

A Preliminary Report on Excavations at the Humphrey and Lucy Chadbourne Site, 1995-2007

by Emerson W. Baker,
January 2009

History

In 1643 Humphrey Chadbourne bought a large tract of land at the confluence of the Great Works and Salmon Falls River from Sagamore Rowls.¹ Four years later Rowls sold more land to Chadbourne's brother-in-law, Thomas Spencer. Finally in 1651, he sold "an ould Corne ground which I the sayd Rowls have formerly made use of" to Chadbourne's mother-in-law, Katherine Treworgy.² Thus, from an early date, the family was well acquainted with the local Indians. Presumably, Humphrey took up residence on the site at the time of his purchase in 1643 or soon afterwards. The confluence of the rivers was an ideal spot for a fur trading post and Chadbourne's primary activity in these years probably was a fur trader, though he also was a house builder, a skill he would have learned from his father. In 1651 George Walton of Portsmouth, successfully sued Humphrey for building a house that was not up to the standards agreed upon in the building contract.³ In July 1654 Humphrey Chadbourne accompanied local Indians on a trading voyage to Lake Winnepesaukee, in southern New Hampshire. There he found himself at a major gathering of peoples, including "sagamores of note."⁴ Collectively this group wanted Chadbourne to help them negotiate a treaty with the government of Massachusetts.

That same year the town of Kittery granted Humphrey's father William Chadbourne a saw mill privilege on the Great Works River. The Chadbournes soon constructed a saw mill on the site, and the fur trade probably took a back seat to the developing lumber industry.

The thin documentary evidence suggests that the first house on the site may have been very simple. In the early eighteenth century Humphrey's great grandson made a deposition as a part of a land claims case on the Saco River. As a part of his deposition he said he remembered his father and uncle reminiscing about their "grandfather's logg house or logging house and that said house stood about half a mile Southerly of Quampeging (sic) Landing in Berwick near Little River now called great works river

¹ Rowls to Chadbourne, *York Deeds*, II, 27.

² Mr. Rowles to Katherine Treworgy, *York Deeds*, III, 10; Mr. Roles to Humphrey Chadbourne, *York Deeds*, I, 6; Mr. Rowles to Thomas Spencer, *York Deeds*, I, 18.

³ John Scales, ed., *Historical Memoranda Concerning Persons and Places in Old Dover, N.H.* (Dover: 1900), 240.

⁴ Humphrey Chadbourne to the General Court, October 9, 1654, Massachusetts Archives, XXX, 34.

and further saith not." ⁵ This locates the "logging house" somewhere near the confluence of the Salmon Falls and Great Works Rivers. While one might immediately think that Chadbourne was referring to a log cabin, a "logging hut" was in actuality a very crude structure, perhaps a lean-to or a semi-subterranean pit house that was constructed by loggers, while establishing a temporary camp in the area. For example, in 1707 the Kittery town records refer to land laid out to Thomas Goodwin, "beginning about 30 or 40 poles below the logging house or wigwam that Wm. Grant, Thomas and Daniel Goodwin, and Joseph Hodsden, kept in, the last winter." ⁶

It would seem that the deponent is probably recalling his father and uncle reminisce about their childhoods, when they remembered the original Chadbourne residence, a very crude affair, indeed. By their childhood the logging hut would have given way to the fine mansion house but the first structure still stood, perhaps being used as some sort of outbuilding.

The Chadbournes were not your typical early New England family, for several reasons. First, they were among the first settlers of the region, and related to the leading families. Humphrey's wife Lucy Treworgy was the niece of Nicholas Shapleigh, one of the richest and most powerful men in Maine. After the death of her husband James Treworgy, Lucy's mother would marry Edward Hilton. The Hiltons were also among the elite of the Piscataqua region. Although it cannot be proven, the family may be also be unusual because of they may have strayed from mainstream Puritan views. In 1645 Humphrey and Roger Nanney had jointly purchased a house in Dover from Christopher Lawson. Nanney was the son-in-law of the antinomian leader, Reverend John Wheelwright. Lawson was a kinsman of Anne Hutchinson and a follower of Wheelwright who had signed the Exeter Compact. Humphrey's and Lucy's daughter Patience married Thomas Spencer, who was disenfranchised in 1659 for entertaining Quakers. Their dealings with Quakers and Antinomians certainly suggest the family may have swayed from mainstream Puritanism.

Humphrey Chadbourne would prosper on the land and would become a leading office holder in and respected man in Kittery. When he died in 1667, he was one of the wealthiest men in New England. In addition to his mansion house and farm, he owned the nearby saw mill, a second farm in present-day Eliot, and other holdings of timberlands. The mansion house and farm were valued at 250 pounds. At the time, the entire estate for the average Maine man was perhaps 80-100 pounds. Thus, the house must have been extensive and well built. Humphrey's will was written May 25, 1667, and recorded on October 15, 1667.

⁵ Deposition of Humphrey Chadbourne, Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court File #138094.

⁶ Mary P. Thompson, *Landmarks in Ancient Dover, New Hampshire* (Bowie, Maryland: Heritage Books, 1991), 99.

Humphrey Chadbourne left behind a young family. The home farm was entailed by his will, and remained in the hands of the eldest son (Lieutenant Humphrey Chadbourne) and his eldest son (Humphrey Chadbourne III) until 1763. People outside the eldest son had very limited rights to use the land. When Lieutenant Humphrey Chadbourne inherited the land, he was only 14. The terms of the will dictated that his mother Lucy essentially controlled the property until he reached adulthood. Even after this point, Lucy and the minor children had the right to continue to live in the family house. Lucy remarried after April 1 1669 and probably by April 13, 1671. Her second husband, Thomas Wills, was a Kittery merchant.⁷

It was a second marriage for Thomas Wills as well, having married Sarah Abbott by 1662. They lived in Kittery, in the Crooked Lane house, which was given to them by Sarah's father, Walter Abbott. No deed was ever made, but this gift was confirmed in a deed on Jan. 30, 1688 (presumably actually 1689, especially since the deed presumes the 1688 death of Thomas Wills Sr.). The deed is from Peter and Thomas Abbott (sons of Walter Abbott) to their niece and nephew, Thomas and Sarah Wills. The deed states the house was a gift from Walter Abbott to their parents, and upon their death, the children were to inherit the house - 2/3 to Thomas Jr. and 1/3 to his sister Sarah.⁸ By this time Sarah had probably married John Geare. So, presumably soon after she married, Lucy moved in with Thomas in his house in Kittery, and she lived there until his death in 1689. She may have moved back to South Berwick at this time, though she would marry a third time, to Elias Stileman.

Probably about 1676 Lieutenant Humphrey Chadbourne married Sarah Bolles, and their first child was born in September 1678. In 1676 Humphrey would have been 23 and Sarah 19. Once he married, he gained the right, according to his father's will, to "fence and in a quantity of the aforesaid lands, at Newichawannock, either ten acres more or less for planting land, and also free liberty to erect and build him a Mansion house and other houses."⁹ It is possible that Structure 3 was occupied by Humphrey Jr. and his family.

King William's War would bring an end to the Chadbourne homestead. In 1689 Dover suffered from a devastating raid. In the spring of 1690 a combined Native and French force attacked Salmon Falls, killing and taking captive many friends and neighbors of the Chadbournes. No document survives to tell us exactly what happened to the homestead, or when it was destroyed, but all evidence suggests it was during the Salmon Falls raid.

⁷ *York Deeds*, II, 27-31.

⁸ *York Deeds*, VIII, 143.

⁹ William Sargent, ed., *Maine Wills, 1640-1760* (Portland: Brown, Thurston and Company, 1887), 49.

History of Excavation

The Humphrey Chadbourne site was discovered in August 1995, during a two-day project to introduce local teachers to archaeology. Every summer since then, the Old Berwick Historical Society has sponsored a two-week excavation at the site. The project is scheduled to conclude in 2001. The project has been a unique partnership between Salem State College, Old Berwick Historical Society, the Chadbourne Family Association, as well as professional archaeologists and dozens of community volunteers. Emerson W. Baker, Ph.D., of Salem State College, directs the project. The field assistants are Richard Fernald, Richard Lunt, and Gordon Russell. Several hundred volunteers have given thousands of volunteer hours to excavate the site, as well as clean and catalogue the artifacts.

Summary of work by seasons

1995 - A two-day field school was organized, on a site that was believed to contain the remains of the 1630s Newichawannock trading post. Instead, a mid-seventeenth-century homestead is revealed, the home of Humphrey Chadbourne Sr. and Jr., and their families.

1996 - The project expanded to two weeks of excavation and laboratory work to clean, catalogue and study artifacts. It became clear that a minimum of two structures had been discovered - a substantial dwelling house, and an earth-fast outbuilding, located just to the north of the house. All evidence indicated a house built in the 1640s or 1650s, and destroyed during the Salmon Falls raid of 1690. In other words, this could not be the 1630s trading post, but the home of the Chadbournes who purchased the land in 1643, and lived there until forced off in 1690. The 1996 dig was a tremendous success - over sixty people volunteered on an excavation that had produced some exciting finds that were beginning to tell us quite a bit about life for the first English settlers of the area. The story was carried far and wide by local newspapers coverage on MPBN's "Quest" television show and through a series of slide talks. The main talk given by Emerson Baker in the fall of 1996 had over 140 people in attendance.

1997 - Building upon previous successes, in 1997 the project lasted three weeks, with two weeks in the field, and one week in the laboratory. The 1997 project began in June with the installation of an exhibit curated by Emerson Baker, which told the story of the dig and displayed some of the significant finds of the 1995 and 1996 seasons. Every year since then, the exhibit has been added on to. In this way, even when the dig is not taking place, people can learn from it. Digging proceeded from July 22-26 (Tuesday-Saturday) and July 28-August 1 (Monday-Friday). After the first week, there were so many finds that Gordon Russell set up the laboratory on the second floor of the Counting House, supervising an average of six volunteers a day. The laboratory work continued after the dig, with the work being completed on August 18. Approximately

seventy people volunteered on the dig in 1997. Most people who helped in 1996 came back, and quite a few new volunteers helped as well. Most volunteers came from the Piscataqua region, but some came from as far north as greater Portland, and as far south as Essex County, Massachusetts. During the first week the crew averaged sixteen people a day. The second week, with a second crew in the lab, the field crew was usually around 10 people. As in the past, many volunteers are teachers and students (middle school, secondary school, undergraduates, and even several graduate students). One class from the University of New Hampshire visited twice: once to dig and once to work in the lab. A class of 35 students from Salem State visited the lab as well. In addition to volunteer excavators, approximately 200 people visited the dig. The archaeological field school from Strawberry Banke Museum toured the site, as did a large group of students from Hong Kong in a summer program at Berwick Academy. Others learned about the dig through newspaper coverage (Portsmouth Herald, Foster's Daily Democrat, Portland Press Herald) or on the 6:00 news on Channel 8 (Portland). The public lecture by Baker took place on September 25 with over one hundred in attendance.

1998 - The brief 1998 field season focused on fully delineating the mansion house, and an adjacent earth-fast barn or outbuilding. After these excavations it was now known that the house underwent at least three phases of construction between ca. 1643, and the time Chadbourne's probate inventory was drawn in 1667. After the 1998 season, the artifact total for the dig surpassed 15,000. In 1998, a third structure, labeled Structure 3 was located immediately to the south of Structure 1.

1999 - Work in 1999 took place in several areas of the site. First, extensive work was carried out in the cellar of the parlor, particularly to reveal the brick chimney remains in the parlor. In addition, extensive work was done throughout the lean-to. Some excavations took place in structure two, in hopes of finding further bounds for it. Finally, work was done to attempt to find the boundaries of the site, particularly, to define structure 3, the structure immediately south of Structure 1. Although the site bounds escaped definition, it became clear that Structure 3 was a seventeenth century residence. The artifacts tend to be very slightly earlier than Structure 1. This gives rise to the speculation that Structure 3 was the initial house built on the site by Humphrey Chadbourne, before he constructed his mansion house.

2000 - Year after year the Chadbourne dig has always seen to provide even more exciting developments than the year before, and 2000 was no exception. Work took place in three distinct areas of the site. The very first excavation unit revealed the sill line of the northern wall of Structure 3. By the time the season was over, much of the outline of this building had been revealed, as well as the building (or shed) that attached Structure 1 to Structure 3. The huge compound of buildings occupied by the Chadbournes is unlike anything yet documented for early northern New England. In

addition to this work, the final section of the rear wall of the house was exposed in the lean-to (the functional kitchen).

The greatest amount of work, however, took place with the excavation of cellar of Structure 1, adjacent to the cellar stairs, and the hearth base. This area proved to be extremely rich in domestic artifact scatter, and also the site of a huge pile of scrap iron, including hoes, hammers, chains, and group of collars and yokes that appear to be used hardware from the saw mill. The presence of this scrap iron suggests that a blacksmith had a nearby workshop. Although the hearth base was initially believed to be made of stone, much of it turned out to be clay, held in place by a wooden retaining wall.

2001 - This season continued to define the outline of Structure 3, in particular, searching for the front (or southern) wall of the house. This proved to be completely illusive, so it may have turned out to be construction via sill on grade, with no features to be discovered below ground. Work on the northeastern corner of Structure 3 did locate a posthole, suggesting a line of fencing running between that end of Structure 3 and the eastern end of Structure 1. This would have formed the fourth side of an enclosed courtyard at the site.

Work continued inside the cellar of Structure 1 as well in 2001, specifically in the units directly to the north of work in 2000. This area exposed the back corner of the cellar, proving conclusively that the side wall and back wall of the cellar were both made out of wooden plank retaining walls, held in place by earth-fast posts.

This find proved that the entire cellar was constructed at one time, and led to a major re-interpretation of the construction sequence for the house. It now appears that the kitchen and parlor, with two substantial chimneys, were all constructed at the same time. This was almost definitely in 1664, or perhaps 1665. This date is confirmed by the brick with "64" which was found in the parlor end of the cellar, and two window leads dated "1664." One lead was found in the parlor, and another was found on the stairwell to the cellar at the kitchen end. It is uncertain whether or not the back lean-to was raised at the same time. It probably was. Certainly this part of the house was built by 1667, for it is included by name in Humphrey Chadbourne's probate inventory.

2002 - Excavations in 2002 focused on Structure 3. One excavation unit exposed a section in the middle of the sill trench for Structure 3. The main area of concentration was the western end of Structure 3. Here a palisade trench was revealed that initially formed a defensive wall that connected Structure 1 and Structure 3. At some time - probably late in the 1680s - this palisade was torn down, and was replaced with a shed or outbuilding with a clay floor.

2003 - Excavations in 2003 were carried out in four distinct areas. Sizable areas were excavated in Structure 2, to better determine the extent and nature of this structure.

Plowzone was excavated above the cellar of structure one, to determine its outline, and as a precursor to completed excavation of the cellar (this was carried out in 2005). Also, a large excavation area was opened up to the west of the cellar of Structure 2. It initially appeared that an extension of the building went in this direction. Unfortunately, after extensive excavation, it was determined that this was a small, simple, twentieth-century building, possibly a chicken coop or some other outbuilding of the Yeaton-Varney homestead. Although the modern nature of this building was disappointing, a seventeenth-century Jesuit ring was discovered in this area - a very significant find.

The area in the vicinity of the front door of Structure 1 was excavated. Excavations in this area sought the broadcast scatter usually associated with early colonial doorways. Interestingly, no broadcast scatter was recovered, suggesting that the front yard may have been kept clean, as a formal court yard.

A third area of excavation was within the front, eastern, earth-fast room in Structure 1. These excavations did reveal an intermediate post in the eastern wall of the room.

Finally, several excavation units were placed in the yard between Structures 1 and 3, to determine possible usage of this area. Virtually no artifacts were recovered here.

2004 - Testing in 2004 was based on remote sensing in 2003, which indicated the presence to two major features. Ground penetrating radar suggested a cellar was located about twenty feet down slope (to the west) of Structure 2. This area had not been previously tested because it is on a significant slope. One large excavation area revealed a substantial cellar, dug into the hillside. Other excavation units revealed the dimensions of the cellar to be approximately 12' x 28'. The cellar is unlined, and dug into the clay subsoil. The cellar is currently interpreted as being under a barn, built on the slope of the hillside. Constructed in this fashion, the cellar would be accessible to a cart, and may have been used for manure.

A second feature, a long trench, had been spotted by ground penetrating radar and soil probing in 2003. It turned out to be a large sill trench - the end wall for a room that expanded Structure 1 to the west. The addition was 14 feet wide, and ran the full 30' depth of Structure 1. This increases the size of Structure 1 to 30' x 56'

2005 - This season focused on the complete excavation of the cellar of Structure 2. Structure 2 is a earth-fast outbuilding. It was hoped this would provide more details on the construction and use of the building. The cellar measured 8' 6" x 13' 3" and had a 4' wide bulkhead off the middle of the eastern wall. The cellar appears to have been lined with wooden planks as its retaining wall, but evidence of the planks was limited to several places. It was initially believed that this cellar might have been some sort of

dairy of cold storage area. Very few artifacts were recovered from the cellar, which makes it difficult to either confirm or rule out this interpretation.

In addition to work on Structure 2, work was carried out in the western end of structure 1, which was discovered in 2004. Work focused on defining the southwestern corner of the room. Also, several units were excavated around the back side of the parlor hearth, and chimney, to determine if the western end had a hearth. No evidence of a hearth was found, suggesting this room was unheated.

In the fall of 2005, an important discovery was made in the archaeology lab. For many years, efforts had been made to identify a specific pattern of polychrome tin-enameled earthenware. Fragments of four plates in the same pattern had been recovered, but the origins of the pieces was unknown. Thanks to the excellent web site of the Florida Museum of Natural history, an exact match was found in their collections. The four vessels turn out to be "platas" (plates) of Aucilla polychrome ware. This ceramic was made in Mexico City between 1650-1700, though the destruction of the Chadbourne site in 1690 suggests a terminal date of 1690 for our specimens. These fragments are the first known example of Spanish colonial tableware found in early New England. Such artifacts would not be expected, as it was illegal for the English to trade with the Spanish in the Caribbean. As such, these platas are evidence of New England's active Caribbean trade, and of clandestine dealings with the Spanish.

2006 - Excavations in 2006 focused on three areas - a section of palisade, an area to the west (outside) the palisade, and Structure 4.

Several excavation units were opened up around the perimeter of Structure 4, in order to better determine the size and nature of this building. It is earth-fast, and probably a barn, built into the hillside. One massive post-hole was exposed, possibly a corner post. Upslope, the building included a wooden retaining wall.

The crew exposed a large section of the clay cap over the palisade. We did not have time to excavate the palisade line under the clay, so the area was mapped, photographed and backfilled, with the palisade trench to be excavated in 2007.

Finally, thanks to Peter Sablock's ground penetrating radar, we also discovered an area about 20 feet to the west of the palisade. This area included several post holes, and the corner of a wattle fence. Overall, this appears to be an area of either livestock pens or garden plots enclosed by fence.

2007 - This was planned as the last year of field work on the site for the immediate future, so that work could focus on the laboratory, in preparation for a new museum exhibit and publications. So, it was a year to tie up loose ends, with work again focusing

on the palisade, and Structure 4. Unfortunately, the rainy summer and clay subsoil conspired against us, meaning work in both areas was curtailed when the water table was hit.

The section of palisade was excavated to its depth, at over five feet below grade. No discernable post holes or molds remained, raising a number of questions. Was the palisade ever completed? Or, were thy posts removed at some time? Unfortunately the extremely muddy conditions at the bottom of the trench made it extremely difficult to read the soil, and give any definitive answers. One thing can be said with certainty – this was a substantial palisade that required a great deal of labor to construct.

Work in Structure 4 was also frustrated by encountering the water table. A section was cut through the eastern wall of the structure, which confirmed the wood lined wall. However, no post holes were discovered. The northwest corner of the structure (or at least its cellar) was also revealed. Though excavation was suspended due to flooding of these excavation units, the corner was filled with evidence of burning, including samples of coal and slag. This would suggest that the blacksmith worked nearby. It is even possible that Structure 4 as a blacksmith shop, however, the amount of coal and slag was limited – far less than one would expect from such an operation. Rather, it seems likely that the blacksmith's shop was nearby, and in the post-1690 clean up of the site, some of the burned remains of the smithy were dumped into the nearby cellar of structure 4. Should excavations start up again, this would be a top priority area to return to.

Archaeological Results

Architectural

Since the earliest extant house in the state is believed to be the MacIntyre garrison of 1707 (in York), we have no standing buildings left to study early building practices in Maine. Therefore, the Humphrey Chadbourne provides some of the most important data yet recovered on seventeenth-century Maine housing.

The core of the site is Structure 1, Humphrey Chadbourne's mansion house. The dimensions of the house are approximately 42' x 30'. Until the 2001 season, it was believed that the house was constructed in at least three phases. However, the construction detail of the cellar make it now clear that the core of the house was constructed at one time, in 1664. It is possible the lean-to running along the back of the house was added on later, or it may have been part of a single build as well. Excavations have made it clear that while the cellar makes use of stonework as well as earth-fast retaining walls, the entire main cellar was constructed at once. This was

almost certainly in 1664 or 1665 at the latest. Window leads dated "1664" have been excavated in both ends of the house. One was recovered from the cellar steps, leading down to the cellar at the eastern end of the house. Another "1664" lead was excavated amid the chimney rubble in the parlor, at the western end of the house. This parlor chimney rubble also produced a brick with the number "64" cut into it before firing, providing a confirmation of the 1664 date. The parlor was plastered, an expensive rarity for its day, but the room sat above a wood-lined cellar, secured by earth-fast posts. The chimney base sat on clay, held in place by a wooden retaining wall, anchored with earth-fast posts. Behind the parlor, the extension of the lean-to was constructed with sills on grade.

The substantial floor plan, plastering and a large number of windows (then an expensive luxury) suggest a true "mansion house," on a grand scale never before found archaeologically in Maine. Still, the house is not out of place for the wealthier settlers of the Piscataqua. Richard Candee, who has provided invaluable advice to the project, has pointed out that architecturally the house has much in common with the 1664 Richard Jackson house, still standing in Portsmouth. At the same time, the Chadbourne house is a bit of an enigma, because of the variety of construction techniques used, including fairly crude techniques such as earth-fast posts, wood lined cellars, and sills laid on grade. Although such techniques are relatively common at other Maine sites, they have tended to be viewed as an expedient, used by people who did not have the money, the skills, or the know how to build in a better fashion. The fact that Humphrey Chadbourne, a wealthy millwright who was also an experienced carpenter, would also build this way is somewhat surprising. Chadbourne also did not lack for labor, for his probate inventory lists five indentured servants. Presumably Chadbourne used earth-fast architecture as a short cut. With a large house raised at once in 1664, there probably was not enough time to completely stone the cellar. There must have been enough work to be done at the mill to keep everyone busy, and Chadbourne had to wait until a business lull to complete the construction of the parlor. In the meantime, lumber was cheap and available from his own saw mill. Unfortunately, he died before he could complete the project.

After his death, Humphrey Jr. and Lucy must have had other priorities, as the - fast features were left as they were. The archaeological evidence suggests that the cellar walls probably started to collapse well before the house burned down in 1690. The cellar walls were two plans thick - one horizontal and one vertical. However, these were not enough to keep the subsoil out. The walls had already buckled at the base in several places, before 1690. Why was the cellar allowed to decay? The answer may at least partially lie in the fact that the cellar appears to have been quite wet, and perhaps not of much use. Furthermore, with so many sheds and outbuildings, there may not have been much need for the cellar for storage space.

Structure 2

Structure 2 is an earth-fast building with a cellar measuring 8' 6" x 13' 3" and a 4' wide bulkhead off the middle of the eastern wall. The cellar appears to have been lined with wooden planks as its retaining wall, but evidence of the planks was limited to several places. This cellar might have been some sort of dairy or cold storage area, however a paucity of artifacts leaves few clues to determine the usage of this building. The presence of redwares that were often used in dairying, combined with the shallow cellar, suggests this area might have been a dairy. However, the presence of tablewares and a lateen spoon also suggest that food consumption took place here as well. Hence, this may have been a multiple purpose building, serving as a dairy, as well as a quarter for the indentured servants.

Structure 3

In 1998 work immediately south of Structure 1 led to the discovery of Structure 3. Work in 2000 and 2001 exposed the northern (interior) wall of the building – consisting of a buried sill. One post hole has been found on the eastern end of the building, seven feet from the sill trench. If this represents a gable post, then Structure 1 would have been fourteen feet wide. Unfortunately, despite extensive excavation, no trace has yet been found of the southern wall of Structure 3. Excavations in 1999-2001 trenched across the presumed location of this wall, and found no evidence of a sill trench. This suggests one of two possibilities. First, while the northern wall sits on a buried sill, the southern wall uses different construction – earth-fast posts. Alternatively, the southern wall was built on a sill that was on grade, rather than buried. Structure 3 sits on a significant slope. From the approximate elevation established for the floor of the building, based on the north wall, if the front wall did have a sill, it would have to have been located above the present-day ground surface. So, the sill here would not have been buried deep enough to leave a trace below the plow zone.

The topography of Structure 3 makes for an unusual western end of the building as well. Again, the downward slope of the land means that this end of the building contained a shallow cellar that was dug into the hillside. It is quite possible that this cellar may have been open at the end, for access to storage on the ground level. More work is planned for this end of the building in 2002 and 2003, to help define this end of the building.

In addition to structural evidence of a building, Structure 3 contains considerable domestic trash – bones, ceramics, and tobacco pipes, suggesting that this building was used in part as a residence. Like structure 2, it may have been used as outbuildings for the farm, as well as for residential use. So far the data suggests that Structures 1 and 3 were occupied at the same time, though it appears that Structure 3 may have been

initially occupied after Structure 1. This suggests that Structure 3 was built (or at least occupied) after the main house. It may have been occupied by indentured servants. Alternatively, it may have been lived in by Humphrey Chadbourne jr., his wife Mary and their young family, while widow Lucy Chadbourne and her younger children remained in the main house.

Structure 4 Barn

Structure 4 appears to be an earth-fast barn, built into the hillside, behind (to the north) and slightly down slope of Structure 1. The building measures a minimum of fifteen feet by twenty-five feet. These bounds are determined by the corners of the cellar, and one major earth-fast post. It is entirely possible that this represents only part of a larger earth-fast building. Structure 4 was built into the hillside, utilizing a wooden retaining wall. It would have been a bi-level building. If it was indeed a bank barn, it would be logical for the cellar to be the manure pit. A wagon could back directly into the cellar from the western side of the building, and easily loaded with manure from the livestock housed above.

Overall, the Chadbourne site would have been an impressive complex of buildings that represent an important discovery for scholars of early New England. Traditionally, early New England homesteads were believed to consist of a dwelling with a detached barn and outbuildings. Instead, the Chadbourne property was an enclosed compound, with a central courtyard. There are few known parallels to the site. The best come from Connecticut, where research by Robert St. George has discovered several similar enclosed compounds. These sites date to the mid-seventeenth century, and were owned by merchants living in rural areas. St. George suggests that these properties may be similar to bawns in Ireland – manor houses that are well fenced, but not truly fortified. They may have been organized to keep close watch over livestock, to keep them from wandering off, or being seized by a hungry Native American.¹⁰

It should be noted that Lucy Chadbourne's family came from the West Country, which is known for its enclosed manor houses. It certainly is possible than rather than trying to replicate an Irish bawn, she and her husband hoped to replicate the style of a Devon manor house. Certainly the Chadbournes had enough wealth, power, and land to emulate the gentry, a fact that is clearly reflected in the artifacts from the site.

The Chadbourne enclosed manor may not be as unique as first thought. Several other probate inventories for Piscataqua merchants, particularly Robert Cutts of Kittery

¹⁰ Robert St. George, *Conversing by Sign: Poetics of Implication in Colonial New England Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 16-44.

and Nicholas Shapleigh of Eliot (Lucy Chadbourne's uncle) are suggestive of enclosed manor houses. Furthermore, preliminary test excavations at the home Lucy Chadbourne's mother, Katherine Shapleigh Treworgy Hilton, in Newfields, New Hampshire, hint at such a large compound as well.

Artifacts

Over 40,000 artifacts have been recovered from the excavations. The site was rapidly abandoned and then burned down, with virtually all of the family's possessions inside. Thus, it presents a complete and well-preserved record of life in Maine in the late 1600s. The fact that the Chadbournes were one of the wealthiest families in the colony means that they left a rather large and wide-ranging set of possessions behind for archaeologists. Many of the artifacts from the dig are on display at the Old Berwick Historical Society's Counting House Museum. The dig is one of the most artifact-rich and most important archaeology sites discovered in Southern Maine. Most artifacts are every-day sort of items: hand-forged nails, window glass, bits of stew bones, or stems from clay pipe stems. Others are much more revealing and unique. Several complete spoons - including one engraved "HL C" for Humphrey and Lucy Chadbourne; passementerie buttons, with silver thread; a mirror with an ivory handle; a decorated spur; an embossing seal with the image of a swan, used to seal letters with wax. Perhaps most telling was the discovery of a broken handle of a silver spoon, found in the trash on the floor of the cellar. This piece was clearly thrown away, rather than melted down.

As one would expect, many artifacts are related to the buildings on site. Thousands of hand-forged nails have been found, as well as hundreds of pieces of window glass, and window leads. Although these artifacts are typical, their sheer volume speaks to the wealth of the family. Since nails were hand-forged and not mass-produced, they were a costly item. Window glass was a relatively new technology, and still expensive. While poor families had few or no glass windows, the Chadbourne house was filled with windows.

One piece of window glass is quite unique, as it has "Tho:" scratched into it, while another has a "W" or an "M" scratched in it. Such window graffiti was not uncommon in colonial times. People would use diamonds and other sharp objects to scratch their names or names of loved ones into glass. "Tho:" was the seventeenth-century abbreviation for Thomas. It presumably refers to either Lucy Chadbourne's second husband Thomas Wills, or her son-in-law, Thomas Spencer.

The site also has several dated artifacts. Two window leads are marked "1664." It was not uncommon for glaziers to place their initials or date of manufacture on the inside seam of a window lead. A brick marked "64" was uncovered in the parlor, not far

from one of the dated window leads. Also, numerous pieces of plaster were found in the parlor, and these are another sign of the wealth of the family. Plastering rooms was a very new technique in the 1660s, when the room was constructed. Indeed, only one other seventeenth-century Maine site has produced plaster. Fancy door hardware and imported "cock's head" hinges as well as curtain rings suggest the house was well furnished.

Another substantial part of the artifact assemblage relates to foodways. Hundreds of pieces of redware would have been used in the preparation and storage of food. Fragments of iron and copper kettles would have been used for cooking. Perhaps the most unusual food-related artifact to be excavated is an iron dripping pan, which would have been placed in a fireplace under a spit, to catch meat juices for gravy. Numerous bones have been found, indicating the family principally a diet of domestic meat from cows, pigs and sheep. They also ate cod fish. The numerous pieces of fine delftware and other tablewares, in addition to spoons and knives suggest the Chadbournes were accustomed to fine dining.

Analysis of the extensive tableware ceramics from the site is underway. The minimum number of vessels indicates there were well over twenty pieces of tableware on site, between 1664 and 1690. This includes: combed-yellow slipware cups, Bartmann stoneware jugs, Westerwald (at least one mug and one jug), sgraffito plates, Portugese majolica plates, English delftware plates and cups (undecorated, blue on white, and polychrome). Many of the tablewares were extremely fancy, including at least one vessel of "Persian Blue" delftware.

The Chadbournes also owned at least four platos (plates) of Aucilla polychrome ware, a majolica made in Mexico City, ca. 1650-1690. This is the first known discovery of Spanish colonial ware on a site in the northeast, and suggests the Chadbournes were directly or indirectly involved in clandestine trading with the Spanish in the Caribbean. Such ties are not entirely surprising, given their role as merchants in the colonial lumber trade.

Other ceramics suggest the Chadbournes maintained ties to family back in England. North Devon gravel tempered wares and sgraffito are present, as is Totnes ware – the first recorded find of this pottery in New England. The potteries in Totnes, Devon, are only a few miles up the River Dart from the home of Lucy Chadbourne's grandfather, the Alexander Shapleigh. He was a merchant in Brixham, with his wharf and warehouses at the mouth of the river, opposite from the trading center of Dartmouth.

Other artifacts indicate occupations and activities on the site. An ax, a chisel, a timber dog, and pieces of saw mill blades are evidence of lumbering and saw milling. Chains, buckles and harness hardware were probably used by the Chadbournes' five

teams of oxen used to haul timber. A file would have been used to sharpen saw blades and other tools. Parts of a scythe blade are a reminder of harvesting crops. Fish hooks were used to catch dinner. Gun flints, musket balls, lead shot, a gun worm, and the breech plug from a pistol are all reminders of the threat of frontier warfare that would eventually claim the site. An embossed brass spur would have been used for horse riding, and also as a conspicuous sign of the family's wealth and power.

Like spurs, horseshoes could be symbolic as well as utilitarian. One horseshoe was found near to the exterior door in the lean-to, not far from the hasp for the door. Another shoe was found in the cellar, near door hardware, and not far from the believed location of the front door. Horseshoes were often over or next to doorways, to ward off evil or witches. While some horse and ox shoes found on the site were purely utilitarian, these two shoes appear to have been used to ward off witchcraft.

A number of personal possessions provide details of daily life. Quite a few artifacts relating to clothing and adornment have been found, including buttons, part of a thimble, dozens of straight pins, brass buckles, and two pair of scissors. Several buttons are made of silver thread. A glass mirror with an ivory handle was found in many pieces but it is a very rare find, exemplifying again the wealth of the family. The embossing seal, decorated with the swan points to the family's literacy.

Because of the range of finds, and their very fine quality, the Chadbourne site is becoming a "type site" for Maine in the late seventeenth century. That is, so many different artifacts have been found on site that other archaeologists are using the Chadbourne collection for comparative purposes as they study their sites.

Conclusions

From a research point of view, the Chadbourne site has revealed very important information, and is clearly a site with not only local but also national significance. Archaeologists and architectural historians have visited the site and all agree that it is well qualified to be on the National Register of Historic Places. The site is an archaeological "time capsule," rapidly abandoned and then burned down, with virtually all of the family's possessions inside. Thus, it presents a complete and well-preserved record of life in Maine in the late 1600s. The fact that the Chadbournes were one of the wealthiest families in the colony means that they left a rather large and wide-ranging set of possessions behind for archaeologists. It is already one of the most artifact-rich and most important historical archaeology sites discovered in Maine.