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INTRODUCTION

The King's Mountain National Military Park consists of an area of 3,950 acres situated in York and Cherokee Counties, South Carolina, near the North Carolina state line (Fig. 1). The Park was established as a unit of the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, to commemorate the Battle of King's Mountain that took place on October 7, 1780. This major battle of the Revolutionary War was a short engagement but resulted in the defeat of the Tory forces, under the command of Major Patrick Ferguson, by troops composed mainly of mountain men.

As a part of the American Bicentennial commemoration, the National Park Service asked the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina to undertake archeological investigations of the Park area. This resulted in three separate contracts between the Service and the Institute. The first of these was designed to survey and test areas of the Park where Revolutionary War period roads, trails, and related features might be found, and to survey and test areas where archeological remains might be present at the proposed location of a new visitors' center (Carrillo 1974a).

The second and third contracts between the Service and the Institute were designed to investigate the remains of an historic house built by Henry Howser around 1803. Finally, the contracts called for excavations to locate the burial place of Major William Chronicle and of a mass burial of the victims of the battle, said to have been gathered from the field and buried in a mass grave in 1815, some 35 years after the battle.

The research undertaken within the terms of the first contract, for the road survey, was accomplished in the fall of 1973 and the spring of 1974 (Carrillo 1974a).

The research undertaken within the terms of the second and third contracts, for the Chronicle Grave and Mass burial and for the Howser House, was accomplished during June-August, 1974, under the direction of the present writer with a crew of seven. Laboratory analyses of these materials and the preparation of the present report have been done inter­mittently during 1975 and 1976. The results of both these latter projects are combined in this report.

The Howser House

The Howser House consists of a two-story stone structure built c. 1803 by Henry Howser, a stone mason and distiller (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974). Due to its unique appearance, the National Park Service is contem­plating a complete restoration to serve as an additional exhibit at the Park.

The contract in which the National Park Service proposed the archeological work at the Howser House consisted of two elements:
1. Archeological excavations would be conducted at the Howser House site to obtain as much information as possible regarding the construction of the foundations, steps, and other architectural features in direct association with the house.

2. Archeological survey and testing to locate buildings and other structural features related to the house complex would be undertaken to obtain information concerning the size, construction, and use of each. This portion of the project would include research related to the following:

a. Structures thought to have been in existence near the house in 1803, consisting of a summer kitchen and outbuildings.

b. The well used by the occupants of the house.

c. The privy(ies) used by the occupants of the house.

d. The terraces surrounding the house and the related stone retaining wall.

The goal of the proposed project was to attempt to gather information which would serve as an added base for interpretation of the Howser House for the visitors to King’s Mountain National Military Park.

In addition to the above outlined archeological proposal, historical and architectural research was conducted to augment the archeological research (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974). The historical research was undertaken by Park Service Historian Edwin C. Bearss. Park Service Historical Architect Michael Adlerstein conducted the architectural study.

**The King’s Mountain Burials**

The second project undertaken at the King’s Mountain National Military Park consisted of:

1. Archeological excavations at the site of a stone marker, known as the Chronicle Marker, in an attempt to verify the burial location of four individuals killed during the Battle of King’s Mountain. One of the individuals believed to have been buried in the grave was Major William Chronicle, an American officer.

2. Archeological test excavations in an attempt to locate the site of the 1815 mass burial of scattered bones of Patriots and Loyalist troops, killed during the battle, for possible preservation and interpretation.

The goal of the proposed archeological investigations was to locate and properly designate the areas where the individuals involved in the battle were buried. The major emphasis of the project was centered around the area where a stone marker, erected in 1815, supposedly served to indicate the location of a burial containing four individuals.
THE HOWSER HOUSE

Historical Background

The historical information relative to the Howser House has been excellently documented by Edwin C. Bearss (1974). For the purposes of this study, only a brief sketch will be presented with emphasis directed primarily towards relevant data concerning the stone structure and excavated outbuildings.

The section of land upon which the Howser House and two outbuildings are situated was purchased by Henry Howser in 1788 (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974: 3). Through purchases and subsequent grants made to him by the Governor of South Carolina, Henry Howser increased his land holdings considerably and at the time of his death in 1822 owned several thousand acres of land in York District.

After his death, Howser's widow, Jane, continued to live in the house until 1832 when it was sold to her son, Henry Howser II. He died in 1842 and his widow continued to reside in the house until her death in 1882 (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974: 7-16).

After 1882, the property changed hands several times until, in 1938, the National Park Service purchased 402 acres including the Howser House, outbuildings, and a stone lined well.

The Howser House is located upon a hilltop (Figs. 2 & 3). The hill has been graded into three terraces forming a semicircular feature surrounding the north, west and south sides. Each terrace is approximately six feet lower than the one above it. The uppermost portion of the hill is approximately 25 feet in width, and is the location of the house and well. This uppermost terrace is supported by a stone wall which encompasses the back and sides of the house (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974: 186). It is believed that the terraces, with the exception of the one upon which the house is situated, were constructed sometime between 1880-1920 when terracing became a common practice in the Southeast (Hall 1940: 26-27).

The stone house is a two-story structure (Fig. 4), the plan of which is rectangular, measuring 31 feet 6 inches by 27 feet 4 inches. A basement is located in the southern half. Two chimneys are located at the extreme ends and are flush with the exterior walls (Fig. 5). The east door lintel contains an inscription which reads:

HENRY HOWSER - Stone Mason
*JANE HOWSER 1803

It is believed that the lintel was inscribed over a period of time and the date is considered to be an approximation of the actual construction of the structure (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974: 186-187).

The west side (back) of the structure has an attached frame addition, dating from approximately 1900 or later, which was used as a kitchen. It is a one-room structure having a porch on the south side (Fig. 6).
FIGURE 2. Map with Howser House and Outbuildings.
FIGURE 3. Archeological Base Map of Howser House.
FIGURE 4. Howser House--View to the West.

FIGURE 5. View of North Side of House.
FIGURE 6. Wooden Structure Attached to House--View to the North.
Interviews conducted with individuals who were familiar with the house as youths indicated that a separate structure had existed earlier, which was used as a summer kitchen (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974: 153-154, 172-173).

Across the road from the Howser House, approximately 260 feet east of the structure, stone foundations were evident. These are thought to have been the remains of a barn and corncrib (Figs. 7 & 8). Interviews with local informants indicated that at least two of the structures had, indeed, served as a barn and corncrib (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974: 154-155).

Research Orientation

The Piedmont area of South Carolina was settled primarily by groups of individuals of British and German cultural traditions beginning in the mid-1700's (Meriwether 1940). The Howser House is a structure built and occupied by an individual representing the German cultural tradition (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974).

Archeological excavations conducted at the towns of Bethabara (South 1972a) and Brunswick (South 1977), in North Carolina, eighteenth century German and English towns respectively, had indicated a difference in refuse disposal practices. At Brunswick, South found that the residents of the structures discarded their refuse adjacent to their homes, both at the front and back doors. He has defined this phenomenon as the Brunswick Pattern (South 1977). Excavations undertaken at the Paca House, an eighteenth century English structure located in Annapolis, Maryland also revealed a pattern similar to that at Brunswick (South 1967). At the site of Bethabara, a German community, only low densities of artifacts were recovered from areas adjacent to the structures (South 1972a).

Further evidence which supports the differences observed in the archeological record has been noted in architectural descriptions:

... basic concepts composed of squares were used to generate ... Anglo-American typological families, and German-American architectural design commences with differently composed base concepts with inevitably distinct results... (Glassie 1973: 329).

It appears that if sociocultural differences are apparent in the architectural makeup of structures attributable to two distinct socio-cultural groups, then the archeological record should reveal evidence of these distinctions as well. Binford (1962: 218) indicates that:

... artifacts having their primary functional context in different operational sub-systems of the total cultural context will exhibit differences and similarities differently, in terms of the structure of the cultural system of which they are a part. Further ... the temporal and spatial spans within and between broad functional categories will vary with the structure of the systematic relationships between socio-cultural systems.
FIGURE 7. Excavations at Barn Site—View to the North.

FIGURE 8. Corn Crib—View to the West.
He goes on to add:

... we cannot dig up a social system or ideology ..., but we can and do excavate the material items which functioned together with these more behavioral elements within the appropriate cultural sub-systems. The formal structure of artifact assemblages together with the between element contextual relationships should and do present a systematic and understandable picture of the total extinct cultural system (Binford 1962: 218-219).

Cleland (1970: 7-23) noted that differences existed between the French and British occupants at Fort Michilimackinac, in the technological, social and ideological systems of these societies. Based on these differences, he indicated that it was logical to assume that the differences exhibited between these systems would have resulted in significant differences in the subsistence patterns.

Archeologists (Schiffer 1972; Schiffer and Rathje 1973; Reid, Rathje and Schiffer 1974) have begun to urge the examination of the archeological record with the goal of determining the behavior responsible for producing that record. The archeological record represents a static, and seemingly ambiguous, but directly observable byproduct of a cultural system. Cultural and noncultural formation processes affecting this record must also be considered (Fritz 1972: 135-157; Binford 1975: 251; Reid, Schiffer and Neff 1975: 209-224). It was with this in mind that the archeological work at Howser House was carried out. This report will attempt to go further than simply setting down a description of artifacts and architectural features; it will attempt to delineate the processes responsible for the archeological record.

In keeping with this approach, the archeological data gathered from the Howser House is viewed within a framework which examines the artifacts within the archeological context and their relationship to each other. Based on the observations, statements in the form of propositions are made regarding the processes involved in creating the archeological record. Once this has been determined, the artifact data will be compared with the material recovered in the areas defined as (1) the well area, (2) the terraces located behind the structure, and (3) the outbuildings, to determine if significant differences can be detected in their deposition because of the assumed differing behavioral processes through which they were deposited. For the purpose of this report, the standard methodology adhered to in most historical archeology reports, which entails separating the artifacts into various categories according to prescribed standards, and describing the artifacts in detail without attempting to synthesize them, was not used. It is hoped that the results obtained by treating the artifacts in the manner used here not only provides a catalogue of cultural material, but in addition, and more importantly, provides a basis from which to make statements in the form of testable propositions regarding the processes responsible for creating the archeological record.
The archeological excavations consisted of examining four areas: (1) the area behind the house for the purposes of gathering information regarding the existence of a separate kitchen, (2) the well area, (3) the lower terraces to locate a privy, and (4) the area where the outbuildings were located (Fig. 9). Plans had been made initially to excavate all areas adjacent to the house. Upon initiating excavations, however, it was found, as had been previously thought based on exploratory tests conducted by Park Service Archeologist Jack Walker and myself (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974: 187), that the areas east and south of the structure had been subjected to grading to subsoil depth and these areas were devoid of evidence of occupation. It is uncertain as to when this disturbance took place. Photographs dated c. 1900 indicate that stripping had occurred prior to that date (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974: 184). In addition, it was noted that the front stone steps, set on a loose rubble base, consisted of two different types of stone. Two stones with dimensions of 3' x 4' x 8" comprising the top two steps are thought to be of the earlier period, while three smaller steps having dimensions of 1' x 4' x 8" appear to have been a later addition, attributable to the period when the grading took place (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974: 198).

The excavations conducted at the Howser House were initially planned to obtain information about structures located in the immediate vicinity of the house. Due to the grading, excavations in the immediate vicinity of the house were restricted to an area behind the structure, surrounded by a rock wall on the south, west, and east sides. Interviews conducted with individuals familiar with the structure revealed that the present wooden ell addition, which was used as a combination kitchen and dining room, was not the original structure housing a summer kitchen (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974: 81, 153-155, 172-175). The excavations concentrated on examining as total a sample as possible from the back area of the house in an effort to make determinations of the existence of a possible detached structure.

Although the primary objective was to obtain architectural data, the excavations were undertaken in anticipation of using the artifact data to detect patterning in their distribution. For this purpose a five-foot grid system was used. All features, e.g., postmolds, stone, etc., were recorded using transit and tape to provide a site plan into which all the features could be incorporated (Fig. 3). A total of 26 5' x 5' units were excavated behind the house. Initial test excavations were made along the north and south sides in order to substantiate that grading had occurred in these areas.

The stratigraphic situation which was found behind the house consisted of five zones (Figs. 10 & 11). The initial zone consisted of a yellow clay subsoil which was defined as Level E. Level D, resting upon this zone, was a humus zone which was quite shallow and produced only twelve artifacts. The original slope of the hill can be seen in Figure 11. Level C consisted of, for the most part, sterile reddish clay. This was apparently brought in at some time during the occupation of the house to level the back area. It was at this time that the surrounding stone wall was built. Another humus zone, designated Level B, was detected above

FIGURE 10. Soil Profile of Units 27-29.
the sterile fill. This consisted of a dark brown, clayey humus. Above this zone, another lighter tan clay soil was defined and termed Level A. Above Level A, a humus zone comprising the recent surface was defined.

The stratigraphic sequence was well defined and consistent throughout the area with the exception of the northwest corner, where it varied, primarily in Units 38, 51 and 40. In this area, the sterile clay zone (Level C) was not detected. This area appears to have served as a dump, and for purposes of analysis was treated as such. Evidence was found (Fig. 3) which indicates that a structure was located in this area. Cut stone footings were found in Units 6 and 28 that may have made up the southeast foundations, and in Unit 68, that may have been the northwest corner. There is a very strong possibility that these were the footings for the structure referred to by informants as a kitchen. If so, the structure would have been approximately 17' N-S by 12' E-W. The stone foundations were situated upon the yellow clay subsoil (Level E) in Units 6 and 28 and upon Level D in Unit 68. It appears that the structure may have been a quite early structure near the main house. Archeological evidence substantiates the fact that, even though alterations in the form of the present ell were made at a later period at the back of the house, a previous structure had also been present.

In addition to the stone foundations, a series of shallow depressions was found (Figs. 3 & 12). They were initially thought to be postmolds, but upon excavation were found to be too shallow, ranging in depth from .2' to .4'. In Unit 72D, a depression containing charcoal was located (Figs. 3 & 13). This depression extended beneath the stone wall which had been constructed over it.

Artifact Analyses

The second goal of this study consisted of using the artifact data to develop an understanding of the behavior which created the archeological record. Although the main objective of the project was architectural in nature, the probability was that the careful examination of the relationships between the artifacts recovered from the various identifiable stratigraphic zones would be of importance in developing an understanding of the behavior which caused the archeological record. The information, in addition, could be used to add to the interpretation of the site in a more comprehensive manner. This approach was successfully demonstrated with the artifactual material recovered at Brattonsville (Wilkins, Hunter and Carrillo 1975).

Although several classes of artifacts were recovered at the Howser House, for the purposes of this study only four functional classes were used: ceramics, bottle glass, window glass, and nails. These classes comprise the greatest quantity of artifacts recovered archeologically, and they were found in sufficient numbers to enable them to be examined statistically. The plan was to analyze the four classes obtained from the excavations conducted behind the Howser House in an effort to clarify temporal and spatial relationships existing among the artifacts throughout the excavated area. Due to this statistical treatment, only artifacts from completely excavated units were considered.
FIGURE 11. Soil Profile of Units 27-29--View to the East.

FIGURE 12. Archeological Excavations at Howser House--View to the North.
FIGURE 13. Depression under Wall--View to the West.
The strategy for the use of the analyzed artifact inventory may be divided into four parts.

(1) Test to determine if significant variability exists in the archeological record between three definable artifact bearing levels: Surface, Level A and Level B. Levels C and D were not included due to the low quantity of artifacts in these levels. The purpose of this procedure was to establish whether or not the total artifact content should be treated as a homogeneous unit for purposes of discussion. This was accomplished using a Chi-square ($X^2$) test which determines significant associations between two or more variables.

(2) Once this had been established, tests were made to determine variability among the various artifact classes using the Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient test (Siegel 1956: 259-60). This test indicates the degree to which two variables are related to one another. The results of the tests conducted on the Brattonsville artifact data revealed distinct dichotomies existing between the ceramics and bottle glass when compared to nails and window glass (Wilkins, Hunter and Carrillo 1975).

(3) Tests were made to determine artifact variability between specific use units (Features) and generally distributed artifacts. These tests were used to make functional determinations between the subsurface artifacts and those found in features. Similar tests conducted with the Brattonsville artifact data indicated differing behavioral activity occurring between artifacts associated with the general subsurface and those found in a feature (Wilkins, Hunter and Carrillo 1975: 37-60).

(4) On the basis of the derived data, statements were made in the form of testable propositions. Hopefully, the propositions will serve two purposes: (a) they will substantiate specific problems relative to the processes involved in forming the archeological record at the Howser House, and (b) the general patterning relative to the Howser House, as presented, should correspond with cultural processes creating archeological records within similar sociocultural contexts.

As has been previously stated, the excavations produced five distinct stratigraphic zones which were clearly defined. Level E consisted of the subsoil. Level D consisted of a brown clay, artifact-bearing zone overlying the subsoil. This zone contained the remains of the initial occupation c. 1803. Level C consists of a red clay fill which was used to level the back area of the house when the stone wall was constructed. Level B, a brown clay, artifact-bearing soil, is thought to represent the occupation of c. 1817, based upon the Mean Ceramic Date Formula (South 1972b), which resulted from the activity which took place after the construction of the stone retaining wall. Level A consisted of a tan clay soil from which a considerable quantity of artifacts was recovered. The surface zone consisted of two to three inches of brown humus.

The following statistical analyses were conducted using the artifacts from the Surface zone, Level A and Level B. Another unit used, isolated from the stratigraphic levels, was a refuse disposal area located in the northwest corner in Units 38, 40 and 51. For statistical purposes, this was treated as a separate homogeneous unit.
Surface and Level A Comparisons

The X\(^2\) test was conducted to determine the variability, if any, existing between the cultural material recovered from the Surface zone and Level A (Figs. 14 & 15). The quantities of artifacts recovered from the excavation units under study (4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40, 51, 53, 54, 55, 67, 68, 70, 71, and 72) are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>207</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>507</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The X\(^2\) test indicated a significant difference between the two zones (X\(^2\) = 37, df=3, p<.001).

Next the X\(^2\) test was conducted for all of the material from the Surface zone, excluding Units 38, 40 and 51, to determine whether the results would be significantly altered. The stratigraphic sequence in these units appeared to coincide with that of the rest of the units with the exception of Level C, which did not correspond; but since Level C was not used for the purposes of this discussion, it was not included.

The frequencies derived from the units, excluding Units 38, 40 and 51 were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 14. Distribution Map of Artifacts from Surface Zone.

FIGURE 15. Distribution Map of Artifacts from Level A.
LEVEL A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The X^2 test (X^2=7.06, df=3, p> .05) served to indicate that the material between the Surface and Level A, even though varying considerably in frequency, tended to be homogeneous, and therefore could be treated as similar for the purposes of analysis.

Since no dichotomy was evident between these levels, excluding Units 38, 40 and 51, and a dichotomy had been demonstrated with the comparisons between the total inventory from the two levels, a X^2 test was conducted between the material obtained from the overall surface material and that in Units 38, 40 and 51.

The X^2 test (X^2=11.77, df=3, p <.01) served to indicate that a difference was evident between these two spatial units within the surface zone. A similar test was done with Level A between the overall subsurface material and Units 38, 40 and 51. The X^2 results (X^2=14.02, df=3, p <.01) also demonstrated a difference.

SURFACE - UNITS 38, 40 and 51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEVEL A - UNITS 38, 40 and 51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of the differences demonstrated by the X^2 tests for the above units, a X^2 test examining the material in Units 38, 40 and 51 (Surface) and Units 38, 40 and 51 (Level A) was made. The test (X^2=8.73, df=3, p <.05) indicated a difference concerning the distribution of the material.
As a result of taking the total excavated sample between the Surface and Level A, a definite difference between the cultural material is evident. If Units 38, 40 and 51 are excluded, the difference exhibited between the two levels is nullified. The test conducted between the material in Units 38, 40 and 51, taken as a unit, and the rest of the surface sample, revealed a difference. In addition, a further difference was detected between the Surface and Level A material in Units 38, 40 and 51. It appears from the results of these tests that the critical factor causing the general differences between the two levels was the difference in distribution existing within Units 38, 40 and 51.

**Level A and Level B Comparisons**

The $X^2$ test was conducted on materials recovered from Levels A and B to determine whether differences existed between these two strata. The artifacts recovered from Level B (Fig. 16) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the $X^2$ test ($X^2=13.24$, df=3, $p < .01$) indicated a difference between the two levels. As was done with the surface units, a $X^2$ test was conducted between Units 38A, 40A and 51A and the rest of the sample recovered in the units in Level A. The results of the test ($X^2=14.02$, df=3, $p < .01$) served to indicate that, as with the surface comparison, these two units were mutually discrete. There is a great contrast in the frequency of material occurring in the area of Units 38, 40 and 51 at the Surface Level and in Level A. There appears to more material scattered throughout the rest of the area around the backyard in Level A than in the area which, in the surface units (38, 40 and 51) contained most of the material (Figs. 15 & 16). The artifact concentration found in the surface zone in Units 38, 40 and 51, then, appears to represent an area used as a dump. In addition, a significant and dramatic difference can be seen in the increase in all the artifact classes within Level A when contrasted with the surface material (Fig. 17).

The $X^2$ test between Level A and Level B, Units 38, 40 and 51 excluded, indicated that the association between these units was not significant ($X^2=7.38$, df=3, $p > .05$). In addition, the test conducted between Units 38A, 40A and 51A and 38B, 40B and 51B revealed differences between these two units. Units 38B, 40B and 51B were tested against the rest of the sample from Level B. The results ($X^2=1.46$, df=3, $p < .80$) revealed no difference between the artifact classes in this level. The results tend to suggest that the stratigraphy is homogeneous in Level B.
FIGURE 16. Distribution Map of Artifacts from Level B.
FIGURE 17. Bar Graph Showing Comparison of Artifact Frequencies.
LEVEL B, EXCLUDING UNITS 38B, 40B, and 51B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNITS 38B, 40B, and 51B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences found between the Surface and Level A appear to indicate that the material found in the Surface zone and that found in Level A is similar throughout the excavated area, and that the significant differences which were demonstrated by the Chi-square test were a result of the area in which Units 38, 40 and 51 were located. In these units the material between the Surface zone and Level A showed a different association ($X^2=8.73$, df=3, $p<.05$). The correlations between the material located in the Surface zone, between Units 38, 40 and 51, and the rest of the sample indicated a distinction ($X^2=11.77$, df=3, $p<.01$). The comparison between the material in Units 38A, 40A and 51A and the rest of the material in Level A indicated that the difference was still apparent ($X^2=14.02$, df=3, $p<.01$). The Chi-square test between Level A and Level B showed a difference between the two levels including the total sample ($X^2=13.24$, df=3, $p<.01$). A test conducted between Level A and Level B, excluding Units 38, 40 and 51, indicated that there was not a significant difference between the artifacts in these strata. The Chi-square test between Levels A and B in Units 38, 40 and 51 (A & B) showed a difference between these levels ($X^2=8.04$, df=3, $p<.05$). However, the Chi-square test between Units 38B, 40B and 51B and the rest of the material from Level B showed no difference ($X^2=1.46$, df=3, $p>.80$).

Therefore, in its entirety, Level B is homogeneous. Level A and Level B are somewhat homogeneous, but a distinction was evident between Levels A and B in tests conducted between Units 38, 40 and 51 (A & B). Due to the fact that the Chi-square test between Level A and Level B revealed possible homogeneity between these levels, the Chi-square test was performed between the Surface zone and Level B. The results ($X^2=16.04$, df=3, $p<.01$), served to indicate that a definite difference in association existed between these units. The difference can possibly be accounted for by the fact that overlap occurred between the material from Levels A and B, but the fact that definite differences existed between the strata is demonstrated by the test between the Surface and Level B material.
Summary of Results of Chi-square Tests

The following observations regarding the stratigraphic sequences encountered and demonstrated using statistical tests on the artifacts at the Howser House are:

(1) The material obtained from the Surface zone indicated that the material obtained from Units 38, 40 and 51 when contrasted with the rest of the material obtained at that level was different. The difference appears to be due to an unusually large deposit of artifact material (85% of the total sample) occurring in Units 38, 40 and 51, compared to that from the rest of the excavated sample. A difference in the disposal pattern is suggested between these two diverse areas.

(2) The comparison of the artifactual material between the surface zone and that recovered from Level A indicated a difference.

(3) A difference existed between Units 38A, 40A and 51A and the rest of the material in Level A. The percentage relationships between the two discrete units was 15% for the material in Units 38A, 40A and 51A, and 85% from the rest of the sample. This again is believed to be indicative of a difference in the disposal pattern.

(4) The material recovered from Level A compared with that from Level B indicated that there were no significant differences statistically, but quantitatively there was a considerable difference (Fig. 17).

(5) All of the artifact material recovered from Level B was homogeneous.

Interartifact Comparisons

The next analytical step consisted of using the Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient test to make determinations regarding variability among the various artifact classes. This was used to determine the strength of the relationships among the four artifact classes within each zone. In addition, this test would allow the artifact classes to be viewed in considerably closer detail and allow for statements to be made regarding their disposal and, therefore, their utilization within the systemic context.

The Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient test indicated that the associations derived from the artifact classes in Level B were all non-significant.

Ceramics and Nails ($r_s = -.20$, $p > .05$)
Ceramics and Bottle Glass ($r_s = .20$, $p > .05$)
Ceramics and Window Glass ($r_s = -.18$, $p > .05$)
Nails and Bottle Glass ($r_s = .17$, $p > .05$)
Bottle Glass and Window Glass ($r_s = .05$, $p > .05$)

The above suggests that, as a result of the nonsignificant associations among the artifact classes, the disposal of the artifacts may have been
the result of accidental loss rather than their being disposed of in a regular, patterned manner.

In contrast to what was obtained in Level B, the Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient test revealed positive associations in four of six tests within Level A.

Ceramics and Nails ($r_s = .55$, $p < .01$)
Ceramics and Bottle Glass ($r_s = .53$, $p < .05$)
Ceramics and Window Glass ($r_s = .46$, $p < .05$)
Nails and Bottle Glass ($r_s = -.17$, $p > .05$)
Nails and Window Glass ($r_s = .53$, $p < .05$)
Bottle Glass and Window Glass ($r_s = .28$, $p > .05$)

The only exceptions were the associations between window and bottle glass and bottle glass and nails. Similar tests conducted with the material from Brattonsville revealed nonsignificant associations between these classes of artifacts. An explanation derived for this phenomenon was that the bottle glass would have served the function of a subsistence item while nails and window glass had architectural functions. Their introduction into the archaeological record would have resulted from different processes (Wilkins, Hunter and Carrillo 1975).

The tests conducted for the surface units resulted in the following:

Ceramics and Nails ($r_s = .78$, $p < .01$)
Ceramics and Bottle Glass ($r_s = .67$, $p < .05$)
Ceramics and Window Glass ($r_s = .39$, $p > .05$)
Nails and Bottle Glass ($r_s = .71$, $p < .01$)
Nails and Window Glass ($r_s = .48$, $p > .05$)
Bottle Glass and Window Glass ($r_s = .38$, $p > .05$)

In contrast to Level A, positive correlations were established between three variables—ceramics and nails, bottle glass and nails, ceramics and bottle glass—for the surface unit comparisons. In this case, a strong correlation exists between these artifact classes, and their association may be a result of their having been expended in a similar manner. On the other hand, window glass and nails, window glass and bottle glass, and window glass and ceramics produced nonsignificant associations. This suggests that the activity which resulted in the deposition of the window glass was different from that involving the other artifact classes.

Discussion

In the initial stratigraphic zone (D) only 12 artifacts were recovered throughout the excavated area. Alterations to the house had been undertaken c. 1803-1817 at which time a retaining wall was constructed and the rear area filled and leveled (Level C).

The cultural material recovered in the zone above the fill is the subject of this discussion. This zone, designated Level B, was dated 1816.94 using the Mean Ceramic Date Formula (South 1972b). The tests
conducted between the artifacts revealed that no apparent association existed between the artifact classes. This is thought to be a strong indicator concerning a particular pattern of behavior being responsible for this occurrence. Excavations undertaken at the Bratton House (Wilkins, Hunter and Carrillo 1975) produced a differing archeological pattern. The same classes of artifacts were subjected to a similar form of analysis with considerably differing results. These differences may possibly be attributable to differing disposal practices over time resulting from operations within a different sociocultural system (c.f., Binford 1962).

Therefore, both Levels D and B are considered to be the result of the initial occupations c. 1803-1831. During this period, Henry Howser built the structure c. 1803 and occupied it until his death in 1822. In 1832 his son Henry Howser II purchased the property and lived on it until his death in 1842 (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974). The materials recovered in Level D and Level B are thought to closely approximate the periods when the structure was built, through the time that Henry Howser II lived there.

Cut stone pilings recovered between Units 6 and 28, 6 and 7 and 68 were resting upon the "D" level which suggested that a structure had been located behind the house (Figs. 3 & 12).

Two separate interviews conducted by Edwin C. Bearss (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974) made reference to a structure separated from the main house.

... the frame kitchen was in a detached structure at the rear of the house. Access to the kitchen was by a wood walkway leading from the house's back doorway (p. 153).

... the frame building at the rear of the house was not like the one there today. There was no porch. Her family used the structure for a combination kitchen-dining room (p. 154).

It seems conclusive, therefore, that the archeological data revealed the remains of the structure, described above as a detached kitchen.

It is assumed from interviews that the destruction of the original kitchen occurred sometime during or after the early 1920's, as the last time the house was seen by an informant in the early 1920's, the kitchen was still standing. The widow of Henry Howser II maintained ownership to the land upon which the house and other structures were situated until 1884, when the estate was sold. The subsequent owners were absentee landlords who employed tenants to live on and farm the property. Apparently, one of the landlords or one of their tenants constructed the present frame kitchen-dining room ell attached to the stone house sometime in the early 1900's (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974: 83).

The material found in Level A is believed to pertain to the destruction of the detached summer kitchen. This would account for the extreme rise in artifact frequencies in this level.
As can be seen from the distribution map (Fig. 14), regarding the artifact frequencies recovered in the Surface layer, an inversion is in evidence in the areas where the artifacts occur contrasted to the situation in Level A (Fig. 15). The Chi-square test noted a difference between the artifacts found in the general subsurface distributions and those located in Units 38, 40 and 51. This is believed to be the result of the area of Units 38, 40 and 51 having been a refuse dump. This may have occurred as a result of gathering the debris occurring throughout the backyard and its being deposited in the northwest corner of the yard. In addition, the associations defined between ceramics and nails, ceramics and bottle glass, and bottle glass and nails were strong. These same class associations between ceramics and nails and ceramics and bottle glass were found in Level A. Their significance at this time is undetermined.

In concluding this as part of the archeology conducted at the Howser House, several important factors were noted. Positive evidence was found relative to a separate structure being located behind the house, thereby verifying accounts obtained through interviews (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974: 153-54). In addition, and of considerable importance, was the information which was obtained through the use of statistical tests. Five definite stratigraphic levels were observed and recorded during the excavation, and these observations were statistically verified by testing associations between artifacts. The distribution of the artifacts associated with the various levels allowed sequences to be identified concerning the occupants of the structure. The artifact data served to further substantiate the fact that a structure was located behind the house. On the basis of the artifact frequencies and their relationships, statements could be made regarding its destruction.

The Well

Besides excavations undertaken behind the Howser House, other excavations were conducted in the area northeast of the house where a well was located (Figs. 3 & 18). Photographs taken c. 1910 showed a well in this location having a square wooden superstructure and a frame for a winch (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974: 188). The interior of the well was not excavated due to the fact that it had been filled and sealed for safety reasons several years before by the park maintenance personnel.

The well was located 30 feet from the northeast corner of the house. The excavations revealed a stone foundation upon which the superstructure had been built. The exterior dimensions were seven feet (NW-SE) by eight feet (NE-SW) with the wall approximately two feet thick. For the purposes of this discussion the artifacts were treated as a homogeneous entity.

For consistency, the same artifact classes were used here, as those previously discussed. The frequencies of the artifacts derived from the well are:
As can be seen, no window glass was recovered from this area. This is an important aspect concerning variability within different areas of a site related to their functional usage.

**The Terraces**

Below the house there are three terraces extending over the north, west, and south areas adjacent to the house (Fig. 2). These terraces are thought to be a late addition constructed between 1880-1920.

Limited test excavations were undertaken around the terraces, primarily behind the house, for the purposes of attempting to find evidence of privies or a dump. No evidence of either was found, although artifacts were recovered.

The ceramics recovered in this area were whiteware, alkaline-glazed stoneware, ironstone, porcelain, and unglazed stoneware. No creamware or pearlware was found which serves to substantiate the fact that the terraces constitute a late addition to the site.

**The Outbuildings**

Two outbuildings were found approximately 260 feet east of the house on the east side of the road (Figs. 2 & 9). The interiors of the two structures were excavated. The stone foundations were assumed to represent the remains of a barn and a corncrib. Although the initial architectural survey (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974: 186, 251) indicated that there were three buildings in this area, archeological excavation revealed that two apparent structures actually made up a single building consisting of four separate compartments of the barn complex (Fig. 9).
The Barn

The barn foundation consisted of four separate compartments separated by stone foundations between each stall. The orientation of the foundations was NE-SW. With the exception of the extreme northeast stall, most of the foundations are still intact. The overall dimensions of the complete structure were 20' x 55'. The dimensions of the individual stalls measured approximately 15' x 20'.

Archaeologically, the fill was fairly shallow consisting of light brown humus and partially decomposed organic material overlying a red subsoil.

The same classes of artifacts were analyzed in order to make determinations concerning variability among the artifact classes between this area and the other areas examined. Although variability in the form of other items such as horse shoes, was noted, for the purposes of this discussion only the four classes of artifacts were used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>446</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is clearly revealed, the nails constitute 92% of the total artifact inventory examined and no occurrence of window glass was noted. Early barns were not noted for having windows (Sloane 1967: 68). The inclusion of the other artifact classes present would alter the above percentages only slightly.

As is clearly demonstrated, the variability between this structure in the form of artifact content in contrast to the house is quite significant.

The Corn Crib

Approximately 60 feet west of the barn foundations, another foundation had been noted during the architectural survey (Bearss and Adlerstein 1974: 186). This structure was small in contrast to the barn. The foundations were not solid as had been the case with the barn (Fig. 9). The dimensions of the foundation were 15' x 15'. The foundations were comprised of 3 piers along a side, upon which joists had been situated.

The following are the artifact frequencies recovered from the structure:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was the case with the barn, no window glass was recovered. The highest frequency of artifacts consisted of nails which comprised 95% of the sample.

It is very clear from the artifacts recovered from the two outbuildings and from the well, in contrast to those recovered from the house, that there is significant variability between these structures in the form and content of the artifact frequencies. This serves to indicate that variability in the archeological record may be used to make determinations concerning the remains of structures for which no documentation or visible architectural features exist.

**Summary**

This study has attempted to make determinations about architectural features to obtain information that will contribute to interpretation of the Howser House and related outbuildings. Attempts were made to integrate the archeological data, specifically from the house, towards defining pattern within the archeological record. In addition, a comparison with other structures serving different functions revealed variability within the archeological record. It is hoped that further research conducted within a similar framework will contribute towards further defining the questions which have been raised in this study.
CHRONICLE GRAVE AND MASS BURIAL

Introduction

The second phase of archeological research at King's Mountain National Military Park was carried out in two stages. The initial stage was an attempt to verify the burial locations of four Americans killed during the Battle of King's Mountain on October 7, 1780. A stone marker on the site known as the Chronicle Marker, was presumed to mark the graves. The second stage of this project was an attempt to locate the site of a mass burial, purported to have taken place in 1815, of the scattered remains of Patriot and Loyalist troops killed during the battle. This archeological research was conducted with the aid of historical documentation compiled and synthesized by Edwin C. Bearss (1974).

Research Plan

The proposed research plan for this phase of archeology at King's Mountain National Military Park consisted of:

(1) Excavations around the Chronicle Marker (Fig. 19) to attempt to verify this as the site of the graves of Major William Chronicle and three compatriots. These four persons were said to have been interred shortly after the battle, and the marker was erected in 1815 to mark the graves. Should the burials be located, plans were formulated to have the remains examined by a physical anthropologist for analysis. Several hypotheses and propositions concerning the burials have been previously set forth (Carrillo 1974b), and these would be operationalized and tested following the recovery of the remains. If the remains were not found in the immediate vicinity of the marker, excavations would be expanded to the surrounding area.

(2) Excavations in the general area of this same marker in an attempt to locate the mass burial of 1815. At the time of the placement of the Chronicle Marker, the scattered remains of both Patriot and Loyalist troops which "whitened" the hillside, were said to have been interred in a mass burial. The topography of the area consists primarily of granite outcroppings, and it appeared that the low, flat area surrounding the Chronicle Marker would have been the only suitable spot for any burial (Fig. 20). If, however, the mass burial was not located here, further tests would be made near the grave marker of Colonel Ferguson (Figs. 21 & 22).

The Chronicle Marker

The excavations to verify the location of the Chronicle burials were restricted to the areas immediately around the marker and the adjoining areas (Fig. 20). East of the marker and road, the land was quite marshy; west of the limited area of excavation was the base of a granite outcrop. Two reference points (R.P. 1 and R.P. 39) were used in this phase of investigation. R.P. 39 had been established to serve as a datum point during the colonial road survey in the spring of 1974 (Carrillo 1974a).
FIGURE 19. Chronicle Marker--View to the East.

The excavations west of the Chronicle Marker (Units 2-5; Fig. 20) encountered a hard, yellow clay layer immediately beneath the brown humus of the surface. A few stones were located in this area, and evidence of burning was found. No evidence of graves was seen here and excavations were extended to the north side of the marker (Units 8-10) where again, no evidence of disturbance was seen. Excavations were then expanded to the east side of the marker, to an area immediately adjacent to the western edge of the road (Fig. 20). The excavations in this area revealed a drainage pipe and concrete wall (Fig. 23). Photographs supplied by the Park Service indicate that an iron fence had surrounded the markers, c. 1930, and the concrete wall is evidently part of that fence.

In summary, the extended tests made to verify the vicinity of the Chronicle Marker as the grave site of Major William Chronicle and three others killed during the Battle of King's Mountain, and buried shortly thereafter, were inconclusive. No evidence of burials was seen; the only cultural features revealed were the drainage pipe and a concrete wall.

1815 Mass Burial

The second stage of this phase of the archeology at King's Mountain National Military Park was an attempt to locate the mass burial, said to have taken place in 1815, of the remains of Patriot and Loyalist victims of the Battle of King's Mountain (Bearss 1974: 58-64).

Robert Mills' Statistics of South Carolina (1972: 778) describes the site:

... this hill was whitened with the bones ... and promiscuously scattered on the mountain until 1816-1815. (Bearss 1974: 60).

Since excavations in the vicinity of the Chronicle Marker had failed to reveal evidence of any burials, excavations were expanded in the area of the Ferguson grave marker. This was the only other area on the site which would have been suitable for burials (Fig. 21). An area northeast of this marker was chosen, because of the constraints imposed by the topography of the site, for excavation. Five test trenches (Units 12-16) were excavated in this area.

No evidence of cultural disturbance was seen in any of these trenches. Because no evidence of burials was found in the attempts to locate either the Chronicle burial or the mass grave in the two most likely spots on the site, excavations were suspended.

Conclusions

The two most likely areas for graves—in the vicinity of the Chronicle Marker and the area of the Ferguson grave—were investigated for evidence of burials. No burials were found in either area. It is likely that other areas, far removed from the immediate vicinity, were the burial locations, if the supposed burials had indeed taken place. Had the burials taken
FIGURE 22. Excavations near Ferguson's Grave—View to the East.

FIGURE 23. Drain Pipe and Concrete Foundation—View to the North.
place in the areas of the investigation, there are two possible explanations for not finding evidence: (1) soil conditions in this area are not conducive to the preservation of skeletal material, and (2) the mass burial is said to have taken place 35 years after the battle. If this were the case, very little skeletal material would likely have remained for interment.

It seems, based upon the archeological evidence and the inscriptions on the Chronicle stone, that the marker is not an actual grave marker, but is rather a commemorative marker.

The inscription on the west side of the stone reads:

Sacred to the memory of Major William Chronicle, Captains John Mattocks, William Dobb, and John Boyd, who were killed here fighting in defence of America on the seventh of October, 1780.

The east side of the stone reads:

Colonel Ferguson, an officer belonging to his Britannic majesty was here defeated and killed.

It seems unlikely that a grave marker would have had the above inscriptions on it; and it is therefore concluded that the graves are removed from the site, and the Chronicle Marker was placed to commemorate the Battle of King's Mountain and the deaths of the men killed there.
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