Nine Gal Tavern

Lenville J. Stelle

The Nine Gal Tavern site (11CH541) is located in western Champaign County, Illinois. Reconnaissance of the locality in 1987 and again in 1991 revealed a complex artifactual assemblage (n=4,875). Historical documentation and the archaeological recovery converge to suggest an evolving site function during the pre-Civil War period. By examining seven sociocultural variables, the pioneer tavern is modeled as passing through three discernable evolutionary stages: the Incidental Tavern, the Incipient Tavern, and the Full Tavern. The first and third of these stages are demonstrated at this site.

The first half of the nineteenth century saw the westward expansion of frontier America into east central Illinois and the upper Sangamon River basin. By the 1830s, where trails and roads intersected the river, pioneer communities began to develop. One of the most common economic expressions in these emerging communities was the tavern. Middletown (later renamed Mahomet), located in western Champaign County, was no exception. The first thing that Daniel Porter did after platting the village at the Sangamon ford of the Fort Clark Trail1 was to build a tavern and general store. During the next 30 years at least four more taverns would do business in this community: the Mathew Johnson Tavern, the Rea Tavern or American House, the Ohio Tavern, and the Nine Gal Tavern. The most historically conspicuous of the taverns has been the Nine Gal. It has become the object of an annual historical reenactment, or passion play, by the local Methodist Church. In spite of this interest, local history is surprisingly unclear as to the Nine Gal Tavern’s location.

The primary objectives of the present research are exploratory and descriptive: (1) to locate the site of the Nine Gal Tavern; and (2) to recover artifactual material indicative of its function as a tavern. The data bearing on these objectives has significance beyond the vagaries of local history. The cultural expression of the tavern was an important commercial activity of the pioneer period. The regional form of the tavern is neither well documented nor well explained in the archaeological literature. While there was a spurt of research interest in the late 1980s, an archaeological identity remains elusive. One of the results of a symposium on Illinois and regional taverns at the 1990 conference of the Society for Historic Archaeology was the realization that there was no formal typological context within which site comparisons could be made. We were still very much relying on early histories and anecdotal classifications. The ultimate goal of the current project is to use Mahomet Township and the Nine Gal locality as a device for illustrating an initial foray into modeling the pioneer tavern phenomenon. Achieving this objective would provide a useful foundation for future studies.
Historical Chronology

An archival search revealed a deep and rich history for the phenomenon known as the Nine Gal Tavern. In fact, as the work at the site progressed, I was to have “local historians” from three different counties in east-central Illinois search me out to inform me that the Nine Gal Tavern was “actually” located at a pioneer community in their own county. Clearly, the Nine Gal Tavern is a well rooted element of a regional folklore. Ultimately the documentary invisibility of the Nine Gal, even in this locale, leaves unresolved its historical veracity. A summary of that which seems historically acceptable follows.

On May 5, 1834, John and Melinda Bryan, newlyweds and recent arrivals from Kentucky, purchased the west 1/2 of the southeast 1/4 of Section 14, Township 20 North, Range 7 East (State of Illinois 1982:274). This property was located on the south side of the Fort Clark Trail, approximately one and a quarter miles east of the Sangamon ford. In the following year, 1835, Scott Fielding, another early pioneer, plowed a furrow from the river crossing to Urbana thereby improving and shortening the transportation link (Fort Clark Trail) between the county seat and the area referred to as the Sangamon Timber Settlement. Early in 1836, the Urbana to Bloomington State Road was completed along this furrow (Champaign County Commissioners’ Record Book A). Later in that year the Champaign County Commissioners ordered a county road to be opened from the State road “…near the house of John Bryan” to the Decatur Road. This became a major traffic corridor from Urbana to Decatur since the prairie sloughs of the Cerro Gordo Till Plain were frequently impassible. The proximity of the homestead to these roads and the river was central to its function as a tavern.

At this location, later commonly referred to as the Timber Edge Farm, John Bryan lived with his family (six children were listed in the 1850 census) and in the ensuing years prospered as a farmer (Roehm 1986:16). The Agricultural Schedule for the 1850 census indicates that he was a wealthy farmer with 400 acres of improved and 600 of unimproved land and 90 head of mixed livestock. Production for the year ending 1 June 1850 included 400 bushels of Indian corn, 75 pounds of wool, 14 bushels of Irish potatoes, $100 worth of orchard produce, 300 pounds of butter, and 12 tons of hay. As the fourth wealthiest farmer in both the county and township, his real property was assessed at $10,000 (Roehm 1986:16).

Maps, land records, and numerous references indicate that it was Bryan’s home that subsequently became the Nine Gal Tavern. The house was a curious structure for the times. Bryan’s affluence made possible the sawed lumber (reportedly freighted from Covington, Indiana) of which the structure was fabricated (Abbott 1985:32). The house was a fairly large structure (Abbott 1985:32). The composite of all descriptions and pictures depicts a rambling two-story building, some 40 feet long. Spanning the entire front was a covered porch supported by plain columns. A black-and-white photograph reproduced in Morgan (1969:19) and a sketch signed “Hazen” reveal a New England salt-box type structure (Morgan, in personal communication, indicated that the photograph was supplied to him by unremembered parties and, as a consequence, he could not attest to its veracity; the “Hazen” sketch was apparently produced sometime in the last century and is based upon unknown sources, although Purnell [1955:79] attributes it to Fred Hazen). In both illustrations the gables were dominated by large, single flue, masonry chimneys. The main entrance was located in the center of the building’s front. Each document shows windows on both stories of the front side, although the number and placement differ. A description of the building appearing in
the Mahomet newspaper (Abbott 1985:181) indicates that “...a number of small rooms, each with a small window were on the second floor.” The exterior of the structure was sheathed with horizontal, lapped siding. The rear of the building was not revealed and one cannot determine if there was a summer kitchen. The documents and descriptions provide no information on out-buildings.

It is not known how long John Bryan and his family resided on this farm. In 1848 Bryan purchased a forty-acre parcel of land from the government in Section 23, the next section south (State of Illinois 1982:51) and the 1850 census continued to place the family at this location. The 1860 census reveals that the family had relocated to the town of Champaign with John’s occupation listed as livery keeper.

Sometime after 1850 the Bryan family left the homestead. In 1853 the building was leased to Thomas A. Davidson and family, new arrivals from Ohio (Mathews and McLean 1979:34). The Davidson’s transformed the dwelling into the “Ohio Tavern” (Abbott 1985:32). The site now functioned as a full tavern. Davidson operated the tavern from 1853 through 1856 (Mathews and McLean 1979:34) and it was during this period that Abraham Lincoln was alleged to have stayed there while traveling the Eighth Judicial Circuit (Abbott 1985:32).

There was probably at least one other tavern keeper (Nine Gal Tavern) after the Davidsons. While the proprietor’s name remains unknown, the appellation “Nine Gal Tavern” is definitive. Folk history has it that the name derived from his nine redheaded daughters who served tables and perhaps, at least according to some, provided commercial sex.

However, by 1860 the property had reverted back to its original function as a single-family residence associated with the farm. In spite of a transfer in ownership to B. F. Harris in 1864, this condition remained until 1891 when the Bryan house was demolished and replaced by a new structure. After 1891 the new residence was reserved for a series of Harris’s farm superintendents and managers. In 1991, after several years of vacancy, the Harris structure was also demolished.

Site Description

As previously indicated, the precise location of the Nine Gal Tavern (Figure 1) is an issue of some debate. Locations offered by local historians number four: (1) just east of the Sangamon ford and north of Bloomington Road; (2) east of the river but on the south side of Bloomington Road; (3) one-half kilometer further east on Bloomington Road also on the south side; and (4) the location on the Timber Edge Farm, approximately 1.1 km east of the ford. Our research centers on this last locale because our reading of the period literature and the government land sales records to John Bryan suggest it to be the most likely site.

The buildings of the farmstead (Figure 2) are situated upon a small loess covered knoll lying down slope of the crest of the Champaign Moraine. The Champaign Moraine is a late Wisconsinan event dating from perhaps 16,000 B.P. While the knoll may only be an erosional expression, its origin may have been as a small ice contact feature. The Sangamon River breaches the moraine some 1.1 kilometers to the west-northwest. This is an area of relatively bold topographic relief. (For a detailed analysis and reconstruction of the natural environment as it existed in Middletown Township in 1820 see Stelle 1986).
Research Design and Data Collection

As was previously indicated, the objectives of the present study are exploratory and descriptive. In its higher registers it falls within that range of investigation labeled culture-historical. The research questions addressed can be loosely organized into two sets. The first centers on the issue of whether this locality had historic occupation prior to the existing (1891) farmstead:

Q1: Was there a residential structure at this location after 1834?
Q2: What was the chronology of occupation?

The second set, dependent upon the outcome of the first, focuses on the nature of early period taverns:

Q3: What was the site function and did it vary over time?
Q4: Is there evidence of different tavern forms?

The data collection strategy consequently entailed activities that would afford systematic site testing and description. Specifically, it involved six elements.

Figure 1. Location of the Nine Gal Tavern (11CH541).
Figure 2. Nine Gal Tavern site map with location of excavations and features.
1. An examination of the interior of the existing house and out-buildings. Of particular interest were exposed structural elements. The goal was to identify materials potentially salvaged from the Bryan constructions.

2. Surface collection of large tracts of the farm. Eighty acres stood as relict timber. All of this tract, as well as some adjacent cultivated ground, was undergoing development as an upper class subdivision by the fall of 1986. The main drainage ways were being reorganized for the construction of two flood control impoundments. Exploiting these disturbances, every exposed patch of earth was examined. Consequently, much of the land surface that had supported forest and savanna was accessed. From the beginning of the survey, the ground that had been prairie revealed extremely low densities of human detritus; consequently, it received less attention.

3. A systematic shovel probe survey of the Harris house site was conducted. The survey was accomplished using a grid based upon two meter centers. At each grid intersect a shovel probe 30 cm in diameter was excavated to culturally sterile soil. The grid was anchored at site datum. The shovel probe grid extended beyond the limits of the primary residential scatter.

4. The north-south and east-west lines of the grid were swept with a metal detector. Where readings indicative of a metallic object were encountered, a shovel probe was excavated.

5. To acquire information about what might lie beneath the existing structure, two 1-m-x-2-m test units were excavated. The units were positioned parallel to the foundation walls and on either side of the front porch. The units were dug to sterile soil.

6. Where subsurface features were encountered test trenches were excavated to sterile soil. They were 50 cm wide and extended beyond the limits of the feature.

7. In the summer of 1991 the buildings related to the Harris constructions were razed. This included the house, cattle barn, horse barn, and chicken coop. The structures were burned and the debris buried in place. At this time a systematic surface collection was conducted for ceramics, bottle glass, and molded glass. Only the ceramic component is included in the present report. Visibility and coverage were 100 percent.

The collection of data (other than the surface collection described in item 7 above) occurred over a five-week period. The work was conducted by various groups of students enrolled in Parkland College field schools. Seventh graders from Columbia Middle School, Champaign, were also involved with some of the surface collecting and the shovel probe survey.

Surface Data, Shovel Probes, Excavations, and Feature Descriptions

The topographic survey collected elevation data at each two-meter intersect of the collection grid. The survey revealed a feature of some importance both in terms of relocating the front margin of the Bryan house and the historically significant Fort Clark Trail. If one examines the contour lines on the northern margin of the plan view drawing of the site
(Figure 2), one will observe a wide-mouthed, U-shaped topographic feature centering on
the front of the Bryan construction. It would seem to have been caused by wheeled traffic,
in this case likely wagon traffic. In fact, this feature helped confirm the northern margin of
the house. Also, insofar as there were no driveways on 1830 farmsteads in this region, one
might argue that this is perhaps the only surviving element of the Fort Clark Trail.

While the shovel probe survey was useful in several ways, one important piece of
information it provided was that there were concentrations of early type brick along what
we consider to be the east and west walls of the Bryan house. The imagery of the house had
suggested the presence of fireplaces under each gable and the probes were able to demon-
strate concentrations in the appropriate areas. The probes, however, gave no indication of
significant footings.

Seven test units were excavated. They included two 1-x-1-m units around the in situ
foundation stones, two 1-x-2-m units directly in front of the existing structure, and three
50 cm wide trenches across subsurface features. Two additional subsurface deposits were
only explored by shovel probes.

Test Unit 1 was located west of the front porch of the Harris structure and parallel to
the foundation wall (unit datum S0.43, W2). The unit contained a large, partially exposed
glacial erratic (Figure 3) that may have been part of the foundation system of the original
Bryan construction. If so, it would seem to have been removed to its present location dur-
ing or subsequent to the erection of the existing house (a region of disturbance extended
completely under the boulder). Earthenwares included redware, hand-painted pearlware,
undecorated whiteware, black transfer-printed whiteware, and nine sherds of indetermi-
nate whiteware. The mean ceramic date for the pearlware and whiteware was 1854. Other
artifactual material included: porcelain (1), bottle glass (4), flat glass, pressed glass (1), milk
glass (1), metal objects (25), both early and late brick, brushes (2), a shell button, and a bone
button.

The date for the ceramic may reflect a refuse disposal pattern frequently encountered
on period sites from the region (Phillippe 1987:64). The pattern involves the formation of
a semicircular sheet midden proximate to nonpublic house entryways (“back” doors). The
home in this case would have been that of the Bryans, some half meter to the north.

Test Unit 2 (Figure 4) was located just east of the front entrance to the Harris building
and parallel to the foundation wall (unit datum S0.67, E6). Artifactual material included:
salt-glazed stoneware (2), bottle glass (26 sherds including an element of a scroll flask), flat
glass, pressed glass (3 including a paneled tumbler), a glass button and bead, metal (32),
both early and late brick, and a piece of plastic. The earthenware recovery was composed
of redware, yellowware, undecorated pearlware, undecorated whiteware, hand-painted
polychrome whiteware, spongeware, flow blue, and indeterminate whiteware. The mean
ceramic date for the pearlware and whiteware was 1845. As was the case for Test Unit 1, the
date for the ceramic may reflect a refuse disposal pattern frequently encountered on early
sites from the region (Phillippe 1987:64). Detritus was likely pitched into the yard from the
rear entrance of the house. The home in this case would be that of the Bryans, some two-
thirds of a meter to the north.

Test Unit 3 centered on the first of the foundation stones found in primary context. This
stone served as site datum. It was located directly out from the front door to the existing
house. The field stone was hidden beneath a thin vegetational mat (Figure 5). Artifactual
material included bottle glass (8 fragments one of which was from an historic flask), flat
glass, metal (13 items), structural materials (both early and late brick), shell buttons (2), and a piece of plastic bottle. Earthenwares were represented by undecorated whiteware, spatter, green transfer-printed whiteware, and mid-blue transfer-printed whiteware. The mean ceramic date for the whiteware was 1855.

Test Unit 4 centered on the second foundation stone still in primary context (Figure 6). It was located at N1.7, E2.2. Recovered from this unit were a sherd of flat glass, modern
machine cut nails (16), wire nails (2), strap metal (2), early brick, mortar, a Rockingham door
knob, a short length of iron wire, and a green glass marble.

A line drawn connecting the two foundations stones is interpreted as representing
the rear of the Bryan construction. We found no evidence of structural elements extending
perpendicularly to the south (for instance evidence of a summer kitchen).
Figure 5. Test Unit 3.
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Figure 6. Test Unit 4.
Feature 1 (Figure 7) was located at W4.25, S0.34. A 50 cm trench was extended across the area of subsurface disturbance. The feature, along this axis, was 192 cm wide and extended down to a maximum of 80 cm. The artifactual material recovered (n=196) included fragments of clay smoking pipes, bottle glass (six items, three of which were from historic flasks), flat glass, pressed glass tumblers (23), pressed glass, milk glass, metal (notable among these 64 items were barrel/cask hoops, metal buttons, harness buckles, a wrought iron hook, a clasp knife, a hand wrought nail, machine cut nails, and a .32 caliber rim fire casing), and both early (6) and late brick (2). Earthenwares were represented by redware, Rockingham yellowware, undecorated pearlware (1), undecorated whiteware (3), hand-painted polychrome whiteware (6), spatter (2), blue transfer-printed whiteware (9), purple transfer-printed whiteware (1), red transfer-printed whiteware (6), edge decorated whiteware with a scalloped rim and impressed bud (1), and indeterminate whiteware (31). The mean ceramic date for the pearlware and whiteware was 1851. Excluding the indeterminate whiteware from the calculation yields a corrected value of 1843.

The original function of Feature 1 was likely that of a cellar located under the west margin of the Bryan house. Judging from its horizontal configuration at 20 cm below surface, it may have been accessible both through the floor and from outside the structure’s perimeter. The exterior access is only hinted at with the weakly defined keyhole extension shown on the plan view drawing. The area of disturbance could also have been produced during a clean-out episode or by animals that would necessarily have visited this interesting subfloor space. The northern margin of the cellar suggests the possibility of a shelf or perhaps even the earthen support for an interior step way.

Why the original function was abandoned is not revealed. However, at the end of this usage the cellar became the repository, particularly at the lower levels, of the detritus of food serving wares and libation. Perhaps this pattern reflects an interior domestic design employing this region of the structure for these activities. Also included in this depositional episode are significant quantities of ash and charcoal. The feature was apparently also functioning as an ash dump.

Feature Fill (FF) 2 and Feature Fill 4 are curious in that they indicate two periods of in situ burning separated by an interlude of more typical midden accrual. More will be said about this issue later in the discussion of the three-subfloor features. FF5 represents a final phase of filling.

The feature and associated deposition is assigned to the Bryan occupation (1833-1853).

Feature 2 (Figure 8) was located at E6.5, N9.8. A 50 cm wide trench was extended to a point beyond the margin of the subsurface disturbance. The exposed portion of the feature had a maximum depth of 59 cm. The artifactual recovery (n=50) included hand-painted monochrome porcelain (3), hand-painted polychrome porcelain (1), bottle glass (1), flat glass (2), cut glass (1), pressed glass (2 objects, one of which was a fragment of a paneled tumbler), metal (12 items, notable of which were a hand wrought spring, machine cut nails, a small spring, and part of a small pair of scissors), and early brick (2). Earthenwares were represented by redware (5), undecorated whiteware (6), hand-painted polychrome whiteware (4), brown transfer-printed whiteware (2), red transfer-printed whiteware (6), and edge decorated whiteware (one item with a scalloped rim and impressed curved lines and one item with a scalloped rim and impressed bud designs). The mean ceramic date was 1844.
Figure 7. Feature 1.
Figure 8. Feature 2.
The original function of the feature is interpreted as a subfloor cellar. The northern margin of the cellar suggests the possibility of a shelf or perhaps even the earthen support for an interior step way. This second interpretation is enhanced by the presence of lithic material at what would have been the foot of the step way, a construction technique echoed in Feature 3. When this original function was abandoned, we find the space being filled with both ash and the artifactual by-products of food service. The thick lens of ash implies its associated use as an ash dump for the fireplace located on the east side of the structure.

The massive ash and charcoal deposit defining FF2 and FF3 is a difficult issue that is discussed after the description of Feature 3. The absence of the burned earth found in Features 1 and 3 leaves uncertain whether the deposition is in a primary context. FF4 represents a final phase of filling.

The feature and associated deposition is from the Bryan occupation (1833–1853).

Feature 3 (Figure 9) was initially located by a shovel probe at E3.3, N9. A 50 cm wide trench was extended north-south past the feature boundaries. The area of disturbance had a maximum depth of 116 cm below surface. Artifacts recovered ($n=169$) included Albany slip stoneware (2), luster porcelain (2), bottle glass (4 items, including two of an embossed peppermint bottle with a rough pontil scar), flat glass (16 objects, of which eight were of a mirror), pressed glass (7 sherds, with six from tumblers), metal (36 items, notable of which were a hand wrought nail, machine cut nails, a hollow iron key, a case knife, a bone handled clasp knife, and a hand wrought chain link), and structural materials (11 objects, including five early brick and two late brick). The earthenwares were represented by redware (3), undecorated pearlware (2), edge decorated pearlware with embossed patterns (2), undecorated whiteware (14), annular whiteware (3), hand-painted blue whiteware (1), hand-painted polychrome whiteware (3), blue transfer-printed whiteware (1), black transfer-printed whiteware (3), green transfer-printed whiteware (9), red transfer-printed whiteware (39), polychrome transfer-printed whiteware (5), and edge decorated whiteware with a scalloped rim and impressed curved lines (4). The mean ceramic date was 1842.

Of the three subfloor features, Feature 3 displays the most complex history of utilization. As our excavation bottomed out, we observed that the unit was beginning to fill with ground water. Notable here was that the water was under some pressure and that it had a strong sulfuric odor. Consequently, a possible initial function for the device was that of cistern. Indeed the structure has many of the attributes of the early unlined cisterns sometimes encountered in this region. If the contrivance was so used and if the ground water had the same properties at that time as it does now, then as a cistern it would have made a poor choice for fresh, soft water. Be that as it may, FF1 indicates that the structure’s bottom was fairly early on sealed with the deposit of this thick lamination. Hence the original function was abandoned and replaced with exploitation as a cellar. The keyhole extending from the north margin may have originally served as part of a rainwater guttering system but was now replaced with a step way terminating at the bottom riser with the placement of several rocks of conspicuous size. This design element is also apparent in Feature 2. FF2 reflects a period of exploitation and cleanout.

Laminations FF3 and A/B signify the two burning episodes to be discussed in the next section of the report. The presence of the large quantities of burned earth in these deposits indicates in situ burning. The use life of the feature was now certainly terminated although judging from the mean ceramic date for the unit abandonment may have occurred quite early. FF4 represents a final phase of filling.
Figure 9. Feature 3.
The feature’s original utilization is associated with the Bryan occupation (1833-1853).

Discussion of Subfloor Features 1, 2, and 3: The reader should note that all three of the subfloor features include copious quantities of ash, charcoal, and burned earth in the fill. The interpretation of their presence is difficult.

The simplest interpretation of this circumstance is that the materials represent a strategy of employing the features as ash dumps for the building’s two fireplaces. Feature 2 provides the best support for this interpretation with its massive accumulation of ash and charcoal. The burned soil in F1 and F2 simply represent times when the dumped ashes were still hot. However, in my judgment, if the coals were hot enough to thermally alter the soil, then they would seem to have been too hot to put under the floor of the house.

Moreover, Features 1 and 3 seems to indicate at least two discrete episodes of in situ burning. For instance in Feature 1, laminations FF-2 and FF-4 demonstrate episodes of in situ burning (note the area of burned earth), separated by a brief period of more typical filling. Accounting for the two episodes of burning is complex and suggest at least two possibilities. The first is that they represent activities associated with the final demolition of the house and clean-up of the substructural landscape. The razing of the structure occurred in 1891. A problem with this interpretation is the 1842, 1843, and 1844 mean ceramic dates for the feature fill and the absence of the profuse quantities of nails and hardware commonly associated with demolition burn piles. A second interpretation is that the building may have burned prior to the Bryan’s departure. In which case, the lower horizon signifies the building’s burning and the second a clean-up activity. Problems with this interpretation are the absence of the carbonized board fragments one would typically expect as a residue from such an event and the lack of evidence from around the foundation stones. While neither of these interpretations is satisfying, I feel that the more difficult anomaly to explain is a house fire. Therefore I tentatively accept the idea of while there may have been some ash dumping, the in situ burning is associated with the final demolition and policing of the building site. What remains clear is that the original functions of the subfloor features were abandoned and that after a period of natural filling and the deposition of household debris to include materials from the fireplaces, there was one and maybe two episodes of in situ burning. The completion of the filling sequence occurred after the demolition of the residence.

An additional item of discussion regarding these three units has to do with the faunal recovery. Faunal material was a small but regular recovery item. Terrance Martin, Illinois State Museum, was able to categorize 45 faunal elements from the larger collection. He (Martin 1990:3, 10) indicates the possibility of an Upland South subsistence pattern in that hog elements were more prevalent than either cattle or deer. Bird bones included chicken, passenger pigeon, and turkey. Small mammals were represented by fox squirrel and eastern cottontail. Aquatic habitats were also exploited judging from the presence of a fish bone, two freshwater mussel shell fragments, and two freshwater gastropods. The only other domestic mammal represented was that of a sheep.

Feature 4 was only investigated by three shovel probes (see endnote 2). The general morphology of this rather shallow deposit is unknown. It was located at E18, S12 and displayed a significant concentration of artifactual material, as well as some charcoal and ash. The maximum depth of the deposit was 40 cm below surface. The recovery included redware, stoneware, bottle glass, flat glass, pressed glass, metal, both early and late brick, and the heel of a ladies leather shoe. All of the remaining ceramic was whiteware (n=68):
undecorated (38%), annular (3%), blue hand painted (3%), spatter (1.5%), blue transfer printed (6%), purple transfer printed (1.5%), green transfer printed (3%), red transfer printed (1.5%), mid-blue transfer printed (1.5%), flow blue (1.5%), and indeterminate (40%). The mean ceramic date was 1857. If the indeterminate whiteware is removed from this calculation, the mean ceramic date is 1855. The bottle glass was represented by 37 items. Most of this was indeterminate except for color, although, there were two rough pontil bases. The pressed glass included five sherds, three of which were from paneled tumblers and one of which was of a small “Lacy” pattern plate (pre-1850).

Faunal material was a regular recovery item from the three shovel probes. A total of 24 items were classified (Martin 1990:3, 11). While such a small sample can be little more than suggestive and is here offered in that spirit, the faunas exploited show only a marginal variation from what was observed for the subfloor features. In this circumstance, cow and deer are proportionately low (9 percent respectively) while hog and fowl constitute 60 percent of the assemblage. The balance of the identified materials (17 percent) was of small nondomestic mammals.

The original function of Feature 4 remains unresolved although shallow trash pits are frequently encountered in early nineteenth-century contexts from the region (Phillippe 1987:64). What is clear is that it displayed considerable quantities of food service debris to include meat scraps. The fill of Feature 4 is assigned to the Davidson occupation (1853–1856) and the operation of the Ohio Tavern.

Feature 5 was also only explored by three shovel probes (see endnote 2). The general morphology of this rather shallow deposit is unknown. The feature was identified at E12, S22 and like Feature 4 displayed a significant concentration of artifactual material, as well as some charcoal and ash. The primary concentration of midden was between 15 and 32 cm below surface with a maximum feature depth of 35 cm. The inventory included salt glazed stoneware, plain white porcelain (n=1), bottle glass, flat glass, machine cut nails, parts of two-barrel hoops, and both early and late brick. All of the remaining ceramic was whiteware and ironstone (n=174): undecorated (90%), spatter (1%), plain with molded rim (5%), and indeterminate (4%). Two maker’s marks were identified. The first included the references “Bridgwood,” “Porcelain,” and “Burslem” below the Royal Arms. Bridgwood and Clarke of Burslem were Staffordshire potters who produced a line of ironstone labeled “porcelain opaque.” Many items of this series have been recovered from the Lincoln home in Springfield and suggest a pre-1861 horizon (Menz, 1983). Bridgwood and Clarke were producing this ware between 1857 and 1864 (Brinks, 2005a). The second maker’s mark included “..ONSTONE CHINA” under the Royal Arms and above the initials “J.F.” The mark is commonly assigned to Jacob Furnival and Company, Cobridge, Stoke-on-Trent, who produced ironstone from 1845 to 1870 (Brinks 2005b). The mean ceramic date for the entire assemblage was 1860 (this value holds even if the indeterminate category is deleted). The bottle glass included 32 sherds of which 30 were of “whiskey” bottles. No pressed tumblers were recovered.

Unfortunately, little faunal material was recovered and none of it could be classified (Martin 1990:3).

As was the case with Feature 4, the original function of Feature 5 remains unresolved, although, again, it may have simply functioned as a shallow trash pit. It was filled with considerable quantities of food service debris. Feature 5 is interpreted as an expression of the unknown proprietor of the Nine Gal Tavern (1857–1859).
Artifact Analysis

The artifactual recovery was significant, numbering a total of 4,875 items. The depth and richness of this data set became the foundation of the publication *An Archaeological Guide to Historic Artifacts of the Upper Sangamon Basin* (Stelle 2001). Consult this on-line guide for both operational definitions of artifact types and full color illustrations.

**Earthen Wares**

Earthenware was one of the most commonly recovered debris categories for this site \( (n=1,412) \). Five types were recognized: redware, yellowware, pearlware, whiteware, and ironstone.

Redware was a common recovery item \( (n=110) \), representing 7.8 percent of the earthenwares. Table 1 indicates the distribution of redware by surface treatment. The most common surface treatment was a lead glaze, of which a small proportion was glazed only on the interior. Three vessels with a dark brown slip were so treated on both surfaces. An element of a large mixing bowl had a white slip interior and a clear glaze exterior. Much of the redware was recovered from Features 1 \( (n=10) \) and Feature 4 \( (n=13) \). Redware was produced in the United States throughout the nineteenth century although its recovery may be more common on sites predating the Civil War.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Treatment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unglazed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead glaze</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark brown slip</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White slip interior, clear glaze exterior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellowware \( (n=41) \) evidenced four forms of surface decoration: clear glaze, Rockingham, annular, and mocha. The mocha body sherd was the familiar dark brown. The Rockingham included three body sherds, a handle, and a molded basal element. Table 2 provides the frequency of each form. Representing only 2.9 percent of the earthenwares, yellowware is an uncommon ceramic from this site. Because of its long period of production, yellowware is not a particularly sensitive temporal indicator, but could have been present from the beginning of the site’s occupation.

Pearlware \( (n=24) \) is the earliest tableware horizon for the site. Twenty-four sherds, representing 1.7 percent of the earthenware, were recovered (see Tables 3 and 4). Objects
Table 2. Yellowware Recovered from the Nine Gal Tavern Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Production Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear glaze</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>1830 onward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1840–1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1840–1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1840–1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany slip</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>1840–1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Pearlwares Recovered from the Nine Gal Tavern Site
(See Table 4 for Shell Edge Treatments).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Median Production Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue hand painted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polychrome hand painted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with no obvious surface decoration were classified as undecorated. It is the most common recovery category and included elements of three cups.

Table 4 presents the data on shell edge decorated ware. The pearlware component included five rim elements: two with scalloped rims and impressed curved lines and three with embossed patterns.

Whiteware is by far the most frequently recovered ceramic from the site \((n=1,237)\) and represents 87.6 percent of the earthenwares (Tables 4 and 5). Objects with no obvious surface decoration were classified as undecorated.

The stylistic elements of the annular decoration included bands of blue, white, brown, and green, as well as a roulette pattern. The spongeware is virtually all blue. Hand-painted polychromes are of the sprig variety.

The transfer-printed wares \((n=284)\) defined 23% of the total whiteware sample. Blue, red, mid-blue, and flow blue were the most common treatments (Table 5). Within all of the color categories there were several variations in motif.

The shell edge colors were primarily a hard blue although some green was also identified. With a mean ceramic date of 1828, the stylistic variations, in both colors, tended to the
earlier forms. This observation is perhaps the more curious given the site’s initial occupation by the Bryans in 1833. They were both young and had only been married a few months prior to their homesteading. The early ceramic date and the considerable variation in motif leave open the circumstances under which these ceramics arrived on the site.

The remaining pearlware and whiteware had a mean ceramic date of 1855. Given the site’s continuous occupation through the late 1980s, the early value for these wares is surprising and may be a function of several factors. Notable is the fact that with the Harris possession of the property in the 1860s, a “junk ditch” some half section from the house became the primary repository of discarded materials.

All or part of nine maker’s marks were identified. They include: “Venables”, “La Belle China”, “Homer...Virg...Ma...9...”, and “Pasto[ral?]...”. One English Registry Mark is mostly complete. It is assigned to (James and Thomas) Edwards and is dated 1851.

Ironstone was recovered primarily from Feature 5. Insofar as ironstone received all of the surface treatments associated with whiteware and reflected the corresponding dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Median Production Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware ((n=5))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalloped Rim,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressed Curved Lines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embossed Patterns</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware ((n=20))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalloped Rim,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressed Curved Lines</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressed Straight Lines</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressed Bud</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embossed Patterns</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unscalloped Rim,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressed Rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmolded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Whitewares Recovered from the Nine Gal Tavern Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Median Production Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated, Plain</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue hand painted</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polychrome, hand painted</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponge/spatter ware</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer printed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-blue</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polychrome</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow blue</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain, embossed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luster</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lined ware</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decalcomania</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiesta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of popularity, it has been folded into Table 5. As indicated earlier, the two recovered items from Feature 5 that revealed marker’s marks suggest a pre-1860 production.

**Stoneware**

Stoneware (n=174) is a ceramic fired at higher temperatures than earthenware. It is associated with relatively thick, heavy vessel forms like jugs and crocks.
The variations in surface treatment recognized in this study include the following types: unglazed, salt glaze, Albany type slip, Bristol, and American blue and gray. The distribution of stonewares from the Nine Gal is displayed in Table 6. Salt glazed forms and Albany type slip were most commonly recovered. Stoneware types were produced over long periods of time and are relatively insensitive horizon markers for the archaeologist.

Porcelain

The porcelain recovery numbered 50 objects, including leg and foot elements from dolls. Table 7 delineates the distribution of tablewares. The majority (65.9%) of this material consisted of undecorated white body sherds. Surface decorations included hand-painted monochromes (6.8%), hand-painted polychromes (9.1%), blue transfer printed (4.5%), over-glaze luster (4.5%), and decals (9.1%). These surface treatments are not considered temporally sensitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6. Stoneware Recovered from the Nine Gal Tavern Site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unglazed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt glazed exterior, unglazed interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazed interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany type slip, interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany type slip, both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue and gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Porcelain Tablewares Recovered from the Nine Gal Tavern Site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface Treatment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-painted monochrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-painted polychrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue transfer printed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clay Pipes

Four stem elements and a bowl fragment were identified in the recovery. Manufacturers could not be identified.

Bottle Glass

While no intact bottles were recovered, one that was 80 percent complete was recovered during the surface collection. It is a small round bottle produced in a two piece mold and displaying a rough pontil scar. The lip was a laid on bead of glass. Embossed on the sides were the words “MEXICAN MUSTANG LINAMENT”. On the basis of technological characteristics the bottle is dated at 1860–1870.

Bottle fragments were classified according to the construction characteristics they displayed. Broadly grouped, the fabrication characteristics included formation process, finish, glass color and surface texture, and embossing and labeling.

A total of 258 bottle glass fragments were recovered. A frequency distribution of the identified characteristics is displayed in Table 8. Each sherd was classified with regard to its most temporally sensitive characteristic. This approach was facilitated by the fact that 141 objects could be classified by color alone, 112 more by only one characteristic other than color, and only five by multiple characteristics other than color. Of these last five, two sherds were from a small bottle embossed with “permint” (peppermint), showing a rough pontil scar, and cast in a two piece mold; one sherd displayed a rough pontil scar and was cast in a two piece mold; and two sherds were rendered in a semi-automatic bottle machine and had applied lips.

One body sherd of a pattern molded and expanded bottle was recovered. This process was most common prior to 1850 (Lorrain 1968:37).

Portions of 14 scroll or violin flasks were identified. These flasks were popular from the 1830s through the 1850s (McKearin and Wilson 1978:423). Embossed motifs included both stars and raised rib swirls.

Embossing on vessels other than the aforementioned included the letters “E, NE, R, ROC/CHE, ST, and DAVIS.”

Mason jars were uncommon in the recovery. Elements of only four vessels were identified. They are frequently encountered on farmsteads post-dating 1858.

Pressed Glass

A total of 105 pressed glass objects were identified. Tumblers accounted for 67.6% (n=71) of the sample. Treatments included swirled patterns (8%), paneled or fluted patterns (30%), and plain (62%). Fluted tumblers were both hexagonal and octagonal. The other pressed tablewares (n=33) included elements of sugar bowls, creamers, jars, plates, and bowls. Design features included ribbing, ray patterns, flower patterns, acid etching, and a single element of cut glass. The vast majority of this material was clear; although, blue, lavender, green, orange, and amber were encountered.

Milk glass was represented by eight buttons (both two and four hole), canning jar seals (n=5), and such incidentals as an “Old Spice” shaving lotion bottle fragment, a marble, and a bead.
Other glass objects in the recovery included three lamp chimney sherds, two light bulb fragments, an opaque green marble, the base to a mercury thermometer, and the lens from a carriage lamp.
Flat Glass and Melted Glass

Flat or window glass included 1,335 sherds with a total mass of 2,221.5 grams. The majority had a greenish hue. Eight mirror fragments (8.2 g) were identified. Twenty eight objects (44.3 g) of melted glass were also recovered.

Metal

As might be expected, a large number of metallic objects were recovered (n=1,302). Of these objects 70.4% were nails. Table 9 presents the distribution of nails by type categories defined by Nelson (1968). The modal category is of early machine headed cut nails. With a production range of 1818 to 1840, they correspond to the initial construction of the Bryan house. The measurable presence of modern machine cut and wire nails leaves open the possibility of later additions or remodeling of the original structure, as well as other building projects. Other fasteners included horseshoe nails, wood screws, staples, machine bolts, nuts, concrete anchors, and a pin.

Table 9. Nail Types Recovered from the Nine Gal Tavern Site (after Nelson [1968]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nail Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Production Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hand wrought</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early machine cut, hand made head</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1780–1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine cut sprigs and brads</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1805–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early machine-headed cut nails</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>1818–1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern machine cut nails</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>1840–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern wire nails</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1850–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cutlery included a two-tined fork, a case knife with a pointed blade and a flat tang, the bowl of an ovoid shaped table spoon, and three handle elements from either spoons or forks, one with a bone grip still attached. Two clasp knives were recovered. Both knives were four bladed. One displayed bone grips.

Brass items included eleven .22 caliber rim fire casings (maker’s marks “H”, “U-High-Speed”, and “Super X”), two .32 caliber rim fire cartridge casing, the base of two Winchester 12 gauge shot shells, elements of a pocket watch, elements of a clock, strap/banding material, and a brass covered button. An unfired lead musket ball was also identified.

Three coins were recovered: a 1920 Wheat penny, a 1914 Liberty dime, and a 1936 Buffalo nickel.
Domestic items included small elements from cast iron cooking vessels, small stove elements, short sections of twelve barrel or cask hoops, a wrought iron pot hook, rim elements of a bucket, elements of tin cans, four jar lids, bottle caps, a lamp bracket, a collar for a #3 kerosene lamp, cast iron hinges, a Rockingham door knob, two hand-worked exterior door plates (interesting because they could be from the Bryan structure), cabinet hardware, a furniture caster, a pull from a blanket chest, a hollow iron key, a curtain ring, storm window hardware, and links of chain.

Tool or tool elements recovered consisted of a well worn plastering trowel or float, a single bit axe head, an alligator wrench, a pair of pliers, an iron file, a screw driver, part of a pair of scissors, a pivot cap, two end caps for wooden handled tools, miscellaneous farm machinery parts, and a valve from an internal combustion engine. Harness buckles and clips, as well as a horse shoe were also identified.

Personal items consisted of a toy cap pistol, a small element from a toy steam locomotive, belt buckles, clothing clips, a boot eyelet, and seven metal overall buttons or studs (one with the embossed word “TEST”).

Several short lengths of wire were identified. Both iron wire and insulated copper wire are represented. Part of an electrical box was also recognized.

Structural Materials

The structural materials category was represented by 234 items. It includes brick (83.3%), stone (0.4%), mortar (9.4%), plaster (6.0%), and caulking compound (0.9%).

The bricks were divided into two categories: early and late. The early brick was hand struck in a five-sided mold, bright orange in color, soft (it could be scratched with a fingernail), lacked temper (although there are occasional inclusions of varying size), contained irregularly sized voids, and sometimes displayed glazed surfaces. The late brick was formed in a press mold, red in color, hard, lacked voids, and displayed tempering material of regular dimension.

Eighty-three percent of the brick recovery was of the early type, 13.3% was of the late variety, and 3.6% was indeterminate. The early type is associated with the structure prior to 1860. The frequency with which they were encountered lends support to the historical interpretations that describe masonry fireplaces at opposite gables of the Bryan structure. “Clamps” may yet be located on the site. The late brick became the object of local industry after 1860. Much of its recovery was related to the foundation and cellar applications in the existing 1890s house.

Also recovered were two pieces of three-in-one tab asphalt shingles, a glob of roofing cement, and a fragment of a red clay field tile.

Other

Nine plastic objects were identified. They included a plastic flower, a bottle brush with plastic bristles, and a small pencil sharpener with an iron blade.

Artifacts rendered from mineral included six pieces of slate from a child’s slate-board, a piece of chalk, a wooden pencil head, a fragment from a modern grinding wheel, a cream-colored clay marble, and 37 small lumps of coal.
Personal items included three shell buttons (two-hole), a two-hole bone button, two shoe heels, a piece of shoe leather, a ladies leather dress glove, a piece of cloth, and a hair brush.

Discussion and Implications

With regard to our first set of research objectives, did this locality have historic occupation prior to the existing Harris farmstead, we met with success. We were able to archaeologically demonstrate the presence of a residential structure located in the front yard of the existing 1891 house (Figure 2). The presence of foundation stones, fireplace elements, topographic features, and subfloor cellars enable a working approximation of the building's outline. I feel comfortable in accepting the historical literature's assertions and that what we have identified is the residence of the Bryan family. Features 4 and 5 imply that there was a continuing occupation of the dwelling subsequent to the Bryans departure.

Addressing the second set of research questions that explores the nature of pioneer taverns necessitates an historical reconstruction of the circumstances within which the economic activity labeled "pioneer tavern" by archaeologists might have occurred. For a variety of reasons the township and county seem convenient social, economic, geographic, and political units within which to describe the cultural phenomenon of the tavern. The tavern is here considered an index of community development.

The theoretic interests driving the present study frame a model of frontier community development common to the study area. As a time transient factor of economic differentiation, the tavern's expressions serve as horizon markers of Euroamerican social and economic diversification. The form of the tavern changed over time in response to a changing cultural milieu and the redefined needs it placed upon the biophysical matrix. Of importance to this work is the prospect that the varying tavern forms have archaeological identities observable from their attendant techno-material assemblages. Historical archaeology is important to anthropology because by adding historical evidence to the archaeological record we are better able to bridge the relationships between material culture and the enveloping cultural system. The tavern presents an opportunity to observe and measure just such relationships.

Archaeological studies of taverns from within the region are limited. From the lower Sangamon valley we find some work at the Rutledge Tavern in New Salem (Petersburg) and Broadwell's Inn near Pleasant Plains. Research from Illinois includes Phillippe's (1987) work at the Cox Tavern in Crawford County, Wagner's (1988) work with the "Old Landmark" Tavern in Marion County, and Johnston and McCorvie's (1990) work with the Young Tavern also in Marion County. Studies from other regions demonstrate that taverns have distinct archaeological expressions relative to other cultural forms. The material assemblage of the tavern has been differentiated on the basis of such variables as region and an urban-rural dichotomy (Rockman and Rothschild 1984). If synchronic variation exists then so also might diachronic variation. As one begins to investigate the tavern phenomenon one quickly discovers that a particular site may display different forms over time. The common appellations "tavern", "pioneer tavern", "early tavern," "latchstring tavern," "frontier tavern," or "inn" would seem too generic and quite likely subsumes several distinct types. The purpose of this section of the study is to explore the isolation of some of these types on the basis of historic reconstruction. We will then present such evidence as exists from the Nine Gal site in support of the historically derived types.
The tavern is a commercial phenomenon signifying particular levels of structural complexity and economic development in a frontier community. Its evolving expression as a cultural form can be traced along several dimensions: population density, transportation, demand, exchange, regulation, community environment, and material form. The proposed model posits three types or levels of taverns: Incidental Tavern, Incipient Tavern, and Full Tavern. The model will be expiated in the milieu of Middletown Township. Whether these conditions and circumstances obtain to other communities remains an empirical question unanswered by the present study.

### Pre-Tavern

Initially, small numbers of travelers moving over varied trails simply bivouacked when the day was done or when they could journey no further. With population densities less than one-half person per square mile for county sized regions, residents were so thinly scattered that it was not possible for the traveler to have nightly contact with habitants. Services, supplies, and civilization were widely dispersed. The traveler was forced to be self-sufficient for extended periods of time.

**Tavern Type I: Incidental Tavern**

The first stage in the development of public accommodations occurred when there were an increased number of travelers, but only private cabin sites on the landscape. Within these private residences social custom and frontier hospitality served the needs of the traveler. In a romanticized county history of 1878 (Brink, McDonough and Co. 1878:20) the author observed:

> Gone is that free-hearted hospitality which made of every settler’s cabin an inn where the belated and weary traveler found entertainment without money and without price.

However, even at this level, the model interprets the offering of public accommodations as an inherently economic act. Moreover, only some of the farmsteads would evidence behavioral patterns warranting the reference “tavern.” In Middletown Township this stage was encountered between 1833 and 1836.

1. **Population Density.** Population densities of less than two people per square mile for township-sized regions would have supported this stage. Platted villages were separated by more than a day’s travel time. Walls (1989) considers this to be extremely low and typical of the early pioneer period. Champaign County was formed in 1833. The Bryans homesteaded in 1834 and were the third family to do so in Middletown Township.

2. **Transportation System.** The transportation system consisted primarily of trails with few wagonable roads. However, it expanded exponentially during this stage as links to homesteads were carved across the landscape. Primary arteries like the Fort Clark Trail were simply unimproved wagon roads. Poorly maintained, the main line of the trail moved laterally and sinuously during wet weather in response to the notorious “chug holes.”

During this time, links were also created between the emerging village nuclei. In 1835, the Champaign County Commissioners approved the survey of a road between the San-
gamon ford at Middletown and the Urbana-Decatur road passing through Centerville. The following year it was built; although, this may be too strong a term in that much of its course was merely blazed. Improvements in the primary transportation routes also occurred.

In 1835 the road from the Sangamon to Urbana, traveled by the early settlers, was of so circuitous a character, that Mr. Scott, who was compelled to travel it often, concluded to straighten it; and accordingly took his horses and plow, and drew a furrow from the Sangamon to Urbana, a distance of twelve miles, and by this direct line a road was made.... (Lothrop 1870:396).

River crossings were affected at natural fords. In some places improvements may have been made in the fords. If this reach of the Sangamon River system itself was ever an important element in the transportation system of east-central Illinois, it had ceased to be so by this stage. Virtually all travel was overland.

To a considerable extent the relationship of the homestead to the transportation network determined the likelihood of visitors.

3. Demand. Economic demand was greatest at those homes located near the intersection of trails, river fords, or at daily conveyance distances along lines of travel. At these loci, sojourners had an interest in warm food, sleeping indoors, sociability, information, supplies, and equipment repair. To the extent that demand remained low and sporadic, travelers were simply fed and put up for the night.

4. Exchange. A reciprocal form of exchange generally obtained. It involved both social and material transfers. The social component could display varied elements. For instance, conversation and interaction with outsiders was both intrinsically rewarding and prestige granting. Secondly, the possessor of information from the world outside had the power to define and interpret that world to the local community. Thirdly, the distinction as the family with the building large enough or attractive enough to be chosen by the traveler provided an external source of social validation for the family's position within the community. Lastly, the demonstration of food surpluses adequate for use in economic exchange with the traveler affirmed prestige within the community.

The transfer of goods could also take unusual forms. For instance, from a personal history authored by Stephen Conger Abbott (Abbott 1902:5) who described his journey from Peoria to Middletown in July of 1847, "Always staid (sic) at farm houses and paid bills with pictures and books." He had earlier purchased ".. $5.00 worth of novels and charts...." with which to compensate home owners.

5. Regulation. Attempts at regulation rarely extended beyond the weight of public opinion. Negative sanctions were informal and typically diffuse. However, in this stage unsanctioned groups of local citizens, vigilantes or "regulators", may have tried to control those individual proprietors who attempted to immorally exploit (theft, assault, and murder) the traveler (Wagner 1988).

6. Environing Community. This level of tavern development demanded a local population capable of responding to the social transfers and rewards of the exchange system. We might best think of these communities as proto-communities, in that they were geographically diffuse. In the present context the community was locally labeled the “Sangamon Timber Settlement.” The physical extent was from near the contemporary village of Fisher to the Piatt County line, a linear distance of 20 miles. It signified the region of early homesteading in western Champaign County. But in its definition, the geographic boundaries were in some ways less important than cultural boundaries. The residents evidenced
homogeneity in their social attitudes, economic activity, religious orientation, and political interests (Walls 1989).

Due to a homestead’s central location, size, and a willing attitude of the owner, some sites functioned as meeting places for social, religious, and political activities. For instance, in 1835 the Bryan home was designated the polling place for all of western Champaign County (Champaign County Commissioners’ Record Book A). Homesteads meeting these requirements likely also occasionally functioned as places where the traveler could find lodging and refreshment. Geography, family wealth, and an attitudinal component of the personality determined the potential of such a site’s function as an Incidental Tavern—a place for strangers to eat and spend the night. Such sites many times formed the nucleus around which villages later formed (Buley 1950:481).

Economic differentiation was minimal. From 1833 to 1836 it was likely that all habitants of Middletown Township were engaged in agriculture.

7. Material Form. The material assemblage would be differentiated from that of a single-family farmstead only in its relative wealth, complexity, and magnitude. The residential structure would be substantial by local standards. While early home sites were hewn of logs in this region, by the early 1830s sawed lumber was available and used with increasing frequency. The ceramic assemblage would center on expensive wares and might evidence considerable variation. While glass would be reasonably common, its incidence would be tempered by technological considerations and availability. One would expect to find both expensive and innovative forms (for instance, flint glass, cut glass, or early pressed glass). Liquor glass, both bottles and service, would be incidental to the assemblage.

Discussion. The Bryan occupation of the Nine Gal Tavern site displays many of the characteristics of the Incidental Tavern. The family was the third such to homestead in the township. They were agriculturalists and never applied for a license to keep a tavern. The large home they built was positioned near the intersection of the two major trails transecting the township and near the most important river ford. The homestead was located approximately a day’s journey west of the county seat and on the east side of the Sangamon. When the river was at flood, west-bound travelers may have been stopped for more than a week waiting for the waters to recede. There were no alternative accommodations for travelers to access.

By local standards the Bryans were wealthy. The artifactual materials recovered from Features 1, 2, and 3 attest to this. Particularly conspicuous were both the variety and value of the ceramics. Fifteen different types of surface decoration were identified. Following McCorvie (1987:272–274) and others, an average ceramic value was calculated (Table 10). For these three features it was 1.99. McCorvie (1987:273) considers values above 1.5 indicative of wealthy families. The glass recovery also suggests relative wealth. The vast majority was pressed glass. Unfortunately much of it is in the form of pressed tumblers, which would seem to confuse the issue of liquor service. A last observation regarding glass is that from these features were identified two objects unique to the entire recovery: a sherd of light blue milk glass frosted with fluoride and a specimen of cut glass.

That the Bryan’s “kept tavern” at all was not independently discernable from the archaeological record. Support for this contention comes from the assertion in the earliest county history (Brink, McDonough and Co. 1878:125) that “…John Bryant (sic) [kept] the first tavern....” The demand for their services would have been greatest between 1833 and 1836.
As the social and economic infrastructure of the community continued to develop, demand may have lessened and become increasingly episodic and situational (i.e., in response to a flooded Sangamon River), but in the early years of the township they were apparently willing to put up travelers for the night. To summarize, the Incidental Tavern may only be affirmed by an examination of a site’s geography, demographic considerations, the relative wealth of the property owner (emphasis on relative), and references from the period literature. Otherwise, the Incidental Tavern will remain reasonably invisible to archaeology.

**Tavern Type II: Incipient Tavern**

The second stage occurred when increased numbers of travelers created the prospect of commercial activity. Morgan (1969:18) cites the case in Big Grove (Champaign-Urbana) when a host recalled that his cabin, 18 feet square, furnished cozy accommodations for 49 guests one night. He admonished the reader to recall that “It must be remembered that people were smaller in those days....” (Morgan 1969:18). The proprietor of an Incipient Tavern “kept tavern” as a secondary economic activity. For farmers and retailers it could have been an additional source of cash. The women of the household would likely play a critical role in its management. In fact, a wife’s employment in this fashion may have provided the major source of hard cash for the family. In Middletown Township this stage was encountered between 1836 and 1849.

1. **Population Density.** Population densities for township-sized areas would have been in the range of 2 to 5 people per square mile. The population density of Middletown Township in 1840 is estimated at 2.5 to 3 persons per square mile (Walls 1989:4).

2. **Transportation.** The transportation system continued to expand with wagon trails forging links to the increased number of homesteads. County and state government increased their response to the need for road improvements. In 1836, the Champaign County Commissioners authorized Isaac Busey and Jonathan Osborn to initiate a state road from Urbana to Bloomington. It followed the furrow plowed by Fielding Scott to the Sangamon ford the previous year (Purnell 1955:40). A differentiated political structure known in Champaign County as the Township Road Commissioner was created. Road taxes were legislated. The tax could be paid with labor rather than money. The Road Commissioner kept track of the number of hours of labor expended by each citizen.

### Table 10. Mean Ceramic Value of Features 1, 2, and 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1855 Value</th>
<th>(f) x (Value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>16.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand painted</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer printed</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>232.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>147</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td><strong>292.94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Ceramic Value = 292.94/147 = 1.9927
River crossings included not only the improved fords, but also ferries. In 1836 the Champaign County Commissioners (Record Book A) began regulating ferries through licensing and fee prescriptions. Licensed ferry service at Middletown was initiated in 1836 (Champaign County Commissioners’ Record Book A).

Public transportation saw its first clear expression in the form of the stage line. It was likely to have been extended through Middletown by 1846.

All of these changes in the transportation system impacted the flow and localization of travelers.

3. Demand. Although demand for public accommodations increased during this stage, it was still not adequate for the initiation of a fully differentiated business activity. While more customers were on the road, the demand remained intermittent in response to such events as flooded rivers and roads or seasonal as in the market created by migratory farm labor. In a developmental context, when the homesteader felt the need to begin charging for services because of increased demand, signage might have occurred with the informal and generic “keep public” (Buley 1950:481).

During this stage, when a competitive environment existed for a finite level of demand, attempts at market definition through the artifice of business names first emerged. While most of the Middletown Township taverns were known by the name of the proprietor, Sarah Rea chose to name hers “The American House.” This strategy became more common during the Full Tavern stage.

4. Exchange. With increased demand, the drain on economic resources was too great for social transfers to provide sufficient reward for the local resident. Exchange became increasingly cash oriented. Signage functioned as a social device legitimating the charging of fees and the utilization of cash as the medium of exchange (Buley 1950:481). Larger local populations and increasing economic differentiation, as well as the need for income producing employment recast the circumstance of the traveler as a commercial opportunity. Exchange at this level followed the market principle; charges were such as the market would bear.

5. Regulation. County level government became involved in the regulation of services and pricing with a likely eye toward potential tax revenues and community image. By 1836 Champaign County had begun licensing taverns and regulating charges (Champaign County Commissioners’ Record Book A). The licensing fee was $2.00 per year. The entry regarding the fee structure reads:

For keeping a man and a horse one night, including:
- supper, bed and horse feed ........................................ $0.75
- For a single meal .................................................. 0.18 3/4
- For single horse feed ........................................... 0.12 1/2
- For one-half pint whiskey ....................................... 0.06 1/4
- For one-half pint French Brandy ............................. 0.18 3/4
- For one-half pint Wine ......................................... 0.18 3/4
- For one-half pint Gin ............................................. 0.12 1/2
- For one-half pint Rum .......................................... 0.18 3/4
- For one half pint Domestic brandy ........................... 0.18 3/4
Because transient populations presented a special moral problem for the community, moral entrepreneurs were interested in the affairs of the tavern. For instance, the possibility that the appellation “Nine Gal” derived from the availability of commercial sex (recall that in the folk lore tradition the proprietor reportedly had nine red-headed daughters) suggests the potential interest of the religious community in such establishments.

6. Environing Community. The community that supported this stage placed increased emphasis on geopolitical boundary definitions. Communities were platted and legal identities established. In Middletown Township commercial differentiation included such enterprises as ferries (1836), saw and grist mills (1837), blacksmiths, and retailing (1836) (Brink, McDonough and Co. 1878:125). In 1836 the village of Middletown was platted and the developer, Daniel Porter, opened a general store and tavern (both were licensed by the county [County Commissioners’ Record Book A]). He also served as postmaster. Developers like Porter used these civil and commercial nuclei as magnets for residential populations, village growth, and long-range profit from land sales.

7. Material Form. The architectural expression that would characterize the Full Tavern surfaced at this stage. A large, two-story frame structure was the style most frequently encountered in the study area. These buildings were rarely fabricated with the tavern function in mind; consequently, existing structures that displayed the appropriate design elements were exploited. Critical considerations included buildings that offered reasonably large public areas for food service and conviviality and multiple segregated areas for sleeping. The ceramic assemblage associated with the Incipient Tavern would be dominated by less expensive wares. There might also be an increase in the number of sets of dishes and durability would be an important consideration. Inexpensive glass, again conditioned by technological considerations and availability, would be more common than in the first stage. Liquor glass, both bottles for storage and sale and tumblers for service, would be common.

Discussion. The history of the Nine Gal site provides no evidence of the Incipient Tavern stage. However, the form is seen in three other tavern sites known to the community: Porter’s tavern (1836) in the platted village, the Mathew Johnson Tavern (by 1847), and the Rea Tavern or American House (1848). All three were ancillary economic activities for the proprietors: Porter was a developer and merchant undoubtedly using the tavern as a device for encouraging settlement and secondary to retailing, Johnson was a farmer whose residence was situated so as to make retailing and tavern keeping an opportunistic form of income, and Sarah Rea kept the American House Tavern in the family residence of the farmstead. What these particular sites would look like archaeologically remains an unanswered empirical question.

Tavern Type III: Full Tavern

In the Full Tavern stage, the entrepreneur and his/her family occupied a relatively large structure and provided services on a cash basis. The tavern served as the primary occupational activity of the proprietor. In Middletown Township this stage was encountered between 1850 and 1859.

1. Population Density. Population densities for a township sized region would be in the range of 5 to 8 people per square mile. Mahomet Township demonstrated a per square mile density of 6.9 persons in the 1850 census (Walls 1989:4). The presence of small villages
was noticeable. Some of these were platted, others were not. These villages had residential populations of one to five families and were separated by less than a day’s travel time.

2. Transportation. The network connecting homesteads to villages and villages to villages underwent further expansion. The interest in the quality and maintenance of highway system continued unabated.

River crossings continued to include fords but the ferry was replaced with the bridge. The plans for the first bridge over the Sangamon at Middletown were launched in 1843 by the Champaign County Commissioners (Record Book A). However, the bridge was not completed until 1850 (Brink, McDonough and Co. 1878:125).

Public transportation still centered upon the stage coach line. In fact, the appearance of the railroad significantly reduced the road traffic upon which taverns were dependent. This reduction in demand created a competitive environment that few establishments were able to survive.

3. Demand. Public transportation in the form of the stage coach was significant to the emergence of this expression. As indicated previously, the stage stop guaranteed a regular and stable market of travelers seeking services. What changed relative to the Incipient Tavern was the volume of stage traffic and number of travelers. In Middletown Township it was this increased volume that enabled the Full Tavern. The increased size and economic complexity of the local community, as well as a sustained flow of travelers, facilitated the creation of multiple taverns. When this expansion of the industry occurred, some establishments worked with specialized markets like wagoner freight haulers, local workers, new arrivals, and stage coach travelers. Others concentrated their business on the local residents who were increasingly using the taverns as places of refreshment and libation. Taverns could now be stratified in terms of the quality and character of the service rendered (i.e., Abraham Lincoln is claimed by local historians to have stayed at the Ohio Tavern).

The targeting of markets is further evidenced by the use of names like “Ohio Tavern” and Dr. Adams’ “Hotel”. The Davidsons clearly attempted to market to the large local population of immigrants from Ohio and Dr. Adams was apparently interested in boarders and a more “citified” image (the “hotel” was situated in what had been Daniel Porter’s tavern). Stephen Abbott (1902:9) indicated in his autobiography that in 1853 he moved “...to a hotel to board in Middletown kept by one Dr. Adams.”

The idea of business image took on a new significance during this stage as proprietors attempted to separate their commercial enterprise from the family home. Of the four establishments known to have been operating in the Township during this period only the Mathew Johnson Tavern (still operating at the Incipient Tavern level) continued to employ the family home concept. The Ohio Tavern, Nine Gal Tavern, and Hotel were by their names alone, fully commercial and professional enterprises.

4. Exchange. Cash was the medium of exchange for this stage, and its production was the fundamental motive for the entrepreneurial activity. Proprietors of a Full Tavern relied upon their business as their primary source of income.

5. Regulation. Unfortunately, the Champaign County Commissioner’s record book for this period has been irretrievably lost to water damage. Consequently, it is much more difficult to determine who was issued a license, if changes in fee structures were occurring, and how rigorously the requirements were being enforced. A likely scenario is that licenses were still required, but fee prescriptions for services other than lodging were largely abandoned, or, in the case of beverage alcohol, replaced by other forms of governmental regulation.
6. Environing Community. The community that supported this tavern stage evidenced a significant increase in commercial diversification. The 1850 census listed 49 farmers and 92 farm laborers, a millwright, a grocer, two inn keepers, a physician, two merchants, four blacksmiths, three carpenters, and a laborer (Walls 1989:32). With the increased economic differentiation, an improved transportation system, an established system of public transportation, institutionalized religious groups (by 1858 there were three churches [Purnell 1955:42–45]), public school districts, and a greatly expanded residential population increasingly interested in leisure time consumptive practices, the frontier community was drawing to a close (Walls 1989). As indicated by the 1860 census, the range of occupational population had increased from 10 to 28. The period from 1850 to 1860 witnessed exponential growth in the occupational infrastructure of the township.

7. Material Form. The material assemblage of the Full Tavern would reflect a combination of seven attributes. There would be a focus on a diversity of (1) inexpensive; (2) durable tablewares (for instance, plain whiteware, ironstone, or hotel china); an increase in (3) liquor storage and service glass; and an increase in (4) pressed glass tumblers. Phillippe (1987) reports fluted, pressed glass tumblers as the most common glass category in the recovery from the Cox Tavern. One might also expect an increase in the frequency of (5) chamber pots. The architectural style that emerged with the Incipient Tavern would continue. In Middletown Township, Full Taverns were (6) located in buildings that had already functioned as taverns. A (7) large, two story building with adequate area on the first floor for food preparation, serving areas, perhaps a bar, and small, private sleeping quarters on the second were typical. There were three Full Taverns operating within the Township during this period: the Ohio Tavern, the Nine Gal Tavern, and Dr. Adams’ Hotel.

Discussion. The Nine Gal site provides evidence of the Full Tavern stage. Both the Ohio Tavern and the Nine Gal Tavern fall into this category. From the exploration of the site, two discrete deposits were identified relating to these two occupations: Feature 4 to the Ohio Tavern and Feature 5 to the Nine Gal Tavern. Both features were dominated by plain whiteware or ironstone. Table 11 contains the data bearing on the calculation of the mean ceramic value of Feature 4 and Table 12 of Feature 5. Note that there are significant differences in both the variety of ceramics (10 types for the Ohio to 3 types for the Nine Gal) and in their mean value (1.39 for the Ohio to 1.00 for the Nine Gal). A possible interpretation of these differences is that the Ohio Tavern, the one that Abraham Lincoln stayed at, was specializing in a higher status segment of the market. Bottle glass constitutes a much larger fraction of the total assemblage than was the case for the Bryan’s Incidental Tavern. Additionally, there is also significant variation between the Ohio Tavern component and the Nine Gal Tavern component with regard to the ratio of dishes to bottle glass. For the Ohio Tavern the ratio is 4.5:1 and for the Nine Gal Tavern the ratio is 2.3:1. Moreover, virtually all (94%) of the bottle glass from the Nine Gal Tavern feature was in the form of liquor bottles. The dispensing of liquor may have been a more important activity at the Nine Gal Tavern. Curiously, no pressed glass tumblers were identified from the Nine Gal feature and only five sherds were identified from the Ohio Tavern feature. Chamber pots were not recovered from either feature. In conclusion, and fully sensitive to the limits imposed by the nature of the samples, the data suggests that the Ohio Tavern and the Nine Gal Tavern may have been directed at specialized segments of the local market and that it is archaeologically feasible to identify the Full Tavern Stage.
Post-Tavern

The end of the tavern form came quickly in Middletown. The occupational categories of the 1860 census include no entry of inn keeper for the Township. In the post-tavern phase, the appellation “tavern” would have fallen into disuse for describing places of public accommodation. In contemporary usage it was now informally applied to rural eating and drinking establishments. However, with sustained community growth, enhanced transportation systems, and increased demand, the modern economic forms of the tourist camp/court, boarding house, motel, and hotel became possible.

Conclusion

Historic research on Middletown Township during the period of 1833 to 1860 has suggested the possibility of three different types of taverns: Incidental, Incipient, and Full. Archaeological investigation of the Nine Gal site has provided some preliminary support for the first and last of these types. John Bryan certainly was in a position, both geographically and socially, to have operated an Incidental Tavern between 1833 and 1836. The historical evidence indicates that he did so. Later, between 1853 and 1859, the structure he built was

Table 11. Mean Ceramic Value of Feature 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1855 Value</th>
<th>(f) x (Value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand painted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer printed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>57.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Ceramic Value = 57.08/41 = 1.3921

Table 12. Mean Ceramic Value of Feature 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1855 Value</th>
<th>(f) x (Value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand painted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer printed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>96.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Ceramic Value = 96.16/96 = 1.0016
employed by at least two Full Taverns, the Ohio Tavern and the Nine Gal Tavern. These last two businesses can be differentiated on the basis of the services they provided.

The primary limitations of the model and the research are twofold. First, the expression of the tavern industry is a complex event. In simplest form, a single site may display the linear, stage specific, evolutionary changes framed by the model. As a cultural form, the site’s varying functional expressions will proceed or falter in response to local circumstances. Consequently, the entire trajectory may or may not be present at the site level. For instance, in the present study the Incipient Tavern stage was not identified and probably never occurred at this site. Larger geographic and cultural units must be explored in order to observe all three stages.

The other critical limitation of the model focuses on the archaeological expression of the different stages. It is not clear that the Incidental Tavern can be distinguished from other area homesteads that display similar wealth. Furthermore, having not effectively examined an Incipient Tavern, it is possible that Incipient Taverns may not be archaeologically discernable from Full Taverns. What is known on the basis of the current data set is that Incipient Taverns are different from Full Taverns and that Full Taverns have the potential of being differentiated on the basis of market specialization. These problems certainly suggest a direction for future research.

The model, at best, presents an exploratory framework within which the tavern phenomenon can be observed. At minimum it may have useful descriptive qualities. Its validity is, of course, an empirical question.

Endnotes

1 The Fort Clark Trail connected Danville with Fort Clark on the Illinois River (modern Peoria, Illinois). Wandering across this portion of the Grand Prairie, it was originally a horse trail and later a wagon road. If one examines the contour lines on the northern margin of the plan view drawing of the site (Figure 2), one will observe a wide-mouthed U-shaped topographic feature centering on the front of the Bryan construction. Insofar as there were unlikely driveways on 1830 farmsteads in this region, one might argue that this is a surviving element of the trail. Of course, the correctness of this interpretation does not lend itself to empirical validation.

2 In 1987, our contract with the Harris Family Trust and Swartz Agricultural Services did not extend to excavations beyond those listed. We could dig as many shovel probes as we wanted (being sure to replace the grass plug), but test excavations were limited. By the time that we were able to regain access to the site, Features 4 and 5 had, unfortunately, been bulldozed out and lost.
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