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Executive Summary

During May and June 2009, a Phase I archaeological survey of a portion of the tract, His Lordship’s Favor, located near Waldorf, Maryland, was conducted in an effort to locate a complex of structures shown in a 1705 plat prepared by deputy surveyor James Manning. His Lordship’s Favor, a 1250-acre tract originally part of Zekiah Manor, was granted by Lord Baltimore in 1699 to his friend William Boarman. Historical research indicates the possibility that this site could have been the ‘summer house’ Charles Calvert erected at Zekiah Manor in 1673. The project was aimed at locating the site, defining its horizontal and chronological boundaries, and exploring the possibility that this site may have been Calvert’s summer house.

The portion of His Lordship’s Favor containing the buildings consists of a series of terraces dissected by fairly steep ravines. Some of these terraces have been mined for gravel throughout the 20th century, while another portion contains the Charles County Sanitary Landfill. Two terraces, however, survive and have not been substantially altered, although both were logged approximately 10 to 20 years ago. These terraces, comprising approximately 15 acres, were surveyed using a program of systematic shovel testing. Shovel tests were excavated at intervals of 25- and 100-feet to document soil stratigraphy and recover artifacts and other materials important for identifying archaeological sites.

A total of 224 shovel tests and three 5-by-5-foot test units were excavated at His Lordship’s Favor, revealing two historic-period archaeological sites (18CH793 and 18CH799). 18CH793 is a late 17th-/early 18th-century domestic occupation measuring approximately 300 by 300 feet. 18CH793 appears to represent the archaeological traces of the buildings shown on the 1705 map, and the site may have been occupied by tenants or servants in the early 18th century. Efforts to determine whether this site was the location of Calvert’s summer house remain inconclusive; however, the possibility remains that this compound may have been initially developed as the Calvert summer house. Recommendations for future work toward resolving this issue include additional limited testing at 18CH793 and an archaeological survey of the greater Zekiah Manor area.

Archaeological site 18CH799 is a 20th-century domestic site located just south of the southern boundary fence of the county landfill. 18CH799 appears to be the archaeological traces of a farmstead shown on a mid-20th-century USGS quad map.

Archaeological site 18CH793 is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under criterion D (sites that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history); if further work reveals that 18CH793 was the location of Calvert’s summer house, the site may also be eligible for the Register under criterion B, or sites that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. Archaeological site 18CH799 does not appear eligible for the National Register, although a program of more intensive testing may be appropriate before making a final determination.

All artifacts, records, and other materials from this project have been prepared for long-term curation and will be placed with the Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory. Copies of the records have also been deposited with the Department of Anthropology at St. Mary’s College of Maryland.
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I. Introduction

In 1672, Governor Charles Calvert (Figure 1), the eldest son of Cecil Calvert, second Lord Baltimore and the Maryland proprietor, wrote to his father in England to tell him that he was in the process of building a house at Zekiah Manor where he “resolve[d] to live in the Summer time.” Governor Calvert went on to tell his father that he intended to build in brick, and that the house would be for his son, “little Cis,” named after his grandfather, Cecil. The following year, in 1673, Governor Calvert again wrote to Lord Baltimore to report that he had, in fact, “built a Country house for summer time at Zachya,” but, instead of building in brick as planned, the house was raised “according to the fashion of the building of this Country,” likely meaning Calvert had erected an earthfast wooden structure.

The location of Calvert’s ‘summer house’ has long been a mystery. The dwelling, which was clearly built, was mentioned several times in contemporary documents as late as 1681 before disappearing from the record. In 1965, avocational historian Anne S. Brown (1965) published a compelling essay that suggested her parents’ home, Western View, located off Hawkins Gate Road in La Plata, was Calvert’s summer house, albeit renovated and enlarged. Farther afield, at least one historian, his or her identity now lost to posterity, has suggested that the core of the house known as Mount Airy, located at Rosaryville State Park in Upper Marlboro, may have been built in the 1670s as a ‘hunting lodge’ for the Calverts, apparently conflating the ‘summer house’ with leisure and, logically, hunting (Department of Natural Resources 2009).

Most historians now conclude that Calvert’s summer house was built as an earthfast wooden dwelling and has probably not survived as an above-ground structure. At best, the summer house, if it survives, probably does so as an archaeological site. Recent documentary and archaeological research in the Zekiah Run watershed, however, has begun to reveal the locations of early settlements in the vicinity (King, Strickland, and Norris 2008). The boundaries of Lord Baltimore’s Zekiah Manor, containing nearly 9000 acres, have been relocated as a part of that effort. A major goal of this research is to identify the sites and places associated with this important period in early Maryland history, including the ‘summer house’ Governor Calvert built in 1673.

Archaeological investigations at “His Lordship’s Favor,” a tract of land within Lord Baltimore’s Zekiah Manor, have revealed traces of an early domestic occupation that may – or may not – be linked with Governor Calvert’s summer house at his family’s ‘Mannor of Sachay.’ This report describes the work undertaken at His Lordship’s Favor in the late spring and early summer of 2009, and the evidence gathered so far about the search for Lord Baltimore’s summer house.
II. The Calverts at Zekiah Manor

The Charter of Maryland, presented in 1632 by Charles I to Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore, gave the new proprietor a landholding of breathtaking size along with the power to govern it. Lord Baltimore used this landholding to attract colonists to his Maryland venture, some of them his friends and kinsmen, who arrived in Maryland beginning in 1634 when the Ark and the Dove first landed on Potomac shores. Thousands of acres—what at the time must have seemed an endless supply of land—were surveyed and patented throughout the 17th century. Baltimore earned quitrents from these grants, payable annually, which helped to build the proprietary family’s wealth.

Baltimore also intended to reserve tracts for his own use, instructing his various agents in the colony to create for him at least two tracts of 6000 acres each in every county. These tracts were to be erected into manors, and lands within the manors leased for five years at a time to tenants. But Baltimore’s agents in Maryland had only sporadically followed through on the proprietor’s wishes and, in March 1673, Baltimore directed his eldest son, Charles, then governor of Maryland, “to Cause the said Mannors to be duly & Exactly Recorded in the Secretaryes office in Maryland and a true Copy thereof sent to his Lopp” (Archives of Maryland [Archives] 15:31).

Of such concern to Lord Baltimore was this problem that he also asked Charles, who had been in Maryland since 1661 as governor, to insert the names of all proprietary manors onto Augustine Herman’s Map of Maryland and Virginia before it was printed in 1673. Governor Calvert was sensitive to his father’s concerns, reporting to Lord Baltimore often about the standing of the proprietary manors in Maryland and Charles’s ongoing efforts to develop the manors, to have their boundaries perfected, and to have squatters evicted.

By 1667, two manors had been erected for Lord Baltimore in Charles County, including Zekiah and Pangayah manors (Figure 2 shows the reconstructed bounds of Zekiah Manor). How much use Governor Calvert made of the two manors, at least initially, is unknown (Calvert’s principal residence, described as a “fair house of brick and timber” by John Ogilby, was at the mouth of the Patuxent in what is today St. Mary’s County). Some of Calvert’s close friends, including William Boarman and Benjamin Rozier, were in the area, and it is not unreasonable to speculate that Calvert visited these men on occasion. At the same time, Governor Calvert had a somewhat strained relationship with his uncle, Philip, who he had displaced as governor and who Charles believed would undermine him given the opportunity. Spending time with his friends in Charles County may have provided the governor with support not always forthcoming from his uncle.

By 1672, it appears that Governor Calvert was spending more time in the Zekiah region, possibly at the instigation of his father who, in his later years, was increasingly concerned with having the manors surveyed and settled. That year, the governor informed his father that

I am now buildinge vpon yor Lordpps Mannor of Sachay where I Resolve to live in the Summer time. It is a very good part of the Country for health. And much Cleered for husbandry the which I am now vpon. It is thought there is at least five hundr Acres of Cleere Ground. My Resolution is to build a bricke house for little Cis the next yeare… I Chose this Mannor to begin vpon, because yor Lopp has two Mannors together Sachaye & pangey… (Maryland Historical Society [MHS] 1889:272).
Governor Calvert appears to have been responding to Lord Baltimore’s increasingly expressed desire to confirm the status of the proprietary manors. Not only did Calvert describe an already cleared tract to his father, he noted that the brick house he was building would be for ‘little Cis,’ Calvert’s eldest son and Lord Baltimore’s grandson and namesake (MHS 1889:272).

True to his word, Governor Calvert wrote to his father a year later, reporting that he had “already built a Country house for summer time at Zachya,” but “according to the fashion of the building of this Country,” that is, in wood and not in brick. Calvert went on to tell Lord Baltimore that building in Maryland was “very Chargeable” and that he was “loth to bestow much more of it, least (though the place be so healthfull) when I have Done Cis should not like it.” Calvert closes his report on Zekiah by telling his father that he planned to have Stephen
Goffe, apparently recommended by his father, reside “this summer neare Zachiah that he may be neare me” (MHS 1889:284-285).

Calvert’s effort at building a country house for use during the summer is fascinating. “Summerhouses” were becoming fashionable in England among the gentry. In his book on armories, Randle Holme (1688) noted that summerhouses were “places to which the Gentry resort, and abide there dureing the Summer season, for their Recreation and pastime.” A 17th-century summerhouse or gazebo was recently unearthed in the Lisburn Castle Gardens in Ireland, and was found to contain a tiled basement floor, a fireplace, and two small ovens. Artifacts, including a decorative brooch and a gaming piece, suggest that the building was used for summertime socializing by the family that owned the property (Lisburn City Council 2007). As important social artifacts, summer houses have been plumbed for what their construction and use might suggest about architecture, leisure, and gender in the early modern period (Lipsedge 2006). For Charles Calvert to tell his father that he was building a house for use during the summer time would have almost certainly conveyed certain images to the senior Calvert, who had never been to Maryland but who would have been, as a member of the English minor nobility, intimately familiar with the notion of places to which one might retreat during the summer.

Governor Calvert’s principal residence in Maryland at the time was at Mattapany, a “fair house of brick and timber” located near the mouth of the Patuxent in what is today St. Mary’s County. Archaeological investigations at Mattapany have uncovered the brick foundations of a relatively large structure, probably at least two-and-one-half stories in height on a raised basement (Chaney and King 1999). Analysis of the intact masonry and brick assemblage suggests that even the proprietor’s son had a hard time finding a brick-maker and mason with much more than passing skills in Maryland. Calvert spent most of his time at Mattapany, it is clear from the Council records, but his position so close to the Patuxent concerned him, and apparently, his father, too. At some point during his residency, Calvert erected a substantial palisade around a portion of the dwelling’s yard and, from time to time, posted a guard at the colony’s magazine, which was kept nearby (Chaney and King 1999; King and Chaney 1999, 2004; Pogue 1987).

So it is not especially surprising that, on at least one occasion, Governor Calvert suggested that his house at Zekiah would provide him with a sense of security he did not always have at Mattapany. When in one of his letters, Lord Baltimore warned his son that some unscrupulous souls had designs on his son’s life, Calvert told his father that he would “remove up to Zachiah” for his protection and be cautious of the ships he boarded (MHS 1889:277).

Although Calvert regularly used Mattapany as a meeting place, only one meeting of the government took place at Calvert’s Zekiah house. Anne Brown (1965:4) reports that a court of chancery met “at our manor house of Zekiah” in April 1673. The location of this citation is unclear, but the court of chancery did meet in June 1673 in the “Charles County Cort house.” At that time, the court was meeting in private homes, and it is entirely possible and even likely that this June meeting took place at Governor Calvert’s Zekiah residence.

Soon after Governor Calvert had finished Zekiah House, his life changed significantly. His father died in late 1675. Calvert now became the third Lord Baltimore, but without the close contacts and relationships his father had cultivated in England for more than four decades. Calvert returned to England following his father’s death, spending at least 29 months there and possibly as many as 31, away from his Maryland holdings. More than his father, who had never come to Maryland, Charles Calvert had feet literally in both worlds, but in many ways, this strained Calvert’s abilities to govern.
When Calvert returned to England in 1676, the governor had left behind a colony experiencing considerable unrest, especially due to growing tensions between colonists wishing to establish plantations and indigenous groups who had been promised certain securities by the proprietary family. This tension was exacerbated by ongoing raids by ‘foreign’ Indians, and it didn’t help that many Marylanders made little effort to distinguish ‘friend’ Indians from sworn enemies. One particular incident, essentially the murder of a number of ‘friend’ Susquehannocks, created huge troubles for the proprietor and, in Virginia, precipitated Bacon’s Rebellion (Rice 2009:146-147).

Calvert fared no better in his relationship with the Crown. He had endured a long struggle with the king’s tax collector, imploring the Lords of Plantation and Trade to remove the collector, but instead the board heavily fined Calvert and directed him to work things out. On the local level, the proprietor’s colonists were increasingly suspicious of his motives, given that Calvert was an English Catholic, and rumors abounded that the Catholics and Indians would join forces to slaughter the Protestants.

In 1684, Charles returned to England, where he anticipated appealing to the Crown about William Penn’s incursions along Maryland’s northern boundary. Not long after Baltimore departed, his cousin murdered the king’s tax collector, the very same collector Baltimore had complained so harshly about, creating even more political troubles for Baltimore. In 1689, the proprietor lost political control of his colony when a group of colonists, calling themselves the Protestant Associators, seized the State House at St. Mary’s City and established their headquarters at Mattapany. The Associators, all fairly wealthy planters, were, among other things, angry that Baltimore had essentially cut them out of lucrative political positions (Carr and Jordan 1974).

Lord Baltimore still owned and controlled Zekiah Manor and the rest of his family’s landholdings, but things were now radically different in the colony. The proprietor never returned to Maryland, although he continued to manage his lands from afar.

The location of Governor Calvert’s summer house at Zekiah Manor remains a mystery. Indeed, the records suggest that Calvert may not have used this dwelling for more than a few years in the early to mid 1670s. Avocational historian Anne Brown (1965) wondered if her parents’ house at Western View off Hawkins Gate Road may have been Calvert’s summer house, but a review of published photographs suggests not (Currey 2000; King 2008). The last mention of the dwelling may have been in August 1681, when one of the rangers for Charles County and two negotiators for the proprietary government are reported to have stayed the night at “Zekiah House,” which was likely Calvert’s summer house. Finding the summer house on the 8,800-acre-plus Zekiah Manor is very much akin to finding a needle in a haystack. In 2008, however, one of us (Strickland) discovered an intriguing plat in the Charles County court records (Figure 3). Prepared in 1705, the plat depicted His Lordship’s Favor, a 1250-acre parcel on Zekiah Manor that had been transferred to Lord Baltimore’s close friend, William Boarman, in 1699. The surveyor whose name is affixed to the plat, Joseph Manning, was also responsible for the famous Charles County court house plat, which had been completed in 1697 (Figure 4). Previous work at the site of the court house has strongly suggested that Manning depicted buildings realistically (King, Strickland, and Norris 2008). Both plats display a level of detail which presents an important visual record of the landscape in this early period.
The 1705 plat depicts four structures (Figure 5), including one building with a gable-end chimney and three structures that appear unheated. The heated building, almost certainly a dwelling, appears to have a chimney of brick construction. Given the place and the period, the presence of a masonry chimney is unusual. Research indicates that none of the owners of the property after 1699 lived at His Lordship’s Favor, making a dwelling with a brick chimney, presumably for a tenant or a servant, even more unusual. The presence of at least three outbuildings suggests a level of investment in this property that would also be unusual for a tenant.

Could this structure represent the later reuse of Lord Baltimore’s summer house by a tenant? That is one of the questions this project sought to address.

III. His Lordship’s Favor Tract History

His Lordship’s Favor was first created and granted by Lord Baltimore to William Boarman on August 20, 1699 (all transfers described in the following section are summarized in
Before then, the land later forming His Lordship’s Favor was part of Zekiah Manor. By 1699, however, Baltimore, who was then 62 years old, was living in England and had no intention of returning to Maryland, although he remained very involved in the management of his affairs in the colony. Boarman, a fellow Catholic, was a friend of Baltimore’s and had managed to accumulate a considerable amount of property during his time in the colony. Boarman apparently had no desire to keep His Lordship’s Favor, however, because he transferred it almost immediately when he sold it to Hugh Teares in 1699.

Teares appears to have been born in 1665 in Charles County, part of the native-born population that was so slow to emerge in the 17th-century Chesapeake. In 1688, he married Ruth Holland, also native-born, and together they had one child, a daughter known as Elizabeth. Ruth was dead by 1698, the year Teares married his second wife, Eleanor. Teares died in January, 1700, he and Eleanor having been married just over a year (Archives 77:596). His daughter (and only child) was 10 years old at the time of his death.

In June 1700, Teares’ widow, Eleanor, married John Beale. Meanwhile, his daughter, Elizabeth (Eleanor’s stepchild), went to live with her maternal aunt, Elizabeth Hawkins. Hawkins appears to have been living at Johnstown, a plantation located just south of the Charles County Court House on a tributary of Clark Run (King, Strickland, and Norris 2008:17-19).

References for transfers were left out of the body of the text and inserted in Table 1 for ease of reading. All references are available at the Maryland State Archives (MSA) in Annapolis, Maryland. Some, but not all, of these records can be found on-line at the MSA website at www.mdsa.state.md.us.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 20, 1699</td>
<td>William Boarman</td>
<td>MSA S11-46 &amp; 39, Pat. Rec. DD 5/186 &amp; WD 500 (mention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2, 1699</td>
<td>Hugh Teares</td>
<td>MSA S11-46 &amp; 39, Pat. Rec. DD 5/186 &amp; WD 500 (mention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 20, 1700</td>
<td>Eleanor (wife) &amp; Elizabeth (dau.)</td>
<td>MSA SM16-17, Prerogative Court 11/189 &amp; 11/204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22, 1700</td>
<td>Eleanor &amp; John Beale (married)</td>
<td>MSA, Vol 77, p. 596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3, 1724</td>
<td>Richard Beale (son)</td>
<td>MSA CE82-24, CCLR L 2/173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2, 1724/25</td>
<td>William Middleton</td>
<td>MSA CE82-24, CCLR L 2/185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1738</td>
<td>John Lancaster</td>
<td>MSA CE82-27, CCLR O 2/267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 26, 1806</td>
<td>Clement McWilliam</td>
<td>MSA CE82-45, CCLR IB 7/172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7, 1810</td>
<td>John Baptist Thompson</td>
<td>MSA CE82-46, CCLR IB 8/402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 11, 1814</td>
<td>Eleanor Middleton Thompson (wife)</td>
<td>MSA CM412-14, CC Reg. of Wills HB 13/302 &amp; 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Date</td>
<td>Henry A. Thompson</td>
<td>MSA CE52-13, CCLR BGS 3/444 (first known mention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14, 1879</td>
<td>Richard T. Boarman</td>
<td>MSA CE52-13, CCLR BGS 3/444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 1892</td>
<td>Henry A. &amp; Margaret Amelia Turner</td>
<td>MSA CE52-23, CCLR JST 5/232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 1899</td>
<td>J. Samuel and Melina Turner</td>
<td>MSA CE52-28, CCLR BGS 9/585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4, 1913</td>
<td>George B. &amp; Margaret B. Berger</td>
<td>MSA CE52-44, CCLR HCC 25/691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 1952</td>
<td>Charles E. &amp; Mary K. Shirk</td>
<td>MSA CE52-122, CCLR PCM 103/586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 6, 1955</td>
<td>Howard S. Margaret T. Carpenter, Merton J. &amp; Rebecca W. Jarboe</td>
<td>MSA CE52-139, CCLR PCM 120/62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16, 1956</td>
<td>Washington Lumber and Turpentine</td>
<td>MSA CE52-142, CCLR PCM 123/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 26, 1964</td>
<td>St. Charles City Inc.</td>
<td>MSA CE52-191, CCLR PCM 172/64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 22, 1968</td>
<td>Waldorf Development Company Inc.</td>
<td>MSA CE52-218, CCLR PCM 199/436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25, 1976</td>
<td>St. Charles Associates</td>
<td>MSA CE52-473, CCLR PCM 454/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1, 1997</td>
<td>St. Charles Community LLC.</td>
<td>MSA CE52-2456, CCLR DGB 2437/104; MSA C2267, CCLR P.B. 41:268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Chain of title, His Lordship’s Favor.
In 1705, Elizabeth Teares turned 16, the age at which her late father had indicated in his will she should receive her inheritance. Her aunt, Elizabeth Hawkins, requested a survey of the tract, His Lordship’s Favor, which was done soon enough by deputy surveyor Joseph Manning (cf. Figure 3). The northern portion of the tract, including 625 acres, was identified as in the possession of John Beale, Eleanor’s husband. The southern portion, also 625 acres, was listed in the possession of Elizabeth Teares. It is the northern lot – the lot controlled by Beale – which shows the four structures, including what appears to be a dwelling and three outbuildings.

That same year, in 1705, John Beale entered the cattle mark for “Zachie Quarter” (which may very well have been the property depicted in the plat) and “Nanjemoy Plantation.” Beale probably did not live at His Lordship’s Favor given that he refers to it as a quarter. By 1724, Beale was living at Durham, and he was still there in 1733, when he prepared his will. Beale’s will mentions “my old tobacco house,” suggesting he had been at that location for some time.

The question of where Beale was living is important, because it could shed light on the builder of the structures seen on the 1705 plat. Durham, located near Port Tobacco, was originally patented by Walter Bayne (or Beane) in 1666 for 750 acres. Walter’s daughter, Eleanor, inherited the property at her father’s death in 1676. Eleanor Bayne, who first married John Stone, later married Hugh Teares and, following Teares’ death, John Beale. When Teares died, he was living in “Nangemy,” or Nanjemoy, and that may be where Beale moved after his marriage to Teares’ widow. The title for Durham was at this time unclear; indeed, Eleanor had to sue to have the property restored to her after her inheritance was mismanaged while she was still a minor. Eventually Beale acquired Durham and had moved there by 1724 and possibly earlier.

John Beale was a man of high standing in Charles County. He served as a ranger in 1699/1700 for Charles County (Archives 24:121-122) and as a clerk for the Provincial Court in 1707 (Archives 25:206). The following year, in 1708, he was elected to the Lower House of the Assembly (Archives 27:202-208). By 1722, he was an alderman, a member of the Lower House (serving once again as clerk), and the keeper of the Great Seal from Charles Calvert to be presented to the new Chancellor, Benedict Leonard Calvert (Archives 25:389, 438, 469). Sometime in the 1720s he appeared as a member of the Upper House, a position he held as late as
1736 (Archives 33-37, 39). In 1738, long after the site at His Lordship’s Favor had been abandoned, Beale, then listed as being from Prince George’s County, was in court accusing his slave, Bess, of trying to poison him (Archives 28:237). Beale died in 1751.

In 1724, the portion of His Lordship’s Favor in the possession of John Beale (described as 1000 acres) was sold by him to Richard Beale, his son with Eleanor. Richard, who had been born sometime between 1701 and 1705 (the later date appears more correct), was living in Essex County, Virginia by 1724. Richard immediately sold 300 acres of his acquisition to William Middleton, who by then had married Elizabeth Teares. The tract of land sold to Middleton contained the buildings shown on the 1705 plat.

Several days later, Richard Beale then leased 50 acres of His Lordship’s Favor to John and Joan Pigion for a period of 10 years. The leased area “lies on the Dressing Branch between Richard Willson’s Quarter & a small branch that runs up by the old plantation and with sd branch until it intersects the line that divides sd Richd Beale’s land & Richard Wilson’s, containing about 50 acres” (emphasis added). The phrase, “the old plantation,” appears to refer to the buildings on the plat.

In October, 1738 or 1739 (more likely the former), His Lordship’s Favor was resurveyed for William Middleton and James Keech, and included all of the original tract and any vacant land adjacent to it. The same year, William Middleton sold 450 acres of His Lordship’s Favor to Joseph Lancaster, including the portion containing the buildings shown on the 1705 plat. Lancaster sold his 450 acres to Clement McWilliams in 1806.

McWilliams further divided His Lordship’s Favor into smaller tracts. In 1810, he sold one of these tracts, containing 219 acres and the portion with the buildings on it, to John Baptist Thompson. The description of the property in the deed to Thompson describes it as beginning on the south side of a stream near the “old noted fording area” (emphasis added) of the said stream. This fording area, or crossing, is located near a crossing that appears on USGS quad maps for the Popes Creek area for a road that connecting Piney Church Road and Maryland Route 488 (Figure 6).

Following Thompson’s death in 1814, the property went to his wife, Eleanor Middleton Thompson, who had a survey done of the property sometime between 1826 and 1829. The survey has not been located. Eleanor died in 1838 and the disposition of the property upon her death is unknown. By 1879, the property was in the possession of Henry A. Thompson, who may have been related to Eleanor but who was not a son. At his death in that year, Henry Thompson left the property to Richard T. Boarman. Boarman sold the land to Henry A. and Margaret A. Turner in October, 1892, who then sold the land to their son and his wife, J. Samuel and Melina Turner, in April, 1899.

In June 1913, J. Samuel and Melina Turner sold the property to George B. and Margaret B. Berger, with the land described as being 300 acres. An unrecorded record plat done in 1945, entitled “The Berger Farm,” shows the property with several buildings and a road located on it, likely the same buildings and road shown on the USGS quad map (cf. Figure 6). The road is described as connecting both Piney Church Road and Maryland Route 488. The Bergers sold the property in 1952 to Charles E. and Mary K. Shirk who then sold it in September, 1955, to Howard S. and Margaret T. Carpenter and Merton J. and Rebecca W. Jarboe. The deed for the Carpenters and Jarboes lists the property as being 262.3 acres. Shortly after acquiring the property, in March 1956, they sold it to the Washington Lumber and Turpentine Company.
From this point, the property went through the hands of several companies and corporations, including St. Charles City Incorporated, Waldorf Development Company Incorporated, St. Charles Associates, and, currently, the St. Charles Community LLC (now American Community Properties Trust). Portions of the property have been sold as outparcels for use for gravel mining and asphalt production. The Charles County Commissioners purchased a large portion on which to build the county’s sanitary landfill. Today, the area shown on the 1705 plat is wooded, but there is evidence of use for logging.

Figure 6. Crossing or fording area near 18CH793.
A. The Buildings Shown on the 1705 Plat

The buildings depicted on the 1705 plat show an extraordinary amount of detail. The plat was prepared by Joseph Manning, a Charles County resident who served as deputy surveyor for the county in the late 17th and 18th centuries (Wilheit 2003). Earlier, in 1697, Manning had prepared the survey of the Charles County court house lot at Moore’s Lodge (cf. Figure 4). This survey also depicted buildings, and archaeological investigations at Moore’s Lodge have indicated that Manning’s drawings are reasonably accurate representations of the buildings then standing on the courthouse lot.

In his study of the 1705 plat, architectural historian Cary Carson (2008) concluded that he had little “to say about the presumed one-room farmhouse with a single end chimney.” The nearby smaller structures, he found, “make sense as service buildings.” The larger building of the three was probably

…not a kitchen given the lack of chimneys, something that the surveyor was careful to include in his rendering of outbuildings on the 1697 [court house] plat. The way he drew the smallest structure [on the 1705 plat] with flared tops to the two interior posts raises in my mind the possibility that he might be illustrating some kind of open sided shelter with up-braces to the plates. But this is only conjecture.

Carson was more interested in the largest structure depicted on the plat. “Let’s start,” he began,

with what can be said about this building with reasonable certainty: it was a long, rectangular structure with a pitch roof. There were no chimneys, not on the gable ends and not internally. At first I was tempted to interpret the faint horizontal lines across the facade as a representation of brick walling, especially in view of the very different treatment Manning gave to the fronts of the other buildings. It seemed possible to me that he was deliberately suggesting different materials. And that may be true. On the other hand, when he rendered the Charles County courthouse eight years earlier, he used horizontal lines to face a structure that we know was not made of brick. Presumably there they stood for clapboards, or alternatively were simply his convention for denoting the most important building in a group of structures (Carson 2008).

Carson, aware of the authors’ interest in this plat as possible evidence for Charles Calvert’s summer house, asked, “could this large, chimney-less (brick or clapboard) structure be Charles Calvert’s [summer house]?” Carson went on to discuss the idea of a ‘banqueting house,’ an architectural space designed for feasting and “indulgence in luxurious entertainment” (Oxford English Dictionary 2009), and he has argued that the 97-foot addition William Berkeley added to his 1645 house at Green Spring, near Jamestown, Virginia, may have functioned as a banqueting hall or banqueting lodge (Carson 2008). Neither Berkeley nor any other contemporary describes Berkeley’s addition as a banqueting hall, but the term was used in the late 17th century in Virginia’s Northern Neck. Apparently, Thomas Gerrard, Henry Corbin, John Lee, and Isaac Allerton built a banqueting house near the juncture of their respective properties sometime before 1670 to which they would, every four years, invite their neighbors to “perpetuate the bounds” of their properties. Thomas Lee, the nephew of John Lee, recalled the building’s purpose in 1744,
noting that his father (John Lee’s brother) “had been at an entertainment in the said Banqueting
House” (Eaton 1942:5).

While, initially, it may be hard to fathom that Charles Calvert would have seriously
considered the need for a summer house in 17th-century Maryland, especially given that, by 1673,
he had been in the colony for well over a decade and was surely aware of the constraints of life on
the frontier, he was probably aware of Gerrard’s banqueting house. Calvert may have also been
motivated by his father’s desire to secure the proprietary manors by actively using them, and may
have envisioned a summer residence as a tangible way to make a claim to manor property, satisfy
his father, and assert his standing as the wealthiest (and most powerful) man in early Maryland.

Finally, Carson noted that,

…it was often Manning’s practice to show one or both gables in
elevation. Distortion though this was, Manning was always careful to
stand the triangular shape of the roof directly above the gable, except in
his depiction of the building in question here. Here, he has consistently
shown the front slope of the roof projecting forward beyond the gable.
Does this imply that there was a roofed porch across the front? Not likely
in 1705. We don’t look for piazzas for another 50 years. (Be careful not
to be misled by Latrobe’s famous sketch of Green Spring in 1797. We
are now all but certain that it shows a major mid-century rebuilding, and
that Berkeley’s c. 1660 addition had been fitted out with an open
[unroofed] platform above the arcaded loggia.) As yet, I have no
plausible explanation for an overhanging front slope on a turn-of-the-
century structure.

Carson does not note it, but the large building also does not appear to have windows in
any form. This has led some of our colleagues to suggest that this building may have functioned
as a tobacco house, for curing tobacco. As a tobacco house, the building as depicted is larger
than would be expected. Garry Stone (1982) has argued that tobacco houses rarely exceeded 20-
by-40-feet in dimension because of the labor requirements for bringing newly cut, heavy tobacco
to the curing shed. The larger the barn, the greater the distance the tobacco would need to be
carried. In addition, households were able to produce only so much tobacco because of the labor
requirements for cultivation; an excessively large barn would potentially be that much wasted
space. Nonetheless, the possibility that this large building was a tobacco barn cannot be
discarded without further evidence.

A third possibility has also emerged. If Zekiah House was a place to which rangers
patrolling the frontier would have gone, perhaps the larger structure served as a kind of garrison.
Far-fetched as this may seem, a still standing blockhouse erected about 1690 in Baltimore County
is essentially a windowless structure, although the building is heated by a large chimney at one
end (Parish 1970).

Banqueting house, tobacco house, block house, or other house—it was becoming clear
that many of the questions raised about these buildings would have to be addressed through
archaeological study.
IV. Archaeological Investigations

The purpose of the present project was to find archaeological evidence of the buildings depicted on the 1705 plat and to determine the buildings’ dates of occupation and use. Precisely locating the plat on modern maps was critical to this effort, especially because of the extensive development that has taken place in this general area, including the mining of gravel for 20th-century road construction projects.

To identify the area most likely to contain traces of the 1705 buildings, we began by assembling modern maps that clearly preserved portions of the original boundaries of His Lordship’s Favor. These include a survey completed in 1789 (Figure 7) as well as a number of more recent surveys; the process of relocating the 1705 plat on the ground is more fully described in Appendix I. It became rapidly clear that much of the land surface in this area of the county has been disturbed by 20th-century mining and construction activities. Fortunately, however, the area where modern maps indicated the buildings depicted on the 1705 plat had been located appeared to remain relatively intact.

A. Project Area

The His Lordship’s Favor project area comprises approximately 15 acres of the original 1250-acre tract. The project area is located approximately four miles southeast of Waldorf and south of Billingsley Road on a knoll overlooking an unnamed stream emptying into Piney Branch in Charles County, Maryland (Figure 8). The Council for Maryland Archeology has classified this area, which is the western shore coastal plain, as Maryland Archaeological Research Unit Number 10 (Figure 9).

The project area is bounded on the south by an unnamed stream and on the north by the Charles County Sanitary Landfill. Access to the project area was through a gate located on the south (back) side of the landfill property (Figure 10). Topography consists mostly of relatively flat, wooded terraces ranging in elevation from 165 to 185 feet above mean sea level dissected by steep, wooded slopes descending 30 to 50 feet to a number of freshwater streams that eventually feed the Zekiah Run (Figures 11-13).

Today, the land is mostly wooded with a forest cover estimated at 10 to 15 years old. Deep tracks across the area suggest logging activities (Figure 14). The soils in the level terrace areas consist of Beltsville Series while those along the slopes are predominantly Grosstown Series (Figure 15). Beltsville Series soils are deep and moderately well-drained silt loams suitable for a wide range of uses, including agriculture. Grosstown Series soils are also well-drained and are primarily used for hay cultivation or as woodland.

With the exception of the logging and, earlier, plowing activities in this area, the project area remains relatively intact. This is not the case for the property both west and north of the project area. Soil survey maps of the area west of the project area indicate extensive gravel mining covering hundreds of acres (cf. Figure 15). North of the project area, the Charles County Landfill has resulted in the reshaping of that landscape.

In the area where the early colonial site was found, at least two now dry springheads were identified, indicating that the site’s occupants did not have to descend the slopes for fresh water.

---

2 According to Maryland Senator Thomas ‘Mac’ Middleton, the property was logged 10 to 15 years ago.
Figure 7. Lands confiscated after the Revolutionary War, including Zekiah Manor. Courtesy, Maryland State Archives.
Figure 8. Location of project area.
Figure 9. Council for Maryland Archeology Research Unit Map. Red dot depicts site area.

Figure 10. The Charles County Sanitary Landfill back gate.
Figure 11. Unnamed tributary of Piney Branch, east edge of 18CH793.

Figure 12. View of 18CH793, facing south.
Figure 13. View of 18CH793, facing east.
Figure 14. Logging road, His Lordship’s Favor.

Figure 15. Soil types in the project area. Source: USDA Web Soil Survey.
B. Previous Investigations

Although no systematic archaeological survey has been conducted within the His Lordship’s Favor project area, a number of investigations have been focused in the vicinity. The earliest, undertaken by Brad Marshall (1976) on behalf of St. Charles Communities, did not include the project area. Marshall’s work, however, was “extremely cursory” (LeeDecker and Wuebber 1988:6-6) and involved minimal field testing. Several years later, Jeffrey Wanser (1982) undertook a systematic survey of extant archaeological collections recovered from the Zekiah Swamp area.

The first systematic archaeological survey undertaken in the vicinity was done in advance of development of the Charles County Sanitary Landfill (LeeDecker and Wuebber 1988). Field strategy consisted of the excavation of shovel test pits placed at 75-foot intervals (Figure 16); fill from the shovel tests was screened through ¼-inch mesh. Three sites were identified, including 18CH334, 18CH335, and 18CH336. Both 18CH334 and 18CH335 were lithic scatters consisting of quartz and quartzite flakes and otherdebitage. No diagnostic artifacts were recovered from either site. 18CH336 was a rural farmstead characterized by both above-ground features and subsurface deposits. Known as the “Old Collier Place,” 18CH336 included the remains of a chimney at least partially fabricated with “conglomerate rock” and machine-made brick and a nearby well. Subsurface testing yielded pearlware and whiteware ceramic fragments, indicating the site was occupied sometime in the early 19th century, possibly by Eleanor.
Middleton Thompson. The site appears to have been abandoned in the mid-20th century, probably when the property passed through several hands before being acquired by the Washington Lumber and Turpentine Company (LeeDecker and Wuebber 1988:18-19).

C. Methods

Because the project area is wooded, we selected a program of systematic shovel testing as the strategy best suited for locating archaeological sites on this portion of His Lordship’s Favor. Shovel test pits — test holes approximately one foot in diameter and from one-half to two feet deep — are useful for documenting soil stratigraphy and recovering artifact samples and distributional information from across broad areas (Figure 17). Further, by using a shovel test strategy, archaeological data collected from His Lordship’s Favor would be comparable with data collected from other survey areas in the Zekiah.

Figure 17. Excavating a shovel test at His Lordship’s Favor.

With the ongoing assistance of surveyor Kevin Norris and his colleagues at Lorenzi, Dodds, and Gunnill, a grid was first established using the Maryland State Plane Coordinate system. Norris used a Real Time Kinematics (RTK) surveying system to locate state plane coordinates on site; the RTK system provides accuracy by computing the error between the GPS-determined location of a fixed site with the site’s known location and transmitting these real-time correction factors via a cellular modem and the internet to a network of RTK base stations. The His Lordship’s Favor grid was established first by arbitrarily placing two iron rods in an open area along the southern boundary of the Charles County Sanitary Landfill. These rods were then tied into the state grid system using the RTK system.
Unfortunately, while the RTK system is precise in open fields and other areas, the system cannot be carried into a forested area. Therefore, once the arbitrary points were set and tied into the state grid, Norris and his colleagues used a laser transit to carry lines from these points along the project baseline at E1345700. The baseline extended some 1200 feet into the woods. This effort required considerable clearing of the baseline and additional transect lines by the crew. Points were subsequently set at 100-foot intervals along multiple transects and shovel tests were initially excavated along these points (Figure 18).

Figure 18. Location of shovel tests for present project.
A total of 224 shovel tests were excavated in the project area, beginning at the southern edge of the landfill and including the area shown in the 1705 plat. Soil was screened through ¼-inch hardware cloth to standardize artifact recovery. All artifacts, bone, and shell were retained; charcoal was counted and discarded in the field. Each shovel test was carefully recorded, including a description of the soil strata encountered using a Munsell soil color chart and a list of the artifacts recovered from each test. After recordation, the majority of shovel tests were backfilled. All measurements for this project were made in feet and tenths of feet.

Using the field artifact counts, preliminary distribution maps were generated in the field to guide the investigations. In areas where colonial artifacts were recovered, the interval between shovel tests was reduced to 25 feet in an effort to increase the artifact sample, to identify subsurface features, and to more precisely determine the site’s horizontal and vertical boundaries. A cluster of 20th-century artifacts found in the northeastern portion of the study area probably derives from a dwelling in that area shown on mid-20th-century maps; the shovel test interval in this area remained at 100 feet.

In areas where concentrations of colonial artifacts were encountered, three additional test units, each measuring five-by-five-feet, were excavated in order to recover a larger sample of artifacts and to determine the nature and extent of undisturbed, sub-plow zone features. The test units, designated Test Units 1, 2, and 3, were excavated using shovels and trowels. Soils were screened through ¼-inch hardware cloth and all cultural materials were retained. Units were subsequently photographed, and plan drawings were prepared as appropriate. Detailed information about each unit was recorded on provenience cards, survey logs, stratum registers, and maps.

Artifacts and records were further processed according to state standards in a field lab provided by the College of Southern Maryland in La Plata. Artifacts were washed, dried, bagged, labeled, and cataloged using standard practices, and the collection was prepared for long-term curation. Spreadsheets containing the artifact catalogs were developed for reporting and computer mapping purposes, and artifact distributions were produced using the Surfer © computer mapping software (Golden Software 2002).

D. Results

The archaeological investigations on this portion of His Lordship’s Favor revealed two single-component archaeological sites, including a late 17th-/early 18th-century domestic site (18CH793) and a 20th-century domestic site (18CH799). 18CH793 measures approximately 300 feet by 300 feet and correlates well with the location of the dwelling and outbuildings shown on the 1705 plat. Based on the recovered artifacts, the site appears to have been initially occupied no later than 1700 (and possibly earlier, as will be discussed) and abandoned no later than c. 1725. 18CH799 dates to the 20th century and may have been associated with the ownership of George and Margaret Berger, who acquired the property in 1913.

The stratigraphic record at His Lordship’s Favor consists of a plow zone overlying subsoil. Plow zone is predominantly a brown to dark brown clayey to sandy clayey loam ranging in depth from five to eight inches. In most cases, plow zone overlies a culturally undisturbed subsoil consisting of a yellowish brown to brown sandy clay. The gravel content of the subsoil varies significantly across the project area.
A total of 1,189 artifacts were recovered from the shovel tests and test units at 18CH793 (the late 17th/early 18th-century component at His Lordship’s Favor). Thirty-eight artifacts were recovered from 18CH799.

18CH793—Shovel Tests

A total of 178 shovel tests were excavated in the area designated archaeological site 18CH793 (Figure 19), with a total of 711 artifacts recovered. Numbers of artifacts recovered from the shovel tests ranged from zero to 202. General categories of these materials are presented in Table 2 (see also Appendix II for a more detailed catalog).

![Figure 19. Location of shovel tests, 18CH793.](image)

Architectural artifacts, including brick, daub, nails, and window glass, comprise 96.6 percent (N=689) of the total shovel test assemblage. Brick represents the largest category in the assemblage, or 84.9 percent of the total artifacts recovered. Most of these fragments are relatively small, averaging less than a half-inch in size, although four brick bats were recovered. The relatively soft texture of these fragments indicates that the brick is handmade. The brick bats, which all came from the same general area, are variable in size (Table 3). Three of the brick bats measured 2 1/4-inches in height, while one measured 1 7/8-inches. Only two had
measurable widths (3 5/8-inches and 4 ¼-inches, respectively), and none of the bats had measurable lengths. Some of the brick fragments, including one of the brick bats and a minority of other fragments, exhibited evidence of glazing, an effect that is likely a result of uneven temperatures in the kiln during the firing process. No whole bricks were recovered from the shovel tests or observed on the ground surface suggesting that, when 18CH793 was abandoned, the bricks were salvaged for reuse elsewhere.

The next largest artifact category, daub (N=46), runs a distant second to brick, comprising 6.4 percent of the total assemblage. Daub consists primarily of a relatively low-fired, erodible clay mix that was, in the Chesapeake, typically used in the construction of chimneys. The distribution of daub generally matches that of brick, although the majority of daub fragments were recovered just south of the highest concentration of brick (see below). The daub recovered from His Lordship’s Favor may represent construction material used in a chimney associated with one of the service structures.

Iron nails and nail fragments formed the third largest category (N=39), comprising 5.5 percent of the total shovel test pit artifact assemblage. Only three nails could be positively identified as wrought in their manufacture, while 34 had shafts with square cross-sections, a characteristic of both wrought and cut nails. The

### Table 2. Artifacts recovered from shovel tests and test units, 18CH793.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Shovel Test Pits</th>
<th>Test Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flake, quartz</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flake, quartzite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biface, rhyolite, fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shatter, quartz</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire-cracked rock</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic, Potomac Creek</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White clay pipe stem, 4/64ths-in</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White clay pipe stem, 5/64ths-in</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White clay pipe stem, unmm.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White clay pipe bowl</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark green glass, case bottle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark green glass, wine bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark green glass, unknown form</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th/20th-century glass, bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin-glazed earthenware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire slipware, combed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire reverse slipware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slipware, unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astbury-type earthenware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhenish brown stoneware</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhenish blue &amp; gray stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English brown stoneware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped white salt-glazed stoneware</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White salt-glazed stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin, silver, ¼ Spanish two-reale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tack, copper alloy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattock, iron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible drawknife, iron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone, probably slate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat glass, colonial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window lead with glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail, wrought</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail, square</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail, unidentified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick, handmade, red</td>
<td>600 (3081.7g)</td>
<td>304 (812.4g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daub</td>
<td>46 (38.4g)</td>
<td>25 (32.5g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron object, unidentified</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ARTIFACTS** 711 478
absence of any positively identified cut nails or nail fragments as well as the almost complete absence of 19th- and 20th-century artifacts suggest that these square nails are probably wrought. Two nails are so corroded that they remain unidentified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N327125 E1345875</td>
<td>1 7/8-inches</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N327150 E1345850</td>
<td>2 ¼-inches</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Some glazing evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N327150 E1345900</td>
<td>2 ¼-inches</td>
<td>3 5/8-inches</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N327150 E1345900</td>
<td>2 ¼-inches</td>
<td>4 ¼-inches</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Brick measurements, 18CH793.

Window glass formed a tiny component of the architectural assemblage, but its presence indicates that at least one of the windows at His Lordship’s Favor was glazed. Four fragments were recovered from the shovel tests. One of these fragments remains embedded in a fragmented portion of a leaded window frame (Figure 20).

Two fragments of what has been identified as slate were recovered from the shovel test pits but it is unlikely that these fragments, which are less than a centimeter in size, were used for architectural purposes. The two fragments look as if they are small, tertiary-type flakes generated from a larger stone.

Domestic material forms less than three percent of the total shovel test assemblage (N=29), and one of those items is a clearly intrusive fragment of clear 19th-/20th-century bottle glass (cf. Table 2). The remainder consists of white clay tobacco pipe fragments (N=13), ceramics (N=12), colonial bottle glass (N=2), and a one-quarter silver 2-reale Spanish coin.

The white clay tobacco pipe fragments include six undecorated bowl fragments and seven undecorated stem fragments with measurable bore diameters of 4/64ths-inch (N=1) and 5/64ths-inch (N=6).

Of the two dark green colonial bottle glass fragments, one clearly derives from a wine bottle while the second fragment is unidentified as to vessel.

The ceramic fragments represent both European- and Indian-made vessels. The English-made ceramics include ware types produced primarily as food and beverage consumption 

Figure 20. Window glass (shown with arrow) still encased by glass window frame (inset). Reconstructed window, Farthing’s Ordinary, Historic St. Mary’s City.
forms (Figure 21). Interestingly, not a single utilitarian lead-glazed ceramic was recovered from the shovel tests at His Lordship’s Favor.

Datable ceramics include two fragments of Staffordshire slipware, which archaeologists generally agree was available in the Chesapeake region by c. 1680, two fragments of English brown stoneware, available in the Chesapeake by c. 1690 (Green 1999:109-130), a single fragment of Astbury-type ware, available in the region in the early to mid-1720s (Noël Hume 1970:70), and a single fragment of white salt-glazed stoneware, available in the region by the mid-1720s (Edwards and Hampson 2005:11-12, 159-165; Noël Hume 2001:198). Other European ceramics include a polychrome-decorated tin-glazed earthenware glaze chip and a small Rhenish blue and gray stoneware fragment.

Four fragments of Potomac Creek pottery, an Indian-made ceramic, were found at His Lordship’s Favor. Potomac Creek pottery is a quartz- or sand-tempered hand-built low-fired earthenware first appearing in the archaeological record c. 1300 AD. Potomac Creek pottery was manufactured by native groups as late as c. 1700 AD and has been found on a number of contact period sites occupied by Europeans (Louis Berger & Associates, Inc. 1989; Pogue 1990) and by Indians (Brown et al 2005; Harmon 1999). The four fragments recovered from His Lordship’s Favor have the characteristic quartz- and sand-tempered compact paste. All fragments exhibit no evidence of surface treatment or decoration.

Figure 21. European ceramics recovered from 18CH793; left to right, top row: polychrome-decorated tin-glazed earthenware glaze chip; Astbury-type ware; second row: Staffordshire reverse slipware; English brown stoneware; Rhenish blue and gray stoneware; third row: white salt-glazed stoneware; English brown stoneware; Staffordshire combed slipware.
The Potomac Creek ceramics were found in association with the European materials recovered from His Lordship’s Favor, suggesting these vessels were likely used by the people living at the site in the late 17th and early 18th centuries. A small scatter of stone flakes, however, may indicate pre-Contact use of the site.

In addition to the architectural and domestic artifacts, two iron tools were recovered from the shovel tests, including a mattock head fragment (Figure 22) and a fragment of what appears to be a drawknife (Figure 23). A mattock functions as a digging tool, with the iron blade typically attached to a wooden handle. A drawknife is a two handled instrument used to shave wood.

Figure 22. Iron mattock prior to conservation treatment.

Figure 23. Possible iron drawknife fragment, prior to conservation treatment, 18CH793.
Twelve stone artifacts of likely pre-Contact Native American manufacture were also recovered from the shovel tests at His Lordship’s Favor. These items include flakes, shatter, a biface, and a fire-cracked rock (cf. Table 2).

Distribution maps of the major artifact categories were generated in an effort to more precisely define site boundaries and activity areas at His Lordship’s Favor. Mapped artifact categories included brick (by weight), daub (by weight), nails, ceramics, and tobacco pipes.

Brick at 18CH793 is tightly clustered around the N327150/E1345900 shovel test (Figure 24), suggesting the approximate location of the brick chimney depicted on the 1705 plat. Smaller concentrations may represent where some masonry was incorporated into the construction of both the dwelling and the other buildings, or it could represent brick that was left behind as the brick was salvaged from the site following its abandonment. As noted earlier, daub is concentrated most heavily slightly south of the highest concentration of brick (Figure 25).

A concentration of nails occurs in the approximate location where the brick was clustered; in addition, clusters elsewhere suggest the locations of service buildings, including a possible unrecorded building located at the ravine’s edge (Figure 26). It is possible that nails were also salvaged when the buildings were abandoned.

The distribution of brick at His Lordship’s Favor was used to anchor the heated building depicted in the 1705 plat to a modern topographic map. Excavations at other sites have suggested that, even in cases where brick has been salvaged and therefore intentionally moved from its original, in situ location, highest concentrations are usually found over foundations or chimney bases (cf. King 1989; Riordan 1988). The sizes of the buildings on the plat were adjusted to fit more reasonably scaled dimensions than those shown on the plat. Even so, these maps should be used only as general guides for interpreting the distribution of other artifacts at the site. While deputy surveyor Joseph Manning probably showed the relationships of the buildings correctly, the scale of the buildings obscures their precise locations.

Given these qualifications, the distribution of ceramic fragments at His Lordship’s Favor is nonetheless intriguing (Figure 27). It is important to remember that this distribution represents a total of only eleven ceramic fragments. However, the ceramic fragments appear to be distributed along the eastern and northern portions of the site and their associations with the different structures may suggest questions for further research.

The distribution of the eight ceramic fragments associated with the dwelling and its immediately adjacent service structures stretches from the location of one ravine head where a spring likely once ran to another ravine head, which probably also had a spring. With one exception, these ceramics represent vessels used for beverage consumption. Only one utilitarian ware fragment—in this case, an Indian-made ceramic, or Potomac Creek—was recovered from this portion of the site.

Far fewer ceramics were recovered from the portion of the site hypothesized to contain the larger, apparently unheated structure. The three ceramic fragments found in this area included two fragments of Potomac Creek. A third fragment of Potomac Creek ceramic was recovered about 150 feet north of this cluster and is not depicted on this distribution map. A single fragment of white salt-glazed stoneware was also recovered in this area.

White clay tobacco pipe fragments are similarly low in total count, amounting to only 13 pieces. Their distribution, however, reveals that tobacco pipes were used in conjunction with
Figure 24. Distribution of brick fragments, by weight, 18CH793.

Figure 25. Distribution of daub fragments, by weight, 18CH793.
Figure 26. Distribution of nails and nail fragments, by count, 18CH793.

Figure 27. Distribution of ceramics, 18CH793.
activities taking place in the dwelling—all but one of the fragments were found in this area, generally matching the distribution of the ceramic fragments (Figure 28). Not a single tobacco pipe fragment was recovered in association with the larger service structure, although a pipe stem was recovered approximately 100 feet west of the building’s projected location.

Emphasizing that the quantities used to generate these maps are small in count, the distributions nonetheless suggest some interesting inferences that can be tested with future work at the site. Clearly, activities involving the use of beverage consumption vessels and tobacco pipes are taking place in the dwelling and adjacent yards located at the southern end of the site. The absence of food consumption ceramic vessels suggests that this activity involved wooden or pewter vessels (cf. Martin 1989). The dearth of utilitarian vessels suggests that Indian-made ceramics may have fulfilled this need.

The association of two and possibly three Potomac Creek fragments and virtually no tobacco pipes with the larger service structure provides little additional evidence for interpreting the use of this structure. Although few colonial tobacco barns in Maryland have been excavated, limited testing at a late 17th-/early 18th-century barn on Richard Smith’s plantation in Calvert County yielded tobacco pipe fragments but few ceramic sherds (King n.d.).

Fitting these buildings to a modern topographic map, however, reveals one important fact. The large building appears to be situated on the highest elevation of the site, perhaps as much as five feet higher in elevation than the dwelling structure.

![Figure 28. Distribution of white clay tobacco pipes, by count, 18CH793.](image)
Three five-by-five-foot test units were excavated in areas where concentrations of domestic artifacts had been recovered from the shovel tests, including ceramics and pipe stems, in an effort to increase the artifact sample and confidence in the dating of the site (Figures 29-32). Materials recovered from Test Units 1, 2, and 3 generally supported the observations derived from the shovel test pit data (cf. Table 2). White clay tobacco pipe stems recovered from the test units consist of both 4/ and 5/64ths stems. In addition, case bottle glass and dipped white salt-glazed stonewares, which were not found in the shovel tests, were recovered from the test units.

Two copper alloy brass tacks were recovered from the test units; these tacks would have been used to fasten furniture, including upholstered chairs. In addition, a silver one-quarter two-reales Spanish coin was recovered from Test Unit 2 (Figure 33). The portion of the coin recovered does not show the city mint mark, so it is impossible to specify which mint master used the ‘J’ initial evident on the His Lordship’s Favor coin. The range of possibilities suggest a first quarter of the 18th-century date. In Madrid, the ‘J’ was used from 1706-1719; in Segovia, in 1717; and in Seville, from 1702-1703 and 1719-1726. The early 2 reales of Phillip V do not have the shield of Castille and Leon as the His Lordship’s Favor coin has, eliminating the 1702-1703 Seville coin as an option. Seville coins had a slightly larger blank (flan) than Madrid or Segovia, and the space between the mint master's mark (J) and the II (2 reales) seems to be wider on the Seville coins, as it would appear on the His Lordship’s Favor coin. The coin may have been minted in Seville between 1719 and 1726, although Madrid and Segovia cannot be entirely ruled out. It is a 2 reales made sometime between 1716 and 1726, and more likely 1719-1726 (Krause and Milner 1997).

Figure 29. Location of test units, 18CH793.
SOIL DESCRIPTIONS

1) Irregular intrusion of strong brown (7.5YR4/6) clay mottled with 10% grayish brown (10YR5/2) clay

2) Irregular intrusion of dark yellowish brown (10YR4/6) clay loam mottled with 20% yellowish brown (10YR5/4) clay loam with occasional brick fragments and flecks [possible root mold]

3) Yellowish brown (10YR5/4) clay mottled with 20% dark yellowish brown (10YR4/6) clay loam with rare brick fleck [subsoil]

Figure 30. Plan view below plow zone, Test Unit 1.
SOIL DESCRIPTIONS
1) Yellowish Brown (10YR5/6) clay with >50% gravel inclusions [subsoil]
2) Yellowish Brown (10YR5/6) clay with 20% gravel inclusions [subsoil]
3) Yellowish Brown (10YR5/6) clay with <5% gravel inclusions [subsoil]

Figure 31. Plan view below plow zone, Test Unit 2.
SOIL DESCRIPTIONS
1) Dark yellowish brown (10YR4/4) clay mottled with 5% dark brown (10YR3/3) clay
2) Yellowish Brown (10YR5/4) clay mottled with <10% brown (10YR4/3) clay loam with rare brick fleck [subsoil]

**Figure 32.** Plan view below plow zone, Test Unit 3.
Figure 33. One-quarter Spanish two-reale piece, obverse and reverse.

18CH799

A second archaeological site was identified in a partially wooded area located just south of the Charles County Sanitary Landfill (Figure 34). This site represents a late 19th/20th-century farmstead that appears on a mid-20th-century USGS quad map. The site first appears along the N328200 line and between the E1345800 and 1346100 lines. The site extends north at least 100 feet, to the N328300 line and possibly further, although this was the extent of the survey area.

Figure 34. Distribution of artifacts, 18CH799; the N328300 line was the northern limit of testing.
Thirty-eight artifacts were recovered from this site, including architectural materials (machine-made brick and iron nail fragments) and bottle glass (Table 4).

In addition to the artifacts, several features are visible above-ground at the site, including ornamental plantings (Figure 35), an open, brick-lined well (Figure 36), and scatters of 20th-century refuse.

18CH799 may be associated with the ownership of the property by George and Margaret Berger, who purchased this portion of the tract in 1913.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bottle glass, colorless</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle glass, aqua color</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle glass, manganese color</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire, iron</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail fragment, iron, square</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail fragment, iron, unidentified</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick, machine made</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ARTIFACTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Artifacts recovered from shovel tests, 18CH799.
V. Discussion

The documentary and archaeological evidence indicate that 18CH793 was an early colonial domestic site almost certainly occupied by 1700 and possibly as early as 1690 with occupation continuing until c. 1725. These dates fit well with the acquisition of the property by William Boarman and subsequently Hugh Teares in 1699, Teare’s widow’s (Eleanor) acquisition by inheritance in 1700, and her new husband’s (John Beale) acquisition through marriage. In late 1724, John Beale transferred the property to his son, Richard, whose mother was Eleanor Teares Beale. 18CH793 appears to have been abandoned when the property transferred.

But is 18CH793 the site of Charles Calvert’s summer house? The datable artifacts recovered from the site suggest that 18CH793 was not occupied before 1690, well after Charles Calvert reports having built his summer house in 1673. Especially problematic for identifying this site as Calvert’s summer house is the absence of white clay tobacco pipes with stem bore diameters of 6/64ths-inch or larger. Although few in number, those pipe stems recovered with measurable bores suggest a date of occupation no earlier than 1700.

The documentary evidence indicates that, after leaving Lord Baltimore’s ownership, none of His Lordship’s Favor’s subsequent owners – William Boarman, Hugh Teares, Eleanor Teares, John Beale, or Richard Beale – likely lived at 18CH793. For example, the 1699 patent granting His Lordship’s Favor describes Boarman as “of Prince George’s County.” Nor did Boarman keep His Lordship’s Favor long, transferring it less than a month after he took possession of the property. Boarman does not seem to be a likely candidate for building the structures depicted on the 1705 plat.
Hugh Teares, recognized by his peers as a gentleman, had carpentry skills or access to skilled carpenters, and he could have conceivably built the structures at 18CH793. Indeed, the year before, in 1698, Teares had been hired to make substantial repairs to the then-30-year-old court house at Moore’s Lodge (King, Strickland, and Norris 2008:5). These repairs consisted of replacing rotted wood, adding a room, replacing a window, and replacing a chimney all building skills needed to build the structures at His Lordship’s Favor. Teares, however, was dead within five months of getting the property, reducing the likelihood he improved the property. Indeed, at the time of Teares’ death, his will indicates he was living in Nanjemoy.

As for the remaining owners, the evidence is strong that all four lived elsewhere. John Beale, who had married Teares’ widow in June 1700, referred to Zekiah Quarter in 1705, a property we believe was His Lordship’s Favor and, if so, suggests this property was an outlying plantation. Teares’ daughter, Elizabeth, just ten years old in 1699 and therefore too young to establish a household on her own, went to live with her aunt, Elizabeth Holland Hawkins, at Johnsontown, just south of the court house at Moore’s Lodge. Elizabeth later married John Keech in 1707 (she was eighteen by that time; Keech was her first husband), but the parcel containing the buildings had already been devised to her stepmother, Eleanor (Elizabeth continued to own the southern half of His Lordship’s Favor).

The evidence suggests that a tenant or a servant was residing at 18CH793. Efforts to identify who that may have been have so far been unsuccessful. No record has come to light to suggest a name, and the rent rolls are silent on the subject. Eleanor Beale, who had been married to Thomas Stone before her marriage to Teares, had children from this earlier marriage but all were minors in 1699; indeed, most were younger than Elizabeth Teares, and none appear to have taken up residence at any time at His Lordship’s Favor.

Given the property’s proximity to Hawkins family holdings (especially Hawkins Purchase) and Elizabeth Teares’ kinship ties to the Hawkins family, members of the Hawkins family were studied as possible occupants but no candidate emerged. Elizabeth’s cousin, Henry Holland Hawkins, lived with Elizabeth when she came to stay with him and his mother at Johnsontown, but documentary and archaeological evidence indicate that Hawkins lived at Hawkins Purchase, a tract south of His Lordship’s Favor.

It is possible, but not probable, that the buildings depicted on the 1705 plat were constructed by John Beale when he married Hugh Teares’ widow, Eleanor, in June 1700. It is simply not possible to pinpoint where the Beales were living. Teares had died in Nanjemoy, and presumably his wife remained there. Beale was in control, after their marriage, of a property in Nanjemoy in 1705, when he records the cattle mark for that plantation. He later managed, in 1719, to gain control of a 750-acre parcel of land known as Durham, near Port Tobacco River. It is unclear, however, where Beale was living before 1719, although Nanjemoy and/or Durham seem more likely than His Lordship’s Favor.

It is possible (and perhaps likely) that His Lordship’s Favor was occupied by a servant. In 1705, when John Beale registered the cattle mark for “Zachia Quarter,” he owned no other land in Zekiah Manor, making it likely that the ‘quarter’ he was referring to was in fact His Lordship’s Favor. Through this act of registration, Beale indicated that he clearly had an ownership interest in the livestock associated with this quarter. When Beale sold the land to his son in 1724, there is no mention in any of the land instruments that anyone held or had recently held a lease on or other interest in the property. Indeed, 18CH793 is abandoned when the property transfers from
father to son. If the property was occupied by servants (or even slaves), Beale would have likely moved these bondsmen to property he retained.

The structures depicted on the 1705 plat and the archaeological evidence recovered from 18CH793 indicate a well-developed complex with a well-appointed dwelling. The presence of a brick chimney, at least one glazed window, and a number of architectural spaces in the form of outbuildings would be unexpected for a tenant or servant/slave household. These architectural amenities are typically (although not always) associated with a landowning planter rather than with a tenant or a servant.

Yet, as the evidence suggests, someone had invested fairly substantially in the dwelling house. Brick construction was limited in early Maryland, although probably not as much as initially concluded by Cary Carson and his colleagues in 1981 (Carson et al. 1981; King and Chaney 1999; Levy 2002). Nonetheless, planters could make more money investing scarce labor resources in the production of tobacco than in that of brick; Calvert said it quite well when he complained to his father that he found building in Maryland to be “very Chargeable.” It was not that bricks were more expensive than wood but, as historian Gloria Main found (1982:149-151), that brick masons were few in number and their services therefore fairly expensive.

What is the likelihood that a tenant built the structures shown on the plat? While colonists had available to them a range of choices for building in turn of the century Maryland, it would be unusual (although not unheard of) to find a tenant investing heavily in the construction of buildings he did not own. Francis Anketill, who held a lease at Eltonhead Manor in Calvert County (now St. Mary’s County), appears to have had at least one brick chimney and glazed windows in his dwelling. Anketill was an exceptional tenant, however, given that he was educated and came to be recognized as a ‘gentleman’ in early Maryland. Anketill’s leasehold, located at the mouth of the Patuxent, was in the center of economic and political activity in 17th-century Maryland, and Anketill would have been hard-pressed to find a similar setting elsewhere. Further, Anketill developed his leasehold a full generation or more before the occupation of His Lordship’s Favor, during the third quarter of the 17th century, when conditions in Maryland were significantly different than they were at the turn of the 18th century (Rivers-Cofield 2008).

Closer to His Lordship’s Favor both geographically and chronologically, the court house at Moore’s Lodge provides interesting comparative data. The courthouse lot was owned by the county, but the surrounding tract, known as Moore’s Lodge, was owned by Thomas Hussey until his death in 1700 and thereafter by his heirs (the site was abandoned in 1715 by the Hussey family heirs). With an estate of more than 700 pounds sterling at his death, Hussey was quite well off. So were his daughter and her husband, who continued living at Moore’s Lodge, but it doesn’t appear that either of these households had much brick incorporated into their dwellings. Brick was recovered from Moore’s Lodge, but the density was low when compared with that found at His Lordship’s Favor. Peak densities at Moore’s Lodge were slightly less than 200 g of brick per shovel test; at His Lordship’s Favor, peak densities amounted to 500 g of brick—more than twice that of Moore’s Lodge.

The 1705 plat also suggests that the settlement at His Lordship’s Favor had a number of architectural spaces for domestic activities. The 1705 plat depicts a dwelling one room in size. Very likely an unheated loft space was available over this room. In addition to the dwelling, two smaller structures are depicted, while a larger structure stands north or behind the dwelling. The distribution of nails and nail fragments suggests at least one other wooden structure at the edge of the ravine. In sum, the compound consists of a dwelling with two rooms (a ground floor hall and a loft) and three or possibly four service structures, for a total of five or six architectural “spaces.”
In her study of room-by-room probate inventories from Maryland and the architectural ‘spaces’ available for domestic activities in the households represented by these inventories, Gloria Main (1982:152-153) found that, between 1660 and 1719, inventories listing five or more spaces belonged to decedents worth about 150 pounds sterling or more at their death (reproduced here as Table 5). In terms of wealth, these individuals were in what Main identified as the “upper third.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPW Class</th>
<th>Percentile Rank Households</th>
<th>Main House Average No. Rooms</th>
<th>Other “Places” Average No.</th>
<th>Total Rooms Plus “Places”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-34</td>
<td>7-21</td>
<td>less than 2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>less than 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>22-34</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5?</td>
<td>2.5?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-71</td>
<td>35-46</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-96</td>
<td>47-56</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-149</td>
<td>57-69</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-228</td>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229-399</td>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-799</td>
<td>90-95.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-up</td>
<td>95.6-99.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Rooms, buildings, “places” by wealth class, Maryland households, 1660-1719 (Source: Main 1982:152).

Even more interesting, when Main separated dwelling spaces from detached service spaces, she found that dwellings with two rooms were typical for householders worth 50 pounds or less at death (the poorest third), while householders worth 150 pounds or more enjoyed an average of five rooms within their dwellings. On the other hand, householders with three or more detached service spaces (as appears to be the case at His Lordship’s Favor) were typically worth a minimum of 229 pounds sterling at death, among the wealthiest people in the colony. In other words, as households accumulated enough wealth to invest in their plantations, dwellings were enlarged before service structures were added. At His Lordship’s Favor, the dwelling provided space no larger than the poorest planters might have experienced while the number of outbuildings suggests a compound of buildings associated with only the wealthiest planters.

What is the likelihood that one of the owners of His Lordship’s Favor built the structures for use by servants? While it would have been unusual for a tenant to have invested the resources in the development of such a compound as seen at His Lordship’s Favor, the possibility that John Beale would have done the same for servants or slaves living in a plantation quarter seems even more remote. Beale may have placed a one room dwelling on the property to provide shelter for his labor while building subsidiary structures for the execution of their tasks. But, would Beale have provided his bondsmen with glass windows and a brick chimney? Probably not.

Is it possible that, whoever is living at His Lordship’s Favor in the early 18th century had moved into the summer house built by Charles Calvert in 1673? By 1699, the summer house, wherever it was located, was more than 25 years old. We know that Calvert’s original intention to build the summer house in brick was not realized, and he later complained to his father that building in the colony was “very Chargeable.” When Calvert reported to his father that his summer house was built “according to the fashion of the building of this Country,” most historians conclude (reasonably) that Calvert had built an impermanent, earthfast structure.
Calvert may have also meant that, in terms of the dwelling’s size, the house he built was small, especially compared with his principal dwelling at Mattapany. In 1678, Calvert used the phrase, “very mean and little” to describe the houses that could be found in the capital at St. Mary’s, suggesting he paid close attention to how his denizens developed their settlements in the colony (Sainsbury and Fortescue 1896).

A small but nonetheless well-appointed summer house surrounded by service structures necessary for running a household of “his Excelencies” may explain the apparent disconnect in size between the ‘spaces’ evident at His Lordship’s Favor and Gloria Main’s findings (cf. Table 5).

Assuming for the moment that the 18th-century occupants of His Lordship’s Favor did move into existing buildings, the fact remains that no artifacts were recovered that could push the beginning occupation date for this site before 1690. Artifacts that could indicate a c. 1673 occupation, including white clay tobacco pipe stems with large bore diameters, terra cotta clay tobacco pipes, and Rhenish brown stonewares, are absent from the collection.

There are two reasons which could explain the near-total absence of materials dating to the third quarter of the 17th century. The first, and the easiest, explanation is that the site was simply not occupied before 1690 (and, possibly, c. 1700).

The second explanation concerns the use of shovel tests as a sampling strategy. Shovel tests placed at distances of 25 feet across a site represent a testing strategy of considerable intensity, but it is also the case that even such closely spaced shovel tests generate a sample less than one percent of the total site area.

Shovel tests placed at 25-foot intervals have been very useful for identifying 17th-century sites and, in many cases, providing information on intra-site structure. Examples include Moore’s Lodge (King, Strickland, and Norris 2008) and Mattapany, the site of Charles Calvert’s principal residence (Chaney and King 1999). These are sites occupied by relatively wealthy individuals for several decades.

But what if the summer house, though constructed, was little used, despite Governor Calvert’s best intentions? In that case, the density of artifacts may be so low that shovel tests at 25-foot intervals could miss key diagnostic artifacts.

A careful review of the historical evidence suggests that, after it was built, Calvert may not have used his summer house much if at all. We know he built the house—not only does he tell his father so in 1673, but the colonial assembly later demurs from improving the road to “His Excelencies house” in 1674. Calvert also tells his father he intends to spend summers there, the place being so “healthful” and all. He may have held a Chancery Court there in 1673, and he tells his father he’s going to invite one Peter Goffe to settle near him at Zekiah. These are all things Calvert’s father, the second Lord Baltimore, would have been pleased to hear, given his concerns with the creation and settling of the proprietary manors.

All good intentions aside, Calvert found himself facing significant challenges beginning in the mid 1670s, and a careful tracking of Calvert’s whereabouts suggests that the governor’s circumstances would have prevented him from making much if any use of his house at Zekiah.

Table 6 presents a timeline of events in Maryland from 1673 on. It is evident that Governor Calvert, after a relatively prosperous and peaceful decade in Maryland, would soon
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1673 | • Gov. Charles Calvert builds house in Zekiah for summer use  
      • Court of Chancery may have met at “our manor house of Zekiah”  
      • Calvert tells his father he was unaware of the designs on his safety but that he would remove to the Zekiah if he thought he was in danger (August 2) |
| 1674 | • Assembly declines to repair the road across Zekiah Swamp “by his Excelencies house” |
| 1675 | • Series of raids between Doags and Susquehannocks and Virginia English, which spill over into Maryland  
      • Fort at Piscataway besieged by Virginia and Maryland forces (September)  
      • Cecil Calvert (second Lord Baltimore) dies November 30 |
| 1676 | • Ongoing raids between various Indian groups and English  
      • Rangers directed to patrol from Piscataway to Patuxent  
      • Calvert departs for England, mid-year, probably June  
      • Bacon’s Rebellion erupts, July  
      • Maryland’s lieutenant governor directs people in a number of counties, including Charles, to “infort themselves in their houses” |
| 1678 | • Daniel Cunningham’s wife gravely wounded by Indians at her plantation on the Northern branch of the Patuxent, early August  
      • Captain Brandt ranges “upper parts of Charles County”  
      • Charles Calvert (now third Lord Baltimore) back in MD sometime after October 26 |
| 1680 | • Piscataway relocate to Zekiah to escape attacks of Susquehannock  
      • Mattawoman severely attacked by Iroquois |
| 1681 | • Calvert “was then living” at Maj. Boarman’s plantation  
      • Ongoing raids between Indian groups; Piscataway report to Calvert that, at their fort at Zekiah, “they dare not venture out of their ffort to plant their Corne for their sustenance,” February  
      • Henry Coursey and William Stevens go to “Zekiah House” in their effort to negotiate with Indians, August 27  
      • Captain Brandt spends night at “Zekiah House,” August 29  
      • Seneca Indians raid Thomas Hussey’s house (believed to be at Moore’s Lodge), taking 10 Piscataway with them; also take Susquehannock man from Henry Hawkins’s house (probably Johnstown), September 10 |
| 1682 | • Raids by Seneca and Susquehannock continue; Piscataway and other local Indians continue at Zekiah Fort  
      • Calvert increasingly concerned with William Penn’s arrival in Pennsylvania |
| 1684 | • Calvert departs for England (October) |
| 1689 | • Protestant Associators seize control of proprietary government  
      • Land Office closes as crown and proprietor “determine extent of authorities” |
| 1694 | • Land Office re-opens; Crown’s secretary “took possession of the patent records and refused to return them to proprietary officers until late 1696” |
| 1696 | • Proprietor gains control of patent records |
| 1697 | • Baltimore directs his agent, Col. Henry Darnall, to grant His Lordship’s Favor to William Boarman “of Prince George’s County,” December 13  
      • Darnall directs Clement Hill, Jr. to prepare a patent |
| 1699 | • Calvert grants William Boarman His Lordship’s Favor August 2  
      • Boarman conveys property to Hugh Teares, September 2  
      • Teares dies February |
| 1705 | • Elizabeth Teares turns 16; Darnall reaffirms transfer of land  
      • His Lordship’s Favor surveyed by Joseph Manning |

Table 6. Timeline of events in Governor Charles Calvert’s life concerning Maryland.
enough have his hands full. The mid-1670s initiated a period of considerable political unrest in Maryland and nearby Virginia, both on the domestic and diplomatic fronts. A series of Indian raids in Virginia followed by retaliations of escalating violence in both Virginia and Charles County led to tense relations with neighboring tribal groups. These events precipitated Bacon’s Rebellion in Virginia and gave rise to a growing fear among English householders for their safety. Many householders went so far as to fortify their dwellings on both sides of the Potomac (see, for example, Neiman 1980).

Meanwhile, in late 1675, Governor Calvert’s father, the second Lord Baltimore, died, and the governor returned to England for at least 29 months, from mid-1676 until late 1678 or early 1679. Calvert, never fully confident in his Uncle Philip Calvert’s motives, left his minor son in charge of the colony. When the governor—now the third Lord Baltimore—returned to Maryland, he found the Maryland Piscataway under ever increasing pressure from “foreign” Indians, including Seneca from New York. Ongoing raids created considerable fear among English and Piscataway people alike, such that the proprietor finally, in 1680, ordered the Piscataway and other friendly Indians into the Zekiah for their protection.

Some of Baltimore’s enemies, including Josias Fendall and John Coode, exploited English fears and used the situation in Maryland to question Baltimore’s leadership, authority, and Catholicism. Fendall, who had served as Maryland governor in the 1650s before being forced out by Lord Baltimore, had old scores to settle, while Coode’s day was coming. Coode would, in 1689, serve as one of the leaders of the Protestant Associators who would seize control of the colony from the Calverts. Coode spent much of the 1680s, then, agitating the population about the Calvert family’s leadership.

As if all of this was not enough, in 1682, Baltimore now found himself having to contend with William Penn on his northern border. In 1684, Lord Baltimore left Maryland for England to air his complaints and appeal his case about Penn to the crown, leaving his four-year-old son, Benedict Leonard in charge as acting governor. Within five years, with Baltimore still in England, an uprising among his own citizens ended with the proprietor losing political control of his colony.

Baltimore had built his summer house in 1673 as much at the urging of his father as for himself; indeed, Baltimore had told his father the house was for “Little Cis,” his eldest son and Cecil Calvert’s namesake, but he was worried about investing too much in the house lest, as he told his father, little Cecil did not like it. Little Cecil had died in 1681, and an Indian fort was now located somewhere in the vicinity.

Do these events mean that the summer house was abandoned almost as soon as it was built? Probably not. In 1674, the lower house considered a request to improve the crossing of the Zekiah at “his Excelencies house,” suggesting that passage to the property was important, if only to Baltimore’s family. Five years later, in 1681, a “Zekiah House” is mentioned in letters sent by Captain Randolph Brandt to Lord Baltimore at his plantation at Mattapany. It is clear from the letters that Brandt and Baltimore knew exactly where ‘Zekiah House’ was located and, unlike other plantations mentioned in the correspondence, no owner was identified, perhaps because the owner (Baltimore) was reading the letter.

Baltimore’s summer house, if it was indeed “Zekiah House,” may have been pressed into service by rangers patrolling the frontier in the late 1670s and early 1680s. In addition to Captain Brandt’s use of Zekiah House, two colonists sent to negotiate with the “foreign” or northern
Indians, Colonel Henry Coursey and Colonel William Stevens, also stayed overnight there in 1681.

When the ProtestantAssociators took control of Calvert’s government in 1689, the proprietary land office closed and remained closed for five years “while royal and proprietary officials determined the extent of their authorities.” Only one certificate was returned during that period. When the land office finally reopened in 1694, the crown’s secretary “took possession of the patent records and refused to return them to proprietary officers until late in 1696” (Wilheit 2003:244).

The political struggles and confusion explain why Lord Baltimore held on to this property through 1697. That year, he had his kinsman and proprietary agent in Maryland, Col. Henry Darnall, handle the transfer of the land to his close friend, Major William Boarman. Darnall directed Clement Hill, Darnall’s son-in-law and the proprietor’s deputy surveyor, to lay out His Lordship’s Favor, declaring the parcel to be 1000 acres, although later surveys would find it to be 1250 acres. The land actually transferred to Boarman in August 1699.

In July 1705, when Elizabeth Teares reached the age of 16, Col. Darnall reaffirmed the property’s transfer to Boarman and then to the Teares heirs, noting that an annual rent would be due for the property given its location in Zekiah Manor and outlining provisions for failure to pay the rent. Three months later, in October, Elizabeth Teares’ guardian, her aunt, Elizabeth Hawkins, commissioned a survey dividing the property between Elizabeth and her mother, Eleanor, who was now married to John Beale. James Manning, deputy surveyor for Charles County, prepared the survey, discovering that, instead of 1000 acres, the property actually contained 1250 acres.

Finally, are there clues to the location of Calvert’s summer house in the name, His Lordship’s Favor? ‘His Lordship’s’ obviously refers to Lord Baltimore, but what does ‘Favor’ signify? According to the Oxford English Dictionary, “favor” in this case may have meant “something conceded, conferred, or done out of special grace or goodwill; an act of exceptional kindness, as opposed to one of duty or justice,” something “in excess of what may be ordinarily looked for” (OED 2009b). Baltimore’s granting of land to William Boarman was not, for Boarman, an exceptional act—Baltimore had granted Boarman hundreds of acres and had given his friend his own manor. Could the act of ‘exceptional kindness,’ in this case, be the granting of a parcel with His Excellency’s summer house still standing?

This project began with a number of questions about a group of structures shown on a plat completed in 1705. Were these structures real? That is, was this complex built, or was it the imaginary fancy of the surveyor? If the structures were real (and we now know they were), do they survive as an archaeological site? What are the chronological and spatial boundaries of that site? Who was living there? Could this complex have been the site of Charles Calvert’s 1673 summer house? While we have much more information about this site, the last two questions remain elusive. The evidence gathered so far indicates that 18CH793 cannot, at the time this report goes to production, be ruled out as the Calverts’ summer house.

VI. Conclusion and Recommendations

In 1673, when Governor Calvert built his ‘summer house,’ documents indicate that he was following the direction of his father, Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore, in securing the family’s proprietary manors. The second Lord Baltimore was in his early 70s and was surely thinking about the future of the Maryland legacy for his family. Governor Calvert had already
invested heavily in a ‘fair house of brick and timber’ at Mattapany, at the mouth of the Patuxent in what was then Calvert County (today, St. Mary’s County), where he sat in the middle of economic and political interaction in the colony. Nonetheless, Calvert, at his father’s urging, began the development of Zekiah Manor by erecting a dwelling where he “resolve[d] to live in the Summer time.”

Calvert was not only alleviating his father’s concerns but making a statement about his standing as a member of the minor English nobility. A place where his son would spend summers surely evoked images of England’s summer houses in the father’s mind, especially since the elder Calvert had never been to Maryland. A summer house may have also reaffirmed the Calvert family’s standing among their peers in the colonies—that is, as wealthy men who could enjoy the luxury of leisure time, even on the colonial frontier. Thomas Gerrard, for example, had a ‘banqueting house’ just across the Potomac, in Westmoreland County, Virginia, and Cary Carson (2008; personal communication) has argued that both Governor Berkeley and Robert ‘King’ Carter had large social spaces for entertainment at their plantations in Jamestown and at Corotoman, respectively.

Whether or not the early colonial archaeological site discovered on what was once known as His Lordship’s Favor represents the site of Calvert’s summer house remains, for now, a mystery. Additional work is necessary to sort out 17th- and early 18th-century occupation in the Zekiah Manor—work that must be carefully directed given the likelihood that the archaeological signature for the summer house may be low when compared with that of domestic sites occupied year-round.

What should not be lost in the discussions concerning the summer house is the fact that 18CH793 has considerable significance as a rare, early 18th-century domestic site located relatively far up Zekiah Run. 18CH793 contains important information about domestic life in the colony at a particularly significant period in its history. The Zekiah Run and Wicomico River drainages, which had been the center of development in Charles County in the third and fourth quarters of the 17th century, were, in the early 18th century, being eclipsed by settlement spreading north along the Port Tobacco River and into what is now Prince George’s County. Indeed, many of the families who had built plantations in the Zekiah Swamp drainage were part of this westward migration. This was also the period that saw the transition to a predominantly enslaved labor force, a transition which was nearly complete by the first quarter of the 18th century. Identifying the occupants at 18CH793 during this period and documenting the material conditions of their lives can reveal what life was like in the older areas of Maryland as the colony spread north and west.

To collect additional information about His Lordship’s Favor, Zekiah Manor, and 18CH793, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Develop detailed land and genealogical histories for all of the tracts listed in the 1789 property confiscation survey (cf. Figure 6), beginning with those bordering or close to Zekiah Run;
2. Identify areas with a high potential for containing 17th- and 18th-century archaeological sites. These areas should take into consideration the following variables, including access to fresh water, suitable agricultural soils, and access to transportation routes, as well as evidence for occupation suggested by documentary records;
3. Undertake additional testing at 18CH793 with the following objectives:
a. Collect a larger artifact sample with the use of five-by-five feet test units associated with the hypothesized dwelling and large building. If the site was occupied in the 1670s, a larger artifact sample may generate material evidence for this occupation;

b. Excavate five-by-five feet test units over the area of the dwelling in order to identify and document architectural features associated with the structure, including the building’s size, hearth, and post holes. At least one or two post holes should be sampled in an effort to recover artifacts suitable for dating the building’s initial construction.

The general lack of previous systematic surveys in the Zekiah Swamp drainage, the nature of the swamp’s topography and ground cover, and modern disturbances such as gravel mining complicate the survey work needed to begin a comprehensive inventory of archaeological resources in the Zekiah. Nonetheless, the evidence assembled for His Lordship’s Favor reveals that important archaeological sites survive in the Zekiah Swamp, and these sites hold the keys to understanding early Maryland history at an especially transformational period in the colony’s history.
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Appendix I.
Fitting the 1705 Plat to a Modern Map
Scott M. Strickland

To overlay the 1705 plat of His Lordships Favor with modern maps, I first examined the 1789 plat of “Zachie Manor,” prepared in that year to depict and record confiscated British property. This plat depicts all of the tracts and tract names within the former manor lands.

His Lordships Favor is depicted alongside tracts such as Lots 1, 2 & 3 of Thomas Luckett’s property (later known as Luckett’s Hardship, and today known as Western View), Baltimore’s Bounty (often referred to in deeds as Rozier’s land), and Walter Moreland’s land (known as Thompson’s Fertile Meadow). Another page of this plat includes an overall outline and plot of the original patent for Zekiah Manor which depicts the southern boundary as being Josias Fendall’s land and the northern boundary intersecting near Jordan Swamp. A rough overlay of this original plot allowed a general location of His Lordships Favor on modern maps.

This rough overlay revealed that His Lordships Favor would be found somewhere between the present Charles County Sanitary Landfill on Billingsley Road and a road called His Lordship’s Place, located off of Route 488. To get a better fit, I reviewed property titles in the area. The Tax Map of this area revealed that a few, although not many, boundary lines as depicted on the 1789 plat still exist today. A particularly well-preserved and well-defined boundary line is the southern boundary of what was once known as Luckett’s Hardship. A clear description of Luckett’s Hardship is found in a 1794 survey for Samuel Hawkins, transcribed below:

\[
\text{Beginning at a bounded stone the first boundary of a tract called His Lordships Favour and Running thence North 84 degrees East 375 perches to a bound stone the second boundary of His Lordships Favour then}
\]
\[
\text{South 23 degrees and 3/4 east 80 perches to a bounded Holley then}
\]
\[
\text{South 33 degrees 45 minutes West 22 perches to a bounded Post then}
\]
\[
\text{South 83 degrees 3/4 west 4 perches to a bound post then}
\]
\[
\text{South 52 degrees and 3/4 west 60 perches to a bounded Red Oak then}
\]
\[
\text{South 35 degrees and 3/4 west 80 perches to a bounded Beach then}
\]
\[
\text{South 83 degrees and 3/4 West 46 perches to a bound Post the beginning of Charles Mankin's land then}
\]
\[
\text{South 47 degrees 1/4 east 61 perches to a bound maple then}
\]
\[
\text{South 39 degrees West 72 perches to a tract of land called Hawkins Purchase then}
\]
\[
\text{North 27 degrees and 1/2 west 242 perches to a bound stone the second boundary of Hawkins Purchase then}
\]
\[
\text{North 73 degrees and 1/2 West 208 3/4 perches to a post standing in the Manor line then running the reverse the given line of Baltimore's Bounty}
\]
\[
\text{North 81 degrees east 168 perches to the given line of His Lordships Favour thence with straight line to the first beginning containing and now laid out for 328 acres.}
\]

(Charles County Land Records, Patent Certificate #669)

After plotting this description on a modern map, I then overlaid the southern boundary line of Luckett’s Hardship, still evident on the Tax Map. The 1789 plat shows this property going beyond the bounds of Zekiah Manor to the South, and this is confirmed in the property description itself, as a it describes one corner of the property standing in the Manor line itself (“to a post standing in the Manor line”).
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After overlaying Luckett’s Hardship, I then addressed the overlay of Walter Moreland’s land, called Thompson’s Fertile Meadow. An 1806 survey for Walter Moreland (transcribed below) provides a description of a portion of His Lordship’s Favor’s eastern boundary:

*Beginning at a bounded stone the third boundary of a tract of land called His Lordships Favour and running thence*
*North 5 degrees West 60 perches to a bounded post then*
*North 29 degrees West 22.75 perches to a bounded sweet Gum then*
*North 6 degrees West 16 perches to a bounded Maple then*
*North 31 degrees 3/4 west 47 perches to a bounded post then*
*North 42 degrees east 91 perches to a bounded stone then*
*North 87 degrees east 33.5 perches to a bounded stone then*
*North 1 degree west 26.25 perches to a bounded stone then*
*North 43 degrees east 56 perches to a bounded stone then*
*North 30 degrees West 10.5 perches to a bounded post the original boundary of Lott No. 6 then*
*North 10 degrees 1/4 east 22 perches to a stone standing in the seventh line of a tract called Jourden tract then*
*South 62 degrees 3/4 west 186 perches to the end of the seventh line of said Jourden tract then*
*North 14 degrees 9 minutes east 20 perches to a bounded stone then*
*South 86 degrees west 8 perches to a bounded stone standing in the head of a Mill Dam then*
*South 15 degrees West 33 perches to a bound stone then*
*North 68 degrees 3/4 west 31 perches to a bounded stone standing in the fourth line of a tract called His Lordships Favour then*
*South 16 degrees 1/2 West 88 perches to the end of third line of His Lordships Favour then*
*with a straight line to the first beginning containing and laid out for 152 acres and 24 perches more or less*

(Charles County Land Records, Patent Certificate #1088)

A good portion of the boundary lines for this property survive today, and I was easily able to overlay it onto a Tax Map.

Now that I had well known boundaries and points to the south and to the east, I could then more accurately place His Lordships Favor onto the Tax Map.

To begin the overlay I first had to reread and transcribe the description given on the 1705 plat, transcribed below:

*In persuance to which I have (by advice and consent of the above Capt. Wm. Barton and Col. James Smallwood, being then and there present) reserved said laid out and decided ye aforesaid tract Situate and lieing in the county above said upon Zachiah Branch, begininge at abounded red Oake standing near the corner of Mr. Rozers land [e.g., Baltimore's Bounty] running thence*
*East 368 peaches to a bounded Spannish Oake Standing by Zachiah Swamp, thence*
*North Easterly 62 degrees 230 perches to another bounded Spannish Oake by ye said Swamp [the eastern most corner that juts out] thence*
*North West 200 perches to a bounded red Oake saplinge, thence*
North Easterly 320 pearches to a bounded maple standing in ye swamp by ye run side [the northeast corner] thence
West 293 perches to a bounded hickory standing on the plaine [the northwest corner], thence South Westerly 23 degrees to ye first bounded tree containing 1250 acres

(Charles County Land Records, B#2/192-193)

Note that some property lines stand by the swamp, and note as well as the mention of a run and a plain. The run is today known as Piney Branch, previously known as Howell’s Run and Thompson’s Run or Branch in older deed descriptions in the 18th and 19th centuries.

I then overlaid His Lordships Favor along these known physical features while at the same time considering the fixed boundaries of Luckett’s Hardship and Thompson’s Fertile Meadow. This overlay, based off of known physical boundaries, fits well with the other known boundaries, with only minor conflicts due to deed descriptions not properly closing.

To check the overlay, I plotted selected parcels of His Lordships Favor that were later (e.g., post-1705) subdivided and transferred out to see if they would match up with either existing boundary lines or physical features. I began with a piece owned by William Middleton in 1730. Its description placed it at the beginning point of the original His Lordships Favor tract (the southwest corner), following along the tract’s southern boundary and then with a stream or branch (Charles County Land Records, M#2/231). Although complicated by the fact that it does not provide degrees but only directions, this deed description nonetheless fits with existing boundary lines shown on a Tax Map, following a stream that was easily defined on county topography maps.

I then examined a slightly later deed to see how the boundary line held up. I plotted out a parcel of His Lordships Favor owned by John Baptist Thompson (the same John Baptist that once owned Thompson’s Fertile Meadow directly adjacent) and described in a deed dated February 7, 1810. The description of the property in the deed to Thompson describes it as beginning on the South side of a stream near the “fording area” of the said stream. What is interesting to note is that this fording area, or crossing, is located near a crossing that appears on USGS quad maps for the Popes Creek area for a road connecting Piney Church Road and Maryland Route 488. It also describes it as following portions of the northern and western boundaries of the original His Lordships Favor tract. This description fit well with the existing stream where it described the fording area based on my overlay.

The completed overlay was thus based on many factors, including Tax Maps, topography maps, USGS Quad Maps, deed descriptions, plats, and patent descriptions. The now-fixed overlay of the 1705 plat showed that the buildings depicted on that plat were likely located on a knoll south of the Charles County Landfill, west of Piney Branch, north of a stream flowing into Piney Branch, and east of a field previously used for gravel mining.

The shovel testing grid was placed using this overlay as a guide. On the first day of the survey, a white clay tobacco pipe stem was located in the second shovel test pit. This tobacco pipe stem, and artifacts recovered from shovel tests in the vicinity, revealed a late 17th-/early 18th-century site, or the remains of the dwelling compound illustrated in the 1705 plat.
Appendix II.
Artifact Catalog, Shovel Test Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18CH793</td>
<td>327025</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick fragment (19.9 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327025</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 unidentified iron object, possibly mattock or other hand tool; 4 handmade red brick fragment (not weighed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327050</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 white clay tobacco pipe bowl fragment, undecorated; 1 black lead-glazed earthenware fragment, possibly Staffordshire reverse slipware; 15 handmade red brick fragments (4.6 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327050</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 unidentified square nail fragment with unidentified head; 1 handmade red brick fragment (0.1 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327050</td>
<td>1345975</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 handmade red brick fragments (9.2 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327075</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327075</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 English brown stoneware fragment; 1 handmade red brick fragment (0.1 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327075</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14 handmade red brick fragments (4.6 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327075</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 charcoal fragment; 3 handmade red brick fragments (14.8 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327075</td>
<td>1345975</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick fragment (less than .1 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327100</td>
<td>1345725</td>
<td>1345975</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 fire-cracked rock; 1 handmade red brick fragment (0.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327100</td>
<td>1345800</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7 handmade red brick fragments (36.3 g); 22 daub or underfired brick fragments (32.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327100</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 possible quartz primary flake; 1 white clay tobacco pipe stem, undecorated, 5/64ths-in diameter; 1 unidentified square nail fragment with unidentified head; 6 handmade red brick fragments (4.3 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327100</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 white clay tobacco pipe bowl fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327100</td>
<td>1345975</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 light green patinated colonial window glass fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327100</td>
<td>1346000</td>
<td>1345975</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 handmade red brick fragments (0.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327100</td>
<td>1346025</td>
<td>1346050</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick fragment (0.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327100</td>
<td>1346075</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327100</td>
<td>1346100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327125</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327125</td>
<td>1345725</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327125</td>
<td>1345750</td>
<td>1345775</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4 handmade red brick fragments (less than 0.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327125</td>
<td>1345775</td>
<td>1345800</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 quartz secondary flake; 3 charcoal fragments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Artifact Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>327125</td>
<td>1345825</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick fragment (less than 0.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327125</td>
<td>1345850</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327125</td>
<td>1345875</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick bat, measurable dimension 1 7/8-in thick (200.8 g); 12 handmade red brick fragments (22.6 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27125</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 unidentified iron nail fragment; 3 small unidentified iron fragments; 2 handmade red brick fragments (less than 0.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327125</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 probable Potomac Creek ceramic fragment, no surface treatment; 8 handmade red brick fragments (4.1 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327125</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2 handmade red brick fragments (1.6 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327125</td>
<td>1345975</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327125</td>
<td>1346000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 Rhenish blue and gray stoneware; 1 handmade red brick fragment (less than 0.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327125</td>
<td>1346050</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327125</td>
<td>1346075</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1 quartz primary flake; 1 unidentified square nail fragment with unidentified head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327125</td>
<td>1346100</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1 unidentified square nail fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick fragment (0.1 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345725</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345750</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345775</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345800</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345825</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>No artifacts (1 rock discarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345850</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick bat with glazing, measurable dimension 2 ¼-in (175.8 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345875</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2 handmade red brick fragments (1.2 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 dark green colonial bottle glass; 1 unidentified probable square nail fragment; 1 handmade red brick bat, measurable dimensions 2 ¼-in by 3 5/8-in (496.4 g); 29 handmade red brick fragments (129.9 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick bat, measurable dimensions 2 ¼-in by 4 1/4-in (greater than 600 g); 1 handmade red brick fragment (558.3 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18 handmade red brick fragments (96.6 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345975</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1 rose head nail fragment; 1 unidentified square nail fragment; 2 handmade red brick fragments (1.8 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1346005</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6 handmade red brick fragments (17.1 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1346025</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1 unidentified square nail fragment with rose head; 1 handmade red brick fragment (0.1 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1346050</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick fragment (2.0 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1346075</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2 handmade red brick fragments (13.4 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1346075</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1346100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2 unidentified square nail fragments; 1 handmade red brick fragment (0.3 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345725</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345750</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick crumbs, not weighed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345775</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick fragment (4.8 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345800</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1 unidentified square nail fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345825</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2 slate fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327150</td>
<td>1345850</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1 tin-glazed earthenware fragment, glaze only,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327175</td>
<td>1345875</td>
<td>47 7 handmade red brick fragments (2.3 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327175</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>48 3 unidentified square nail fragments with unidentified heads; 1 unidentified square nail fragment; 1 unidentified iron fragment; 197 handmade red brick fragments (266.9 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327175</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>49 27 handmade red brick fragments (6.4 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327175</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>50 1 Astbury-like earthenware fragment, red paste; 1 unidentified nail fragment; 10 handmade red brick fragments (4.1 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327175</td>
<td>1345975</td>
<td>51 3 handmade red brick fragments (4.7 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327175</td>
<td>1346000</td>
<td>52 1 handmade red brick fragment (0.2 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345600</td>
<td>N/A No artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345625</td>
<td>N/A No artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345650</td>
<td>54 1 rock (discarded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345675</td>
<td>N/A No artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>N/A No artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345725</td>
<td>N/A No artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345750</td>
<td>N/A No artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345775</td>
<td>55 1 unidentified square nail fragment with wrought rose head; 4 unidentified square nail fragments; 1 unidentified iron fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345800</td>
<td>56 1 light green patinated blown flat glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345825</td>
<td>N/A No artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345850</td>
<td>N/A No artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345875</td>
<td>N/A No artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>57 1 unidentified square nail fragment with unidentified head; 6 unidentified square nail fragments; 2 unidentified iron fragments; 42 handmade red brick fragments (49.2 g); 7 daub or underfired brick fragments (2.1 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>58 6 handmade red brick fragments (3.2 g); 13 daub or underfired brick fragments (3.3 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>N/A No artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1345975</td>
<td>59 1 white clay tobacco pipe stem, undecorated, 5/64ths-in diameter; 1 unidentified iron fragment; 5 handmade red brick fragments (5.8 g); 1 daub or underfired brick fragment (0.1 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1346000</td>
<td>60 1 possible quartz primary flake; 1 possible quartzite primary flake; 1 white clay tobacco pipe stem, undecorated, 5/64ths-in diameter; 1 unidentified square nail fragment with T-head; 1 unidentified square nail fragment; 2 unidentified iron fragments; 12 handmade red brick fragments (12.9 g); 3 daub or underfired brick fragments (0.4 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1346025</td>
<td>61 1 unidentified square nail fragment with unidentified head; 10 handmade red brick fragments (7.5 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1346050</td>
<td>62 1 handmade red brick fragment (0.7 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327200</td>
<td>1346075</td>
<td>N/A No artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327225</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>N/A No artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327225</td>
<td>1345725</td>
<td>N/A No artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Code</td>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327225</td>
<td>1345750</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327225</td>
<td>1345775</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327225</td>
<td>1345800</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1 unidentified square nail with wrought T-head; 1 unidentified iron nail fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327225</td>
<td>1345825</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327225</td>
<td>1345850</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327225</td>
<td>1345875</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5 handmade red brick fragments (0.6 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327225</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1 unidentified square nail fragment; 6 unidentified iron fragments; 13 handmade red brick fragments (6.7 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327225</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1 unidentified square nail fragment with unidentified head; 20 handmade red brick fragments (75.4 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327225</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1 modern clear bottle glass fragment; 8 handmade red brick fragments (14.9 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327225</td>
<td>1345975</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick fragment (less than 0.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327225</td>
<td>1346000</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1 white clay tobacco pipe stem, undecorated, 4/64ths-in diameter; 1 English brown stoneware fragment; 1 unidentified metal fragment; 9 handmade red brick fragments (13.2 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327225</td>
<td>1346025</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2 white clay tobacco pipe stems, undecorated, 5/64ths-in bore; 2 unidentified square nail fragment; 1 unidentified iron nail fragment; 7 handmade red brick fragments (2.9 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327225</td>
<td>1346050</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2 white clay tobacco pipe bowl fragments, undecorated; 2 handmade red brick fragments (1.9 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327250</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1 quartz shatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327250</td>
<td>1345725</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327250</td>
<td>1345750</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2 handmade red brick fragments (less than 0.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327250</td>
<td>1345775</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327250</td>
<td>1345800</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327250</td>
<td>1345825</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1 unidentified iron object, possibly part of a draw knife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327250</td>
<td>1345850</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1 unidentified square nail fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327250</td>
<td>1345875</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick fragment (less than 0.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327250</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1 unidentified square nail fragment with unidentified head; 1 unidentified square nail fragment; 1 unidentified iron fragment; 1 charcoal (discarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327250</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3 rock fragments (discarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327250</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1 rhyolite biface fragment; 1 Staffordshire slipware; 1 window lead with lead still attached; 1 unidentified square nail fragment; 2 handmade red brick fragments (2.0 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327250</td>
<td>1345975</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2 unidentified iron fragments; 1 handmade red brick fragments (less than 0.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327250</td>
<td>1346000</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1 white clay tobacco pipe bowl fragment, undecorated; 1 unidentified square nail fragment; 1 unidentified iron fragment; 9 handmade red brick fragments (2.4 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327250</td>
<td>1346025</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1 white clay tobacco pipe bowl fragment, undecorated; 1 dark green wine bottle glass fragment; 1 unidentified white metal cylindrical object; 1 unidentified iron object; 4 handmade red brick fragments (0.6 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Grid</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327275</td>
<td>1345675</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327275</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1 hand blown flat glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327275</td>
<td>1345725</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1 rock (discarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327275</td>
<td>1345750</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327275</td>
<td>1345775</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick fragment (0.7 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327275</td>
<td>1345800</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327275</td>
<td>1345825</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327275</td>
<td>1345850</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick fragment (4.7 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327275</td>
<td>1345875</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2 handmade red brick fragments (0.6 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327275</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick fragment (0.1 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327275</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6 handmade red brick fragments (5.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327275</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2 handmade red brick fragments (0.8 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327275</td>
<td>1345975</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick fragment (2.9 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327275</td>
<td>1346000</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick fragment (0.1 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327300</td>
<td>1345675</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327300</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1 white clay tobacco pipe stem, undecorated, 5/64ths-in diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327300</td>
<td>1345725</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327300</td>
<td>1345750</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327300</td>
<td>1345775</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327300</td>
<td>1345800</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327300</td>
<td>1345825</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327300</td>
<td>1345850</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1 rock (discarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327300</td>
<td>1345875</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1 Potomac Creek fragment, no surface treatment or decoration; 1 glazed handmade red brick fragment (89.8 g); 5 handmade red brick fragments (1.9 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327300</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3 handmade red brick fragments (0.3 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327300</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3 handmade red brick fragments (29.0 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327300</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2 handmade red brick fragments (4.8 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327300</td>
<td>1345975</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2 handmade red brick fragments (0.3 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327325</td>
<td>1345675</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327325</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327325</td>
<td>1345725</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327325</td>
<td>1345825</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327325</td>
<td>1345850</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1 white salt-glazed stoneware base fragment; 1 handmade red brick fragment (less than 0.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327325</td>
<td>1345875</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327325</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2 charcoal fragments; 2 handmade red brick fragments (less than 0.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327325</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327325</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327325</td>
<td>1345975</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1 handmade red brick fragment (less than 0.5 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327350</td>
<td>1345825</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1 Potomac Creek fragment, undecorated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327350</td>
<td>1345850</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327350</td>
<td>1345875</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327350</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327350</td>
<td>1345925</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1 quartz secondary flake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327350</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327350</td>
<td>1345975</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327400</td>
<td>1345500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327400</td>
<td>1345600</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1 quartz shatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid No.</td>
<td>H.E.</td>
<td>L.E.</td>
<td>Artifact(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327400</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327400</td>
<td>1345800</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327400</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327400</td>
<td>1345950</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327500</td>
<td>1345500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327500</td>
<td>1345600</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327500</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327500</td>
<td>1345750</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327500</td>
<td>1345775</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327500</td>
<td>1345800</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327500</td>
<td>1345825</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327500</td>
<td>1345850</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327500</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327600</td>
<td>1345500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327600</td>
<td>1345500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327600</td>
<td>1345600</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327600</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327600</td>
<td>1345800</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327600</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327700</td>
<td>1345400</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327700</td>
<td>1345500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327700</td>
<td>1345600</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327700</td>
<td>1345750</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327800</td>
<td>1345400</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327800</td>
<td>1345500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327800</td>
<td>1345600</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327800</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327900</td>
<td>1345500</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1 quartz shatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327900</td>
<td>1345600</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327900</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327900</td>
<td>1345800</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327900</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 iron wire fragment; 3 blown-in-mold aqua colored bottle glass fragments, late 19th/early 20th century; 10 modern colorless bottle glass fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327900</td>
<td>1346000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327900</td>
<td>1346100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 rock (discarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327900</td>
<td>1346200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 manganese-tinted glass fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328200</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328200</td>
<td>1345800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 unidentified square nail fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328200</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328200</td>
<td>1346000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328200</td>
<td>1346100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 rock (discarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328200</td>
<td>1346200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 manganese-tinted glass fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328200</td>
<td>1346300</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328300</td>
<td>1345700</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328300</td>
<td>1345800</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328300</td>
<td>1345900</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 iron wire fragment; 3 blown-in-mold aqua colored bottle glass fragments, late 19th/early 20th century; 10 modern colorless bottle glass fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328300</td>
<td>1346000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 machine-made red brick bat; 1 machine-made red brick fragment; 12 iron nail fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328300</td>
<td>1346100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7 probable machine-made red brick fragments (2.4 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328300</td>
<td>1346200</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328300</td>
<td>1346300</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No artifacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix III.**  
Artifact Inventory, Test Units 1-3, 18CH793

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Test Unit 1 Lot 114</th>
<th>Test Unit 2 Lot 115</th>
<th>Test Unit 3 Lot 116</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quartz flake, tertiary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL INDIAN</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe stem, white, 4/64ths inch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe stem, white, 5/64ths inch</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe stem, white, unmeasurable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe bowl, white</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PIPE</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin-glazed earthenware</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire slipware</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Staffordshire reverse slipware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified slipware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhenish brown stoneware</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English brown stoneware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped white salt-glazed stoneware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White salt-glazed stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EUROPEAN CERAMIC</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark green bottle glass, case bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark green bottle glass, probable case bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark green bottle glass, wine bottle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark green bottle glass, form unknown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th/20th-century bottle glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BOTTLE GLASS</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin, ¼ Spanish two-reale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Description</td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td>Count 2</td>
<td>Count 3</td>
<td>Count 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper alloy tack</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial window glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail, whole, unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail fragments, wrought</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail fragments, square</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail fragments, unidentified type</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazed brick</td>
<td>2 (78.9 g)</td>
<td>2 (45.6 g)</td>
<td>1 (37.7 g)</td>
<td>5 (162.2 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>123 (277.7 g)</td>
<td>93 (139.0 g)</td>
<td>83 (233.5 g)</td>
<td>299 (650.2 g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daub</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25 (32.5 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified iron fragment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron rust fragments</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>209</strong></td>
<td><strong>175</strong></td>
<td><strong>137</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IV.
Archaeological Site Forms, 18CH793 and 18CH799

MARYLAND INVENTORY OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES
ARCHEOLOGICAL SITE SURVEY: BASIC DATA FORM

Date Filed: 
Check if update: 

Maryland Department of Planning

Maryland Historical Trust
Division of Historical and Cultural Programs
100 Community Place
Crownsville, Maryland 21032

Site Number: 18CH793
County: Charles

A. DESIGNATION

1. Site Name: His Lordship’s Favor
2. Alternate Site Name/Numbers: None
3. Site Type (describe site chronology and function; see instructions):
   Late 17th/early 18th century domestic site
4. Prehistoric ______ Historic x Unknown ______
5. Terrestrial x Submerged/Underwater ______ Both ______

B. LOCATION

6. USGS 7.5” Quadrangle(s): La Plata (For underwater sites)
   NOAA Chart No.: (Photocopy section of quad or chart on page 4 and mark site location)
7. Maryland Archeological Research Unit Number: 10
8. Physiographic Province (check one):
   ______ Allegany Plateau ______ Lancaster/Frederick Lowland
   ______ Ridge and Valley ______ Eastern Piedmont
   ______ Great Valley ______ x Western Shore Coastal Plain
   ______ Blue Ridge ______ Eastern Shore Coastal Plain
9. Major Watershed/Underwater Zone (see instructions for map and list): Lower Potomac

C. ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

10. Nearest Water Source: ______ unnamed tributary of Piney Branch ______ Stream Order:
11. Closest Surface Water Type (check all applicable):
    ______ Ocean ______ x Freshwater Stream/River
    ______ Estuarine Bay/Tidal River ______ Freshwater Swamp
    ______ Tidal or Marsh ______ Lake or Pond
    ______ ______ x Spring
12. Distance from closest surface water: ______ meters (or 100 feet [estimated])
C. ENVIRONMENTAL DATA [CONTINUED]

13. Current water speed: _______________ knots  
14. Water Depth: __________ meters

15. Water visibility: ________________________

16. SCS Soils Typology and/or Sediment Type: Beltsville and Grosstown ________

17. Topographic Settings (check all applicable):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hilltop/Bluff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Interior Flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upland Flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ridgetop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rockshelter/Cave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terraces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upland Flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interior Flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Slope: __________ approximately 5% ________

19. Elevation: ________ meters (approximately 150 feet) above sea level

20. Land use at site when last field checked (check all applicable):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Plowed/Tilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-Till</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Wooded/Forested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standing Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standing Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Condition of site:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Disturbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undisturbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Cause of disturbance/destruction (check all applicable):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Plowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vandalized/Looted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dredged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Eroded/Eroding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heavy Marine Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Extent of disturbance:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Minor (0-10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate (10-60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major (60-99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Describe site setting with respect to local natural and cultural landmarks (topography, hydrology, fences, structures, roads). Use continuation sheet if needed.

18CH793 is located in a formerly open but now wooded area overlooking an unnamed tributary which empties into Piney Branch. The slope to the tributary is wooded and generally steep, although certain areas are passable on foot. The site is located approximately 1200 feet southwest of the Charles County Sanitary Landfill in an area that has been extensively mined for gravel or otherwise industrially developed. Fortunately, 18CH793 has not been impacted by these 20th-century activities. The site appears to have been logged 10-20 years ago, and is now covered with a young, dense forest.

25. Characterize site stratigraphy. Include a representative profile on separate sheet, if applicable. Address plowzone (presence/absence), subplowzone features and levels, if any, and how stratigraphy affects site integrity. Use continuation sheet if needed.

The site is characterized by a plow zone generally less than one foot in depth overlying subsoil; sub-plow zone features are generally unknown although anticipated.

26. Site size: _______ meters by _______ meters (or 300 feet by 300 feet)

27. Draw a sketch map of the site and immediate environs, here or on separate sheet:

Scale: North arrow:
Photocopy section of quadrangle map(s) and mark site location with heavy dot or circle and arrow pointing to it.
### D. CONTEXT

28. Cultural Affiliation (check all applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREHISTORIC</th>
<th></th>
<th>HISTORIC:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paleoindian</td>
<td>17th century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>1630-1675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Archaic</td>
<td>1676-1720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Archaic</td>
<td>18th century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Archaic</td>
<td>1721-1780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terminal Archaic</td>
<td>1781-1820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adena</td>
<td>1821-1860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Woodland</td>
<td>1861-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Woodland</td>
<td>20th century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>1901-1930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONTACT</td>
<td>post-1930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. INVESTIGATIVE DATA

29. Type of investigation:

- x Phase I
- x Phase II/Site Testing
- x Phase III/Excavation
- x Archival Investigation
- Monitoring
- Field Visit
- Collection/Artifact Inventory
- Other:

30. Purpose of investigation:

- Compliance
- Research
- Regional Survey
- Site Inventory
- MHT Grant Project
- Other:

31. Method of sampling (check all applicable):

- Non-systematic surface search
- Systematic surface collection
- Non-systematic shovel test pits
- x Systematic shovel test pits
- x Excavation units
- Mechanical excavation
- Remote sensing
- Other: __________________________

32. Extent/nature of excavation:

- Shovel tests spaced at 25-foot intervals across site area and excavation of three 5-by-5-foot test units.

### F. SUPPORT DATA

33. Accompanying Data Form(s):

- x Prehistoric
- x Historic
- x Shipwreck

34. Ownership:

- x Private
- Federal
- State
- Local/County
- Unknown
35. Owner(s): St. Charles Community, LLC
Address: 222 Smallwood Village Center; St. Charles, MD 20602
Phone: 301.843.8600

36. Tenant and/or Local Contact: none
Address: 
Phone: 

37. Other Known Investigations: none

38. Primary report reference or citation: Julia A. King and Scott M. Strickland, In Search of Zekiah Manor: Archaeological Investigations at His Lordship’s Favor, Ms. on file, MHT.

39. Other Records (e.g. slides, photos, original field maps/notes, sonar, magnetic record)?
   - Slides
   - Photos
   - Field maps
   - Field record
   - Sonar
   - Magnetic record
   - Other: notes provided by informant

40. If yes, location of records: MAC Lab (anticipated)

41. Collections at Maryland Archeological Conservation (MAC) Lab or to be deposited at MAC Lab?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unknown

42. If NO or UNKNOWN, give owner:
    location: 
    and brief description of collection:

43. Informant:
   Address: 
   Phone: 

44. Site visited by: Julia A. King, Scott M. Strickland, Field crew.
   Address: c/o Dept. Anthropology; St. Mary’s College of MD; St. Mary’s City, MD 20686
   Phone: 240.895.4398
   Date: May 20-June30, 2009

45. Form filled out by: Julia A. King
   Address: PO Box 213; St. Mary’s City, MD 20686
   Phone: 240.895.4398
   Date: June 21, 2009
18CH793 is late 17th/early 18th century domestic site located in the middle of what was once Zekiah Manor. Zekiah Manor was one of two proprietary manors created in the 1660s for the Calvert family; Zekiah Manor comprised 8800 acres with its east boundary along Zekiah Run. Gov. Charles Calvert built a summer house there in 1673, although how extensively used the summer house was is open to question. 18CH793 is a part of His Lordship’s Favor, which was a 1250-acre tract cut out of Zekiah Manor in 1699 and granted by Lord Baltimore to William Boarman. Boarman immediately transferred the land to High Teares; Teares died the following year and the property was divided between his widow, Eleanor, and daughter, Elizabeth. A plat prepared in 1705 depicted a complex of buildings, and 18CH793 represents the archaeological traces of those buildings.

The portion of His Lordship’s Favor containing the buildings consists of a series of terraces dissected by fairly steep ravines. Some of these terraces have been mined for gravel throughout the 20th century, while another portion contains the Charles County Sanitary Landfill. Two terraces, however, survive and have not been substantially altered, although both were logged approximately 10 to 20 years ago. Approximately 15 acres, including the terraces, were surveyed using a program of systematic shovel testing. Shovel tests were excavated at intervals of 25- and 100-feet to document soil stratigraphy and recover artifacts and other materials important for identifying archaeological sites.

A total of 224 shovel tests and three 5-by-5-foot test units were excavated at His Lordship’s Favor in 2009, revealing two historic-period archaeological sites (18CH793 and 18CH799). Domestic materials recovered from 18CH793 included ceramics, bottle glass, tobacco pipes, and an unusually large number of brick fragments, suggesting the dwelling did indeed have a brick chimney.

18CH793 measures approximately 300 by 300 feet. 18CH793 appears to represent the archaeological traces of the buildings shown on the 1705 map, and the site may have been occupied by tenants or servants in the early 18th century. Efforts to determine whether this site was the location of Calvert’s summer house remain inconclusive; however, the possibility remains that this compound may have been initially developed as the Calvert summer house. Recommendations for future work toward resolving this issue include additional limited testing at 18CH793 and an archaeological survey of the greater Zekiah Manor area.

Archaeological site 18CH793 is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under criterion D (sites that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history); if further work reveals that 18CH793 was the location of Calvert’s summer house, the site may also be eligible for the Register under criterion B, or sites that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. Archaeological site 18CH799 does not appear eligible for the National Register, although a program of more intensive testing may be appropriate before making a final determination.

All artifacts, records, and other materials from this project have been prepared for long-term curation and may be placed with the Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory if the owner agrees to donate them. Copies of the records have also been deposited with the Department of Anthropology at St. Mary’s College of Maryland.
MARYLAND ARCHEOLOGICAL SITE SURVEY: HISTORIC DATA FORM

Site Number 18CH 793

1. Site class (check all applicable, check at least one from each group):
   a.  x  domestic
       ___ industrial
       ___ transportation
       ___ military
       ___ sepulchre
       ___ unknown

   b.  ____ urban
       x  rural
       ____ unknown

   c.  standing structure:
       ____ yes
       x  no
       ____ unknown

   d.  above-grade/visible ruin:
       ____ yes
       x  no
       ____ unknown

2. Site Type (check all applicable):
   x  artifact concentration
   x  possible structure
   x  post-in-ground structure
   x  frame structure
   ____ masonry structure
   ____ farmstead
   x  plantation
   ____ townsit
   ____ mill (specify: ______________________)
   ____ raceway
   ____ quarry
   ____ furnace/forge

3. Ethnic Association:
   ____ Native American
   ____ African American
   x  Angloamerican
   ____ other Euroamerican (specify):
   ____ unknown
   ____ other:

4. Categories of material remains present (check all applicable):
   x  ceramics
   x  bottle/table glass
   x  other kitchen artifacts
   x  architecture
   x  furniture
   ____ arms
   x  clothing
   x  personal items
   x  tobacco pipes
   ____ activity items
   ____ human skeletal remains
   ____ faunal remains
   ____ floral remains
   ____ organic remains
   ____ unknown
   ____ other:

5. Diagnostics (choose from manual and give number recorded or observed):
   English brown stoneware
   Rhenish blue and gray stoneware
   Staffordshire Slipware
   Tin glazed earthenware
   Wine and case bottle glass
   Spanish silver reale (quarter section)
   White salt-glazed stoneware
   Tobacco pipes: 4/ and 5/64ths inch bores
   Astbury ware (1)
   Potomac Creek (4)
6. Features present:
   - Yes
   - No
   - X unknown (but likely)

7. Types of features present:
   - Construction feature
   - Foundation
   - Cellar hole/storage cellar
   - Hearth/chimney base
   - Posthole/postmold
   - Paling ditch/fence
   - Privy
   - Well/cistern
   - Trash pit/dump
   - Sheet midden
   - Planting feature

8. Flotation samples collected:
   - Analyzed:
     - Yes
     - X No
     - Unknown

9. Soil samples collected:
   - Analyzed:
     - Yes
     - X No
     - Unknown

10. Other analyses (specify):

11. Additional comments:

12. Form filled out by: Julia A. King
    Address: PO Box 213; St. Mary's City, MD 20686
    Date: August 26, 2009
Maryland Department of Planning  
**Maryland Historical Trust**  
**Division of Historical and Cultural Programs**  
100 Community Place  
Crownsville, Maryland 21032

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number: 18CH799</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County: Charles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. DESIGNATION

1. Site Name:  
   
2. Alternate Site Name/Numbers:  None
   
3. Site Type (describe site chronology and function; see instructions):  
   20th century domestic site
   
4. Prehistoric  
   Historic  x  
   Unknown

5. Terrestrial  x  
   Submerged/Underwater  
   Both

### B. LOCATION

6. USGS 7.5' Quadrangle(s):  
   La Plata
   (For underwater sites)
   
7. Maryland Archeological Research Unit Number:  10
   
8. Physiographic Province (check one):  
   Allegany Plateau  
   Ridge and Valley  
   Great Valley  
   Blue Ridge  
   Lancaster/Frederick Lowland  
   Eastern Piedmont  
   Western Shore Coastal Plain  
   Eastern Shore Coastal Plain

9. Major Watershed/Underwater Zone (see instructions for map and list):  Lower Potomac

### C. ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

10. Nearest Water Source:  Piney Branch  
    Stream Order:  

11. Closest Surface Water Type (check all applicable):  
   Ocean  
   Estuarine Bay/Tidal River  
   Tidal or Marsh  
   Freshwater Stream/River  
   Freshwater Swamp  
   Lake or Pond  
   Spring

12. Distance from closest surface water:  meters (or 1000 feet [estimated])

---
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C. ENVIRONMENTAL DATA [CONTINUED]

13. Current water speed: _______________ knots

14. Water Depth: ___________ meters

15. Water visibility: _______________

16. SCS Soils Typology and/or Sediment Type: Beltsville

17. Topographic Settings (check all applicable):
   - [ ] Floodplain
   - [ ] Interior Flat
   - [x] Terrace
   - [ ] Low Terrace
   - [ ] High Terrace
   - [ ] Hillslope
   - [ ] Hilltop/Bluff
   - [ ] Upland Flat
   - [ ] Ridgetop
   - [ ] Rockshelter/Cave
   - [ ] Unknown
   - [ ] Other:

18. Slope: ___________ approximately 5%

19. Elevation: _______ meters (approximately 180 feet) above sea level

20. Land use at site when last field checked (check all applicable):
   - [x] Plowed/Tilled
   - [ ] No-Till
   - [ ] Wooded/Forested
   - [x] Logging/Logged
   - [ ] Underbrush/Overgrown
   - [ ] Pasture
   - [ ] Cemetery
   - [ ] Commercial
   - [ ] Educational
   - [ ] Extractive
   - [ ] Military
   - [ ] Recreational
   - [ ] Residential
   - [ ] Ruin
   - [ ] Standing Structure
   - [ ] Transportation
   - [ ] Unknown
   - [ ] Other:

21. Condition of site:
   - [x] Disturbed
   - [ ] Undisturbed
   - [ ] Unknown

22. Cause of disturbance/destruction (check all applicable):
   - [x] Plowed
   - [ ] Eroded/Eroding
   - [x] Graded/Contoured
   - [ ] Collected
   - [ ] Vandalized/Looted
   - [ ] Dredged
   - [ ] Heavy Marine Traffic
   - [ ] Other:

23. Extent of disturbance:
   - [x] Minor (0-10%)
   - [ ] Moderate (10-60%)
   - [ ] Major (60-99%)
   - [ ] Total (100%)
   - [ ] % unknown
C. ENVIRONMENTAL DATA [CONTINUED]

24. Describe site setting with respect to local natural and cultural landmarks (topography, hydrology, fences, structures, roads). Use continuation sheet if needed.

Site is located in a still open but reforesting area just south of the southern fence of the Charles County Landfill. The site is visible on the surface in the form of an open well, scattered bricks (all modern machine-made), and non-native residential plantings. Portions of the site have been logged; an old road leads down to Piney Branch, a tributary of the Zekiah Run.

25. Characterize site stratigraphy. Include a representative profile on separate sheet, if applicable. Address plowzone (presence/absence), subplowzone features and levels, if any, and how stratigraphy affects site integrity. Use continuation sheet if needed.

The site is characterized by a plow zone generally less than one foot in depth overlying subsoil; sub-plow zone features are generally unknown although anticipated.

26. Site size: _____ meters by _____ meters (or 150 feet by 200 feet, although additional survey warranted)

27. Draw a sketch map of the site and immediate environs, here or on separate sheet:

| Scale: | North arrow: |
Photocopy section of quadrangle map(s) and mark site location with heavy dot or circle and arrow pointing to it.
D. CONTEXT

28. Cultural Affiliation (check all applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREHISTORIC</th>
<th>HISTORIC:</th>
<th>___ UNKNOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____ Unknown</td>
<td>_____ Unknown</td>
<td>___UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Paleoiandian</td>
<td>17th century</td>
<td>1630-1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Archaic</td>
<td>_____ 1676-1720</td>
<td>18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Early Archaic</td>
<td>_____ 1676-1720</td>
<td>18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Middle Archaic</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>1721-1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Late Archaic</td>
<td>1781-1820</td>
<td>1781-1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Terminal Archaic</td>
<td>1821-1860</td>
<td>1821-1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Woodland</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>1861-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Adena</td>
<td>20th century</td>
<td>1901-1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Early Woodland</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>1901-1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Middle Woodland</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>Post-1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Late Woodland</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>1930-1970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. INVESTIGATIVE DATA

29. Type of investigation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>x Phase I</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____ Phase II/Site Testing</td>
<td>Field Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Phase III/Excavation</td>
<td>Collection/Artifact Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>x</em> Archival Investigation</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Purpose of investigation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Site Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>x</em> Research</td>
<td>MHT Grant Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>x</em> Regional Survey</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Method of sampling (check all applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-systematic surface search</th>
<th>Systematic surface collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-systematic shovel test pits</td>
<td>Systematic shovel test pits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>x</em> Excavation units</td>
<td>Mechanical excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote sensing</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Extent/nature of excavation: Shovel tests spaced at 100-foot intervals across site area.

F. SUPPORT DATA

33. Accompanying Data Form(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_____ Prehistoric</th>
<th>x Historic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____ Shipwreck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Ownership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>x</em> Private</th>
<th>Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____ Unknown</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Local/County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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35. Owner(s): St. Charles Community, LLC  
Address: 222 Smallwood Village Center; St. Charles, MD 20602  
Phone: 301.843.8600

36. Tenant and/or Local Contact:  
Address:  
Phone: 

37. Other Known Investigations: none

38. Primary report reference or citation: Julia A. King and Scott M. Strickland, In Search of Zekiah Manor: Archaeological Investigations at His Lordship’s Favor, Ms. on file, MHT

39. Other Records (e.g. slides, photos, original field maps/notes, sonar, magnetic record)?  
- Slides  
- Photos  
- Field maps  
- Field record  
- Other: notes provided by informant

40. If yes, location of records: MAC Lab (anticipated)

41. Collections at Maryland Archeological Conservation (MAC) Lab or to be deposited at MAC Lab?  
- Yes (a portion of the collection was donated)  
- No (a portion remains in the possession of the landowner)  
- Unknown

42. If NO or UNKNOWN, give owner:  
location:  
and brief description of collection:

43. Informant:  
Address:  
Phone:

44. Site visited by: Julia A. King, Scott M. Strickland, Field crew.  
Address: c/o Dept. Anthropology; St. Mary’s College of MD; St. Mary’s City, MD 20686  
Phone: 240.895.4398  
Date: May 20-June 30, 2009

45. Form filled out by: Julia A. King  
Address: PO Box 213; St. Mary’s City, MD 20686  
Phone: 240.895.4398  
Date: June 21 and August 29, 2009
During May and June 2009, a Phase I archaeological survey of a portion of the tract, His Lordship’s Favor, located near Waldorf, Maryland, was conducted in an effort to locate a complex of structures shown in a 1705 plat prepared by deputy surveyor James Manning. His Lordship’s Favor, a 1250-acre tract originally part of Zekiah Manor, was granted in 1699 by Lord Baltimore to his friend William Boarman. Historical research indicates the possibility that this site could have been the ‘summer house’ Charles Calvert erected at Zekiah Manor in 1673. The project was aimed at locating the site, defining its horizontal and chronological boundaries, and exploring the possibility that this site may have been Calvert’s summer house.

The portion of His Lordship’s Favor containing the buildings consists of a series of terraces dissected by fairly steep ravines. Some of these terraces have been mined for gravel throughout the 20th century, while another portion contains the Charles County Sanitary Landfill. Two terraces, however, survive and have not been substantially altered, although both were logged approximately 10 to 20 years ago. Approximately 15 acres, including the terraces, were surveyed using a program of systematic shovel testing. Shovel tests were excavated at intervals of 25- and 100-feet to document soil stratigraphy and recover artifacts and other materials important for identifying archaeological sites.

A total of 224 shovel tests and three 5-by-5-foot test units were excavated at His Lordship’s Favor, revealing two historic-period archaeological sites (18CH793 and 18CH799). Archaeological site 18CH799 is a 20th-century domestic site located just south of the southern boundary fence of the county landfill. 18CH799 appears to be the archaeological traces of a farmstead shown on a mid-20th-century USGS quad map. The site first appears along the N328200 line and between the E1345800 and 1346100 lines. The site extends north at least 100 feet, to the N328300 line and possibly further, although this was the extent of the survey area. Thirty-eight artifacts were recovered from this site, including architectural materials (machine-made brick and iron nail fragments) and bottle glass. In addition to the artifacts, several features are visible above-ground at the site, including ornamental plantings (Figure 34), an open, brick-lined well, and scatters of 20th-century refuse. 18CH799 may be associated with the ownership of the property by George and Margaret Berger, who purchased this portion of the tract in 1913.

Archaeological site 18CH799 does not appear eligible for the National Register, although a program of more intensive testing may be appropriate before making a final determination.

All artifacts, records, and other materials from this project have been prepared for long-term curation and will be placed with the Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory. Copies of the records have also been deposited with the Department of Anthropology at St. Mary’s College of Maryland.
MARYLAND ARCHEOLOGICAL SITE SURVEY: HISTORIC DATA FORM

Site Number
18CH799

1. Site class (check all applicable, check at least one from each group):
   a. _____ domestic
      _____ industrial
      _____ transportation
      _____ military
      _____ sepulchre
      _____ rural
      _____ unknown
   b. _____ urban
      _____ rural
      _____ unknown
   c. standing structure:
      _____ yes
      _____ no
      _____ unknown
   d. above-grade ruin:
      _____ yes
      _____ no
      _____ unknown

2. Site Type (check all applicable):
   _____ artifact concentration
   _____ possible structure
   _____ post-in-ground structure
   _____ frame structure
   _____ masonry structure
   _____ farmstead
   _____ plantation
   _____ townsite
   _____ mill (specify: ________________________ )
   _____ raceway
   _____ quarry
   _____ furnace/forge
   _____ other:

3. Ethnic Association:
   _____ Native American
   _____ African American
   _____ Angloamerican
   _____ other Euroamerican (specify):
   _____ Hispanic
   _____ Asian
   _____ unknown
   _____ other:

4. Categories of material remains present (check all applicable):
   _____ ceramics
   _____ tobacco pipes
   _____ bottle/table glass
   _____ activity items
   _____ other kitchen artifacts
   _____ skeletal
   _____ faunal
   _____ faunal
   _____ furniture
   _____ floral remains
   _____ arms
   _____ organic
   _____ clothing
   _____ unknown
   _____ personal items
   _____ other:

5. Diagnostics (choose from manual and give number recorded or observed):

   Machine made bricks
   Clear modern bottle glass
   __________________________
   __________________________
6. Features present:
   _x_ yes
   _____ no
   _____ unknown (but likely)

7. Types of features present:
   _____ construction feature
   _____ road/drive/walkway
   _____ foundation
   _____ depression/mound
   _____ cellar hole/storage cellar
   _____ hearth/chimney base
   _____ posthole/postmold
   _____ paling ditch/fence
   _____ privy
   _x_ well/cistern
   _____ trash pit/dump
   _____ sheet midden
   _____ planting feature

8. Flotation samples collected: analyzed:
   _____ yes
   _x_ no
   _____ unknown

9. Soil samples collected: analyzed:
   _____ yes
   _x_ no
   _____ unknown

10. Other analyses (specify):

11. Additional comments:

12. Form filled out by: Julia A. King
    Address: PO Box 213; St. Mary's City, MD 20686
    Date: July 28, 2009
Appendix V.
Professional Qualifications

JULIA ANN KING

Address:   P.O. Box 213                      Phone:  240.895.4398
          47520 Dutchman’s Drive               301.862.1404
          St. Mary’s City, MD 20686             Email:  jking@smcm.edu

EDUCATION:

Ph.D., 1990, Historical Archaeology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
Majors: anthropology and history; Minor: English.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

2006-present, Associate Professor of Anthropology, St. Mary’s College of Maryland
St. Mary’s City, Maryland, 20686.
2008-present, Coordinator, Museum Studies Program, SMCM.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

1996 to 2006: Director, Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory, Maryland
Historical Trust, St. Leonard, Maryland, 20685.
1987 to 1996: Director of Research, Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum, St. Leonard,
Maryland.
1978-1986: Numerous field crew and field supervisor positions, including Flowerdew
Hundred, (VA), Governor’s Land (VA), St. Augustine (FL), St. Mary’s City (MD).

OTHER POSITIONS:

2003  President, Society for Historical Archaeology (www.sha.org).
2003-2011  Member, President’s Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
           (www.achp.gov).
2002-2006  Member, St. Mary’s County Planning Commission (appointed by the Board of
           County Commissioners)

GRANTS, AWARDS, and FELLOWSHIPS:

2005-2007  National Endowment for the Humanities, Division of Preservation and
           Access.  Project: Developing a Records Database for the State of Maryland’s
           Archaeological Collections.
2002-2005  National Endowment for the Humanities, Division of Collaborative Research.
           Project: A Comparative Archaeological Study of Colonial Chesapeake Culture.
2002  Research Fellow, Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum, Winterthur, Delaware.
2000  Andrew Mellon Fellow, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS and SERVICE:

Society for Historical Archaeology, Member, Director (1997-2000), President (2003)
Society for American Archaeology, Member
Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Life Member
Register of Professional Archaeologists, Member
American Anthropological Association, Member
Society of Early Americanists, Member
Society for the Study of Southern Literature, Member
Virginia Historical Society, Member
Associate Editor, Historical Archaeology (Journal of the Society for Historical Archaeology)
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Archaeology Task Force, Chair

PUBLICATIONS:


with Bruce W. Bevan and Robert J. Hurry
1993 Geophysical Surveys at Historic Period Cemeteries: An Example from the Plains, Mechanicsville, Maryland. Historical Archaeology 27(3):4-16.

with Dennis B. Blanton, co-editors

with Edward E. Chaney


*with William Lees*

*with James G. Gibb*

*with Henry M. Miller*

*with Thao T. Phung and Douglas H. Ubelaker*
2009   Alcohol, Tobacco, and Excessive Animal Protein: The Question of an Adequate Diet in the 17th-Century Chesapeake. *Historical Archaeology*.

*with Dennis J. Pogue*

*with Eric N. Powell*

**WEB PAGES:**

*with Gregory J. Brown, Catherine L. Alston, and Edward E. Chaney*

*with Edward E. Chaney and Katherine J. Dinnel*

*with Katherine L. Priddy, Edward E. Chaney, and Sharon Raftery*
Scott Morgan Strickland  
48664 Packer Court, St. Inigoes, MD 20684  
240-925-7548  
stricklandscottm@gmail.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Demonstrated ability in Computer Aided Drafting (CAD), mapping, surveying, and data analysis.  
- Strong surveying background with more than 5 years of experience.  
- Skilled at learning new concepts quickly, maintaining deadlines, and displaying data in a clear and cohesive manner.  
- Extensive CAD experience, word processing, database entry & analysis, and graphic design.  
- Archaeological field & lab experience with strong interest in colonial history. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B.A. Degree in Sociology/Anthropology  
*St. Mary’s College of Maryland, St. Mary’s City, MD*  
Concentration in Anthropology, member of Lambda Alpha, speaker at the Mid-Atlantic Archaeology Conference in February, 2008. Course work with an emphasis on archaeology. Graduated with 3.4 G.P.A. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associates Degree in Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>College of Southern Maryland, La Plata, MD</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career History &amp; Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Historical Research and Patent Reconstruction, Wetherburn Associates LLC.**  
2008-2009  
- Extensive research at the Maryland State Archives; including research in land records & patents, wills, and colonial council & court records.  
- Using Computer Aided Drafting software to reconstruct colonial patents.  
- Producing maps for the purpose of planning archaeological field work in Charles County Maryland.  
- Researching the history of the Piscataway Indians in Charles County Maryland in order to locate important archaeological sites. |

| Field Archaeologist, St. Mary’s College of Maryland  
2008  
- Directed and Supervised Field Crew.  
- Lab work, including completing site survey forms as well as washing, labeling, and cataloging artifacts.  
- Co-Authored Archaeological Site Report, titled: *The Search for the Court House at Moore’s Lodge – Charles County’s First County Seat*; primarily producing maps, graphics, and data analysis.  
- Co-Authored Article in Maryland Archaeology (biannual publication by the Archaeological Society of Maryland), titled: *The Search for Charles County’s First Courthouse*, vol. 43 no. 2.  
- Designed a display of artifacts for the general public in a county government building. |
Draftsmen and Field Technician, Offenbacher Land Surveying 2003-2008

- Drafted boundary surveys, site plans, ALTA-ACSM surveys, FEMA Flood Insurance Certification, and subdivision plans.
- Worked with State and County government agencies for development approval.
- Extensive use of Computer Aided Drafting, GIS, and Electronic Transit instruments (Leica & Topcon).