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ABSTRACT

A combination of archeological, historical, and oral data are presented to document a post-bellum Black residence in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. Utilizing a systematic sampling strategy, site limits and activity areas are identified and delineated. Oral data relate these findings to non-extant above-grade features and the occupants of the site. Historical data tie the occupants to a temporal framework and add information on other associations. All of these diverse sources are combined to evaluate the significance of the site within the context of rural Black studies.
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INTRODUCTION

This report details the findings of a Phase II Archeological assessment of 18AN500, the Fischer Site, in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. Work was undertaken at the request of the State Highway Administration of Maryland in compliance with Federal regulations concerning environmental and cultural resource clearance. The work was carried out by the Division of Archeology, Maryland Geological Survey, under the direction of Maureen Kavanagh and Silas Hurry. The field work was accomplished in June, July, and August, 1982. Laboratory processing and report preparation proceeded through September and October 1982.

This report is organized into a number of pertinent subsections. First, previous research, documentary research, and oral data are presented. Archeological field techniques and findings are then described with an emphasis on spatial patterning and chronology. These varying sources are then combined to describe 18AN500 within its historical context. Finally, an assessment of the planned impact and recommendations for mitigation are included.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

18AN500 was located in 1980 by Terrence W. Epperson of the Division of Archeology, Maryland Geological Survey. Utilizing a transect interval sampling technique, Epperson surveyed the area of the proposed Baltimore Annapolis Transportation Corridor (Epperson, 1980). Among the sites located was 18AN500 (see Figure 1). Above-grade remains of a chimney were visible, and two shovel test pits yielded one whiteware sherd and one window glass fragment.

Based on historic research, Epperson associated the site with Benjamin Lusby, who owned the farm from 1850 until his death after 1880. While not the residence of Mr. Lusby, the structure was interpreted as either a slave dwelling or a tenant house. Based on these data, Epperson suggested additional research to test the extent and integrity of 18AN500. The strategy proposed was a systematic sample of the area with shovel test pits, sifting of soils for artifacts, and collection of soil samples for analysis (Epperson 1980:18). Epperson also suggested additional historic research to better document the site.

DOCUMENTARY RESEARCH

The 1878 Hopkins Atlas of Anne Arundel County shows the present Fischer house and identifies it as the residence of Benjamin Lusby. The 1850 Federal Census lists Lusby as a farmer, aged 52, in Anne Arundel County. With him are listed his wife Elizabeth (48), a daughter Susan (10), a son Robert (6), Elizabeth Journey (65), Isaac Nicholls (16), and Mary Nicholls (14). Elizabeth married Benjamin Lusby in 1841. Her maiden name was Nicholls which probably explains the presence of the two Nicholls children, Isaac and Mary. They are perhaps younger siblings or nephew and niece of Elizabeth Nicholls Lusby. It is possible that they are Elizabeth's children from a previous marriage. However, the records are mute on this subject. Elizabeth Journey appears to be some relation to Benjamin's brother Eli Lusby, who married Sophia Journey in 1832.
FIGURE 1

Topography of 18 AN 500
The 1860 Census still lists Benjamin Lusby as a resident of Anne Arundel County with his wife Elizabeth, children Susan and Robert, and Isaac Nicholls. Fifteen slaves are recorded in two dwellings. No names are given. The 1864 Register of Slaves (Anne Arundel County, Second Election District, 1864:68-69) lists Benjamin Lusby as owning 19 slaves. The surnames listed are Richardson, Bias, Troy, Butler, Clark, and Snowden. The 1870 Census has the same white people listed as in 1860. Robert Lusby's occupation is now given as a physician. Isaac Nicholls is now married to Amanda and they have a child named Rosetta. Isaac's profession is listed as a farmer. After the Lusby household, resident Black families are listed. Thomas Anderson (45) is recorded as a farm laborer, Maria Anderson (35) as a cook. It is assumed that they were married and the three children listed after them are their offspring. These are a boy, Riziu (12), Fanny (5), and Thomas (2). This family was probably in residence near the Lusby household as Maria is listed as a cook. The next Black family listed is the Brown family. William is 65 and listed as a farm laborer, as is Aunny, 55, who is assumed to be his wife. Also listed as farm laborers are Thomas (36), Mary (40), Rachel (35), Maria (30), and Harriet (13). These are assumed to be William and Aunny's offspring. Five children with the surname Johnson are listed, but no adults with this name appear. The children range in ages from 2 to 12 and include one boy and four girls. Dinah Hepburn (45) is listed as a farm laborer, apparently with four offspring: Philip (13), Alice (17), Louise (7), and Prince Albert (3). One final Black individual listed with the Lusby's is John Magruder, age 28, recorded as a farm laborer. The 1880 Federal Census lists Benjamin Lusby as in good health, aged 83 and with no profession. Only three other white people are recorded as being in residence. These are James Connor (W 41) listed as a farmer, Elizabeth (W 40) his wife, listed as a housekeeper and M.A. Nicholls (White female, 43) listed as an unmarried boarder. M.A. Nicholls is apparently Mary Nicholls, Isaac's sister who was last listed in 1859. As previously stated, Benjamin Lusby's wife was Elizabeth Nicholls. The relationship of Elizabeth to Mary and Isaac is not clear. Isaac Nicholls is now listed in a separate household with his wife Amanda and children Lucita and Lillie. Eight separate Black households are listed between Isaac Nicholls and Benjamin Lusby. The surnames include Hughes, Scott, Mathews, Blackiston, Simons, and Reed. The Simons household includes Charles, 45, listed as a laborer, and his wife Ellen, 48. Six children are listed aged 1 to 18. The only boy is Daniel Simons age 14.

Benjamin Lusby evidently died between 1880 and 1900 as he does not appear in the 1900 census (the 1890 census is not extant). Isaac Nicholls is listed in 1900 with his wife and children. Three Black families are listed following the Nicholls' entry. The surnames are Colgist, Hall, and Butler. Daniel Simons is listed as a lodger at the Butler residence. Daniel's age is given as 42 which is an 8 year difference from his age as calculated based on the age given in the 1880 census. His father, Charles, is listed as 65 and living alone in Annapolis.

The 1910 Census lists Daniel Simons as living on South River Road in Anne Arundel County. His age is listed as 47 and he is recorded as a wood chopper. His wife was Mary C. Simons, age 32, listed as a laundress. Three other individuals are listed as residents in the household: Mary F. Johnson, a lodger and laundress; Clifton Colbert, a boarder and farm laborer; and Norman Colbert, a boarder and dairyman. Placing this household on the map is quite difficult. None of the white families associated with the Lusby farm are listed near the Simons family in the census. Isaac Nicholls is not listed at all. Frisby Anderson (see below) is listed...
in the 2nd precinct of the 2nd Election District some 20 pages following the Simons' entry. It is possible that the enumerator's travels took him down the South River Road and he accessed the Simons family from this route while he visited the main house from Crownsville Road. It is not clear from the records. Therefore, it is possible that Daniel Simons was at 18AN500 at this time, but conclusive evidence is not forthcoming.

From the documentary data it is unclear which of the Black families who appear in the documents were the residents of AN 500. Benjamin Lusby owned the land from before 1850 to his death. Since the structure apparently stood during this time, some of the families listed probably lived there. The occupants could have been any of the families in residence during the period. Only oral data can clarify the picture somewhat and allow us to infer associations.

ORAL HISTORY

This section of the report details information gained from Mr. Bernard J. Fischer in an interview conducted in September of 1982. Mr. Fischer has been a resident of the farm on which 18AN500 is located since 1913. He moved there with his family at that time from Baltimore where his father had operated a store. Following a doctor's advice, the elder Mr. Fischer moved from the city to the country. The farm was owned by Mr. Fischer in partnership with Cecil Brown. Mr. Brown sold Mr. Fischer his interest in the farm when the latter moved in 1913.

The Structure

Mr. B.J. Fischer's memories of the structure begin ca. 1915 when his daily walk to school took him near 18AN500. The structure was of log construction with a riven shingle roof. A stone and brick chimney was on the extreme eastern gable end of the house and a small lean-to shed was attached to the other gable end. The floor plan consisted of two rooms in the main cell downstairs, a small room under the lean-to, and one room upstairs. The upper room was lit by windows in the gable ends. Mr. Fischer could not recall window locations on the ground floor. However, he did remember that the only external door opened into the center room. Internal door locations joined the central room to both the eastern room and the lean-to. Mr. Fischer could not recall the location of the stairway or ladder connecting the upstairs to the ground floor.

Mr. Fischer recalled several details about the construction techniques used in the house. The logs had been hewn square before being corner-notched in place. They apparently rested on a sandstone foundation. The spaces between the logs had been chinked with very hard mortar. The exterior of the structure was unpainted but Mr. Fischer believes the interior may have been whitewashed. The chimney was apparently designed for a hearth, but had been blocked off except for a small space for a stove flue. The structure had wood floors.

The functions of the rooms were multipurpose. The lean-to shed was apparently used as a store or pantry. Mr. Fischer described the central room as a kitchen. Food was apparently heated in the adjacent room but processing and preparation was confined to the central room. The eastern room was used as a primary living
area, something analogous to a hall. The upstairs room was used as a sleeping area. Mr. Fischer was inside the house only a few times so he did not recall furnishings beyond a cook stove in the eastern room.

The exterior landscape was remembered very well by Mr. Fischer as he walked near the site every day on his way to school. The homelot had a small vegetable garden south of the structure. The house and garden were surrounded by a fence of split pine poles nailed to pine saplings. The fence was two rails high. Mr. Fischer could not remember gate locations. However, travel was south to Old Chesterfield Road and north towards Crownsville so paths led off in these directions (Figure 2). The path towards Crownsville led towards the Fischer's house. Between the two structures was a "bubbling spring" which supplied water for the occupants of AN500. The spring was lined with brick in the early 20th century but that lining has now been superceded by concrete well rings. The path from AN500 to the spring is still visible along the eastern edge of the ridge. Mr. Fischer believes a privy was located somewhere near the site but does not recall its location.

18AN500 moved from the realm of architectural history to archeology sometime in the early 1920s when combination of decay and vandalism reduced the structure to the archeological record. Mr. Fischer said that local children broke the windows and toppled the chimney, and the wood portions of the structure were quite decayed and collapsing. Later, when Mr. Fischer milled some logs from the area he encountered nails which had secured the poles of the fence. The area reverted to scrub growth and was used as a wood lot pasture for livestock.

Occupants

According to Mr. Fischer, the residents of 18AN500 during the period from 1913 until its demise were the Simons family. Daniel Simons, Sr. worked on the Fischer farm in exchange for his housing and a $5 to $6 weekly wage. Living in the house with Mr. Simons were his wife (whose name Mr. Fischer cannot recall), Daniel Simons, Jr. (their son), and the son's wife and four children. Needless to say, conditions were quite cramped within the structure.

Daniel Simons, Sr., worked on the farm performing a variety of agricultural tasks. In addition to his housing and salary, Mr. Fischer's family provided milk every day for the Simons from their 18-head dairy herd. Water was supplied by the aforementioned spring, and firewood was obtained free from the farm. The small garden near the structure provided vegetables. Mr. Fischer could not recall if the Simons kept hogs or other livestock, but assumes some meat source was available.

Background and Association

In addition to information specific to 18AN500, Mr. Fischer provided useful background and ancillary data concerning the farm. When the Fischers arrived in 1913, the farm was occupied by Frisbee Anderson who had been operating under a lease as a tenant. Mr. Anderson remained around the farm for three years to help teach the Fischers agricultural techniques. Mr. Anderson's son Alec married
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FIGURE 2
Site Area ca. 1906
Lola Nicholls and they lived on the third floor of the Fischer house for a period of time. The relationship between Lola Nicholls and the Nicholls family associated with Benjamin Lusby is not clear. Her name does not match with any of Isaac Nicholls' offspring. Mr. Fischer is not sure, but he believes that someone named Clayton owned the farm before his father acquired it.

Mr. Fischer knows of only one other dwelling on the farm. Immediately west of the Fischer house, a small structure was located which Mr. Fischer characterized as a "slave cabin". This structure was of log construction with a small root cellar beneath. A depression is still obvious at the location. Mr. Fischer said this structure was not occupied during his family's tenure there and it was used only for the storage of root crops. This structure collapsed in the early to mid-1920s.

Summary

Mr. Fischer's recollections of 18AN500 provided us with a wealth of data on the above-grade nature of the site. The Simons house was of simple log construction, with three ground floor and two upstairs rooms. The structure had a hearth type masonry chimney and wood floors. The site was surrounded by a pole fence which enclosed both the house and an adjacent garden. Water came from a spring northeast of the site. Outward travel proceeded north and south to Crownsville Road and Old Chesterfield Roads respectively.

FIELD TECHNIQUES

The field techniques used to recover the data base for this study were designed to address questions of site extent, spatial utilization, and time of occupation, while minimally impacting the fragile cultural record. A strategy of test pits excavated with a 15 cm diameter post hole digger on an interval of 3 meters was used to recover a systematic sample. After identification of the major site loci, additional transects of these test pits were excavated on 6 meter intervals beyond the main site area to test for additional cultural material. The locations of all the tests are illustrated in Figure 3.

The advantage of post hole digger excavated test pits rests in the consistency of diameter practical with the method. It is difficult to maintain a consistent diameter with shovel dug test pits, whereas post hole diggers create a standard unit of approximately 15 cm in diameter. By recording depth and soil profile, these consistently-sized test units allow for efficient comparison among units. Additionally, in the case of an unusual site such as 18AN500, impact by the archeologist on the fragile cultural record is minimized.

All soils were sifted through ¼" mesh screen and all cultural material was retained. A soil sample was retained from the top 15 cm of the test for chemical analysis. Soil analysis can address questions of spatial utilization and disposal patterns not recorded in the artifactual record (Keeler, 1977). On a site like 18AN500 with a low artifact density, "subtle clues" such as soil chemistry must be utilized to effectively evaluate the resource (Ferguson, 1979:385).
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FIGURE 3
Test Pit Locations
An additional element of the research design for 18AN500 involved systematic probing around the above-grade remains of the chimney. It was hoped that additional foundation lines could be delineated. The structure appears to have had an intermittent stone footing. Material from the chimney collapse litters the area, making segregation of in situ masonry very difficult. However, general house outlines were obtained.

The final technique used to address spatial utilization involved an additional set of post hole digger excavated test pits around the structure as outlined by the systematic probing described above. This set of tests was spaced at one meter intervals around the periphery of the foundation approximately 0.5 meters from the original structure edge. These pits, oriented to the structure, provide data concerning door and window location and disposal habits of the occupants. The locations of these tests are presented in Figure 4.

In sum, the field techniques utilized at 18AN500 were directed toward obtaining a systematic sample of artifacts and soil in the vicinity of the structure. Additionally, pits along the periphery of the foundation itself allow us to reconstruct the architectural use of space and disposal habits. The findings of each of these strategies will be presented below.

FIELD FINDINGS

Stratigraphy

The stratigraphy exposed by the post hole digger excavation units is rather consistent throughout the sample area. A layer of humic material approximately 6 cm. thick leaches into an undisturbed yellow brown clayey subsoil (Figure 5). Twenty-two contiguous tests uncovered a different soil profile: in these units a layer of mixed humic loam about 20 cm. thick gives way to a yellow brown clayey subsoil. The mixed humic loam appears to be a plow zone. Figure 5 illustrates a typical profile through the plowed soil. Figure 6 shows the location of the pits which encountered this horizon in a roughly rectangular area south of the chimney. The rest of the site does not appear to have been plowed during or since occupation. It is possible that the area had been plowed before occupation, but if so all evidence has eroded away. This is quite possible given the highly erodible nature of the Monmouth clay loam series which overlies the area (Kirby and Matthews 1973:38).

Artifact Distributions

Distributional analysis of various classes of artifacts has effectively delineated loci of occupation at 18AN500. Figure 7 illustrates the distribution of architectural debris (nails, glass, and brick). A marked concentration is located adjacent to the chimney and some material appears south and west of the house. Further refinement of the architectural patterning can be accomplished through mapping various architectural classes. Nails are widely dispersed but tend to cluster around the house (Figure 8). The outlying nails may relate to fences, ephemeral outbuildings, or trash and fireplace ash disposal. Window glass clusters tightly around the structure (Figure 9) clearly delineating the architectural locus. Red brick fragments also show a peak adjacent to the structure.
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The diffuse scatter emanating from the structure may be a measure of the distance brick fragments could be tossed by juveniles. Taken together, the distributions of the various architectural debris elucidate the pattern of architectural activities at 18AN500.

The distribution of domestic artifacts delineates areas of activity around the structure. Figure 11 illustrates total domestic material, consisting of ceramics and bottle glass. Material is clustered around the structure and extends somewhat to the east, south, and west. An additional, relatively linear scatter of material extends north-northwest of the structure. Refinement of these patterns can be achieved by mapping discrete domestic classes. As Figure 12 illustrates, ceramics cluster tightly around the structure with some dispersal towards the south. A suggestion of a northwest trending linear pattern is still present. An attempt was made to map dining versus utility ceramics. Both of these subclasses showed similar distributions, probably resulting from similar activity of deposition patterns. Distribution of bottle glass again clusters around the structure (Figure 13). Additionally, a linear pattern is observed northwest of the house. The tendency for most domestic artifacts to cluster south of the house indicates that this was a principal area of trash dumping and other domestic activities. The linear scatter northwest of the house may indicate the presence of a foot path leading away from the structure, possibly to Old Chesterfield Road.

When the architectural and domestic artifact distribution patterns are considered together a fairly clear picture of the occupation of 18AN500 begins to emerge. The structure appears to be an isolated architectural locus without additional associated structures. Activities appear to be centered around the house and in the area to the south.

Artifact Distributions near the Structure

In addition to overall site distributional analyses, structure specific tests were undertaken to identify door and window locations. The results of these tests are quite instructive. Figure 14 illustrates the distribution of nails around the house. One would expect relatively similar concentrations on all sides. Instead, a greater number of nails were recovered from the southern edge. This may imply more activity to the south of the house than to the north. The larger number of nails could be the function of non-structure-related use of nails south of the house. Alternatively, the nail pattern may document the demise of the structure. If the south and north walls fell southward, we might expect the pattern indicated by the nail distribution. This would fit well with the prevailing northern winds of winter storms.

Figure 15 illustrates window glass frequencies around the house. Notable clusters occur on the southeast and southwest corners of the structure. An additional cluster occurs near the center of the northern wall. These clusters point to the locations of windows in the house, two on the south wall and one on the north wall. Bottle glass distribution presents an inverse situation to that of window glass. A very strong cluster occurs near the center of the southern wall suggesting a door location (Figure 16). Very little material is along the northern wall suggesting low activity in this area. Greater quantities are obvious.
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FIGURE 12
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FIGURE 13
Distribution of Bottle Glass
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FIGURE 14

Distribution of Nails Around Structure
(Numbers represent nails per test pit)
FIGURE 15

Distribution of Window Glass Around Structure
(Numbers represent glass fragments per test pit)
Distribution of Bottle Glass Around Structure (Numbers represent sherds per test pit)
along the south wall, suggesting high activity. Ceramics were not mapped as only 4 sherds were recovered.

The distribution of material adjacent to the structure suggests the form of the structure and the activities that went on about it. The structure had three windows on the ground floor, two on opposing corners of the south wall, and one central to the north wall. Only one door is indicated by the artifact patterns. It is central in the south wall. Activities around the house seemed to focus towards the south (the garden area). This is logical as the only door from the structure opened in this direction.

ARTIFACTUAL DATING

Ceramics

Dating the occupation of late 19th- and early 20th- century sites is very difficult due to the lack of changes in ceramic technology and decoration through the period. The refined whitewares and semiporcelains developed by the middle of the nineteenth century are essentially the same ceramics we use today. Most of the types in our present collection fall into this class.

| Undecorated whiteware | 28 |
| Brown transfer printed whiteware | 1 |
| Cream colored earthenware | 1 |
| Porcelain | 1 |
| Rockingham glazed earthenware | 1 |
| Undecorated yellow ware | 5 |
| Annular decorated yellow ware | 1 |
| Grey salt glazed stoneware | 2 |
| Lead glazed brown earthenware | 4 |
| **Total** | **44** |
| % dining wares | 75% |
| % utility wares | 25% |

Noel Hume (1976:130) dates whiteware to 1820 - 1900+. Whitewares are still being manufactured today, so this bracket date could be expanded to 1820 - 1982. Needless to say, this is not of great utility in dating the occupation of 18AN500. Fortunately, one fragment of a manufacturer's bottom-mark was recovered. This mark is apparently that of the Edwin Bennett Pottery Company of Baltimore, Maryland. This mark was in use from 1890 to 1908 (Barber, 1909). The Bennett Pottery was the largest ceramic manufacturer in Baltimore throughout the latter 19th and early 20th centuries (Pearce, 1959:89).
The additional dining wares present include cream colored earthenware, porcelain, Rockingham glazed earthenware, and annular decorated yellow ware. None of these wares are particularly temporally diagnostic. All date to the later 19th and 20th centuries (Noel Hume, 1976:100-101). The Rockingham glazed earthenware and the annular decorated yellow ware are very similar to types produced by the Bennett Pottery of Baltimore in the period 1846-1908 (Pearce, 1959:78-81). Similar wares were produced by Bennett's competitors throughout the period so specific association with one pottery is tenuous at best.

The utilitarian ceramics are even less temporally diagnostic than the dining wares. Grey salt glazed stoneware was manufactured throughout the 19th century (Noel Hume, 1976:100). Yellow ware is common throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, generally in the form of large bowls. Finally, lead glazed earthenwares are difficult to place any temporal brackets upon as their use extends to before 1700 and well into the 20th century.

**Bottle Glass**

Bottle glass is generally of greater utility in dating late 19th and early 20th century sites due to the major revolution in glass container technology underway in the period. However, one must have enough of a vessel to discuss the technology of manufacture to effectively date an item. Unfortunately, we have no vessels with sufficient completeness to date by this method. The nature of the testing recovered only small fragments so that dating the site by glass is quite difficult.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>clear bottle glass</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lavender (manganese tinted) bottle glass</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pale blue bottle glass</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aqua tinted bottle glass</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brown/amber bottle glass</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green bottle glass</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of these glass types are temporally diagnostic except the lavender (manganese tinted) variety. The use of manganese as a decolorant in glass dates to before 1913 when supplies of the material were cut off from Germany (Toulouse, 1971:534). While only a small number of fragments are present, it does suggest occupation on the site before 1913.

Other artifact classes present at 18AN500 do little to further define the temporal limits of the site. Eleven fragments of a hurricane type lamp globe suggest the occupants lit their home with such lamps, but such lamps were used throughout the 19th century and to the present. Architectural debris is quite mute on dating the site. Both wire and cut nails are present, suggesting perhaps that both types were in current use at the time of construction. This would be
from ca. 1880 to present (Nelson, 1962:3). The wire nails may, however, relate to repair and therefore post-date the original construction. Other than pointing to the latter 19th and early 20th centuries, the miscellaneous artifacts from 18AN500 do little to date the site.

Summary

Based on the artifacts recovered in our investigation of 18AN500 a bracket date of ca. 1880 to 1920 is suggested. The cut nails may indicate construction before ca. 1880 as this is when wire nails began to supercede cut nails. However, cut nails continued to be used for specialized purposes, so a later date may be indicated. The manganese tinted glass suggests occupation before 1913, but does not let us know how long before 1913. Finally, the bottom marked white ware sherd dates from 1890 - 1908. This does not tell us when the object was discarded, only when it was manufactured. In sum, the artifacts suggest occupation from ca. 1880 to 1920+.

DATING ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES

Dating any vernacular structure on architectural criteria is a difficult pursuit. Dating a structure which exists above grade only as a pile of chimney stones is very nearly impossible without associated diagnostic artifacts. However, some characteristics of the structure can be identified which assist in delimiting its construction date. The most important artifact in this pursuit is the chimney base. The evidence is for a simple U-shaped chimney with an open hearth. In his useful study, Hearth and Home, George McDaniel discusses antebellum Black housing in Maryland and its evolution following emancipation. He notes a general transition occurring in the 1880s and 1890s. During this period new structures being built began to be designed with masonry chimneys rather than log chimneys. This change apparently began nearer the urban centers such as Washington and Baltimore and diffused outward (McDaniel, 1982:136). This suggests construction of the chimney by 1890.

Concurrent with this shift in chimney type was the addition of wood floors and glass windows. We have only ethnographic evidence for the wood floors in 18AN500, but there is archeological evidence for glass windows at the structure. The structural features suggest a construction date in the 1880's or 1890's.

SYNTHESIS

By combining the diverse data sources utilized in this study, a rather clear picture of life at 18AN500 emerges. The documentary data give us a framework of fact upon which to hang additional information. The oral information puts flesh and blood on this framework in the form of people and personalities recalled by Mr. Fischer. Finally, archeological data tie the fleshed-out framework to the earth and adds its own illumination.

The house at 18AN500 was probably built in the 1880's while Benjamin Lusby was still alive. It was designed to house tenants or farm laborers working on the Lusby farm. It could have been the dwelling of the Hughes, Scott, Mathews, Blackiston, Simons, or Reed families. None of these families are listed in the
1900 census, which suggests a rapid turnover in tenants. At this time the tenant families are Colgist, Hall, and Butler. Daniel Simons is listed as a lodger at the Butler residence. He was previously listed with his father in the 1880 census. By 1913 he is living in the structure at 18AN500 with his wife and adult son, and his son's wife and offspring. It is possible that the structure in which Charles Simons was dwelling in 1880 is the same house Daniel occupied in 1915. It is also possible that the same structure was the one in which Daniel lived as a lodger with the Butler family. Such instances of kin oriented reoccupation of a non-owned dwelling have been recorded by McDaniel (1982:185). A structure may well be associated with a family even if they do not own it. Such may be the case with 18AN500 with four generations of Simons occupying it at one time or another.

The house at 18AN500 was a very simple affair. The structure was built of hewn logs on a sandstone foundation and with a masonry chimney on the gable. The house was only 16 x 12 feet, divided into two ground floor cells. A small shed was attached to the gable end opposite the chimney. Access was through one door on the wall opening into the central room. Internal doors connected the other rooms to this room. The upstairs was merely a loft. Windows were in the gable ends upstairs and probably in the southern wall in each of the main rooms on the ground floor. (see Figures 17&18). No other structures appear to have existed on the site. South of the house was a small garden plot. This and the house were both surrounded by a fence of poles nailed to pine saplings.

**WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF HISTORY**

The significance of 18AN500 should be viewed within the context of what it can tell us about the people it represented. The residents of 18AN500 were poor black people. These people often never owned land, and existed only as statistics in the public record. Most could not read or write. Traditional history has focused on the great man and ignored the common-folk. Poor people are so busy trying to stay alive that they leave little record for the modern historian to pursue. However, these poorer sorts represented a significant portion of the population. To ignore their contributions to history presents an unbalanced picture.

George McDaniel in Hearth and Home has made great progress in approaching the houses and lifeways of rural Black people in Maryland (1982). His extensive survey of standing structures has found the older Black housing to be a dwindling resource. Within his own survey sample, six of the structures he recorded have subsequently been destroyed (McDaniel, 1982:246). This is in keeping with the national trend of depopulation of the rural areas followed by reoccupation as suburban areas. What was once rural tobacco land is now becoming suburbs for Washington, Baltimore, and Annapolis. McDaniel found only 16 structures in Anne Arundel County in his survey (1982:251-252). Additional structures may exist, but they must be viewed as a rapidly disappearing phenomenon. Preservation and study of these structures is a necessity if we are to understand their place in culture history.

As fewer structures remain, it will fall more upon the shoulders of archeologists to address the research of how the "folks" lived. Only archeology can now answer questions upon which history is mute. 18AN500 is an unique example
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Conjectural Perspective View of the Simons House, ca. 1915
of an archeological site which has a record not only in the ground, but also in the minds of people who saw it standing. Mr. Fischer's memories of the house allow us to reconstruct above grade what we never could based solely on archeology.

Within a slightly broader context than site specific interpretations, 18AN500 could be effectively used to address questions of comparison between economic classes within a single farm. Comparison of material from 18AN500 to material which probably exists adjacent to the Fischer's residence could be used to evaluate the comparative wealth/status of the two households (Miller, 1982). Similar comparisons have been attempted with a slave, overseer, and master complex in Georgia (Otto, 1977:92). Such research could aid measurably to our understanding. In addition to 18AN500, material associated with the structure behind the Fischer residence could let us compare the "main house" with a slave dependency. One could then examine the shift that occurs with emancipation. This complex of archeological sites and standing structure offers a unique opportunity to compare the relative lot of socio-economic classes through time.

The integrity of 18AN500 is excellent. No post-occupational plowing or other disturbances have occurred. Mr. Fischer's memories of the site enrich it greatly, allowing us to see the structure which exists only as an archeological pattern. While such sites are not intrinsically rare (the 1900 Census lists 50,000 Blacks in rural Maryland), those with both high integrity and associated oral data are few. No other systematic archeological investigations have been undertaken on 19th and 20th century rural Black dwellings in Maryland (Clark, personal communication, 1982). For all these reasons, 18AN500 appears eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNED IMPACT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL WORK

The area of proposed impact at 18AN500 is illustrated in Figure 19. While missing the immediate house area and garden, construction as presently planned will severely impact the pattern of domestic materials identified by the testing. Specifically, artifacts and probable features which are of great importance to fully understanding the site would be destroyed. The area shaded on Figure 19 represents the portion of the site which should be intensively examined before construction takes place.

Any mitigation plan must include large amounts of budgeted time for additional historic research. Historic research with late 19th and early 20th century records is time-consuming due to the great number of records available and the general lack of indexes. Additional oral research is also of much importance in this inquiry, and diverse individuals must be found and contacted. However, it is only through oral research that many important questions could be addressed.

Field work for the project should be directed to testing the activity patterns delineated by artifact distributions and locating and explaining subsurface features. These features would include trash pits, post holes, privy fills, and other deposits within the site area but not immediately adjacent to the chimney. Of particular
FIGURE 19

AREA OF PROPOSED MITIGATION
importance would be segregation of material from sealed contexts. Artifacts from such features could be used to assess status and time period while floral and faunal remains would provide data on diet. All of these significant matters must be addressed if the site is to be disturbed.

Based on current knowledge of activity patterning across the site, it is assumed that approximately half of the impact area would need to be excavated. This amounts to roughly 400 square meters (see Figure 19). Given the level and length of occupation, few subsurface features may be present. However, their rarity increases the significance of any features found.

Excavations undertaken should retain all artifacts recovered. Laboratory analysis should address temporal questions, status questions, and general life-ways questions. Site 18AN500 provides a rare opportunity to investigate a group who, due to their status and concomitant wealth, left a very incomplete documentary record. The site should make a significant contribution to our understanding of post-bellum Blacks in both Anne Arundel County and in Maryland in general.
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APPENDIX I

SOILS ANALYSIS
APPENDIX I

Soils Analysis

This appendix presents the results of chemical analyses of soil samples recovered from 18AN500. The analyses provide distributional data which relate to the artifact distribution patterns presented in the text. The artifact and soil chemical patterns clearly delineate areas of activity at 18AN500.

The distributional analysis of various soil chemicals has been effectively used by Keeler (1977) and others in examining historic sites. The assumption is that human activities alter the soil chemistry and that this "signature" of activity remains for a long period after site abandonment. The greatest success with such analyses has centered upon phosphate, potassium and calcium.

Phosphate is derived from organic wastes and suggests deposition habits, animal penning, and garden manuring. Potassium relates to the deposition of fireplace ash and the location of exterior surface fires. Finally, calcium results from oyster shell deposition, agricultural liming, and architectural sources such as mortar. The pattern of each of these soil elements will be discussed separately.

The phosphate pattern (Figure 20) shows a strong peak south and west of the chimney. This correlates well with the area of the garden identified by the test pits (see Figure 6), and suggests intentional manuring of the garden area. East of the structure is a concentration of phosphates which may relate to overbank deposition of organic wastes. A third concentration of phosphate occurs in the north of the site. Very little domestic material was recovered in this area (see Figure 11). The most plausible hypothesis is that this concentration results from domestic animals. The fence described by Mr. Fischer was designed to keep animals out of the homelot. In the interview, he commented upon the cattle's tendency to congregate adjacent to this fence where trees provided shade. Their presence is reflected in the soil chemistry.

The potassium distribution (Figure 21) shows a generally dispersed and random pattern. There appears to be only limited intentional deposition in the garden area, and greater deposition south of the garden. The dispersed nature of distributions has been observed on other sites where soils analysis has been undertaken (Miller, personal communication 1980). The very random dumping of fireplace ash is probably a function of the material. It is much less odious than other organic wastes. Both Keeler (1977) and Fine (1980) had marked concentrations of potassium in their respective analyses. These have been interpreted as ash banks and garden areas. The random distribution of potassium in our study seems to suggest that the occupants of 18AN500 neither used the fireplace ash in their garden nor did they consistently dispose of it in one location. A pattern of dumping wherever was convenient seems to be implied.
Phosphate Distribution at 18 AN 500
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Potassium Distribution at 18 AN 500
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The distribution of calcium (Figure 22) clearly shows the location of the garden. It appears that the soils have been consistently limed, as one would expect in a garden. The additional concentration nearer the structure relates to calcium derived from architectural sources such as mortar. Little evidence of other activity is reflected in the calcium distribution. The low number of oyster shells recovered suggests a limited utilization of shellfish in the diet. With such a small use of oysters and concomitant shell deposition, soils analysis for calcium does not reflect general trash deposition patterns, only architectural and horticultural patterns.

Analysis of soils from the structure specific tests (see Figure 4) also revealed meaningful distribution patterns. Figure 23 illustrates the pattern of phosphate distribution adjacent to the structure. Door location is quite obvious given the "right-handed toss" phenomenon: i.e., as nearly 75% of the population is right-handed, greater deposition would occur to the left of the door. The additional concentration at the south-western corner of the house may be a function of it being the nearest point to the door not immediately in sight of a window. The latter deposition habit has been referred to as the "tavern pattern" by one researcher (Miller, personal communication 1980) but doubtlessly relates to a broader cultural activity.

Potassium (Figure 24) shows little clustering or concentration in relation to the structure. This is not surprising given the generally random distribution of potassium observed elsewhere on the site. Again, it is probably a function of fireplace ash being less disagreeable than kitchen offal.

Calcium distribution (Figure 25) does not seem particularly meaningful in the pits adjacent to the structure. The highest concentrations are from two test pits which recovered fairly large quantities of mortar. The lack of calcium patterning is likely a result of oysters not being an important part of the diet. The pattern only reflects architectural activities already apparent.

Summary

In conclusion, the soil chemistry patterns of 18AH500 provided useful information for filling in the cultural picture at this site. Phosphate patterns are most illustrative of the deposition of organic wastes and animal restraining fences. On a structure specific basis, phosphate concentrations reinforce our interpretation of door location and provide useful inferences to other important activities. Potassium concentrations are quite random, suggesting little pattern to the deposition of fireplace ash. Calcium distribution strongly correlates with garden location suggesting liming of this area. Additional calcium appears architectural in origin. Together, these chemical patterns better illuminate the activities at 18AH500.
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SITE LOCATIONAL DATA
Numbers Designate Maryland Archeological Research Units (Council for Maryland Archeology)

COASTAL PLAIN PROVINCE
Unit 1 - Atlantic Drainage
Unit 2 - Pocomoke Drainage
Unit 3 - Nanticoke-Wicomico-Manokin-Big Annemessex Drainages
Unit 4 - Choptank Drainage
Unit 5 - Chester Drainage
Unit 6 - Sassafras-Elk-Northeast-Bush-Susquehanna Drainages
Unit 7 - Gunpowder-Middle-Bay-Patapsco-Magothy-Seyersouth-Rhode-West Drainages
Unit 8 - Riverine Patuxent Drainage
Unit 9 - Estuarine Patuxent Drainage
Unit 10 - Estuarine Patomac Drainage
Unit 11 - Riverine Potomac Drainage

APPALACHIAN PROVINCE
Unit 18 - Catoctin Creek Drainage
Unit 19 - Antietam Creek-Conococheague Creek Drainages
Unit 20 - Licking Creek-Tomoloway Creek-Fifteenmile Creek Drainages
Unit 21 - Town Creek Drainage
Unit 22 - Nicholas Creek-Georges Creek Drainages
Unit 23 - Potomac-Savage Drainages
Unit 24 - Toughlougheny-Casselman Drainages

PIEDMONT PROVINCE
Unit 12 - Patomac Drainage
Unit 13 - Patuxent Drainage
Unit 14 - Patapsco-Back-Middle Drainages
Unit 15 - Gunpowder-Bush Drainages
Unit 16 - Susquehanna-Elk-Noxon Drainages
Unit 17 - Monocacy Drainage

FIGURE 26
Location of 18 AN 500
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