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Abstract

From 1749–1755, a migration of Acadians from Nova Scotia saw hundreds relocate to Île Saint-Jean and Île Royale. Among them, following the founding of Halifax, were the Acadians of Chezzetcook, Mirliguèche and those living at modern-day Lawrencetown.

In 1753 and 1754, the French and Mi’kmaq community of Mirliguèche and an area east of Halifax called “Musquodoboit” were resettled by the British and renamed Lunenburg and Lawrencetown. These efforts at resettlement of deserted French communities would presage the reoccupation of Acadian land established after 1760.

This thesis is a study of a landscape. It utilizes an interdisciplinary approach of historical research, cartographic analysis, community engagement, landscape archaeology, remote sensing and empirical archaeological investigation to explore a historiographically neglected episode in Nova Scotia history. This work approaches events surrounding the abandonment of the eastern shore and resettlement of Lawrencetown as a micro-history of successive land use.
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Chapter One

The Eastern Shore of Nova Scotia: Historical Evidence of Colonial Settlement

Introduction

Despite its proximity to seasonal fishing grounds, its historical position along valuable trade routes, and its near-continuous occupation during the millennia since human beings first came to know the region, the period of early European settlement on the eastern shore of Nova Scotia has been historically and archaeologically neglected. This research is intended to assemble, through multidisciplinary techniques, a better understanding of the events that led up to and followed the abandonment of the Pre-Deportation Acadian communities of the eastern shore between Cole harbour and Chezzetcook, following the extension of the British Imperial banlieu, with the founding of Halifax. As a form of micro-history, this thesis attempts to illustrate the similarities of events happening on the eastern shore with those occurring elsewhere in the region in the years leading up to the Seven Years’ War (1756-63) and a bellwether of British reoccupation of Acadian land that would become standard with the arrival of the New England Planters. This opening chapter will discuss the history of Acadia or Nova Scotia as it relates to the communities of the Atlantic coast, the settling of Halifax, the abandonment of the shore by the Acadians and the efforts at reclamation of these abrogated lands by the British. The focus of the thesis then narrows in Chapter Two, to details of the 1752 Charles Morris survey of the eastern shore. Using critical cartography, aerial photograph analysis and landscape archaeology, the survey plan and description are
used as guides to discovering the archaeological remnants of the settlements they describe. The third chapter is a report of the results of fieldwork from 2009-2011, which details geophysical surveys in the communities of Grand Desert and Lawrencetown, and sub-surface testing in Lawrencetown that resulted in the filing of two new archaeological sites with the Nova Scotia Museum – The Green Estate Site (BdCu-9) and The Lawrencetown Township Site (BdCu-8).

Few publications deal directly or exclusively with the history of the eastern shore, and those that exist typically ignore or only briefly mention the early pattern of settlement of the region by the French in the mid-seventeenth century, their integral relationship with the Mi’kmaq and the mid-eighteenth century efforts by the British to settle on vacated French land. Among the few publications that include discussion of the eastern shore is William C. Wicken’s doctoral thesis, “Encounters with Tall Ships and Tall Tales: Mi’kmaq Society 1500-1760” (1994), which is exemplary in its analysis of poorly documented and poorly understood phases of Mi’kmaq lifeways in the colonial period by drawing comparisons from similar and/or nearby sources. Ronald Labelle’s (1995) valuable review of the post-1760 reoccupation period devotes only a single paragraph to the pre-deportation Acadian settlement of the area (Labelle 1995:12). Aside from writing on early efforts by the French to establish a capital on the south shore, the accounts of the first siege of Louisbourg, and the curiosity of the failed Duc D’Anville expedition, scholarly attention does not fully come to the Atlantic shore of Nova Scotia until the founding of Halifax. Even then, little attention has been given to Lawrencetown,
one of only two additional settlements attempted by Britain in the period. As with its preferred counterpart, Lunenburg, its peninsular defense is unusual in Canadian history (Young 1980:21). This research includes generally as its study area the portion of the Atlantic shore from Lunenburg in the west to Musquodoboit in the east. It also includes the mid-eighteenth century Acadian migration to Île Royale (Cape Breton). Specifically, the cartographic and archaeological analysis of this thesis is confined to the boundaries of the 1752 Charles Morris survey of the eastern shore, which includes the coast from Cole Harbour to Chezzetcook (Figures 1-1 and 1-2). The indefatigable Charles Morris – teacher, military officer, cartographer and judge – with his survey provided the most detailed mapping of this portion of the eastern shore from the eighteenth century.\footnote{For an excellent summary of the career of Charles Morris, see André Robichaud, Jonathan Fowler and}
Figure 1-1: Eighteenth Century Acadie/Nova Scotia with prominent place names mentioned in this thesis. Mapping by Sarah-Marie McDonald.
Figure 1-2: The study area of this thesis: the eastern shore from Cole Harbour to Chezzetcook. Mapping by Sarah-Marie McDonald.
However, limitation in sources is a primary reason for the shortage of written material about the eastern shore. This is due to the relative isolation of its communities from the centres of population and government at Port Royal and Louisbourg. Lack of British influence outside of Annapolis Royal, after 1710, meant infrequent interactions with eastern shore communities. Following Abbé Antoine Gaulin’s appointment as vicar-general of Acadia in 1702, and his establishment of missions at Cape Sable, La Hève (La Have), Shubenacadie and Mirliguèche (Lunenburg), more regular contact was maintained. The non-natives most frequently on the eastern shore in the colonial period were fishermen from New England, who rarely left records. With that consideration, this thesis attempts to utilize alternate research strategies and methodological approaches in addition to direct historical research, including critical cartography and elements of archaeological investigation such as landscape archaeology, geophysical remote sensing and archaeological testing – modern tools of reconnaissance to broaden our understanding of a little-studied area of Nova Scotia in a pivotal time in the province’s history. A somewhat ethereal description of landscape archaeology is offered by Christopher C. Fennel when he writes:

> Within the frame of human perception and analytic capabilities, we are fascinated by a contest of three dimensions with a fourth. We try to freeze time by etching maps, excavating through strata, and creating contour models with laser pulses from airplanes. What, then, is time, one might ask. It is the conceptual gloss we offer to stand for the concourse of natural forces and human agency writ in movement upon the earth (Fennel 2011:1).

Landscape archaeology is the body of archaeological theory which examines the broader environment and the impact and residual evidence of past human occupation. It
examines the relationship between the landscape and the people who once lived there, their economy, and can help trace land use patterns. It utilizes techniques such as field survey, including geophysical techniques, interpretation of aerial photography, period mapping, and historical research (Ashmore and Knapp 1999; Kelso and Most 1990; Rubertone 1989; Yamin and Metheny 1996).

The Peopling of the Eastern Shore

Historical evidence, especially when taken together with the cartographic and archaeological evidence considered in the chapters to follow, can identify the eastern shore as a longstanding area of occupation for the region’s First Nations people and early occupation by Europeans. Indeed, even toponymy establishes First nations occupancy, with names such as Nooloktoochk (bivouacking place), now Cow Bay, NS (Pacifique, 1930), Chezzetcook (flowing rapidly in many channels) (Melanson 1985:1), Musquodoboit (flowing out square or rolling out in foam or suddenly widening out after a narrow entrance at its mouth) (Brown 1922:100), and nearby Shubenacadie (place where ground nuts grow). The name Petpeswick, the community east of Francis Nose Island in Musquodoboit Harbour, may derive from the Petitpas family, which had joint Acadian and Mi’kmaq heritage (White 1999:1297). Claude Petitpas Jr. operated the trading post at Mouscadabouet (Musquodoboit, various spellings) in 1698 (Murdoch 1865:243) and was still living there with his Mi’kmaw wife, four sons and three daughters, along with several other Métis families in the census of 1708. Officials in Halifax recognized early
on that the Lawrencetown region of the eastern shore was “a great rendezvous for Indians”.2

Research has shown that the Atlantic northeast, like the rest of the northern hemisphere, saw a cooling trend beginning in about 1450 through to 1850, with the period of steepest decline from 1550 to 1690, preceding a slight warming in the early eighteenth century. Compared to the rest of Nova Scotia, due to its proximity to the Atlantic Ocean, winters on the eastern shore are mild and summers are cool and short. Fog is a common characteristic of the weather on the Atlantic shore, with up to 25 per cent annual cover (Wicken 1992:24-25; 28).

Historic references to climactic conditions give good insight into life on the colonial frontier in the eighteenth century. Snowfall typically lasted, especially in Cape Breton, from late October until late April or early May. The harbour at Louisbourg was often icebound well into the spring, as it was in the third week of April, 1745 (Wicken 1994:27). Harbours along the eastern and southern shore, conversely, were typically free of ice all winter. Edward Cornwallis noted that, during his first winter at Halifax, the harbour was clear of appreciable ice that “would hinder vessels from coming in and going out. Vessels come in every month, almost every week.”3

---

3 Nova Scotia Archives (NSA), Cornwallis to Board of Trade, 17 March 1750. RC 1 Vol. 35, Doc 11.
Some of the earliest historical documents from the region identify the eastern shore as a popular destination for European seasonal fishermen, with its many harbours and beaches, the harbour of Canso being the best known at the time in what is now Nova Scotia. Contact with the First Nations would have also occurred early on as fur trading and missionary posts were established (Clark 1969:74-75; Wicken 1994:12). A different kind of contact began about a generation after the first permanent settlements at Port Royal and along the Dauphin (Annapolis) River, when Acadians began a period of rapid population rapid growth which saw them begin to move and settle in other areas of the peninsula in significant numbers. This was fairly common for old-established families in Port Royal, since the younger generation found the ancestral farms were not large enough to support each of the children when they reached adulthood, and so would move to a new area to start a fresh settlement. The eastern shore would have seemed a suitable location. The area was well known for its fishing, and many of its protected harbours also included salt marshes. Despite some tension, Mi’kmaq and Acadians were able to co-exist due to different economic cycles. Aside from the reclamation of salt marshes which the Mi’kmaq would have used for hunting sea birds, as farmers, the French did not significantly interfere with Mi’kmaq subsistence practices (Wicken 1994:230). Yet permission to settle on Mi’kmaq land was sometimes required, as was recorded by French officials in 1724, when five or six French families wished to inhabit land south of the Shubenacadie River, possibly within the study area of this thesis.4

The expansion had begun with a move to settle marshes upriver from Port Royal, the founding of settlements in the Chignecto area with Beaubassin in 1671 and the Minas Basin, with the founding of the village of Grand Pré, in the early 1680s (Johnston and Kerr 2004:2). But also, sometime before the first territorial census in 1671 to the time of the census of 1706 many small fishing and trading posts along the southern and eastern shores became at least seasonally occupied communities (Clark 1968:121). The first recorded incidence of permanent settlement within the study area occurred when Guyon Chiasson is listed as being involved in the fur trade at “Mouchecadoboueit” in 1668 (White 1999:350). The loose English administration under Governor Sir Thomas Temple (1657-70) may have afforded the opportunity for such settlers to temporarily break free of the constraints of the seigneurial system (Reid et al. 2004:21, 38).

**The Seigneury of “Mouscoudobouet”**

Not until 1691 did Mathieu de Goutin, Lieutenant General of the Ordinary Court of Acadia, become seigneur of “Mouscoudobouet”. The description of the grant was as follows:

a tract of land of two leagues front, at a place called Mascendabouet (Musquodoboit) [that is to say]: one league above said river and one league below it, by two leagues in depth in going up the river, and along it, with the islands and islets that are before the two leagues of front (Murdoch 1865:199).

The seigneurial system of the French Ancien Régime was being used in the New World, much as it was in the Old, to encourage clearing and cultivation of land and to apply
control over settlement of it. With the scarcity of free land in France, the assigning of seigneuries in Acadia gave minor nobles and military officials an opportunity to acquire property for the future betterment of their family names. Other districts apportioned along the Atlantic shore of Acadie included Minitiguich (also spelled Mirliguèche, which later became Lunenburg) to Hugues Randin in 1697, and Port Maltais (Port Medway) to Baron de Beauville in 1700 (Clark 1968:118). R. Colebrook Harris (1984) argues that the Seigneury and seigneur were not defining elements in the life of the communities in the St. Lawrence River region. There is little documentary evidence of the extent to which the onerous seigneurial rights and obligations were paid or extended to those established in Acadia/the Atlantic shore, including the construction of mills, manor houses or roads. For the most part, the censitaires appear to have lived as freeholders, paying the occasional or cens et rentes (land tax and annual rent) (Harris 1984:160).

Although the southern and eastern shore seigneuries included many of the best harbours in the region, some with dyke-able salt marshlands, it is possible that these areas were selected, in part, because by the late seventeenth century they had already been settled, or at least utilized, for some time.

Differing rules regarding the enforcement of seigneurial conditions in Acadia from those in Quebec can be seen in rulings by the French court from 1703 and 1705. Seeking to ratify his original seigneurial grant to the Beaubassin region from 1676, Michel Leneuf de La Vallière de Beaubassin (the elder) was awarded conditional rights which required settlers to pay appropriate dues to La Vallière, but he in turn could not
dispossess any settlers of land or inheritances that had been already cleared, lived on or otherwise improved (Griffiths 2005:192-193). A signature component to N.E.S. Griffiths’ argument regarding Acadian cultural maturation and identity was the loose application of seigneurial regulations, granting the Acadians the freedom to act as agents in legal matters, to migrate, and to forge their own economic ties. It is possible that settlers already occupying land within the Musquodoboit Seigneury were similarly impacted by the grant to de Goutin.

There has been some historical and historiographical confusion regarding the location of the Seigneury of Musquodoboit. An examination of some French and British maps of Nova Scotia from the mid-eighteenth century, such as the 1744 Jacques-Nicolas Bellin and 1755 Thomas Jefferys maps (Figure 1-3), reveals Musquodoboit as being located in the area of Lawrencetown and Cole Harbour, just east of Chebucto (Halifax) Harbour. The Bellin map contains an apparent compression of the coast between Chebucto and the “Baye de toutes les Isles” where the locations of modern Cole Harbour, Lawrencetown and Chezzetcook are not indicated, and the prominent Musquodoboit River is shown just to the east of Chebucto. The map displays the major harbours and rivers within Acadia and important portage routes and “chemin[s]”. The river associated with Musquodoboit is called “R. S. Theodore” (i.e., Riviere St. Theodore, possibly the origin of the place name Jeddore). The river, along with R. St. Marie (St. Mary’s River),

---

This and several other maps show Musquodoboit at Cole Harbour/Lawrencetown, including a 1755 Jean Baptiste Bourguignon map, and a 1778 Antonio Zatta map. These maps were located at the David Rumsey Map Collection found at http://www.davidrumsey.com.
is prominent on the coast, due to its distance inland. It follows a route that curves toward
the east, ending at a point within a short portage to R. du Nord Est, which appears to
represent the Stewiacke River. This compression of the coast line appears to stem from
efforts of early cartographers to include on their maps the most relevant information such
as prominent harbours and navigable rivers important to trade with the native population,
like the Musquodoboit River. This resulted in the compression of certain sections of
coastline, as in the distance from Chebucto Harbour to the Musquodoboit River. The map
produced in 1755 by British cartographer Thomas Jefferys also labels the section of coast
east of Halifax Harbour as “Muscadaboit”. On this map the significance of the
Musquodoboit River appears to have been diminished. Only a single small river, labelled
“Sidore”, is identified on the eastern shore in Chezzetcook Harbour. This naming
convention was also in effect in 1752 when Charles Morris conducted the survey of the
eastern shore that is the focus of the second chapter of this thesis. Thirty-three years after
the publication of the Jefferys map, a map by Antonio Zatta continued to label the area
east of Halifax as “Muscadaboit”. The map of the 1686 De Meulles tour of Acadia,
(Figure 1-4) aside from showing Chebucto Harbour eponymously renamed as “Baye de
Meulles”, places “Mouscoudabdy” and “R. Teodore” as the third and fourth rivers east of
Chebucto, respectively, which places them in a more accurate context.
Figure 1-3: Detail of Jacques Nicolas Bellin (1744)⁶ (top) and Thomas Jefferys (1755)⁷ (bottom) maps of the eastern shore depicting Musquodoboit (“Mouchoudaboy” and “Muskodoboit”) east of Chebucto Harbour, but west of Chezzetcook (“Shezetcook” and “Shillingkook”) and Jeddore (“Gidore” and “Jedore”).

⁶ Nicloas Bellin, 1744, NSA. F/202-1744.
⁷ Thomas Jefferys, 1755, NSA 202-1755. 3.5.4.
This naming convention has been perpetuated by Nova Scotian historians.

Referring to the Lawrencetown grant, Beamish Murdoch explains that it “extended from Chezetcook to Cole Harbour (Murdoch 1865:II, 230). A recently as 2003, the Seigneury has been described as “an area from the head of present-day Chezzetcook to the western shore of Cole Harbour” (Chapman 2003:27).

It is the opinion of archaeologist, and resident of Musquodoboit, Mike Sanders (personal communication, December 2012), that given its course and distance inland, and its relationship to other rivers, the harbour depicted as “Mouchoudaboy” on the

---

8 Jean Baptiste Louis Franquelin, 1686. NSA 200-1686 Nova Scotia. 3.5.5.
eighteenth century maps represents the actual Musquodoboit Harbour. Excavations by Sanders on Francis Nose Island in Musquodoboit Harbour in 1999 produced trade goods, such as a medallion (Whitehead 1982:14, plate 21), a trade axe and a trade bead. Cannon balls and other early eighteenth century artifacts and structural remains indicate the site as the location of an “Old Fort” on a ca. 1800 grant map in the Halifax County East Portfolio at the Crown Land Information Management Centre.

If the historically and currently named Musquodoboit Rivers are one and the same, then the distance of one league on either side is not great enough to encapsulate Chezzetcook or Lawrencetown, which lie approximately two and four leagues (approximately 11 and 22 kilometres) to the west, respectively. Mathieu de Goutin, upon his arrival in the territory in 1688, would serve as Lieutenant General for Justice for most of the next two decades, presiding over all civil and criminal suits as well as those dealing with navigation and trade. He appears to have done little with his seigneurial titles in Acadie (Griffiths 2005:148; Pothier 2000:257-8; Vanderlinden 2004:71-19).

The British conquest of Acadia in 1710 permanently disrupted French administration of the territory. At the time, however, this was not yet evident. In the minds of French and Mi’kmaq, who had collective memory of past imperial disturbances, this shift in the European seat of power represented just another in a series of such disruptions. While seigneurial regulations had been enforced under Charles De Menou d’Aulnay, Governor of Acadie from 1635-1650, they had little influence over the
Acadians under the rule of Thomas Temple. However, subsequent administration of land distribution was impeded by heirs of seigneurial title who made legal claims against the British government (Reid et al. 2004:142).

**Censuses and Tours**

Various descriptions and censuses from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries provide some indication of the size and condition of the settlements of the Atlantic coast. Most descriptions are quite brief and at times offer conflicting evidence. French census records from 1686, 1688, 1693 and 1708 give incomplete and sometimes confusing results. The first census of Acadia, conducted by Hector d'Andigné de Grandfontaine, the governor of the colony in 1671, shows that there already existed a number of outlying settlements or family-based villages along the southern and eastern shores (Clark 1968:121). Clark feels that the record enumerate with accuracy the residents of Port Royal and surrounding area, while it canvassed the Atlantic coastal settlements less reliably (Clark 1968:121). The census included 14 people at Pubnico, a single family of ten at Cap Neigre (suggested by Clark (1968) to be Port la Tour, p. 123), and a family of three at Port Rochelois, or present day Shelburne Harbour. Numbers for Pentagoet (Maine) indicate one family and 25 soldiers (possibly that of Grandfontaine and his forces since Pentagoet was the site of his new capital, chosen over Port Royal, after he had assumed control of Acadia from the English regime of Sir Thomas Temple in 1670). There were 13 people at “Mouskadabouet” (Musquodoboit) and a single family at St-Pierre (St. Peter’s) in Île Royale (Cape Breton). There is no mention in the census of
occupation at Chezzetcook, Chebucto or any other part of present-day Halifax County. Some communities are indicated to have an amount of land under cultivation, though none is listed for Musquodoboit, perhaps an indication that the site was used as a trading and fishing post (Clark 1968:155).

A census conducted by Jacques de Meulles, Intendant of New France, based on his voyage through Acadie in 1685-86, lists settlers only at the following locations along the Atlantic coast: Cape Sable, which had 15 people and seven arpents of cultivated land (a square arpent being roughly five-sixths of an acre); La Hève and Mirliguèche (La Have and Lunenburg) with 19 people and three arpents; and Chedabouctou (near Canso) with approximately 25 people, which may have included some seasonal fishermen. Land was being cleared by three or four settlers. There is no listing for Musquodoboit or Chezzetcook (Clark 1968:124; Morse 1935:163). This may indicate sporadic and intermittent settlement in the area. The census lists 114 people as living in communities outside of Port Royal and vicinity, and estimates by Raymond Roy place the population at 150, meaning that the census takers may not have known or underestimated the size of communities on the eastern shore (Roy 1975:30-32). Table 1-1 summarizes the totals from these and censuses canvassing the Atlantic coast in 1693 and 1708.
Table 1-1: Summary of Census Data for the Eastern and Southern Shore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1671⁹</th>
<th>1686</th>
<th>1688</th>
<th>1693¹⁰</th>
<th>1708¹¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pubnico</td>
<td>8¹²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap Neigre (Port La Tour)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Rochelois (Shelburne Harbour)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentagoet (Maine)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Family and 25 Soldiers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musquodoboit</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Pierre (St. Peter’s)</td>
<td>1 Family</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Sable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Hève (La Have)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19¹³</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirliguèche (Lunenburg)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19¹³</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chedabouctou (Guysborough)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chebucto (Halifax Harbour)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canseau (Canso)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>59 + 2 Families</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>342</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>786</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another census taken in 1688 by the little-known colonial official Gargas¹⁴ (Clark 1968:124; Morse 1935:144-155) listed 46 people (22 Europeans and 24 Mi’kmaq) at Cape Sable, with four houses and six wigwams, and four-and-a-half acres of land under cultivation; 41 people at Port Rochelois (20 Europeans and 21 Mi’kmaq), four houses and three wigwams, and one acre under cultivation; 60 people at La Have (12 Europeans and 48 Mi’kmaq), with four houses and eight wigwams, and two acres cultivated; 21 at Mirliguèche (ten Europeans and 11 Mi’kmaq), in one house and two wigwams, with half an acre under cultivation; and 36 at Chebucto (three Europeans and 33 Mi’kmaq), one house and seven wigwams, and half an acre under cultivation. There is a distinction

---

⁹ Census information available at: [http://www.acadian-home.org/census1671.html](http://www.acadian-home.org/census1671.html)

¹⁰ PAC microfilm C-2572.

¹¹ Census information available at: [http://www.acadian-home.org/census1708.html](http://www.acadian-home.org/census1708.html)

¹² A.H. Clark lists the population of Pubnico at 14, which is the number given on the table at the front of the census. However, the nominal list only gives a total of two families and eight people (Clark 1968:153).

¹³ The 1686 census records La Hève and Mirliguèche as the same community.

¹⁴ Murdoch (1865: 174) identifies Gargas (first name not known) as the individual Mathieu de Goutin relieved as écrivain principal at Port Royal, in 1688. Morse (1935: 31-33) adds that he had obtained his appointment in July, 1685, but did not arrive in the territory until July, 1687. Morse speculates that Murdoch’s information on Gargas came from his being mentioned in reports of de Goutin. His census is the first to include the Native population.
made between Chedaboucto (the head of the harbour, at present day Guysborough)\textsuperscript{15}

which had 103 people (51 Europeans and 52 Mi’kmaq), four houses, eight wigwams, a
church and seven acres under cultivation, and Canceau (Canso), which had 13 people (all
Mi’kmaq) who were living in three wigwams. There is no reference to locations within
the study area in this census.

Stopping at Chebucto Harbour for supplies during his voyage of 1699, the author
Dièreville described an abandoned fishing outpost he found there:

This Harbour is of great extent, And Nature has, herself formed there
A splendid Basin, and around about Green Fir-trees, which afford the
eye A pleasant prospect; at its edge A Building used for drying Cod;
That such construction is not known to Mansard, is quite possible. It
was half as long, & quite as wide as the Mall in Paris, built on a fine
Beach along the River, at a distance which permitted the water to pass
under it at high tide & carry away the refuse of the Cod. Imagine a
wooden Bridge, built over the land, of large trees driven well in on the
side facing the water; at their extremities, other pieces of wood placed
crosswise & securely clamped...\textsuperscript{16}

The fish processing station had been constructed the year before by the Company of
Acadia, but by the time of Dièreville’s visit had been deserted. Dièreville notes an
encounter with some Mi’kmaq while hunting and gathering water, who also visited the
next morning and were treated to breakfast.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15} The fort at Chedabucto was known as Fort St. Louis (Landry 2007: 80).
\textsuperscript{16} Sieur de Dièreville (1933), \textit{Relation of the voyage to Port Royal in Acadia or New France, Volume 20 of
Publications of the Champlain Society}. Ed. John Clarence Webster, Toronto: The Champlain Society, p. 73-
74. A location “on a fine Beach along the River” may refer to Dartmouth Cove, which as the outlet for the
Dartmouth River, would have been the most seaward of the major freshwater outlets in Chebucto Harbour.
\textsuperscript{17} Dièreville, \textit{Relations}, 1933: p 76-77.
Governor Joseph Robinau de Villebon, on a tour of the region in 1699, noted some of the locations along the Atlantic coast of the territory:

The founders of Port Royal knew the country well before they selected it as their fortress. They had forts at Port Latour, at Lahève, Musquodoboit, where there is one now. River St. Mary, yet fortified, and establishments in cape Breton. These all belonged to individuals, and when a good understanding existed among them, which was but rarely, they used to come to Port Royal to seek refreshments, as did those of Pentagouet on the west shore, which was also fortified, also the river St. John. But it is to be remarked, that except Port Royal and Lahève, where they cultivated land and carried on fishery, the other posts were only kept up for trading with the savages (Murdoch 1865:245).

He also noted the presence of some fishing activity along the coast, by the French, who had been sent to Chibouctou (Halifax), and the English, who were also present, though not using the shore to cure their fish. However, in reporting on illegal trading by the English, Sieur Decostre indicated an English ketch had visited a Petitpas at “Mouscadabouet”. He also listed a priest at “Chibouctou” and named the missionary Louis-Pierre Thury near “Mouscoudabouet” (Murdoch 1865:243).18

Siblings Bernard and Marguerite Petitpas, children of the first Petitpas to travel to Acadie, Claude Petitpas (1626-1691), Sieur de Lafleur, Notary of the Tribunal at Port-Royal, and his wife Catherine Bugaret (1638-1693), appeared as children in the 1671 census at Port Royal, but were settled, with families of their own at Mirliguèche in the census of 1686. In the 1708 census, Bernard and Marguerite’s younger brother, Claude

---

18 The appendix to chapter 28 of Murdoch (1865: 239-242) lists several events related to the eastern shore in 1698-99, including the tour of the area by Villebon. It also describes the report of a “Sieur decostre” who mentions the visit of an English ketch at Musquodoboit.
Petitpas Jr., appeared living in Musquodoboit, and married to Marie-Thérèse, a Mi’kmaw woman. They moved to Musquodoboit by 1706 and raised seven children there (White 1999:1294-98). This move may have been the result of an invitation by de Goutin, who had succeeded Claude Petitpas Sr. as secretary to the Governor (Melanson 1985:4). In this census there are 161 persons, a combination of French and Mi’kmaw living there. After the death of Marie-Thérèse, Claude Jr. moved his family to Port-Toulouse (St. Peter’s), Cape Breton. On January 7, 1721, he married for a second time to Françoise Lavergne. Claude and Françoise raised four more boys, two of whom, through the tumult of the deportation, and imprisonment by the British, eventually came to Chezzetcook and were amongst the first to resettle there (Labelle 1995:13-15; White 1999:1302).

The family connection among these settlers of the Atlantic shore and their familiarity with the coast can be seen in the account of the emigration of the Godet brothers from their home on the Annapolis River to Cape Breton, in 1714. Denis and Bernard Godet, on May 22 of that year, make their way along the Atlantic coast to Cape Breton, stopping at Baccareau (Barrington) Passage to pick up the family of Jean Pitre (possibly the family noted by Villebon as living there in 1699, Clark 1968:153), before visiting the family of Claude Guedry at Merligueche (Lunenburg). Claude Guedry was married to Marguerite Petitpas. They then sailed to Musquodoboit to meet with Marguerite’s brother, Claude Jr. (d’Entremont 1981:1576; 1610).
The Post-Conquest Atlantic Coast

In 1713, following the War of the Spanish Succession and the Treaty of Utrecht, Acadie, renamed Nova Scotia, which included the peninsular mainland (and all territory from the St. Lawrence to the border of Maine, from the British perspective), became the possession of the British Empire for the final time, at least from a non-aboriginal perspective. France retained control of the sparsely populated Île Royale (Cape Breton) and Île Saint-Jean (Prince Edward Island). Recognizing their vulnerable position, the French began construction of a new stronghold, Fortress Louisbourg, in 1719. Île Royale was now the only French possession along the Atlantic seaboard, with the British at least nominally in control of lands from mainland Nova Scotia to the border of Spanish Florida. Naturally, the French wished to maintain a foothold in the proximity of the lucrative fishing grounds off the coast of Newfoundland. It was their hope that large numbers of Acadians would move from their homes in British Nova Scotia and resettle in Île Royale (Johnston 1988:105).

To effect the establishment of viable settlement at Louisbourg and throughout the colony of Île Royale – which, for administrative purposes included Île Saint-Jean – in addition to the movement of the French military force from Port Royal and the fishing infrastructure from Newfoundland, there also began an extended effort to encourage emigration of Acadians from peninsular Nova Scotia to French-controlled areas. The offer included land and free provisions. The British discouraged such a relocation for fear of leaving the province “intirely destitute of inhabitants” and making Île Royale “at
once the most powerful colony the French have in America and of the greatest danger and damage to all the British colonies as well as the universal trade of Great Britain”\textsuperscript{19}. With the conquest of Acadia came an effort to transition the French-speaking, Catholic population into proper British subjects through the signing of an oath of allegiance. The British also officially enacted, though were effectively unable to enforce, a provision of the peace treaty which denied Acadians the freedom to move with their possessions and livestock after one year of its signing had elapsed (Pothier 1970:117-188).

Ignoring these unenforceable regulations, Acadian deputies were sent to Île Royale, and between 1714 and 1734 a slow procession of approximately 60 families (over 500 people), including the Godet and Pitre families, emigrated to Louisbourg and St Peter’s/Port Toulouse. The area was known to be agriculturally less viable than the Fundy shore, so it is not surprising to note that, of the few who moved, many heads of families were not farmers, but captains/navigators, merchants, fishermen or shipwrights and carpenters (Pothier 1970:123-127). Many emigrants were among the young or old and owned no livestock or cultivated land. The offer of provisions from the French crown may have lured the destitute. While certainly the draw to be nearer to a centre of one’s faith and country would have been present, and the migration would have been influenced by the treaty and the subsequent demand by the new British government to sign an oath, many of these settlers may have chosen to relocate because of the opportunity that the situation provided. As with the settlers of the Minas Basin,

\textsuperscript{19} NSA, CO 217/1 fol. 97-97v.
Beaubassin, and the Atlantic shore in the 1670s, the Acadians who would have been willing to move were those with the least to lose – not the established farmers, but the individuals who could best make a living in the new location.

Among the listed families were four with ties to the eastern shore: the previously mentioned Claude Petitpas Jr., a merchant, of Musquodoboit, his son Barthelemy, a navigator and interpreter, Claude’s nephew Nicolas, a carpenter and fisherman, as well as his son-in-law Bernard Mars dit La Sonde, a fisherman, also of Musquodoboit (Pothier 1970:123-127). This may signify a lack of permanency or long-term viability in these settlements. The emigration of Acadians to Île Royale in the first half of the eighteenth century was not what the French administration had expected, however. While the fishing-based community at Plaisance (Placentia, Newfoundland) was adaptable to life at Louisbourg with its continued access to cod stocks, the same was not true of the established agricultural-based population of Nova Scotia. Few Acadians could see the advantage of uprooting their lives in a fertile country that had become their home only to relocate to the uncertainty of Île Royale. A second concerted effort at Acadian emigration to Île Royale and Île Saint-Jean would occur following the founding of Halifax (Johnston 2005:152).

Early accounts of communities from the eastern and southern shores describe them as fishing stations or trading posts with relatively little agriculture, dependent on trade, fishing, or hunting for sustenance (Morse 1935:190-91). Interestingly, A.H. Clark
notes, “[i]t is probable that the other seigneurs [those not located on the Fundy shore] had been more interested in fish or fur than in agricultural lands in any event” (Clark 1968:119). This suggests that the early settlers and their subsistence, as environmental considerations would also have dictated, relied more on the fishery and the fur trade than on agriculture. Chezzetcook inlet and the areas between there and Dartmouth described by Chief Surveyor Charles Morris in 1752 do include some acreage of farmable salt marsh, but not near the quantity or quality of the Bay of Fundy marshes. Estimates of the area of dyke-able Fundy salt marsh available to the Acadians in the early eighteenth century run to nearly 90,000 acres (approximately 36,422 hectares) (Percy 1996). Morris indicates only a few thousand acres, with parts described as “being more sunken and broken with pits of Water”. Census records from 1671, 1688, and Robinau de Villebon’s journey of 1699, for the communities of Port La Tour and Port Razoir (Shelburne), indicate the presence of a small number of livestock with adequate hay to feed them, and some cultivation of peas and grain, but little else (Webster 1935:134-35).21

A letter from Governor of Canada, Marquis Charles de Beauharnois de la Boische, and the Intendant Gilles Hocquart, to Jean Frédérick Phélypeaux, Comte de Maurepas and Minister of the French Marine, dated September 12, 1745, explained:

The fishery is much more abundant on the East coast, which has three or four very excellent harbours capable of accommodating the largest sized vessels, viz’t., LaHeve, Chibouctou, and Port la Tour. This coast is not settled; at Mirligueche, a small harbour five leagues east of

20 NSA CO 217/13 MM#13845, p. 299-303.
21 Villebon accurately describes the geography of the eastern shore, placing “Mouscoudabouet” [Musquodoboit] three leagues east of “Magannechis” [Three Fathom Harbour], p. 136.
LaHeve, are only 8 settlers, among the rest are Paul Guedry, alias Grivois, jovial or jolly, a good coast pilot. Again, West of LaHeve, at the place called Little River, are two more settlers. Germain Lejeune, one of these, is intimately acquainted with the coast. The man named Boutin, and his children, live three leagues east of the entrance to Chibouctou. The attachment of these people to France can be relied upon (Murdoch 1867:81).

This letter was written in the tumultuous times of the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-1748), Louisbourg having capitulated to a force of New England and British soldiers not quite three months prior. The measurement of “three leagues (9 miles or 15.3 kilometres) east of the entrance to Chibouctou” places the community near Chezzetcook Inlet when measured from the edge of the outer mouth of Halifax Harbour. Given the approximation of the distance, the settlement could also be at modern day Lawrencetown or Three Fathom Harbour. The Mi’kmaq name for Porter’s Lake is “Magannechis” (various spellings), which John Clarence Webster (1934:136) explains includes Three Fathom Harbour in the eighteenth century. Villebon, on his tour of 1699, places Magannechis three leagues east of Chebucto. In 1748, Abbé Jean-Louis Le Loutre, Catholic priest and missionary and leader of the French forces and the Acadian/ Mi’kmaq militias during King George's War (1744–1748), wrote: “Makamshish is a port for fishermen and small crafts. It is not inhabited. It is but a half league [approximately 2.8 kilometres] from there to the Boutins by the river” (Melanson 1985:4). It is unclear to

---

22 The full letter can be found in Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, ed. By E.B. O’Callaghan, 10 (1858), 3-19.
23 Louisbourg surrendered after a two and a half month siege on June 16, 1745.
24 Incidentally, the distance of “three leagues” to the east of Halifax appears in several period documents. In 1755, a proposal by the Mi’kmaq presented to British officials in Halifax suggested a boundary for a Mi’kmaq territory within Nova Scotia. Its southern border formed a line from three leagues east of Halifax to the mission at Shubenacadie (Wicken 2002: 169-170).
25 This naming convention is continued by Morris on the 1754 Lawrencetown land grant map (NA CO 700 Nova Scotia 27).
which river Le Loutre was referring, but it may be one of the cleared areas indicated on the Morris eastern shore survey, in the area of Lloy or even at Lawrencetown. These documents give us the name of settlers within the study area – the Boutin family. The Boutins were another family that moved from Port Royal to the eastern shore, sometime before 1708 (White 1999:264).

Also from 1748, we have a French report on the status of Acadia, where it is claimed there were 15 families and a church located at Chezzetcook, three leagues east of Halifax:

In Acadia there are one thousand Indians who inhabit the forest and who are dispersed along the coasts from Campseau [Canso] to Port Royal... they have M. LeLoutre for their missionary; the mission is on the upper Shubenacadie River at twelve leagues from Cobeguitk [Truro]... from Shubenacadie one can go by birch bark canoe via the rivers, lakes, and portages to Chibouctouk [Halifax] on one side, and to Mousquedaboit [Musquodoboit] on the other. There are many French habitations the length of the East Coast: the first is Chegekkouk [Chezzetcook], the missionary had a church built for them, there are fifteen French families, it is three leagues from Chibouctouk.

The second is Mirliguech [Lunenburg] at three leagues from la Haive [La Have], the missionary had a church built, there are twenty French families...
The third is Missistiguesch otherwise called The Passage [Barrington], the missionary had a church built for them, there are ten French families.

The fourth is Peaubomcoup [Pubnico] or otherwise Cape Sable, the missionary had a church built for them, there are twenty French families...

The fifth is Tebok [Tusket], the missionary had a church built for them, there are twenty French families...

---

In a report from 1746 Abbé Jean-Louis LeLoutre wrote: “From Chigabenakadi [Shubenacadie] he [Le Loutre] leaves for Chegekkouk [Chezzetcook] about 30 leagues, where there are ten French Families.” He stated that he had also built a chapel there. (Melanson 1985:4). Two years later he noted the presence of seven or eight families (Melanson 1985:4).

**Build-Up to The Seven Years’ War**

The nervous or fragile “peace” that existed between Britain and France from the end of the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-48) to the beginning of the Seven Years’ War (1756-1763) saw a build-up of forces in the region by both sides. The region had just witnessed the French capture of Canso (1744), two unsuccessful French assaults on the fort at Annapolis (1744) and the capture of Louisbourg by New England forces (1745). The Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748), to the displeasure of New England, mandated the return to the French of Louisbourg, which they immediately began rebuilding and reinforcing. To substantiate their claim to the territory west and north of the isthmus of Chignecto, the French also began building a series of forts in the region, most notably Fort Beauséjour. In part to respond to the threat of Louisbourg, the British decided to build a major settlement on the Atlantic coast at Halifax, and to move their capital there. They also built a blockhouse at Grand Pré and Fort Edward at Piziquid (Windsor) (Clark 1968:333). These changes in the politico-military configuration caused

---

27 COL C11D 10/6p. Also found in “Nova Francia: organe de la Société d'histoire du Canada.” by Société d'histoire du Canada (Paris, France), Vol. 6, p. 5.

28 The war was formally declared in 1756, but hostilities commenced in North America in 1754.
an increase in Acadian emigration to French territory. Fearful of their future in British-controlled territory, Acadians sought the security of land that was both French and Catholic (Johnston 1988:106). Though Île Saint-Jean became the preferred destination for migrant Acadians, Île Royale saw a significant influx of refugees as well. Shortly after his arrival in the mid-summer of 1749, newly appointed governor of Louisbourg, Charles Des Herbier de la Ralière, wrote to the minister of the Marine that:

Several Acadians have come to me asking for land at Baye des Espagnols [Sydney]. They assure me that the land there is very good for ploughing, that grain will grow as well as in Acadia, and that there is enough land to establish thirty heads of household. There are eight or nine families who would bring their cattle to settle this autumn.29

These settlers were later identified as being from near Halifax.30

Taking steps to prevent the Acadian migration, Edward Cornwallis, in July of 1749 wrote:

As soon as the Garrison arrives from Louisbourg, I propose to send two Companies to Minas, with Orders to build a Barrack and stay there the Winter, I shall likewise send an Armed Sloop to ly in the Bason of Minas - This will shew the French that we can master or protect them according to their behaviour, and in case any of them should be decoy'd to Canada or Louisbourg or St. John's, that force will prevent their carrying off their affects.31

The resultant fortifications at Vieux Logis (‘Old House’), located in modern-day Hortonville, amounted to little more than a triangular palisade surrounding a few abandoned houses (Murdoch 1865:II, 226). Despite that within eighteen months of the

founding of Halifax the British had fortifications in place at most of the major centres of Acadian population – Piziquid (Fort Edward), Grand Pré (Vieux Logis) and Chignecto (Fort Lawrence) – the force could do little to block the outflow of Acadians to French territory from the territory (Faragher 2005:268-269) and no apparent effort was made to interfere with the movement of Acadians from the eastern shore.

When Edward Cornwallis sailed into Chebucto Harbour in June, 1749, the communities of the eastern shore were extant. In his first letter to the Lords of Trade and the Duke of Bedford, dated June 22, 1749 he notes that “[t]here are a few French families on each side of the bay, about three leagues off. Some have been on board” (Murdoch 1865:138). Cornwallis also separately described the French settlement at Mirliguèche, which he visited on the day before reaching Chebucto. It is interesting that Cornwallis knew of these French families, separated by about 15 kilometres east and west from Chebucto Harbour. It would appear that shortly following Cornwallis’s visit the Acadians of the eastern shore made their petition for relocation to Île Royale with the French administration at Louisbourg.

A letter from Charles Des Herbiers, dated August 15, 1749, concerning the British settlement at Halifax, sheds some light on what appears to be similar events happening on the other side of the province. He reported that seven families, totalling 100 persons, had already been moved from Acadie to Baye des Espagnols (Sydney, Cape Breton), and that Abbé Jean-Louis LeLoutre would do all in his capacity to send more:
Monsieurs Prevost and Des Herbiers of the Ministry regarding the settlement that the English made at Chebucto. Established seven heads of Acadian families at Île Royale, others must follow. These seven families comprise 100 people who are to be established at Spanish Bay. There are still others, from Beaubassin, who withdrew to the Île Saint-Jean, and Father Le Loutre will do everything in his power to send more. Granted land to the Acadians. Mr. Bonaventure sending orders to Île Saint-Jean.  

The Guedry dit Grivois, LeJeune, and Boutin families mentioned in the Beaubarnois letter are known to have resided on the southern and eastern shore before 1750 and all four families appeared at Île Royale in the 1752 la Roque census. Paul Guedry, himself of mixed Acadian and Mi’kmaw ancestry, was born in January 1701 at Mirliguèche, the son of Claude Guedry and Marguerite Petitpas. He married Anne Mius d’Entremont, daughter of Philippe Mius, and Marie, a Mi’kmaw woman, around 1720 in Acadia (White 1999:772). Paul Guedry and Anne Mius d’Entremont moved to Baie des Espagnols in August 1750, as part of this migration. There were five households of the Boutin family living in Baie des Espagnols in the 1752 census, listed as having been residing “in the colony” from 18 to 30 months. Further evidence is the fact that Governor Des Herbiers, who wrote the letter describing the movement of individuals, was listed as landlord to these families now living in Île Royale.  

---

32 Likewise, by early October 1750 between 600-700 Acadians had emigrated to Île Saint-Jean (PEI), (Wicken, 2002: 179; Des Herbiers au minister, 15 Aout 1749, Serie C11B, Vol. 28, Fol. 10-13v).


The French ministry of the Marine considered the relocation of mainland Acadians to the French controlled islands of such importance that, for 1750-51, they poured nearly 100,000 livres into the relocation effort. Yet, for many of the Acadians of the eastern shore who relocated to Île Royale, their period of hardship was not over. Only a year passed before the settlement at Baye de Espagnols was described as unlikely to succeed. Even though the Acadians had been tasked with, in the span of a year, preparing virgin woodland for habitation and cultivation and producing a sustainable harvest, they were characterized by French financial commissary Jaques Prévost as “indolent” and “lazy,” and in need of continued government assistance.\(^\text{35}\) They were regularly accused of being unwilling to clear land and follow direction from the French Crown (Johnston 1988:111). In 1754, the return on the crop sown was not large enough to provide for the inhabitants, causing the Acadians to present to the new Governor of Île Royale, Augustin de Boschenry de Drucour, a “request to leave their habitations”, which they claimed “could never produce enough to feed and keep alive a family” (Johnston 1988:112).\(^\text{36}\) Drucour gave his permission in the fall of 1754 and many of the inhabitants of Baye des Espagnols returned to Nova Scotia. On October 9 of that year a group of 28 refugees, comprising six French families, appeared before Halifax council claiming to have come from Île Royale, requesting permission to “return to their said lands”. When asked why they quit their lands they declared:


that upon the first settling of the English at Halifax, they were so terrified by the threats that M. LeLoutre had used and his declaring the great distresses they would be reduced to if they remained under the Dominion of the English, that they on that account had retired and were set down on the Island of Cape Breton, where they had remained ever since; but that the land there being so very bad they were utterly incapable of subsisting their families, and had applied to the Governor of Louisbourg for leave to return to their former Habitations. To which he had consented. 37

If these settlers would be allowed to return, they promised to take the oath of allegiance, which they “cheerfully” did. Four of the individuals were allowed to return to Piziquid and the remainder were sent to Lunenburg. On August 24, 1754, William Cotterell, provincial Secretary, wrote Colonel Patrick Sutherland, who had replaced Colonel Lawrence at Lunenburg, providing us with the names of the refugees:

...Paul Boutin, Julian Bourneuf, Charles Boutin, François Lucas, Sebastian Bourneuf, Joseph Gedri [Guedry], Pierre Gedri, Pierre Erio [Therieau?] and Claude Erot, with their families, in all twenty-five persons, are just arrived here from Louisbourg, from whence they made their escape to avoid from starving. Some of them were formerly inhabitants of this country and are nearly related to Old Labrador; they have all taken the oaths; the Colonel desires you would treat them kindly, order them to be victualled, to have tools given them, and land laid out for them where you shall see the most convenient (DesBrisay 1980:45).

Charles and Paul Boutin and Joseph Guedry appear in the 1755 victual list for Lunenburg (Keddy 2000). 38 According to Acadian genealogist Stephen White (S. White, conversation with author, May 2011), these families were among approximately 50

Acadians deported from Halifax to North Carolina aboard the sloop *Providence*, in 1755 (Murdoch 1865:246). The Boutins and the Guedrys eventually found their way to Louisiana. The family of Germain LeJeune continued to live in Cape Breton. His sons Christophe and Joseph settled in Little Bras d’Or and their descendants became known as the Young family. Louis Petitpas, son of Claude, became Father Miarriard’s aide-de-camp. The Clerge family, half siblings with Petitpas, were among the early re-settlers of Chezzetcook. Other prominent Chezzetcook residents, the LaPierres, Bellefountaines and Romas all married into the Petitpas/Clerge family (S. White, conversation with author, May, 2011).

There is clear evidence to support, therefore, that, shortly after the founding of Halifax in June 1749, the French communities on either side of the newly founded British town, in the face of an encroaching enemy, were evacuated and moved to Île Royale by LeLoutre to be near the French stronghold at Louisbourg. Gérard Finn, in the *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* indicates that LeLoutre lured the settlers away with promises to feed and sustain them for three years (Rogers 1930), but according to Naomi Griffiths (1992), LeLoutre burned their houses down so that they would have no choice but to leave (Griffiths 1992:83). Morris’s report of burned houses appears to lend substance to the latter view.
**Lunenburg and Lawrencetown**

As is discussed in the next chapter, in 1752, the Chief Surveyor of Nova Scotia, Charles Morris, conducted a survey\(^\text{39}\) of the eastern shore, which by this time had been abandoned by the Acadian population (Clark 1968:344), in an attempt to identify a suitable site for the placement of “Foreign Protestants”. This group of immigrants, from Germany, Switzerland, and Montbeliard (a French-speaking territory bordering Switzerland), were intended by the British to be settled among the Acadians so as to ‘protestantize’ them, and ultimately to convert the Neutral French into proper British subjects (Clark 1968:339). Deciding against the initial plan, Governor Peregrine Thomas Hopson commissioned the coastal survey to provide information in preparation for the placement of the settlers. The report described the various shoals, salt marshes, and harbours that might be suitable for settlement, or fortification, from the town of Dartmouth to Chezzetcook. Also indicated were the remains of several French settlements. The eastern shore was not immediately selected for settlement. Instead the settlers were relocated to another abandoned French-Mi’kmaq village known as Merliguèche, what would become the community of Lunenburg in 1753. But Morris noted in his survey a number of inlets and bays that he suggested might make suitable locations.

Long identified as a sheltered harbour with sustainable farmland, the British established the town of Lunenburg in June 1753 on the site of the seventeenth century

French and Mi’kmaw community of Mirigúèche. With offers of generous land grants and settlement allowances, some 1,400 “foreign Protestants” answered the call to resettle in the early Canadian frontier (Bell 1961:401-431). In this foreign landscape, as with Halifax, British administrators attempted to recreate a piece of the Old World in the new by designing a town based on the British grid system of street and block layout (Lennox 2007:385). The defences of Halifax, Lunenburg and Lawrencetown were unusual in that they each lie on a peninsula. They could be easily and inexpensively defended by a small detachment of troops fortified within blockhouses.

The history of the study area during the period immediately following the French abandonment of the eastern shore communities saw attempts at British settlement followed by some limited Acadian re-occupation. Though the Foreign Protestants were eventually settled in the new town of Lunenburg in 1753, the potential for the site of the former French settlement was not forgotten. On March 16, 1754, a proposal by 20 proprietors was brought before council in Halifax for the settling of a township at “a certain Tract of Land bounded on the East by the harbour called Chillingcook or Little Jedore, and on the West by a Harbour commonly called Cole Harbour the said land to Extend Northward Nine Miles, with the islands adjacent, will be most convenient for that purpose.”\(^{40}\)

This initial plan involved the settling of 20 families and then expanding the community to 40 and then 60 families within ten years. As the proprietors would be settling these families at their own expense, they petitioned council for military support as

deemed necessary, including one or two blockhouses. Deeming that the requested tract of land was too large to be granted to twenty individuals, a reduction in size of the grant to one thousand acres per signee was suggested. Therefore, in an effort to promote the settling of the territory, Governor Lawrence, in June of 1754, established the second British enterprise since the founding of Halifax with the granting to twenty proprietors a tract of twenty thousand acres east of Chebucto Harbour which was to be known as the Township of Lawrencetown. It was bounded in the west by the freshwater brook at the western head of Cole Harbour identified in the Morris 1752 description, going inland 540 rods (2.72 km, one rod being a little over five metres), and bounded in the east by the Chezzetcook river. The town plot was to be placed on the first defensible location, identified by Morris as “Muscodoboit”, on the site of the former French settlement, in the modern community of Lawrencetown (See Figure 2-12 in the following chapter for a plan of the township).

The proprietors were established and gentlemanly settlers of Halifax. They included Richard Bulkeley, who came to Halifax with Cornwallis and became Secretary of the Board of Trade under Hopson; Benjamin Green Jr., son of Benjamin Green Sr., a member of the Governor’s Council and provincial treasurer; William Morris, son of the Chief Surveyor; and William Nesbitt, one of Governor Cornwallis’s clerks and later

---

43 The full list of Lawrencetown grantees is as follows: John Barker; William (Spike) Drake; John Hussey; John Collier, Justice of the Peace; Robert Ewer, a lieutenant in the army; Richard Bulkeley, Governor’s Secretary; William Nesbitt, Attorney General; George Saul; Reverend John Brynton, rector of St. Paul’s Church in Halifax; Arthur Price; John Taggert; William Magee; Robert Grant, surgeon; David Lloyd; Robert Walter; Richard Wenman; Mathew Barnard; Benjamin Green Jr.; John Baxter; and William Morris.
Attorney General and Speaker of the Assembly (Chapman 2003:32). They were required to settle twenty families amounting to no fewer than 80 people on the cleared lands within the township and provide for their maintenance for the first three months with full rations for each person, except children under 12 months, which included: “four pounds of bread, three pounds of Indian meal (cornmeal), four pounds of pork, one pint of pease and one pint of molasses”. Rations were to be halved for the remaining nine months. In addition to building materials, after three months each family would be provided with one cow, two sheep, one sow and four fowl. For all 20 families there would be provided “one bull, two boars, two rams, 20 bushels of potatoes for planting, seeds for garden lots, two crosscut saws, a gondola for navigating the shallows, and one sailboat fit for the fishery”.

Governor Lawrence offered additional details:

The spot where the Town is to be is so situated as to be defended with a very inconsiderable Force it being on a Peninsula the neck of which the Proprietors have already Picketed in at their own Expence, hoping to establish 40 families before this fall. They have already planted potatoes and began gardening. As the place had been formerly a great Rendezvous for Indians I sent two Hundred Troops with some Rangers for their protection under the Command of Captain Stone of Lascelle’s Regiment... The Troops marched there by Land from Dartmouth and on their March cut a Road... the Blockhouse they have erected within the Picketing, which Blockhouse Your Lordships will perceive by the minutes of Council we did agree to give them for their Encouragement.

44 Captain Stone was a member of Lascelle’s (the 47th of Foot) Regiment who was killed in action during the Battle of Monongahela in the 1755 Expedition against Fort Du Quesne (Fort Duquesne, now in modern-day Pittsburgh), under Major-General Edward Braddock, who also died in the expedition (Sargent 1856). Lascelle’s Regiment was deployed to Nova Scotia in 1750, and took part in the Seven Years’ War, seeing action in the 1758 siege on Fortress Louisbourg. The following year the 47th took part in the Battle of Quebec which saw British forces, under the command of General James Wolfe, Capture Quebec (Fortescue 1899).

Under the terms of the grant the proprietors would be required to pay annual quit rents of one shilling per 50 acres granted, beginning 10 years from its commencement. In exchange, the government pledged to build a blockhouse, provide a garrison, and was encouraged that the proprietors had already picketed in an enclosure and stocked it with cattle.\textsuperscript{46} Like Lunenburg, the site was positioned on an easily defended peninsula which Governor Lawrence outfitted with 200 troops who accompanied the first settlers on May 16, 1754. They trucked a blockhouse with them and a road was cleared as they went – the likely origins of Cole Harbour Drive/Highway 207. Once the area was made secure with the construction of the blockhouse and palisade, the garrison was reduced to 40 Rangers (Young 1980:25). Lawrence believed that establishing the new settlement would bring added security to the owners of the lots laid out on the east side of Halifax Harbour, who up to this point had been too fearful of attack by the Mi’kmaq to clear and cultivate their lands. Due to its proximity to the Shubenacadie River, it was believed Lawrencetown would interrupt one of the most frequented routes from the east to Halifax and Dartmouth (Trider 1999:103). A promising report in the Halifax Gazette from June 16, 1754 states:

\begin{quote}
The settlers of Lawrencetown set out in order to go by land for that place, having a strong guard of 200 regular soldiers, exclusive of officers, and commanded by Captain Stone, with a number of Rangers, which place they arrived in Saturday following, having made a road from Dartmouth side to the said town, which is little more than 11 miles distance. They immediately went to picketing the neck which they completed in a short time and have raised and furnished the Block House, Store House and mounted some cannon. They are picketing the town and have broken up the soil which appears to be
\end{quote}

extraordinarily good, and planted a considerable quantity of potatoes, and they are in high spirits, and hope in a few years the settlement will answer our best expectations (Trider 1999:105).

It was also hoped that the establishment of a new out-settlement would encourage people, especially fishermen, from other parts of the continent to settle in Nova Scotia. On November 3, 1756, Lawrence informed the Board that the bounty offered to fishermen for the curing of fish in Nova Scotian townships had been unsuccessful due to the lack of a distinction in the law for receipt of the bounty between green and cured fish, resulting in the fishermen returning to New England at the end of the season, with no long lasting benefit to Nova Scotia. He wrote:

With respect to the settlements of Lunenburg and Lawrencetown, the latter being a kind of frontier and generally exposed to the Indians, the inhabitants cannot without the greater care and protection, venture into the woods to clear the ground. This prevents them from earning money to buy their clothes and necessities and they have to depend on Government to provide provisions. When the troops arrive from Ireland I hope to drive out the French and Indians. The settlers will not come from New England while the threat is on (Lawrence 1756, transcription by Trider 1999:121).

The fear of attack by French and Mi’kmaw forces, including thirteen recorded incidents from 1749 to 1757 (Landry 2007:228-231), resulted in the abandonment of the settlement after only three years, just when, according to Morris, it was becoming self-sufficient.\textsuperscript{47} Settlers failed to take up the offer of land and slowly the original landowners moved back to the relative security of Halifax (Young 1980:25). On August 25, 1757, it was resolved

to withdraw the soldiers from Lawrencetown. The small garrison would likely have been incorporated into the preparations for the impending attack on Louisbourg. Colonel Monckton summed up the situation in a letter to the Lords of Trade, dated 13 October, 1757:

His Majesty's Council having taken the Affairs of Lawrence Town into Consideration, have come to a Resolution of withdrawing from thence the few Inhabitants that remained, as they were in continual apprehensions from the Enemy in their Neighbourhood which prevented their being able to Cultivate the Lands or even to venture abroad without the most imminent danger of being killed. This has accordingly been done and the Troops and Blockhouse brought away. 48

With the blockhouse dismantled and the buildings and palisade demolished, the proprietors, in the promotion of the township, suffered a loss of six hundred pounds. Their only assurance was that their investment of land would not be forfeited. 49 With the peace that followed The Seven Years’ War (1754-63), 50 the province began to open up for settlement. In 1762, the Lawrencetown tract was once again surveyed and awarded to a group of proprietors, many the same as those of 1754, this time broken into lots of at least 300 acres, to as large as 1,200 acres. In May of that year a draw was carried out by the proprietors to allocate nineteen of the lots – the "first division" of Lawrence Town Township. Lots 5 and 6 were not included in the draw as improvements, presumably the

50 Most of the fighting between France and Britain in continental North America ended in 1760.
remains of the town site, had already been made to them by Benjamin Green Jr. “for himself and his brother Francis Green”. 51

**The Green Estate and the Resettlement of Chezzetcook**

Little other activity is known for the region during the latter part of the eighteenth century. In 1768, an unsuccessful petition to Government by five Lawrencetown proprietors sought an extension of the exemption from quit rents, stating the ten year anniversary date on which payments would begin should have started when it was safe to settle the region, in 1761, and not in 1757, when the proprietors were cleared of the terms of the first grant by complying to have the troops removed and the blockhouse dismantled (Trider 1999:184).

Benjamin Green Jr. married Susanna Wenman, daughter of Richard Wenman, a Halifax merchant who was also on the list of 1754 grantees, in 1773. Benjamin died in December 1793, and as part of a dower, Susanna apparently continued to live in an estate on the Lawrencetown lot until her death on April 12, 1841 Green 1773:84-85). 52 Their son Henry Green left descendants at Lawrencetown (Akins 1895:226). Figure 1-5 is a detail from an undated map from the Waverly-Preston-Lawrencetown Portfolio, available at the Nova Scotia Crown Land Information Management Centre, showing the property

---

of “Mrs. Green.” This property and the structure shown, appears to occupy the centre of the Acadian settlement and its successor, the Lawrence Town Township.

![Figure 1-5: Detail from “WPL11 Old Plan of Lots in Preston Township, North of Lake Loon”, showing Lawrencetown Road and the property (with house) of “Mrs. Green”. Note that the road appears on the west side of the house, when most other sources show it in its current position, to the east of the house.](image)

Survey documents regarding property boundary disputes between the Greens and their neighbours, also available in the Waverly-Preston-Lawrencetown Portfolio, give some insight into the lives of the settlers of Lawrencetown. One account dated Friday, April 12, 1824 states:

At the request of Joseph Green and by written order from Mrs. Green [I] attended at Lawrencetown to run the road lot where I arrived at 8 O’Clock in the morning, but the sea manure had come in on their shores for the first time since the last fall, and they were so much engaged about that they would not attend that day. Spent the day & night at the mansion house and on the morning of the thirteenth in
company with Joseph Green, Wm Stowel, James Murphy & John Monovan made the survey in part as follows.

Figure 1-5 indicates the road ran along the west side of the house, but most other plans indicate the opposite. The “mansion house” is the home of Benjamin Green Jr. and his widow. It appears on several nineteenth-century maps and was the site of archaeological testing described in chapter three.⁵³

Figure 1-6 is an undated map by A. W. Holmes showing land grants for what would become Grand Desert and the west side of Chezzetcook Harbour. The plan shows relatively large parcels of land for the west side of the harbour, but smaller parcels for the Grand Desert peninsula. These parcels were more valuable since they were cleared and inhabited during the earlier Acadian occupation period. The map also shows how the channel running along the eastern length of Grand Desert peninsula had, in this time, been dyked, enabling the pond to the west of the peninsula to be “brought to bear grass.”⁵⁴

---

⁵³ WPL11, n.d. CLIMC.
Other activity in the area during the early nineteenth century included an ambitious reclamation project proposed in 1832 for the marshes adjacent to the Green Estate. A group of signees petitioned to government for funds for the construction of an “aboiteau” to block the river and drain the marsh to the west of the Green Estate and for the construction of a tidal lock as part of the bridge from the Green Estate to McDonald Hill on the southeast of the Green property. This reclamation, according to the petition, would allow for better access to the fishery with a deepening of the harbour at high tide, better hay production off the drained marsh for “the poorer people in particular” and...
better overland communication with other communities to the east of Halifax. The petitioners included many citizens from the region with familiar names such as Green, Stowel, Porter, Conrad, Loyd, Sellar, Graham, and Gates. A number of signees from as far away as Chezzetcook were included in the petition including families such as “Bellfoughton”, “Pettepaw”, “Lappier” “Wolf” and “Rabishaw”. These English spelling of French names were entered by a clerk, as “these men [were] not able to write their names”. See Chapter 3, Figure 3-7 for the plan accompanying this petition.

Deed records for the property from 1891 discuss the transfer, to a party of buyers, of “all those lots of land, part of the real estate of the late Benjamin Green, situate at Lawrencetown, in said county of Halifax, which were lots of land allotted to Susan Green, his widow, as her dower” (Archibald to Conrod et al., 1891). The “Dower Farm”, approximately 311 acres in size, is again recorded in a deed from as recently as 1941 (Sullivan et al. to Conrad, 1941).

Ronald Labelle cites the genealogical work of Mgr. Frédéric Melanson, who identified several of the first families to re-inhabit the Chezzetcook area in the 1760s as coming from among the Acadian prisoners held in Halifax. Among them were the surnames Bellefontaine, Lapierre, and Wolfe, which can still be found in the area today. Some, as in the case of the Petitpas family, returned to Chezzetcook by way of Cape Breton (Labelle 1995:13-14). The evidence of the presence of these families is fragmentary but clear. A petition addressed to the Lieutenant Governor by Louis
Petitpas in 1780, for example, requested a license to cut salt marsh hay on the property of a Captain Allen on the east side of Chezzetcook Harbour,\textsuperscript{55} while a land grant from 1784 listed 32,000 acres within Halifax County, covering land from Lawrencetown to Chezzetcook, granted to Theophilus Chamberlain and 163 others, including John Bellfountaine.\textsuperscript{56}

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, the end of The War of Austrian Succession (1744-48) saw a shift in British foreign policy in northeast North America. Military conflicts during the war, including the French capture of Canso (1744), two unsuccessful assaults by the French on the fort at Annapolis Royal (1744), the New England capture (1745) of Louisbourg and its return to French control (1748) did little to resolve the larger issue of imperial control of the region, as evidenced by the construction of forts by the French and British on opposite banks of the Missaguash River (1750-1751).

Accompanying the founding of the military stronghold of Halifax in 1749, the British administration at last expanded their presence in the region with the placement of newly arrived immigrants, the construction of several additional forts and the founding of new settlements. This increased activity caused a change in attitude among the Acadian


population regarding their future under British rule, resulting in the emigration of hundreds of Acadians to the French-speaking and Catholic region of Île Saint-Jean and, in smaller numbers, to Île Royale (Harvey 1926:121-131; Johnston 1988:106). Through the movement of Acadians that had moved to Cape Breton and others who survived the Deportation as prisoners, re-occupation of the eastern shore had begun within a short span of years following the abandonment of the older settlements. Yet the historical evidence reviewed in this chapter, leaves no doubt as to the existence and even the prosperity of the original French settlements. The effort to locate and evaluate the dwellings of the earlier settlers through critical cartography, aerial photograph analysis, landscape archaeology, however, raises questions and challenges of its own that will be addressed in the next chapter.
Chapter Two

The 1752 Charles Morris Survey of the Eastern Shore of Nova Scotia

Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of current models of analysing colonialism and imperialism as they relate to the rationale for and content of the 1752 Charles Morris survey of the eastern shore, and the political climate at that time between the British, French, Acadian and Mi’kmaw communities. The Morris survey plan and accompanying description will be examined from the perspectives of critical cartography and landscape archaeology, including comparison with modern topographic maps and aerial photography. These techniques led to geophysical survey and archaeological testing during the summers of 2009-11, the results of which are discussed in the chapter to follow.

Colonialism and Imperialism Theory

Elizabeth Mancke’s (2005) approach to colonialism and imperialism theory advances the concept of “intersecting and competing spaces of power,” (p. 32) in that power was manifested in more than just political or military forms, and in more configurations than just a sphere emanating from a metropole. She submits that diversity of population is one of the distinguishing characteristics of Nova Scotia and that the standard colonial model of settlements with governments as the basis of new societies
does not fit the region. She argues against Brebner that Nova Scotia was not governed by a “Greater New England” paradigm (Brebner 1927:33). She writes that there were different claimants to different spheres of influence and that these areas were not necessarily focussed on a population centre. Reorganizing power in functional and spatial terms allows for differential analysis of the shift in balance between sources of power (Mancke 2005:33-34).

Mancke describes the small areas of influence occupied by Europeans in Acadia during the sixteenth, seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries as tiny pockets in an otherwise native environment, through which they were powerless to supplant native control:

Fur trading forts were small spaces of European presence, outposts of transatlantic merchant networks that depended on native goodwill and sufferance for their survival. Monarchs, ministers, and diplomats in Europe nevertheless attempted through charters to convert these commercial enclaves into colonial spaces of power with vast territorial pretentions that generally ignored native claims (Mancke 2005:37).

Sixteenth and seventeenth century fishing and trading enterprises, like that at Musquodoboit, may have engaged in temporary settlement and were initially guided by economic, rather than political or military goals. European settlements allowed access to fishing grounds and trade with the native population. Later, more permanent settlers of the Atlantic shore (descendants of first-generation French colonists) followed in the footsteps of these earlier merchants by seeking a way of life based on fishing and agriculture. Yet the Mi’kmaq were not farmers or labourers; they did not live in the
principal European settlements in the region and were only marginally incorporated into the European economy. A political layer was added to the region at the end of the seventeenth century with the establishment of the Seigneury of Muscoudabouet (1692) (Mancke 2005:41).

For the migrant French families of the late seventeenth century, moving to the Atlantic shore of Nova Scotia and choosing to subsist through and have greater dependence on the fishery represented the formation of an economic space of power, in contrast to that which had developed along the Fundy marshlands. The people in these small settlements had little or no title to their land, had little access to government for the settling of disputes and were seldom and incompletely included in population census records. Initial settlement outside the Port Royal region was facilitated, in part, by the temporary suspension of the seigneurial system after the 1654 English capture of Port Royal. The settlers were not colonists in that their few acres of cleared land and connection to the sea did not “legitimate more grandiose territorial ambitions” on the part of France (Mancke 2005:44). Their lands were marginal, much of it marshland reclaimed from the sea through dyking or directly harvested of its salt grass in the tidal zone. Politically, the territory was still a native one, with complementary fur trade activity. French land use through farming was largely outside native concern and there existed a mingling of cultures in the case of intermarriage and cohabitation.
If, when captured by the British thirty-nine years before, the newly named town of Annapolis Royal was considered “an English island in the midst of a sea of French and Mi'kmaq” (Moody 2004:128), in the intervening decades before the building of Halifax in 1749, that sea had roiled into a surge. Without the regular and detailed census records of the French regime, we are left with estimates made by British officials and French clergy, yet it seems clear that during the forty-year period following the conquest of Acadia the population of French-speaking inhabitants of Nova Scotia had essentially quintupled, from about two thousand five hundred to between thirteen and fifteen thousand people (Clark 1968:201). Through painstaking research, genealogist Stephen White has estimated the Acadian population at the time of the Deportation to have been between 13,738 and 14,468 (White 2005:56).

Estimates for the Native population of Acadia (encompassing its “ancient boundaries”, which included the Gaspé Peninsula and the portion of northern Maine extending to the Penobscot River) at the time of the conquest are around 4,500-5,000 (Reid et al. 2004:ix). From a variety of admittedly incomplete enumeration sources, William Wicken lists the Mi’kmaq population in settled villages as having increased from 842 in 1708 to 1,222 by 1735 (Wicken 1994:96). Abbé Gaulin’s 1721 census included 838 Mi’kmaq living in nine mainland communities, and one in Unimaki (Cape Breton). The mainland communities made up 87 percent of the total population. Six of the villages included in the census, totalling 543 people, were located on or south of the Shubenacadie River (Wicken 2002:31). By 1720, however, the Acadian population had
eclipsed that of the First Nations (Reid 2008:175). In 1748, a year before the founding of Halifax, the Fortress of Louisbourg was returned to French control by the terms of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, presenting once again, a dominant French military force on the Atlantic coast. The piteous fort at Annapolis contained the only British garrison in the territory.

Barry Moody (2004) attributes Britain’s lack of progress in settling the province in the post-conquest period to anti-Nova Scotian propaganda from New England, as well as to bureaucratic barriers and political lethargy in London (Moody 2004:128). The garrison in Annapolis Royal was chronically undermanned, and despite regular petitioning from a succession of provincial leaders, the fort was in a perpetual state of disrepair. Settlement outside the Annapolis region was further hampered by the existence of naval rights to un-surveyed woodland, surveys which the territorial government could not afford to conduct (Dunn 2004; Mancke 2005:45). The Privy Council also instituted a measure stipulating that lands within 200 yards of the coast would not be granted to prospective settlers, so as to ensure space for the drying of fish by New England fishermen (Wicken 2002:103).

With the new administration of Nova Scotia, the British faced the arduous situation of having dominion over a territory that contained already-established “foreign” European and native populations, who were connected culturally and economically to France and to each other. According to Moody, from very early in the British
administration of Nova Scotia there was a separation between British and Acadian society. During the first decades of British rule many Acadians withdrew from the Annapolis Royal area to the countryside (or out of the territory altogether), and no British residents purchased farmland outside the town itself. Additionally, after the first decade of the conquest, there were no intermarriages between French and British residents of Nova Scotia. Moody writes: “A complete geographic division evolved, drawing a line sharply between the two communities” (Moody 2004:130). The same can be said of the relationship between the British and Mi’kmaq. Despite several overtures on behalf of the native population, no formal agreement of peace was established with them until open conflict in the 1720s forced the issue. Terms of peace were not reached until after the founding of Halifax (Wicken 2002:109). Moody argues that had an integration of cultures taken place, with an influx of Protestant settlers in similar numbers to those settling in New England over this time span, the circumstances of the residents of Nova Scotia may have been quite different. Since this did not occur, the early bonds of community failed to emerge and the British carried a practice of segregation forward, up to and following the founding of Halifax. The French and Mi’kmaq were residents of the countryside, the British of the “urban” centre (Moody 2004:129-130).

Moody further argues that this separation of cultures and lack of development in Nova Scotia made it clear to the Acadians and Mi’kmaq that the British were in a position of military and governmental weakness, which contributed to the failure of the British to extract an unequivocal oath of allegiance from the Acadians during this period (Moody
The lack of defensive capabilities and fear of the Mi’kmaq also made New England fishing families reluctant to relocate closer to their annual fishing grounds on the Atlantic coast of Nova Scotia (Wicken 2002:104). Much of the economy would have also operated outside of official government sanction, as with trade between the Mi’kmaq, Acadians and the fortress at Louisbourg. While the British maintained nominal political control of the territory, they were essentially prisoners in their own fort. The region was geographically, socially, and even militarily Mi’kmaw and Acadian, and the predominant religion was Roman Catholicism. Power over religious, economic and cultural space resided in non-British hands.

**British Relations with the Acadians and Mi’kmaq**

Consideration for the assimilation of the Acadian population, through the introduction of English-speaking, Protestant settlers into Acadian villages, had been given, and a proposal for their deportation had been made early in the tenure of Governor Richard Philipps (1717-1749). The financial crisis of 1722 and intermittent hostility with the Mi’kmaq precipitated yet another shift in colonial relations with the Acadians, resulting in an oath of fidelity, making them exempt from military service and within a loosely defined category of British subject based on their Catholicism (Plank 2001:87-88). Geoffrey Plank (2001) portrays a much more interactive and fluctuating relationship between the British and the Acadians. Prudent Robichaud, Acadian resident of Annapolis Royal, was at one point punished for fraternizing with the Mi’kmaq and was later deputized and involved in British trade talks with them (Plank 2001:94). At least at
Annapolis Royal, by the 1730s, Plank argues, a “vibrant bilingual community had emerged” (Plank 2001:89), and “a sense of community had developed embracing both English-speakers and Acadians” (Plank 2001:100), with daily interactions between the Acadian and British populations. The level of freedom and control given to local Acadians extended even to administrative positions under whose jurisdiction British subjects were sometimes held. Plank writes that the British government categorized the Acadians based on where they lived. For residents of outlying areas, such as the residents of the St. John Valley, allegiance to Britain could not be pledged by the Acadians, nor even British rule of law observed, for fear of reprisal from native warriors, French trading partners, Catholic priests and even fellow Acadians loyal to France (Plank 2001:89).

During the period immediately following the conquest, the Mi’kmaq and Abenaki represented a serious military force, having killed a large number of British soldiers at Bloody Creek which led to an attack at the fort at Annapolis Royal. In June 1711, a timber cutting expedition up the Annapolis River, accompanied by 70 New England soldiers, was ambushed by a force of Abenaki and Mi’kmaq, led by Bernard-Anselme d’Abbadie de Saint-Castin and Abbe Antoine Gaulin, resulting in 16 British deaths before the natives forced a surrender (Faragher 2005:134). Bolstered by this victory, later that summer a besieging force of several hundred Mi’kmaq, Abenaki and Wolastoqiyyik, known as the Wabanaki Confederacy, blockaded the fort at Annapolis. The siege, which bore no artillery, was lifted in the fall when Governor Samuel Vetch arrived with 200 New England volunteers (Faragher 2005:135). The tiny British garrison hung on through
these lean years with smaller skirmishes occurring elsewhere, highlighted by the British-Abenaki War (also known as “Dummer’s War” after Massachusetts Lieutenant-Governor William Dummer) in the 1720s. Following the founding of Halifax, the Mi’kmaq attempted to maintain treaty rights established in the treaty of 1726 through a series of guerrilla-style attacks, until peace was reached with the treaties of the 1760s. The period of the 1750s and early 1760s was one where British and aboriginal pacification strategies competed, ending only with the increase in British population following the Loyalist migration of the 1780s (Reid 2008:174).

Provisions of the British-Mi’kmaq treaty of 1726 were interpreted differently by each signee. According to the Mi’kmaq, the treaty guaranteed that they would not be disturbed in their hunting and fishing activity, but, from the British perspective, they would be allowed to make “lawful” settlement in the territory. Thus, the Mi’kmaw considered the unilateral founding of Halifax (and later fortifications and communities) to have been established without their approval (Wicken 2002:169). The British strategy of pacification was to clear and cultivate lands adjoining military strongholds, while the Mi’kmaq used treaty rights which sought to limit colonial settlement. As Reid writes, “environmental destruction became a tool of empire” (Reid 2008:176).

The 1752 treaty negotiated between Halifax officials and Jean-Baptiste Cope, Mi’kmaw chief from Shubenacadie, included a clearer definition of the language used in
the 1726 treaty, which suggested payment for British acquisition of Mi’kmaq land and for the establishment of distinct British and Mi’kmaw territories within Nova Scotia. Living some 65 kilometres to the north and greatly dependant on the Shubenacadie River, with a portage route to the Dartmouth Lakes, this Mi’kmaw group would have been most affected by the founding of the new British town. Their yearly movement pattern would have consisted of spending winters inland, and in the spring travelling to coastal areas from Halifax to Musquodoboit (Wicken 2002:183). The founding of Lunenburg (1753) and Lawrencetown (1754) did not spark an immediate return to open warfare, but prompting by the French government and Abbé LeLoutre, would aggravate years of instability, with Britain attempting to seize legitimate control in the region through colonization, while the Mi’kmaq resorted to guerrilla-style warfare to stop them (Grenier 2008:166-170; Landry 2007:228-231; Wicken 2002:183; 188).

The fact that Morris’s survey, with its toponymic and geographic errors, represents the best information the British had of a region so close to Halifax, and that no detailed French maps exist, shows a lack of official concern for the area. This “cartographic confusion” shows the marginal place the eastern shore in particular and the territory in general, held in the political thoughts of the imperial powers up to this time (Mancke 2005:35). Yet like Morris’s earlier regional surveys (Lennox 2007:384), inclusion of this once French-occupied territory in the catalogue of British charts in some
ways validated Britain’s claims to the area and was a necessary precursor to physical claims through direct colonization.

Nova Scotia/Acadia, for much of the colonial period, did not exist as an integrated society, but as a series of overlapping spaces of power, with native spaces, not European, being the most powerful (Mancke 2005:47-48). It was not until the 1748 Parliamentary decision to fund the building of Halifax and subsidize the settling of foreign Protestants, the subsequent founding of the town of Dartmouth, the construction of Vieux Logis and Forts Sackville, Edward and Lawrence, and the settlement of Lunenburg and Lawrencetown that the power-shift began and the shift from nominal to actual control began to take place.

**Critical Cartography**

Both in the selectivity of their content and in their signs and styles of representation, maps are a way of conceiving, articulating, and structuring the human world which is biased toward, promoted by, and exerts influence upon particular sets of social relations. By accepting such premises it becomes easier to see how appropriate they are to manipulation by the powerful in society (Harley 1988:278).

Maps are more than mere two-dimensional depictions of three-dimensional space. They are physical representations of spaces of power, thereby granting them a political element. Through critical cartography, a more holistic understanding of colonialism can be gained. Critical cartography, a discipline that developed in the 1980s and 1990s, with works such as *The Power of Maps* (1992) by Denis Wood, examines how maps inscribe
power and support dominant political structures (Crampton 2006:15). The late Brian Harley introduced to the discipline the concepts of power and ideology and dissolved the false dichotomy of cartographic analysis as either: true or false, accurate or inaccurate, subjective or objective and literal or symbolic (Harley 2001). Cornell University historian Raymond Craib noted accurately that “maps are active, creative, and constitutive” and can be used “as sources and texts for re-examining issues of colonialism, imperialism, and state formation” (Craib 2000:12).

Jeffers Lennox’s formative 2007 article “An Empire on Paper: The Founding of Halifax and Conceptions of Imperial Space, 1744–55”, through critical analysis of maps from early Halifax, equips the reader with tools applicable to the analysis of other maps and the events surrounding them. Lennox discusses the push by Great Britain to expand its defences in Nova Scotia in the years following the founding of Halifax (1749-54), and the build-up to conflict with the French and Mi’kmaq. The article covers the construction of several British forts and proposed blockhouses and the associated requests for cartographic information by the Board of Trade. The establishment of Lunenburg (1753) and Lawrencetown (1754) offer additional evidence of the processes by which cartographic knowledge precedes colonization.

Lennox places the rationale behind the creation of maps of the fledgling town of Halifax within a colonial context, showing how they were “more than precise representations of physical space,” but were also “tools of empire that create knowledge
and power through their representative functions” and that critical cartography examines maps as “active, creative, and constitutive” texts or images that “are implicated in creating the reality that they presume to reveal” (Craib 2001:12; Lennox 2007:374). Research into this project’s study area provides an opportunity to apply critical cartography to the Morris survey plan and the Lawrencetown land grant map.

In critical cartography there is a distinction made between geographic knowledge, which pertains to the understanding of elements of the environment, from landforms and waterways to wildlife and vegetation, to human impact on that environment, and cartographic knowledge, which is the representation of geography and the value the mapmaker places on the various elements. Maps tell stories about the world. At once they are scientific and authoritative, just as they are a product of the cartographer’s ideals. As Lennox puts it – “maps and reports [in early modern Canada] negotiated a fine line between value-free geographic information and imperially favourable geographic imaginations” (Lennox 2007:373). Maps have economic, political and social power. A map may attempt to accurately portray the physical landforms within its boundaries, but the map maker or map reader may place his or her own bias on the content of that representation. Charles Morris’s map and survey of the eastern shore was a reconnaissance, a claim to territory and was an advertisement for the settlement of the area. It formed part of what Lennox calls “cartographic imperialism – the process by which maps delineate imperial possessions and lay claim to geographic areas” (Lennox 2007:401). It and the accompanying description detailed the natural resources and the
geographical assets of the region (geographic knowledge), while emphasizing the suitability and feasibility of British expansion in the area (cartographic knowledge). Areas chosen for settlement were those most easily defended, and most easily settled.

Forgotten in Morris’s depiction of the eastern shore was any notion that this land was part of Mi’kma’ki. What Lennox notes about Halifax can be related to the eastern shore in this period when he writes: “Morris and the other geographers demonstrate a British cartographic ambivalence towards Natives. When included on maps, Aboriginals were often controlled and suppressed in ways that were impossible in reality” (Lennox 2007:394). Early maps of Halifax did not accurately portray the reality on the ground with respect to the threat posed by the indigenous population, who harassed the fledgling population and hampered the development of the region for years afterward; “…despite what British maps presented: the British at Halifax inhabited a pale beyond which lay a geography dominated by Natives” (Lennox 2007:395). Mapmakers have the power to deny the presence of aboriginals through their inclusion or exclusion on maps, affecting the way the region was portrayed by the British. Morris’s plan excludes any mention of the Mi’kmaq, but in his description he is careful to comment on how the areas selected for possible settlement could be fortified for defence against them.

The political power of maps is illustrated by Morris through the exclusion of the Mi’kmaq from the map of the eastern shore. “The Enemy” is referred to in his accompanying description but no consideration of their rights of ownership is made, or
their having occupied the land for millennia. They are “dispossessed” or made silent by not being included on the map and a new space, recently vacated by the French, ripe for imperial expansion, is created (Lennox 2007:377-378). This was not Morris’s first effort as imperial place setter. In 1748 he was commissioned to survey the Fundy, Chignecto, and Minas regions for potential settlement of Protestants to help husband the existing French occupants under British dominion. In his “Brief Survey of Nova Scotia”, Morris did the same on a regional scale.57 A final note on reconnaissance mapping – “Spatial knowledge, from Morris to Shirley to Dunk, served two important purposes during this early reconnaissance phase: first, the land was measured and mapped; second, geographic information was presented in terms favourable to imperial expansion” (Lennox 2007:386-387). From here we move from the interpretive study of maps to the more empirical analysis of aerial photographs.

Aerial Photography

It has been suggested that aerial photography has revolutionized “the science of antiquities” even more than radiocarbon dating and “as vital a contribution to archaeological investigation as the invention of the telescope did to astronomy” (Deuel 1969:6). At the very least, the use of aerial photography in archaeological landscape analysis can be an important tool in understanding past land use and in remotely identifying potential archaeological features. Thus, it is highly complementary to the analysis of contemporary maps. This technique requires an examination of the size and

shape of the subject matter, as well as using the shadows, tone and texture of the objects portrayed in the photograph. Comparison of known objects within a photograph with potential features can give an indication of their size. Man-made features tend to have straight or smoothly curved lines compared with the more irregular shape of natural features. Shadows can give important identifying clues by the familiar profiles they project as well as giving information on the dimensions of objects. A fence line, for example, might not be readily perceptible in a vertical image were it not for the shadow it casts. Relative lengths of shadows also indicate the height (or depth) of a given feature. When examining black and white photography, colour is represented through shades of grey. Colour can also be affected by the texture of the subject matter, with the surface of a ploughed field reflecting light differently than a smooth paved road. The surface of water can vary from black to white from one image to the next depending on the angle of the reflected sunlight. Historic aerial photographs can give tantalizing evidence of archaeological features that, sadly, may have already been destroyed due to subsequent development, but also may show features that are no longer visible, but which have not been disturbed. They can also reveal changes to the landscape over the years, such as obvious building construction, but also evidence of coastal erosion or accretion, or the realignment of a road (Kipfer 2007:244-246). Aerial photography allows the best appreciation of the ground surface and its features. It aids in the perception of patterns and the relationship of one feature to another. An observer on the ground may be too close or observing a feature, especially those revealed by crop or soil marks, at an angle which prevents its appreciation. Subtle earthworks may be difficult to trace on the
ground and may take the overall view of an aerial photograph to make them discernable (Wilson 1982:16-17).

Aerial photographs of portions of the study area from 1945, 1954, 1974, 1982, 1992, 2003 and 2009 were reviewed as part of the landscape analysis. Photographs from 1933 were also available for Grand Desert and West Chezzetcook. Digital scans of the photographs were obtained with permission from the Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources aerial photograph library, Founders Square, Halifax (See Appendix B for a complete list of photographs examined as part of this research). Photographs were examined for history of development, coastal change, change in ground cover, and indications of possible archaeological features through discolourations or shapes in the ground surface.

Photographs from 1945 of the Lawrencetown properties show a long driveway leading to the house near the end of the property, now belonging to Nancy Smithers. The length and route of the driveway alone might suggest past use. The small bright feature, indicated by a red arrow in Figure 2-1, may be evidence of remnants of the Green Estate mansion house, and the site of brick foundations or a chimney base encountered during house construction in the 1970s. Between 1945 and 2003 a home at 3930 and 3940 Lawrencetown Road were built, the home at 3950 Lawrencetown Road was expanded. The property shows a number of narrow ploughed plots and fence lines that have fallen into disuse. The properties have been manicured and several outbuildings, including a
detached two-vehicle garage at 3940 Lawrencetown Road, have been built over time. Lawrencetown Road itself was significantly straightened disturbing the ground as it was shifted to the west. The sites that were eventually tested in Lawrencetown were not immediately identified through initial aerial photograph analysis, however, at the location of the BdCu-8 tests, two small lighter coloured areas (yellow arrow), separated by a fence or field line, exist, which might be an indication of parched grass caused by a lack of moisture in soil thinly covering buried stone and brick. Little evidence of the feature is visible in the 2003 image.

Figure 2-1: Detail of aerial photographs of Lawrencetown properties from 1945 (left, photo number A8781-55) and 2003 (right, photo number 03324-13). A soil mark near the bend in the driveway, indicated by a red arrow, may be the remains of the Green mansion house. The house of the Conrads’, built in 1979 (red circle), was built near that location. The location of 2010-11 testing at 3950 Lawrencetown Road, visible as a lightened area of ground cover, is indicated by a yellow arrow.
Photographs of Grand Desert from the 1930s to the 1950s show a small, relatively dense cluster of homes and outbuildings centred at the current intersection of Range and Dyke Roads, the approximate location of the former French settlement, with cleared fields demarked by visible property boundaries (Figure 2-2). Over time the number of buildings has decreased as the area has become less agricultural. The 1933 photo shows a number of mottled discolourations among the cluster of buildings which may constitute archaeological features, but they are difficult to differentiate from modern disturbances such as gardens. One area, indicated by a red arrow, contains a roughly square series of lines that might indicate a past structure or area of activity. Fields once farmed or used as pasture have become overgrown with dense brush and softwood trees, including at the core of the community. Range Road has grown from a path in the early part of the twentieth century to a graded gravel road.
Figure 2-2: Detail of aerial photographs of Grand Desert from 1933 (top, A4630-34) and 2003 (bottom, 03306-1-3) showing the change in distribution of buildings as well as land cover change, including significant forest cover regrowth.
**The Morris Survey**

Included in the orders issued to Edward Cornwallis following the founding of Halifax were instructions to lay out townships as security against “enemies”, the French and native populations, encompassing as well the Acadian settlements, so they could be brought under the jurisdiction of the townships. It was hoped that the planned influx of Protestant settlers would soon outnumber the Acadians (Reid 2008:177). With that intent, Chief Surveyor Charles Morris was commissioned by Governor Peregrine Hopson to survey the coast due east of Halifax, from the “Town of Dartmouth round the Sea Coasts to a French deserted Settlement called Shillencooke”. The original hope for the recently-arrived “Foreign Protestant” colonists in Halifax was to settle them among or in communities near the existing French Catholic and Mi’kmaq population to facilitate eventual conversion to Protestantism, thereby spurring the transformation of the existing population into what would be considered proper British subjects (Clark 1969:339).

Facing the military reality in the region, with the standoff between the British and the French at the Isthmus of Chignecto, Mi’kmaq warriors taking up arms against British settlements on the Atlantic coast, and fearful for the safety or subversion of the Foreign Protestants, Hopson decided against this plan, and instead commissioned the coastal survey to provide information in preparation for the eventual placement of the settlers closer to the security of Halifax (Plank 2001:122-23).

---

58 NSA CO 217/13 MM# 13845 pgs. 299-303.
Just one week after Hopson assumed his duties as Governor, he informed the Council of the instructions he had been given regarding the placement of the foreign Protestants. It was decided that any decision on their placement should wait until after “the Surveyor (Morris) could repair to a place to the Eastward of the Harbour of Halifax called Musquodoboit and make report” (Minutes of Council, 10 August, 1752). It is not surprising that this area was targeted for a reconnaissance survey. The earlier existence of French communities along this portion of the shore was well known to the British and, from the tone of the survey, it appears likely that the desertion of the communities was known as well. The balancing of the colonial expansion efforts of the British following the founding of Halifax, with the very real need to consolidate their limited numbers in a defensible position, made the proximate and vacated French communities very appealing resources. It meant cleared land, proven to be capable of sustaining livestock and of providing for at least a modest human population, making these areas good candidates for early expansion along the shore. The survey was designed to gather information on the geography of the coast of which the British seemed to have little accurate detail, the extent of the cleared land, its defensive potential and its capacity to foster livestock, the suitability of its harbours and the resources of the upland country. Facing the prospect of establishing satellite communities outside of Halifax was the very real threat of indigenous attack. The presence of the fortified town of Halifax was not enough to prevent the attack on the town of Dartmouth by Mi’kmaw warriors on May 13th, 1751 (Landry 2007:229). Between the settling of Halifax and the completion of the Morris survey there were no fewer than a half-dozen recorded incidents of Mi’kmaw attack on
British subjects, including three attacks on Dartmouth and two against the Halifax peninsular blockhouses (Landry 2007:229-230). This appears to have been foremost in Morris’s mind as he compiled his description. Thus, in October of 1752 Morris recorded a description of the coast and harbours from Dartmouth to Chezzetcook with their associated shoals and salt marshes, indicating their suitability for settlement and/or fortification. Also identified among what he considered the highest potential locations for settlement were the remains of several recently abandoned French settlements.

**The Morris Plans**

The description is accompanied by a plan (Figure 2-3) found at the British National Archives\(^59\) (in fact there are a couple of versions) which illustrates most of the parcels of cleared and cultivated land, structures (including a proposed town), and salt marshes mentioned in the description. The plan is a rather simple representation of the eastern shore, concerned only with coastal features, and shows no inland detail. The interior, with its many lakes and rivers is not detailed on the map, but is simply referred to as “Inland Country”. This suits the map’s purpose as an accompaniment to a coastal survey, for private use by imperial officials in Nova Scotia, and not for wider publication. It also communicates the irrelevance of any aboriginal inhabitants of this “space” and signals its readiness to be remade through British-sponsored colonization.

\(^{59}\) National Archives C.O. 700 Nova Scotia 21. The card catalogue listing for the survey description at the Nova Scotia Archives indicates that their copy of the plan has been missing since the mid-eighties.
Figure 2-3: ‘Chart of part of the Bay of Muscadoboit,’ MS. About 1¾ inches to 1 mile.” National Archives CO 700 Nova Scotia 21. By C. Morris, Chief Surveyor, 1752.
Figure 2-4 is a detail of the National Topographic System (NTS) topographic map showing the eastern shore from Cow Bay in the west to Chezzetcook Inlet in the east (1988). The red rectangle indicates the approximate portion and orientation of shoreline covered by the Morris plan, which includes the modern communities of Cow Bay, Cole Harbour, West Lawrencetown, Lawrencetown, Lloy, Three Fathom Harbour, Seaforth, West Chezzetcook and Grand Desert.

Figure 2-4: Extract of NTS (1988) 1:50,000 Topographic Map 11D11 West Chezzetcook, 1988. Red box indicating approximate portion of the coast included in the 1752 Morris survey plan.
The Morris plan misrepresents a number of prominent features in the region such as Porter’s Lake. The discrepancy between the historic and modern placement of Musquodoboit and other place names, as discussed in the previous chapter, is a carry-over from earlier maps, suggesting that the British had little or no firsthand knowledge of the topography of this part of the territory at this time. Following a naming convention that endured from early French cartographers\(^60\), Morris, in several of his maps in the period, uses the respective names Musquodoboit and Jeddore in the modern locations of Cole Harbour/Lawrencetown and Three Fathom Harbour, and not at their modern locations east of Petpeswick Inlet. \(^61\) Dating to the earlier French period, the place name Musquodoboit (with various spellings) referred not only to the modern harbour, river and community, but to the portion of the shore designated by the seigneurial grant.

In his description, Morris identifies Halifax Harbour as Chebucto Bay and McNab’s Island by its earlier name of Cornwallis Island. When he mentions Musquodoboit, Morris is referring to the part of the shore that now encompasses Cole Harbour and Lawrencetown. The island he identifies as Little Jeddore is modern day Shut-In Island, at the entrance of Three Fathom Harbour. “Shillencooke” or

---

\(^60\) Nicolas Bellin, 1744, NSA F/202-1744.

\(^61\) These maps include: “A Draught of part of the Sea Coast of Nova Scotia from Port Senior to Shillingcook, taken by order of the Governor-in-Chief of the said Province in 1751 and 1752”. [By Charles Morris.] MS. 3 miles to 1 inch. CO 700 Nova Scotia22; “Nova Scotia. Chart of the Coast and part of the Bay of Fundy. [By Charles Morris, 1752.] MS. 3 miles to 1 inch”, CO 700 Nova Scotia23; “A Plan of a tract of land granted by the Hon. Charles Lawrence, Esq., Commander-in-Chief of H.M.’s Province of Nova Scotia, to John Barker, William Drake Spike, and others, situate to the eastward of Dartmouth, to be called Lawrence Town, containing in the whole twenty thousand acres”. [By Charles Morris.] MS. About 1\(\frac{3}{4}\) inches to 1 mile. CO 700 Nova Scotia27; “Part of the Sea Coast of Nova Scotia and the Bay of Fundy”. [By Charles Morris.] MS. 3 miles to 1 inch. CO 700 Nova Scotia31.
“Shillingcook” are older spellings of Chezzetcook and the abandoned French settlement he describes there is in the modern community of Grand Desert, a drumlin peninsula south of West Chezzetcook.

There are other errors and/or omissions in Morris’s representation of the coast including, at the modern communities of Lloy and Three Fathom Harbour, the connection by water of West (Halifax) Marsh and Lawrencetown Lake with Cole Harbour and the shortening of Porter’s Lake. Also omitted are the islands of Halifax (Chebucto) Harbour, including Devil’s Island at the eastern entrance to the harbour. Yet, Morris’s survey remains the most detailed eighteenth century map of this part of the coast and the frame Morris imposed on the landscape delineates the study area for this project. The map uses a scale of one mile to an inch. The legend, or “Explanation of the Colours”, in the lower right of the map, tells us that:

The Red is to distinguish the borders of the shore on the land side; the Lighter Green is to distinguish the sea bounds on the shore; the Darker Green with spotts is to distinguish those lands which are salt marshes; the Yellow is to distinguish that part of the shoals which are either dry at low water or have but small depth of water; the Blue is to distinguish fresh water lakes from the sea. (punctuation added)

The colours as they appear on the digital scan of the map from the National Archives do not correspond with those listed. Either they have faded or been altered over time or the scanned colours are not true to the original. There is no red, green or yellow visible and the once green salt marshes now appear blue. All others colours have apparently faded to

---
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a shade of grey or brown. Depth soundings are recorded in fathoms (a fathom equals six feet) in deeper waters and in feet in the shallows. The map is decorated with three 16-point compass roses indicating north at the top. It is dated in the lower left as having been received on November 30th, 1752 “with Governor Hopson’s Letter dated October 16th”. The same reference and date appears on the written description (Morris 1752). 63

The Morris Description

A comparative landscape analysis of Morris’s survey with modern geography and mapping can provide valuable insight into the location of eighteenth-century habitation and areas of high archaeological potential. In this section, the description accompanying Morris’s 1752 survey is compared with his plan and a modern topographic map to identify features and landmarks used in the site selection process for fieldwork conducted as part of this thesis in the summers of 2009-11. The description follows the plan from left to right (west to east).

The Morris report begins with a brief description of the east side of Halifax Harbour:

From the Town of Dartmouth thro’ the Southeast passage of Chebucto to the Easternmost point of the said Bay is Seven miles 2/3, and from thence to the Inner Harbour of Muscodoboit, to the most Westerly Head of the said Harbour is Seven miles by several courses, according to the plan, at the Head where of is a fresh Water Brooke issuing out

63 NSA CO 217/13 MM# 13845 pgs. 299-303.
Morris described the distance from the town of Dartmouth to the easternmost point of Halifax Harbour (through the southeast passage) to be 7 ⅔ miles (12.3 km). The “eastern point of Chebucto” as indicated on the map (Figure 2-5) is Hartlen Point. Also shown is Cow Bay, Cow Bay Beach and Cow Bay Lake, which is listed as a “Fresh Water Lake”. Modern Cole Harbour is labelled “The Inner Harbour of Muscodoboit”. The Town of Dartmouth, itself practically abandoned at this time, would have been a small settlement in 1752, centred at Dartmouth Cove. From there, the distance to the inner harbour of Muscodoboit (Cole Harbour) is another 7 miles (11.3 km). He describes the westerly head (the head of the harbour being the farthest point inland, as opposed to the point of the harbour which is its mouth or most seaward point) as having a freshwater brook which can be seen in the plan. This brook, at the western head of the harbour, is a significant navigation point as it appears on the CO 700 series of Morris maps mentioned above and is used to form the western edge of the 1754 Lawrencetown land grant. Today it forms part of the boundary between the Federal Electoral Ridings of Dartmouth and Cole Harbour. On Figure 2-6, it is the unnamed brook which runs south from Broom Lake in Cole Harbour. From this point, heading overland back to the northwest at 82º for 5 miles (8 km) would lead back to Dartmouth. Also drawn on the map is a “Proposed Road (from Dartmouth) to the Abandoned French Settlement at Muscodoboit”. This road

64 NSA CO 217/13 MM# 13845 pgs. 299-303.
65 Charles Morris, “Plan of a Tract of Land granted by the Honourable Charles Lawrence Esquire… now to be called Lawrencetown…”, 1754. National Archives, C.O. 700, Nova Scotia no. 27.
was eventually cut by 200 troops and rangers of Lacelle’s Regiment accompanying the initial settlers of Lawrencetown follows closely the route of modern Cole Harbour Road/Marine Drive (Highway 207).

Figure 2-5: Detail of Morris plan showing east side of Halifax (Chebucto) Harbour to Cole (Muscodoboit) Harbour.⁶⁶

⁶⁶ NA CO 700 Nova Scotia 21.
Figure 2-6: NTS (1988) Map 11D11 – Eastern Passage to Cole Harbour.
Morris’s next entry commented briefly on the area comprising Dartmouth and Eastern Passage:

All this Coast & Country is covered with Woods and dont in any part appear to have been Cultivated by the Native Indians or French, except a small point opposite to Cornwallis [McNabb’s] Island, now the right of Mr [Richard] Bulkeley, nor is there any Quantity of Natural Marshes, except Two Small pieces of Salt Marsh, one Containing about five Acres, on the South Side of the said Eastern Point, the other containing about Fifteen Acres, on the Northeastern part of the said point.67

Despite a few historical mentions of French activity and known Mi’kmaw occupation of Halifax Harbour and surrounding area, Morris commented on how this part of the shore has not been much “improved”, or cultivated, with one exception, indicating some possible habitation nearby or that the shore was used for processing and drying fish. To British eyes, this lack of claim to improved land on the part of the Mi’kmaq within Chebucto Harbour was important in the establishment of Halifax. Though the plan does not include McNab’s or Lawlor Islands, making the area mentioned difficult to determine, two 1752 listings for land granted to provincial secretary, Richard Bulkeley, exist on the east side of Halifax Harbour, of 200 and 219 acres.68 No map accompanied the grant listing but the Crown Land Index (Sheet 66) shows a 200 acre parcel of land in Eastern Passage, opposite McNabb’s Island (Figure 2-7).69 The access to such choice land in the early years of Halifax’s existence by a member of the elite is noteworthy. Richard Bulkeley, Secretary to the Governor, is later one of the twenty Lawrencetown grantees.

67 NSA CO 217/13, p. 299-303.
The salt marsh acreage, five acres on the southeast side of Hartlen Point and 15 acres on the northeast side, can be seen on the plan in blue.  

![Map Image]

Figure 2-7: Detail of Crown Land Index Sheet 66 showing 200 acre land grant to Richard Bulkeley in Eastern Passage, opposite McNabb’s Island.

Morris next described Cole Harbour, known to him as Musquodoboit:

The Inner Harbour of Muscodoboit is Shoal, at low Water the Sands appear dry almost all over it, There are two small Channells, the one running from the Entrance towards the North West on the Western Shore up to the Brook above mentioned & the other running from the said Entrance first Northeast & then to the North and North West. These Channells have From nine feet Water to about five, but are Extream narrow not being one Hundred feet over.

---

70 The frequent use of the word “said” in eighteenth century writing, in this case as a reference to an earlier mentioned geographic feature, can sometimes be confusing to the reader. Although Morris had just mentioned the “small point” opposite Cornwallis Island that had been granted to Bulkeley, the “said Eastern Point” he describes as having two pieces of salt marsh is the eastern point of Chebucto (Hartlen Point) mentioned at the beginning of the description, indicated in blue on the plan, and is not the Bulkeley property.

There is no appearance in this Harbour of any Lands which have been under Cultivation, there is a Salt Marsh on the East side of the Entrance of this Harbour which contains about Twenty five Acres.\textsuperscript{72}

A comparison of the Morris depiction with a modern map of Cole Harbour (Figure 2-8) confirms the existence of two channels which converge at the harbour entrance, one running to the northwest on the western side of the harbour and the other running roughly northeast and winding its way through the eastern portion of the bay. The harbour and surroundings, not having much potential for settlement in Morris’s estimation, are only given a brief mention. The narrow north-south running piece of salt marsh is indicated on the plan in blue, the southern end of which roughly corresponds with the northern end of Tanner Avenue in Lawrencetown. Modern aerial photography shows only the northern section of this marsh as being above water.

\textsuperscript{72} NSA CO 217/13, p. 299-303.
Figure 2-8: Detail from Morris plan showing Cole Harbour and the French settlement at “Musquodoboit” (Lawrencetown) (top)\textsuperscript{73}, Detail of NTS (1988) 11D11 showing Cole Harbour and Lawrencetown (bottom).
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Morris commented at greater length on the next inlet to the east, directing the reader’s attention to the location of an abandoned French Settlement at what is now Lawrencetown, still referring to the area as Muscodoboit. He then described the settlement and Lawrencetown Harbour more closely:

From the mouth of the above described Harbour to the French Settlement at Muscodoboit the Course is S.E.B.S. [southeast by south] three miles [4.8 km]. From the Easternmost point of the Harbour of Chebucto to the said Settlement is Six miles and 2/3 of a mile [10.7 km], & the said Settlement is distant from Halifax by Water Fourteen miles and 2/3 of a mile [23.6 km] by Water, From the Town of Dartmouth over Land five mile to the Inner Harbour of Muscodoboit and round the said Harbour to the said Settlement is about Seven mile [11.3 km].

The Harbour to this Settlement is but indifferent it being rather a Salt Water River or Creek, which is Shoal at its entrance, not having above Ten feet & gradually decreasing to Six feet, till you come to the Land on which the French had their Dwelling Houses, therefore it will not be safe for any other Vessels to use this Harbour than small craft, such as small Schooners, Sighters, & Boats, whose draught of Water does not exceed Six feet, the Channell being very narrow at Low Water & the Tide flowing at Common Tides not above Six feet on this Coast.

It lays open to the Winds that blow from the West round South to the Southeast, which Winds when they blow hard heave a large Swell on this Shoar, at which time (as I am informed by the people now making Hay here) the Sea makes a Breach quite across the Harbour.

The Creek divides into two Branches, One running to the Westward, the other Running to the Northeastward of the said Settlement but are Shoal being almost dry at Low Water & in some places fordable.\(^74\)

The shallowness of the harbour may have suited members of the French community well, if they were conducting a local inshore fishery. It is possible that a sloop or other small vessel could have been brought up to the point of land the French had built upon (Figure

\(^74\) NSA CO 217/13, p. 299-303.
This type of harbour would not have allowed for the presence of a full-sized military vessel to position itself in the harbour, however. The movement of people and provisions would be much more difficult, hence the proposed road to the settlement. The river running to the west is that which flows north of Fox Island and into West Marsh. The hay harvested from the marsh, which still produces today, would have been the most important economic resource in the area and compensated for the other deficiencies in the area. This importance is evidenced by the people gathering hay there. The river to the east is connected to Lawrencetown Lake. The high point of land in between the two contained the abandoned French settlement. There does not appear to be any dyking of the salt marsh. Interestingly, by the time of Morris’s visit, there were already British settlers from elsewhere visiting to cut hay on the estimated thirty acres of salt marsh and cleared land left untended by the French. It is possible that they had sailed from Halifax or Dartmouth to take advantage of whatever cleared land they could in the mostly forested region. As far as can be determined, these farmers were not troubled by harassment from the Mi’kmaq. Perhaps they were staying in the buildings that were recorded as still standing in the settlement. This reuse may have left its own archaeological footprint.

Morris next gives us specifics regarding the abandoned French Settlement at what is now Lawrencetown, still referring to the area as Muscodoboit:

The Land where the Inhabitants had their Dwelling Houses is a piece of Land elevated about Fifty feet above high Water marke & Commands a prospect of the Sea and all the adjacent cleared Lands and Marshes has about Thirty Acres clear’d mostly covered with Fine
English Grass, has a gradual Descent from the Center toward the Two rivers & Marshes described in the plan, & gradually rising into the Country North. 

Figure 2-9: Detail of Morris plan showing “French Settlement Muscadoboit” and areas of “upland in grass” (top), Detail of NTS (1988) 11D11 showing West Marsh Conrad Road, West Lawrencetown Road, Fox Island (bottom).

75 NSA CO 217/13, p. 299-303.
The centre of the French settlement was the dry land peninsula at the fork of the salt water river which divides West Marsh and Lawrencetown Lake. The present civic addresses of the property are 3930 to 3950 Lawrencetown Road (Highway 207). Cleared of trees, the property affords a view as far as Cow Bay to the west and McDonald Hill, portions of Lawrencetown Beach and Leslie Road to the east. The property has a plateau of approximately 70m east-west by 250m north-south before sloping to the east and west to the marshes on either side. The total width (east-west) of the peninsula is approximately 220m. Assuming that Morris’s 30 acres of cleared land started at the southern end of this point, the clearing would have extended approximately 550m to the north, whereby 30 acres equals approximately 121,406m².

Despite the shortcomings of its harbour, Morris recognized the site as a candidate for future settlement and described the logistics of establishing a fortified town there:

It is so scituated, that if a Settlement Should be concluded to be made there it may be so Fortified, that the Inhabitants may Defend themselves against the Incursion of the Indians, because a line of about Seven hundred feet [213.3m] will extend from Water to Water which will enclose the Town designed on the plan, the other parts being surrounded with Water and a morass, & therefore no Danger would arise to them from the Enemy, unless, as the Winters in this Country are Subject to great Frosts, which by Freasing the Rivers & Morass will make them passable, it would be prudent in the Inhabitants to fence those side of their Lots which lay next the Water & morass with high pickets, and breast Works before their Streets, and that advantage might be rendred useless to the Enemy and the whole Town would be Inclosed tho’ it is not likely the Enemy would ever attack them [on] those sides, as they must march above [a] mile in an open plain, before they could come[...]77

---
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The political and military climate would have necessitated the fortification of any settlement in the area due to the very real fear of attack by local Mi’kmaq. As he indicates on the plan, Morris offers that the construction of a palisade wall 700 feet wide, including a number of bastions, would extend across the peninsula and help protect settlers against a landward attack by the Mi’kmaq.

A stamp of British imperialism on the land was the imposition of the gridded street and block format of the British town. As with Halifax and later Lunenburg, Morris assumes that, if the former French settlement were to be converted into a British one, that it would follow the grid structure promoted by George Montagu-Dunk, 2nd Earl of Halifax, and the city’s namesake. Annapolis Royal, captured from the French, has a more organic layout with its streets following the adjacent rivers with lots near the water, facilitating communication and access to water promoted under the seigneurial system (Lennox 2007:385). With the survey of the eastern shore, Morris was following Dunk’s mandate “that a survey be now likewise made of their [the French] lands now under actual improvement, specifying the numbers of acres cultivated by each particular person”.

Part of Dunk’s plan was to introduce gridded townships adjacent to and extending onto lands already occupied by French settlers as a measure to begin controlling their land transactions and to enforce British imperial and military rule (Lennox 2007:386). In this reconnaissance, Morris is, in essence, laying claim to these lands in the name of Britain, and since these lands were vacated, they were free for the

---

taking. Underlying the detail of the description, the land was being mapped and recorded, and was being presented in a manner favourable to British expansion.

Another advantage this area possessed lay in its salt marshes and acreage of cleared land surrounding the former settlement:

To the southeast of this Settlement is a large Salt marsh extending one mile & a half in length & Contains about two Hundred Acres of Lands which may be mowed on the said marsh to the South, & next the Sea is a Piece of upland containing about Eighty Acres, the greatest part of which is cleared & brought to English Grass; the Southeast end of the marsh is joined to two large Tracts of Upland the Southernmost has about Thirty Acres, & the Easternmost has about Fifty Acres cleared and in English Grass these are the Cleared Lands which lay to the Southeast of the sd French Settlement.\(^79\)

Southeast of the point of land is Lawrencetown Beach, north of which is Lawrencetown Lake. The southern end of the lake matches the large 200 acre marsh described and depicted in blue on Morris’s plan (Figure 2-10). A number of islands still exist in that part of the lake, though much of the described marsh is now below water, consumed by sea level rise and coastal erosion. The 80 acre (32.4 Hectare) area of upland described as being next to the sea corresponds to McDonald Hill, home of McDonald House. It is a grassy hill that, based on aerial photograph analysis, may be naturally devoid of forestation.

Two other pieces of upland are described as being adjacent to the Lawrencetown Lake/marsh, the easternmost of 30 acres and the southernmost of 50 acres. Though the

\(^{79}\) NSA CO 217/13, p. 299-303.
directional descriptors are confusing, these two pieces depicted on the plan correspond to
the two hills on the north and south side of the cove of Porter’s Lake known as the
community of Lloy. The northern piece of upland on the plan has two structures
indicated which suggest French habitation. It is now identified as Smelt Hill and is the
location of a recently developed subdivision. The southern piece of upland is the grassy
hill immediately west of Terminal Beach and may also be naturally treeless.

Morris next described suitable farmland to the west of the settlement:

To the West of the said Settlement is another large Salt marsh
about one mile in length & contains about one Hundred and Twenty
Acres, to the West of which is another piece of cleared upland in
English Grass Containing about Twenty Acres and a House Still
remaining.

Besides these there are Several other pieces of Salt marsh from
whence a consider-able Quantity of Salt Hay may be taken.

The whole of the Cleared Lands in English Grass with the Salt
marshes may Yeild Hay Sufficient for three Hundred head of neat
Cattle, besides a Considerable number of Sheep, provided it may be
managed with good Husbandry.  

The plan depicts the now forested Fox Island as a salt marsh and the small marsh
immediately to the west of the Lawrencetown study properties as a “morass” – a tract of
low, soft, wet ground. This tract of land is, at present, quite marshy, with a small island
at its centre. West Marsh is depicted as being part of the river westward of the French
settlement.

---
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Figure 2-10: Detail of Morris plan showing salt marshes and cleared upland southeast of the abandoned French settlement (top)\textsuperscript{81}, Detail of NTS (1988) 11D11 showing Lawrencetown, McDonald Hill, Lloy, Smelt Hill, Lawrencetown Beach (bottom).
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The piece of upland described as containing a house to the west of the marsh is in West Lawrencetown. Morris indicates the presence of a structure on the plan. Examination of aerial photography gives some indication of possible anomalies in the soil on that property which may indicate the remains of former structures. A future research goal includes archaeological investigation of that property. Food and income for the proposed settlement would come in the raising of cattle and sheep fed from the hay of the salt marsh and cleared uplands. With the ability potentially to support several hundred head of livestock, this community, and others along the coast, would have traded surplus hay which would have formed an important part of the region’s economy.

Information on building materials for the area that would eventually become Lawrencetown is provided next, along with clues regarding another abandoned settlement nearby:

**Materials for Building**

There are large Number of Picketts which Grow on the Upland adjoining within Two Hundred Yards of the place markt for a Settlement, and on two Islands on thee Southermost marsh and indeed on almost every piece of Upland Surrounding it, the[re] is also Large Timber such as Beach, Birch, Hemlocke, Spruce ect. With which the Country about is covered; there is also Wood for fireing within three Hundred Yards of the Designed Town, for Covering their Buildings; there are large Quantities of Sedge which make the best Thache. For Chimneys, the Uplands are stoney, [and] cannot fail of affording a Sufficient Quantity for that use and for Cellars, there is at present the stones of two Chimneys laying on the Ground, where the Houses were burnt down There are at present two Barns about Twenty Feet Square each, built of logs with Thackt Roofs from one of which at a Small distance is Spring of Good Water.\(^2\)

\(^2\) NSA CO 217/13, p. 299-303.
‘Picketts’ refers to trees of a size appropriate for the construction of a stockade. Morris explains that materials for the construction and defence of the proposed town are accessible within a short distance. Considering the threat posed by the native population, in addition to the ease of transporting construction materials, firewood, stone for chimneys and cellars and thatch, working within proximity of the protection of a settlement was highly desirable. A clue to the events surrounding the abandonment of the French settlement is revealed in stones from the collapsed chimneys of two burnt houses lying ready for reuse. Two log barns, twenty feet to a side, one near a spring, remained standing. The two structures indicated on the plan, south of the proposed palisade wall, may be these two standing barns. While not conclusive, this evidence may suggest that the removal of these colonists – as with those of Beaubassin in 1750 – had not been voluntary (Plank 2001:130). Much of the village of Beaubassin had been burned by the Mi’kmaq during the first British landing at Chignecto in April of that year, on orders of Abbé LeLoutre, forcing the Acadian inhabitants to the north of the Missaquash River. When the British returned in September they were met with resistance from LeLoutre’s force of Mi’kmaq and Acadians who burned the remainder of the former village. The British then erected a pre-fabricated blockhouse and soldiers’ barracks within the remains (Grenier 2008:155-161).

Moving on from the proposed Lawrencetown Site, Morris examined the next section of coast to the east:

The number of Islands & Peninsula which lay Southeastward from this Settlem[ent] The one is, & the other being in a mann[er] almost,
surrounded by Water may be of great Advantage, because they will be less exposed, to the Indians than the main Continent, where a small party may Surprise a few people, Scattered at their Labour, and secure their [sic]. These Island & peninsula may contain about Fifteen Hundred Acres of Upland, and from What appears by that which is already cultivated is of an Excellent Soil.

On the Northeast side of One of these peninsula’s has been a French Settlement and has about Twenty Acres of cleared Land.  

This stretch of land includes the points and peninsulas that make up Terminal Beach, Three Fathom Harbour and Lower Three Fathom Harbour (Figure 2-11). Morris depicts Lower Three Fathom Harbour as an island within a shortened Porter’s Lake which he argues would provide protection for working settlers against surprise attack by Mi’kmaq. Previous Mi’kmaq attacks at Halifax – on the north peninsular blockhouse in 1750 and on a hunting party in 1751 (Landry 2007) – had involved small groups attacking settlers or soldiers outside of the protection of fortifications. Among the various “Islands & Peninsula”, Morris identifies a parcel of cleared upland of about 20 acres with a house still standing. This piece of property is on the northeast side of the peninsula that comprises the west side of Three Fathom Harbour. The plan includes a single structure on the land but Morris does not depict Massey’s Beach. Interestingly, Morris’s map of the Lawrencetown Township land grant (Figure 2-12) also includes a depiction of these cleared parcels, which would have been important resources for the British colonists. This parcel of land may have been among the earliest occupied on the west side of Three Fathom Harbour and may be that belonging to the A. Gates family as shown on the 1865
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Ambrose Church County map (Figures 2-13). Should further research be conducted in this area, this property would be considered to be of high archaeological potential.

Figure 2-11: Detail of Morris plan showing cleared upland at Lloy and in Three Fathom Harbour (top), Detail of NTS (1988) 11D11 showing Lloy, Terminal Beach, Lower Three Fathom Harbour, Three Fathom Harbour (bottom).

85 NSARM Map Collection: A.F. Church Maps, Halifax County (1865).
Figure 2-12: Morris plan, 1752 (left); Church map, 1865 (centre); and aerial photograph, 1954, showing west side of Three Fathom Harbour and possible location of successive land use.
Morris next moved to the final noteworthy French settlement highlighted in his report: Chezzetcook.

From the Settlement [Lawrencetown] to the Island called little Jeydore is Five mile, & from thence to the Settlement at Shillencooke is Five miles more.

---

87 Charles Morris, “Plan of a Tract of Land granted by the Honourable Charles Lawrence Esquire… now to be called Lawrencetown…”, 1754. NA CO 700 Nova Scotia 27.
This Settlement has also but an indifferent Harbour, having about three fathom without and at the Entrance within about nine feet & a very narrow Channell, This Harbour is Covered with sand at low Water except in the said Channell which carrys up to the Mass House about four feet at low Water. This Settlement is made on a peninsula almost Surrounded by Water, at high Water but otherwise with Flatts at Low Water. It has a South East & North a piece of Salt Marsh about two mile in Length, but of small Wedth, being about forty Rod & Contains near two Hundred Acres, but is not in Quality equal to that at Muscodoboit, it being more sunken and broken with pits of Water (Figure 2-14).  

Chezzetcook harbour matches Morris’s account of containing breaks and bog-like holes and a narrow channel. Again we encounter some confusion regarding the place names in the region. The island Morris names “Little Jeydore” is Shut-in Island at the mouth of Three Fathom Harbour (Figure 2-15).

---

88 NSA CO 217/13, p. 299-303.
The settlement, which contained a chapel located near the shore, existed on the drumlin peninsula of Grand Desert Hill and according to a number of Morris maps,\textsuperscript{89} was concentrated near the isthmus, at the intersections of Dyke and Range Roads. Increasingly, beginning in the mid-twentieth century, drastic coastal changes have occurred. Aerial photograph analysis shows the slow shifting of the beachhead at Cape

\textsuperscript{89} Several large-scale Morris maps produced during the 1750s-60s, available from the British National Archives, depict French settlements at Lawrencetown and Chezzetcook. Some of which indicate structures, but whose placement fluctuates, and due to the scale, can only be used as a rough guide. These include: CO 700 Nova Scotia 22, CO 700 Nova Scotia 23 and CO 700 Nova Scotia 31.
Antrim toward the headland of the Grand Desert peninsula, until by 1974 the beach sealed the tidal lagoon forming Grand Desert Pond (Atkinson 1999:31). The results of geophysical surveying in Grand Desert during the summer of 2009 are discussed in the following chapter. The areas of salt marsh surrounding the peninsula are indicated on the plan in blue.

Morris described the hill and another habitation site farther north comprising four houses:

The upland which is a high Hill has about Eighty Acres of English Grass, and further North about half a mile is another piece of upland cleared of about Twenty Acres, here are four Houses. These are all the Settlements within the Harbour, without to the Westward is another piece of upland cleared of about Twenty Acres. The Quantity of Hay produced from all of them may be Sufficient to support One & Fifty head of Neat Cattle besides Sheep.  

Again, this community had the ability to produce hay, in Morris’s estimation, to support over a hundred cattle, which would have potentially taken as important a role in the region as any other element of their economy. A half mile (0.8 km) north of Grand Desert Hill places one in a relatively undeveloped, but overgrown stretch of land along Marine Drive on the number 207 highway north of the intersection of Marine Drive and Dyke Road. The plan indicates a square area of cleared upland adjacent to a stretch of salt marsh which contained four standing houses at the time of Morris’s visit. Outside of the harbour, to the west, the plan indicates another piece of cleared land of 20 acres,

---

90 NSA CO 217/13, p. 299-303.
Located at modern day Sellars Head. Today there is a single residential property located there.

Despite the poorer quality salt marsh in this harbour, the Chief Surveyor appreciates the proximity to Halifax and the defensibility of the isthmus and so proposed establishing a town here:

The most convenient & defensible place to build a Town is, where the Mass House is from thence Southward where thee Will have the Widest part of the marsh in the Front of the town, & the Creek for their small craft & for Information & land-ing, It is also next to the Isthmus from whence they may expect to be molested chiefly.

But the Topp of the Hill will overlook it at the Distance of about Four Hundred Yards, gradually ascending the whole hight of the Hill is about one Hundred Fifty feet. If a Settlement be made here it may be Necessary to have a Blockhouse on the Hill which will answer two Designs, prevent the Enemy from Possessing the Hill, and Command the whole hill, there being a Regular Decent there from, to the Water on each side.\textsuperscript{91}

If a town were to be built here, it would be laid out along the east side of Grand Desert Hill, south of where the chapel stood, adjacent to the salt marsh and with easy access to the water. Morris also proposed the construction of a blockhouse at the top of the hill to overlook and protect the town and surroundings.

\textsuperscript{91} NSA CO 217/13, p. 299-303.
Figure 2-15: [Top] Detail of Morris plan showing “Little Jeddore” (Shut-in Island) to Shillencook (Chezzetcook)\textsuperscript{92}. [Bottom] Detail from NTS (1988) 11D11 showing the coast from Shut-in Island to Grand Desert.
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Morris finished his description with a summary of materials, potential for cleared lands and speculation on a road connecting the two settlements:

There are the same materials for Buildings & other uses handy & near, and Springs of Fresh Water at the Foot of the Hill. This Settlement will also have the Conveniency of a number of Islands not cleared which are connected together with Stoney Beaches, and run up the coast for four mile, which will not be so exposed to the Indian Ravages as the main Land and may contain about a Thousand Acres. The French having been a long time settled in these two places, there is no doubt but that a Road has been made from one Settlement to the other by Land in the most Convenient place which will soon be discovered by the Settlers. The Distance from one Settlement to the other is about Seven mile by Land Course thro’ the Country E.B.N & S. [east by north and south] & length By Sea is ten mile around the Coast. These are all the remarks the short-ness of the time would permit me to make.

Signed, Charles Morris

Working to clear several of the islands in the inlet, as opposed to the mainland, would allow the inhabitants a measure of protection from attack by Mi’kmaw forces. Morris suggested that communication between the dispersed communities should include a road.

This description of the abandoned and burnt-out (at least at Lawrencetown) settlements agrees chronologically with an effort by the French to “induce the Acadians of the peninsula to retire to the territory north of the isthmus of Chignecto [and to Isle Royale and Ile Saint-Jean] which was claimed by France” (Griffiths 2005:73-74). In a dispute over the actual boundaries of Acadia, resulting from the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht, a showdown between British forces and those of the French, Acadian and
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93 NSA CO 217/13, p. 299-303.
Mi’kmaq would be a rehearsal for the French and Indian War (1754-63), events that would lead to Mi’kmaq guerrilla warfare, the expulsion of the Acadians and the fall of French empire in North America (Grenier 2008). According to the known timeline, it seems that the communities along the eastern shore were also a part of the movement of Acadians by the French to help support their interest in maintaining a territorial foothold.

**Lawrencetown Township**

While not immediately followed in determining sites for settlement, Morris’s survey was eventually used in the formation of the 20,000 acre township of “Lawrence Town”, in 1754 (Figure 2-16). The freshwater stream indicated at the western head of Cole Harbour in the 1752 plan was used as the western extent of the land grant. The grant extended from there at a heading of 350 degrees (North, 10 degrees West) for 540 rods (one rod equals roughly 5m, for a distance of approximately 2.72km). It then extended east for 4,000 rods (approximately 20.1km) until reaching Chezzetcook River in the east.
The area chosen for the town and blockhouse at Lawrencetown was the location of the former French settlements at “Musquodoboit”, which was considered by Morris to be a defensible position. The Lawrencetown Township map also indicates many of the areas of cleared land from the 1752 survey. By the time of the land grant the harbour formerly identified as “Muscodoboit” is also listed as “Wampawk (Wanpa’q – calm water) (T. Sable, email to author, December 2012), by some call’d Cold Harbour”. The town site of “Lawrence Town” is indicated at the location of the former French settlement by name and by a representation of a north-south rectangular structure, possibly a palisaded compound with corner bastions. The harbour at Lawrencetown is now given
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the name “Tawboashomkee Harbour”. In addition to Three Fathom Harbour being identified as “Little Jeddore”, it is also given the name “Magonshish”. Shut-in Island at the entrance to Three Fathom Harbour is given the names “Little Jeddore or Cape Charles”.

There are four areas of beach or salt marsh (numbered 1 to 4) listed as “Reserved for the fishery, for the Fishery, Shipbuilding, and other publick Uses”. They include the marsh at the mouth of Cole Harbour, Fox Island in Lawrencetown, Shut-in Island, the east side of Three Fathom Harbour and the marsh adjacent to Grand Desert. A discussion of the results of archaeological testing carried out in Lawrencetown in 2010-11 will be covered in the following chapter. The abandoned French settlement at Chezzetcook, the eastern terminus of the survey, formed the eastern boundary of the Lawrencetown Township land grant and was a site of resettlement by Acadian families beginning in 1762 (Clark 1969:344).

**Conclusion**

Through Morris’s descriptions and mapping we have clear evidence of the habitation and subsequent abandonment of French settlements along the eastern shore, one of which was later utilized by the British in an early attempt at expanding their influence in the region. Figure 2-17 indicates the various parcels of land within the study
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95 Charles Morris, 1754. “Plan of a Tract of Land granted by the Honourable Charles Lawrence Esquire… now to be called Lawrencetown…”. NA CO 700 Nova Scotia 27.
area cleared and possibly inhabited by the French prior to the founding of Halifax, and those of high archaeological potential. Using the description and plan, it is possible to narrow the areas of highest potential to those described as having burnt out or extant structures, such as West Lawrencetown, Lawrencetown, Lloy, Three Fathom Harbour, Grand Desert and West Chezzetcook.

Figure 2-17: Charles Morris 1752 plan of the eastern shore with areas of possible French settlement sites and potential locations for further field work (yellow circles).\textsuperscript{96}

The Morris survey contains a wealth of information about the land use patterns of the Acadians of the eastern shore, and through revealing the abandonment of the communities, gives insight into the politics of the period and how this length of coast compares to other events happening in the region. The survey was a forerunner to the

\textsuperscript{96} NA CO 700 Nova Scotia 21
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survey that established the short-lived settlement of Lawrence Town, which points to the ultimate futility of a British survey of territory that was only under nominal imperial control. In the chapter to follow, an examination of subsequent cartography and land records will be utilized to examine these areas of highest archaeological potential. The Two areas described in greatest detail in the survey, at what are now Lawrencetown and Grand Desert, were the subjects of archaeological investigation during the summers of 2009-11, which included the use of geophysical survey, and, in the case of Lawrencetown, subsurface testing.
Chapter Three

Archaeological Investigations on the Eastern Shore of Nova Scotia

Introduction

From documentary evidence, French settlers called parts of the eastern shore their home from the last quarter of the seventeenth century to the middle of the eighteenth, a period of approximately 80 years. Shortly after the founding of the nearby town of Halifax in 1749, these French settlers relocated to French centres of power. In a region largely unaltered by Europeans, the British administration of Nova Scotia utilized cleared and cultivated land to the east of Halifax recently vacated by the French, choosing to establish the township of Lawrencetown there in 1754. Following the abandonment of the fledgling settlement after only a few years, the family of original grantee Benjamin Green Jr., a prominent citizen of early Halifax, settled on the site, which established the permanent British occupation of the community. Today the Lawrencetown Township and Green Estate sites are spread over a number of residential properties in the community of Lawrencetown, Halifax County. Following the initial abandonment of Chezzetcook by Europeans, the area was once again occupied by French-speaking settlers when Acadians held captive at Halifax were allowed, in 1762, to occupy their former lands. Many of the family names still present in West Chezzetcook and Grand Desert can be traced to this resettlement (S. White, communication to author; Melanson 1985:9).
The historical dynamics defined in Chapter 1 and the detailed evidence of the Morris survey considered in Chapter 2, taken together, point to the need for archaeological study as the key to establishing firm linkages between the general and the local. Much of Acadian archaeology to date has focussed on Acadian village sites along the Fundy shore. This region includes areas of highest population densities, those tied to the most significant events of the deportation and with the largest amount of supporting documentary evidence. That work, conducted especially during the 1980s, has helped form the pervasive interpretation of Acadian material goods, trade economy and architecture (Christianson 1984; Dunn 2002; Lavoie 1987). Among the challenges of studying the eastern shore and the history of its settlement are the smaller number of primary documents and of known archaeological resources, and the difficulty of introducing historical archaeology to the landowners within the study area, whose permission is needed before fieldwork can be conducted but who have had little exposure to the discipline. The purpose of this research was to add to our understanding of the history of the eastern shore along with colonial period settlement patterns in the region through historical research, landscape analysis and geophysical prospection, and through the recovery of material remains of the daily life of the residents of these early communities through the discipline of archaeology. Through a multi-disciplinary investigation of French sites identified by Chief Surveyor Charles Morris in his 1752 survey, and those related to subsequent British occupation of these lands, the potential for
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97 Parks Canada and the Canadian Museum of Civilization have commissioned various works including a series of interpretive paintings and models based largely on the results of archaeological investigations at Belleisle by David Christianson in 1983, and to a lesser extent, excavations at the Melanson Site in 1984-85.
discovery included evidence of eastern shore Acadian life-ways that may have differed from their Fundy shore cousins, and early British expansion into the area. Possible avenues of interpretation included differential Acadian trade practices and subsistence economies (than those of the Fundy shore Acadians) and insight into the creation of colonial settlements on the part of the British. The archaeological component of the current research comprised three phases: geophysical survey of properties in the former French community of “Shillingcook” (now Grand Desert, NS, Figure 3-1), geophysical survey and subsurface testing in the former French settlement identified by Morris as “Muscadoboit” (now Lawrencetown, Figure 3-2).
Figure 3-1: Detail of 1:50,000 NTS map of NTS map 11D/11 showing Chezzetcook Harbour, indicating Grand Desert Study Area.

Location of Woodland Period shell midden recorded in 2005.
While British-manufactured material was utilized by Acadians and is subsequently found in the archaeological record on Acadian sites, no definite eighteenth-century French-made material was recovered during fieldwork during this project. Therefore, archaeological testing in Lawrencetown has revealed two sites that appear to be the remains of mid-eighteenth and nineteenth century British occupation, which are

Figure 3-2 Detail of 1:50,000 NTS map 11D/11 showing Lawrencetown and indicating 2010-11 Study Area.
now registered with the Maritime Archaeological Resource Inventory (MARI). The first is related to the early attempt at settlement known as Lawrencetown Township (Borden Number BdCu-08), and the second is the remains of the estate house of an early Lawrencetown resident, Benjamin Green Jr. (BdCu-09). By using historical and archival documents available at the time and the diagnostic artifacts recovered from test excavations, an appropriate date of occupation and function of the sites can be identified. Ultimately, it is the story of the people that we hope to better understand.

**Landowner Consultation**

Connecting all phases of work was the effort to communicate plans and results of the project to local enthusiasts, community groups and landowners. The sites chosen for investigation all fall on privately owned property within rural areas of Halifax Regional Municipality. In an effort to make the introduction of the project to landowners as comfortable and unobtrusive as possible, and to inform and involve regional experts, early on, relevant community groups and historical societies were contacted. In Grand Desert, the Acadian House Museum, and its governing body, the West Chezzetcook/Grand Desert Community Interest Group (CIG) was contacted. The project was introduced through a presentation at the CIG’s 2008 Annual General Meeting. As a member of the community, the chair of the CIG, Mrs. Shirley Lowe, was able to provide some information about the area and to help facilitate contact with an initial group of landowners, and she was present during the first visits to meet with them. The holdings of the now-defunct Lawrencetown Community Historical Society and the Ocean Breezes
Interpretation Centre are held at the Cole Harbour Rural Heritage Farm, Mr. Terry Eyland, Curator, whom was contacted in the summer of 2010. Through the farm I was given the name and contact information of an amateur historian, Mr. Jack Friis, who facilitated my introduction to the landowners in this phase of the project.

After the accompanied introductions with the initial group of landowners, as with any return visits, I carried out the meetings on my own. At each location I explained the project, usually with the aid of a brief slideshow. I explained the impact or lack thereof, of a geophysical survey and of subsurface testing and the potential results. I also explained the ramifications of encountering archaeological features as it applied to property rights under the statutes of the Special Places Protection Act (SPPA), the governing legislation regarding the protection of archaeological resources in Nova Scotia.

The response from property owners was predominantly positive. Most were interested to learn of the new historical information I was able to provide and were willing to permit at least the geophysical survey (Phase I) portion of the project. Of the 14 householders I met in person, 12 were agreeable to Phase I. Two contacted me after the initial meeting to inform me that they had changed their minds, while the two property owners with whom I only spoke on the telephone declined to participate without a face to face meeting.

Five of the 14 property owners were open to all components of the project and were generally interested in the prospect of having archaeology conducted on their
property. In each case there were no long term plans to sell or develop their property further. Of these five properties, only four were surveyed, and only three, all in Lawrencetown and West Lawrencetown, were part of a subsurface testing program. Based on cartographic analysis, the property not surveyed was determined to be outside the area of highest archaeological potential. One other property was surveyed geophysically, but the results of the survey did not warrant further investigation.

Four landowners were willing to allow the geophysical portion of the fieldwork but took a wait and see approach, pending results of the survey before determining if they would allow testing. Once explained, there was considerable reluctance to allow archaeology to take place due to the ramifications of the SPPA. In each instance the results of the survey did not warrant a testing program. One of the landowners I spoke with by telephone resided out of province, and since his goal was to sell the piece of property in question, did not wish to have any type of activity on his land which may possibly interfere with or add any costs or time constraints to that process. Finally, one other landowner, with whom I also spoke only by telephone, did not wish to participate in any aspects of the project and did not offer a reason.
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98 Current Nova Scotia archaeological legislation, the Special Places Protection Act, places the potential expense of archaeological investigations on the developer/property owner and can potentially limit the development of property based on significance of known archaeological resources.
Previous Archaeological Investigations

Several significant archaeological projects have taken place on the eastern shore of Nova Scotia. Work conducted in the 1970s and 1980s on the Salmon River in Jeddore Harbour, known as the Brown Site (BeCs-3), contributed significantly to the understanding of late pre-contact aboriginal cultural history in Nova Scotia (Sheldon 1988). Following up on notes made in 1970 by John Erskine (Erskine 1970:26), investigations in 1999 at Francis Nose Island in Musquodoboit Harbour by archaeologist Mike Sanders (2000) identified the remains of a pre-contact and contact period aboriginal site. His work also showed evidence of a French-period occupation, which may be the location of the settlement and trading post of “Mouscodouet” as recorded in the first Acadian census of 1671.99 Within the boundaries of the Morris map, the Nova Scotia Museum Assistant Curator of Archaeology, Steve Powell (2005), recorded a Middle/Late Woodland (Ceramic) Period shell midden at the beachhead of the Grand Desert peninsula following hurricane Juan in 2003 (Figure 3-1). The project undertaken within this thesis represents the first archaeological investigations for historic sites at Grand Desert/Chezzetcook or Lawrencetown.

Archaeological Potential – Grand Desert

As described in the previous chapter, though the entire drumlin now comprising Grand Desert Hill was cleared and under cultivation in the 1750s, the mapping evidence

99 National Archives of Canada, Microfilm C-2572.
indicates areas of high archaeological potential as being on the east side of Grand Desert, near the isthmus of the peninsula and an area of 25 acres to the north said to contain four houses. A grant map from the 1762 first division of Lawrencetown shows the smaller and more desirable lots along Grand Desert peninsula, indicating that they are cleared and available for immediate occupation (Figure 3-3). The area has been subject to a great deal of settlement activity since the late eighteenth century, which means that archaeological resources may have been negatively impacted. The “Mass House” is of particular interest and information on the degree to which it may have been impacted will require further investigation. Unfortunately, many of the properties surveyed in this portion of the study were outside this high potential area.

\[100\]
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Figure 3-3: Detail of 1752 Morris plan (top left)\textsuperscript{101}, 1754 Lawrencetown Grant map (top right)\textsuperscript{102} showing French Settlement of “Shillingcook” and 1762 Plan of Lawrencetown Township Lots Reserved, showing apportioning of lots in West Chezzetcook and Grand Desert, Waverly Preston Lawrencetown Portfolio 110E-18-84, Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources Land Information Centre.

\textsuperscript{101} NA CO 700 Nova Scotia 21.
\textsuperscript{102} NA CO 700 Nova Scotia 27.
Archaeological Potential – Lawrencetown

In Lawrencetown, the same considerations were made with respect to archaeological potential. The point of land shared by the French and then the British fortification is indicated in historic mapping (Figure 3-4) and the description given by Morris matches well with the local geography. Several modern structures now currently exist on this site across a number of properties, and there is some likelihood that there has been some impact to archaeological resources here.

Figure 3-4: Detail of 1752 Morris plan (left)\textsuperscript{103} and 1754 Lawrencetown Grant map (right)\textsuperscript{104} showing French Settlement of “Muscadoboit” and site of “Lawrence Town”.

The French at the settlement of “Musquodoboit” had built upon a high point of land about fifty feet above the historic high water mark near where the creek merges from the marsh on each side. Using this description and consulting period maps, the site of the

\textsuperscript{103} NA CO 700 Nova Scotia 21.
\textsuperscript{104} NA CO 700 Nova Scotia 27.
French settlement is the same location chosen for the settlement of Lawrencetown in 1754. The site that contained this short-lived settlement and the earlier settlement lies on the properties of 3930 to 3950 Lawrencetown Road (Highway 207) near the intersections of Island View Drive and Marine Drive in Lawrencetown. The combined properties now contain three houses, a detached two-car garage, a greenhouse and a number of other small outbuildings.

Several maps (Figures 3-5 to 3-7) from the Department of Natural Resources’ Crown Lands Records Office “Displaced Plans” portfolio and maps from the Nova Scotia Archives show structures or specifically identifies the Green “Mansion House” in relation to the surrounding shoreline and marshes, placing the mansion near the current residences at 3930 to 3950 Lawrencetown Road. Many of these maps do not contain information on their authors, date of production or indeed include accurate scales.

Figure 3-5 is an undated\textsuperscript{105} John Chamberlain grant map cluttered with grant numbers, notes and measurements showing Lawrencetown and two structures on the Green Estate (red circle). The rectangular structure may be the “Mansion House” depicted in Figure 3-6 and the house depicted in Figure 3-7. This would mean the more northerly square structure in Figure 3-5 may have been an outbuilding. Although each map places the structures at various locations on the height of land, this northerly outbuilding, if it is one, may correlate to the extant barn indicated by the 1752 Morris

\textsuperscript{105} The note “half the dower” on the map, presumably that of Susanna Green, wife of Benjamin, places its creation after his death in 1793.
plan. Otherwise, there is no indication whether or not cellars and/or material from collapsed chimneys mentioned in the description, or those of the first British attempt to settle the area have been reused by later occupants. Site formation processes of abandoned settlement sites is in of itself a field of study within archaeology and ethnoarchaeology. Distinctions are made in the distribution of artifacts from the disposal of objects during site use and maintenance and those left at a site with the knowledge of whether or not the habitation will ever be reoccupied. At abandoned sites, for example, the distribution of material culture has more to do with the dismantling of the site than in its everyday use (Cameron and Tomka 1996:39). Also to be considered is the rate at which a site is abandoned. Rapid abandonment tends to result in the deposition of large quantities of items, often in a useable state, while slow, methodical site abandonment results in a much smaller amount of material (Cooper 1992:1).106 As discussed below, a destruction event and rapid infilling of a structure were identified at Lawrencetown.

A number of survey documents in the Waverley-Preston-Lawrencetown Portfolio from the Nova Scotia Crown Land Records Office contain information on measurements of property boundaries which are often tied to survey markers that have long since disappeared, but which comprise portions of modern property lines. No mention of the structures on the property in relation to the property boundaries are made.107

106 This article can be found at: http://www.webarchaeology.com/html/dorppr.htm.
107 John Chamberlain. n.d. Displaced Plans Portfolio, plan number 40007, CLIMC.
Figure 3-5: Detail of Displaced Plan 40007 by John Chamberlain, undated, showing structures on the Green Estate (red circle), Department of Natural Resources Land Information Centre, Halifax, Displaced Plans Portfolio.
Figure 3-6: Detail of Displaced Plan 382007, anonymous and undated, “Lott No. 11 on the Plan of the division of the late Benjn Greens Estate at Lawrencetown, drawn by the Surrogate General for Elizabeth Stowel, of which the adjoining is a plan...” Note Green Estate “Mansion House” (red arrow) and “Seat of the Abutto” [aboiteau] on the left. Department of Natural Resources Land Information Centre, Halifax, Displaced Plans Portfolio.
In 1979 a new house was constructed at 3930 Lawrencetown Road by the current landowners, Beverley and Gary Conrad. During excavation of the building’s foundation, buried stone and brick was encountered. Figure 3-8 is a view of the property from a helicopter fly-over showing the machine-dug hole prior to foundation pouring. Figure 3-9 is a close-up of the brick pad or possible chimney base uncovered during house construction. It was this discovery and information provided by the landowners about
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108 NSA, RG 1 vol. 311, doc. 18, reel #15392, Doc. 17A.
ceramics and other artifacts uncovered during house construction that provided the impetus for Operation B at 3930 Lawrencetown Road (BdCu-9).

Figure 3-8: Aerial photograph showing house construction at 3930 Lawrencetown Road, facing south. Newly built house at 3920 Lawrencetown Rd. can be seen in the foreground. Houses currently owned by Earl Conrad (3940 Lawrencetown Rd.) and Nancy Smithers (3950 Lawrencetown Road) can be seen in the background, respectively. Highway 207 can be seen on the left. Photo by Beverley Conrad, 1979.
Figure 3-9: Photo showing brick and dry stone feature, possibly a chimney base, uncovered during house construction at 3930 Lawrencetown in 1979. Photo by Beverley Conrad, 1979.
The possible remains of the former residence of the Green Estate can be seen in aerial photographs from the middle of the twentieth century, which show a single residence on the property, now the residence of Mrs. Nancy Smithers at 3950 Lawrencetown Road (Figure 2-1). A feature on the photograph can be seen near the bend in the driveway which is near the location of the current house at 3930 Lawrencetown Road.

**Soils**

Examination of soil types and geology within the study areas provides general information useful in geophysical analysis and provides a framework when conducting sub-surface testing. Soil within the Grand Desert and Lawrencetown survey areas belongs to the Wolfville series, a soil developed from fine-textured parent material (Figures 3-10 and 3-11). It is a well-drained, moderately undulating series with brown to dark brown loam surface material and reddish-brown loam subsoil. Its parent material is dark red to dark reddish-brown loam to sandy clay loam till. Surface stones vary from few to many with approximately 30 percent of the soils considered very stony (Cann et al. 1963; 1965:24). Both study areas have seen past use as both farmland and pasture. The similarity in soils between Grand Desert and Lawrencetown, and their suitability for cultivation, likely played a part in the selection of the areas for settlement.

The soil at West Lawrencetown belongs to the Bridgewater Series, a soil from medium-textured parent materials. Typically it appears as a brown shaly loam over
yellowish-brown shaly loam. Its parent material is olive shaly loam till derived from Precambrian slates. The soil also includes quartzite and granite fragments while some areas contain carboniferous materials mixed with the till resulting in a sandy clay loam. The topography includes some drumlins and steep slopes with good drainage. About half of the soils are considered stony (Cann et al. 1963; 1965:28).

No systematic study to determine the effects of seasonality on soil moisture within Grand Desert or Lawrencetown for the purpose of geophysical analysis has been done, but due to a similar soil series, perhaps a seasonal comparison could be made with soils of the Grand Pré/Wolfville area. All surveys were conducted in late summer and fall. The effect of lower soil moisture content on the geophysical surveys is unknown (Gaffney, 2006:145). Electromagnetic (EM) surveys, in their non-ground contact application, hold an advantage over electrical resistance surveys, which require ground contact, on sites with a dry surface (Gaffney 2006:43). This means that an EM device can be used in the height of summer and over asphalt surfaces.
Figure 3-10: Detail of Halifax County soil map (Cann et al. 1963) indicating soils within Grand Desert study area.

Figure 3-11: Detail of Halifax County Central Sheet soil map (Cann et al. 1963) indicating soils within Lawrencetown study area.
Geophysical Survey – Methodology

In areas of the world where heavy occupation or intense farming have occurred, above-ground evidence of past human activity has, in many instances, been obliterated. The remains of these past cultures lay just below the surface, which are usually studied by archaeological excavation. In locations where large scale subsurface testing or excavation is a last resort or impractical, non-invasive remote sensing techniques have been developed to provide an additional layer of information (Scollar 1990:1). The use of geophysics in this research is part of a growing application, dating to the 1990s, of non-invasive or low impact survey techniques in research-based archaeology in Nova Scotia (Ferguson 1990). In preparation for this project, a directed reading course, as part of the coursework for this thesis, added to the extensive EM geophysical surveying conducted at Grand Pré National Historic Site (NHS) (Fowler 2006), which has also included the use of ground penetrating radar (GPR) (Cottreau-Robins 2009). Recent geophysics at the Thibodeau Site, the location of a pre-Deportation Acadian and New England Planter site in Poplar Grove, is being used to direct fieldwork at the site during the summer of 2013. The use of EM and GPR remote sensing has also been applied at the Saint Mary’s University Poor’s Farm Archaeological Field School, in the identification of grave shafts (MacLeod-Leslie 2008). Low impact core sampling analysis has also been conducted on dyke structures in Grand Pré as part of its application for UNESCO World Heritage Site designation (Cottreau-Robins 2008; 2009).
EM remote sensing provides a versatile method of non-invasive examination of the soil, allowing measurement of its electric or magnetic qualities. All EM surveys measure the response of the ground to the emission of EM waves, which are transmitted by one end of a non-conducting, non-magnetic instrument and create electrical currents in the soil. These waves are affected by the soil’s conductivity and the change to the EM field is recorded by the other end of the instrument, the receiver. Surveys which measure the magnetic susceptibility, or how easily the soil can be polarized by a magnetic field, can delimit the spread of material remains of former occupation, with large or long-term settlement sites producing the most significant anomalies. Because of the variability of conductivity of buried objects, EM surveys can be used in the detection of buried stone structures or rubble, pits and metallic artifacts. The magnetic susceptibility can be affected by the iron-rich (mafic) mineralization of the soil, in which the field acts on microscopic mineral grains, causing them to align with the magnetic field. A similar effect can be detected with the mineralization present in any boulders in the soil, and on whether the soil has been subjected to extreme heat, as in the case of burning (McNeill, 2012; 2013). Another advantage of the EM survey is its ability to operate without direct contact with the soil. This allows for rapid survey over an undulating or variable surface (Gaffney 2006:42-45).

The geophysical surveys in this thesis were carried out using the EM-38B, by Geonics Ltd. of Mississauga, Ontario, a device which simultaneously measures the sub-surface conductivity (or Q-phase) of the soil, converted to millisiemens per metre
(mS/m), and volume magnetic susceptibility (or Inphase), measured in parts per thousand (ppt), for the detection of spatial anomalies over a surveyed area. The EM-38B has a 1m coil separation and operates on a fixed frequency of 14.6kHz (Jones 2008).

Measurements were taken in the vertical, or upright, dipole mode, giving an approximate measurement depth of 1.5m. Recording parameters were kept consistent throughout the fieldwork in Grand Desert and Lawrencetown. The instrument was calibrated prior to each survey and was set to record data points automatically at five readings per second. Fiducial markers within the dataset were recorded manually by the operator along a flagged rope at the start and end of each transect and at five metre intervals in between. Alternating transects were walked every metre. Due to the sensitivity and of the instrument, only areas relatively free of structures (sheds, garages and other outbuildings, above-ground well components, known septic fields, gardens, dog kennels, etc.) and dense trees were considered for the surveys. Areas containing sparse trees, shrubs, and large lawn ornaments (benches, clothesline poles, birdbaths) were sometimes surveyed with the obstacles noted and locations recorded. Visual inspection of each property was done with landowners. Fieldnotes and photographs were used to document the survey grids which were each measured and triangulated to a known datum.

Data for the surveys was collected using the Allegro CX Field PC data logger and processed with the EM-38BW software program. Recording parameters in the field were kept consistent throughout the project. Data was interpreted through the DAT38bw program by Geonics and colour-contour plan images were produced using the Surfer 8
program by Golden Software. In each instance, the image maps are positioned such that North is at the top and the scale is in metres. The readings produced by the instrument are generally interpreted as follows. High conductivity readings tend to represent areas of high moisture, such as decaying organics or poor drainage soils. Low conductivity readings tend to indicate areas of low moisture, such as areas containing an abundance of large-sized stones, and/or well-drained soil. Susceptibility readings are relative to each individual survey. High readings tend to indicate metal objects, areas subject to burning or stone which is relatively magnetically susceptible.

**Geophysics Results – Grand Desert**

In the summer and autumn of 2009, a geophysical survey was conducted on five privately-owned properties in the community of Grand Desert (Figures 3-12). The purpose of the survey was to locate and record any archaeological features existing in an area of Grand Desert Hill indicated by historical research related to a pre-deportation French community. Based on this research, it was speculated that the survey might confirm the location of cultural resources related to the Acadian community known as “Shillingcook” on the west side of modern day Chezzetcook Harbour. The project was undertaken according to the terms of Heritage Research Permit A2009NS80, with the assistance of the West Chezzetcook/Grand Desert CIG, and the permission of the owners of the properties surveyed.
The results of the geophysical survey of one of the five properties covered in Grand Desert in 2009 are detailed below. Since all results from geophysics during this phase of the project did not warrant further archaeological investigation, a representative example of the research will suffice for the discussion to follow. For a full description of the 14 surveys on all five properties, see the final report submitted to the Special Places Program under Heritage Research Permit A2009NS80 (Shears 2011).

When considering survey locations, areas were plotted to maximize coverage of areas relatively free of obstruction and/or obstacles, which meant limiting surveys to the cleared and relatively groomed portions of the properties. Some properties contained large areas of thick coniferous forestation, compounded by uncleared tree falls, making geophysics impossible. Areas used as driveways covered by gravel, garden plots and other landscaping features, septic fields, wells or areas known to have been heavily disturbed, either by the removal or infilling of material were also not suitable for survey. For each survey a corner of a permanent structure such as a house or other large outbuilding was used as a datum point.
Figure 3-12: Detail of 1:10,000 aerial photograph indicating 2009 Grand Desert study area, north at top (Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources photograph # 2003 03306-1-3).
In each instance, the results of the geophysical surveys of this phase of the project did not warrant further investigation or subsurface testing. This is believed to be due to the lack of subsurface features in the surveyed areas and/or the highly disturbed context of the developed residential properties, which each contained some or all of the abovementioned alterations. Geophysical anomalies, when they appear, are identified as being part of the known features of the property, such as wells, metal poles, or other objects within a residential property, or, due to their spatial relationship, are appreciated as random, and most likely, small metal objects or naturally occurring buried stone. Therefore, no Maritime Archaeological Resource Inventory forms (MARI) were completed for this phase and no artifacts were collected. Below is a comprehensive map of the 2009 Study Area (Figure 3-13) with corresponding Property ID numbers (PIDs). It shows properties surveyed (shaded green) which did not warrant further investigation and properties (shaded yellow) which were not surveyed which are considered to be of high archaeological potential.
Figure 3-13: Nova Scotia Property Online map showing 2009 Grand Desert Study Area with properties surveyed (green) and those not surveyed but considered to be of high archaeological potential (yellow).
140 Dyke Road

The property chosen for inclusion in this thesis was the first surveyed and the property closest to the presumed location, based on map evidence, of the former French settlement. The property is northwest of the intersection of Range and Dyke Roads in Grand Desert (Figures 3-14 and 3-15). Each of the remaining properties lies on Range Road, a private road maintained by the landowners, which bisects Grand Desert Hill north-south. Two surveys were conducted on this property, recorded as Chez01 and Chez02.

Figure 3-14: Nova Scotia Property Online map for 140 Dyke Road, Grand Desert.
The first survey, recorded as Chez01, covered the back yard of the property. It was an area 25m east-west (E-W) by 20m north-south (N-S). The NE corner of the survey area was 3.45m from the NW corner of the house and 10.25m from the centre of the concrete well, which can be seen in the foreground of Figure 3-16 and in the middle right of Figure 3-17.
Figure 3-16: The back of the house at 140 Dyke Road facing east with concrete well in foreground.

Figure 3-17: The backyard at 140 Dyke Road (Chez01), facing west.

The conductivity and susceptibility image maps are presented below (Figure 3-18). The conductivity reading was recorded at a range of -50 to 35 mS/s. The
susceptibility had a range of -2 to 3.5 ppt. The well appears as a faint anomaly in the image maps at 10m S and 17m W. An unidentified point anomaly appears at 17m S and 16m W. The anomaly appears as a low reading on each map possibly indicating a piece of buried metal. Increased readings at the eastern edge of the survey area are attributed to the instrument’s proximity to the house and the disturbed context associated with activity around and the construction footprint of the building.

Figure 3-18: Property 1, Survey 1 (Chez01): Conductivity (top), Susceptibility (bottom).
The second survey at this property (Chez02) was a 35m E-W by 10m N-S area to the south of the house adjacent to the driveway (Figure 3-19). The SW corner of the survey area was 14m S of the SW corner of the house and 16m S of the well. The conductivity reading was recorded at a range of -180 to 80 mS/s. The Susceptibility had a range of -3 to 18 ppt.

Figure 3-19: 140 Dyke Road showing survey area two (Chez02), facing east.

The results of this survey show little geophysical activity (Figure 3-20). An isolated point anomaly appears at 2m S and 29m W. Speaking with the landowners revealed the presence of a number of derelict vehicles in this space in the past. This
accounts for the small point anomalies in the southwest potion of the survey, which may be pieces of metal from the vehicles.

Figure 3-20: Property 1, Survey 2 (Chez02): Conductivity (top) and Susceptibility (bottom). North at top of each image.

Upon consultation with the landowner, areas to the north and east of the house were not surveyed due to the known location of a septic tank and extensive landfill.

**Geophysics Results – Lawrencetown**

In the summer and autumn of 2010, a geophysical survey was conducted on the properties of Deborah and Gary Conrad, located at 3930 Lawrencetown Road, and Nancy Smithers located at 3950 Lawrencetown Road, in the community of Lawrencetown, Halifax Co. (Figure 3-21). The purpose of the survey was to locate and record any
geophysical anomalies that may be related to an abandoned pre-deportation French community and the subsequent British occupation of the site. The project was undertaken according to the terms of Heritage Research Permit A2010NS59, the assistance of the Cole Harbour Rural Heritage Society and field crew volunteers, and with the permission of the owners of the properties surveyed.

Figure 3-21: 1:3,500 property map showing location and PIDs for sites BdCu-08, Lawrencetown Township and BdCu-09, the Green Estate.
Geophysical surveying during this portion of the project was conducted under the same parameters and conditions as earlier phases. The survey of the backyard, west of the house at 3930 Lawrencetown Road was recorded as LTOWN01. Discussion with landowners regarding past landscaping, construction work and other major soil disturbances, areas of heavy vegetation and other obstacles resulted in only one survey conducted on this property. Due to the sensitivity and application of the instrument, only areas free of tree cover or heavy undergrowth were considered for the surveys. Areas used as driveways covered by gravel, garden plots and other landscaping features, septic fields, or areas known to have been heavily disturbed, either by the removal or infilling of material were also not suitable for survey. The fieldwork was conducted by Robert Shears and two volunteer assistants. Visual inspection of each property was also done. Fieldnotes and photographs were used to document the survey grids which were each measured and triangulated to a known datum.

3930 Lawrencetown Road

The EM survey conducted on this property, recorded as LTOWN01, covered the back yard of the property, west of the house. It was an area 50m E-W by 50m N-S (Figures 3-22 and 3-23). The backyard slopes downward from east to west. The original survey area was measured to be 56m E-W by 50m N-S, but it was decided to shorten the survey area to 50m² due to proximity to the foundation berm surrounding the house, which is modern fill.
Figure 3-22: The backyard at 3930 Lawrencetown Road, facing west, showing survey area LTOWN01. Note test excavation underway on the left. Photo by Robert Shears.

Figure 3-23: Plan sketch of 50m x 50m Survey Area 1 (LTown01) at 3930 Lawrencetown Road.

The conductivity and susceptibility image maps are presented below (Figure 3-24). The conductivity reading was recorded at a range of -300 to 400 mS/s. The susceptibility had a range of -6 to 34 ppt.
Figure 3-24: Conductivity image for LTOWN01, showing anomaly selected for testing (black circle). North at the top of the image.

The faint anomaly detected at 13-19m N/35-42m E, indicated by a black circle on Figure 3-24, matched the former location of a large stone and stone pile visible in aerial photographs (Figure 3-26), which were also mechanically removed during the 1979 house construction. Upon secondary inspection, the anomaly also matched a shallow depression in the soil. Due to the known existence of a pile of stone and the geophysical signature left behind, it was felt that a test excavation was warranted. Other anomalies in the survey included a band of relatively high conductivity, as seen by the dark orange line running from approximately 50m N/25m E to 27m N/50m E which is a known buried
water line running to a shed in the northwest of the property. The extreme readings at 0m N/50m E were caused by proximity to an existing greenhouse. The susceptibility readings for this survey were less useful and seem to correlate to the slope of the survey area as seen by the varying bands running E-W (Figure 3-25). The anomaly identified in the conductivity results is still faintly visible at 13-19m N/35-42m E while the strong reading in the lower right of the image is once again due to proximity to a modern structure.

![Figure 3-25: Susceptibility image for LTOWN01. North at the top of the image.](image)
Figure 3-26: Aerial photograph showing house construction at 3930 Lawrencetown Road, facing southeast. Location of Operation A is indicated. The house currently owned by Earl Conrad at 3940 Lawrencetown Road can be seen in centre. Highway 207 can be seen at the top. Photo by Beverley Conrad, 1979.

3950 Lawrencetown Road

The EM surveys conducted on this property, recorded as LTOWN02 and LTOWN03, as permitted by the landowner, covered the northern portion of the property, at the border between 3950 Lawrencetown Road (PID 40454829) and 3940 Lawrencetown Road (PID 40310294). The first was an area 40m east-west by 25m north-south (Figure 3-27). It was bounded by dense brush to the north and west and by a section of asphalt driveway on the east. The second survey (LTown03) ran east-west along a stretch of lawn between 3940 Lawrencetown Road to the north and the asphalt
driveway of 3950 Lawrencetown Road to the south. It shared its northern baseline with LTown02 and was bound in the east by brush.

Figure 3-27: Plan sketch of 40m x 25m Survey Area 1 (LTown02) and 35m x 8m Survey Area 2 (LTown03) at 3950 Lawrencetown Road. The house at 3940 Lawrencetown Road is used as a datum.

The conductivity and susceptibility image maps for each survey are presented below (Figures 3-28 and 3-29). The conductivity reading for LTown02 was recorded at a range of -22 to 12 mS/s. The susceptibility had a range of -0.6 to 0.5 ppt. Two large areas of relatively low conductivity, seen on the contour image from 10-20mE/0mS to 10-20mE/15mS and from 5-25mE/20mS to 5-25mE/25mS (Figure 43, red circles) matched two slight depressions in the soil. The low conductivity readings indicated buried objects, possibly stone. Further evidence for buried stone and possibly burnt material can be seen in the northern anomaly in susceptibility readings for LTown02 (Figure 44, red circles). Permission was acquired to introduce two 2m x 1m test excavations in the northern anomaly which revealed eighteenth century material. The conductivity reading for
LTown03 was recorded at a range of -8.5 to 16 mS/s. The susceptibility had a range of -0.3 to 0.3 ppt. The results of the survey appear to be natural and did not warrant further investigation.

Figure 3-28: Conductivity image (Top), Susceptibility image (Bottom) for LTOWN02. North at the top of the image.
Test Excavation – Methodology

Archaeological investigations at 3930 Lawrencetown Road (The Green Estate Site, Borden Number BdCu-9) consisted of a 1m² test pit based on the results of the geophysical survey of the backyard (Operation A) and a second 1m² test unit south of the existing house, which was based on information provided by the landowners regarding the remains of the historic brick and stone cellar/chimney base feature uncovered during the 1979 house construction (Operation B). Investigations at 3950 Lawrencetown Road (The Lawrencetown Township Site, Borden Number BdCu-8) were conducted based on results of geophysical survey LTOWN02, which consisted of two adjacent 2m x 1m test excavations (Operations A and B) (Figure 3-30).
Each test unit was excavated by hand, paying close attention to color and texture changes occurring in the soil. Depth-below-surface measurements were taken for each unit at 10cm intervals unless a color change occurred sooner. Once the sod had been
removed by shovel, the content of each unit was excavated with trowel and brush. Daily activities, conditions and all pertinent information were recorded in a field notebook. Photographs of excavation progress were taken daily and plan and profile photographs of each unit were taken upon their completion. All excavation unit profiles were also drawn to scale. Excavated soil was screened through a ¼” steel mesh, and artifacts were collected in specimen bags by lot. Soil was screened onto a tarpaulin and re-deposited into geotextile-lined units when excavation was completed. As water retention conditions in Operation A of the Lawrencetown Township site became an issue, a transition to water screening became necessary. The water retention within the unit in conjunction with the high concentration of brick debris and clay-rich soil made artifacts difficult to distinguish during the screening process. Water screening greatly alleviated this problem.

While it was the intent to carry out all excavations to culturally sterile soil, this was only feasible with Operation A of the Green Estate site, as will be discussed below. Discussion of each excavation unit will follow a “top-down” stratigraphic analysis of newer to older deposits. This phase of the project was successful in identifying two new archaeological sites now registered with the Nova Scotia Museum’s MARI system. Operation B of the Green Estate site contains late eighteenth to twentieth century material, as well as some of possible French origin, which corroborates information provided by the landowners indicating the presence of a former dwelling adjacent to the existing house at 3930 Lawrencetown Road. Operations A and B of the Lawrencetown
Township site contains the remains of a brick and timber structure destroyed by fire. The artifact assemblage indicates a mid-eighteenth century occupation.

**Testing Results – The Green Estate Site (BdCu-9)**

**Operation A**

Operation A was a 1m x 1m test excavation introduced in response to a geophysical anomaly and the former site of a historic pile of stone removed by machine excavator in 1979, during construction of the existing house. It was hoped that the excavation would help ground-truth the geophysics and to determine the nature of the former stone pile. Following the original survey boundaries, a point was measured at 35m E/15m N. Viewing the shallow depression to which the anomaly was related, and to hopefully increase potential of encountering cultural material, it was decided to place the test pit one metre north, at 35-36m E/16-17m E (Figure 3-31).
The unit consisted of a dark brown homogenous sandy loam (7.5YR 3/3) to a dark brown sandy loam (7.5YR 3/4) with pockets of brown sandy clay (7.5YR 3/3). There were no features identified (Table 3-1). A shovel test to verify the anthropological sterility and qualities of the soil was dug in the SW corner of the unit at the end of excavation (Figure 3-32). The predominant artifact type was a range of 19th-20th Century dark green bottle and colourless container glass, which made up 90% of the 145 pieces recovered (Chart 3-1). Much of the glass contained mould seams, indicating a production date of early nineteenth century or later (Jones 1986:88). Other pieces of glass included colourless moulded container glass with a moulded grapevine decoration and other
undecorated colourless glass. Ceramic artifacts recovered are indicative of late eighteenth century occupation and included six pieces of Creamware (1762-1820), five pieces of Pearlware (1780-1840), and two pieces of a coarse redware, which may be Anglo-American Redware (1700-1900) (Hume 1969; Webster 1971). One piece of underglaze blue porcelain was also recovered. From the architectural functional group (South 1977) there were five pieces of window pane glass, one wrought iron nail (not collected) and a small sample of brick fragments (five pieces).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Event(s)</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Sod</td>
<td>Sandy loam and loosely consolidated sod development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Topsoil and cultural layer</td>
<td>7.5YR 3/3, dark brown sandy loam with pebbles (2-5cm) and cobbles (10-20cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Cultural layer with disturbed subsoil</td>
<td>7.5YR 3/4, dark brown sandy loam with pockets of 7.5YR 4/3 brown sandy clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Subsoil</td>
<td>7.5YR 3/4, dark brown sandy loam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-32: BdCu-9, Operation A, end of excavation, showing shovel test dug into culturally sterile soil. Arrow indicating north.
Operation B

Based upon information gathered from landowners regarding architectural remains uncovered during their 1979 house construction, including a brick they had saved from the work which was a broad, flat hand-made style, and corresponding map and aerial photograph evidence, it was decided to introduce a second test unit on the property. This material may relate to the structure identified in Figures 3-5 to 3-7, the Green Estate “Mansion House”, and homestead of the “Dower Farm”. Permission was obtained to introduce a 1m² test pit 3 metres south of the southeast corner of the house (Operation B) – suggested by the landowner to be outside of the construction footprint of the modern structure (Figure 3-33).
The unit contained a combination of eighteenth to twentieth century material, in a mixed context, as it was later discovered that the entirety of the buried foundation was machine-excavated by the landowners in 1979 and subsequently backfilled (Figure 3-34). The landowners suggested more photos exist of the work that had been done, but they have not been located. All available photos of the work done, including additional aerial photograph of the property at that time, have been included in the photo catalogue of the project. Though in a mixed context, the unit contained several interesting and diagnostic
artifacts that tell of longstanding occupation on the site. Aerial photography from 1945 does not show a structure on the property, while the houses at 3940 and 3950 Lawrencetown Road are present.

The soil transitioned from a 5YR 4/4 sandy loam to a 5YR 3/3 sandy loam with pockets of clay loam (Table 3-2). Lot designations were made based on increase in stone and brick inclusion size, though the artifact assemblage and soil matrix remained fairly

Figure 3-34: Plan of BdCu-9 Operation B at end of excavation. Note modern rug at the bottom of the excavation. Arrow indicating north.
consistent. The disturbed nature of the site was confirmed by the landowner’s admission of having removed and re-deposited the foundation fill during house construction. The test was excavated to a depth of 70cm before it was stopped. The material continued to be of a mixed context and a piece of modern, vinyl-trimmed rug or carpet was exposed at depth. Consequently, this mixed deposit was not excavated to sterile soil.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Event(s)</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sod</td>
<td>5YR 4/4 reddish brown sandy loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Redeposited cellar fill material</td>
<td>5YR 4/4 reddish brown sandy loam, pebbles 1-5cm, brick fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Redeposited cellar fill material</td>
<td>5YR 4/3 reddish brown sandy loam, pebbles and cobbles 20-25cm, near-intact bricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Redeposited cellar fill material</td>
<td>5YR 3/3 dark reddish brown sandy loam, pebbles and large cobble, 35cm, in NE corner of unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Redeposited cellar fill material</td>
<td>5YR 3/3 dark reddish brown sandy loam mottled with clay loam with pebbles, cobbles and brick fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Redeposited cellar fill material</td>
<td>5YR 3/3 dark reddish brown sandy loam with pebbles, cobbles and brick fragments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 258 objects recovered from the unit, exactly two-thirds were from the Kitchen functional group (Chart 3-2) (South 1977). The ceramic assemblage covers a range of styles and types indicative of eighteenth century material such as Staffordshire Slipware, Creamware and Pearlware (including blue shell-edged and hand painted polychrome, 1775-1830) (Miller 2000:12) to nineteenth and twentieth century material such as Maritime Slipware, a heat-altered fine stoneware, and refined white earthenware, including an annular decorated variety (Noel Hume 1969; Burke 1991; Erikson and Hunter 2001; Chaney 2008). Examples of Creamware, Pearlware, and refined white earthenware were each recovered across various lots, again indicative of the disturbed
nature of the soil. Two pieces of porcelain were recovered. One ceramic sherd of note was a heat-altered coarse earthenware which most closely resembles a French ware, Barton L12 – green & purple trailed slipware (Figure 3-35), which may date to the French occupation of the site (Barton 1981:37). Glass artifacts included mostly modern examples of amber, lime green and colourless bottle and container glass. Among the lime green bottle glass were two which bear the base stamp of “C.D.G.A. Limited” and were date-stamped to 1930. There were 12 pieces of windowpane glass. Faunal remains, mostly shell, made up nearly one quarter of the artifacts recovered. Other notable early artifacts included an English grey prismatic type gunflint (Figure 3-36), and a cast copper-alloy button (Figure 3-37) similar to type seven of the North Carolina University button typology (1700-50) (Noel Hume 1969:91; White 2005:51). Metal button manufacturing in England rose to prominence during the eighteenth century. In the first half of the century buttons were cast with an attached eyelet which was then drilled. There were six smoking pipe stem fragments and one pipe bowl fragment.
Figure 3-35: BdCu-9: 61, coarse slipped and trailed redware, possibly Barton L12 - green & purple trailed slipware, French, eighteenth century.
Figure 3-36: BdCu-09: 56, English gunflint.

Figure 3-37: BdCu-09: 75, copper-alloy button.
Testing Results – Lawrencetown Township Site (BdCu-8)

Operation A

In 2010, a north-south facing 2m x 1m unit, designated Operation A, was introduced in the northern end of 3950 Lawrencetown Road to test the results of the geophysical survey. The southeast corner of the unit was placed at 15m E/4m S on survey area LTOWN02 (Figure 3-38). Immediately beneath the sod (Lot 1), the material culture from the unit was from an exclusive eighteenth century context. An influx of ground water curtailed excavation at the end of the 2010 field season, leaving a unit containing a layer of disarticulated stone (Figure 3-39), possibly from a former foundation (Lots 3 and 4). In 2011, the unit was reopened and excavated to a destruction layer of brick debris (Lots 5 to 8) and burnt timbers (Lot 10) within a pit dug into the subsoil (Lot 9) which contained evidence of structural remains. The structural elements combined with the material culture point to a mid-eighteenth century British occupation which is likely that of the short-lived fortified settlement of Lawrencetown Township (1754-57).

Unfortunately, water once again inundated the unit at the end of the 2011 field season preventing complete excavation of the operation. Figures 3 and 4 detail the lots within Operation A and B, respectively. In the analysis of the structural features, since they appear across the unit, Operations A and B will be discussed concurrently and lot correlations made where they appear. There were 884 artifacts (not including hundreds of
brick and charcoal fragments) recovered from both Operation A and B in 2010 and 2011.

Among those recovered were 313 wrought iron nails which were recorded but not collected. Chart 3-3 is a breakdown of the finds by functional group. See Appendix C for a full artifact catalogue.

Figure 3-38: Plan sketch of 40m x 25m Survey Area 1 (LTown02) at 3950 Lawrencetown Road showing location of BdCu-08 Operation A and B.
Following the removal of the sod (Lot 1), the next two lots, contained no discernible change in the soil matrix. The lots were designated based on an increase in the frequency and size of stones encountered, but also incrementally (by approximately 10cm unless a soil change occurred sooner), to help in dating the site through the analysis of changes in artifact typology. Thus, the first three lots contained only one modern artifact, a threaded iron bolt (found in the sod, not collected). The lots contained several pieces of ceramic with production dates spanning late in the seventeenth century to the first half of the eighteenth century including four pieces of Staffordshire Slipware, four pieces of tin-glazed earthenware, 18 pieces of white salt-glazed stoneware and one piece
of Nottingham stoneware. The lots also contained ceramics produced in the second half of the eighteenth century, including 13 pieces of Creamware and 13 pieces of Pearlware. After this, the artifact assemblage was devoid of ceramics or other artifacts known to have been produced only in the second half of the century or later, including Creamware and Pearlware, and suggests a context from the first half of the eighteenth century, or at the very least, prior to 1760.

Table 3-3: Stratigraphic Summary of BdCu-8 Operation A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Event(s)</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Sod</td>
<td>5YR 3/4 dark reddish brown sandy loam, lightly compacted, 1-2cm gravel/pebble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>5YR 3/4 dark reddish brown sandy loam, lightly compacted, 1-2cm gravel/pebble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Post-destruction fill</td>
<td>5YR 3/4 dark reddish brown sandy loam, lightly compacted, cobbles 20-25cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Post-destruction fill</td>
<td>5YR 3/4 dark reddish brown sandy loam, lightly compacted, cobbles 10-40cm, evidence of burning/destruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Destruction event</td>
<td>10YR 3/3 dark brown silty loam, gravel and cobble 2-40cm, pebbles 5mm-1cm, chunks of charcoal and degraded brick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Destruction event?</td>
<td>Medium brown sandy loam with chunks of brick and charcoal comprising approximately 10-15% of the soil matrix. Otherwise homogenous with pebbles, cobbles and small boulders 2.5cm – 45cm. Same context as Lot 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Remains of 18th C. brick and timber structure</td>
<td>Reddish brown soil matrix where present, but mostly comprised of brick and degraded brick material (80-90%), heavily compacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Remains of 18th C. brick and timber structure</td>
<td>Material associated with the large chunks of brick in south of unit, soil matrix is a homogenous medium brown loam, heavily compacted. Same context as Lot 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Culturally sterile subsoil forming a pit</td>
<td>Medium greyish brown with a yellow hue silty clay loam with parcels of clay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Charcoal layer lining pit</td>
<td>Sooty black charcoal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beginning in lot 4, though the primary soil matrix remained the same, evidence of a past destruction event could be detected with fragments of brick and charcoal. The lot was the first of several which contained a quantity of cobbles and small boulders that were rapidly in-filled as evidenced by the base of a white salt-glazed stoneware dish broken in place between two stones (Figure 3-40). This lot was also the first to contain significant numbers of artifacts from the architectural functional group with 50 pieces of wrought iron nails. Other artifacts of a diagnostic nature included ceramics such as white salt-glazed stoneware, Nottingham stoneware, Staffordshire slipware, tin-glazed earthenware and Imari-style porcelain. There were also two grey prismatic English-style gunflints and a blonde coloured gunspall, possibly of French manufacture.
Figure 3-40: *In-situ* photo of BdCu-8: 34 (Operation A, Lot 4), white salt-glazed stoneware base fragment fractured in place by stone.

Other artifacts of note from Lot 4 included an intact tobacco pipe bowl stamped with the crowned “WM” maker’s mark of William Manby, *ca.* 1719-63 (Figure 3-41; Davey 1980:368) and a pewter spoon handle, of the Hanoverian Pattern (Figure 3-42), with its rounded end and ridged on top forming hollows on either side. This pattern was produced in the first decade of the eighteenth century and remained the most popular
spoon type until about 1770. On early examples, the stem is turned sharply upward, which become less marked on later examples, which appears to be the case here. The size of the handle suggests that this utensil was a serving or “gravy spoon” (Snodin 1974:38).

Figure 3-41: BdCu-8: 46 (Operation A, Lot 4), William Manby clay tobacco pipe bowl, ca. 1719-63 (left), Illustration of Manby pipe bowl (Davey 1980) (right).

Figure 3-42: BdCu-8: 62 (Operation A, Lot 4), pewter spoon handle.
Lot 5 was designated late in the 2010 field season based on darkening of the soil and the increasing intensity of the charcoal and brick fragments. However, little work was done on the lot that year due to the height of the water table causing the unit to become water-logged. The unit was reopened and the lot was finished in 2011. Artifacts included white salt-glazed stoneware, Staffordshire slipware, Jackfield ware (1740-1790) and fragments of a delicate and fractured tin-glazed earthenware cup with a diapered blue circular rim decoration (Figure 3-43). Several examples of diapered, or repeated, rim patterns can be seen in a number of references detailing British and French manufacturers of tin-glazed ware, or Delft, showing a diamond-shaped pattern with short lines extending from the sides of the diamonds (Ray 1963; Garner 1972; Caiger-Smith 1973; Horvath 1979), dating from ca. 1700-1770. No examples of a circular version have been found. Parks Canada material culture researcher Denise Hansen (personal communication, July, 2011) was unable to confirm the piece’s ascription as either British or French. Fragments of tin-glazed earthenware with the same pattern type were later found in Lot 7, indicating a rapid in-filling of the unit. Lot 5 also contained a gunspall, lead waste, a large iron rod (25cm), 87 wrought nail fragments and a tobacco pipe bowl fragment with an unknown “WN” manufacturer’s mark within a circular cartouche. The lot contained several large stones (30-40cm), of a size useable in a foundation, bedded upon destruction fill.
Despite the fascinating archaeology, beyond this point excavation became troublesome in Operation A due to the rise in ground water following precipitation. It would sometimes take several days for the bottom of the unit to be free of standing water and to dry despite efforts at bailing and sponging water. Lot 6 was designated based on an intensification of destruction material in the centre of the unit. Contained within it was a course of disarticulated stone, that when removed, revealed two large pieces of burnt and collapsed timbers which ran east-west through the lot (Figure 3-44).
Lot 7 referred to a layer of bricks and brick debris filling a pit feature outlined by Lot 9 and underlying Lot 6 which runs the length of the pit feature extending into Operation B. The same context is recorded as Lot 4 in Operation B. Lot 8, in the far south of the unit is from the same context as Lot 7 and both lots were later merged. Since the lot was predominantly comprised of brick and brick debris in a heavily compacted layer, few artifacts were collected within it. These included 14 pieces of dark green wine bottle glass, a sample of food waste bone totalling 47 pieces, lead waste, an opaque white glass seed bead, the aforementioned tin glazed bowl fragment and the first of several pieces of Whieldonware, a white to light cream-coloured refined earthenware with mottled and spattered designs in purple and brown, produced between 1740-1770 (Noel
Hume 1969:123-24; South 1977:202). Other examples of this ware type were recovered in small numbers from Lots 1 through 4 in Operation B (Figure 3-45). Just five pieces of wrought iron nails were recovered from this lot.

Due to waterlogged conditions in the unit at the end of the field season, the full extent of Lot 7 was not completely excavated. The limits of the lot within the unit were identified with respect to the visible pit cut into the sterile subsoil. Identified as Lot 9, the sterile soil was a medium greyish brown with a yellow hue silty clay loam with parcels of clay. As the limits of the pit were defined, directly underlying Lot 7, separating it from the sterile soil, was a thin (2-4cm) layer of charcoal which lined the pit throughout both Operation A and into Operation B. Near the end of the season, as the contents of Lot 7

Figure 3-45: Whiedonware fragments recovered from BdCu-8, Operation B.
were being removed, two upright burnt posts were identified, presumably associated with the charcoal layer. The charcoal layer and posts were identified as Lot 10 (Figure 3-46). The only artifacts recovered from this lot were small fragments of burnt bone, totalling 30 pieces. As the outward edges of the pit were delineated and the material from Lot 7 was removed, the charcoal layer was exposed. Unfortunately, the full extent of these structural elements and all associated artifacts were not recovered before excavation conditions forced the premature closure of the unit.

Figure 3-46: Brick filled pit - BdCu-8 Operation A, Lots 7, 9 and 10. Trowel indicating north. September 27, 2011.
Operation B

At the beginning of the 2011 field season, a 2m extension was added immediately to the north of Operation A, intersecting the northern baseline of the survey area (Figure 3-38). Following the results of geophysical survey and the results of the 2010 test excavations, it was anticipated that a northward extension would reveal more of the buried stone encountered in Operation A. Instead the unit was brought to culturally sterile soil at a depth of approximately 40cm in all but the southern 50cm, into which was cut a steep-sided pit forming the end or corner of the same feature identified in Operation A (Figure 3-47). The pit feature in Operation B contained the same burnt material, brick debris, charcoal lining and similar artifact assemblage as Operation A.

Figure 3-47: East profile drawing of BdCu-8 Operation B.

Following the convention from the previous year, initial lots in Operation B were assigned on a distinction in the size of the stone and an arbitrary depth of approximately
10cm, unless a noticeable change in the soil matrix occurred sooner. Lot correlations with Operation A are included in Table 3-4. Lots 1 and 2 correlate to Lot 1 of Operation A and included eighteenth century ceramics such as Staffordshire slipware, white salt-glazed stoneware, Jackfieldware and Whieldonware. Fragments of wrought iron nails totalled 46 for the two lots (not collected). Lot 3 consisted of a layer of topsoil, analogous to Lot 2 and 3 of Operation A. Similar eighteenth century ceramics were present in this lot, as well as the inclusion of Anglo-American Redware, an unidentified mottled redware, Nottingham stoneware and Imari porcelain. 73 nail fragments were recovered from this lot (not collected).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Event(s)</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sod and sod development (analogous to Op. A, Lot 1)</td>
<td>Medium brown silty loam, light compaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sod development (analogous to Op. A, Lot 1)</td>
<td>Medium brown silty loam, pebbles and cobbles 2-15cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Topsoil (analogous to Op. A, Lot 2 and 3)</td>
<td>Medium brown sandy loam, pebbles and cobbles 5-20cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Destruction debris and brick-filled pit (analogous to Op. A, Lots 4, 5 and 7)</td>
<td>Medium brown sandy loam with brick and charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Culturally sterile (analogous to Op. A, Lot 9)</td>
<td>Greyish brown with a yellowish hue, gravelly silty clay with parcels of clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Charcoal lining pit (analogous to Op. A, Lot 10)</td>
<td>Sooty black charcoal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Lot 3 was being excavated, an increase in charcoal and brick debris was recognized in the southern portion of the operation and designated as Lot 4. The Lot first appeared in the southwest corner of the operation before spreading eastward across the entire southern 60cm of the unit. The remainder of Lot 3 was then quickly brought down onto sterile subsoil in the northern portion of the unit, which was identified as Lot 5, and
is analogous to Lot 9 of Operation A. The content of Lot 4 then receded into a pit cut into the subsoil, forming the northern end of the brick-filled feature described in Operation A (Figure 3-48). No distinction within Lot 4 was made with respect to Lots 5 through 7 in Operation A, as Lot 4 (Op. B) and Lot 7 (Op. A) were excavated simultaneously. Lot 4 contained fractured and intact bricks but few other artifacts. Those of note include Whiedonware, homogenous white salt-glazed stoneware and three pieces of a drab and incised white salt-glazed stoneware bowl, with a fan or scallop-shaped incised pattern (Figure 3-49). Patricia Samford, Director of the Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory ascribed the piece as an English-manufactured teabowl (P. Samford, email to author, June, 2012).

Figure 3-48: Plan view of BdCu-8, Operation B, Lots 4 (brick rubble) and 5 (sterile subsoil). A small amount of Lot 6 (charcoal) can be seen in the lower right, at the edge of the brick-filled pit. Trowel indicates north. September 13, 2011.
Figure 3-49: BdCu-8:161 (Operation B, Lot 4) – White salt-glazed stoneware bowl fragments with incised fan-shaped decoration.

The charcoal layer lining the portion of the pit in Operation B was given the designation of Lot 6. As Lot 4 was being removed at the transition between Operation A and B, Lot 6 was exposed. Figure 3-50 is an oblique angle view of the north end of the pit feature showing Lots 7 and 10 from Operation A and Lots 4 and 6 from Operation B. The photograph is taken from Operation A, looking north into Operation B. The upright burnt timbers can be seen near the bottom centre of the image, at the transition between Lot 10 and 7 in Operation A. Presumably, the burnt wood rests within Lot 10 and may be posts belonging to a former brick and timber structure. It was also at this level of
excavation that the water table was encountered, making excavation difficult. The top of the timber was at 73cm depth below surface and the adjacent extent of excavation was at a depth below surface of 89cm. Given the size of stone, suitable for a foundation, the presence of brick and associated burnt timbers in a pit dug into the subsoil, it is possible that the material recovered from this excavation is that of a domestic structure or possibly the blockhouse at Lawrencetown Township.
Figure 3-50: Oblique angle photograph of the division between BdCu-8 Operation A, Lots 7 and 10, and Operation B, Lots 4 and 6, showing charcoal-lined pit. Note upright burnt timber at lower centre of image. Trowel indicating north. September 26, 2011.
There were 55 measurable fragments of clay tobacco pipe (stems, bites and junctures), two complete pipe bowls, 26 other bowl fragments and one pipe spur recovered in BdCu-8, for a total of 84 pieces. Using Heighton and Deagon’s regression formula (South 1972), an update on the Binford regression formula for determining dates from kaolin clay pipe stems, a mean date for the Lawrencetown Township site (BdCu-8) was determined. Table 5 lists the number of fragments of each size bore diameter, measured in sixty-fourths of an inch, which gave a mean diameter for the boreholes from the sample of 4.69. The compound interest rate curve formula used to determine the date is shown below where Y equals the mean bore diameter:

\[
X = -\frac{\log Y + 1.04435}{0.05234}
\]

The value for X was calculated as 7.0088, which is then entered into the following formula:

\[
\text{Mean Date} = 1600 + 22X
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bore Diameter</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Fragment Count</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/64”</td>
<td>1750-1800</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/64”</td>
<td>1710-1750</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/64”</td>
<td>1680-1800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Date: 1754.19**

The mean date of 1754.19 matches well with the advancement that the site contains the remains of the early British effort to settle Lawrencetown.
The same calculation was made with a filtering of the sample, removing those pipe stem fragments from contexts containing known post-Deportation manufactured artifacts such as Pearlware and Creamware (BdCu-8, Operation A, Lots 1-3). Those layers are considered ascribed to occupation of Lawrencetown in the period following the 1754 attempt. The sample size was reduced to 41 pieces with a mean bore diameter of 4.87, where X equalled 6.82. The mean date then became 1749.98. This small shift in date, while eliminating some possible entries from a later context, does not result in a clear indication of a French occupation.

**Discussion**

The use of geophysical survey as the primary means of investigation in this project limited the areas surveyed to those free of obstruction and vegetation as described in the Methodology section. This resulted in a relatively small survey area when compared to the actual size of the properties investigated. Other tools, such as field-walking and consultation with landowners regarding history of property development, allowed for a more thorough examination of the properties. To its advantage, the ability to investigate sites with a non-invasive technique provided an opportunity for study of land that might not have been possible due to reluctance on the part of landowners to permit subsurface disturbance of their property. There was concern among many of the landowners, particularly in Grand Desert, about the prospect of excavation of significant archaeological resources on their properties due to the potential limitations imposed upon
their land use by the Special Places Protection Act (SPPA). Access to some properties, as indicated in Figure 3-51, was denied due, in part, to those concerns.

![Property Online Map]

**Figure 3-51:** Nova Scotia Property Online map showing areas of high archaeological potential within Grand Desert.

### The Green Estate Site (BdCu-9)

It would appear that the former stone pile at the location of BdCu-9, Operation A was either a naturally occurring glacial deposit or created from historic field clearing and did not represent a structural feature. The latent geophysical signature of the stone and/or the soil disturbance related to their removal was strong enough, however, to be detected by the EM-38B. Perhaps some glass bottles had been broken against the stones sometime in the past, accounting for the predominance of glass bottle fragments recovered from the
test pit. The other household artifacts recovered can be attributed to general occupation of the site in the late eighteenth to early twentieth centuries.

Due to the disturbed nature of the soil, stratigraphical analysis of BdCu-9, Operation B was not possible, preventing an accurate measure of the period of occupation. From the recovered artifact assemblage it appears the site contains the remains of a former dwelling occupied at least from the 1760s and perhaps until the first decades of the 20th Century. Coinciding map evidence suggests that the remains are likely those of the mansion house of the Estate of Benjamin Green Jr. The specific reissuing of the Lawrencetown Township property parcel to Benjamin Green in 1762 was based on “Improvements” he had made – either still standing from the initial settlement effort of 1754-57, or during the intervening years prior to reissue in 1762.

Lawrencetown Township Site (BdCu-8)

At the end of the 2011 excavation season the unit was beginning to reveal the most interesting archaeology, in the form of a charcoal-lined pit feature – the delicate remnants of a burnt timber and brick structure, possibly the remains of the foundation and chimney of the compound’s blockhouse or domestic building. Within the pit there appear to be at least two upright posts. The associated artifact assemblage of the unit indicates an occupation from sometime in the early eighteenth century to about 1760 and pipe stem analysis dates the site to 1754. While no concrete evidence of French occupation was found, several stand-out artifacts may date to the French period.
Unfortunately, the influx of water from the high water table prevented completion of the excavation. As a measure to help protect and cushion the charcoal and burnt wood, the unit was lined with a layer geo-textile fabric and three square bales of straw were placed into the unit, and once again lined with fabric before being covered with soil from the screened backdirt pile.

Aside from the sheer amount, the very presence of brick at the Lawrencetown Township site was surprising. Morris makes no mention of brick structures in his coastal survey and bricks are not included in the provisions provided to the settlers of Lawrencetown, whereby each family would receive “700 feet of boards, 700 nails, one hammer, one axe, one spade, [and] one handsaw” (Trider 1999:103). Three complete or fractured but mendable bricks collected from Operation B, Lot 4 each measured 10 x 7 x 23cm. According to Gunke (1987), dating or ascribing bricks based on their size is unreliable, due to the wide variability of manufacture. Based on their crudeness, however, including impressed grass or straw on the bottoms, indicating they were made on the ground or placed there during drying as opposed to being placed on palettes, it is possible that the bricks were made on site. Many brick fragments from the rubble field showed signs of charring on one side, indicating their use in a fireplace or chimney.

No confirmed French-manufactured material was recovered in an undisturbed context during this project and despite the entire peninsula being incorporated into its holdings, it is unknown if any standing or former French buildings were incorporated into the new settlement of Lawrencetown. The artifact assemblage contains a number of ceramic types
that could have been used during the French period, such as white salt-glazed stoneware, Staffordshire slipware and tin-glazed earthenware, with the exception of a small number of gunspalls that may have been of French origin, no readily identifiable pieces of French manufacture associated with Acadian occupation, such as Saintonge coarse earthenware were recovered. However, British and Anglo-American manufactured materials are frequently found on pre-Deportation Acadian sites (Lavoie 1987).

During the early stages of the British settlement, as was Morris’s initial suggestion to help fortify the town, the width of the peninsula was picketed, and the troops assigned to its protection had also “pitched the neck”, presumably exterior to the fortifications as a defensive measure against attack.109 A blockhouse was erected within a picketed compound which, once erected, was garrisoned by a reduced force of 40 rangers. While the original grant required the settling of 20 families, it is unknown how many homes and outbuildings were actually constructed or how the soldiers were housed. Buildings from the French settlement, or their remains, may have been present on site at the time of the arrival of the British. Ruined buildings, at the very least, would have afforded accessible stone for the building of new foundations and chimneys.

We have no clear idea of the specific design of the blockhouse at Lawrencetown. From historical documentation we know the materials used in its construction were

---

transported to the site by the soldiers. It would have been designed for quick assembly and disassembly, which was carried out when the garrison was recalled. The practice of prefabrication and overland transportation of blockhouses was not uncommon in the British military of the eighteenth century. The blockhouse at Fort Edward, built in 1750, was prefabricated in Halifax and carried overland to Piziquid. It measured 18 feet square in the lower storey. Its walls were pine square timbers, nine inches high and six inches thick laid horizontally on each other. Size and weight would have been important factors in its design. The floor of the blockhouse would have been two-inch thick softwood planking (Young 1980:20).

However temporary it may have been, the Lawrencetown blockhouse would have required a stable footing or base, which may have required a below-ground foundation or wall sill. As with the blockhouse at Fort Edward, its hearth and central chimney would likely have been constructed of brick. While several hundred wrought nail fragments were recovered on site, the excavation units contained relatively few pieces of window pane glass, indicating the presence of a structure with few windows. Fort Edward had two barracks capable of housing 200 men, so it is unlikely that the blockhouse there would have been used for that purpose. The 40 garrisoned rangers at Lawrencetown, however, could have used part of the structure as living space.

Although no indication of a ditch or palisade was visible from the geophysical results, to give a sense of its size, we know that the compound was enclosed by pickets.
Picketing, usually made of poles 10-14 feet long, planted in a ditch dug into the ground below the frost line, would have been the first line of defence, with perhaps a ditch surrounding the compound for an even more imposing defensive position (Young 1980:12).

The prefabrication of the British blockhouse in Nova Scotia would have led to a level of standardization of form. Blockhouses were inexpensive to manufacture and provided a versatile defensive structure. Charles Morris recognized their potential in his initial survey of the region as a temporary and quick means to establish a military presence in the territory. In the case of Lawrencetown, however, the presence of the fortified structure was not enough to prevent the abandonment of the community in the face of threat from outside the compound’s walls.

**Conclusion**

During the field seasons of 2009-2011, geophysical survey in Grand Desert and Lawrencetown, and subsurface testing in Lawrencetown provided evidence, both positive and negative, of the location of Pre-Deportation Acadian and later British settlements on the eastern shore of Nova Scotia. The research also afforded an opportunity to positively communicate the history of the region and the field of archaeology to community groups and to the landowners involved.
Two sites, The Green Estate site (BdCu-9), a late eighteenth to twentieth century domestic site, and The Lawrencetown Township Site (BdCu-8), the remains of an eighteenth century brick and timber structure destroyed by fire, attributed to the 1754-1757 Lawrencetown Settlement, were added to the Maritime Archaeological Resource Inventory of the Special Places Program. Further research in Grand Desert and Lawrencetown, as well as at locations in West Lawrencetown, Lloy and Three Fathom Harbour, will reveal the forgotten and neglected remains of an enduring colonial landscape.
Chapter Four

Conclusion and Discussion

The story of the various residents of the eastern shore of Nova Scotia comprises a valuable addition to the inclusive framework of Atlantic Canadian historiography, but it has gone largely neglected. This local study shines a focussed light on the broader processes of colonialism and imperialism through the comparison of how events occurring within the study area resemble those that happened elsewhere in the region. Following the founding of Halifax, the Acadian residents of the eastern shore departed for Île Royale. Similarly, Acadian settlers elsewhere in the region migrated to Île Royale and Île St Jean. As with the destruction of the village of Beaubassin, the eastern shore communities saw subsequent British reoccupation. There was intermittent pushback by the Mi’kmaq, but ultimately a shift of power occurred following the Deportation and the vacated Acadian lands were re-occupied by the New England Planters. The establishment of Lawrencetown would presage the arrival of the Planters and the formation of the townships of the 1760s where palisaded forts were erected. This was an early example of the process of reoccupation of French land that became the norm after 1760.

The cultural landscape of the eastern shore and the shortage of historical documentation allows for the consideration of multiple sources of evidence to contribute to a multi-faceted interpretation. While areas of sparse colonial settlement were far from
unimportant in the historical development of the region, they present significant difficulties for researchers in gaining access to the reality of what was happening on the ground. This study presents a reconnaissance of how interdisciplinary approaches may be the key to resolving this problem. The use of a landscape approach with a document such as the Charles Morris survey of 1752 is a means for exploring large regions. From this approach it is evident that the eastern shore was significant to the identity of its residents, who returned as refugees after being removed by the French, who had viewed the residents as resources of empire. The British authorities saw the abandoned land itself as a resource, founding Lunenburg and Lawrencetown on the deserted remains.

This thesis illustrates that the cultural landscape contains more information than what is visible to the eye. A landscape is both what is seen and what can be understood through the disciplines of history and the physical and social sciences. While this research has gathered large quantities of data, there is still much more work to be done. For the historical archaeologist, the eastern shore awaits the discovery of a constellation of important archaeological sites. The need for discovery and identification of these resources becomes apparent through the multidisciplinary approach provided by historical research, landscape theory, and community outreach. Through this thesis we have a tangible contribution to the historiography of a pivotal time in Mi’kmaki, Acadie and Nova Scotia.
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A Report of a survey made by order of his Excellency Governor Hopson, from the Town of Dartmouth round the Sea Coasts to a French deserted Settlement called Shillencooke.

From the Town of Dartmouth thro’ the Southeast passage of Chebucto to the Easternmost point of the said Bay is Seven miles 2/3, and from thence to the Inner Harbour of Muscodoboit, to the most Westerly Head of the said Harbour is Seven miles by several courses, according to the plan, at the Head where of is a fresh Water Brooke issuing out of the Country from the West. North West, from which Brooke across the Country to the Town of Dartmouth is 82º West Five miles.

All this Coast & Country is covered with Woods and don’t in any part appear to have been Cultivated by the Native Indians or French, except a small point opposite to Cornwallis Island, now the right of Mr Bulkeley, nor is there any Quantity of Natural Marshes, except Two Small pieces of Salt Marsh, one Containing about five Acres, on the South Side of the said Eastern Point, the other containing about Fifteen Acres, on the Northeastern part of the said point.

“The Inner Harbour of Muscodoboit is Shoal, at low Water the Sands appear dry almost all over it, There are two small Channells, the one running from the Entrance towards the North West on the Western Shore up to the Brook above mentioned & the other running from the said Entrance first Northeast & then to the North and North West. These Channells have From nine feet Water to about five, but are Extream narrow not being one Hundred feet over.

There is no appearance in this Harbour of any Lands which have been under Cultivation, there is a Salt Marsh on the East side of the Entrance of this Harbour which contains about Twenty five Acres.

From the mouth of the above described Harbour to the French Settlement at Muscodoboit the Course is S.E.B.S. [southeast by south?] three miles. From the Easternmost point of the Harbour of Chebucto to the said Settlement is Six miles and 2/3 of a mile, & the said Settlement is distant from Halifax by Water Fourteen miles and 2/3 of a mile by Water, From the Town of Dartmouth[...] over Land five mile to the Inner Harbour of Muscodoboit and round the said Harbour to the said Settlement is about Seven mile.
“The Harbour to this Settlement is but indifferent it being rather a Salt Water River or Creek, which is Shoal at its entrance, not having above Ten feet & gradually decreasing to Six feet, till you come to the Land on which the French had their Dwelling Houses, therefore it will not be safe for any other Vessels to use this Harbour than small craft, such as small Schooners, Sighters, & Boats, whose draught of Water does not exceed Six feet, the Channel being very narrow at Low Water & the Tide flowing at Common Tides not above Six feet on this Coast.

It lays open to the Winds that blow from the West round South to the Southeast, which Winds when they blow hard heave a large Swell on this Shoar, at which time (as I am informed by the people now making Hay here) the Sea makes a Breach quite across the Harbour.

The Creek divides into two Branches, One running to the Westward, the other Running to the Northeastward of the said Settlement but are Shoal being almost dry at Low Water & in some places fordable

The Land where the Inhabitants had their Dwelling Houses is a piece of Land elevated about Fifty feet above high Water mark & Commands a prospect of the Sea and”
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“and all the adjacent cleared Lands and Marshes has about Thirty Acres clear’d mostly covered with Fine English Grass, has a gradual Descent from the Center toward the Two rive[…] & Marshes described in the plan, & gradually rising into the Country North.

It is so situated, that if a Settlement Should be concluded to be made there it may be so Fortified, that the Inhabitants may Defend themselves against the Incursion of the Indians, because a line of about Seven hundred feet will extend from Water to Wat[…] which will enclose the Town designed on the plan, the other parts being surrounded with Water and a morass[?], & therefore no Danger would arise to them from the Enemy, unless, as the Winters in this Coun[…] are Subject to great Frosts, which by Freasing the Rivers & Morass[?] will make them passable, it would be prudent in the Inhabitants to fence those side of their Lots which lay next the Water & morass[?] with high pickets, and breast Works befor[…] their Streets, and that advantage might be rendred[sic] useless to the Enemy and the whole Town would be Inclosed tho’ it is n[…] not?] likely the Enemy would ever attack them those sides, as they must march above [a] mile in an open plain, before they could come[…]

To the southeast of this Settlement is a large Salt marsh extending one mile & a half in length & Contains about two Hundred Acres of Lands which may be mowed on the said marsh to the South, & next the Sea is a Piece of upland containing about Eighty Acres, the greatest part of which is cleared & brought to English Grass; the Southeast end of the marsh is joined to two large Tracts of Upland the Southernmost has about Thirty Acres, & the Easternmost has about Fifty Acres cleared and in English Grass these are the Cleared Lands which lay to the Southeast of the sd[sic] French Settlement.
To the West of the said Settlement is another large Salt marsh about one mile in length & contains about one Hundred and Twenty Acres, to the West of which is another piece of cleared upland in English Grass Containing about Twenty Acres and a House Still remaining.

Besides these there are Several other pieces of Salt marsh from whence a consider-able Quantity of Salt Hay may be taken.

The whole of the Cleared Lands in English Grass with the Salt marshes may Yeild [sic] Hay Sufficient for three Hundred head of neat Cattle, besides a Considerable number of”
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“of Sheep, provided it may be managed with good Husbandry.

Materials for Building.
There are large Number of Picketts which Grow on the Upland adjoining within Two Hundred Yards of the place markt for a Settlement, and on two Islands on the Southernmost marsh and indeed on almost every piece of Upland Surrounding it, the[re] is also Large Timber such as Beach, Birch, Hemlocke, Spruce ect. With which the Country about is covered; there is also Wood for fireing within three Hundred Ya[rd]s of the Designed Town, for Covering their Buildings; there are large Quantities of Sedge which make the best Thache.

For Chimneys, the Uplands are stoney, cannot fail of affording a Sufficient Quantity for that use and for Cellars, there is at present the stones of two Chimneys laying on the Ground, where the Houses were burnt dow[n] There are at present two Barns about Twenty Feet Square each, built of logs wi[th] Thackt Roofs from one of which at a Small distance is Spring of Good Wat[er]

The number of Islands & Peninsula which lay Southeastward from this Settle[ment] The one is, & the other being in a mann[er] almost, surrounded by Water may be of great Advantage, because they will be less exposed, to the Indians then the main Continent, where a small party may Surprise a few people, Scattered at their Labour, and secure their [sic]. These Island & peninsula may contain about Fifteen Hundred Acres of Upland, and from What appears by that which is already cultivated is of an Excellent Soil.

On the Northeast side of One of these peninsula’s has been a French Settlement and has about Twenty Acres of cleared Land.

From the Settlement to the Island called little Jeydore is Five mile, & from thence to the Settlement at Shillencooke is Five miles more.

This Settlement has also but an indifferent Harbour, having about three fathom without and at the Entrance within about nine feet & a very narrow Channell, This Harbour is Covered with sand at low Water except in the said Channell which carries up to the Mass House about four feet at low Water. This Settlement is made on a peninsula almost Surrounded by Water, at high Water but otherwise with Flatts at Low Water. It
has a South East & North a piece of Salt Marsh about two mile in Length, but of small
Wedth, being about forty Rod & Contains near"
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“near two Hundred Acres, but is not in Quality equal to that at Muscodoboit, it being
more sunken and broken with pits of Water.

The upland which is a high Hill has about Eighty Acres of English Grass, and
further North about half a mile is another piece of upland cleared of about Twenty Acres,
here are four Houses. These are all the Settlements within the Harbour, without to the
Westward is another piece of upland cleared of about Twenty Acres.

The Quantity of Hay produced from all of them may be Sufficient to support One
& Fifty head of Neat Cattle besides Sheep.

The most convenient & defensible place to build a Town is, where the Mass
House is from thence Southward where thee Will have the Widest part of the marsh in the
Front of the town, & the Creek for their small craft & for Information & land-ing, It is
also next to the Isthmus from whence they may expect to be molested chiefly.

But the Topp of the Hill will overlook it at the Distance of about Four Hundred
Yards, gradually ascending the whole hight of the Hill is about one Hundred Fifty feet. If
a Settlement be made h[ere] it may be Necessary to have a Blockhouse on

on the Hill which will answer two Designs, prevent the Enemy from Possessing the Hill,
and Command the whole hill, there being a Regular Decent there from, to the Water on
each side.

There are the same materials for Buildings & other uses handy & near, and
Springs of Fresh Water at the Foot of the Hill.

This Settlement will also have thee Conveniency of a number of Islands not
cleared which are connected together with Stoney Beaches, and run up the coast for four
mile, which will not be so exposed to the Indian Ravages as the main Land and may
contain about a Thousand Acres.

The French having been a long time settled in these two places, there is no doubt
but that a Road has been made from one Settlement to the other by Land in the most
Convenient place which will soon be discovered by the Settlers.

The Distance from one Settlement to the other is about Seven mile by Land
Course thro’ the Country E.B.N & S. & length By Sea is ten mile around the Coast.

These are all the remarks the short-ness of the time would permit me to make.

Signed

Cha. Morris

Rec’d with Gov’t Hopson’s Letter
dated 16th Octob’ 1752

Rec’d Nov’br 30 1752
Read Dec’br 12 1752
# Appendix B

## A List of Scanned Aerial Photographs from the Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources Aerial Photograph Library

### Grand Desert/West Chezzetcook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Number</th>
<th>Roll Number</th>
<th>Line Number</th>
<th>Photo Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11D</td>
<td>4630</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A-8769</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A-14288</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D/11E</td>
<td>74122</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D/11</td>
<td>03306</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### West Chezzetcook (Hwy 207)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Number</th>
<th>Roll Number</th>
<th>Line Number</th>
<th>Photo Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92330</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>03304</td>
<td>L2-E</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 23</td>
<td>14282</td>
<td>14 W</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D</td>
<td>A8769</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D</td>
<td>4630</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D</td>
<td>4630</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lawrencetown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Number</th>
<th>Roll Number</th>
<th>Line Number</th>
<th>Photo Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>02324</td>
<td>L16-1-E</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14288</td>
<td>L11</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A8781</td>
<td>L4W</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A8781</td>
<td>L4W</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### West Lawrencetown Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Number</th>
<th>Roll Number</th>
<th>Line Number</th>
<th>Photo Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Number</td>
<td>Roll Number</td>
<td>Line Number</td>
<td>Photo Number</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Colour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>02324</td>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>02324</td>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-14282</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-14282</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-14288</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A-8781</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A-8781</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lawrencetown Marsh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Number</th>
<th>Roll Number</th>
<th>Line Number</th>
<th>Photo Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>02324</td>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A14282</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A-8781</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lawrencetown – McDonald Hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Number</th>
<th>Roll Number</th>
<th>Line Number</th>
<th>Photo Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>02324</td>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-14288</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A-8781</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lloy – Smelt Hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Number</th>
<th>Roll Number</th>
<th>Line Number</th>
<th>Photo Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>02324</td>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-14282</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Number</td>
<td>Roll Number</td>
<td>Line Number</td>
<td>Photo Number</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Colour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>02324</td>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-14282</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-14282</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-14288</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-14288</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A-8781</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A-8781</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three Fathom Harbour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Number</th>
<th>Roll Number</th>
<th>Line Number</th>
<th>Photo Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>02324</td>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>02311</td>
<td>17-1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-14282</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-14282</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A-8781</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A-8781</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A-4630</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A-4630</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seaforth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Number</th>
<th>Roll Number</th>
<th>Line Number</th>
<th>Photo Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>92350</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>02324</td>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>02311</td>
<td>17-1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-14282</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-14282</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A-8781</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A-8781</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A-4630</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D11</td>
<td>A-4630</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1:15,840</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hfx East</td>
<td>82318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Entered</td>
<td>Borden #</td>
<td>Cat #</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Level/Lot</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Ware Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Coarse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Coarse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Entered</th>
<th>Borden #</th>
<th>Cat #</th>
<th>Collection Unit</th>
<th>Level/Lot</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Material Descr.</th>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th># of Pieces</th>
<th>Comp./Frag.</th>
<th>Heat-altered</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>Maker's mark - probably &quot;TD&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded Bottle, Wine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded Window Pane</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Blue Tint</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Lead Muscleball</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Piece of lead, possibly from the production of musketballs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Leaded</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Colourless glass, possibly leaded.  &quot;Check under UV light&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, Fine</td>
<td>Flatware</td>
<td>White Salt-glazed Stoneware, Homogenous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>4 base frags which are mendable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>White Salt-glazed Stoneware, Homogenous</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>White Salt-glazed Stoneware, Homogenous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Decorated with at least two bands of incised/tooled annular motif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Nottingham Stoneware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Nottingham Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Rim fragment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Nottingham Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Incised decoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Coarse</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Tin-glazed Earthenware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Paste only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Coarse</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Mottled Redware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Greensh-brown lead glaze with streaks of iron oxide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Coarse</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Redware frag with iron oxide decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Coarse</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Staffordshire Slipware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Underglaze blue, overglaze red</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>Complete pipe bowl with WM cartouche. William Manby (p. 1719-63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>4/64&quot; bore diameter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C – Lawrencetown Township Site (BdCu-8) Artifact Catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Entered</th>
<th>Borden #</th>
<th>Cat #</th>
<th>Collection Unit</th>
<th>Level/Lot</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Mat. Descr.</th>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th># of Pieces</th>
<th>Comp./Frag.</th>
<th>Heat-altered</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>5/64&quot; bore diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bite</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>Reworked pipe stem/bite. 5/64&quot; bore diameter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>Incomplete bone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Gunflint</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dark Grey</td>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>Gunflint likely of British origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, Wine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>One base fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, Wine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Possibly a lid or base of stemware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Light Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Possible rim fragment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Window Pane</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Green tint</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Copper Alloy</td>
<td>Button</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>Spoked/floral design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Pewter</td>
<td>Utensil Handle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Utensil handle with rutal design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fumail</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>White Salt-glazed</td>
<td>Stoneware, Homogenous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>巴aneware, Fine</td>
<td>Hollowware</td>
<td>Jackfield Ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Likely jackfield, although the sherd has a yellowish fabric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Staffordshire Slipware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>5/64&quot; bore diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bite</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>6/64&quot; bore diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>Incomplete bone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C – Lawrencetown Township Site (BdCu-8) Artifact Catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Entered</th>
<th>Borden #</th>
<th>Cat #</th>
<th>Collection Unit</th>
<th>Level/Lot</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th># of Pieces</th>
<th>Comp./Frag.</th>
<th>Heat-altered</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, Wine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Window Pane</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Green tint</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Gaspall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dark Grey</td>
<td>Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Gaspall Flake</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dark Grey</td>
<td>Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Sheet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Sproe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Shot</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Funnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified, White Salt-glazed Stoneware, Homogenous</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Slightly heat-altered. 1 rim frag, 1 pc with annular dec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified, Nottingham Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Rim sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified, Jackfield Ware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>1 possible teapot spout frag, molded with a tree branch decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthware, Coarse</td>
<td>Unidentified, Staffordshire Slipware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Unspecified, molded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Flatware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Pipe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, Wine, Shoulder/Neck Finish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Entered</td>
<td>Borden #</td>
<td>Cat #</td>
<td>Collection Unit</td>
<td>Level/Lot</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Mat. Descr.</td>
<td>Object Name</td>
<td>Ware Type</td>
<td># of Pieces</td>
<td>Comp./Frag.</td>
<td>Heat-altered</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, Wine, Base</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, Wine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, Wine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Flatglass</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Gunspall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Gunspall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Gunspall Flakes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Copper Alloy</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Strap</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Shot</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone, calcined</td>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Faunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone, calcined</td>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Faunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Hollowware</td>
<td>10-glazed Earthenware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>- Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>White Sub-glazed Stoneware, Homogenous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>- Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, Wine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bead, seed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Opaque White</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Faunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Wheeledware (1590- 1770)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>- Kitchen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Entered</th>
<th>Borden #</th>
<th>Cat #</th>
<th>Collection Unit #</th>
<th>Level/Lot</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Mat. Descr.</th>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th># of Pieces</th>
<th>Comp./Frag.</th>
<th>Heat-altered</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Blue decorated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone, calcined</td>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Coarse</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Staffordshire Slipware</td>
<td>1 Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Whieldonware (1740-1770)</td>
<td>1 Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Window Pane</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, Case</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Seed bubbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone, calcined</td>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Coarse</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Staffordshire Slipware</td>
<td>2 Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Whieldonware (1740-1770)</td>
<td>1 Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>White Salt-glazed Stoneware, Homogenous</td>
<td>2 Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>1 rim sherd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Jackfield Ware</td>
<td>1 Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1 Fragmentary</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Heat-altered ceramic rim sherd?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>Pipe bowl with mark on spur possible 'T' or 'T'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>Partial circular cartouche &quot;TD&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>4/64&quot; bore diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>5/64&quot; bore diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, Case</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Seed bubbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, Wine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Button</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Faceted black glass button with iron clasp missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Window Pane</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Green tint</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone, calcined</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Entered</th>
<th>Borden #</th>
<th>Cat #</th>
<th>Collection Unit</th>
<th>Level/Lot</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Wore Type</th>
<th># of Pieces</th>
<th>Comp./Frag.</th>
<th>Heat-altered</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Coarse</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Staffordshire Slipware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stone ware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>White Salt-glazed Stoneware, Homogenous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Coarse</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Mottled Redware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Coarse</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Anglo-American Redware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Whieldonware (1740-1770)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stone ware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Nottingham Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Rim fragment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Underglaze blue, overglaze red</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Rim fragments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>4/64&quot; bore diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>5/64&quot; bore diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, Wine, Finishing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Up-armed string rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>possible gunspall flake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Shot</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>Possible waste lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Nail, Wrought</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone, calcined</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>possible piece of mortar or bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stone ware, Fine</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>White Salt-glazed Stoneware, incised</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Incised fan-shaped decoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Coarse</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Whieldonware (1740-1770)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Coarse</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>White Salt-glazed Stoneware, Homogenous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stone ware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>White Salt-glazed Stoneware, Homogenous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay, White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>5/64&quot; bore diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Nail, Wrought</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Entered</td>
<td>Borden #</td>
<td>Cat #</td>
<td>Collection Unit</td>
<td>Level/Lot</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Mat. Deser.</td>
<td>Object Name</td>
<td>Ware Type</td>
<td># of Pieces</td>
<td>Comp./Frag.</td>
<td>Heat-altered</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone, calcined</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Funeral</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay; White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe Clay; White</td>
<td>Smoking Pipe, Stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>Incomplete bore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Nail, Wrought</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Not collected, reinterred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Nail, Wrought</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Not collected, reinterred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Nail, Wrought</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Not collected, reinterred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Nail, Wrought</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Not collected, reinterred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Nail, Wrought</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Not collected, reinterred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Nail, Wrought</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Not collected, reinterred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Nail, Wrought</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Not collected, reinterred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Nail, Wrought</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Not collected, reinterred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Nail, Wrought</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Not collected, reinterred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Nail, Wrought</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Not collected, reinterred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Nail, Wrought</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Not collected, reinterred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2012</td>
<td>BdCu-08</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Nail, Wrought</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Not collected, reinterred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C – The Green Estate (BdCu-9) Artifact Catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Entered</th>
<th>Borden #</th>
<th>Cat #</th>
<th>Collection Unit</th>
<th>Level/Lot</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Wareware Type</th>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th># of Pieces</th>
<th>Comp. Frag.</th>
<th>Heat-altered</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>Earthenware Coarse</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>4pcs of redware with right half of leaf painting, possibly Anglo-American Redware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>1pc blue decorated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, wine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Container</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Window pane</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Container</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>2 base fragments, possibly a flask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Window pane</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Flatglass</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Operation A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Container</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Moulded grape and leaf pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pearlware, hand-painted poly-chrome</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>White refined earthenware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C – The Green Estate (BdCu-9) Artifact Catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Entered</th>
<th>Borden #</th>
<th>Cat #</th>
<th>Collection Unit</th>
<th>Level/Lot</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Mat. Desc.</th>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th># of Pieces</th>
<th>Comp. Frag.</th>
<th>Heat-altered</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>White earthenware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Blue decorated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, wine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Container</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>One finish fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Window pane</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Window pane</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone, calcined</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td>Butcher marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Mollusk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
<td>Flatware</td>
<td>Pearlware, blue shell-edged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Blue decorated, possibly pearlware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>White earthenware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Blue decorated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>White earthenware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Fabric only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe clay white</td>
<td>Smoking pipe, stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>5/64&quot; bore diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Button</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Opaque white</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>4 holed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Window pane</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Light green</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Window pane</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C – The Green Estate (BdCu-9) Artifact Catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Entered</th>
<th>Borden #</th>
<th>Cat #</th>
<th>Collection/Unit</th>
<th>Level/Loc</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th># of Pieces</th>
<th>Comp.Frag.</th>
<th>Heat-altered</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Probably clear bottle glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Bottle, wine</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>1 neck fragment, 1 base fragment with stamp showing “E” inside a circle with vertical arrow running through it. Moulded-blown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>20th C. &quot;Javex&quot; brand glass bottle. One sherd has “...vex” stamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>1 neck sherd, one rectangular base sherd, possibly from a flask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>One finish fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Gunflint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>Incl. one intact small long bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Mollusk</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/11/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Coarse</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Staffordshire slipware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/11/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/11/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Flatware</td>
<td>Pearlware, blue shell-edged</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/11/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/11/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>White moulded earthenware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/11/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Bottle, wine, base</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/11/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Window pane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Light green</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/11/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Window pane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/11/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/11/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Bottle, octagonal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/11/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/11/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Lid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Floral moulded decoration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C – The Green Estate (BdCu-9) Artifact Catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Entered</th>
<th>Borden #</th>
<th>Cat #</th>
<th>Collection Unit</th>
<th>Level/Lot</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Mat. Descr.</th>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th># of Pieces</th>
<th>Comp. Frag.</th>
<th>Heat-altered</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Cu-Alloy</td>
<td>Burtons</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Cu-Alloy</td>
<td>Tacks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Broad metal tack set in piece of wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Mollusk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Cinder</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware</td>
<td>Coarse</td>
<td>Redware, slipped</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Coarse slip decorated redware with specking, rim sherd. Possibly Barton L19 or L20 (Barton, p. 53-55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>White refined earthenware</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Hand painted refined earthenware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Hand painted, possibly pearlware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>White refined earthenware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Brown glazed exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Blue decorated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, fine</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Stoneware, fine</td>
<td>Handle</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Blue decorated lid handle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe clay, white</td>
<td>Smoking pipe, bowl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pipe clay, white</td>
<td>Smoking pipe, stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>4/64&quot; bore diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, wine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Mould blown, 1 neck sherd with moulded diamond pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Container</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle, wine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Light bulb filament</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Probably from a light bulb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Unleaded</td>
<td>Window pane</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/2011</td>
<td>BdCu-09</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Entered</td>
<td>Borden #</td>
<td>Cat #</td>
<td>Collection Unit</td>
<td>Level/Lot</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Mat. Descr.</td>
<td>Object Name</td>
<td>Ware Type</td>
<td># of Pieces</td>
<td>Comp.Frag.</td>
<td>Heat-altered</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/2011 BdCu-09 100</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Organic Bone</td>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/2011 BdCu-09 101</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Organic Bone, calcined</td>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/2011 BdCu-09 102</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lithic Mortar</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/2011 BdCu-09 103</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic Earthenware Coarse</td>
<td>Unidentified Maritime slipware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Barton L25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/2011 BdCu-09 104</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified Pearlware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Blue decorated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/2011 BdCu-09 105</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified White refined earthenware, annular decorated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Brown decorated banded ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/2011 BdCu-09 106</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic Earthenware Fine</td>
<td>Unidentified Creamware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/2011 BdCu-09 107</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic Porcelain</td>
<td>Flatware Porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Hand painted, 20th C. &quot;Made in Japan&quot; stamp on bottom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/2011 BdCu-09 108</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ceramic Pipe clay white</td>
<td>Smoking pipe, stem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>5/64&quot; bore diameter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/2011 BdCu-09 110</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glass Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Colourless</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/2011 BdCu-09 113</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glass Unleaded</td>
<td>Bottle wine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/2011 BdCu-09 114</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Organic Bone, calcined</td>
<td>Mammal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/2011 BdCu-09 115</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Organic Shell</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/2011 BdCu-09 116</td>
<td>Operation B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lithic Mortar</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>