Introduction

The Revolutionary War had a massive impact upon Western Pennsylvania and upon many of its newly arrived inhabitants. One of these early immigrants, Robert Hanna, founded Hannas Town, and on February 26, 1773, when Westmoreland County was estab-
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lished, Hannas Town became the first county seat west of the Alleghenies. By 1775, Hannas Town rivaled Pittsburgh in size, consisting of over thirty domestic dwellings, several taverns, a jail, stockade and blockhouse, in addition to barns, stables, and outbuildings. But Hannas Town had a relatively short history, for on July 13, 1782, it was almost totally destroyed by a British and Indian attack. The town never recovered. In 1785 Greensburg was laid out on the route of a newly proposed highway that was to replace the Forbes Road. By 1790, with the completion of the road, the Westmoreland County seat was moved to Greensburg, where the first court session was held on January 7, 1787. Thus, after only fourteen years, Hannas Town was no longer of economic or political importance, and soon thereafter the town site reverted to farmland.

In the fall of 1969 the Westmoreland County Historical Society began excavations at the site of Hannas Town under the direction of Jacob L. Grimm, and lately under Ms Peggy Fields. During the summer of 1970 the University of Pittsburgh conducted an archeological field school at the site and in the course of its investigations, discovered the location of several refuse pits which can be attributed to Charles Foreman's tavern.

This study consists of two parts, a historical and an archeological component. The combination of historical documentation and archeology has made it possible to reconstruct much of the life and times of Charles Foreman. The historical record has provided dates, places, and names pertaining to Charles Foreman from militia rolls, court records, deeds, and census and tax lists. Archeological data have provided information on Foreman's material culture that reflect many aspects of his social, political, and economic roles within the Hannas Town community, as well as the precise location of his home and tavern where he spent some twelve years of his life.

Charles Foreman, born around 1750,1 was a resident of Westmoreland County from about 1770 until his death on January 9, 1806. He married Sarah Early, with whom he had nine living children: Samuel, James, Charles, Jr., Dorcas, Jenney, Nancey, Mileah (m. Cummins), Sarah (m. Ford), and Elizabeth (m. Sloan).4 We do not know where Charles Foreman was born or where he lived before his residence at Hannas Town, but if his birth date is correct, he was about twenty years old when he settled in Western Pennsylvania. The

---
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only evidence that Foreman was in Hannas Town in 1770 comes from a 1780 deed to property in Hannas Town which states that the property in question was formerly rented by Charles Foreman from Robert Hanna on October 2, 1770.\textsuperscript{5}

\textit{Tavern Proprietor}

Although Foreman may well have operated a tavern before 1774 in Hannas Town, he received a tavern license in January of that year, along with seven other individuals.\textsuperscript{6} Again, in July 1774, another tavern license was awarded, which was good through July 1775.\textsuperscript{7} In October 1775 Foreman's license was extended through July 1776.\textsuperscript{8} No mention is made in the court records of any tavern licenses from July 1776 through 1779, and many of the court records for this period are missing. In October 1779 Samuel Foreman, Charles's eldest son, was given a tavern license, and again in April 1782 Samuel received a license.\textsuperscript{9} The last license for a tavern operation was awarded Charles on July 5, 1785.\textsuperscript{10} Awarding a license to Samuel in 1779 and 1782 is not surprising, since Charles was president of the court and could not legally hold a license during the period when he was a judge. It appears that Robert Hanna, also a tavern keeper, managed this legal hurdle in the same manner, for in October 1775 Jean Hanna, his daughter, was given a license.\textsuperscript{11}

Apart from the fact that Charles Foreman ran a tavern in Hannas Town from 1774 to 1785, as stated in the court records, we know nothing of the tavern structure itself. In the rental deeds that Robert Hanna gave to the inhabitants of the town, it was stipulated that a house eighteen feet square with a shingle roof must be built within a year. How much larger than this Foreman’s tavern was, is suggested by the offer for sale of the Ryan farm near Washington, Pennsylvania. This property, with a dwelling twenty by thirty feet, of two stories containing four rooms as well as detached kitchen, was advertised in 1786 as suitable for a tavern.\textsuperscript{12} In 1798, William Thomas of Hempfield Township operated a tavern that consisted of two floors, each measur-
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ing twenty by thirty feet, with five windows and an outside kitchen, fourteen by fifteen feet.\textsuperscript{13}

Foreman's dwelling in Salem Township, where he spent the last sixteen years of his life, was a two-story, shingled home, twenty by twenty feet, and it seems doubtful that his former house and tavern in Hannas Town was any larger.\textsuperscript{14} Since Foreman operated his tavern after the destruction of the town in 1782, the building may have been standing in 1798 when the 1798 property tax was computed. Robert Hanna's dwelling may also have been standing at this time. The tax lists of Hempfield Township include the dimensions of all the structures on the property and their mode of construction. Since only 4 percent of the population in Western Pennsylvania lived in towns in 1800, the 1798 tax lists give the size of rural buildings constructed to that date. There were a total of 489 two-story homes listed for Hempfield Township, all constructed of logs (thirteen of which were weatherboarded), except for two of stone and four of brick. The average dimensions of the dwellings were 18.6 by 22.7 feet, and of the 124 homes that list windows, there was an average of seven windows per structure.

There are several descriptions of Hannas Town, but these date to after its destruction. The earliest is from Samuel Vaughan's journal of July 1 through 2, 1787, in which he said that Hannas Town was comprised of thirteen miserable log houses.\textsuperscript{15} Vaughan wrote as if he was forced to stay in a tavern in Hannas Town due to severe weather, which he designated as Freeman's tavern. But, since Freeman's tavern was in the Ligonier Valley, he may have been staying in Foreman's tavern, for on July 2, he attended a church service one-half mile from Hannas Town. The second reference is that of John Heckewelder, who spent the night in Hannas Town on September 18, 1788, and on June 13, 1789. He described the town as consisting of "20 wretched houses, all windowless, in a fertile, but [by] no means beautiful region."\textsuperscript{16}

The dispensing of alcoholic beverages was regulated by the court and in the April session of 1773 the rate for tavern keepers was established as follows:
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In the court records there are numerous references to cases involving tavern owners brought before the court for keeping disorderly houses, encouraging drunkenness, cheating travelers, and making illegal whiskey. Charles Foreman's name does not, however, appear among these individuals and this negative evidence therefore suggests that Foreman kept a respectable establishment.

Landowner

In addition to his tavern business, Charles Foreman amassed considerable property in Westmoreland County. He initially rented property from Robert Hanna in 1770, as previously noted. In 1778 he purchased 316 acres of land in Hempfield Township from William Mason for £300 — a large amount of money in those days. Foreman did not settle on this property, for on June 6, 1780, he rented two inlots from Robert Hanna in Hannas Town, each 60 feet on the front and 240 feet on the back, situated on the south side of the Forbes Road opposite the town spring. On July 12, 1780, he rented from Hanna an additional three acres for use as outlots.

In 1782 Foreman purchased land south of the Allegheny River from David Sample and in 1785 he bought 300 acres from James Butland. James Butland was formerly a gold and silver lacemaker from Philadelphia who was being sued for a debt of five pounds by John Ormsby, a tavern keeper in Pittsburgh. Foreman paid the debt and received the deed to Butland's property in Armstrong Township, 250 acres of which he sold soon after to Ezekial Matthews for ten
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pounds, a five-pound profit plus the extra 50 acres.23

Also in 1785 Foreman bought the land of a debtor, Joshua Archer, at a sheriff's sale24 which he sold to Jacob Painter for ten pounds.25 There is no indication how much he paid for Archer's land, but it could not have been much, since it had been for sale for two years. Again in a warrant of 1785 he bought from the state a tract of land, called Baltimore, consisting of 307 acres in Westmoreland County, for which he received a patent in 1798.26

Foreman in 1786 bought the property of another person in debt — 300 acres from James McKim on White Pine Run.27 Two years later he received a patent from the state of Pennsylvania to the land that he moved to after leaving Hannas Town, for forty-five pounds.28 This tract was known as Mequineg and consisted of 316 acres in Salem Township on the road to Fort Pitt. This property was sold to Foreman's next door neighbor, Robert Hunter, by Sarah Foreman, Charles's widow, and James and Jane Foreman in 1807.29

In 1788, Foreman bought 184 acres and 30 perches on Turtle Creek in a sheriff's sale which he sold for a loss of twenty-seven pounds to Samuel Hays.30

As far as can be ascertained, the land that remained unsold was given to Foreman's children. Samuel resided in Armstrong Township, probably on the fifty acres that were held back from the sale of the Archer estate.

How much profit Foreman made from his land transactions is not known, but it appears that during this period of depression after the Revolution he had the necessary cash to speculate in land. He also loaned money and as a consequence was involved in fourteen court cases. Most of the cases do not indicate the reasons for the suit, except for debt, and the only case — besides those for recovery of debts — is that of George Chippingen, who brought suit against Foreman for the replacement of a stove which was delivered at a cost of £18 by Foreman.31 It certainly would be interesting to find out how
Foreman got himself into this predicament.

Census and Tax Data

Charles Foreman was a wealthy man by local comparisons, and this is borne out by the census and tax records of the period. In November 1782 Foreman is listed as having a female slave, seventeen years old, named Amynta. In 1783 the census for Westmoreland County lists Charles Foreman as owning 300 acres, two horses, two cattle, and five sheep in Hempfield Township. In 1786 he paid a state tax of $3.10 for property in Hempfield Township, south district. The 300 acres refers to the land that he bought from William Mason in 1788.

The first census of the United States in 1790 shows that Charles Foreman's family consisted of two free white males sixteen years of age and up (Charles and Samuel), six free white females (Sarah and five of her daughters), two free white males under sixteen (James and Charles, Jr.), and two slaves. Either Jenney or Dorcas was born after 1790. Foreman lived in Salem Township at this time on the property known as Mequineg. Since only four slaves were listed for all of Salem Township in the 1790 census, Foreman's wealth must have been considerable to support slaves plus his large family. Westmoreland County had 128 slaves owned by sixty heads of families in the 1790 census. The total population of Westmoreland County was 16,018 persons of whom 2,814 were heads of families.

In the direct United States tax records for 1798, Charles Foreman is listed as possessing 188 acres, upon which stood a shingled two-story home twenty by twenty feet and a log barn twenty-four by twenty-six feet, valued at $802.

By the 1800 census of Salem Township, Charles Foreman's family had decreased by three daughters, presumably married off, and Samuel, his eldest son, who had moved his family to Armstrong Township. Samuel Foreman's family at this time consisted of three sons and one daughter under ten years of age. In the census of 1810 neither Samuel nor Charles's widow Sarah, or other children are listed. By 1810 the Foremans of Hannas Town had moved elsewhere.
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Civil Service

The first court west of the Alleghenies was held in July 1773 in the home of Robert Hanna, across the road from Charles Foreman's tavern. Four sessions were held each year at Hannas Town until 1786 when the county seat was moved to Greensburg.

Charles Foreman's civil service began as a juror on the Grand Inquest in October 1774. In the quarter session of October 11, 1775, a private session of the court was held in Foreman's home and full court sessions were held in his dwelling in May 1780 and June 9, 1781. In 1777 he was named a justice of the peace.

He was four times the president of the court of Westmoreland County; first in January 1779, when he presided over the admission to the bar of the first lawyer west of the Alleghenies, Michael Huffnagle. Edward Cook succeeded Foreman in the next session, at which time Joseph Jones complained to Foreman of Cook's illegal distilling of whiskey. Apparently the accusation was never taken to court, for no further records exist in the court proceedings. In October 1779, Foreman was president judge, and again on January 4, 1780, when severe weather conditions prevented the constables from the various townships from appearing in court.

Foreman last served as court president in April 1783, and it was in this session that John Smith was sentenced (for theft) to thirty-nine lashes, to have his ears cut off and nailed to the pillory, to remain at the pillory for an hour, make restitution for the stolen goods, and to pay a fine of twenty pounds. In addition, a fellow tavern keeper in Hannas Town was fined for keeping a disorderly house and encouraging drunkenness in soldiers and others.

In the April session of 1789 Foreman served on a committee to review a proposed road near Greensburg, and on February 20, 1799, he was appointed the justice of the peace of Salem Township.
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Foreman appears to have been well respected in Westmoreland County and was a force in the politics of Western Pennsylvania. Of the five president judges who served the court from July 1773 to July 1784, Archibald Lochry served once; John Moore, three times; Charles Foreman, four times; Robert Hanna, eight times; and Edward Cook, twenty times.

Military Service

Western Pennsylvania, continually on the alert for British and Indian attack, was also the recruiting ground for the Eighth Pennsylvania Continental Regiment, the Thirteenth Virginia Line Regiment, and various other Continental units, including Morgan's Riflemen. Most of the defense of the western frontier fell upon the shoulders of the local militia, since most of the regular regiments were serving in the eastern campaigns. Charles Foreman served during the Revolution, much the same as his neighbors did, in short-term militia organizations within their own geographic region.

Charles Foreman's first recorded military service was with Brigadier General Edward Hand's expedition against the Indian towns in the New Castle area of northwestern Pennsylvania. The force was under the command of Colonel Alexander Barr and it consisted of four battalions of Westmoreland County militia — a total force of 362 men. Charles Foreman was captain of a company of twenty-eight men; one of seven companies that made up the first battalion.42 The expedition left on February 8 of the winter of 1778 and returned March 10, 1778. Soon after the detachment left Fort Pitt, it was beset by rain which caused the snow to melt and the rivers to rise. Many of the creeks had to be waded and some of them swum. Captain Foreman and his company destroyed only a few Delaware camps in what must have been a miserable campaign.

In the spring of 1778, Charles Foreman was a coronet in Captain William Lochry's company of light horse, a separate unit of Westmoreland County militia. The other officers in this company were Lieutenant Robert Hanna and Lieutenant Abraham Hendricks.43

Foreman served on several committees to form plans to protect
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the frontier from British and Indian incursions. He was a member of a committee that proposed that 100 men from Westmoreland County be raised and commanded by Colonel Archibald Lochry to meet General George Rogers Clark for a combined attack on Fort Detroit. This force was ambushed on the Ohio August 24, 1781, and all its participants either killed or captured. The destruction of this body of troops stripped Western Pennsylvania of many of its most able fighters. Charles Foreman’s neighbor, Robert Orr (1744-1833), was captured on this campaign and his arm broken. He was first marched to Sandusky and then to Fort Detroit, where an English surgeon saved his life. He was such a model prisoner that Major De Peyster, commander of Fort Detroit, wrote to General Frederick Haldimand, Governor of Canada (May 14, 1782), as follows: “I must beg you will put in a word for Captain Orr, who was taken when Col. Lochry was killed, and has been on parole at Detroit ever since, where his behavior has been so circumspect as to entitle him a preference, he has a large family at home, and is ready to promise anything, tho, I firmly believe he will say no more than he will perform.” Robert Orr was not released, and it was not until 1783 that he was exchanged at Montreal and returned to Hannas Town, which had been destroyed in his absence.

The day after the destruction of Hannas Town, the Westmoreland County militia was mustered, and both Charles and Samuel Foreman were placed on active duty in Captain James Bryson’s company from the day after the attack, July 14, 1782, for three months. Each man was paid fifteen pounds, fifteen shillings.

On August 8, 1782, Charles Foreman was a member of a committee composed of Colonel Christopher Hays, Colonel Alexander McClean, Colonel Benjamin Harrison, and Captain Hezekiah McGruder, to plan an expedition against Sandusky, composed primarily of Westmoreland County militia. Charles Foreman was the only member without military rank, which indicates that his advice in military matters was valued. The attack, however, was never carried out.

In addition to Foreman’s service with various militia units and
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his presence in councils of war, he provided provisions to the West-
moreland County militia. He was paid fifteen dollars for provisions
he provided Colonel Lochry sometime between 1777 and 1781.48

Charles Foreman also incurred the displeasure of Robert Hanna
which resulted in a dispute over the allocation of gunpowder that
Foreman had received from Brigadier General William Irvine at Fort
Pitt. Hanna's letter reads as follows:

Hanna’s Town, December 34, 1781

Govonouwer General
We are apprehensive that we shall labour under great difficulty on the
Frontier if any approaches should be made by the savages for want of amunition
and it does not appear that there will be any opportunity of Purchasing any of
this Country —

We find that Mr. Foreman has sometime ago drew a small supply out of
the magazine at Fort Pitt for the use of the militia and are well assured that
he has Expended a considerable part of it to Hunters and others for his own
private Emolement. It is not our desire that the Amunition should now be devided
amongst the Inhabitants but best it should be prevented [?] from improper use.
We would wish for the benefit of the People who may be liable to suffer that the
General would order a demand of it to be made and it be put in the hands of
some careful Person whom the General may think proper to nominate — in
order that in any case of Emergency we might know where to apply — We have
the honor to be.

Honoured General
Your very Humble Servants
Robt. Hanna

The Honrouable Brigadier General
William Irvine, Commander
the Western District

P.S. It may perhaps be thought that this Remonstance has rather proceeded
from malice than for the value of so small a Quantity of amunition, but we are
suspicious that this is not the first deception of this kind that has been used
to the great Injury of the Frontier.49

There is no indication of the course of action that Irvine took to
answer Hanna, but it appears that there was friction and possibly
jealousy — as exhibited in the above letter — between Foreman and
his landlord, Robert Hanna.

The Hannas Town Attack: The British Position

The American side of the attack on Hannas Town is well known
from the correspondence of Michael Huffnagle and William Irvine.
However, the British position in the attack has never been researched
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or elucidated. The following will hopefully dispel much of the myth and legend about the attack.

In most of the published sources concerning the Hannas Town attack, various British and Indian leaders are mentioned as possible organizers of the attack, including Guyasuta, Simon Girty, John Connolly, and Alexander McKee.

George D. Albert stated that "we have not been able to find out who was the leader of the Indians and renegades in the invasion and the true story will perhaps never be found out." John N. Boucher has reiterated this position and written: "Who commanded the Indian forces on the Hanna's Town raid will never be certainly known. It was most likely Guyasuta of the Indians and Connolly of the tories, though his presence was never proved."

The answer to Albert's and Boucher's questions concerning the identity of the leaders and composition of the attacking force has been in the Haldimand Papers of the Public Archives of Canada since the 1870s, a listing of which was published in the 1886 and 1887 annual reports of the archives.

The unpublished correspondence between General Frederick Haldimand, Colonel John Butler, and the various commanders of Forts Detroit and Niagara, and the Indian department commanded by Colonel Guy Johnson are summarized below. The documents establish beyond doubt that the leadership of Guyasuta, or of others mentioned in early histories of the attack on Hannas Town, are without foundation.

On June 9, 1782, a force of 250 Seneca Indians, led by Sayengaraghta, a renowned Seneca war chief of the Turtle Clan, left his encampment at Buffalo Creek, south of Fort Niagara, to attack Hannas Town. Colonel John Butler, deputy superintendent of Indian affairs and commander of Butler's Rangers, sent Captain John Powell, company commander of the Indian department's Lower Seneca, and Captain Robert Lottridge, company commander of the Indian department's Cayugas, two lieutenants of the Indian department, three or four volunteers, and some foresters to accompany them. The forester
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company was composed of two sergeants and forty-two privates and was attached to the Indian department, commanded by Colonel Guy Johnson. This company performed support duties for the department, such as carrying provisions to Indian villages, cutting firewood, and attending to officers; occasionally a few were sent with Indians on their forays into the frontier. Although uniform buttons were found, no units of the King’s Eighth Light Infantry Regiment were dispatched with the attacking force. Possibly some of the volunteers were members of the Eighth, or some British or Indian members of the expedition were wearing castoff uniform coats of the Eighth, which were discarded at Hannas Town for garments looted from the dwellings. The total number of British and Canadians on this expedition probably did not exceed fifteen to twenty persons.

The expedition was led to Hannas Town by a recent deserter from Fort Pitt, who Colonel John Butler stated was from the ninth company of a Maryland regiment. It certainly would be interesting to determine who this individual was.

The attack took place Saturday, July 13, 1782, while the court was in session. The inhabitants, forewarned, fled to the safety of the stockade, taking the court records with them. Except for two dwellings, the town was burned, and all the livestock slaughtered. Charles Foreman and his family were among the defenders that day against 275 attackers. Only one settler was wounded, Peggy Shaw. Captain Michael Huffnagle made a special plea to Irvine, the commander of Fort Pitt, to send a surgeon to help Miss Shaw, but it was to no avail, for the girl died several weeks later.

---

Sunday with an intention of cutt off a village near Fort Pitt. As the party is large, have thought proper to order Capt.’s Powell and Lottridge, 2 Lieuts. and 3 volunteers with some Forresters to accompany them.” Col. Butler at Niagara to Capt. Matthews [Haldimand’s secretary in Quebec], June 1, 1782.
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Dear Sir [no date]

The bearer here of Moses Shaw had his daughter wounded in the Fortt we have been doing every thing in our power for her, yet the wound is worse and she is in a very dangerous way. he has required of me to mention it to you to give permission to one of the Surgeons to come to this place to help her and give such directions as he may judge necessary — if you can possibly let one come it will be a great satisfaction to the Family.

Your most obt. Hble. Sevt.

Mich. Huffnagle

Brigadier General Irvine
The human toll came in the attack on Miller’s Station near Hannas Town on the same day. A wedding had taken place the day before and many local persons were in attendance. Captain Samuel Miller, the builder of the fortified cabin, had been killed on June 10, 1778, with seven of his Continentals from the Eighth Pennsylvania Line Regiment, fourteen miles north of Hannas Town. Miller’s wife Dorcas and nine others were captured and marched to Fort Niagara. Several persons were killed in the attack, including Lieutenant Joseph Brownlee and his son, whose wife and daughter Jane were among the prisoners. Elizabeth Brownlee and her daughter were prisoners in the Indian village of Buffalo Creek, near Fort Niagara, and were sold to Captain Robert Lottridge for $30 and two gallons of rum. From Fort Niagara they were sent to Montreal, where they were exchanged in 1783 and had to make their way home by way of Fort Ticonderoga, Albany, New York, Philadelphia, and then back to Hannas Town after a year’s captivity. Elizabeth Hanna and her daughter Jane were also held captive and released in Canada. Thus many residents of Hannas Town suffered during the attack, even though they were not present at the time of the attack.

Sayengaraghta remained in the neighborhood for several days, raiding outlying cabins, killing and capturing additional settlers. His expedition had returned to Fort Niagara by August 5, 1782, and Colonel John Butler wrote to Captain Matthews, secretary to Governor Haldimand:

Niagara 5th Augt 1782

Dear Sir

Sayengarahta and his Party are returned from War, after burning and destroying Hanna’s Town and the County for seven or eight Miles round it, this Settlement were about 30 miles below Fort Pitt, on the Road to Philadelphia, they Killed between three and four hundred head of horned cattle, 70 horses, sheep and hogs innumerable, and brought away to their villages 70 horses and two cows — Also killed 15 of the enemy and took 10 prisoners —

All the News papers that Capt. Powell could collect have enclosed them for his Excellency’s perusal; I impatiently wait upon answers to the many things already wrote upon. I must beg [?] his Excellency to order the Indian presents to be forwarded as soon as possible, being so much in arrears last Winter, has already consumed the greatest part of the most useful articles sent me this Summer, the bad assortment, and the want of some material articles obliged me to be more extravagant in others —

I am Sir your most obedient and Humble Servant

John Butler

The years 1781 and 1782 were the darkest period for Western
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Pennsylvania during the Revolution, for a continuing series of major reverses greatly affected the inhabitants of Westmoreland County. First, there was the annihilation of the Lochry expedition with many of Westmoreland County's finest men in August 1781, and then the disastrous defeat of Colonel Crawford's force at Sandusky in June 1782. Finally came the Hannas Town burning.

The attack on Hannas Town by Sayengaraghta and Captains Powell and Lottridge of the British Indian department was conceived by Sayengaraghta as early as 1779, when he proposed that Fort Pitt be attacked and destroyed. Throughout 1781 and 1782 Sayengaraghta had to be restrained by Colonel John Butler, General Haldimand, and Colonel Guy Johnson from leading his warriors against Fort Pitt and the neighboring region. Sayengaraghta finally left with his force, without announcing his intentions to the British. When Colonel Butler learned that the Indian chief was going to lead his Senecas towards Fort Pitt, he immediately sent the small British and Canadian contingent to join them, as well as the deserter from Fort Pitt to lead them to Hannas Town.

Charles Foreman, concerned about the deteriorating conditions on the frontier, sent a personal letter to General Irvine, the commander of Fort Pitt, on May 21, 1782, in which he wrote:

Hon. Sir

I take the Freedom of acquainting your Honor of our distressed Situation in this neighborhood. How the people have been driven by the Enemy; Obliged to abandon their habitations; by the late depredations made by the Indians. Which I am Persuaded you are fully aware of the alarming Circumstances already. I solicited Col. Cook in the strongest terms for a few men in order to cover our Frontier and he has Promised every relief in his power, but nothing hath been done as yet. He also wrote me the Plan agreed in which I think might answer as valuable if well executed Your Honor will therefore see the necessity of sending a few men in order that if they should make Discoveries to alarm the Settlement or otherwise to have the plan well executed, we be continually in danger to the Enemy as there is such a [?] from Brush Run to Fort Barr, not less than twenty five miles and not a single man to cover us; Perhaps you have not been acquainted with the matter before as I conceive it a duty incumbent on me. I have truly stated the matter to you. There is one thing I cannot help observing to you that the whole of the Militia has been kept up from Brush Run to Fort Pitt and the standing troops there give us a Reason to think that we are left to fall a Sacrifice to the Enemy. Unless something speedily is done for us our Settlement will be abandoned and become a Prey to the Enemy. I have the Honor to be your

very Hble. Servant
Charles Foreman

This letter was a forecast of doom, for Irvine apparently did not heed Foreman's warning. Michael Huffnagle, writing to General
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Irvine five days after the attack, July 17, 1782, maintained that “I am much afraid that the scouting parties stationed at the different posts have not done their duty. We discovered that the enemy had encamped and they must have been there for at least about ten days; as they killed several horses and eat them about six miles from Brush Run and right on the way towards Barr’s Fort.”

General Irvine replied to Foreman in what must have been very stern terms, for Foreman wrote from Fort Reed on August 12, 1782:

Dear Sir

This moment I had the Sight of a circular letter examined before yourself, as I believe, which gives me much pleasure. I have just returned from Col. Cook’s who have the pleasure of transmitting to your Honor the Proceedings of that day concerning the Entended Expedition which I hope will render it satisfactory to you. Col. Cook will in a few days inform you fully of the plan which was fell on by a Committee appointed for that purpose — I am fully Persuaded this Expedition will Greatly depend on the exertions of the officers who seem to be very spirited at present. You wrote me a letter some time ago wherein you seemed to be something displeased with me. But we assure you that nothing was intended to Displease your Honor. My meaning was that the Continental Troops were at the Extreme part of the County and the Militia being too near them which at that time I did not know wheather you might be acquainted with their station or not. However the General Remarked that if Hanna’s Town of the Frontier falls a prisoner, it must be among ourselves. You must know that could not be my fault, for I believe it is well known that I have done as much as any man could do of my abilities, not for any novelty, but for the Rightichness of the Cause, but now and for the future, I hope to be at good understanding with you and will always [be] ready and willing to com- municate my Sentiments on any particular occasion. I have the Honor to be

Your Obedient Servant
Charles Foreman

P.S. We are very desparate for arms at this garrison.60

Foreman appears to have been an independent individual, who at times voiced his opinions to persons in high authority, without fear. He was also a fervent patriot, as the last few lines of his letter reflect. The meeting he refers to is the one discussed previously that took place August 8, 1782.

Foreman’s letter was posted from Fort Reed, which raises the question of what the fort at Hannas Town was named. George D. Albert was convinced, on the basis of Huffnagle’s letter, dated Fort Reed, July 17, 1782, to President Moore, that the stockade at Hannas Town was called Fort Reed after Joseph Reed, president of the Supreme Council of Pennsylvania from 1778 to 1781.61 In addition, there is an unpublished letter from Huffnagle to Irvine, dated at Fort Reed, —
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August 10, 1782, in which Huffnagle asks for guns, flints, and ammunition. The Foreman letter from Fort Reed, dated August 12, 1782, reinforces Albert's conclusions that the fort at Hannas Town was indeed Fort Reed. Except for two houses, the town had been destroyed. The fort was the only major structure among the smoldering ruins and, at least for the summer of 1782, was locally known as Fort Reed.

**Material Culture**

Foreman's will, made on December 24, 1805, and proved on January 9, 1806, provides the only information that we have on the worldly goods of Charles Foreman. He apparently was on his deathbed when the will was written, because he made provisions for payments of cash to his daughters on specific dates for the following several years. He died sixteen days later.

He bequeathed to his wife, Sarah, their home and garden, one mare, and a saddle, two cows of her choice, five sheep, a bed and bed clothing, curtains, a chest and table, chairs, cupboard and contents, two pots, two brass candlesticks, two servers, a looking glass, two spinning wheels, a shelot, two buckets, one-half dozen knives and forks, the cloth in the fulling mill, all the hogs, all the meat in the house, the grain in the stackyard, all the grain in the ground, and firewood to be provided by her sons, Charles and James. In addition he gave a total of $300 and fifteen shillings to his daughters as well as a featherbed, one coverlet, and two blankets to Jenney, and a bed and blue curtains to Dorcas.

Foreman previously had given land and other goods to his sons and daughters, for in his will he made it clear that these gifts were to be considered part of their inheritance.

The inventory of material objects in the 1806 home of Charles Foreman provides the archeologist with a list of items that he might expect to recover in the excavation of Foreman's tavern at Hannas Town. Many of the artifacts are of a perishable nature, but similar lists in wills and of debtors of the period further expand the Foreman inventory of artifacts that the archeologist might encounter.

The inventory of material goods of the debtor, Lucas Gibbs, declared in 1799, was similar to that of Foreman's will. Every item in Gibbs's home was itemized as follows:
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It must be kept in mind that Gibbs was a debtor and thus his inventory was probably not as substantial as Foreman's would have been.

The contents of Charles Foreman's will are similar to those of 159 wills analyzed by James T. Lemon in 1967 that described food and clothing left to widows from 1740 to 1790 in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. From the analysis of the data, Lemon was able to state that approximately 150 pounds of meat per person (100 pounds of pork and 50 pounds of beef with some wild game included) was needed per year. In addition, the dairy needs were to be supplied by one or two cows; ten to fifteen bushels of grain; a garden plot containing six or seven fruit trees to provide fruit, cider, and brandy; fleece of two sheep or fifteen pounds of flax or hemp; and one horse were provided by the will to these Pennsylvania widows.65 Using this as a base, Lemon then computed the number of acres a family of five would need to support themselves as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 table</td>
<td>1 girdiron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 large looking glass</td>
<td>1 iron spider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 set of irons</td>
<td>2 earthen dishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bake oven</td>
<td>1 bucket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pot</td>
<td>2 plated candlesticks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 tea kettle</td>
<td>½ dozen knives &amp; forks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 tea pots</td>
<td>1 carving knife &amp; fork, plated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cream cup</td>
<td>1 plated handle fork, steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 set tea cups &amp; saucers</td>
<td>½ dozen common knives &amp; forks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 delph bowls</td>
<td>candle molds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pepper box</td>
<td>2 pairs of snuffers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sugar dish</td>
<td>1 iron ladle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 crock</td>
<td>½ dozen tea spoons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 earthen pans</td>
<td>1 coffee mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 double barrel gun</td>
<td>1 tea canister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ dozen chairs</td>
<td>1 pair japanned spitting bones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 set sprokets</td>
<td>1 axe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pair scissors</td>
<td>1 hair trunk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pair hand irons</td>
<td>1 horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pair pot hooks</td>
<td>1 cow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 dozen shovels &amp; tongs</td>
<td>1 man's saddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 touniquit</td>
<td>1 bed &amp; bedding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bread server</td>
<td>wearing cloths64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 wine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be kept in mind that Gibbs was a debtor and thus his inventory was probably not as substantial as Foreman's would have been.

60 bu. of wheat and rye for bread, etc., at 10 bu. per acre ........................................ 6

Flax, orchard, garden ............................... 2

Support for livestock: 5 pigs at 100 lbs., ½ steer at 500 lbs.,
3 cows, 8 sheep, 4 horses:

40 bu. of corn at 20 bushels per acre ................................. 2

200 bu. of oats, rye, spelt, buckwheat at 15

Since Foreman provided for his wife the same benefits as did the farmers in southeastern Pennsylvania, their requirements must have been similar. Lemon's calculations probably approximate the subsistence requirements needed for Sarah Foreman and the four children remaining with her after her husband's death in 1806.

**Summary: Historical Record**

The historical record has revealed that Charles Foreman was a tavern proprietor, judge, militia captain, and landowner. He was the father of nine children and he lived in Hannas Town from 1770 to 1790, when he moved to Salem Township, where he died in 1806. We know nothing of his origins or what happened to the Foremans after they left Westmoreland County in 1807. For thirty-five years Charles Foreman was influenced by the social, economic, political, and military events of Western Pennsylvania; he raised a large family, provided for them, and seems to have been well respected by his peers.

What, then, can the excavation of Charles Foreman's Hannas Town tavern site tell us about the man and his times that has not been dug out of the historical record? As we shall see, the excavation of two refuse pits and the analysis of the artifacts pertaining to Foreman's tavern enable the archeologist to reconstruct aspects of past socio-cultural, economic, political, and religious systems of the Hannas Town community that are not available in the historical documents. In addition, the material culture that has been buried for two hundred years at Hannas Town provides information on economic interaction with populations east of the Alleghenies as well as with England and Europe.

**The Archeological Record**

Excavations were carried out at the site of Hannas Town from June 22 through August 13, 1970, as part of the University of Pittsburgh's first annual archeological field school.

Initially we had planned to use this site as a proving ground for

---

anthropological theory. The buildings had been burned, along with their material contents. By plotting all items of material and nonmaterial culture of each house floor, we hoped to determine if valid inferences and cultural reconstructions could be made regarding the past socio-cultural, economic, political, and religious systems of the Hannas Town community. By treating the town as a prehistoric site we would then check our inferences against the written record to determine to what degree artifact patterning reflects the past cultural behavior at the site. Information of this sort should be of aid when dealing especially with the nonmaterial aspects of prehistoric cultures.

The site did not, however, lend itself to this type of analysis, due to the fact that it appears that all the structures were built on ground level without basements, and have been completely destroyed by over 100 years of plowing and later building activity.

Most of the interpretations concerning the reconstruction of cultural patterns are dependent upon the analysis of artifacts from subsurface features below the level of plowing.

Excavations

No authenticated map or lot plan of the town has been found to date, although deeds continually refer to one. There is the Steel plan drawn in 1895 showing all the lots paralleling the Forbes Road,67 and the Walkinshaw town plan including the known streets, which formed the basis for Blair's painting of Hannas Town.68 The historical evidence (other than deeds) for these two diverse plans is not known. It is now known that all of the published plans of Hannas Town are not valid since they show the fort situated near the town spring. The fort has been located, and it is on the south side of the spring, some 100 feet from the Forbes Road (Plate 1).

Therefore, we treated the site as one would approach a prehistoric site. We ran a series of test trenches in an attempt to locate artifact concentrations. In two areas we discovered a scattering of artifacts in the plow zone and proceeded to concentrate on these two zones.

In area 1 we encountered two plow zones and had partially excavated a shallow oval feature before we were forced to abandon it due to water problems caused by continual heavy rainfall. This feature (Plate 2) was part of the now defunct stream bed that served as a
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channel for the spring that emerged from the fort. Artifacts washing into the area due to continual erosion and the hummocky surface of the base of the stream bed can be interpreted as the result of pigs rooting in what must have been an open, polluted stream. A great deal of refuse bones and trash were recovered.

The area that we concentrated on was area 2 (Plates 2 and 3), in which we discovered two large subsurface pits that had been dug into the hard yellow subsoil. The fill in both these features consisted of layerings of charcoal, ash, stones, and hundreds of artifacts. Both these pits were excavated in six-inch arbitrary levels and feature 4, the larger of the two, was 5½ by 12 feet in diameter and 2 feet in depth, while feature 5 was 6½ feet by 7 feet 4 inches in diameter and 1 foot, 10 inches in depth. Since both of these features overlap each other in date the artifacts will be discussed as coming from a single excavation unit.

Foreman’s Table Service

The majority of the artifacts excavated from the two pits were fragments of plates, cups, saucers, bowls, teapots, and mugs. Because the date of the manufacture of ceramic artifacts is well established, they will be used to provide a chronology of their use by Charles Foreman and to reconstruct the precise nature of his table service.

The following is a list of ceramic types and percentages for each feature:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Type</th>
<th>Feature 4</th>
<th>Feature 5</th>
<th>Plow Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREAMWARE</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEARLWARE</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDWARE</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINESE EXPORT</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALT GLAZE</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELFT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKFIELD</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIPWARE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The earliest ceramics in the features were fragments of delftware, which was developed in the early 1700s and manufactured in both England and northern Europe. The shards represent the remains of a minimum of five bowls (Plate 4, no. 6) and three plates. Punch bowls and plates were manufactured until the early nineteenth century long after the rest of the delft vessel forms disappeared from the market.69

Salt glaze originated in the 1720s and became the predominant tableware throughout England and North America by the 1750s. Only fragments of vessels associated with tea services (teacups and saucers) were recovered. Several pieces of teacups were decorated with incisions filled with cobalt, known as scratch blue, made between 1720 and 1775.\textsuperscript{70} Five pieces were also decorated with overglaze floral designs.

Creamware was perfected by Wedgwood by 1762 and it became plentiful on colonial and Revolutionary sites after 1770. Creamware is a hard-fired, yellowish earthenware that was coated with a clear glaze and was far superior to both delft and salt glaze in the durability of its finish. It is this ware that made up the Foremans' table service. The majority of the approximately thirteen plates (as deduced from the rim fragments) represented were the 9½-inch plates of the Royal Pattern (Plate 5, no. 4).

Two other plates of the Royal Pattern measured 9¾ inches in diameter and two other 9½-inch plates had a plain ridged rim. The remainder of the creamware vessels were again fragments from tea services and bowls. A minimum of six teacups were found, two with polychrome overglaze floral decorations (Plate 5).\textsuperscript{71} In addition, seven saucer fragments were found, of which four were decorated with motifs similar to the cups.

The handle of a large teapot or pitcher, a teaspout fragment, several small handles and knobs to the lids of bowls, and two pieces of black transfer ware were located, one of which had the words Amor Honor on it. The fragment was from teaware which had a masonic pattern (Plate 4, nos. 4 and 5).

Pearlware was invented by Wedgwood by 1779 and it was whiter than creamware, with cobalt added to the glaze to give it a bluish tint. Except for an eight-inch green shell-edged plate (Plate 5, no. 5) dating to between 1780 and 1795, all of the pearlware vessels were originally from tea services. A fluted teacup with blue floral wreath designs (Plate 5, no. 1) was excavated from each pit, along with five other cups (Plate 5, nos. 2 and 3). Seven tea saucers and four bowls had the typical underglaze Chinese blue floral and pagoda scenes (Plate 6, no. 1) or overglaze polychrome, painted, floral decorations (Plate 4, no. 3).

Chinese porcelain was imported from China in great quantities in the late eighteenth century, much of it as ballast in ships. All of the

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid., 117.

\textsuperscript{71} Jacob L. Grimm, "Hanna's Town," \textit{Carnegie Magazine} 46 (June 1972) : 225.
examples are fragments of tea services, decorated with underglaze blue floral designs and Chinese scenes, representing a minimum of five teacups and eight saucers (Plate 4, nos. 1 and 2). None of the basal fragments had reign marks, but they belong to the Ch'ing (1644-1912) Dynasty.\(^\text{72}\)

Red earthenware comprises over one-fourth of all the pottery fragments found and it consists mainly of bowls (3½ to 8 inches in diameter, Plate 6, no. 2), mugs, and large-mouthed storage jars. Eight percent of the fragments are glazed on the interior and 30 percent are glazed both on the interior and exterior. These pieces were probably parts of containers for liquids, for glazing prevents liquids from seeping through the vessel walls. Jacob Grimm feels possibly the unglazed red earthenware was produced in the Hannas Town area and thus represents an indigenous pottery production.

Thirteen fragments of slipware were found, making up a maximum of six plates. Slipware was manufactured both in England and the Americas.\(^\text{73}\) In addition, several pieces of Jackfieldlike ware were found in feature 4. This ware was produced between 1745 and 1790.

One of the most exciting ceramic finds was a piece of Bonnin and Morris porcelain, originally identified at the site by Peggy Fields. Bonnin and Morris was the first porcelain to have been manufactured in North America, but this first attempt in Philadelphia lasted only from 1770 to 1772 when the factory closed down.\(^\text{74}\) Hannas Town is the farthest west that Bonnin and Morris has been reported and in fact is the only archeological site at which it has yet been found.\(^\text{75}\)

Except for the red earthenware and the Bonnin and Morris porcelain, all of the ceramics at the site were imported from England and then carried by wagon or pack horse over the Alleghenies by immigrants or traders. The American colonists were heavily dependent upon England for much of their material goods and it was not until the early part of the nineteenth century that commercial ceramics manufacture in the United States came into prominence.

What did not show up in the excavations were wooden and leather vessels, basketry (all perishable), or pewter plates or mugs that could be remelted and recast when they became defective. Thus we do not know the priority of use of ceramics over red earthenware,

\(^{72}\) Hume, *Guide*, 263.
\(^{73}\) Ibid., 136, fig. 51.
\(^{75}\) Grimm, "Hanna's Town," 227.
wooden plates, mugs, bowls, or pewter vessels. Did Charles and Sarah 
Foreman set their everyday table with creamware, pearlware, or 
Chinese porcelains or was the everyday table service a combination 
of red earthenware, wooden, and pewter vessels? Were the imported 
ceramics reserved only for special occasions when friends were invited 
for dinner or tea? This we do not know, but Sarah Foreman’s cupboard 
must have contained an assemblage of ceramic artifacts similar to that 
appearing in her trash pits.

The main table service consisted of creamware, but it is significant 
to note that when pearlware was introduced to Western Pennsylvania 
it was not in the context of the total assemblage or range of vessel 
forms, but rather, was restricted to a specialized function — the 
serving of tea. The excavated ceramics further indicate that the salt 
glaze and Chinese export vessels, also associated with tea serving, 
were the last to persist when the ware decreased in popularity. The 
introduction of pearlware after 1779 was interrupted by the American 
embargoes placed upon trade with England during the Revolution. If 
the two refuse pits had been in use after 1790 one would expect to 
find that the main table service of the Foremans would have been 
predominately pearlware and not creamware. Sarah Foreman’s cup-
board in 1806 probably contained only a few treasured pieces of 
creamware that remained from her life at Hannas Town.

Tavern Artifacts

The broken pieces of six stemmed wineglasses were found, one 
of which had an air twist design in its stem. One wineglass bowl frag-
ment had a wheel-engraved flower on it; these are normally found in 
sites dating to between 1770 and 1820. A fragment of a flip or toddy 
glass, a stopper from a decanter, handles from glass mugs, and bases 
of five glass tumblers were uncovered. Again, pewter, wooden, or leath-
er mugs were not found, but the red earthenware vessels previously 
discussed were probably also used for liquid refreshment. Other glass 
fragments included the base of an apothecary bottle and a small glass 
decanter or perfume bottle (Plate 7, no. 3).

Fragments of only six rum bottles and three case (wine) bottles 
were recovered. This is not surprising when one considers that most 
of the whiskey consumed in Western Pennsylvania was brought over 
the normally impassable Allegheny Mountains or made locally. The 
latter is probably the case, since in this heartland of the Whiskey Re-
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Plate 1  Air photograph of Hannas Town site
1. Fort Reed
2. Foreman's Tavern
3. Abandoned road, circa 1876
4. Town spring
bellion there were 572 known stills in 1795.

Table Cutlery and Spoons

A total of three bone-handed pistol-grip knives and seven blades with an upsweeping bulbous end were found, dating before 1770. Two of the knife handles and one fork handle had three parallel incised lines, which may have denoted ownership. Fifteen two-tined forks, four with pistol-grip handles and two with straight incised bone handles, and eleven fragments of bone fork and knife handles were also excavated from the two features (Plate 8).

Fourteen whole and fragmentary spoons were located; six table or soup spoons of pewter; five teaspoons of pewter, two of a metal alloy and one teaspoon of silver. One of the handles of a tablespoon had the shell design molded on it. The single most important archeological find at the site was the recovery of the silver teaspoon (Plate 9). The teaspoon from feature 4 was 45/4 inches long and had the initials CFS engraved on its handle. The initials stand for Charles and Sarah Foreman and provide us with definite evidence that we were digging in the Foremans' refuse and in the vicinity of their tavern. On the back was a dove holding an olive branch which was struck to commemorate the end of the Seven Years' War in 1763 or possibly the Olive Branch Petition to George III in 1775, that failed when the king refused to see Richard Penn. The maker's mark, ILT, is stamped into the back of the handle. ILT is the mark of John Le Telier, a Philadelphia silversmith operating on Second Street in 1777 and in 1793 at 172 North Front Street.

The only other piece that can be directly linked to Foreman is the end of a silver spoon or ornament with the initials AFK, which may stand for a member of the Foreman family (Plate 7, no. 1). The maker's mark (II) designates Jack Jennings (1739-1817), a silversmith in Norwalk, Connecticut.

Clothing and Personal Items

The most prevalent artifact that can be directly related to clothing are the buttons and cuff links from the two features. Twenty-five buttons and nine cuff links were recovered from feature 4 and forty-one buttons and seventeen cuff links from feature 5. Of the total,
seventeen are bone buttons with either a single or four holes that were at one time cloth covered. Forty of the buttons are flat disks, some of which have engine turned designs and the remainder are hollow buttons. Five have pearl inlays and must have been attached to a worn out garment that was discarded into feature 5 (Plate 10).

The cuff links fall into two categories: oval disks connected by single link; or glass jewels in a circular or oval setting. One of the disk cuff links has an anchor engraved on it, possibly reflecting the naval service of one of Foreman's tavern customers. One of the glass cuff links had the masonic emblem on it and it is an exact duplicate of one excavated at a Revolutionary British army site in New York City.80

The only other artifacts that can be associated with clothing are the various buckles. In addition to shoe buckles of brass, there are several knee buckles and stock buckles (stocks were worn around the neck). The pin terminals of the shoe buckles date them to the latter part of the eighteenth century (Plate 11).

Items for the manufacture and repair of clothing include six brass thimbles, two open ended tailors' thimbles (one of brass and one of iron), three pairs of scissors and hundreds of brass common pins.

Twenty-six clay pipestems and sixteen bowls from long and short stemmed pipes were recovered. One of the bowls had a floral design on it and several had geometric designs at the lip of the bowl. Two bowls were black glazed earthenware that would have had a hollow reed stem attached. It was not possible to determine the age of the pipes from the diameter of the bore of their stems, since dating of bore measurement is only accurate before 1760 (Plate 12).

Other personal items of ownership include: a complete fine toothed delicing comb of bone, exactly like the plastic ones of today suggesting that the Foremans were bothered by body lice; a narrow brass comb with thirty-six tines that may have adorned Sarah's or one of her daughters' hair; a brass pendant (Plate 13); seven jackknives (Plate 8); two lead pencils; a Jew's harp; a clock key; a brass scale weight (Plate 13); and the circular brass drawer plate for a Heppelwhite drawer pull. This is the only information that we have on the furniture in Foreman's tavern.

Agricultural and Transport Activities

The two trash pits were used mainly for the disposal of trash that resulted from the activities carried on in Foreman's house and tavern, and thus few artifacts can be attributed to farming or transportation. A scythe handle and sharpening stone reflect harvesting of domesticated grains. The fragment of a wheel hub indicates that wagons were present. Spurs, a snaffle watering bit, and an iron curry comb validate the presence of riding horses.

Firearms

During this period the flintlock rifle, musket, and pistol were the main weapons of the hunt as well as for offense and defense. Thirty-four gun flints (twenty-five from feature 4 and nine from feature 5) were excavated, most of which were yellowish flints that were imported from France and were considered of better quality than those produced by the English. A musket trigger guard, gunlock, and a frizzen, all of iron, were found in feature 5, as well as a brass ramrod guide. Twenty-nine musket balls were found, several of which were probably fired to kill wild game and then discarded after the animal was brought back to Hannas Town and butchered. Several also had not been trimmed after being molded. The twenty-nine lead balls were of six different calibers: one of 10 mm; eight of 11 mm; eight of 12 mm; eight of 13 mm; three of 14 mm; and one of 15 mm.

Court Artifacts

Only one artifact can possibly be linked with the Westmoreland County Quarter Sessions Court, which was held in Foreman's tavern on several occasions. This is a lead wax seal with the impressed bust of a woman and the inscription of Queen Charlotte on its periphery (Plate 7). Charlotte was the consort of King George III (1744-1818), and her seal may have been used on court transactions.

Currency

The analysis of the coins from the two features was completed by Edward Long. In feature 4, ten coins were found: three William III ½d (1694-1702) all badly worn; two George I ½d (1724 and

82 Edward Long, “Hanna's Town Coins from the 1970 Excavations” (manuscript, Department of Anthropology, University of Pittsburgh, 1971).
1745); one George II ½d (1757); one George III Hibernia ½d (17XX); one George III Virginia ½d (1773); one Charles III (1767) real minted in Mexico; and one unidentifiable halfpenny. In feature 5 the following thirteen coins were recovered: seven George II ½d (175X, 173X, 1740, and the rest 1727-60); three George III ½d (176X, 1771, and 1775); one George III Hibernia ½d with the date clipped off; two Connecticut cents (1786 and 1787); and one unidentifiable silver coin or medal.

The spread of dates for feature 4 is from 1694 to 1773 and for feature 5, 173X to 1787. This is not surprising, for through most of the eighteenth century, minor coins were scarce. Halfpennies circulated longer than present-day coins, and a date spread of almost eighty years would not be reflected in any random sample of thirty-six modern coins today. The extreme wear on many of the Foreman tavern coins is indicative of this coin shortage and of a wide and lengthy circulation of each coin. The coin chronology from the two features cannot be relied on to give an absolute date for their use, for there is a thirteen-year gap between the last dated coin in feature 4 (1773) and the last dated coin in feature 5 (1787). The Connecticut cents of feature 5 were very common in the late 1780s, and the fact that they do not appear in feature 4 may indicate that it fell into disuse before 1785. Since no United States pennies have been found in either feature or in the plow zone in the vicinity of the features, a pre-1793 date for both the pits is probable. In 1793 the United States mint opened and by 1801 had minted 8½ million pennies and halfpennies.

Several coins from the plow zone above the two pits have some interest since one is a Charles III ½-real minted in Mexico in 1781. Another is a Charles III, 1778, Mexican two bits, which had been freshly cut, and the last is a Brunswick-Luneberg one pfennig dated 1752 (Plate 14). This coin may have been a souvenir taken from a Hessian during the Revolution. It also could be a keepsake lost by Jacob Mires, a German immigrant, who settled at the spring in Hannas Town and was burned out by Indians in 1763, or a coin lost by some other German traveler or immigrant of the same period.

Subsistence Analysis

The faunal materials from the pits were identified by Dr. Sandor Brokonyi of the Magyar Nemzeti Museum in Budapest, Hungary. The following is a list of the animal bones that were identified:
It must be kept in mind that pigs have almost twice as many bones as other comparable mammals, but even so, the pig was the prime meat source. Depending on the age at death, the animals that provided the bulk of meat for the Foremans were pigs, followed by cattle, mule deer, chickens, squirrels, fish, and sheep or goat. The domestic animals probably provided the bulk of the meat, but wild resources were certainly a welcome addition to the table. The archeological data are further corroborated by Lemon's previously discussed analysis.

**Floral Analysis**

The contents of feature 5 were sifted by water flotation and the following seeds and plant stems were identified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Domesticated</th>
<th>Wild</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Flax (Linum striatum)</td>
<td>Black Raspberry (Rubus allegheniensis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wheat (Triticum aestivum)</td>
<td>Hackberry (Celtis occidentalis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Oats (Avena sativa)</td>
<td>Elderberry (Sambucus canadensis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rye (Secale cereale)</td>
<td>Lambsquarter (Chenopodium album)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Corn (Zea Mays)</td>
<td>Pigweed (Amaranthus hybridus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pumpkin and Squash Rinds (Cucurbita)</td>
<td>Dock (Rumex crispus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grape (Vitis aestivalis)</td>
<td>Ragweed (Ambrosia artemisiifolia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Buckwheat (Fagopyrum esculentum)</td>
<td>Purslane (Portulaca oleracea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stripped Maple (Acer pensylvanicum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oak Nut? (Quercus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the fill, snails flourished, representing three species (*Mesomphix inornata*, *Haplotrema concavum* and *Anguissira alternata*). They are significant since they all have been scorched and killed by fire, indicating that the refuse pits were burned over periodically. This is very logical since they must have produced quite a stench.

All the seeds were carbonized except for the black raspberry and elderberry seeds. This may be explained by the fact that when one con-
sumes these berries, the seeds are also ingested. When they are eliminated as human waste, their encasement within the fecal remains would have protected them from the periodic burnings of the features. So, in addition to functioning as waste disposal pits, they also were used on occasion as latrines.

The domesticated plants are those that one would normally expect to encounter in an archeological site of this period. The frequency of the seeds may indicate the relative importance of the crops grown at Hannas Town. Wheat is most abundant, followed by oats, rye, buckwheat, and corn. Flax, of course, was the main fiber used for the making of clothing on the frontier. This is the same sequence that Lemon ascribed to southeastern Pennsylvania between 1740 and 1790. The most dominant of the wild plants are the berries, which may have been collected from nearby patches for food, while the remainder of the wild plants represent seeds that were naturally introduced into the pits by wind. Pigweed, ragweed, and lambsquarter were probably growing at the edge of the pits in the disturbed soil and the maplekeys were likely blown in from a nearby tree. The chicken egg shells were discarded after use, and the fish scales were the result of the cleaning of fish before cooking.

The plants suggest that the pits were open during the summer and fall, perhaps all year around. Since the historical documentation does not specify what was grown at Hannas Town, except that Captain Michael Huffnagle grew wheat, the above list gives accurate information on the plant foods that the townspeople were dependent upon, thus filling in another gap in the reconstruction of the subsistence base of Charles Foreman and his neighbors.

_ Interpretation _

Originally the two features were interpreted as storage cellars situated beneath the floor of Foreman's tavern, but due to the fact that they were burned over periodically, it is clear that they were used as refuse pits. Kirke Wilson always maintained that they functioned originally as sources for clay for the chinking and repairing of Foreman's home and tavern and it certainly appears that he was correct. After the pits served their original function, they were then used for garbage disposal.

The sequence of the use of each of the features becomes clear when both the ceramics and the coins are used in developing the chronology. Many of the ceramic vessels were composed of fragments from both features 4 and 5, the pieces from the upper levels of feature 4 fitting together with pieces from the bottom of feature 5. When feature 4 was almost full, feature 5 was beginning to receive refuse. The coins also reinforce this interpretation since the last dated coin in feature 4 is dated 1773 and the last one in feature 5 is 1787, pointing to the fact that feature 4 dates earlier than feature 5. The presence of creamware in both pits indicates a post-1770 and the pearlware a post-1780 date for their use. The absence of the United States coins dating to after 1793, suggests a time period of ten years or so when the features were functioning. The historical documentation has provided us with a date of 1790 when the Foremans were residing in Salem Township, on land that they had bought in 1788. Feature 4 was in use, then, sometime between 1780 and 1785, and feature 5 between 1785 and 1790. It is difficult to determine how long they were in use, but the scarcity of coins in the United States during this period suggests that they were used for a considerable time in order to accumulate the variety and number of coins that were recovered. It must also be remembered that the features contained at least a foot more of refuse which has since been destroyed by deep-bottom plowing. This means that almost one-third of their contents has been distributed throughout the topsoil in the immediate area of the pits. The ceramic percentages and coins from the plow zone, as indicated on the ceramic percentage list, are consistent with those of the features. Feature 5 was the last garbage pit that Foreman used as indicated by the presence of the Connecticut cents of 1786 and 1787, and he must have moved to his new habitation sometime between 1788 and 1790.

Conclusions and Significance of Study

The application of archeological methods to the study of history by archeologists trained as anthropologists is a relatively recent development. Archeologists have been traditionally concerned with interpreting and reconstruction of the cultures of prehistoric societies. Archeologically derived studies of colonial, Revolutionary, and later period historic sites are providing a wealth of new data on the history of North America from excavations. In addition, the excavation of historic sites is providing a proving ground for the testing of hypotheses regarding the degree to which artifact patterning in historic sites reflects socio-economic, political, and religious systems of past Ameri-
can populations, thereby establishing guidelines as to the validity of reconstructing the culture of prehistoric societies from artifacts alone.

This combined historical and archeological study has provided precise data on the material culture used by the Foremans in their everyday life and information on their subsistence pattern. The lists of china, earthenware, clothing, and other possessions found in wills and debtors' lists do not give the exact identification of the object that can be achieved with its recovery from a known site. We can now talk of creamware and pearlware, their measurements, decoration, and how they functioned during the period of their use. Historical records do not reveal much about the personal activities of the Foremans, but they do give us the all-important dates, property ownership, civil and military service, and tax and census lists that are not recoverable from the archeological record. The archeological material enables us to reconstruct what Foreman's table service was like, what he served at his meals, and gives us a glimpse at some of his behavior which must have included smoking, drinking tea, and taking an occasional drink. The wild animal bones from the pits indicate that he or his son Samuel did some hunting or purchased game. The excavations have also pinpointed the approximate location of Foreman's home and tavern.

If Foreman's home and tavern is ever reconstructed, the historical data will provide an accurate replica of the structure from the documentation of similar dwellings discussed previously in this article. The archeological data will show how the Foremans set their table, what they ate, what they drank from, and aspects of their dress. All this brings us closer to Charles and Sarah Foreman as real persons and not just names on yellowing documents.

Most of our knowledge of frontier America is dependent upon the historical record, much of which is incomplete, especially for reconstructing accurately the life styles of frontier groups. The archeological record from Foreman's tavern greatly amplifies this record, and, when combined with historical documentation, gives us a more precise reconstruction of the material culture, subsistence, political, religious, and socio-cultural organizations of one frontier household and business during the Revolutionary period.