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ABSTRACT

In the summer and fall of 1982, volunteer excavations were conducted at the Richard Carter homestead (41BZ74) in College Station, Texas. This work was performed by the Texas A&M University Archeological Research Laboratory, students in the Department of Anthropology, and local citizens. The Carter homestead was determined to be the earliest historic settlement within the corporate limits of College Station, circa 1831, and remained within the same family until 1883. Extensive documentary research was conducted, using available public records, to compare the known economic status of Richard Carter with the archeological evidence at the site. Carter was found to be one of the wealthiest men in Brazos County during his lifetime. However, his wealth was primarily reflected in land and slave ownership rather than in the archeological record.
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INTRODUCTION

Archaeological excavations at the Richard Carter site (418274) were made possible in the summer and fall of 1982 by a matching grant received from Texas A&M University and the City of College Station (Figure 1). This grant was made in response to a growing local interest in the history of Brazos County. In addition, the Carter homestead remains, characterized by a massive limestone-lined well, were well-known and facing imminent impact. Investigations at the site would fill a need in the community as well as a gap in its history.

Documentary research was initially conducted to learn more about Richard Carter and his family. Because he was not well-known or extensively involved in politics, public records were relied upon to learn about his former life in Brazos County. Once a profile had been established, a proton-magnetometer survey was done to determine the limits of the site and pinpoint subsurface disturbances. Both the homestead and the cemetery were examined for these anomalies. Four half-meter wide trenches, measuring 30 meters in length, and a series of shovel tests radiating from the house site were used to define the limits of the cultural remains. The field investigations were completed by Texas A&M University anthropology students who volunteered their time along with the staff of the Archeological Research Laboratory and several interested local citizens. The remains of the homestead were analyzed at the Archeological Research Laboratory and are curated there. The location of the Carter family cemetery was also established. Though the results of the excavations have not previously been published, a large interest in the site has demanded numerous public presentations over the course of the past two years.
Figure 1. Location of Richard Carter Site (41B274) in Brazos County, Texas.
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The natural resources taken into consideration by Richard Carter in his choice of a homesite were many. The open stands of oaks in Brazos County, interspersed with prairie grasses, were conducive to both farming and grazing. The knoll-top homesite was well-drained, yet near a permanent water source. The site's proximity to the Old San Antonio Road and its location between the Navasota and Brazos rivers was important as well. All of these considerations were consistently heeded by many of the pioneers contemporary with Carter.

Geology

Brazos County is located in the western margin of the forested Gulf Coastal Plain and within a region of Red-Yellow Podzolic soils (United States Department of Agriculture [USDA] 1958:31). The geological formations include the Crockett member of the Cook Mountain formation and the Yegua, Jackson, and Catahoula formations. Deposition began with the Cretaceous and continued intermittently through the Tertiary. Younger Pleistocene deposits of Quaternary age are found on terraces while the youngest materials include recent alluvium found on the flood plains of streams.

Soils

The soils of Brazos County support three major landscapes: floodplains, prairies, and post oak savannas (USDA 1958:22-47). The soil association of the Richard Carter site (41BZ74) in College Station is the Lakeland-Derby soil association (deep sands) of the post oak savannah, which comprises 61% of the county. These soils are poor for both crops and pasture and generally occur on large holdings. Though they have good drainage and are not susceptible to erosion, they have low fertility. Many cultivated fields have
been abandoned in recent years and improvement for pastures is not recommended. However, certain crops, such as cotton, can be successfully grown in these soils and livestock production is widespread.

The Carter homestead is located on a knoll west of Carter Creek and is characterized by Tabor series soils (USDA 1958:13). These soils are moderate to low in productivity and are usually found on gently sloping uplands in combination with scrubby hardwood forest and an understory of shrubs, vines, and bunchgrass. The thin surface soils are a friable, pale-brown, fine sandy loam underlain by dense clay subsoils. The Tabor series soils are only classified as "fair" for crops and pasture, and a combination of farming and stockraising is recommended.

To the north of the Carter homestead site is a deeply entrenched gully which has no economic value. Its only value, according to the USDA (1958:6), would be water impoundment for livestock.

Sloping southward from the homestead area are Lufkin series soils which are common throughout the county and mainly support a post oak savannah woodland with a thin undergrowth of bunchgrass (USDA 1958:8). The fine sandy loam soils south of the homestead are suitable for crops such as cotton, sorghum, and oats, but cultivation is difficult due to the thin surface soils and dense clay subsoils (USDA 1958:20).

**Flora**

The post oak savannah of Brazos County is characterized by a distinct plant community of open stands of post oaks (*Quercus stellata*) and blackjack oaks (*Quercus marilandica*) with a ground cover of tall grasses (USDA 1958:27). Most of the native and improved pastures have been seeded with...
Bermuda grass, Dallis grass, Vasey grass, carpet grass, and clovers (Correll and Johnston 1970:6). The climax grasses include little bluestem (Schizachyrium scoparium var. frequens), Indian grass, switchgrass (Panicum virgatum), purpletop (Tridens flavus), silver bluestem (Bothriochloa saccharoides), Texas wintergrass (Stipa leucotricha), and Chasmanthium sessiliflorum (Correll and Johnston 1970:6). Invading plants in this area include red lovegrass (Eragrostis oxylepis), broomedge, split beard bluestem (Andropogon ternatus), yankee weed, bull nettle (Gnidia glauca var. texana), green briar, yaupon (Ilex vomitoria), smutgrass, and western ragweed (Ambrosia psilostachya).

**Fauna**

Selected species of mammals included within the ecotone which encompasses the Richard Carter site include: Virginia opossum (Didelphis virginiana), Eastern mole (Scalopus aquaticus), Fox squirrel (Sciurus niger), Plains pocket gopher (Geomyodes bursarius), Fulvous harvest mouse (Reithrodonotomys fulvescens), White-footed mouse (Peromyscus leucopus), Hispid cotton rat (Sigmodon hispidus), Eastern cottontail (Sylvilagus floridanus), and Swamp rabbit (Sylvilagus aquaticus) in the woodlands, and Thirteen-lined ground squirrel (Spermophilus tridecemlineatus), Hispid pocket mouse (Perognathus hispidus), Deer mouse (Peromyscus maniculatus), and Black-tailed jackrabbit (Lepus californicus) in the grasslands.

Also found, are two species of Terrapene, Western box turtle (T. ornata), and Eastern box turtle (T. carolina). Common species of lizards found in the forests include Green anole (Anolis carolinensis), Eastern fence lizard (Sceloporus undulatus), Ground skink (Scincella lateralis, Five-lined...
skink (Eumeces fasciatus), Broad-headed skink (Eumeces laticeps), and Slender glass lizard (Ophisaurus attenuatus), while those common to the grasslands include Collard lizard (Crotaphytus collaris), Texas spiny lizard (Sceloporus olivaceus), Texas horned lizard (Phrynosoma cornutum), and Great Plains skink (Eumeces obsoletus).

Frequently occurring snakes include racer (Coluber constrictor), Coachwhip (Masticophis flagellum), Common King snake (Lampropeltis getulus), Diamondback water snake (Natrix rhombifera), Eastern ribbon snake (Thamnophis sauritus) Copperhead (Agkistrodon contortrix), Cottonmouth (Agkistrodon piscivorus), and Timber rattlesnake (Crotalus horridus).

Urodèles include Small-mouthed salamander (Ambystoma tigrinum), Tiger salamander (Ambystoma tigrinum), and Lesser siren (Siren intermedia). The most common anuran fauna include Couch's spadefoot (Scaphiopus couchi), Spotted chorus frog (Pseudacris clarki), Strecker's chorus frog (Pseudacris streckeri), and Narrow-mouthed frog (Microhyla olivacea) (Blair 1950:101-102).
HISTORICAL SETTING

Richard Carter never acquired fame during his lifetime, but his past is typical of those "who did not write, or who were not written about..." and his achievements were relative to the frontier he penetrated in 1831 (Ascher 1974:11). Consequently, our only knowledge of people like Carter, and the majority of early Texas settlers, comes from public records. These records document everything from birthplace to crops raised. By piecing these fragments of information together, it is possible to create an historical overview of Carter’s life and note the cultural trends of the time.

Since no substantive research had previously addressed the life of Richard Carter, an intensive search of the public records was made to provide a framework from which research questions could be generated. The initial considerations included such basics as: (1) When did Carter first arrive in Texas? (2) When did he first settle along Carter Creek? (3) How long did he occupy the site? and (4) Who were other occupants or owners of the site? Other questions, which reflect the cultural significance of the Carter homesite, include: (1) What was Carter’s socioeconomic status within Brazos County? (2) What archaeological evidence is there of Carter’s daily activities, particularly for agriculture and ranching? and (3) What is the significance of Carter’s relationship with his offspring and their subsequent inheritance of his wealth and property? These questions helped structure the ensuing historical and archaeological research and allowed for the development of problem-oriented research.

Establishment of the Carter Family in Texas (1831-1845)

Richard Carter (1789-1863), son of Joseph Carter and Nancy Menefee of Virginia (Eleanor Nance, personal communication 1982), may have been a
constituent of the "Alabama Settlement" which migrated from Virginia to Tennessee, Alabama, and finally East Texas during the latter part of the 18th century and the first quarter of the 19th century (Freeman and Fawcett 1980:2-5). Carter and his wife, Elizabeth Lones, were married in 1811 in Knoxville, Tennessee (Toni Desem, personal communication 1982) and moved in 1820 to Decatur in Morgan County, Alabama (Eleanor Nance, personal communication 1982; U.S. Census, Population Schedule, 1830). On April 30, 1831, Richard Carter received a grant for one league of land within the Stephen F. Austin colony in Brazos County, Texas (General Land Office [Texas] 1941; Appendix I). Later that year his family left Alabama for Texas by way of Natchez, New Orleans and Galveston Bay (Eleanor Nance, personal communication 1982).

The first reference to Carter in Texas comes from an 1878 interview with his daughter, Evaline Burton. According to the author, Burton claimed "that from the arrival of their family, in October, 1831, until the following July, she never saw a white woman, or had any association with women other than those of her own family and squaws and that during this time their family lived exclusively on wild meats and honey, with butter and cheese, etc., without any bread, except that made out of turkey breasts" (Efrom 1878:238). Another early Brazos County settler, Harvey Mitchell, described the Carter Creek bottom as "an unbroken canebreak, infested with bear, panthers, wild cats, and other enemies of hogs and cattle, as well as of men..." (Mitchell n.d.a:11:Appendix I). In another account, Mitchell says, "This family remained at this home completely isolated from the world and all social intercourse except with friendly Indians till 1835, their nearest and only white neighbors being the Millicans and Woottons... These were the only
people that had settled in this territory previous to the 'Runaway Scrape' in 1836..." (Mitchell n.d.b).

Carter apparently moved, sometime after 1835, to a place called "Tinnanville," located north of the San Antonio Road on the west bank of the Navasota River in Robertson County (Galveston Daily News 1876; Mitchell n.d.a:2). He is listed in the first tax rolls of Robertson County (1838) as paying taxes on 1,476 acres, purchased from Jeremiah Tinnan on August 13, 1838 (Robertson County Tax Rolls, 1838; Robertson County Direct Index to Deeds, 1838:17; General Land Office [Texas] 1941 (3):851). Harvey Mitchell boarded with the Carters at Tinnanville in 1839 and 1840 and may have taught school from their home during those years (Mitchell n.d.a:2).

Tinnin's Crossing was another name for this community which was a "misspelling of the surname Jeremiah Tinnan..." (Dism 1981:90).

The tax returns of 1840, which served as a substitute census, listed Richard Carter, son Wiley, and son-in-law Wilson Reed as residents of Robertson County (White 1966:iii, 158, 162). Richard Carter was taxed on one slave and 24 cattle. Wilson Reed was taxed only on 12 cattle. Each of the men was charged a $1.00 poll tax, a head tax on white males over the age of 21. All of the Carters' and Reeds' real and personal property, including land, cattle, and slaves, was taxed at 1/2 of 1% of its assessed value.

The Carter entourage, i.e., Richard Carter, his son Wiley Carter, and sons-in-law, Wilson Reed and Samuel Burton, did not appear in any county tax rolls during the year 1841. This can be attributed to two factors: (1) the creation of Navasota County from Washington County on January 30, 1841, which was adopted one year later as Brazos County (Texas Historical Records Survey 1941:xi) and (2) their move to Navasota County, i.e., Brazos County in 1840.
(Galveston Daily News 1876). According to Harvey Mitchell (n.d.a:1), he spent Christmas Day of 1841 at "Carter's Creek bottom near the then residence of Richard Carter, four miles below old Boonville." Carter's property had been surveyed by Horatio Chrisman and was located "upon what is called Saline Creek to the East of the River Brazos and above the Labahia Road and is known as the league No. 5" (Brazos County Survey Records n.d. (1):33).

Carter's proximity to Boonville, which was established as the county seat in 1841, influenced his involvement in county affairs. Richard Carter, along with John H. Jones and Hiram Hanover, served as the first Board of Commissioners in 1841 and were appointed to survey the town of Boonville and auction off the lots (Nance 1962). Carter continued to serve as a county commissioner through 1850 (Brazos County Commissioner's Court Minutes, 1844-1873). Carter's son, Wiley, served at the first meeting of the grand jury in Boonville. Prior to the construction of the first courthouse, which was a log cabin with dirt floor built by volunteer labor, the jurors of the first meeting "...retired to the shade of a hickory tree still standing near the historical spring on the old Ferguson farm, to consider of their duties, and after two hours' session, they returned in a body and reported to the court that no violation of the law had come to their knowledge and were discharged" (Mitchell n.d.b). The old Boonville courthouse was used for all public meetings, religious functions, as a ballroom, a Masonic lodge, and a schoolroom. In 1846, Wiley Carter also served as a commissioner and an overseer for county roads. The road from Boonville to Fuqua's Ferry on the Navasota River was under his supervision and included the laborers of Samuel Burton, Wilson Reed, and eleven of their neighbors (Brazos County Commissioner's Court Minutes, 1844-1873:515; Diem 1981:50). In 1848 and
1849, Wilson Reed served as the overseer for the same road; however, the laborers of Richard Carter, Wiley Carter, and J. F. Carter were also included under his supervision. In 1852 and 1866, Reed served as a county commissioner (Brazos County Commissioner's Court Minutes, 1844-1873:520-521; Marshall 1937:226). Samuel Burton served as county commissioner in 1844, as county treasurer from 1845-1848, and as county assessor and collector in 1847 (Brazos County Commissioner's Court Minutes 1844-1873:516-518). Alfred Kelly, husband of Carter's granddaughter, Geraldine Reed, was appointed to a committee in 1852 to draft "a plan of suitable building for a courthouse for Brazos County" (Brazos County Commissioner's Court Minutes, 1844-1873:557).

In 1842, Carter began dividing up his original grant of land among his family (Brazos County Deed Records; Figure 2). During the month of October (1842), Richard Carter deeded 500 acres of his 4,428 acres to his son, Wiley, 120 acres to Wilson Reed, 976 acres to Samuel Burton, and a gift of 300 acres to his daughter, Mary Ann Carter Reed. The surveyor, Horatio Chriesman, classified this land as 4/25 arable and 21/25 pasture (Brazos County Survey Records n.d. (1):33).

The 1842 tax rolls for Brazos County only reflect the 420 acres deeded to Wilson and Mary Ann Reed, suggesting that they may have been living on that tract of land in 1842, while the others were not living on their tracts. It was not until 1846 that Samuel Burton and Wiley Carter were taxed for the property deeded to them by Richard Carter (Brazos County Tax Rolls). At that time, Richard Carter's total acreage dropped to 2,532 acres and later to 2,342 acres which he maintained until his death in 1863 (Brazos County Tax Rolls 1842-1883).
Division of Richard Carter Estate 1842

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Burton</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Carter</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Carter</td>
<td>2532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Carter</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Reed</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hwy. 30

Figure 2
It is probable that the Carters, Burtons, and Reeds were all living on their respective tracts of land within the original Carter grant by 1846, if not earlier, and were neighbors. Richard Carter, Wiley Carter, Samuel Burton, and Wilson Reed were all listed as residents of Brazos County in the poll lists for the Republic of Texas in 1846 (McLain, 1974:23, 27, 140).

By the end of the Texas Republic period, Richard Carter had succeeded in increasing the value of his real and personal property over a seven year period from 1838-1845 by an average of 25% per year. Wiley Carter, Samuel Burton, and Wilson Reed each started with nothing in 1838 and increased their wealth to $3,224, $2,151, and $1,545, respectively, in 1845. (Robertson County Tax Rolls 1838-1840; Brazos County Tax Rolls 1842-1845; Figure 3). Each of these four men owned property in Brazos County as well as in other counties. Richard, Samuel, and Wilson each had property within Robertson County, while Wiley owned property in Bell County and Milam County. Of the four, Samuel Burton was the only one who appeared not to be a stockraiser, while Wiley and Wilson were the only slave owners as well as the only property owners – two essentials for successful stockraising on the Texas frontier.

Expansion and Growth of the Carter Estate (1846-1860)

The period between 1846 and 1860 was reflected in the Carter family by consistent growth and prosperity (Brazos County Tax Rolls 1850-1860; McLennan County Tax Rolls 1856-1860). The first U.S. Census taken in 1850, tells us much about the family. Richard Carter, Wilson, and Samuel Burton were listed sequentially in the 1850 Population Schedule of the census, suggesting that they were, in fact, neighbors.
Carter (age 61) and his wife, Elizabeth (age 62), reported the value of their real estate as $1,272 and Carter gave his occupation as farmer (U.S. Census 1850b). The Brazos County Tax Rolls, however, suggest a more prosperous year for the Carters (Figure 4). The total value of their real and personal property was assessed at $5,898. This included five slaves, five horses, 100 "milch cows [sic]," 200 beef cattle, and 100 swine. The only crop raised by Carter was 30 bushels of corn. This is not surprising considering that only 25 of his 2,532 acres were improved at the time (U.S. Census 1850a).

At the next dwelling, Wilson Reed (age 39) and his wife, Mary Ann (age 33), were listed with their five Texas-born children: John (13), Geraldine (12), Richard (9), Wiley (7), and Elizabeth (1) (U.S. Census 1850b). Both Wilson and Mary Ann were born in Tennessee. Reed's occupation was listed as a farmer with real estate valued at $1,084. Again, the county tax rolls indicated larger holdings valued at $3,344 with a considerable investment in slaves, horses, and cattle (Brazos County Tax Rolls 1850; Figure 4). Reed's only crop was also corn, but he raised ten times more than Carter (300 bushels), on the same amount of acreage, which placed him in a medium corn production bracket for Brazos County (U.S. Census 1850a). In addition to his Brazos County lands, Wilson Reed also received a land grant for 1,107 acres in Robertson County where the Old San Antonio Road defines the northern border of that county (General Land Office [Republic of Texas] 1838:103; General Land Office [Texas] 1941:112).

Samuel Burton (age 40) and his wife, Evaline (age 34), resided at the next dwelling with their four children: William (13), Elizabeth (11), Mary (9), and Wiley (8) (U.S. Census 1850b). Also listed were Penalton (6 months), Peloo (4 months), and John Ne(c)hem (40). The Burton's first child, William,
REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY, 1846—1860

![Graph showing the value of real and personal property from 1846 to 1860. The graph includes data for Richard Carter, Wiley Carter, Samuel Burton, and Wilson Reed.](image)

Legend: Name
- Richard Carter
- Wiley Carter
- Samuel Burton
- Wilson Reed

Figure 4
was born in Mississippi (1837), though Samuel and Evaline's marriage was not recorded until July 5, 1838 in Robertson County, Texas (Swenson 1981:22). Marriage ceremonies were rare in Texas as late as 1837 due to the lack of clergy (Crane 1939:27). Samuel Burton paid his first taxes in Robertson County in 1838, the year his second child was born. However, he owned no property and was charged only a poll tax (Robertson County Tax Rolls 1838. By 1850, the value of his real estate was listed as $3,395 and he owned 3,196 acres of land, only 30 of which were improved (Figure 4). Burton owned no slaves and less livestock than either Carter or Reed (49 milch cows, 80 beef cattle, 78 swine). His only crop was 300 bushels of corn. (U.S. Census 1850).

Wiley Carter died in January 1850 from pneumonia (Martin and Hill 1968:27). According to the mortality schedules, he was 37 years old and had been ill for 13 days. Like his siblings, he was born in Tennessee and was a farmer. Wiley's wife, Harriet, was the sister of Wilson Reed (Toni Desern personal communication 1982). She was a native of Alabama and her five sons were all born in Texas. In 1850, Harriet (age 30) and her sons, William J. (12), Samuel H. (10), John C. (7), Jesse F. (3), and Wiley S. (1), were residing in the Milam and Williamson District which was later to become Bell County (U.S. Census 1850b). At the time of Wiley's death, his estate included 1,107 acres in Bell County, 2,585 acres in Limestone County, and 500 acres in the Richard Carter Headright in Brazos County (Bell County Tax Rolls 1850) (Figure 4).

Wiley Carter, Richard Carter's only son, received a land grant in Bell County (Milam and Williamson District) for 1,107.1 acres (6 1/4 labors or 1/4 league) on January 17, 1835 which "commences at the upper corner of W. C.
Sparks, on the S.W. Bank of the San Andres" (General Land Office [Republic of Texas] 1838:155; General Land Office [Texas] 1941:20). He must have been residing in Robertson County, however, because he was paying taxes there in 1838. He was charged a poll tax, but had no property listed. In 1839, he was taxed on the 1,107.1 acres though not on his 13 head of cattle (Robertson County Tax Rolls 1838-1839).

Wiley Carter also received a bounty warrant for 320 acres in Freestone County as a result of his service in the Texas War of Independence from April 29, 1836 to July 27, 1836 (Miller 1967:160; General Land Office [Texas] 1941:406). According to Miller (1972:46), soldiers serving three months were entitled to 320 acres. The dates of Carter's service suggest that he may have been called to help "guard baggage and care for the sick and wounded" at Harrisburg after the battle of San Jacinto on April 21, 1836 (Miller 1972:49). However, he also served in a company commanded by Captain L. H. Mabbett and was responsible for burying the remains of Colonel James Walker Fannin's men who were massacred at Goliad on March 27, 1836 (Battle 1936:32). Wiley Carter's service also included pursuit of the Indians who massacred the settlers at Morgan's Point, six miles above present-day Martin in Falls County. He and Wilson Reed both served under Captain Benjamin Bryant after the January 1839 massacre (Martin and Hill 1965:3).

Later that year, Wiley Carter served with the Texas Rangers as a private under Captain J. D. Matthew from March 8, 1839 to June 8, 1839 (Texas Ranger Service Records n.d.). According to Miller (1972:46-47), after Texas gained its independence, frontier regiments served as protection from the Indians - most soldiers serving between the years 1839-1841. There is no record, however, that Wiley Carter received any land for this service.
Carter's third daughter, Elizabeth Whitmore, was mentioned only in his Last Will and Testament (Brazos County Probate Records 1860:313). Richard Carter disinherited Elizabeth because she lived in Salt Lake City, Utah. The conditions for her inheritance required that she change her residence to a state that was not under Mormon government within ten years of the probate of Carter's will. Since she never claimed her inheritance, it is assumed that she remained in Utah.

From 1846-1860, Carter, Reed, and Burton profited through raising cattle and swine, although they were listed as farmers in the 1860 U.S. Census (U.S. Census 1850a, 1860). This probably was a reflection of the Mexican Colonization Law of March 24, 1825 which granted each settler who was the head of a family and engaged in both farming and ranching one league of land (4,428.4 acres). One labor (177.1 acres) was intended for farming while 26 labors (4,251 acres) were intended for grazing. Naturally, most people claimed to be both farmers and ranchers (Miller 1972:17, 22).

According to Jordan (1969:65-70), Lower South immigrants brought cattle ranching to Texas during the period 1820-1840 along a major route of diffusion. It extended through the pine barrens belt from South Carolina to Louisiana and across the Coastal Prairie of southwestern Louisiana and southeastern Texas. Cattle ranching in Texas centered in the Coastal Prairie between the Sabine and Guadalupe rivers - an area which Richard Carter settled slightly north of - and was a blend of Anglo-American and Spanish-Mexican ranching traditions. The typical rancher either (1) owned a herd and produced limited crops for subsistence, or (2) was a large-scale planter-herder whose territorial operation produced both cash crops of cotton and sugar cane as well as cattle. Most cattle ranchers also owned swine.
Most settlers brought five to ten cattle with them to Austin's Colony and were able to expand their herds because of the sparse population and the acquisition of large land grants from the Mexican government (Jordan 1969:71-77). The cattle were managed on horseback, mostly by Negro slaves who periodically rounded them up for branding but otherwise left the sturdy longhorns to fend for themselves. Only a limited local market existed for cattle. By 1831, drovers were coming from Louisiana to purchase the herds in Austin's Colony and drive them back to New Orleans or ports along the Red River for market. In the late 1840s, cattle were being driven to Galveston and then shipped by steamboat to New Orleans. By post-Bellum times, cattle were being driven to the railroad towns of Kansas.

At least 2/3 of the cattle raised by Carter, Burton, and Reed were milk cows, which produced quantities of milk and butter, probably for home consumption and for sale in nearby Boonville (U.S. Census 1850a, Schedule 1850). In 1850, one-half of the residents of Brazos County were engaged in raising cattle, while only three of those people raised more cattle than Richard Carter (Figure 5).

The diet of these cattle was probably supplemented through corn production. In 1850, Carter, Reed, and Burton all raised Indian corn, though none of them raised cotton. Ironically, Richard Carter produced the least amount of corn of the three, even though he had the greatest number of cattle as well as working oxen.

While the majority of Brazos County residents were non-slave owners, including Samuel Burton, both Richard Carter and Wilson Reed were among the 22 slave owners in 1850. According to Jordan (1969:18, 78), the combination of large cattle owners (over 100 head) and slave owners along the Coastal
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Prairie of Texas has been well documented through the years in tax rolls and reflects the use of Negro slaves by cattle ranchers to manage their stock. Apparently, this is what Carter and Reed were doing. Both were large cattle owners and among the top 17% of slave owners (Brazos County Tax Rolls 1850).

By 1860, Carter and Reed were producing cotton and were among the top corn producers in the county (U.S. Census 1860a). Each had a herd of 1,000 cattle, placing them in the top 1% of cattle raisers in the county (Brazos County Tax Rolls 1860; Figure 6). Carter had 22 slaves and 31 horses while Reed had 16 slaves and 20 horses. Samuel Burton, on the other hand, who had moved to McLennan County by 1856, had a herd of 470 cattle, 21 slaves, and 14 horses (McLennan County Tax Rolls 1860). Of the 36% of Brazos County families who owned slaves, Reed and Carter were among the top 3% in 1860 (Figure 7), and were in the top 3% of wealthiest property owners.

From 1846 to 1860, Richard Carter's estate had increased from $5,775 to $30,230; Wilson Reed's estate had increased from $25,900 to $82,415; and Samuel Burton's estate had increased from $1,865 to $5,700 in part due to an increase in land value from $0.25 to $1.00 per acre in 1846 to $2.50 to $3.00 per acre in 1860. Also, the value of cattle had increased from a low of $3.30 per head in 1848 to a high of $9.33 per head. Increased production of corn and cotton was possible through a greater number of improved acres. However, the most significant factor that propelled their prosperity over the years was the value of slaves. For Carter and Reed, half of their taxable property was based on the value of a slave, averaging $750 to $800 in value in 1860. In contrast, Joseph owned no slaves and the total value of his estate in 1860 was only one-fourth as much as Reed and Carter.
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Figure 6
The only events to mar this period of prosperity for the Carters were the deaths of Carter’s children, Wiley and Mary Ann. Wiley died in 1850 while Mary Ann died in August 1857 (Brazos County Probate Minutes 1867:578). Wiley’s widow, Harriet, continued to live in Bell County with her children. Mary Ann’s husband, Wilson, remarried the following spring, on April 11, 1858, to Georgia Ann Caroline Bowman who bore him another eight children (Brazos County Marriage Records 1858:12; U.S. Census 1860a, 1870, 1880).

An inventory of the community property of Wilson and Mary Ann Reed was recorded on December 3, 1867 (Brazos County Probate Minutes 1867:578) and included the following: 2,214 acres from the G. W. Coleman Headright in Brazos County, valued at $2,294; 114 acres from the M. A. Foster Headright in Brazos County, valued at $1,114; 11 Negro slaves, including Fanny (female, age 55, value $100), March (male, age 13, value $200), Frank (male, age 10, value $500), Wash (male, age 25, value $1,200), Mary (female, age 21, value $1,000), Pompey (female, age 2, value $200), Bony (sex not listed, age 6 months, value $100), George (male, age 25, value $1,200), Andrew (male, age 16, value $600), Alice (female, age 33, value $1,000), and Harriet (female, age 3, value $200); 12 head of horses at $50 per head; 1,000 head of stock cattle at $5.00 per head ($5,000); and household and kitchen furniture, farming implements and tools appraised at $500 for tax purposes. The total estate of Wilson and Mary Ann Reed at the time of her death in 1857 was $5,728.

**Impacts of the Civil War (1861-1865)**

From 1861-1865, a number of tragedies occurred for the Carter family. The deaths of Richard Carter in 1863 and Samuel Burton in 1865-1866 were
unfortunate, but the loss of their accumulated wealth through slave ownership was devastating (Figure 8).

The date of Richard Carter's death has not been established, although it occurred sometime between September 21, 1862 when he added a codicil to his Last Will and Testament and May 14, 1863, when the application for probate was filed (Brazos County Probate Records 1862, 1863; Appendix III). The will was written on November 25, 1860 (Brazos County Probate Records 1860:313). Apparently, Carter had no inclination that emancipation would be proclaimed within the lifetime of his family. Upon the death of his wife, Elizabeth, he requested that his property be divided among his children and grandchildren. The first bequest was to his daughter, Evaline Burton, and included the care and possession of 14 of his slaves. At an average value of $750 in 1860, these slaves were worth $10,500. Though the Burtons had never owned slaves, Carter's only alternative was to sell them since Wiley and Mary Ann had preceded him in death and Elizabeth resided in Utah. He was probably influenced by his desire to keep 10 of the 14 together who were a family - he referred to the other four as his "orphan" Negroes.

The remainder of Carter's estate, which included a family of eight slaves, was to be sold and the profits divided among Elizabeth Whitmore, the children of Wiley Carter, and the children of Mary Ann Reed. In the event that Elizabeth did not renounce the Mormon government within ten years of Carter's death, her share of his estate was to go to Evaline Burton, and the children of Wiley and Mary Ann (Brazos County Probate Records 1860:313).

Through the war years, Richard Carter's estate climbed to an unprecedented $43,927 while Wilson Reed's reached $35,293 (Brazos County Tax
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Rolls 1861-1865; Figure 8). Samuel Burton's estate remained more or less constant, but began to dwindle little by little (McLennan County Tax Rolls 1861-1865). Economic data concerning the war years were limited, but it appeared that Carter, Reed, and Burton were able to maintain their large herds of cattle as well as their slaves and horses.

The events of the war and Carter's death apparently resulted in an arrangement between Elizabeth Carter and Samuel Burton in 1864. Burton was listed as a taxpayer and resident of Brazos County, rather than McLennan County, but was not paying taxes on any land. Elizabeth Carter, however, was paying the taxes on Burton's 976 acres in McLennan County (Brazos County Tax Rolls 1864; McLennan County Tax Rolls 1861). It is possible that Burton was, in fact, living in Brazos County and helping Elizabeth after the death of her husband. She may have paid his taxes in compensation for his help, or perhaps to compensate for his own losses during the war. According to the 1876 Galveston Daily News, Elizabeth Carter went to live with her grandson, Wiley Reed, five miles north of Bryan, where she resided from 1863 until her death in 1876.

It was not until the taxes were assessed for 1865, after the war was officially over, that the value of the Carter family's estates plummeted (Brazos County Tax Rolls 1865; McLennan County Tax Rolls 1865). In 1865, Elizabeth Carter's estate was valued at $9,775, Samuel Burton's at $7,238, and Wilson Reed's at $7,921 (Figure 8). The tremendous losses for Carter and Reed, a result of their investments in slaves, had little effect on their economic status within the county. In spite of the loss of 3/4 of their accumulated wealth, Elizabeth Carter was the second largest cattle owner in the county in 1865, and, economically, remained within the top 2% of the
county (Figures 9-10). Likewise, Wilson Reed was the fourth largest cattle owner in the county and maintained an economic standing within the top 5% of the county. Burton, however, lost comparatively little.

Four of Wiley Carter’s five sons reappeared in the records in 1861. Jesse Frank Carter, age 30, joined the 14th Brigade of the Confederate Army at Hunt City on July 6, 1861. His commanding officer was Captain Jackson Wilson. Samuel Houston Carter enlisted on March 24 in Belton at age 21. He served as a 3rd Corporal with the 7th Brigade, Allen's Regiment, under Captain H. M. Bouldin and was discharged on June 30, 1862. William J. Carter enlisted at Belton on January 15, 1862 at age 23. His commanding officer was Captain Milton W. Damron. He served with Company D of the 18th Texas Calvary, Darrell’s Regiment, and was discharged 12 months later as a corporal. Finally, Wiley H. Carter enlisted September 8, 1861 at Dallas for 11 months, 28 days. His commanding officer was Captain Jack Wharton and was a private with Company E, 6th Regiment, Texas Calvary (Stone’s Regiment, 2nd Texas Calvary) (Confederate State of Texas n.d.a, n.d.b).

By 1864, J. Frank Carter, Sam H. Carter, and Wiley Carter, Jr. were listed as tax payers in Bell County (Bell County Tax Rolls 1865). Wiley Carter, Jr. owned 250 acres of the original Wiley Carter Headright while Sam and Frank each had 412 acres from that grant.

Decline of the Carter Estate (1866-1883)

From 1866 to 1876, the state of Elizabeth Carter's finances was relatively grim compared to the pre-war years. After the initial loss in 1865, the value of her estate dropped to a low of $7,495 in 1867 followed by a jump to $9,400 in 1868 (Figure 11). From 1868 to her death in 1876, her
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The events of the war and Carter's death were not the only changes occurring in Brazos County during this time. Elizabeth Carter and Samuel Carter were still living in the county and helping to raise cattle. She may have paid his taxes in compensation for his own losses during the war. The Commissioner's Office of Texas, (1981) recommended that the value of the Carter estate was valued at $1,000 in 1865.

The Commissioner's Office of Texas, (1981) recommended that the value of the Carter estate was valued at $1,000 in 1865.

The Commissioner's Office of Texas, (1981) recommended that the value of the Carter estate was valued at $1,000 in 1865.

The Commissioner's Office of Texas, (1981) recommended that the value of the Carter estate was valued at $1,000 in 1865.

The Commissioner's Office of Texas, (1981) recommended that the value of the Carter estate was valued at $1,000 in 1865.

The Commissioner's Office of Texas, (1981) recommended that the value of the Carter estate was valued at $1,000 in 1865.

The Commissioner's Office of Texas, (1981) recommended that the value of the Carter estate was valued at $1,000 in 1865.

The Commissioner's Office of Texas, (1981) recommended that the value of the Carter estate was valued at $1,000 in 1865.

The Commissioner's Office of Texas, (1981) recommended that the value of the Carter estate was valued at $1,000 in 1865.

The Commissioner's Office of Texas, (1981) recommended that the value of the Carter estate was valued at $1,000 in 1865.

The Commissioner's Office of Texas, (1981) recommended that the value of the Carter estate was valued at $1,000 in 1865.

The Commissioner's Office of Texas, (1981) recommended that the value of the Carter estate was valued at $1,000 in 1865.

The Commissioner's Office of Texas, (1981) recommended that the value of the Carter estate was valued at $1,000 in 1865.

The Commissioner's Office of Texas, (1981) recommended that the value of the Carter estate was valued at $1,000 in 1865.
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property dwindled in value until it reached a meager $3,400 in 1876. Similarly, the estate of Evaline Burton dwindled in value until it reached a low of $3,770 in 1879, after which she could no longer be traced in the tax rolls. Wilson Reed, however, experienced regular fluctuations in the value of his property until his death in 1883 when his estate was valued at $11,250 the following year (Brazos County Tax Rolls 1866-1883; McLennan County Tax Rolls 1866-1879).

The first Agricultural Census taken after the war was in 1870 and depicted a drastic change in production on the Carter and Reed ranches. The most significant drop was noted in the number of cattle raised and crops produced. Elizabeth Carter, who produced 150 bushels of corn in 1870 and Wilson Reed, who produced none, were among the 64% of Brazos County property owners who produced 200 bushels of corn or less that year. In terms of cotton production, Elizabeth Carter, with only seven bales, and Wilson Reed, with only 11 bales, were in the top 1/3 of cotton producers in the county. Even though Elizabeth Carter halved the size of her cattle herd to 500 head, she remained the second largest cattle raiser in the county, while Wilson Reed had the seventh largest herd. In 1870, only 40% of the taxpayers were raising cattle, and of those 40%, almost 70% had 25 head or fewer. In spite of their losses and reduction in cattle and crops raised, Carter and Reed remained in the upper 2% of the economic division of the county in 1870 (Brazos County Tax Rolls 1870).

The estate left by Elizabeth Carter upon her death on December 19, 1876 had little comparison to the estate left by Richard Carter in 1863. No probate records could be located, with the exception of a decree, dated September 8, 1877, partitioning her estate (Figure 12). The final estate of
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Carter consisted of 2,342 acres in the Richard Carter Headright in Brazos County; 676 acres of the Samuel Burton Headright in McLennan County, previously deeded to Richard Carter; and $4,107.68. The estate was divided three ways: (1) Evaline Burton received 1/3 of the cash ($1,369.22), plus the 676 acres in McLennan County and 330 acres of the Richard Carter Headright; (2) Sam, Frank, and Wiley Carter, sons of Wiley Carter, Sr., received $1,369.34 plus 1,131 3/4 acres in the Richard Carter Headright; and (3) the heirs of Mary Ann Reed, i.e., her daughter, Geraldine Kelly, her son, Wilson Reed, Jr., and her grandchildren (children of her son Wiley), Mary and Stephen Reed, received $1,369.23 plus 880 1/4 acres in the Richard Carter Headright. In 1881, the tract encompassing the Richard Carter homestead was passed on to Geraldine Kelly who sold it by 1884, thus ending the long reign of Carter family ownership (Brazos County Tax Rolls 1879-1884).

Summary

A wealth of information was revealed through the primary documents search for Richard Carter and his family. In particular, the yearly tax rolls have provided us with a detailed economic profile of Carter. Throughout the documents search, the name of Richard Carter consistently appeared within the upper economic brackets of Brazos County. This profile is the basis of several research questions which concern not only Carter's economic status within the county, but his social and political status as well. Through our knowledge of his yearly gains and losses, it is possible to speculate on the regularities and irregularities of his finances as a reflection of the general economic climate of the county. His placement within the economic hierarchy of Brazos County from 1841-1863 provides a relative assessment of the economy for Brazos County during that period.
RESEARCH GOALS

Our research goals were mainly directed toward a comparison of Richard Carter's documented economic status with the archaeological record. Previous studies by Stone (1970), Miller and Stone (1970), and Cleland (1970) have attempted to define status differences archaeologically through ceramic analysis, but without the aid of documentation. According to Stanley South (1978:80-81), status differences had not been adequately demonstrated in these studies and he suggested,

Another approach to this problem could come through the excavation of ruins of homes of historically known affluent people at one particular point in time and comparison of the ceramics recovered from ruins of historically known non-affluent individuals at the same period in time.

George Miller (1980:1-40) suggested a classification for 19th century ceramics which would provide information on social status. Miller points out that "Social status of any commodity is related to how much the object costs. Prices for pottery were determined by how they were decorated" (1980:3). On the basis of price-fixing lists, Miller (1980:4) suggested that transferprinted wares were the most expensive ceramics during the 19th century, followed by handpainted wares, annular wares, and undecorated wares. From 1850 to 1870, undecorated ironstone apparently replaced transferprinted wares in both popularity and cost.

On the basis of these studies and the knowledge that Richard Carter and his wife were in the highest economic bracket in Brazos County during their occupation of the site, several predictions were made about what might be found. It was expected that during the period 1831-1855, the ceramic assemblage would be composed largely of transferprinted wares and handpainted
table wares supplemented by a variety of utilitarian stonewares. From 1855-1863 and later, an assemblage composed almost entirely of undecorated whitewares (ironstone) was expected.

Secondly, items characteristic of a ranching operation were expected. According to Bernard Fontana, based on his experiences at Johnny Ward’s Ranch in Arizona (Fontana and Greenleaf 1962; Fontana 1967), the distinction between ranches and farms is not understood. The function of outbuildings, tools peculiar to ranching, and the habits of livestock have yet to be addressed in archaeology. As primarily a stockraiser and, to a lesser extent, a farmer, it was expected that the Richard Carter homesite might yield a substantial quantity of hardware reflecting both agricultural and stockraising activities.

Finally, no intact structural remains were expected. Both the primary and secondary structures were probably log and any stone used during construction was probably salvaged and reused in later years. However, recent studies by Southern Methodist University at Richland Creek have concluded that sheet middens, like the one at the Carter site, are patterned and reflect certain types of behavior which can be studied in the absence of architectural remains (Moir 1982:140).
METHODS

A variety of methods was used in testing the Carter site. Initially, a proton-magnetometer survey was done over a 30 meter square gridded area indicated as the old homesite by local residents (Figure 13). This area was located on a prominence above Carter Creek and within 20-50 meters of a stone-lined well which had been filled in recent years. A datum stake was driven near the well and designated N200/E200. A search for the family cemetery was also conducted by magnetic survey of a 15 meter square area located approximately 150 meters north of the homesite and within tree cover. Readings were taken at two-meter intervals over both of these grids. Based on the results from these surveys, half-meter-wide trenches were used at both the homesite and cemetery (Figure 14).

Carter House Site

Trench 1 was established from N200-N230/E200. It was excavated in 5 meter sections by 10 centimeter arbitrary levels within each natural level. The soils were brown silty clays with an undulating red clay subsoil. The clay subsoil was deepest at the southern extent of this trench and was characterized by a layer of Pleistocene deposited river gravels above it. The sterile clay subsoil was generally reached within 8-15 centimeters below ground surface with the silty clays exhibiting some disturbance, probably plowing.

Trench 2 was situated perpendicular to Trench 1 and was established from N200/E200-E230. This trench was similar to Trench 1 but exhibited a more uniform clay subsoil, fewer river deposited gravels, and heavier organic deposits in the silty clay level.

Trench 3, which measured 15 meters in length and 0.5 meters in width, was situated diagonally near two wild plum trees west of the gridded area.
Figure 13. Map of magnetometer data reflecting grid coordinates used in excavation plan (see Figure 14). Note anomaly located at N202/E202 that was later identified as a barrel strap.
Figure 14. Excavation plan.
This unit bisected two depressions that were designated by a local resident, Ben Boriskie, and were believed to have some cultural significance. Excavation, however, exhibited dark organic soils characteristic of tree roots along with what was believed to be redeposited materials.

Trench 4 was laid perpendicular to Trench 1 and extended 30 meters eastward along the N220 line. It was characterized by dark silty clay soils, moderately compacted, and underlain by sandy gravels with a uniformly laid clay subsoil. One feature was recorded at E228.77 in this trench but was later defined as a burned tree root.

Two test units were excavated, including one 2 x 2 meter unit at the juncture of Trenches 1 and 2, and one 1.6 x 0.8 meter unit bisecting the stone-lined well. The 2 x 2 meter unit was characterized by heavy cultural deposits, mixed with ash, and deep deposits of river gravels to approximately 40 centimeters. The soils were loosely compacted and largely silty sand with considerable mottling. The well unit was characterized by a layer of modern topsoil underlain by redeposited red clay, a buried "A" horizon, river gravels and sand, and sterile clay subsoil (Figure 15).

The four trenches and two test units were all excavated by 10 centimeter arbitrary levels within natural levels. Shovels and trowels were used in excavation. Due to time limitations, soils were trowelled rather than screened. Because the site was overgrown with weeds and shrubs, a series of shovel tests was excavated along transects radiating from the homesite in an attempt to define the limits of the site and uncover evidence of outbuildings or slave quarters.

From the well, a second datum point was established and transects were laid east, south, and west a distance of 30 to 50 meters. Shovel tests were
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dug at 10 meter intervals in all transects. Another transect was established perpendicular to Trench 1 and extended 40 meters east along the N210 line at 10 meter intervals. A transect was also tested west of Trench 3 at 10 meter intervals to 40 meters. A northern transect extended along the N200 line from N230-N280.

West of the house site, a survey was done of a three hectare field, reportedly the site of slave cabins. Shovel tests were dug at 15 meter intervals by a crew sweeping back and forth across the field, but no indication of prior cultural activity was evident. This field was located on a slope below the Carter house site and may have been subject to erosion.

Carter Family Cemetery

In the cemetery area, a separate grid was established which measured 15 meters square and encompassed a recent disturbance in the ground. Magnetometer readings were taken at 1 meter intervals and recorded. Based on these readings, a half-meter wide trench measuring 15 meters north-south was established which straddled the area of highest magnetometer readings. An iron fence footing was exposed in the trench. Also, a recent disturbance, measuring approximately 1 x 1.5 x 1 meter was investigated. No evidence of cultural material or grave pits was found in the disturbance with the exception of another fence footing in the extreme southwest corner of the unit. The two footings were five feet apart.

Oral History Interviews

In addition to the field survey and testing, four local residents were contacted for information. Mrs. Toni Desern, an employee at Texas A&M University, originally notified the Archeological Research Laboratory in July of 1982 that she was a descendant of Mary Ann Carter Reed. Mrs. Desern
provided the Laboratory with genealogical data about the Carter family. Also, Mrs. Eleanor Hanover Nance, a descendant of Hiram Hanover, provided information about Richard Carter that has already been incorporated into the section entitled "Historical Setting."

Mr. Ben Boriskie, a long-time resident of College Station who grew up on a farm located within the Richard Carter League, was interviewed on July 27, 1982 at the Carter site. His first remembrance of the site was in 1919 when his brother returned from World War I and, together, they went pecan picking at the Carter site. He claimed that the excavation area had been a cotton patch circa 1920-1921 when he was seven years old. Nearby was an unpainted frame house inhabited by black sharecroppers. The house faced south and may have had brick or limestone footings. In later years, after the house was torn down, Mr. Boriskie recalled piles of brick and limestone where the house had stood. No outbuildings or fences were present that he remembered.

Prior to construction of the Highway 6 Bypass, in the mid-1960's, Boriskie visited the old cemetery site. At that time, the markers were still standing. The cemetery measured approximately 10-15 feet square and was enclosed by an iron fence set in concrete. The concrete was approximately six inches deep and the iron fence about 3.5-4 feet high. Within the enclosure were the graves of Richard and Elizabeth Carter marked by tall narrow marble stones. Slave graves were outside the cemetery and marked with stone slabs. There may also have been two smaller graves enclosed with the burials of Richard and Elizabeth Carter.

Information concerning the Carter family cemetery was also obtained from a manuscript prepared by Clayton A. Greer on May 9, 1971. Greer claims that the first time he saw the Carter cemetery was in the fall of 1941. At that
time, the cemetery was enclosed by an iron picket fence and two large marble headstones marked the graves of Richard and Elizabeth Carter, which lay side by side. A similar marble headstone outside the fence marked another grave while several sandstone slabs were used for additional graves. Throughout the years, Greer and his wife visited the cemetery on numerous occasions. On April 23, 1964, they again visited the cemetery and found it to be intact. This was in contradiction to an article that had appeared on the preceding day in the Bryan Daily Eagle that stated that the graves had been desecrated, a portion of the old fence removed, and the grave stones uprooted. In July 1965, Greer visited the site and found the markers and fence still intact. However, the marble marker outside the cemetery had been placed inside the fence and all the sandstone markers had been piled near the graves of Richard and Elizabeth. It was not until Greer’s visit to the site on April 17, 1967 that he found the iron fence and all the markers gone.

Mrs. John Bishop (Victoria Dominik) was contacted in October 1982 concerning her early life on the Dominik Plantation adjacent to the Carter homestead. She indicated that no structures ever stood in the project area. The sharecropper house described by Boriskie was apparently located where the Highway 6 Bypass is now situated and was destroyed when that highway was constructed. Mrs. Bishop directed us to the affidavits she had made in the late 1930s, concerning the project area, which explicitly identified fences, houses, and lanes within the Richard Carter League but just outside the project area.
RESULTS OF INVESTIGATIONS

The artifacts recovered from the Carter site were concentrated in the area of the old homestead and generally spanned the period 1830-1900. Since the tract of land where the site is located was occupied by the Carter family from 1831 until Richard Carter's death (Eleanor Nance, personal communication, 1982) and remained in the family until at least 1883, there is little doubt that this is the Carter homestead.

The cultural remains recovered from the site reveal much about what was available to the early settlers of the frontier. Many of the remains from the Carter site reflect purely functional or utilitarian attributes. Because Carter's economic status is well documented, it is important to note whether differential access to goods was a factor in frontier acquisition of manufactured goods.

Distribution of the Artifacts

A total of 1,754 artifacts was recovered from the homesite area (Table 1). Trenches 1 and 2 contained 60% (1,052) of the collection while Trench 3 yielded 7% (123) and Trench 4 13.5% (238). A 2 x 2 meter unit excavated at the juncture of Trenches 1 and 2 yielded 13.1% (230) of the collection while the unit outside the well yielded only 2.5% (43). A series of transects radiating from the main site area in each of the four cardinal directions yielded no remains north or south of the site. Negligible remains were recovered west of the site and the eastern transect yielded 4.4% (77) of the total collection from only four shovel tests. Also, no remains were recovered from the shovel tests located over a three hectare area downslope and west of the homesite.

The scattered remains covered an area measuring approximately 40 meters north-south by 60 meters east-west. Trenches 1, 2, and 4, which were of
## Table 1
Artifact Type by Provenience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>38.30</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>40.45</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61.79</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>40.44</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Metals</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
equal dimensions, yielded surprisingly different results. Trench 4, which bisected the main site area, yielded substantially fewer artifacts (13.5% of total). Trench 1 (31.9%) and Trench 2 (28.1%) were situated on the north and west perimeter of the main site area and yielded the majority of the remains. This strongly suggests that Trench 4 bisected the actual site of the Carter home while Trenches 1 and 2 reflect the sheet midden deposit along the periphery of the yard.

Shovel testing to the north, west, and south suggested little or no activity in those areas. However, shovel testing to the east indicated that the site may continue further in that direction, particularly since no sterile shovel tests were encountered. This is interesting in light of the fact that the old road from Boonville (adjacent to the northeast corner of Richard Carter's League) to Fuqua's Ferry on the Navasota River probably paralleled Carter's Creek out of Boonville and may have passed between the creek and Carter's home, i.e., where the Highway 6 Bypass is located today. It is likely that Carter's outbuildings were located between the house site and the road for easier access. Since the road cut through his property, he probably used it for access to his fields and pastures.

**Context of Utilization**

A functional classification scheme for historic artifacts was simplified and adapted for use with the Carter site remains. Four "contexts of utilization" (Stone 1974), describing the general function of the artifacts, were used. These included: personal context, household context, structural context, and craft/activity context. The personal context primarily includes clothing related items such as buttons or buckles but can also be extended to
such things as jewelry, watches, or pipes. The household context generally includes items that are used within the household but largely focuses on ceramics and glassware. The structural context is probably more limited in variety and includes such things as bricks, cut stone, nails, hardware, and window glass. Finally, the craft/activity context is used to identify activities at the site such as washing, butchering, cooking, and farming.

PERSONAL CONTEXT

Personal remains recovered from the Carter homesite were few and generally of a functional nature, suggesting little opportunity for self-indulgence on the frontier (Table 2). In Trenches 1 and 2, clothing accessories included one suspender slide, one brass shoe eyelet, three buttons, and one glass bead. The three buttons included one brass button with a center hole by the "P. & A. Co." patented on January 16, 1883 and August 17, 1897; one four-hole white porcelain button (9/16"); and one decorative glass button, with missing back, similar to those used on women's Victorian dress sleeves (Figure 16). One plain wire wound glass bead with a 3/8 inch diameter was also found (Figure 16). The only other clothing item from the remainder of the site came from the 2 x 2 meter unit at the juncture of Trenches 1 and 2. One snap cover with "SOUTHERN" imprinted on it was found.

Tobacco pipes were the only remnants of social or recreational activities. Three of these fragments, made of gray clay, may have come from the same male effigy pipe (Figure 16). All were bowl fragments exhibiting either hair or facial features. One fragment was found on the surface, one in Trench 2, and one along the eastern shovel test transect. The remaining
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Trench 1</th>
<th>Trench 2</th>
<th>Trench 3</th>
<th>Trench 4</th>
<th>2 x 2m Unit</th>
<th>N110/E110-240</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craft/Activity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>61.24</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>52.34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46.43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48.25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72.22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
<td>54.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>44.68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51.79</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48.25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>331</td>
<td>41.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>804</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 16. Glass and Ceramic Artifacts from the Carter Site: (a) lavender improved tooled bottle finish, 1880-ca.1915, (b) brown applied tooled bottle finish, 1820s-1870s, (c) aqua improved tooled bottle finish, 1870s-ca.1915, (d) brown snuff bottle improved tooled finish, 1870s-ca.1915, (e) clear folded bottle finish, 1870s-1870s, (f) clear flanged bottle finish, 1870s-1870s, (g) lavender tumbler base, 1880-ca.1918, (h) clay male effigy pipe, (i) brown salt-glazed stoneware from Peoria Pottery company in Illinois, 1873-?, (j) wire-wound glass bead, and (k) glass button.
two fragments, of lead-glazed red clay, may also represent a single pipe. Both are shaft fragments from a short-stemmed pipe.

HOUSEHOLD CONTEXT

Items used in the preparation and consumption of foods were the most numerous (Table 2). From Trenches 1 and 2 and the 2 x 2 meter unit at their juncture, a total of 225 fine tableware ceramics was found (Table 3). These included 10 undecorated pearlware sherds and 160 undecorated whiteware sherds. The remaining 55 sherds were all decorated whitewares as follows: annual wares (7), mocha wares (1), cut-sponged wares (1), sponged wares (2), decal decorated wares (1), shell-edged wares (3), molded edged wares (10), molded edge and transferprinted wares (1), blue transferprints (6), lavender transferprints (1), green transferprints (1), handpainted wares (4), undecorated porcelain (8), molded porcelain (6), and ironstone (3) (Table 4) (Figure 17). The pearlware generally pre-dates 1830 while the decorated wares span the 1830-1860 period (Price 1979). The exceptions include molded whitewares which were popular during the 1860-1880 period (Wetherbee 1980), decal decorated wares which were popular after 1900 (Lehner 1980), and the porcelain wares which are probably of early 20th century origin.

Tableware ceramics from the remainder of the site included 2 undecorated pearlware fragments, 51 undecorated whiteware fragments, and 19 decorated whitewares. Among the decorated whitewares were: handpainted wares (3), flow blue transferprinted wares (1), blue transferprint (2), ironstone (2), molded porcelain (1), annular ware (1), marbled annular ware (1), copper tea leaf lustre ware (1), and unidentified (2). Again, these decorated wares span the period 1830-1860 with the exception of copper tea leaf which was popular during the 1890s (Wetherbee 1980).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Trench 1</th>
<th>Trench 2</th>
<th>Trench 3</th>
<th>Trench 4</th>
<th>2 x 2m unit</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coarse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacelure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>65.30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>76.11</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64.29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14100.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3**

Ceramic Paste by Provenience
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Trench 1</th>
<th>Trench 2</th>
<th>Trench 3</th>
<th>Trench 4</th>
<th>2 x 2 #1 Unit</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>91.72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85.96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>80.77</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annuar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out Sponged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Painted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 17. Ceramic Artifacts from the Carter Site: (a) blue shell-edged whiteware, (b) blue transferprinted whiteware, (c) flow blue whiteware, (d) annular whiteware, (e) polychrome handpainted whiteware, (f) annular ware, (g) cut sponged whiteware, (h) molded semi-porcelain, (i) ginger colored stoneware beer bottle, and (j) blue Bristol glazed chamber pot rim.
The utilitarian ceramics were largely stoneware crocks and jugs with exterior salt glazes, Bristol glazes, and Albany slips. The interiors of these vessels were either unglazed, slipped, or Bristol glazed. From Trenches 1 and 2 and the 2 x 2 meter unit 58 stoneware fragments were recovered (Table 3). From the remainder of the site 19 fragments were found. One brown, salt-glazed stoneware fragment from the Peoria Pottery Company (1873 or later) in Illinois was found (Figure 16). Additionally, three red coarse earthenware sherds, two with a mossy green slip, were recovered.

For the most part, the glassware recovered from the Carter site was too fragmentary for this researcher to identify by function. Consequently, all glass has been identified according to manufacturing techniques including lip finishing, shaping, form, and color (Tables 5–6). In some instances, specific function could be identified. For the majority of the collection, however, function can only be generally assessed from the observed attributes.

A total of 706 glass fragments was recovered. Almost 70% was recovered from Trenches 1, 2, and the 2 x 2 meter unit combined. Trench 3 yielded 76 fragments while Trench 4 yielded 96 fragments, the well unit 20 fragments, N210 transect 6 fragments, west transect 5 fragments, and the east transect 33 fragments. Of the 706 fragments recovered, 50.8% (359) were cylindrical fragments, probably representing bottles; 10.3% (73) were flat fragments from panel or rectangular bottles; 7.5% (53) were window glass fragments, most of it coming from Trench 3.

From Trench 1, nine bottle fragments were recovered that exhibited datable attributes (Figure 16). These included one clear flanged bottle (early 1870s); two brown and one light green folded finish (?-early 1870s);
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Trench 1</th>
<th>Trench 2</th>
<th>Trench 3</th>
<th>Trench 4</th>
<th>2 x 2a Unit</th>
<th>H210/E210-240</th>
<th>West Transact</th>
<th>East Transact</th>
<th>North Transact</th>
<th>Surface Transact</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>38.60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73.68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavender</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.74</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Green</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.74</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patinated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Bottle Glass Finish by Provenience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flanged</td>
<td>1 11.11</td>
<td>1 33.33</td>
<td>1 33.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 100.00</td>
<td>1 100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 19.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folded</td>
<td>3 33.33</td>
<td>2 28.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 19.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied, String</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 19.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied, Toolled</td>
<td>2 22.22</td>
<td>3 42.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 23.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved, Toolled</td>
<td>3 33.33</td>
<td>1 14.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 33.33</td>
<td>2 100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 26.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machined</td>
<td>1 14.29</td>
<td>2 66.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 11.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 100.00</td>
<td>7 100</td>
<td>3 100.00</td>
<td>3 100.00</td>
<td>2 100.00</td>
<td>1 100.00</td>
<td>1 100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 190.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
one brown and one clear applied tooled finish (circa late 1820s to early 1870s); and three lavender improved tooled finishes (circa 1915) (Deiss 1981:94). Thirteen basal fragments, exhibiting the following: two olive and one light green, three-piece plate bottom molds (early 1830s to circa 1905); two brown, three aqua, one lavender (circa 1858-1915), and one lavender three-piece plate bottom molds (circa 1905-1915); and two olive bottle bases made by a snap case (1860-circa 1900) (Deiss 1981:92-93).

The remainder of the glassware from Trench 1 included 142 cylindrical bottle fragments of varying colors, seven flat fragments from rectangular or panel bottles, four flat window glass fragments, seven globular or conical fragments, one hexagonal fragment, one octagonal fragment, one rectangular fragment, and 24 unidentified fragments. These glass remains largely represented olive wine bottle fragments, aqua, lavender, and clear panel bottle fragments (possibly patent medicine bottles), snuff bottles, flasks, canning jars, and canning jar lid inserts.

In Trench 2, seven bottle fragments were found with datable attributes and included one brown flanged finish (?-early 1870s); one brown folded finish (?-early 1870s); one olive, one aqua, and one brown applied tooled finish (circa late 1820s-early 1870s); one lavender improved tooled finish (1880-circa 1915); and one lavender machine-made finish (circa 1903-1915) (Deiss 1981:94).

The remainder of the glass from Trench 2 included 104 cylindrical bottle fragments of varying colors, 23 flat fragments from rectangular or panel bottles, 4 flat window glass fragments, 8 globular or conical fragments, 2 hexagonal fragments, 2 octagonal fragments, and 21 unidentified fragments. This glassware was largely identified as fragments from wine bottles, snuff
bottles, clear, aqua, olive, brown, light green panel or rectangular bottles, a clear tumbler, a lantern chimney rim, a medicine vial with a blowpipe pontil (pre-1840), and an aqua medicine or perfume vial.

From the remainder of the site, four flanged bottle finishes, two applied tooled finishes, four improved tooled finishes, and two machine-made finishes were found. Basal fragments included seven three-piece dip bottom molds, nine three-piece plate bottom molds, and two snap case molds. Fragmentary body sherds included 143 cylindrical bottle fragments, 43 flat panel or rectangular bottle fragments, 45 flat window glass fragments, 8 globular or conical fragments, 1 hexagonal fragment, 1 octagonal fragment, 1 rectangular fragment, and 10 unidentified fragments. The only metal artifacts related to the preparation and consumption of food were cast iron stove parts, kettle parts, and tin cans. From Trenches 1 and 2 and the 2 x 2 meter unit, nine cast iron kettle parts and 41 tin can fragments were found. From the remainder of the site, two cast iron stove parts and eight tin can fragments were found.

One barrel hoop fragment, possibly representative of food or beverage storage facilities, was found in the 2 x 2 meter unit at the juncture of Trenches 1 and 2. Two chamber pot fragments, one from the well area and one from the east transect, were also recovered.

Furniture remains were few. One brass clock mechanism from the 2 x 2 meter unit was the only household furnishing recovered.

STRUCTURAL CONTEXT

Structural remains were categorized according to component materials (brick, sandstone, mortar, etc.) and hardware (Tables 2, 7). From Trench 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Trench 1</th>
<th>Trench 2</th>
<th>Trench 3</th>
<th>Trench 4</th>
<th>2 x 2m Unit</th>
<th>N210/E210-240</th>
<th>West Transact</th>
<th>East Transact</th>
<th>North Transact</th>
<th>Surface Transact</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>1 1.19</td>
<td>4 36.36</td>
<td>1 2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 33.33</td>
<td>6 2.01</td>
<td>6 2.01</td>
<td>5 1.68</td>
<td>1 0.84</td>
<td>1 0.84</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut Sandstone</td>
<td>4 4.76</td>
<td>2 2.38</td>
<td>1 2.17</td>
<td>2 4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 2.35</td>
<td>3 1.01</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 6.52</td>
<td>4 1.01</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbed Wire</td>
<td>1 1.19</td>
<td>2 1.15</td>
<td>1 2.17</td>
<td>1 2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 1.19</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolts</td>
<td>1 1.19</td>
<td>1 0.99</td>
<td>4 8.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 1.01</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Springs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasps</td>
<td>1 1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 1.01</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooks</td>
<td>1 1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 1.01</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latches</td>
<td>1 1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2.17</td>
<td>1 2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 16.67</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails, Used</td>
<td>21 36.90</td>
<td>77 82.80</td>
<td>2 10.10</td>
<td>11 67.38</td>
<td>10 60.00</td>
<td>2 33.33</td>
<td>0 120.00</td>
<td>0 120.00</td>
<td>0 120.00</td>
<td>0 120.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails, Cut</td>
<td>24 20.57</td>
<td>5 5.38</td>
<td>1 9.09</td>
<td>1 2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 18.08</td>
<td>3 42.00</td>
<td>3 42.00</td>
<td>3 42.00</td>
<td>3 42.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screws</td>
<td>4 4.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0.84</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spikes, Cut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>1 0.34</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spikes, Wire</td>
<td>10 15.48</td>
<td>6 6.45</td>
<td>1 2.17</td>
<td>9 10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 1.01</td>
<td>2 2.26</td>
<td>2 2.26</td>
<td>2 2.26</td>
<td>2 2.26</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84 100.00</td>
<td>93 100.00</td>
<td>11 100.00</td>
<td>46 100.00</td>
<td>50 100.00</td>
<td>6 100.00</td>
<td>6 100.00</td>
<td>6 100.00</td>
<td>6 100.00</td>
<td>6 100.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
only one brick fragment was recovered while four possible cut sandstone fragments and two possible cut limestone fragments were found. One mortar fragment was found in Trench 2 and two possible cut limestone fragments were found in the 2 x 2 meter unit. From Trench 3, four brick fragments were recovered and in Trench 4 one brick fragment and one possible cut limestone fragment were found. The western shovel test transect yielded one possible cut limestone fragment and the eastern transect along the N210 line yielded two possible cut sandstone fragments.

The hardware recovered from Trenches 1 and 2 and the 2 x 2 meter unit included 1 wrought nail, 138 cut nails, and 36 wire nails. Also found were barbed wire fragments (4), bolt (1), door lock (1), hook (1), screw (1), wire spike (1), staples (4), wire fragments (28), and strap iron fragments (20). Hardware from the remainder of the site was similar, though in less quantity, and included four door spring fragments from Trench 4. A total of 53 window glass fragments was recovered, mostly from Trench 3.

CRAFT OR ACTIVITY CONTEXT

Few remains were found which could be categorized according to (1) acquisition of subsistence resources, (2) commercial items, (3) skills or crafts, or (4) transportation (Stone 1974) (Table 2). From Trenches 1 and 2 and the 2 x 2 meter unit, one knife blade was found in addition to one tool shaft, one bucket handle, two chain fragments, one pulley, four plow fragments, one chisel, one horse bit, one harness buckle, two harness rings, and one wagon wheel ring. From the remainder of the site, similar items were found in addition to a horseshoe and a wagon box strap bolt (Figure 18).

The remaining metal artifacts were categorized as miscellaneous and included such things as unidentified corroded hardware and nails. Also
Figure 18. Metal Artifacts from the Carter Site: (a) possible pulley, (b) wagon box strap bolt, (c) unidentified, (d) horse bit, (e) bolster plate, (f) unidentified, and (g) plow fragment.
included, were nail fragments, slag iron, scrap iron, cast iron and tin fragments, and modern debris such as meter caps, pipe fittings, and shotgun shells.

SUMMARY

The artifacts recovered from the archeological investigations at the Carter site are consistent with an occupation between 1831 and 1900. While there is some evidence of pearlware, which generally predates 1830, the majority of datable ceramics consists of decorated wares which were largely manufactured between 1830 and 1860. Likewise, many of the bottle finishes that were recovered date to the middle of the 19th century as well (fire-polished, flanged, folded, applied string, and applied tooled). Although lavender bottle glass, which was manufactured between 1880 and circa 1918, does occur, there were only three machine made bottle finishes in the entire collection. This strongly suggests that there was little or no occupation of the site after 1903 when automation in bottle manufacturing began.

The presence of numerous stonewares and negligible canning jar remains also support the statement that occupation of the site ended circa 1900.

Faunal remains recovered from the site (Appendix V) suggest that the Carter's diet was dependent upon pigs, cows, sheep or goats, opposum, deer, chicken, turkey, and wild birds. The pigs, cows, and sheep or goats were apparently butchered at the site.

The distribution of artifacts across the site is typical of a domestic dwelling. Through both trenching and shovel testing along transects, the
house and yard location were identified in close proximity to the limestone lined well.

Numerous structural and domestic remains were recovered in this vicinity of the house. No outbuildings were identified although the eastern limits of the site were not defined. Outbuildings are suspected to have been located between the house and well location and the Highway 6 Bypass.

Trenching at the cemetery location did not reveal any grave pits, but two iron fence footings were located and presumed to be associated with the old cemetery.
CONCLUSIONS

The results of the archeological and historical investigations at the Richard Carter site (41BZ74) suggest that economic status is relative within a given region. Carter, who was consistently within the upper economic brackets of Brazos County throughout the 19th century, began his economic ventures in Texas with the expenditure of only $117.00 for a league of land (Miller 1972:22). Presumably, he brought some slaves and cattle with him from Alabama in 1831. He quickly became dependent upon slave labor for the production of cotton and corn and, likewise, his investments in livestock were dependent upon a large slave force to herd cattle. It is evident from tax assessment records that Carter's wealth was primarily in property ownership, i.e., land, slaves, and livestock. Income received from the sale of crops, cattle, or dairy products probably went first to replenishment of seed and livestock before any luxuries could be considered. The cultural remains recovered from the Carter homesite suggest that luxuries were, indeed, of little importance.

Because the value of ceramics can be determined through time, they were considered to be the best physical indicator of status. Using Miller's (1980) scheme for economic scaling, the decorated ceramics at the Carter site were examined. Of the 280 refined earthenware pieces recovered, only 51 (18.2%) were decorated. The most frequently occurring were edge decorated wares (18 or 6.4%), transferprinted wares (11 or 3.9%), annular wares (10 or 3.6%), and handpainted wares (7 or 2.5%). According to Miller (1980:4), transferprinted wares were the most expensive, followed by handpainted wares, annular wares, and undecorated wares. Although the large number of undecorated sherds probably represent portions of decorated vessels, the 51
decorated sherds do not suggest an affluent lifestyle. On the basis of these wares, it is believed that Carter's wealth was not reflected by the artifact assemblage, but rather, by his property ownership.

Similarly, the artifact assemblage did not reflect Carter's ranching activities. With a herd of 1,000 cattle in 1860, it seems that any accoutrements unique to ranching would have been apparent. The only artifacts reflecting site activities, however, included horse and wagon gear, hand tools, and plow fragments. Shovel testing did not reveal any activity areas north, west, or south of the house area. Outbuildings, if they existed, are believed to have been east of the homesite towards the Highway 6 Bypass which formerly led to Boonville. Unfortunately, excavations were not undertaken in the eastern portion of the site. It is suggested then, that land use records may be a critical aid in distinguishing farm and ranch related sites.

Finally, the structural remains from the Carter site are consistent with a 19th century structure. The preponderance for cut nails suggests a structure built before the latter part of the 19th century when wire nails began to be common. The meager windowpane fragments (a total of eight from Trenches 1 and 2) suggest a house with few windows. The limited brick and cut stone fragments may have been used in piers supporting the house or in a chimney. These artifacts are unreliable, however, since many were probably salvaged and reused. On the other hand, the cut limestone may indicate construction at the same time as the limestone lined well or discards from the well construction. Carter reportedly lived in a one room log cabin in 1841 (Mitchell n.d.a:4) but it is not known if that structure was ever replaced by a more modern frame building. The artifacts recovered from the house area
strongly suggest that it was not. Furthermore, Carter's children were already of marriageable age when he arrived in Texas. The need for a larger, or more modern house, may never have been warranted.

After Richard Carter died in 1863, his wife, Elizabeth, moved to the home of her grandson, Wiley Reed, five miles north of Bryan. We do not know if the Carter home was occupied after this date. In 1881, Geraldine Reed Kelly, a granddaughter, acquired through a partition deed the tract of land where the homesite is located. By 1884, she had sold this tract. It is presumed that from Carter's death in 1863 until final sale of the property, circa 1884, the land was farmed and grazed by Carter descendants, or possibly leased. There appeared to be few cultural remains dating from the post-Carter occupation of the site. The tract was eventually acquired by H. P. Dansby who purchased a quantity of land in the Carter Creek vicinity after the turn-of-the-century. The site has not been used for crops or grazing since sometime prior to 1941. Recently, a Texas Historical Marker was acquired for the Richard Carter site. The site may be potentially eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places or as a State Archeological Landmark, and this status should be taken into consideration during future park development of the site.
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APPENDIX I

PLAT AND FIELD NOTES OF RICHARD CARTER SURVEY

Brazos County, Texas

Recorded in Volume 1, page 33
Survey Records, Brazos County, Texas

I concede in possession to Richard Carter one league of land which
land has been surveyed by the Surveyor, Horatio Chriesman previously
appointed for the purpose under the following situation and lines: Situated
upon what is called Saline Creek to the East of the River Brazos and above
the LaBahis Road and is known as the league No. 5 and

BEGINNING at the Northern corner of the league No. 4 which is a landmark
dis 10 vs from a Red Oak bearing N 49 W and another bears S 50 W 12 vs from
another

THENCE on a line N 45 W and at 2020 vs crossed a Creek at 2460 crossed
the aforesaid Saline Creek 240 vs crossed the same Creek again 280 vs more
set another stake for the Northern corner of this league from which a Hickory
bears S 13 W 4 vs and a Red Oak bears S 27 E 5 vs from

THENCE S 45 W crossing the aforesaid creek at 40 vs at 1160 more vs
crossed another creek at 3300 vs more crossed another creek 500 vs more set a
stake for the Western corner, from

THENCE S 45 E 5000 vs to where intersected the western corner of said
league No. 4 from which a Black Jack bears N 47 W 18 vs and a Red Oak bears S
72 E 12 vs, from
THENCE N 45 E and following the N W line of the aforesaid league No. 4 5000 vs to the PLACE OF BEGINNING. This league has 5000 vs on each side and an area of 25,000,000 square varas.

The aforesaid land belongs to the arable class in 4/25 parts, and to the pasture class in 21/25 parts.
State of Coahuila and Texas

GRANT

Dated April 30th, 1831

Filed March 3rd, 1939

Recorded in Volume 99, page 245,

Deed Records, Brazos County, Tex.

---

THIRD SEAL: TWO REALS

Authorized by the State of Coahuila and Texas for the Biennium of 1828
and 29, 30 and 31

WILLIAMS (RUBRIC)

Lord Commissioner:

Town of San Felipe de Austin, March 30, 1831, To the Agent of Citizen
Empresario Estevan F. Austin for him to please report on this petition,
adding whether the tract is vacant and out-side the ten cost leagues.

ARCINIEGA (Rubric)

I, Richard Carter, a native of the United States of the North and one of the
colonists introduced by Empresario Austin, before you with the greatest of
respect declare: That my status is that a married man, that I have entered
this country with my family for the purpose of acquiring land to settle forever, for which end, having the approval of said Empresario, I have chosen a league of land, which is situated on a stream called Saline Creek east of the Brazos River and above the Bahia Road, known as League No. 5, wherefore I present myself before you in order that you may be pleased to admit me and give me possession of said league of land, with the understanding that I promise to settle and cultivate it as the law requires, and to fulfill all the other obligations of same. Therefore, I beg you to be pleased to do as I have set forth, for therein I shall receive grace.

Town of Austin, March 30, 1831

RICHARD CARTER (Signed)
Lord Commissioner

In view of your foregoing decree, I must say that what has been declared by the applicant is true, he is one of the colonists introduced by Empresario Austin, he is married and a man of much honor, good habits, and well-known industry, and I consider him by law deserving of the grant that he requests. The tract is entirely vacant and outside the ten coast leagues.

Town of Austin, March 31, 1831

SAMUEL M. WILLIAMS (Rubric)

In view of the declaration of Citizen Agent Samuel M. Williams in the foregoing report, I admit this Petition according to law, and order that the tract indicated be surveyed by Surveyor (left blank), in order to issue the corresponding title.

Town of Austin, April 1, 1831

MIGL. ARCINIEGA (Rubric)

I, Citizen Miguel Arciniega, Commissioner appointed by the Supreme Government of this State for the distribution and granting of lands and issuing of titles to the new Colonists in the colonization enterprise of Empresario Citizen Estevan F. Austin, outside the ten littoral leagues of the Coast:

Whereas, Richard Carter has been received as a colonist in the colonization enterprise contracted with the Government of the State of Coahuila and Texas, by Empresario Estevan F. Austin on June 4, 1825, as appears on page 1389 of this record book, and whereas said Richard Carter has
established that he is married and the requisites prescribed by the colonization law of the State of March 24, 1825, are found in his person; in accordance with said law and the instructions governing me dated September 4, 1827, and the additional article date April 25, of the past year of 1830, and in the name of the State, I grant, concede, and put said Richard Carter in real and personal possession of a league of land which tract has been surveyed by the surveyor Horacio Chreisman previously appointed for the purpose, with the following situation and boundaries;

Situated on the creek called Saline Creek east of the Brazos River and above the Labahia Road, and known as number 5; and from the north corner of number 4, which is a landmark 10 varas distant from a Spanish Oak bearing north 49 degrees west, and another bearing south 50 degrees west 12 varas distant, a line was run north 45 degrees west, and at 2020 varas crossed a little creek, at 2460 at 2460 varas farther crossed said Saline Creek, 240 varas farther crossed the same creek again, 280 varas farther drove another landmark for the north corner of this league, from which a hickory bears south 13 degrees west 4 varas distant, and a Spanish Oak bears south 27 degrees east 5 varas distant; and

THENCE South 45 degrees west ran another line, at 40 varas crossed said creek, 1160 varas farther crossed a little creek, at 3300 varas farther crossed another little creek, 500 varas farther drove another landmark for the west corner; and

THENCE South 45 degrees east ran another line 5,000 varas until intersecting the west corner of said league No. 4, from which a black jack
bears north 47 degrees west 18 varas distant, and a Spanish Oak bears south 72 degrees east 12 varas distant; and

THENCE north 45 degrees east, following the northwest line of said number 4 5,000 varas to the point of beginning. This league has 5,000 on each side and 25,000,000 varas in plane area. Said tract has four twenty-fifth parts farming and twenty-one/twenty-fifth parts grazing land, which serves as a qualification for the price that he must pay the State therefore according to Article 22 of said law under the penalties therein established; it is being understood to him that within one year he must construct permanent landmarks at each corner of the tract and that he must settle and cultivate according to the requirements of the law.

Therefore, exercising the powers vested in me by same law and instructions to this end, I issue the present instrument and order that testimonie be made thereof and be delivered to the interested party in order that he may possess and enjoy the land -- he, his children, heirs, and successors, or whoever may have his or their cause or right.

Given in the Town of San Felipe de Austin on the thirtieth day of the month of April, 1831, whereto I sign with witnesses of attendance according to law.

MIGL. ARCINIEGA (rubric)

Attending Witness:

ROBERT TAYLOR JR
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Attending Witness:  
C. C. GIVENS (rubric)

May 24, 1831

GENERAL LAND OFFICE

Austin, Texas, February 9, 1939

I certify that the foregoing three pages contains a correct translated copy of a one-league grant to Richard Carter, existing in the Spanish Archives of this office, Vol. 5, pages 1386-1389.

Thomas Sutherland, Spanish Translator

I, Bascom Giles, Commissioner of the General Land Office of the State of Texas, do hereby certify that Thomas Surtherland, whose signature is subscribed to the foregoing certificate, is the Spanish Translator of this office, duly qualified according to law, and that his official acts, as such, are entitled to full faith and credit.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of said office to be affixed, the day and date first above written.

(SEAL)  
Bascom Giles, Commissioner
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APPENDIX II

Col. Harvey Mitchell's First, Last and Only Bear Hunt
(Reproduced from the Holdings of the
Texas A&M University Archives)

The unusually fine weather during the recent Christmas holidays reminds me of the similar Christmas weather of 1841 and of my first, last and only bear hunt.

The scene was at Carter's Creek bottom near the then residence of Richard Carter, four miles below old Boonville. The bottom was then and unbroken canebrake, infested with bear, panthers, wild cats, and other enemies of hogs and cattle, as well as of men, and as pig and cattle, as well as of men, and as pig and calf-raising were the chief if not the sole industries at that time, it was decided by the neighbors to inaugurate a war of extermination, and Mr. Carter's house, (Uncle Dick's, as there familiarly called), was the place, and Christmas day the time appointed for rendezvous.

My home was then at Major Eli Seale's on Cedar Creek, but having boarded at Uncle Dick's during '39 and '40 at Tinninville, where the family then resided, I was especially invited by Uncle Dick to be his guest on this occasion, and as a further inducement he told me that the ladies were to have a "quilting," and that the Misses Evette and Miss Curd, reigning belles of the Millican settlement whom I had never seen, and several other young ladies would be on hand and that his wife and daughters were anxious for my presence and assistance during the frolic.

I promised to go, and accordingly on the morning of the 24, I donned my "Sunday best," (a fine suit of black cloth brought with me to the country in 1839, and which was well preserved, having been used but seldom) and a ride of about thirty miles landed me at Uncle Dick's about sundown.
I found a quite a number of hunters already there, all dressed in buckskin suits from head to foot, and armed with rifle and Bowie knife and lots of "b'ar dogs". There were also several young ladies and a few old ones--mothers of Texas.

The house, as did most houses of that day, comprised but one room, a log cabin which served as parlor, bedroom, dining room and cook room, and for that occasion was assigned to the ladies exclusively, the adjacent forest furnishing ample room for cooking and eating, and sleeping apartments for the men and dogs.

The night was most lovely, and so were the girls, and I being the only decently dressed gallant in the crowd, felt an assurance of supreme enjoyment next evening after the "b'ar hunt," Christmas dinner and "quilting" were over and the good old time plays, "Sister Phoebe," "Juniper Tree," etc., should be in order; but alas! alas!

"Twas ever thus from childhood's hour,
 I've seen my fondest hopes decay;
  I never loved a tree or flower,
  But 'twas the first to fade away."

The next morning the crowd was augmented by the arrival of more men "b'ar dogs" and a few more ladies. At and early hour all hands plunged into the creek bottoms, and in less than thirty minutes the dogs opened on a fresh trail. Their screams and yells reminded me of a long eared hound. Their screams and yells reminded me of a little frolic I had with the Comanche
Indians the preceding year, and excitement ran equally as high as then except
I did not have the same apprehension as to the safety of my scalp.

But I tried my best to keep up with the crowd, but being a novice I
failed most signally, and it was not long until bear, men, dogs and all were
entirely out of hearing and I took to make a survey of myself. To my
surprise and disgust I found myself as bloody as a beef-face, hands, arms and
legs lacerated and bleeding and not three inches square of my clothing that
was not in shreds and tatters. I have no words at command that could
adequately express my mortification and disgust at that hour. The happy
anticipation of the previous evening, a big Christmas dinner, a lovely time
with the lovely girls, and bright prospects of possible future bliss all
collapsed, with no possible remedy in reach.

I quietly returned to a big post-oak tree near the house (the tree is
still standing and I was beneath it a few days ago) and after waiting a while
I succeeded in attracting the attention of little Frank, Uncle Dick's baby
boy, then about ten years old. After bringing my horse to me he returned to
the house to report my condition, and I mounted my horse and reached my home
a little wiser if not a better boy. This was my first, last and only bear
hunt.
APPENDIX III

ESTATE OF RICHARD CARTER, DECEASED

* * * *

Application,
Recorded in Volume E, page 380,
Probate Records, Brazos County, Texas

---

STATE OF TEXAS    In County Court for Probate Business etc.
BRAZOS COUNTY     To May Term, 1863

To the Chief Justice of said County:

Your petitioner, William McIntosh, a resident of said County, represents that Richard Carter deceased on the 25th day of November A.D. 1860 at his residence in the aforesaid County, previous to his death made, published and declared his Last Will and Testament, in which said Last Will and Testament your petitioner, William McIntosh, is appointed sole executor and trustee of the same; your petitioner therefore prays that the said Last Will and Testament of Richard Carter be admitted to probate in your Court, and that your petitioner be appointed Executor and Trustee of the said Last Will and Testament of the said Richard Carter, deceased, and that the legal notice be given for a hearing of the case at the next May Term of your court.

May 14th, 1863

Wm. McIntosh
STATE OF TEXAS

BRAZOS COUNTY KNOW ALL MEN that I, Richard Carter, of the State and County
aforesaid, being of sound disposing mind and memory and being desirous of so
arranging my effects as to prevent misunderstanding and dispute after my
death, do hereby make, publish and ordain this my Last Will and Testament.

1st: I desire that all my just debts, if I should be owing any to be
paid immediately out of any money I may be posed of at the time of my death.

2nd: After the payment of my debts, I give, devise and bequeath to my
beloved wife, Elizabeth Carter, during her natural life, all of my estate,
real, personal and mixed, consisting of lands, tenements and appurtenances
thereunto belonging, and negroes, stock of all kinds, money, notes, accounts
and all property of any kind whatever that may belong to my estate at the
time of my death, to be held, controlled, used, enjoyed, and possessed by
her, the said Elizabeth Carter, during her life; and immediately after her
death I desire all my property above mentioned to be divided among my
children and grand-children as follows, to-wit:

3rd: After the death of my wife, the said Elizabeth Carter, I desire
that the following negroes be given to my daughter, Evaline Burton and
immediately placed in her possession, to-wit: my negro man, Kel, and his wife, Maria, and their children, Viz, Lyla, Allen, Nelson, Jerre, Kelsey, Edmund, Marry and Lotty, and all other of their posterity that may hereafter be born before this bequest shall take effect, and also my orphan negroes, Malinda, John, Eliza, and Betsey, and all children that may be born to them before this bequest shall take effect. The above mentioned negroes to be valued by appraisers appointed for that purpose.

4th: After the above mentioned negroes shall have been taken from my estate, and placed in the possession of my said daughter, Evaline Burton, I wish and desire my executor hereinafter to be named, to proceed at the earliest practicable time to sell on a credit of twelve months all my lands, all my remaining negroes all stock of every kind and all property whatever belonging to my estate, to the highest bidder, taking notes with ample security either personal or by mortgage or by both, for the purchase money after given proper notice of the sale as the law requires in such cases, and in making this sale I desire that the family to negroes, to-wit: Eliza, Phillip, Sallie, Harriet, Sicily, Coz, Amanda, and Richmond, and all children that may be born to them before making this sale, shall be sold together to one purchaser so that they may not be separated.

5th: So soon as my executor shall get the proceeds of the sales of my property into money and good responsible cash notes secured as aforesaid, I wish and hereby direct him to divide the same into three equal moities, the one of which moities he shall distribute in equal portions to my grand-children, William J. Carter, Sam H. Carter, Jesse F. Carter and Wiley
Carter, children of my son, Wiley Carter, Dec'd, or to such of them as may be of age when this bequest shall take effect; and in like manner another of said moities he shall distribute in equal portions to my grandchildren, Geraldine Kelly, Richard C. Reed, Wiley Reed, William Reed, Betty Reed and Wilson Reed, children of my daughter, Mary Ann Reed, Dec'd, or to such of them as may be of age at the time this bequest shall take effect, all to receive share and snare alike; and the other of said moities he shall deliver to my daughter, Elizabeth Whitmore, now a resident of Salt Lake City, upon the condition that she shall within ten years from the probate of this will become a citizen of Texas or some other state or territory not subject to Mormon government; and in case my daughter, the said Elizabeth Whitmore shall not become a permanent citizen of some state or territory not under the Mormon government within ten years from the probate of this will the moity or portion of my estate herein allotted and bequeathed to her shall lapse as to her and be divided equally between my daughter, Evaline Burton and the children of my son, Wiley Carter, Deceased, and the children of my daughter, Mary Ann Reed, deceased in the same manner as is directed in regard to the direct legacy.

6th: In case the negroes herein bequeathed to my daughter, Evaline Burton, be valued at more than one fourth of my whole estate, then I direct my executor to collect from her in money a sufficient sum to equalize the value of her portion with the other three moities of my estate; then said sum of money shall be added to the said other three moities; but should said negroes not equal in value one fourth of my whole estate or should Maria and her children be recovered by James McFarland and others in a suit which they
have instituted against me for that purpose, then in either case my executor shall make the remaining negroes bequeathed to my said daughter, Evaline Burton, equal in value to one fourth of my estate by adding money to them taken from the balance of my estate.

7th: I desire my Executor to pay over to my above named grand children their respective interests in my estate as they shall arrive at lawful age, and not before; and until they shall so arrive at lawful age he shall keep their respective portions together with the portion not delivered to my daughter Elizabeth Whitmore out at interest so that it shall be fully and safely secured by mortgage or ample personal security or both, until it shall all be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of this will; and I wish said funds to annually reinvested as above directed.

8th: And finally, I hereby nominate, constitute and appoint my true and trusty friend, William McIntosh, of said State and County, my Executor and Trustee, reposing full confidence and trust in his ability and integrity in the execution of this my Last Will and Testament.

In Testimony whereof I hereunto set my hand in the presence of these subscribing witnesses, this Nov. 25th, A.D. 1860.

Richard Carter

Signed, published and declared by the said Richard Carter as his Last Will and Testament in the presence of us, who at the request of said Richard Carter
and in his presence and in the presence of each other, have hereunto subscribed our names as witnesses.

J. L. Kendall

George Carter

I, Robert Johnson, do solemnly swear that I am well acquainted with the handwriting of Richard Carter, Dec'd., the maker of the annexed instrument of writing or Last Will and Testament, bearing date on the 25th Nov. 1860 that the signature of the said instrument of writing is the genuine signature and handwriting of the said testator.

Robt. Johnson

Sworn to and subscribed before me in open Court on this the 25th day of May, 1863, to which I certify under my hand and seal for the Court on the day above written.

(SEAL) G. B. Reed, C. J. B. Co.

I, Harvey Mitchell, do solemnly swear that I am well acquainted with the handwriting of Richard Carter, the maker and signer of the hereto annexed instrument of writing or Last Will and Testament, bearing date on the 25th day of Nov. A.D. 1860, that the signature of the said Richard Carter to the
Last Will and Testament is the genuine signature and handwriting of the said testator.

H. Mitchell

Sworn and subscribed before me in open Court on this the 25th day of May, 1863, to which I certify under my hand and seal of the Court on the day above written.

(SEAL) G. B. Reed, C. J. B. Co.

We, Thomas J. Wootton and James N. Guest, do solemnly swear that we are well acquainted with the handwriting of James L. Kendall, one of the subscribing witnesses to the hereto annexed instrument of writing or Last Will and Testament of Richard Carter, dec'd., bearing date on the 25th day of Nov. 1860, that the signature of the said James L. Kendall to the said instrument of writing is the genuine signature and handwriting of the said witness.

T. J. Wootton

J. N. Guest

Sworn to and subscribed before me in open Court on the 25th day of May, 1863, to which I certify under my hand and the seal of the Court on the day above written.
We, Nancy Ann Carter and William McIntosh, do solemnly swear that we are well acquainted with the handwriting of George Carter, one of the subscribing witnesses to the hereto annexed instrument of writing or Last Will and Testament of Richard Carter, dec'd., bearing date on the 25th day of Nov, 1860, that the signature of the said George Carter to the said instrument of writing is the genuine signature and handwriting of the said witness.

N. A. Carter
Wm. McIntosh

Sworn to and subscribed before me in open Court on the 30th day of May 1863, to which I certify under my hand and seal of the Court on the day above written.

(SEAL)                     G. B. Reed, C. J. B. Co.

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF BRAZOS KNOW ALL MEN, that I, Richard Carter, of the State and County above written, being feeble in body but of sound mind and deposing memory do hereby make, constitute ordain and publish this as a codicil or supplement to the Last Will and Testament made by me on the 25th day of November, A.D. 1860 and witnessed by J. L. Kendall and George Carter and signed by said witnesses in my presence, that is to say:
I wish and desire that my executor in my aforesaid Last Will and Testament named shall withhold the negro boy Phillip from the sale wished and desired in the fourth article of my aforesaid Last Will and Testament and shall deliver the said negro boy, Phillip, to my daughter, Evaline Burton, and have the said negro Phillip appraised as required in the third article of my said Last Will and Testament and shall dispose of the valuation of the said negro as directed in the sixth article of my said Last Will and Testament.

In witness hereof I hereto set my hand in the presence of the subscribing witnesses on this the 21st day of September, A.D. 1862.

Richard Carter

Witnesses:
Wm. C. Boylos
William H. Ragsdale

I, William H. Ragsdale, do solemnly swear that I was present and saw Richard Carter sign the hereto annexed instrument of writing or codicil bearing date on the 21st day of September, A.D. 1862, and that Wm. C. Boyles and myself in the presence of the said Richard Carter and of each other signed the said instrument of writing at the request of the said grantor.

W. H. Ragsdale
Sworn to and subscribed before me—in open Court on this the 25th day of May, 1863, to which I certify under my hand and seal of the Court on the day above written.

(SEAL) G. B. Reed, C. J. B. Co.
APPENDIX IV

Galveston Daily News, December 19, 1876; page 4, column 6.

Brazos County. Mrs. Elizabeth Carter is dead. In company with her late husband, Richard Carter and family, immigrated to Texas in the spring of 1831, and during that year settled to "Carter's Creek," five miles southeast of the present city of Bryan. At that time there were but five families living between the Brazos and Navasota rivers, and the nearest settlement was eight miles distant from their new home. Two years thereafter a settlement was formed in Robertson's colony, near the crossing of the San Antonio Road, on the Navasota River, which the Carter family joined. In 1840 they returned to their home on Carter's Creek, where the old people remained until the death of the old gentleman in 1863, soon after which Mrs. Carter went to live with her grandson, Mr. Wily Reed, five miles north of Bryan, where she continued to reside until her death, which occurred on the 10th instant, in the 88th year of her age.
APPENDIX V
ANALYSIS OF THE CARTER SITE (41BZ74) FAUNAL REMAINS
(Cristi Assad)

Excavation of the Carter site (41BZ74) in 1982 by archeologists from the Archeological Research Laboratory, Texas A&M University, resulted in the recovery of a small sample of faunal remains. Only 189 specimens were found. The vertebrate remains consist of 40 identifiable bones (ID) and 147 unidentifiable bones (UID). The remaining two specimens of the sample are invertebrate remains. This faunal sample has been analyzed as one population due to disturbances from plowing at the site (Shawn Carlson, personal communication).

A breakdown of the faunal sample by horizontal provenience, taxonomic level, as well as the quantity and type of element found is presented in Table 1. There are ten identified vertebrate taxa. Six of these are from the Class Mammalia, including four domestics (Sus scrofa – pig; Bos taurus – cow; Caprine – sheep or goat; and Equus spp. – horse or other equid), with the remaining two taxa representing wild forms (Odocoileus spp. – deer; and Didelphis virginiana – opossum). It is probable that the deer specimens may be a recent intrusion at the site since these bones were found on the surface. The remaining three ID taxa are of the Class Aves. There is the domesticate Gallus gallus (chicken), with Meleagris gallopavo (turkey) present as either a domestic or wild form.

The two invertebrate taxa represented consist of one Bivalvia (a freshwater mussel) specimen and one Mollusca (a marine univalve specimen). The univalve specimen is a fossil shell from Cretaceous age deposits. The function of the Bivalvia specimen at the site is unknown; however, the presence of the latter specimen is probably fortuitous.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench Number</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Quantity/Element</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1 L calcaneus frag.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>1 sesamoid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>large mammal</em></td>
<td>1 shaft fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1 R DL1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1 RG, male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1 R I2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>2 R T, females</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>2 L temporal bones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1 R M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>2 mandible frags.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1 R femur - distal epiphysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1 R tarsal frag.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1 R MC V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1 metapodial frag.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>1 proximal phalange frag.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>1 R M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench Number</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Taxon</td>
<td>Quantity/Element</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>1 R P4 frag.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td>Caprine</td>
<td>1 petrosal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td>medium-large mammal</td>
<td>67 bone fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-30</td>
<td>expansion</td>
<td>Aves</td>
<td>1 sternum frag.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-40</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Odocoileus virginianus</em></td>
<td>1 R metatarsal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-40</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Odocoileus virginianus</em></td>
<td>2 proximal phalange</td>
<td>Probably all the same animal - a recent intrusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-40</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Odocoileus virginianus</em></td>
<td>1 medial phalange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 N200-205/ E200-199.5</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1 L scapula frag.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N200-205/ E200-199.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>medium mammal</td>
<td>2 bone fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 N200-205/ E200-199.5</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1 L J2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 N200-205/ E200-199.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>medium mammal</td>
<td>1 bone fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 N205-210/ E200-199.5</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1 mandibular incisor frag.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 N205-210/ E200-199.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>medium mammal</td>
<td>2 bone fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 N205-210/ E200-199.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>medium-large mammal</td>
<td>3 bone fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 N210-215/ E200-199.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>large mammal</td>
<td>1 bone shaft frag.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench Number</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Taxon</td>
<td>Quantity/Element</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N215-220/</td>
<td>Gallus gallus</td>
<td>1 sternum fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E200-199.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N215-220/</td>
<td>medium mammal</td>
<td>7 bone fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E200-199.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N215-220/</td>
<td>medium mammal</td>
<td>2 bone fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E210-199.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N220-225/</td>
<td>Meleagris</td>
<td>1 R scapula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E200-199.5</td>
<td>gallopavo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N220-225/</td>
<td>medium mammal</td>
<td>7 bone fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E200-199.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N200-199.5</td>
<td>medium-large</td>
<td>3 bone fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E200-205</td>
<td>mammal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N200-199.5</td>
<td>vertebrate</td>
<td>1 bone fragment</td>
<td>burned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E200-205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N200-199.5</td>
<td>vertebrate</td>
<td>1 bone fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E205-210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N200-199.5</td>
<td>Bivalvia</td>
<td>1 freshwater mussel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>shell</td>
<td>shell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N200-199.5</td>
<td>medium-large</td>
<td>3 bone fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E210-215</td>
<td>mammal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N200-199.5</td>
<td>Sus scrofa</td>
<td>1 L C, male</td>
<td>large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E215-220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N200-199.5</td>
<td>medium mammal</td>
<td>3 bone fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E215-220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N200-199.5</td>
<td>medium mammal</td>
<td>2 bone fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E220-225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Depression B</td>
<td>large mammal</td>
<td>1 bone fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.5 x 5m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E200-205</td>
<td>medium mammal</td>
<td>1 bone fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E200-205</td>
<td>Mollusca</td>
<td>1 univalve marine</td>
<td>Cretaceous Age,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non-food, Fossil shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench Number</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Taxon</td>
<td>Quantity/Element</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E205-210</td>
<td>large mammal</td>
<td>1 bone shaft fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E215-220</td>
<td>large mammal</td>
<td>5 fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E225-229.3</td>
<td><strong>Bos taurus</strong></td>
<td>1 L astragalus</td>
<td>Feature 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E225-229.3</td>
<td><strong>Sus scrofa</strong></td>
<td>1 L I₁</td>
<td>Feature 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E225-229.3</td>
<td><strong>Sus scrofa</strong></td>
<td>1 R scapula</td>
<td>Feature 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E225-229.3</td>
<td>Caprine</td>
<td>1 R tibia shaft</td>
<td>Feature 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E225-229.3</td>
<td><strong>Didelphis virginianus</strong></td>
<td>1 L scapula frag.</td>
<td>Feature 3, burned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E225-229.3</td>
<td>medium-large mammal</td>
<td>19 bone fragments</td>
<td>Feature 3, 1 burned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N200-E200.5</td>
<td><strong>Didelphis virginianus</strong> (Unit 5)</td>
<td>1 R mandible frag.</td>
<td>sub-adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N200-E200.5 (Unit 5)</td>
<td>medium-large mammal</td>
<td>7 bone fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N200-E200.5 (Unit 5)</td>
<td>medium-large mammal (.5 m Extension)</td>
<td>5 bone shaft frags.</td>
<td>1 burned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 6 (outside well)</td>
<td><strong>Sus scrofa</strong></td>
<td>1 L mandible frag.</td>
<td>Zone 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 6 (outside well)</td>
<td>Equus spp.</td>
<td>1 R I₁</td>
<td>Zone 3, Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 6 (outside well)</td>
<td>large mammal</td>
<td>3 bone fragments</td>
<td>Zone 3, Level 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The size categories of bone UID bone fragments are:

  - **small mammal** - rodents (none represented at the site)
  - **medium mammal** - carnivora (canids, felids), rabbits, caprines, suids, etc.
  - **large mammal** - deer, bovids, and equids
The identified vertebrate taxa are presented in Table 2 which provides information on the quantities of body parts represented, the percentage of identified taxa by count, minimum number of individuals (MNI), the percentage of identified taxa by MNI count, and the sex of the animals (when diagnostic characteristics were distinguishable). As can be seen in this table, the pig is the best represented species by count and MNI figures, with its MNI being determined by the presence of two female canines and one male canine. The MNI for all of the remaining forms is one per taxa excepting the opossum which is represented by the remains of an adult and a subadult specimen.

It is difficult to do other than make suggestions about the nature of the vertebrate faunal sample from the Carter site because it is such a small sample. Certain factors such as sample bias by natural factors (such as soil chemistry or carnivore activity) and recovery factors must be taken into account. For this analysis, it has been assumed that soil chemistry has had an equal effect on all of the bone from the site. No carnivore activity has been observed on the bone, indicating that either no carnivores were present in the area where the bones were deposited and recovered or that all of the bone that carnivores may have chewed on was totally destroyed by them. The bones were recovered by trowelling; therefore, it is assumed that only the larger taxa are equally represented.

The animals that would have provided food for the Carters include pigs, cow(s), caprine(s) (either sheep or goats), opossum, deer (if counted as part of the sample), chicken, turkey, and wild bird(s). Additional use of the cows as work animals and the caprines to provide wool would also be possibilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Body Parts Represented</th>
<th>% by Count</th>
<th>% by MNI</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sus scrofa</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos taurus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equus spp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odocoileus spp.+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didelphis virginianus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallus gallus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meleagris gallopavo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aves</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Represents mostly teeth with a few cranial and mandibular fragments.
** Represents mostly foot and hind leg pieces. Only two pectoral fragments are present.
+ This probably represents a recent intrusion at the site and was not included in the percentage figures.
All of the taxa suggested as food items made up part of the Antebellum southerner's diet (Hilliard 1972). Pork was the most important meat in that diet; however, beef, lamb or mutton, and the meat of various wild game animals was also desirable to the southerner's palate. Very little can be suggested about butchering patterns of the fauna from the site. However, the presence of cranial and distal appendages of pigs, the cow, and the caprine in the sample indicate that it is very probable that these animals were killed and butchered at the site.

As stated earlier, only generalized conclusions can be made about the Carter site faunal remains. With such a small sample of identifiable taxa available, it is not possible to determine what economic importance these animals would have had or what the particular animal husbandry practices of these early settlers were. What is known from the sample is that domestic animals were probably the major source of protein in the diet of the occupants of the site, while the use of wild animals as a food source is quite probable. However, they are only represented in the faunal sample by a few specimens. The presence of cranial and distal appendage elements of most of the ID taxa indicates that these forms were killed and butchered at the site.
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