Year</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maurice, James</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>67 Wall, h L.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice, John</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Saleratus</td>
<td>11 old st. h L.I.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Saleratus is listed as: "a leavening agent consisting of potassium or sodium bicarbonate" by Merriam-Webster online dictionary. John Maurice is listed as a "soda manufacturer" in the 1880 Federal Census (Appendix A).

Sources: 1869 New York City Directory.