

Samuel Fuller Homesite Report Series

Volume 7 of 7

Summary and Conclusions

Craig S. Chartier
Plymouth Archaeological Rediscovery Project (PARP)

Visit us at
www.plymoutharch.com

Contact us at
craig@plymoutharch.com

ABSTRACT

Site examination testing was conducted at the Samuel Fuller Homesite prior to residential subdivision development in Kingston, Massachusetts. The site is one of three contemporaneously occupied homesites dating to the middle to late nineteenth century and situated within the proposed subdivision development area that were identified during and Intensive Survey of the area. The intensive survey was conducted in the undisturbed sections of the project area by MAP personnel under permit No. 2865 issued by the State Archaeologist. As a result of the survey, 153 test pits (142 test pits placed in six transects, seven judgmental test pits and four array test pits) were excavated, 1,018 artifacts (24 prehistoric and 995 historic) were recovered, and two prehistoric and six historic sites were identified. Three historic cellar holes associated with the Fuller brothers (Samuel, Smith and Daniel) were identified as being potentially eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places and were recommended for site-examination testing. Two of the cellar holes, those of Smith and Daniel, were determined to be located in areas that could be protected from further development and were thus preserved in situ. The cellar hole associated with the Samuel Fuller family, could not be avoided by the proposed development and was subjected to site-examination testing. Surface vegetation consists of developing hardwood scrub and forest with little underbrush. The Samuel Fuller Homesite is situated on a small rise overlooking a historic road and in close proximity to present day cranberry bogs.

The testing strategies employed for the site examination consisted of the excavation of a series of 50 cm square shovel excavated test pits placed in a grid pattern, followed by the excavation of three trenches (two in a cross-shaped pattern within the cellar hole and one across the width of a depression situated on the edge of the site boundary), and six one-meter-square excavation units. Excavation was carried out to a minimum of 50 cmbgs, well into the B2 subsoil. The site size, based on the presence of test pits with and without cultural material, was determined to be 25 meters east to west by 45 meters north to south. The western edge was defined by the cranberry bog road; the northern edge was defined by a low area of possible soil removal activities and sterile test pits, while the south and east boundaries were defined by two sterile test pits. The overall distribution of material appears to be in a roughly oval shape oriented north to south.

Prehistoric cultural material was recovered from several contexts, all believed to have come from one site with scattered material. The prehistoric site was determined to be a low density lithic scatter likely resulting from short term occupation, possibly during the Middle Archaic period. The location of the site was determined to roughly parallel that of the historic site with prehistoric materials occurring in a more random and scattered fashion.

Historic cultural material consisted of an appreciable assemblage of ceramics, faunal remains and household architectural material. No outbuildings were identified. Site examination testing found that the site possessed definite boundaries, with a yard scatter, subsurface features, and overall good integrity in the sense that the site has not been disturbed by subsequent post-occupation activities, and a high research potential. The high research potential was due to the observed spatial patterning of subsurface artifacts and features across the site. The site was found to possess definite boundaries, good integrity in the sense that the site has not been disturbed by subsequent post-occupation activities, and high research potential. While it was difficult to attribute various deposits to time periods, there appears to be spatial patterning of subsurface artifacts and features across the site. Archaeological investigations identified deposits dating to the occupation of the site by the Fullers, as well as occupation of the site immediately after, possibly by Kingston's famed hermit, Daniel Fuller.

Extensive background research was conducted, principally focusing on census and tax records, in order to place the Fullers within a larger community context. It is felt that further investigations at the site have the potential to yield significant information regarding the lives of individuals living at a low economic level throughout much of the nineteenth century. The site was found to possess definite boundaries, good integrity in the sense that the site has not been disturbed by subsequent post-occupation activities, and high research potential. While it was difficult to attribute various deposits to time periods, there appears to be spatial patterning of subsurface artifacts and features across the site. Archaeological investigations identified deposits dating to the occupation of the site by the Fullers as well as occupation of the site immediately after, possibly by Kingston's famed hermit, Daniel Fuller. The Trench 1 and North Yard Midden deposits are terminal deposits of materials cleaned out of the house following Samuel's death. As a result, they represent the artifacts that were present in the house at the time of his death, and that were determined by the cleaners to be worthless and disposable. It is unknown what material may have been removed from the site by those who were cleaning out the house. While the deposit in these contexts seems to show an occupation by someone who saved old bottles and ate off of old plates, it may be a case of these being the artifacts that were not wanted by those who cleaned out the house. In fact, they may have originally made up only a small portion of the actual material-culture assemblage. The Fullers may have had fine china and gold, but these materials could have been removed by the cleaners and thus did not present themselves archaeologically. However, by coupling the archaeological findings with extensive background research, it was determined that the Fullers were of a lower economic station and thus unlikely to own fine china. The disposal of their possessions in an associated pit and a yard midden, indicates that they may not have had much that was worth anything at the time of Samuel's death and thus many of their possessions were subsequently disposed of on-site. Further excavations could help clarify this issue. As a result, the site is considered eligible for listing on the National Register and avoidance of the site is recommended.

CONCLUSIONS

A. Site Boundaries

In order to determine the boundaries of and activities occurring at the Samuel Fuller Homesite, the excavation of 50-x-50 -cm shovel test pits in a five-meter grid pattern around and between the Intensive Survey test pits extending out to the north, south and west from the cellar hole was conducted. This grid included Transect 4 test pits 6 to 10 and Judgmental Test Pits (JTPs) 1-3. The grid lines ceased either after two sterile test pits were located in any direction or if topographical features clearly representing the edge of the site, such as the drop off to the cranberry bog road, were encountered.

A total of fifty-four 50 x 50 cm square shovel test pits were excavated in the five-meter grid pattern around the cellar hole. Half of these test pits contained historic cultural material. The site size, based on the presence of test pits with and without cultural material, was determined to be 25 meters east to west by 45 meters north to south. The western edge was defined by the cranberry bog road; the northern edge was defined by a low area of possible soil removal activities and sterile test pits, while the south and east boundaries were defined by two sterile test pits. The overall distribution of material appears to be in a roughly oval shape oriented north to south.

Prehistoric cultural material was recovered from several contexts, all believed to have come from one site with scattered material. The prehistoric site was determined to be a low density lithic scatter likely resulting from short term occupation, possibly during the Middle Archaic period. The location of the site was determined to roughly parallel that of the historic site with prehistoric materials occurring in a more random and scattered fashion.

B. Integrity

For purposes of National Register eligibility, integrity describes “the level of preservation or quality of information contained within a district, site, or excavated assemblage. A property with good archaeological integrity has archaeological deposits that are relatively intact and complete.” While archaeological properties may have some subsurface disturbance, integrity can be demonstrated by the presence of “spatial patterning of subsurface artifacts or features that represent differential uses or activities, spatial patterning of subsurface artifacts or features, or lack of serious disturbance to the property’s archaeological deposits” (Little et al 2000).

The site maintained a high degree of integrity, but prior to 1850, when Samuel appeared in the census records, and post 1892, when Samuel died, no historic records have been found to determine who lived at the site. It appears that following the death of Samuel Fuller, the house was cleaned out, resulting in the creation of the deposits in Trench 1 and the North Yard Midden, after which the house may have been re-occupied for a short period. Extensive faunal remains from around the hearth indicate that the occupant may have been Daniel Fuller who died in June of 1894, over two years after Samuel (January 1892). Even though the news article written about Daniel the Hermit was dated 1893, he may have been living in or using his brother’s house at some point between 1892 and 1894. The structure eventually collapsed to the north and east and the bricks from the hearth and chimney may have been salvaged prior to the collapse.

Intact deposits were found in Trench 1 (late nineteenth century), EUs 1-3 (late nineteenth century, north yard midden), EU 4 (possibly earlier nineteenth century kitchen midden), EU 5 and the southern half of Transect 3 (earlier nineteenth century Terrace fill), and in the cellar hole (nineteenth

century Fill layers 3-4). The site was not plowed and appears to have been undisturbed following abandonment.

C. Research Potential and Significance

Nineteenth century rural sites, such as the Samuel Fuller Homesite, are by far one of the most common historic archaeological sites encountered in the northeast during the course of CRM field work and with the multiplicity of sites encountered, not all can be considered equally significant. Essentially, there must be some redundant sites and sites that lack the integrity to make it likely that they have something important to add on a local, regional or national level. But, as Miller and Klein (2001-2002: 156) have outlined with regards to farmsteads, they are potentially significant areas for better understanding the culture and society in which they were created. This is because they are generally isolated from their neighbors making it unlikely that they will have intrusive materials from other sites or occupations present to confuse the archaeological signature of the site. Generally, rural homesites also may have higher levels of documentation than other sites and they were occupied by diverse social, economic, and ethnic groups ranging from wealthy farmers with large estates to tenant farmers and freed slaves (Miller and Klein 2001-2002: 156). Various archaeologists have posited ways to determine site significance and research potential. Some archaeologists see the oldest sites and those with the least amount of historical documentation as having the most potential to provide information that would represent a significant loss if the site was destroyed (Miller and Klein 2001-2002: 156). But documents do not directly equate to the data gained from archaeological excavation and so the two are not mutually exclusive. Others see only those sites that can help answer broader research questions as being the most important, while another group of archaeologists see all sites as important because we don't know what questions will gain importance in the future (Smith 1990: 34).

In the 1990s, archaeologists began to develop ways to rank the numerous farmsteads so that not every site would need to be excavated, only those that had good potential for providing potentially significant information (Hinks, et al 1998; Moore et al 1997, Miller and Klein 2001-2002). All of these ranking systems considered the following aspects of the farmstead under review to be important: length and period of occupation, historical significance of occupants, number of families occupying the site, farm type, refuse disposal patterns, extent of site disturbances, quality and quantity of historical documentation, potential to provide information on poorly documented groups, and the proposed level of impact by the project.

At the most essential level, rural sites can be considered significant if they have intact, spatially and temporally distinct features; their superstructures were destroyed in a catastrophic versus organized dismantlement or abandonment fashion; and if there is a good documentary record of the occupants living at the site (Wilson 1990: 30). Wilson saw the best sites as being those with a good documentary record because one of the keys to understanding the site lies in the examination of readily available primary and secondary sources and then placing the sites within a broad geographical and socio-economic context (Wilson 1990: 23). He also considered it important that a site was occupied for a period of less than 20 years because short-term occupations potentially have analytical clarity, although at the same time, because of the short-term occupation, they may have lower visibility and lower artifact counts (Wilson 1990: 30). A site with a high potential for being able to significantly answer questions at the local, regional and national levels (a "good" site in Wilson's discussion) would be one which had a rich documentary record, was occupied for a short period of time and was destroyed by a major catastrophe such as a fire. A site with a low research potential (a "bad" site in Wilson's discussion) would be one that had a minimal record of occupation, evidence of major rebuilding at the same location, destruction through house cleaning

coupled with a complete removal of the house superstructure.

Miller and Klein (2001-2002) went the farthest in developing a system that was applicable throughout the eastern United States, which helps to make the investigations of the sites and the types of sites investigated, more significant at a regional and national level. The use of Miller and Klein's ranking system results in the production of a "score" for the site under review (Table 1).

Table 1. Miller and Klein's ranking system for rural site significance.

Site Type	
Unknown	0
Country Estate	1
Owner-occupied farm or rural site	2
Tenant farm/Rented site	3
Tenant farm or rented site where name of tenant is known	4
Enslaved African-American site (Ethnic minority or African-American add 2 pts)	4
Structural Evidence	
No visible structural information	0
Ruins with discernible orientation of buildings	2
House standing	3
House and out-building standing	5
Archaeological Evidence	
No intact features	-4
Field scatter, high concentration of domestic and architectural artifacts	1
Unplowed Site	2
Sheet trash clustered near buildings	3
Discreet deposits and/or assemblages that are not feature deposits	4
Intact features with primary deposits	6
Documents	
Tax Records	1
Write up in county history	1
Deeds (depending on the level of detail)	1-3
Probate records depending on detail	2-3
Insurance records	3
Diaries	4
Account records (depending on detail and length of time)	2-4
Photos of site (depending on how much they document)	2-4
Oral History	
Knowledgeable local historian	1
Old neighbors of the site	2
Long term occupants of the site	3
Occupation Period	
Between WWI and WWII	1
1880-WWI	2

1861-1880	3
1815-1861	4
Length of Occupation	
More than 20 years	0
Burnt site, fire date unknown	2
Known catastrophe end date to site	3
Less than 20 years	3
Less than 10 years	5

According to Miller and Klein, generally, sites with higher scores can be considered to be ones with good research potential and sites with scores below 18 for the 1815-1861 period, 19 for the 1861-1880 period, 19 for the 1880-World War I period, and 27 for the World War I to World War II period, could be considered as having less potential and probably would not be considered the best sites to excavate (Miller and Klein 2001-2002: 164). This ranking system should not, of course, be considered the only criteria to base a site's significance and research potential on, but it does provide a number of good site specifics that need to be considered when deciding whether a site is worth the effort and expenditure needed to mitigate it prior to the construction phase of a CRM project.

Using Miller and Klein's ranking system, the Samuel Fuller Site would receive a score of 26 if we rely only on what we know from the Intensive Survey (Table 2).

Table 2. Application of Miller and Klein's ranking system for farmstead site significance at the Samuel Fuller site for all time periods.

Site Type	
Owner-occupied Site	2
Structural Evidence	
Ruins with discernible orientation of buildings	2
Archaeological Evidence	
Unplowed Site	2
Sheet trash clustered near buildings	3
Intact features with primary deposits	6
Documents	
Tax Records	1
Write up in county history	1
Occupation Period	
1880-WWI	2
1861-1880	3
1815-1861	4
Length of Occupation	
More than 20 years	0
Score	26

Therefore, according to the results of the intensive survey the site would prove especially significant if discrete deposits attributable to specific periods in the site's occupation could be identified during the Site Examination. This would allow for a focused examination of the change in lifeways by the site's inhabitants over time. The Site Examination documentary research had the

potential to increase the Miller and Klein rank in terms of the kinds of documentary evidence that may be found at the Massachusetts State Archives, in Plymouth County Deeds, Plymouth County Probate Records, and the Kingston Town Records, while the field investigation could have the potential to increase the site’s research potential if it was found that the site had burned or was destroyed from some other catastrophic event.

Site examination research and field testing confirmed the findings of the intensive survey. One intact deposit was identified during the intensive survey (JTP-3/ Trench 1) and a minimum of five more were identified during site examination testing (north yard midden, hearth, cellar hole, terrace, west yard) and areas of yard scatter around the structure were investigated. Deed research was able to generally trace the purchase and potential ownership of the property but failed to identify what happened to the property after Samuel Fuller’s death in 1892. An exhaustive study of census records traced Samuel and Maria Fuller and their household throughout the century, and into the next century in the case of Maria Fuller. Census records also provided an unprecedented level of comparison of the Fullers and their neighbors in terms of socioeconomic rank and the changing nature of trades and occupations in Kingston during the industrial period. Applying site examination findings to the Miler and Klein ranking system resulted in an increase of only one point (Table 3). Unfortunately Miller and Klein’s ranking

Table 3. Application of Miller and Klein’s ranking system for farmstead site significance at the Samuel Fuller site for all time periods following the site examination.

Site Type		
	Owner-occupied Site	2
Structural Evidence		
	Ruins with discernible orientation of buildings	2
Archaeological Evidence		
	Unplowed Site	2
	Sheet trash clustered near buildings	3
	Intact features with primary deposits	6
Documents		
	Tax Records	1
	Write up in county history	1
	Deeds (depending on the level of detail)	1-3
Occupation Period		
	1880-WWI	2
	1861-1880	3
	1815-1861	4
Length of Occupation		
	More than 20 years	0
Score		27

did not take into account census records or the overall number of intact deposits identified. A site with a greater number of intact deposits spanning multiple periods of the site occupation should have a higher ranking than a similar site with only one intact deposit identified. Also, Miller and Klein’s system does not take into account the classes of material recovered and their potential to contribute to the study of rural lifeways. Site Examination testing at the Samuel Fuller homesite yielded multiple potentially informative classes of artifacts such as faunal remains, ceramics, glass, and personal items.

But it does have to be pointed out that the documentary research for the site examination called into question who was at the site prior to Samuel being there in 1850. The date of Consider's will when compared with the ages of his children show that the children from his first marriage ranged in age from his eldest son, Ezra, at 38 to his youngest son, John, at 28. All of those children received \$5.00 from the estate. The children from his second marriage who received the \$5.00 were the oldest son Nathan age 22, Daniel W. age 17, Samuel age 15 and his youngest daughter Hannah age 10. The estate was then divided between Smith who was 20 and Waldo who was 8 with the caveat that both of the sons would take care of his wife/their mother, Hannah, as long as she remained a widow. Hannah was 59 when Consider died, so if she lived at least twenty years longer and Smith for some reason preceded her in death, she would be taken care of by their youngest son assuming he was still alive. As Hannah was still alive, there probably would be no reason to place Waldo's inheritance in a guardianship until he came of age. As Nathan was given \$5.00 he may have been on his own at the time of his father's death and it is likely all the other children born to Consider and Hannah were living at the homestead that ended up being Smith's property. Exactly who if any one, was living at the "small dwelling" Waldo inherited that appears to be the location of the dwelling that Samuel ended up living in is unknown. Archaeologically, it was found that someone must have been living there though and through census records, it is known that the only siblings who were consistently living in close proximity to each other were Samuel, Smith and Daniel, making it likely, but presently unprovable, that Samuel was living at the site. The 1832 map of Kingston shows two structures in close proximity to each other within the project area. These structures may be the family homestead (Smith's house) and the "small house" left to Waldo. Future documentary research could be directed at further identifying the occupants of the house and possibly locating missing deeds such as the deed from Consider Fuller to Levi Wright and any transferences from Waldo to Samuel.

In conclusion, using Miller and Klein's ranking system the Samuel Fuller homesite can be considered to be one with good research potential as it scored 27, a full eight to nine points higher than their minimum of 18-19 for similar sites. When the other data discussed above, the number of intact deposits, the extensive census data and census comparisons, and the classes of material culture present, this site should receive an even higher score.

Rural Home Site Studies

Research questions for large scale farmstead archaeology seeks to delineate both patterns of farm development; the variety of farm sizes, buildings, dates of construction and arrangement of buildings; typicality in terms of size, wealth, and resources of each farm; the incremental fashion in which most farms achieved this organization; the prevalence in the 19th-century of a rearrangement of farm buildings; and the recurring patterns of spatial organization and activity usage (Beaudry 2001-2002: 130). At rural homesites where farming does not appear to have been the main economic focus, focus can be placed on landscape archaeology research questions as well, such as those proposed by Adams (1990). These include studying such things as when and if forests were cleared, why and where were roads built, what subsistence farming practices, if any, were used, were draft animals used for manual labor, what changes to the woodlots of the farm occurred once coal and oil became widely used, and what crops were planted (Adams 1990: 93).

Rural homesite archaeology can examine the larger question of what was happening at rural homesites in an age when agricultural economics was being replaced by industrial economics, market dependence, and a potential decline in rural self-sufficiency. Homesites, like farmstead sites, represent the culmination of years of occupation, adaptation and change and should be thought of in

these terms (Catts 2001-2002: 145). Beaudry advocates a system where we stop thinking in terms of potsherds and start thinking in terms of landscapes, to not think of just individual features at a site, but to think of the entire feature system (Beaudry 2001-2002: 139). This view goes hand-in-hand with the views of other archaeologists such as Wade Catts who see nineteenth century rural places as needing to be examined for evidence of long-term change through the development of land use histories for the entire farm (Catts 2001-2002: 150). One noticeable improvement to the Fuller dwelling was the construction of the terrace in front of the house, a similar landscape feature was identified and investigated at a rural home site in Hopkinton (Donohue et al 2000). In 1842 a book entitled *Cottage Residences* discussed the aesthetics of domestic architecture linking the design of a house to the economic circumstances, personal interests, and family life of its owners. Aside from urging the installation of items for convenience and comfort in the house, it also linked the house and its grounds through landscape features (Garvin 2001). One such feature was a terrace off the front of a house. The results of the field testing of the terrace fill in Trench 3 suggests that it was constructed sometime after 1840 due to the presence of flow blue ironstone (1840-1879) in the upper fill deposit. As Samuel and family were living in the house in 1850, it's possible that they may have constructed the terrace. A structure like a terrace in front of a rather common central chimney house may have been an attempt to project an image of affluence greater than was in reality present. Beaudry stated that ideological factors resulted in the manipulation of the domestic landscape as a means of social display (Beaudry1986:38). The terrace would have visually set the house upon a pedestal, especially when viewed from the road running to the south of it and would have been just a form of social display. The presence of faux gemstone and imitation gold jewelry such as those recovered from the house, may also have been a way to exhibit a desired station versus ones real social station.

Other important areas for research include looking at long term change within the rural homesite as a reflection of the changes that occurred within the larger society during the era of the Industrial Revolution; examining ethnic and class differences of the occupants within the context of the dynamics of rural society; examining the roots of modern communities in the past; and using sites to create micro-histories, site biographies and ethnographies that will lead to a broader understanding of rural and agricultural culture and society (Klein and Baugher 2001-2002: 167). Klein and Baugher came up with a potential framework for identifying, evaluating, testing and preserving nineteenth century farmstead sites, and their approach can be extended to any type of rural homesite. They advocate first developing historic contexts by identifying the theme, time period, and geographic limits of the site, and defining the type of site. Archaeological investigations should involve survey and testing of all components of the site, excavating large areas within the entire site, using remote sensing within areas outside of the core, giving equal attention to areas with and without large artifact densities, and using the full range of historical sources, including literature, paintings, agricultural journals and publications, and oral history (Klein and Baugher 2001-2002: 168-169). The results of the documentary research for the Site Examination suggest that the Smith Fuller site, which has been left in situ and will be protected by a Preservation Restriction, may be more likely to reveal further insight into two generations of the Fuller family and long term change within this rural section of Kingston.

Examination of Self-Sufficiency

One of the research questions for this project involves the degree to which this family, which was living only a few miles outside of Kingston center, was involved with the local market economy. This question revolves partially around the Fuller's degree of self-sufficiency. The nature and degree of rural inhabitants be they farmers or laborers, self-sufficiency rests not on economics but on attitudes. Rural inhabitants could and did often produce their own food, fuel, and furniture but

no one really believes that they were totally self-sufficient. The stereotypical New England Yankee, self-sufficient, independent, relying on no one but themselves, the view that has been presented of Daniel Fuller, is more of a romantic notion of the idealized American. Rural inhabitants in the nineteenth century, especially those who lived only five miles outside of the center of town like the Fullers did, must have sold produce or labor to pay their taxes and procure a limited range of high utility commodities such as imported ceramics. Food, firewood, and clothing do not survive well archaeologically and the most common artifacts we are generally left with to investigate socio-economic position are often those which specifically had to be produced at the markets- glass, ceramics and metal items. In many ways this does not make consumer goods purchased at the market a good indicator of the overall standard of living enjoyed by the people who used them. Overall, it has been found that consumer produced goods accounted for only a small percentage of total household expenditure in the nineteenth century (Friedlander 1991; Klein 1991). However, if the purchase of consumer goods, thus relatively lower degree of self-sufficiency, was a high priority for inhabitants of any economic level, then this should be reflected in a high occurrence of such items in an assemblage. If, on the other hand, the purchase of matched sets of ceramics or of the finer or finer looking tea sets was not a high priority of the inhabitants, if they were more interested in helping their families or in having time to spend in communal projects, then the percentage, quality and types of market-produced goods present at a site may reflect this. Unlike Stewart-Abernathy's work among the rural households in the Ozarks (Stewart-Abernathy 1986), no evidence of self-sufficiency was identified at the Samuel Fuller site and evidence to quite the contrary was present. No canning or Mason jar fragments were recovered, indicating the occupants likely did not process and store anything that they grew around their house, and no indications of any agricultural activity was identified. The faunal assemblage appeared to have been the result of the purchase of meat cut versus the raising and slaughtering of their own kine on site and the overall impression appears to be one of a consumer based household with little self-sufficiency evident in the archaeological record. The only evidence of self-sufficiency, which is believed to date to after the occupation of the house by Samuel and Mary Fuller, was the wide variety of bones of wild game recovered from around the hearth. This deposit is hypothesized to have been the result either of occupation of the house by Daniel Fuller following his brother's death, or by squatters at an unknown time following Samuel's death.

Research questions investigated by the Site Examination were:

- 1. What was the nature of the relationship between the Fullers and their neighborhood and town spheres of interaction?**

Samuel and his brother Smith both married daughters of their neighbors the Churchills and it is assumed that they continued to have a supportive relationship with them following the marriages. With the exception of Samuel who was classified as a shoemaker in the 1850 census, the Fullers were either laborers (possibly working for a farmer) and/or farmers from 1850 through 1880. They were likely working at mills or farms in their immediate vicinity, so they were likely working for their neighbors. Other evidence of possible neighbor associations is the set of initials present on the cuprous plate found in the North Yard Midden. The letters KW may also be a neighbor whom Samuel shared tools with. From the faunal and artifactual evidence, it appears that the Fullers were active consumers who purchased goods in the town including glassware, ceramics, meat and possibly shellfish, much as any consumer would in the nineteenth century. The deposit found associated with the hearth, the wild animal species, may represent meals by Daniel Fuller or by an unknown squatter following Samuel's death and Maria's abandonment of the property. These remains are more typical of what one would expect if the Fullers were more self-sufficient than the average nineteenth century family.

Stewart-Abernathy, in his study of the nineteenth century Ozark farmsteads, hypothesized that the choices of manufactured goods present at an archaeological site reflects the support of a family version of social reality and that they indicate an allegiance to the local community and to the world in terms that kept the local community strong (Stewart-Abernathy 1986: 102). It has also been suggested that the acquisition of consumer goods is the common thread that has held Americans together from its founding (Carson 2006). The material culture recovered from the Samuel Fuller Homesite indicates that the Fullers had a connection to the larger town of Kingston and were not focused just on themselves and their houselot. The meat cuts indicate interactions with a local butcher, the ceramics and glassware indicate interaction with local merchants, while the presence of an abundance of mismatched buttons may indicate a connection either to local individuals in the form of rag-picking, cloth washing or sewing. The Fullers were not isolated or acting in isolation, they were an active part of the larger Kingston cultural system.

2. Was Samuel Fuller employed by one of the town's shoe manufacturers or was his shoe making business a cottage industry? Can any of the material remains at the site (shoe making tools, worked leather) help to investigate this?

Samuel was only listed as a shoe maker in the 1850 U.S. Census, no information was found either in the documentary record or archaeologically to further examine this point. No tools were identified that could be specifically linked to shoemaking.

3. To what degree was the family self-sufficient and to what degree did they rely on the larger local, regional, national and international markets?

Ceramics recovered from the site were represented by presumably locally made redwares, as well as American-made yellowwares, stonewares and whitewares. English ceramics in the form of creamware and pearlware were well represented. The Fuller men were listed as laborers and shoemakers in the various census records. Their work would have taken place away from their homes, placing them within the larger town sphere of influence. Their purchase of meat cuts versus the raising of their own livestock made them reliant on the local butcher for their meat supply. No records were found to indicate that they farmed, which would mean that they were reliant on local markets for produce and dry goods. No evidence of self produced items (wooden bowls, non-traditional forms of metal work, extensive reuse of broken ceramics) was found and aside from the recovery of numerous buttons and a single pair of scissors, no evidence of sewing was found. The recovery of a pipe bowl bearing a Masonic symbol may be evidence that Samuel Fuller may have belonged to this organization as well. The Fullers appear to have been fully involved with the local markets, much more than one may have expected based on their lower class socio-economic status. They appear to have labored to earn an income and then spent that earned income on goods produced locally, nationally and internationally.

4. What evidence is present in the documentary and archaeological records that the family may have utilized multiple subsistence strategies such as factory day labor, in-house piecework shoe production, charcoal burning, hunting and small-scale agriculture?

No documentary records were found that could help answer this question. Archaeologically, the abundance and variety of the recovered buttons may indicate that Mary Fuller had been a seamstress or had taken in piece sewing work or mended or washed other people's clothes. No

evidence of hunting or fishing was found, except for what is believed to be a post Samuel and Marty Fuller deposit of wild game and low quality cut domestic animal bones, fish hooks and a gunflint on and around the hearth. Faunal remains seem to indicate that the inhabitants did not raise their own stock, but purchased meat from another source. Unfortunately, the nature of the identified deposits makes it difficult to ascertain the origin and context of the material. The charcoal burn areas identified during the intensive survey did not contain any artifacts that could date them temporally and so it is unknown if they were created by the Fullers or if they date to before or after the purchase of the land by Consider Fuller in 1790. The area around the house did not appear to contain a plowzone, indicating that at least the immediate house lot was not farmed.

5. What was their socio-economic level and how did it manifest itself in their consumer choices (ceramics, glass, and faunal)?

At the time of their death Samuel and Maria Fuller appear to have owned an appreciable amount of older material, as revealed from the artifacts recovered from Trench 1 and the North Yard that have been interpreted as midden deposits resulting from a cleaning out of their house following Samuel's death and Maria's abandonment of the property. Most of the recovered bottles appear to date to before 1875 and ceramics such as spatterware, redware, and mocha-decorated pearlware, recovered from Trench 1, were all out of fashion by the time 1890s. The recovery of silver spectacles, a silver button, a faux gemstone and gold jewelry may indicate a period of relative wealth or a desire to make an outward presentation of wealth whether it was real or not. Based on census records, the Fullers were lower class members of the community.

6. What can the architectural style of the house and the layout of its surrounding yard tell us about the Fuller's participation in larger regional and national trends in architectural styles and farm/work yard layout in the nineteenth century and about the family's socio-economic status?

Housing, as opposed to clothing and other more perishable elements of culture, is usually well represented and more visible archaeologically, and some see housing as the most sensitive indicator of class in 19th century America (Soltow 1992: 131). Other classes of material culture, ceramics, glass, faunal remains, etc., can be used to better understand the lifestyles of the inhabitants versus their use as status indicators. Catts and Custer (1990: 227) found that 450 square feet formed a convenient dividing line between the houses of the poor and those of the middle class. The Fuller house floor size was approximately 432 square feet, making it below dividing line between middle class and poor. The examination of the size, structure and layout of the Fuller 's house, can provide insight into the social class and real status of this industrial period working class family. Conversely, some investigators see status as best indicated by social status followed by the quality of the house or residential area (neighborhood) (Spencer-Wood 1984: 35).

During the Victorian Period, architectural styles changed so that individuals had their own rooms, specialized rooms for children appeared and special ritual and presentation rooms appeared. Some of these changes were the result of the Industrial Revolution which often led to men, who were up to this point the leaders of the home and family, being away from home working in the new burgeoning industries. This led to women taking control of the day to day workings of the home, thus creating two world spheres, the home and workplace, where once, in the more rural pre-industrial times, they were both one and the same. In preindustrial times, the family often had to make what it needed to survive, with the rise of industry, men could now go to jobs that produced goods and services while the remainder of the family stayed at home. The idea was also created that the work world (the public sphere of life) was a rough place full of temptation, vice and

violence where men had to do whatever it took to survive. Women, being weak and delicate creatures (as the wisdom of the time believed) needed to be defended and protected from this world. It was logical that they and the children would remain at home while the men went out, confronted and conquered the new Industrial Age. The emerging middle-class, which soon became the ideal for the lower class and the rungs on the ladders of power for the upper class, began to look at itself and the nuclear family as the backbone of society.

The Victorian Age recognized women's new roles as house managers and created the ideology of the "cult of domesticity", the virtues of which were extolled in many aspects of popular culture of the time. The cult of domesticity was a belief that women, as keepers of the home, were also viewed as being the keepers of purity, piety and domesticity. The home became a man's refuge from the dog eat dog world of industry and became the showplace for status, affluence and the ideals that women were relegated as the keepers of. This led to the creation of ritual rooms in the house in which the ideals could be showed off and savored. These rooms included the parlor and dining rooms. These rooms were located on the first floor of the house and were rooms which were visible to the public and thus a place to display your real or desired status. The parlor was the room where afternoon tea parties were held and as it was a showplace of the home, it was often the most luxuriously furnished room in a middle-class house. The parlor essentially served as the area where class members aspired to make their claims to refined gentility and the afternoon tea was an important showplace for the family's social status (Di Zerega Wall 1991: 79). By the early 19th century, meals had taken on the form of ritual and were considered as a time to affirm the moral values of the family and a good dining room was seen as a space that reinforces the spiritual unity of the family (Di Zerega Wall 1991: 80). Concurrent with the appearance of dining rooms and parlors is an increased attention to table settings including glass and ceramic dishes. This included an elaboration over time of the types, and quality of vessels used in meals which was reflected in the decorative styles, the amount of decoration and the relative cost of ceramics (Klein 1991: 79). As has been shown by George Miller's work on cream-colored ceramic pricing (1991), ceramic prices dropped between 1810 and 1850 as plain creamwares were replaced by edged, dipped, and painted wares in the 1780s. These wares were subsequently replaced by transfer printed wares following the War of 1812. By the 1830s as the price of transfer printed wares dropped and a greater variety of vessel forms and sizes increased, these wares had become the most popular type for both tea and table (Klein 1991: 80).

Not all houses of the period contained formal rooms such as the dining room and the parlor. Farm and rural families were not building houses with dining rooms due to the nature of work on farms and in rural settings. Rural families became involved in domestic changes at a slower rate than their urban counterparts. By the 1830s the ideal of the farmhouse as a unified work place had begun to erode and there was now a noticeable shift in the arrangement of rooms within the house. From the 1850s farmhouse plans began to separate the house into public and private areas. The public areas were the front porch, front door, and sitting room or parlor, these contrasted with the private rooms of the kitchen and bedrooms (Adams 1990:98).

No evidence of an actual farmyard or work yard was identified during site examination testing. The house itself appears to be of Colonial style dating to the late eighteenth to early nineteenth century. While details of the exterior appearance are unknown, the interior appears to have been divided into a minimum of two rooms- a hall and a parlor- on either side of a central chimney. The house may have begun as a single room house with a chimney on the western wall-possibly the "small house" inherited by Waldo Fuller- which was subsequently expanded to form a hall and parlor house plan. In any case, the house form appears to have been more utilitarian versus reflective of the wider regional and national trends of Georgian architecture. Georgian architecture projected an air of

symmetry and order, whereas Colonial architecture was more of a reflection of utility. It is possible that if the structure began as a single-cell dwelling, the addition of a second cell and the terrace may have been done to “modernize” the house, to bring its outside appearance more into line with Georgian ideals, and provide more space for a larger family. Further investigations at the site could investigate the architecture and its development further.

The house occupied a rise and faced a portion of the road to the south where the road turned to the west and continued towards other homes. It is estimated to have measured eight meters east to west by six meters north to south and had a central chimney and a cellar hole that was accessed through a staircase placed against the north side of the hearth. A two meter wide by eight meter long terrace was constructed on the front (south) side of the house in the 1830s-1840s. Terraces are used to add height to the appearance of a house, to create a separation and transition zone between the home and world beyond it and were used as show places for flower and herb gardens. The south yard in front of the 50 cm high terrace was “attached” to the house by a meter and a half long by 50 cm wide professionally quarried and roughly shaped walkway stone. The positioning of the house on the rise and the construction of the terrace may have been an attempt by the builder or the occupants to set this house off from the surroundings and to essentially place it on a pedestal and a place of prominence as an expression of its perceived importance.

The house appears to fit in well with a lower class attempt to present themselves within the cultural language of the Victorian ideals. The possible expansion of the house from a single-cell to double-cell plan separated the kitchen (the hall) from the parlor more than was possible in a single-cell house, but not as much as was possible with the addition of a room on the rear of the house as was present in saltbox and Georgian style houses. This the apparent time lag in architectural styles present at the site may be a reflection of the rural nature of the site, the possible construction by Consider Fuller, a man who practiced his craft in rural settings just after the first generation of Georgian architecture was being adopted, and the construction of a utilitarian or vernacular versus a trendy or secular house plan. The possible expansion of the house and the construction of the terrace on the front of the house reflect a rural lower class expression and interpretation of the Victorian ideals of the house as a show place and expression of domesticity. The presence of tea sets, multiple tea pots and faux gemstone and gold jewelry also represent the Fullers’ expression of presentation of desired status and their interpretation and expression of the wider Victorian ideals.

No evidence of farming or animal husbandry were identified, except possibly the oxen shoe, which may date to the earlier occupation, It appears that the Fuller’s purchased most of their goods as opposed to producing them themselves.

7. Is there any evidence that the structure that Samuel and Mary Fuller occupied was the same structure built by Samuel’s father Consider and lived in by Samuel, Smith and Daniel?

Documentary research indicates no structures were recoded on the property when it was purchased by Consider Fuller, but when it was later sold by Fuller to Wright, a structure was present, indicating that it may have been built by Fuller. A structure is shown on the 1832 map of Kingston and was referred to in Consider Fuller’s 1829 will. While a few earlier ceramic vessels were present in the assemblage, it is believed that these were heirloom items and do not reflect occupation during the eighteenth century.

8. Did the homesite ever function as a farm?

No evidence of farming existed for the site. The topsoil varied in depth from 10-18 cm and appears to represent a natural A horizon versus a plow zone. While the inventory of Consider's estate mentioned farming tools, crops and orchard crops this was likely done elsewhere. No agricultural tools were identified and the limited faunal remains appear to point to a purchase versus raising system of procurement for the vertebrate faunal portion of their diet.

9. How did the layout and utilization of the yard space around the house change over time throughout the nineteenth-century and can these changes be related to changing occupations of the inhabitants, changing local conditions and changing national trends?

The only change in the landscape around the house appears to be the construction of the terrace sometime between 1830 to 1840, the later date attributes to the flow blue fragment present) a time period in which aesthetic landscape design was popular. The excavation of the depression where Trench 1 was located may be related to off-site filling of a depression, the construction of a road, or possibly even cranberry bog maintenance. No further identifiable changes in the layout or use of yard space were identified. A small surface scatter was identified around the house for a distance of approximately 20 meters east to west and 40 meters north to south. No areas of activity other than at least two dump deposits were identified. Material from the EU 4 dump appears to date from the earlier occupation and relatively little later nineteenth century refuse was found here, possibly indicating a removal of refuse from the area of the immediate house during the later nineteenth century. Some later material was found in the east yard, possibly indicating some refuse disposal in this area but it is unknown if this dates to the occupation or cleaning out of the house.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From the historical documents, a fairly clear picture can be painted of the history of the land and the Fuller's position in the neighborhood and the town. Consider Fuller was a Kingston house wright who married twice, eventually having 12 children, 11 of which were alive when he died in 1829. During his life, between the years 1790 to 1821, he purchased a number of pieces of property in the town, including, in 1790, the land on which at least two (Smith's and Daniel's) houses stood. In 1821 he purchased three-quarters of an acre of land and a small house from Ezra Morton. This land was adjacent to Consider's 1790 purchase and is believed to be the property Waldo inherited and where Samuel eventually lived.

During Consider's lifetime the economy of Kingston was focused on iron, nail and shoe manufacture with a slow population increase as the fishing fleet expanded. By the time of his death, the town economy relied less on subsistence agriculture and cottage industries and more on small scale industrial ventures. The inventory of Consider's estate showed that like others of the time period he employed a number of strategies from subsistence and market-orientated agriculture (he had farming tools, he raised sheep, owned oxen, a cow, had crops in his fields and fruit on his trees) to commercial labor as a house wright (he had woodworking tools, 150 boards and shingles) for the economic support of his family. It is likely that the 11 children he left \$5.00 to were living on their own and that he provided many years of support for his wife having left his estate and her care to a 20 year old (Smith) and an 8 year old (Waldo). Consider also made sure that his youngest son had future security by leaving him half of the family homestead. Unfortunately, in 1830 it was determined that Consider's estate value was not enough to repay his debts by a total of \$190.00 so a portion of land in the north section of his homestead was sold to cover this debt suggesting that employing multiple strategies for economic survival was not enough. Later that year the remainder of the estate was divided between Waldo and Smith.

When Waldo reached 21 in 1842, he sold his inherited property to his half-brothers Ezra and John for \$250.00 who in turn sold the property back to Waldo in 1852. Waldo lived in Braintree in 1852, lived in Plymouth in 1867 when he mortgaged his land in Kingston, and had returned to Kingston by 1870. Kingston town records show that he was assessed a tax of \$8.97 while Smith, Samuel, and Daniel were assessed a tax of \$2.00 in 1870, the same year that Smith received \$7.04 in support from the town. Following Waldo's death in 1872, his property was sold at auction to pay his debts. It remains unclear if Samuel had any clear ownership of the property while Waldo was alive or if he may have purchased the land following Waldo's death.

Kingston in the second half of the nineteenth century relied on the mills and shipyards for its economic base, with these two industries employing a high percentage of the population. This economic structure led to wide gaps between the owners of these industries and their workers. By 1890 this disparity was obviously reflected in the town taxes where out of the 750 persons taxed, only 24 had tax bills of over \$100.00. The Fullers fit right in to the 96.8% of the town who was taxed below \$100.00, and in fact, they consistently ranked in the very lowest taxable portion. Even among their neighbors, the Fullers consistently scored in the lower two-thirds of the appraised estate values between 1850 and 1870. Still, in 1865, the town was considered one of the wealthiest in Massachusetts and it boasted that as a town, it was debt free. Samuel and Mary Fuller were recorded as living near Smith, presumably in the house where the Site Examination was conducted. Immediately around Samuel and Mary along the main roads were consistently 50+ neighbor families who largely had similar status and similar occupations to the Fullers. By looking at the changing nature of the occupations of the residents within one mile of the Fullers, trends related to the larger economic situation of the town and state were highlighted.

Farming and shoemaking were important occupations in this section of the town between 1850 and 1860, but by 1870, there were less shoemakers and more farming-related jobs around the Fullers. Labor and factory workers also increased in number, reflecting the rising importance of these occupations in the second half of the nineteenth century. While farms were operated by fewer individuals, they appeared to have provided employment in West Kingston as the town's growing population of both American and immigrant workers had to be fed. It was not surprising when Site Examination testing revealed appreciable amounts of consumer goods, little evidence of self-sufficiency, and little evidence of farming at the site. The Fullers were full members of the consumer class in Kingston, but a certain amount of time lag, possibly due to curation and the economic inability to keep up with the latest trends in ceramics appears to be present. It appears from items such as silver glasses and buttons, faux gold and gemstone jewelry, pewter spoons, and appreciable amounts of tea ware and specialty table service pieces, that the Fullers may have wished to have been among the upper classes of the town, economically they may have satisfied themselves with the appearance of wealth while maintaining a lower class consumer lifestyle. But the question remains unanswered as to whether they themselves purchased these goods or were given them as poor aid.

Overall the site has definite boundaries, good integrity in the sense that the site has not been disturbed by subsequent post-occupation activities, but low research potential. It is difficult to attribute various deposits to time periods and there appears to be no spatial patterning of subsurface artifacts or features across the site. Archaeological investigations failed to identify deposits dating to the actual occupation of the site by the Fullers. The Trench 1 and North yard Midden deposits represent terminal deposits of materials cleaned out of the house following Samuel's death. As a result, they represent the artifacts that were present in the house at the time of his death, that were determined by the cleaners to be worthless and disposable. It is unknown what material may have been removed from the site by those who were cleaning out the house. While the deposit in these contexts seems to show an occupation by someone who saved old bottles and ate off of old plates, it may be a case of these being the artifacts that were not wanted by the those cleaned out the house and in fact they may have originally made up only a small portion of the actual material culture assemblage. The Fullers may have had fine china and gold, but these materials could have been removed by the cleaners and thus did not present themselves archaeologically.

The Site Examination has been able to add information to Kingston's history on a variety of levels from national trends to local adaptive strategies in West Kingston adding small pieces to a big puzzle. Detailed research on the Fullers has revealed that family relationships are complex and at times do not lend themselves to interpretation through documentary sources. The concept of marginality was investigated in the 1990 Conference on New England Archaeology. In the newsletter for the conference Mrozowski (1990) broaches the questions "Is environmental marginality an important consideration if it cannot be shown to influence behavior or result in economic marginality?" The Fullers provide a good case study to explore this question.

When Consider first moved into the project area there were a number of roads that crossed the interior of Kingston. One gets the feeling from deed transactions associated with Consider that others were living within this interior section of town. Even though Consider practiced a variety of subsistence strategies, he was in debt when he died. While the 1794 map series was not supposed to note residences or town roads, the 1830 map series was supposed to note town and county roads and some also noted residences. We now know that both houses shown on the 1832 map had been part of Consider Fuller's estate and that the house on the east was occupied by

Smith Fuller and the house on the west that had belonged to Consider Fuller, then Levi Wright , then Ezra Morton and then Consider again, may or may not have been occupied in 1832. Of particular interest is that the Fullers and the street they lived on do not appear on the 1856 Map of Kingston (Walling 1857).

From the first time they appear in both the Town Reports and the U.S. Census the Fullers are poor residents in what was for the most part a prosperous town. The artifact assemblage associated with Samuel Fuller seems to suggest this also. It may be possible that living in an interior marginal area away from the more populated town roads and work areas contributed to what appears to also be their economic marginal status in the town. The 1893 newspaper article on Daniel Fuller the “hermit” suggests that he is living in no man’s land with little contact with others. The writer does not seem to realize that he had been living next to his brothers and family homestead – Daniel appears in the news article as living in a marginal environment. As so aptly stated “historical archaeology’s repeated engagements, investing long periods of time in applying methods in the context of households, industrial landscapes or its many other themes and places, result in complex and evocative stories, rather than neat, closed accounts of prime movers” (Hicks and Beaudry 2006).

Discussions with the Massachusetts Historical Commission helped to further clarify the significance of the site. **The Samuel Fuller homesite meets the criteria of eligibility (36 CFR 60) for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under criteria A, B and D at the local and possibly state levels.**

Criteria A- The site is associated with broad patterns of history: the nineteenth century settlement patterns in Kingston and the shift from agriculture to industrialization in Kingston and Plymouth County in the nineteenth century.

Criteria B-The Fuller family is prominent in local history as remembered well into the twentieth century through contemporary and later retrospectives about the family, beginning in 1893, especially the last surviving member, Daniel Fuller. He occupied his own house near the project area (his brother Samuel and Samuel’s wife Mary’s house) and was likely a frequent visitor. Evidence recovered during the Site Examination of abundant wild animal faunal remains from around the hearth may indicate that he later occupied the home site following Samuel’s death in 1892. Daniel Fuller was perceived in the 1890s at least, as a famous eccentric “hermit”, a man of the woods like Thoreau at Walden Pond, living marginally and independently on the periphery of Kingston, well into his 80s. Characterized in the town historical files, including an anonymous letter, an 1893 *Boston Journal* article, and a late *Yankee Magazine* articles as Kingston’s favored town eccentric, woodsman and hunter, Daniel Fuller was recently reintroduced to the town through a 2004 newspaper article in the *Kingston Observer*. The *Observer* article also mentions Samuel Fuller and the Fuller family as a “large family” who were “old fashioned, even for them days [back in] 1820.” While the basic facts of the article are not correct, the Fullers lived at the opposite end of the nineteenth century, were never really a “large family” and from the archaeological record were competent and participating consumers until their deaths, the article exemplifies the important, if somewhat mythical, position that Daniel and his family held and continue to hold in the town’s collective historical memory.

Criteria D- The site retains integrity and site examination data indicates intact surface and subsurface archaeological features, and high densities of artifacts. The site includes classes of data that are known or expected to yield important information for multiple research topics, including socio-economic patterns, consumer choice, gender and class definition. Archaeological

and documentary data from the site examination suggest that the Fullers, including Daniel, were living a lower class, previously possibly agricultural and later wage-based lifestyle very much connected to the economy and surrounding neighborhood of Kingston during the shift from agriculture to industrialization of the town throughout the nineteenth century. The early documentary record and material culture directly refutes the stereotypes of the Fuller family promoted in later town history as anomalous, marginal, eccentric, and only peripheral members of the town, when in fact they had been solid, if less socio-economically privileged, tax-paying members of the town for at least two generations.

Faunal remains constitute an important comparative assemblage to contextualize other regional discussions of eighteenth and nineteenth century consumption practices such as David Landon's 1996 *Feeding colonial Boston: A zooarchaeological study*. In associations with the ceramic and glass assemblage artifacts and ferrous material artifacts may answer questions related to consumer choice, class definition and socio-economic constraints in urban versus rural portions of Massachusetts such as those presented by Stephen Mrozowski in his 2006 work *The Archaeology of Class in Urban America (Cambridge Studies in Archaeology)*. Artifacts of food preparation, clothing and personal adornment, may with supplemental analysis, such as Mary Beaudry 2006 *findings: The Material Culture of Needlework and Sewing*; Karlis Karlin 2000 (editor) *Studies in Material Culture Research*; and Carolyn White 2005 *American Artifacts of Personal Adornment 1680-1820*, allow comparison among the Fullers and other occupants of the structure in terms perceptions, roles and presentation of self and family during the nineteenth century.

REFERENCES CITED

950 CMR 70

Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth, Massachusetts Historical Commission. Code of Massachusetts Regulations, Title 950, Part 70. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Boston, MA.

Adams, William Hampton

1990 Landscape Archaeology: Landscape History and the American Farmstead. *Historical Archaeology*. Vol 24: pp 93-101.

Andrew, George F.

1866 *Report of Selectmen of the Town of Kingston and the Annual Report of the School Committee for the Year Ending March 1, 1866*. George F. Andrew, Plymouth, MA.

Anonymous

1795 Map of Kingston. On file at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston, MA.

Bailey, Sarah Y.

1920 *The Story of Jones River in Pilgrim Plymouth 1620-1726 which in the latter year became Kingston, Mass.* Kingston Branch of the Alliance of Unitarian Women, Kingston, MA.

Barber, John Warner

1839 *Historical Collections*. Dorr, Howland and Co. Worcester.

Barlow, Raymond E. and Joan E. Kaiser

1993 *A Guide to Sandwich Glass Pressed Tableware*. Barlow-Kaiser Publishing Company, Inc., Windham, NH in conjunction with Schiffer Publishing Ltd., Atglen, PA.

Beaudry, Mary

2001-2002 Trying to Think Progressively about 19th Century Farms. *Northeast Historical Archaeology*, Vol. 30-31, pp. 129-142.

1999 House and Household: The Archaeology of Domestic Life in early America. In *Old and New Worlds*. Edited by Geoff Egan and R. L. Michael. Oxbow Books 117-126.

1986 The Archaeology of Historic land Use in Massachusetts. *Historical Archaeology* 20 (2), pp.38- 46.

1984 Archaeology of the Historical Household. *Man in the Northeast* 28: 27-38.

Binford, Lewis R.

1980 Willow Smoke and Dogs' Tails: Hunter-Gatherer Settlement Systems and Archaeological Site Formation. *American Antiquity* 45:4-20.

Bourne, Silvanus

1832 Map of Kingston. Lithographs, Boston, MA.

Boynton, E.N.

1876 *Map of the Town of Kingston Plymouth county Mass.* E. N. Boynton, Boston, MA.

- Bragdon, Kathleen J.
1996 *Native People of Southern New England 1500-1650*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Oklahoma.
- Braun, Esther and David Braun
1994 *The First Peoples of the Northeast*. Lincoln Historical Society, Lincoln, Massachusetts.
- Bussey, Stanley D., James M. Briscoe, Marsha K. King, Edna Feiner, and Duncan Ritchie
1992 *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey and Soils Inspection of Hanscom Air Force Base*. Prepared by The Public Archaeology Laboratory, Inc. Pawtucket, Rhode Island, for Hanscom Air Force Base, Bedford, Lexington, and Lincoln, MA.
- Carson, Cary
2006 "Consumption" in *A Companion to Colonial America*, ed by Daniel Vickers. Blackwell Publishing, Malden, MA.
- Catts, Wade P.
2001.2002 Research Questions for the Archaeology of Rural Places: Experiences from the Middle Atlantic. *Northeast Historical Archaeology*, Vol. 30-31, pp. 143-154.
- Catts, Wade P. And Jay F. Custer
1990 *Tenant Farmers, Stone Masons, and Black Laborers: Final Archaeological Investigations of the Thomas Williams Site, Glasgow, New Castle County, Delaware*. Delaware Department of Transportation Archaeology Series No. 82, Dover.
- Chartier, Craig
2007a *Report on the Intensive Survey Testing at the Wildcat Hill Residential Subdivision, Norwell, Massachusetts*. Report on file at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston.
2007b *Completion Memorandum of Data Recovery Investigations at the Ja-Mar Farm Estates Lots 1 and 2, Massachusetts*. On file at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston.
2007c *Report on the Intensive Survey Testing at the Tall Timbers Estates Project Area, Kingston, Massachusetts*. Report on file at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston.
- Clark, Christopher
1990 *The Roots of Rural Capitalism: Western Massachusetts, 1780-1860*. Cornell University Press, Ithica, N.Y.
- Cross, John R.
1996 The Paleo-Indian Period (ca 11,500-9000 B.P.). In *History and Archaeology of the North Atlantic Region: A Context for Cultural Resource Management*. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Washington, DC.
- Curran, Mary Lou and Dena Dincauze
1977 Paleoindians and Paleo-Lakes: New Data from the Connecticut Drainage. In

Amerinds and their Paleoenvironments in Northeastern North America, edited by W. S. Newman and B. Salwen, pp.333-348. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Vol. 288, Albany, NY.

Davis, Charles G.

1869 *Report of the trial of Samuel M. Andrews: indicted for the murder of Cornelius Holmes, before the Supreme judicial court of Massachusetts, December 11, 1868. Including the rulings of the court upon many questions of law, and a full statement of authorities upon the subject of transitory insanity.* Hurd and Houghton, New York. Available on Google Books.

Dincauze, Dena F.

1980 Research Priorities in Northeast Prehistory. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Northeastern Archaeology*, edited by J. Moore, pp. 29-48. Research Reports 19, Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

1976 *The Neville Site: 8,000 Years at Amoskeag, Manchester, New Hampshire.* Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Monographs No.4. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

1975 The Late Archaic Period in Southern New England. *Arctic Anthropology* 12 (2):23-34.

1974 An Introduction to Archaeology in the Greater Boston Area. *Archaeology of Eastern North America* 2:39-66.

Dincauze, Dena and Judith Meyer

1977 *The Archaeological Resources of East-Central New England* U.S. National Park Service. Report on file at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston, MA.

Dincauze, Dena and Mitchell Mulholland

1977 Early and Middle Archaic Site Distributions and Habitats in Southern New England. In *Amerinds and Their Paleoenvironments*, edited by W. S. Newman and B. Salwen. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 288:439-456.

Di Zerega Wall, Diana

1991 Sacred Dinners and Secular Teas: Constructing Domesticity in Mid-19th-Century New York. *Historical Archaeology* 25 (4): 69-81.

Division for Historic Preservation, State of Vermont

1990 *Vermont Historic Preservation Plan.* Division for Historic preservation, Montpelier, VT.

Donohue, Barbara

2002 *Data Recovery Report for the Footprint of the Proposed Hammond Street Building and Construction Impact Zone at the Thwing/Haynes/Slade Site, Chestnut Hill Campus, Boston College, Newton, Massachusetts.* On file at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston, MA.

2001 *Intensive Survey for the Proposed Hammond Street Building Chestnut Hill Campus Boston College Newton, Massachusetts.* On file at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston, MA.

Donohue, Barbara, Martin Dudek, and Leith Smith

2000 *Site Examination of Historic Site No. 1 in The Planned South Street Development in Hopkinton, Massachusetts*. On file at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston, MA.

Donohue, Barbara and Leith Smith

2003 *A Site Examination at the Sophronia Young House Site in the New Seabury Development, Mashpee, MA*. On file at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston, MA.

Doucette, Dianna

2005 Reflections of the Middle Archaic: A View from Annasnappett Pond. *Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society*. Vol. 66 (1).

Dudek, Martin

2005 The Whortleberry Hill Site: An Early Holocene Camp in Dracut, MA. *Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society*. Vol. 66 (1).

Dunford, Frederick

1992 *Conditional Sedentism: the Logistical Flexibility of Estuarine Settlements in Circumscribed Environments*. Paper presented at the fifty-seventh annual meeting of the Society of American Archaeology, 8-12, April, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Dutton, Henry W. & Son

1870 *Annual Report of the Selectmen and Assessors of the Town of Kingston for the Financial Year Ending February 28, 1870*. Henry W. Dutton & Son, Boston, MA.

1869 *Annual Report of the Selectmen and Assessors of the Town of Kingston for the Financial Year Ending February 28, 1869*. Henry W. Dutton & Son, Boston, MA.

1868 *Annual Report of the Selectmen and Assessors of the Town of Kingston for the Financial Year Ending February 29, 1868*. Henry W. Dutton & Son, Boston, MA.

Dwyer, Alison and Alan T. Synenki and Nora Sheehan

1990 Archaeological Investigations of David Fiske's 17th Century "Homestall". In: *Archaeological Investigations of Minute man National Historical Park, Volume 1: Farmers and Artisans of the Historical Period*. Cultural Resources Management Study no. 22. National Park Service.

Esary, Mark Edward

1982 Archaeological Geographical And Historical Comparison. Eleven Nineteenth-Century Archaeological Sites Near Belleville. M.S.thesis. Illinois State University. Normal, Illinois.

Farwell, J. E.

1867 *Annual Report of the Selectmen and Assessors of the Town of Kingston for the Financial Year Ending February 28, 1867*. J.E. Farwell & Company, Boston, MA.

1864 *Annual Report of the Selectmen and Assessors of the Town of Kingston for the Financial Year Ending February 28, 1864*. J.E. Farwell & Company, Boston, MA.

1861 *Annual Report of the Selectmen and Assessors of the Town of Kingston for the Financial Year Ending February 28, 1861*. J.E. Farwell & Company, Boston, MA.

Feder, Kenneth L.

1994 *A Village of Outcasts: Historical Archaeology and Documentary Research at the Lighthouse Site*. Mayfield Publishing, Mountain View, CA.

Forrest, Daniel T.

2000 *Population Movement and Lithic Technology During the Early Archaic of Southern New England* Paper presented at the annual Conference on New England Archaeology, May 20, 2000, at Sturbridge, MA.

Friedlander, Amy

1991 House and Barn: The Wealth of Farmers 1795-1815. *Historical Archaeology*, 25 (2): 15-29.

Funk, Robert F.

1972 Early Man in the Northeast and the Late Glacial Environment. *Man in the Northeast* 4:7-39.

Garvin, James L.

2001 *A Building History of Northern New England*. University Press of New England, Hanover, NH.

Grettler, David J., George L. Miller, Wade P. Catts, Keith Doms, Mara Guttman, Karen Iplenski Angela Hoseth, Jay Hodny, and Jay F. Custer

1996 *Original Farms on the Edge of Town Final Archaeological Investigations of the Moore-Taylor, Benjamin Wynn (Lewis-E), and Wilson-Lewis Farmsteads, State Route 1 Corridor, Kent County, Delaware*. Delaware Department of Transportation, Wilmington, DE.

Haggett, Peter, Andrew D. Cliff; and Allen Frey

1977 *Locational Analysis in Human Geography*, 2nd edition. Wiley, New York, NY.

Handsman, Russell

1981 Early Capitalism and the Center Village of Canaan, Connecticut: A study of Transformation and Separations. *Artifacts* 3.

Hasenstab, Robert

1999 Fishing, Farming, and Finding the Village Sites: Centering Late Woodland New England Algonquians. In *The Archaeological Northeast*, edited by Mary Ann Levine, Kenneth E. Sassaman, and Michael S. Nassaney. Bergin & Carvey, Westport, CT.

Hasenstab, Robert, M. Mulholland, and R. Holmes

1990 *Archaeological Investigations at Prehistoric Site 19-HD-109, Westfield Massachusetts*. Report on file at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston, MA.

Henretta, James A.

1978 Families and Farms: Mentalite in Pre-Industrial America. *William and Mary Quarterly* 35: 3-32.

Hickock, Russell

1859 Improve Insulators for Lightning Rods. U.S. Patent No. 23, 373. March 29, 1859. January 2009. <http://www.nia.org/timeline/text/0023373.htm>

Hicks, Dan and Mary C. Beaudry

2006 *The Cambridge Companion to Historical Archaeology*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.

Higgs, E.S. and C. Vita-Finzi

1982 Prehistoric Economies: A Territorial Approach. *Papers in Economic Prehistory: Studies by Members and Associates of the British Academy Major Research Project in the Early History of Agriculture*. ed. E.S. Higgs. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England

Hinks, Stephen J., Denise L. Gantz, and Martin T. Fuess

1998 Separating the Wheat from the Chaff: Evaluating the Research Potential of Postbellum and Early Twentieth-Century Farmsteads. Paper for the 1998 Summer Meetings and Workshop, Transportation Research Board, Committee on Historic and Archaeological Preservation in Transportation, San Diego.

Hurd, D. Hamilton

1884 *History of Plymouth County, Massachusetts, Vol. One*. J. W. Lewis, Philadelphia, P. Kenyon

Ierley, Merritt

1999 *Open House A Guided Tour of the American Home 1637-Present*. Henry Holt and Company, New York, NY.

Johnson, Eric S., and Thomas F Mahlstedt

1984 *Guide to Prehistoric Site Files and Artifact Classification System* Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston, MA.

Johnson, Frederick

1942 *The Boylston Street Fishweir*. Papers of the Robert S. Peabody Foundation for Archaeology, Vol.2. Andover, MA.

Johnson, Frederick (editor)

1949 *The Boylston Street Fishweir II: A Study of the Geology, Paleobotany, and Biology of a Site on Stuart Street in the Back Bay District of Boston, Massachusetts*. Papers of the Robert S. Peabody Foundation for Archaeology 4(1) Andover, MA.

Johnson, Susan A. and Russell G. Handsman

1996 *Histories and Archaeology in the Near Interior Region of Southern Rhode Island*. University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I.

Kenyon, Victoria B. and Patricia McDowell

1983 Environmental Setting of Merrimack River Valley Prehistoric Sites. *Man in the Northeast* 25.

Kerber, Jordan E.

- 1988 Where are the Late Woodland Villages in the Narragansett Bay Region? *Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society* 49(2): 66-71.
- Kintigh, Keith
 1988 The Effectiveness of Subsurface Testing: A Simulation Approach. *American Antiquity* 53:686-707.
- Klein, Terry H.
 1991 Nineteenth-Century Ceramics and Models of Consumer Behavior. *Historical Archaeology*. 25 (2): 77-91.
- Klein, Terry H. And Sherene Baugher
 2001.2002 Addressing an Historic Preservation Dilemma: The Future of Nineteenth-Century Farmstead Archaeology in the Northeast. *Northeast Historical Archaeology*, Vol. 30-31, pp 167-180.
- Kovel, Ralph M. and Terry H.
 1973 *Know Your Antiques*. Crown Publishers. New York, New York.
- Kulik, Cary
 1987 "Dams, Fish, and Farmers: Defense of Public Rights in Eighteenth-Century Rhode Island" pp.25-51 in *The Countryside in the Age of Capitalist Transformation* Steven Hahn and Jonathan Prude, eds. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel, NH.
- Kulikoff, Allan
 1989 The Transition to Capitalism in Rural America. *William and Mary Quarterly* 46: 120-144.
- Lehner, Lois
 1988 *Lehner's Encyclopedia of U.S. Marks on Pottery, Porcelain & Clay*. Collector Books, Paducah, Kentucky.
- Leibowitz, Joan
 1985 *Yellow Ware: The Transitional Ceramic*, Schiffer Publishing Co., Exxon, PA.
- Lightfoot, Kent
 1986 Regional Surveys in the Eastern United States: The Strengths and Weaknesses of Implementing Subsurface Testing Programs. *American Antiquity* 51.484-504.
- Little, Barbara, Erika Martin Seibert, Jan Townsend, John Sprinkle Jr., and John Knoerl
 2000 *Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Archaeological Properties*. National Register Bulletin 36. United States Department of the Interior, National Parks Service.
- Luedtke, Barbara E.
 1988 Where are the Late Woodland Villages in Eastern Massachusetts? *Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society* 49(2): 58-65.

Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC)

- 1985 *Historic and Archaeological Resources of Southeastern Massachusetts*. Massachusetts Historical Commission, Office of the Secretary of State, Boston, MA.
- 1984 *Reconnaissance Survey Report: Kingston*. Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston, MA.

Massachusetts, Plymouth County

- 1880 United States Census Population Schedule. January 2009. www.ancestry.com
- 1870 United States Census Population Schedule. January 2009. www.ancestry.com
- 1860 United States Census Population Schedule. January 2009. www.ancestry.com
- 1850 United States Census Population Schedule. January 2009. www.ancestry.com

McClelland, Linda Flint, Timothy J. Keller, Genevieve P. Keller and Robert Z. Melnick

- 1990 *National Register Bulletin 30: How to Identify, Evaluate and Register Rural Historic Landscapes*. National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

McConnell, Kevin

- 1990 *Spongeware and Spatterware*. Schiffer Publishing.

McCorvie, Mary R.

- 1987 *The Davis, Baldrige, And Huggins Sites Three Nineteenth Century Upland South Farmsteads In Perry County Illinois. Preservation Series 4*. American Resources Group, Ltd. Carbondale, Illinois.

McManamon, Francis P.

- 1984 Prehistoric Cultural Adaptations and Their Evolution on Outer Cape Cod. In *Chapters in the Archaeology of Cape Cod!*, Vol.2, edited by Francis P. McManamon, pp.339-417. Cultural Resources Management Study No.8. Division of Cultural Resources, North Atlantic Regional Office, National Park Service, Boston, MA.

Melville, Doris Johnson

- 1976 *Major Bradford's Town: A History of Kingston 1726-1976*. Town of Kingston, Kingston, MA.

Meltzer, David

- 1988 Late Pleistocene Human Adaptations in Eastern North America. *Journal of World Prehistory* 2:1-52.

Miller, George L.

- 1980 Classification and Economic Scaling of 19th-Century Ceramics. *Historical Archaeology* 14:1-40.
- 1991 A Revised Set of CC Index Values for Classification and Scaling of English Ceramics from 1787 to 1880. *Historical Archaeology* 25(1):1-25.

Miller, George L. and Robert R. Hunter, Jr.

- 1990 English Shell Edged Earthenware: Alias Leeds Ware, Alias Feather Edge. Paper presented at the 35th Annual Edgewood Seminar.

Miller, George L. And Terry H. Klein

- 2001 A System of Ranking the Research Potential of 19th and 20th century Farmstead Sites.

Miller, J. Jefferson

1965 Transfer-printed English Earthenware for the American Market. *Apollo* 81(35):46-50).1987

Moore, Roger G., Shawn Bonath Carlson, and Nicola Hubbar1997

1997 Archaeological Assessment of Parcels within the ball Park at Union Station Project, City of Houston, Harris County, Texas. MAC Project No. 96-104. Moore Archaeological Consulting, Houston.

Mulholland, Mitchell T.

1984 *Patterns of Change in Prehistoric Southern New England: A Regional Approach*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

Mrozowski, Stephen A.

1990 "The Faces and Places of Marginality" in *Conference on New England Archaeology Newsletter*, Vol. 9, No.2, pp 3-6.

Nanapashamet

1996 Wampanoag Subsistence Cycle. Wampanoag Indian Program Training Manuel. Plimoth Plantation.

Nason, Rev. Elias

1874 *A Gazetteer of the State of Massachusetts*. B.B. Russell, Boston, MA.

National Parks Service

2007 Listing a Property: Some Frequently Asked Questions. January 2009
www.nps.gov/nr/listing.htm

Nicholas, George P.

1990 *The Archaeology of Early Place; Early Postglacial Land Use and Ecology at Robbins Swamp, Northwestern Connecticut*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Mr.

Noel Hume, Ivor

1969 *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America*. Vintage Books, New York.

Parker, George Kinship

1968 *Sailor's Narratives of Voyages along the New England Coast 1524-1624*. Burt Franklin Press, New York.

Paynter, Robert

1982 *Models of Spatial Inequality: Settlement Patterns in Historic Archeology*. Academic Press, New York, NY.

Plymouth Deeds

Plymouth County Courthouse, Plymouth, MA.

Plymouth Probate

Plymouth Registry of Probate, Plymouth, MA.

Price, Cynthia R.

1979 *Nineteenth Century Ceramics in the Eastern Ozark Border Region*. Center for Archaeological Research, Monograph Series 1. Southwest Missouri State University.

Ritchie, William A.

1969 *The Archaeology of Martha's Vineyard*. Natural History Press, Garden City, NY.

Root, Dolores

1978 *Predictive Model of Prehistoric Subsistence and Settlement on the Outer Continental Shelf*. Institute for Conservation Archaeology, Peabody Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Rothenberg, Winifred B.

1981 The Market and Massachusetts Farmers, 1750-1855. *Journal of Economic History* 41: 283-314.

Sellers, Charles

1991 *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America 1815-1846*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Shaw, Leslie C.

1996 The Middle Woodland Period (ca. 2000-1000 B.P.) In *History and Archaeology of the North Atlantic Region: A Context for Cultural Resource Management*, edited by Eric S. Johnson pp. 84-100. North Atlantic Region, National Park Service, Boston, MA.

Skehan, James

2001 *Roadside Geology of Massachusetts*. Mountain Press Publishing Company, Montana.

Slotkin, Richard and James K. Folsom

1978 *So Dreadfull a Judgement: Puritan Responses to King Philip's War 1676-1677*. Wesleyan University press, University Press of New England, Hanover.

Smith, Samuel D.

1990 Site Survey as a Method for Determining Historic Site Significance. *Historical Archaeology*. Vol. 24: pp. 34-41.

Snow, Dean

1980 *The Archaeology of New England*. Academic Press, New York

Soltow, Lee

1992 Inequalities in the Standard of Living in the United States, 1798-1875. In *American Economic Growth and Standards of Living Before the Civil War*, ed. By Robert E. Gallman and John Joseph Wallis, 121-171. University of Chicago Press.

Sonderman, Robert Charles

1979 Archaeological Explorations of the Jesse Lindall and Twiss Hill Historic Sites St.

Clair County Illinois. M.S. thesis. Illinois State University. Normal, Illinois.

Spargo, John

1926 *The Potters and Potteries of Bennington*. Houghton Mifflin Company. Boston, Massachusetts.

Spencer-Wood, Suzanne and Scott D. Heberling

1984 Ceramics and Socio-Economic Status of the Green Family, Winsor, Vermont. *Northeast Historical Archaeology*, 13: 33-52.

Stelle, Lenville J.

1988 History, Archeology, and the 1730 Siege of the Foxes. Paper presented at the 33rd Annual Meeting of the Midwest Archaeological Conference. Champaign, Illinois.

Steponaitis, V. P., and K. W. Kintigh

1993 Estimating Site Occupation Spans from Dated Artifact Types: Some New Approaches. In *Archaeology of Eastern North America: Papers in Honor of Stephen Williams*, edited by J. B. Stoltman, pp. 349–361. Archaeological Report, no. 25. Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson.

Sussman, Lynne

1977 Changes in Pearlware Dinnerware, 1780-1830. *Historical Archaeology*, 11: 105-111.

Stewart-Abernathy, Leslie C.

1986 Urban Farmsteads: household Responsibilities in the City. *Historical Archaeology* 20 (2), pp.5-14.

Stone, B. D. and H. W. J. Borns

1986 Pleistocene Glacial and Interglacial Stratigraphy of New England, Long Island, and Adjacent Georges Bank and Gulf of Maine. In *Quaternary Glaciations in the Northern Hemisphere*, edited by V. Sibrave, D.Q. Bowen, and G.M. Richmond, pp.39-52. Pergamon Press, Oxford, UK.

Taylor, William

1976 A Bifurcated Point Concentration. *Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society* 37 (3-4):36-41.

Thorbahn, Peter

1988 Where are the Late Woodland Villages in Southern New England? *Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society* 49(2): 46-57.

1984 *Survey and Planning Project Completion Report, Prehistoric Land Use Zones Along the Taunton River*. Report on file at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston, MA.

1982 *Settlement Systems in Prehistoric Southern New England: Final Report on the I-495 Data Recovery Program*, Volume I. Report on file at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston, MA.

Thorbahn, Peter F., and Deborah C. Cox

1984 *Survey and Planning Project Completion Report, Prehistoric Land Use Zones Along the Taunton River*. Report on file at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston, MA.

- Thorbahn, Peter, Leonard W. Leopard, Deborah C. Cox and Brona Simon
1980 *Prehistoric Settlement Processes in New England: A Unified Approach to Cultural Resource Management and Archaeological Research*. Report on file at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston, MA.
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)
1969 Soil Survey of Plymouth County. On line at <http://nesoil.com/plymouth>.
- United States Department of Interior (USDI)
1980 *Cultural Resources in Massachusetts: A Model for Management*. United States Department of Interior, Washington, D.C.
- Waldbauer, Richard C
1986 House Not a Home: Hill Farm Clustered Communities. *Man in the Northeast* 31:139-150.
- Walker, George H.
1879 Atlas of Plymouth County. George H. Walker and Co. Boston, MA.
- Walling, Henry E.
1857 Map of Plymouth County Massachusetts. Harvard University Library Image Delivery Service. January 2009.
<http://ids.lib.harvard.edu/ids/view/2979360?buttons=y>
- Williams, Roger
1971 *A Key Into the Language of America*. 1971 edition.
- Wilson, John S.
1990 We've Got Thousands of These! What makes an Historic Farmstead Significant?
Historical Archaeology, Vol 24: pp. 23-33.
- Wood, Joseph
1978 *The Origin of the New England Village* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Geography, Pennsylvania State University, Altoona, PA.
- Zimler, Dana L.
1987 A Socioeconomic Indexing of 19th Century Illinois Farmsteads. Manuscript on file. Department of Anthropology. University of Illinois. Urbana, Illinois.