burials; Julian Chambliss, who worked with the J. Horace McFarland collection at the Pennsylvania State Archives, shedding light on to McFarland's significance in the contributions to civic improvement and the "City Beautiful" movement of the early twentieth century; and J. Adam Rogers who examined records at the Pennsylvania State Archives and focused his interpretation on the Civil War soldier's return home.

ARCHAEOLOGY WITHOUT EXCAVATION: DIGGING THROUGH THE ARCHIVES OF THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE MUSEUM

April M. Beisaw
Heidelberg University

The Scholars in Residence program afforded me the opportunity to undertake archaeological research on some of Pennsylvania's most important archaeological sites without conducting fieldwork or analyzing artifacts. Instead, I did my digging within the Pennsylvania State Museum. My research focused on field records from archaeological excavations, an important but underutilized form of historic document.[1]

Archaeology is a destructive science; to dig a site is to destroy it in a controlled fashion. To counteract this destruction, archaeologists are trained to document all they do with drawings, photographs, and written descriptions. As we excavate we record not only what we see but also what we think about what we are seeing at that time. In this way, archaeologists record the facts but also the biases of their experience, research interests, and contemporary method and theory.

Archaeological sites are also an irreplaceable resource. Although new sites are constantly being created by ongoing human habitation, the sites of those people who came before us are in limited supply. Sites that were once visible to the untrained eye were routinely disturbed by generations of collectors, if not completely destroyed by any number of cultural or natural forces, including archaeology. The sites that remain untouched are more likely to represent small camps than large villages. Exceptions continue to be found but they are rare. To conduct new studies on the large pre-Contact villages of Native Americans, archaeologists should do their digging in the archives.

Field records provide a means of revisiting sites and asking new questions of data and data collectors. Artifacts (pot sherds, stone tools, etc.)

housed in museums and other curation facilities are only one aspect of the archaeological site. The context in which these objects were found, the actual three-dimensional space in which the artifact once laid, tells its own story. Early archaeologists were more concerned with recovering objects than in documenting their context. The controlled excavation procedures that archaeologists use today only became widespread in the early 1970s. Highly controlled excavation may be a relatively new aspect of archaeology but documentation is not.

By reexamining the field records of a prehistoric site in New York State I was able to complete a dissertation[2] on a site that was destroyed by road construction almost forty years earlier. Prior to my analysis, the Engelbert Site was described by Barry Kent as having the "largest concentration of clearly identifiable Susquehannock remains."[3] After my analysis, I concluded that some of the individuals previously identified as Susquehannock were probably not Susquehannock and that Susquehannock use of the site spanned a time range much greater than allowed by the Witthoft hypothesis[4] of complete group migration to Lancaster by 1580. The difference in the number of Susquehannock individuals was due to several examples of grave reuse. It appears that existing non-Susquehannock graves were reopened after the buried individual had decomposed, and a Susquehannock individual was then placed within the existing grave. This pattern was not evident to the archaeologists who excavated the site although they documented the evidence for it. The burials clearly contained more than one individual, what I call a "multiple burial." But close inspection of the field records revealed anomalies in the anatomical position of the human remains that suggested grave reuse. This interpretation was supported by soil data and by the positioning of the individuals and their artifacts within this soil.

As a Scholar in Residence at the Pennsylvania State Museum, I reexamined the field records generated during the excavation of several Susquehannock sites in Pennsylvania to determine if a similar pattern of grave reuse could be found. Was grave reuse, I wondered, a way that Susquehannocks symbolically represented their links to people who had come before them? My research focused on seven sites (Table 1) that span approximately three hundred years of occupation and contained more than seven hundred human burials. Approximately 39 percent of these burials did contain more than one individual. Close examination of the field notes and photographs of these burials

TABLE 1.	Number of Susquehannock individuals identified at each site in all mortuary contexts and the subset from multiple burial contexts.		
SITE	OCCUPATION (A.D.)	ALL CONTEXTS	MULTIPLE BURIALS
Schultz	1575–1600	23	6 (26%)
Funk	circa 1600	171	29 (17%)
Ibaugh	1600–1625	56	17 (30%)
Frey Haverstick	1625–1645	32	10 (31%)
Strickler	1645–1665	157	57 (36%)
Byrd Leibhart	1665–1680	52	31 (60%)
Conestoga Town	1690–1763	80	43 (54%)
Total		*571*	*193*

revealed that some, but not all, of these multiple burials are suggestive of grave reuse. The old sites were providing new data to answer my research questions.

Field Records as Historical Documents

Archaeological method and theory changes approximately every ten to twenty years. The best practices of one decade are not those of another. For this reason, archaeologists now rarely excavate a site in its entirety; a portion is always left for the next generation to revisit. This approach is a relatively new one. Although excavations were once more complete, collection practices were more selective. In the early to mid-twentieth century, archaeologists were sure to collect "museum quality" artifacts from the field but left fragmentary objects behind as perceived information value decreased with artifact size or completeness. Some artifacts, such as animal bone, were often just noted in a cursory manner (deer, turtle, etc.) and left in the field. Human skulls were brought back to the lab for cranial measurements while other skeletal elements were not, unless skeletal lesions or other pathologies were evident. Archaeologists are now much less selective about what is collected and virtually all objects encountered are described and documented, usually using multiple techniques. This hypercollectivity generates a lot of

data, and only a fraction of it is ever written about in technical reports or other publications.

Much of what we know about the prehistory and early history of the Pennsylvania landscape comes from excavations that took place in the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. These sites can be revisited by conducting new excavations, if anything is left unexcavated, or by reexamining existing data through artifact analysis or review of field records. The archaeological sites that I chose to study were all excavated between 1954 and 1974, when archaeological methods were quite different from today. The field records of these sites are quite comparable to each other, although some change through time is evident. Many were excavated by the same people; archaeologists affiliated with the William Penn Memorial Museum's Section of Archaeology, now known as the Pennsylvania State Museum. When these field notes are organized by date of excavation, changes in documentation methods become apparent. The records of five sites in particular exemplify some of the shifts.

Ibaugh (36La54)

The oldest field records examined were those of the Ibaugh Site. Field notes and photographs regarding burials were dated to 1957 and 1958. These records differ from those of the other sites examined in several ways. First, there is a clear lack of standardization. Second, much of the documentation is in the form of simple drawings on graph paper; descriptions of methods used and interpretation of findings are not common.

Field notes for the other sites were composed on standardized field forms. Some sites used special forms, labeled "Burial Record" to record burials while others used a the same generic forms, labeled "William Penn Memorial Museum's Section of Archaeology" and "Square Sheet" for documenting all types of archaeological features (burials, storage pits, etc.). Field notes for Ibaugh, however, were recorded on simple graph paper, and even the type of graph paper changes from one page to the next.

An exception to the graph paper records is a series of typewritten notes, one of which bears the letterhead of the "Lower Susquehanna Chapter No. 9, Society for Pennsylvania Archaeology." These notes were clearly not made while in the field as they refer to photographs and transparencies using specific catalog numbers (not exposure counts) and ascribe detailed measurements to many artifacts (not rough approximations). Therefore, it is unclear if any of the data contained within these notes was transcribed from field notes or if they are simply recollections documented at a later time. An analysis of

the language used suggests amateur archaeologists created them. Professional archaeologists rarely interpret their findings with the level of certainty found here; "The arrows in the grave fill are probably due to they standing on their shaves in an elevated position when the grave was filled."[5]

Photographs of the Ibaugh burials are also non-standard. Few include photo boards with information to identify the site, the number assigned to the feature being documented, and/or the date that the image was taken. Those that do include photo boards are taken at an angle or exposure that make them difficult to read. In many images, a simple numbered card was used, if any identifying information was included at all. The photographs are also non-standard in that most are close-ups of specific aspects of a burial, without an accompanying image to show the burial in its entirety.

The Ibaugh field records do include the most comprehensive site map of all sites examined. In this way the excavators made it easier for others to envision the site as a whole and to conduct spatial analyses. But, the freehand drawing of this map on unlined paper suggests that it is an approximation of the site and is not a scaled drawing.

Schultz (36La7)

Field records for the Schultz Site burials date to the summer of 1969. These field notes are more standardized and use both the Burial Record form and the Square Sheet previously mentioned. The Burial Record form contains many fields with blanks of two to five inches in length for note taking. Unfortunately these blanks were consistently filled in with just a few words, if they were filled in at all. The most verbose section of the form was reserved for "Associations: (Specific, with exact location of each in relation to skeleton)." The word selection here, specific and exact, suggests that the creators of this new form wanted to ensure that the excavators improved their data collection. This section was never left blank.

Schultz's field drawings are far superior to Ibaugh's in detail and clarity. The Associations field is supported by these drawings in that they depict a more exact location for the associated artifacts (bone beads, animal bones, pots). The drawings also clearly depict the body and its position in the grave, which made it easier to correlate the numerous field photographs to specific burials. Photo boards were not used in any of the Schultz burial photos examined. The Burial Record form's field for "Photographic Numbers" was always left blank, despite the six-inch long line provided.

The Schultz field records lack interpretation. There is no way to revisit the impressions that excavators had of what each burial or the site as a whole meant. While the amateur Ibaugh documents may have a bit too much interpretation, the professional Schultz records have too little.

Byrd Leibhart (36Yo170)

Field notes from Byrd Leibhart, also known as Lower Leibhart, date to the summer of 1970. These notes are taken on the Square Sheets and an associated "Features" log. Like the Schultz Burial Record forms, the Square Sheet contains several requests for standardized information, however many of the fields are consistently left blank.

Square Sheets contain fields for the following information: Site, Square, Date, Level, Observer, Depth, Nature of the floor, Nature of the level, and Refer to profile drawing No. The only fields that are consistently filled out are Site, Square, Date, and Observer. The fields for Nature of floor and level are for field interpretations, but none are made. Profile drawings serve to show changes in soils with increasing depths and the shapes of excavated features. None appear to have been made for this site's burials or for the burials of the other sites examined. At the base of the Square Sheet, in a smaller font, are the words "Write notes on reverse," and some Square Sheets do contain such notes. The quality of these notes varies but many contain interpretive detail.

Additional details for each Square Sheet are occasionally to be found on a new form labeled "Features." This form has fields for Site No., Square No., Level No., Cat No., Field No., Description, and Diam./Depth. The only fields used for this site are Field No. (a number ascribed to each feature in the field), Description, and Diam./Depth (diameter and depth of the feature). The information recorded is descriptive but little interpretation of the features and/or their contents is provided. In contrast, notes written on the blank reverse of the Square Sheet are much more detailed.

The Square Sheets are mostly devoted to field drawings, with 75 percent of the form as lined and measured graph paper. Each drawn square represents an excavated area of soil. A square appears to represent a ten by ten-foot area of excavation, although precise dimensions are not provided. What is drawn is a plan view of the furthest extent of excavation, the lowest level observed. Modern archaeological field methods usually call for the excavation of much smaller squares, five by five-foot or one by one-meter are common, and the drawing of plan views for each level of excavation, not just the lowest level. Evidently the

creator of the Square Sheet intended excavators to document each excavation level, as the fields provided but never used request this information.

Field drawings of the Byrd Leibhart burials vary in quality. Some are quite rough while others contain much more detail. The detailed drawings proved useful in correlating the field photographs with each burial as photo boards were not used. Photographs for this site are of a higher quality than previous field photos in that the subject fills the frame. Several photos do, however, suffer from significant shadows being cast on portions of the burials due to the depth of excavation. Modern field technique calls for minimizing these shadows, usually through blocking direct sun with a tarp or by strategically selecting the time of day in which photos are taken.

Conestoga Town (36La52)

Field notes for Conestoga Town date to the summer of 1972 and consistently use the Square Sheets and their blank reverse sides. The quality of these notes varies greatly from one Square Sheet to the next. None of these sheets contain information for Level, Nature of floor, Nature of level, or Refer to profile drawing. Some sheets even have the Date and Observer fields left blank. Drawings also vary from a basic stick figure to depictions of significant detail. Notes taken on the reverse focus on the artifacts found within each grave and describe the position of each grave good with respect to the human remains. Some also include measurements of unusual grave goods and drawings of caches or clusters of artifacts.

The field photographs for Conestoga Town are much improved over the previous sites. Shadows remain a problem in some photographs but others do contain clear photo boards to that identify the site number, square number, and feature number represented by the photograph. Almost all burials have clear photographs of their entirety and some also have close-up shots of specific components of the grave, such as artifact caches. There are also photographs of some graves before or during excavation, which provides additional information about excavation methods used. The use of photo boards makes it easy to identify unexcavated features. Together the field notes and photographs for this site provide a wealth of data.

Funk (36La9)

Field records for the Funk Site date to the summer of 1974 and are quite different from those of the preceding sites. A new form is in use, the "Archaeological Feature Record." This form was used for some, but not all burial features.

More common are the Burial Record forms used during the 1969 excavations at the Schultz Site.

The Archaeological Feature Record contains a significant amount of space for interpretation. In one case this request for field interpretation seems welcome and so much information is provided that the notes continue onto a second form and a Square Sheet is used for a field drawing. In another case, this new form contains the same basic information as was recorded using the old forms, with many of the new interpretation fields left blank. These Archaeological Feature Record forms were successful in obtaining stratigraphic information from the excavators; details about the types of soils that were found within the graves. In contrast, modern methods include extensive documentation of all soils and soil changes encountered.

The Burial Record form also asks for soil information with the "Matrix (Pit Fill)" field. It is clear that excavators of the Schultz Site were not very interested in or educated about soils. They described their soils as "ordinary" or "normal" and then went on to say what artifacts were found in it. Excavators of the Funk Site were a bit more descriptive about the soil itself, using terms like "homogenous brown fill" and "mixed topsoil + clay fill". Modern methods call for describing both the texture of the soil, such as silty sand or sandy clay, and the color of soil using a Munsell Soil Color Chart for standardization.

In general, the Burial Record forms for the Funk Site are not only completely filled out (except for Datum and Photographic Numbers fields) but they are also supplemented by the use of Square Sheets or drawings on blank paper. There is a good deal of written description for each burial; however, the field drawings and photographs of these burials are inferior to those of the preceding sites.

Field photographs for the Funk Site tend to focus on the excavators or artifacts found within the grave instead of providing an overall view of the grave itself or the human remains they contain. Excavators are included in many of these images, which often created depth of field and/or exposure problems for the photographer. As was the case at Conestoga Town, photo boards in some images allow for the identification of specific burials when field drawings are lacking or when the photograph was taken before the burial was fully excavated.

Susquehannock Multiple Burials

The field notes reviewed show that there is evidence for grave reuse in many, but not all, Susquehannock graves of more than one individual, or multiple

burials. New individuals were buried slightly above the grave's original inhabitants, whose anatomical elements were often disturbed by the process. In general, these multiple burials usually contained an adult with one or more children, suggestive of a family plot where those that were separated in life were reunited in death through grave reuse. This is especially evident in adult burials that include a child placed atop or adjacent to an otherwise standard single adult burial. In several cases, the child's remains were so decomposed that excavators recorded only a single adult with a cache of beads by the hands. When these beads were cataloged in the laboratory, the presence of a child's tooth was often noted.

Multiple burials of two adults are not married couples as there are no clear male/female pairs yet there are clear same sex pairs. Similarly, there is little evidence for children being buried with their mothers, as most adult/child pairs include adult males. Multiple burials are also not associated with epidemic disease. These burials do not contain those who are most susceptible to disease, young children and elderly adults, and their frequency does not increase at sites where epidemics are known to have occurred.

Conclusions

The Pennsylvania State Museum contains the original field records for many archaeological sites. Other states have similar facilities that curate archaeological documentation. Field records are an important but under utilized form of historical document through which researchers can revisit excavated sites and study the history of archaeology itself. By revisiting the original field records of several Susuquehannock sites, I was able to ask new questions of the burials that they contained. While the quality and types of information recorded varied from site to site, the records were sufficient to address my research question; Did the Susquehannocks reuse existing graves to inter the newly dead as a way of representing a link to these earlier people? The answer to my question is yes.

NOTES

2. April M. Beisaw, "Osteoarchaeology of the Engelbert Site: Evaluating Occupational Continuity through the Taphonomy of Human and Animal Remains" (Ph.D. diss., Binghamton University, 2007).

3. Barry C. Kent, *Susquehanna's Indians*, *Anthropological Series No. 6*. (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 2001, Original edition, 1984).

4. Witthoft, John, "Ancestry of Susquehannocks," in *Susquehannock Miscellany*, ed. John Witthoft and W. Fred Kinsey (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1959), 19–60.

5. Burial FB-1 notes, page 3.

FOLLOWING ULYSSES: THE SEARCH FOR KEYSTONE UNION VETERANS AT THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE ARCHIVES

J. Adam Rogers
Pennsylvania State University

Nearly a month before marching with his comrades of the 83rd Pennsylvania Infantry into the American Civil War's bloody Overland Campaign in the spring of 1864, Private Daniel B. Foote wrote to his parents Daniel and Jane in Erie County of the post-war future. The men, he explained while encamped near Brandy's Station Virginia, still acted "as so many old farmers in-stead of fiery soldiers of a dozen battles. I think it shows how quietly we can live when this war is out; how well we will be satisfied with excitement and [be] settled and be wonderful examples of grave, steady, moderate men."[1] Unfortunately, despite the continued public and academic interest that produces hundreds of titles annually on the nation's bloodiest conflict, modern historians have tended to remain reticent on the accuracy of Foote's or the myriad of other such postbellum prognostications that swirled throughout the Keystone state—and the North in general—during the final year of the Civil War. Indeed within the past twenty years no less than three separate surveys of Civil War literature have lamented the "underdevelopment" of the field of veteran studies—especially when compared to the continued attention and subsequent fruitful analysis of the men's lives while they were soldiers. The most recent, Larry Logue and Michael Barton's *The Civil War Veteran*, even (correctly) proclaimed that the best comprehensive study of the Republic's old warriors still remained Dixon Wecter's sixty-five year old study, *When Johnny Comes Marching Home*.[2]