IV. EXCAVATION RESULTS

LANDSCAPE HISTORY

The project area consisted of the grounds of the Lee-Fendall House, measuring 156x128 feet, less the standing house itself and the existing twentieth-century privy. The remainder of the property (the garden) measures about 112x128 feet. The modern Lee-Fendall property is the same size as the lot purchased by Philip Richard Fendall in 1784. The property boundaries were expanded in the early twentieth century by the Downham family to include the entire south side of Oronoco Street between Washington and Asaph streets. By 1937, when the property was sold to Myrta and John L. Lewis, the original boundaries had been restored.

The late twentieth-century period is very distinct in the stratigraphy of the site (see box, right). The existing surface of the Lee-Fendall House garden is at 49 to 51 feet above mean sea level (amsl). The highest elevations in the garden are in the north and west sections, sloping gradually down toward the south and east. The brick walkways, lawn, and planting beds installed during the 1976 garden redesign are all clearly visible. Beneath this twentieth-century ground surface is buried grayish brown to brown silt loam topsoil. This surface is only a couple of inches below the current grade and likely represents the ground surface of the garden during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Beneath this buried topsoil is a thick layer of mixed olive yellow and brown fill. The top of the fill deposit sits at approximately 48.30 to 49.70 feet amsl. It ranges in thickness from 0.2 foot in the west and center of the garden to 0.5 foot in the east and south portions of the property. It is rich with late eighteenth- to mid-nineteenth-century artifacts. The fill was likely imported by Louis Cazenove in 1850 to raise and level the yard surface to design his pleasure garden. The presence of so much late eighteenth- to early nineteenth-century cultural material suggests that Cazenove imported the nearby yard soil from either a neighbor or some other location within the City of Alexandria. Underneath the fill deposit is a layer of brown silt loam that represents a buried ground surface dating to when the Fendall family purchased the property in 1784 to Edmund J. Lee’s death in 1843. The top of this historic ground surface lies from 0.8 to 1.0 foot below the current grade of the modern garden. Beneath this layer sits sterile brownish yellow to olive yellow silty clay subsoil. The top of subsoil was identified at approximately 47 feet amsl in the south half of the garden and 48 feet amsl in the north.

EXCAVATION OVERVIEW

The archaeological excavations at the Lee-Fendall House Garden showed that two buried historic ground surfaces exist across the project area. The earliest historic surface dates to the Fendall and Lee families’ occupations of the property dating to 1785 through 1843. A later historic surface was also identified, which dates to the Cazenove redesign and ownership of the property from 1850 to 1870. During the 2010 excavations 11 trenches, 1.5 to 2.0 feet wide, were dug into the historic-era soils (Figure 18). Added to these were six 3x3-foot test units and 21 1.5-foot-square shovel tests. In all, over 280 square feet of the Lee-Fendall House Garden was excavated in.
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FIGURE 18: Plan of Testing and Features at the Lee Fendall Garden

SOURCE: Carvalho & Good, PLLC 2010
In addition to the historic surfaces, 27 features were identified (Table 3). All of the features were excavated by hand. Of the 27 features, nine were root stains, rodent burrows, or fill deposits. Two of the features appeared to be modern mechanically excavated trenches, and four

Table 3: Feature List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEA. NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
<th>TOP/BASAL ELEVATIONS (feet amsl)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Linear brick and mortar deposit, 5.5x3.0 feet, rectangular</td>
<td></td>
<td>Test Units 2 and 15, Trench 3</td>
<td>Concentration of architectural debris associated with early twentieth-century construction of the brick wall along property’s south boundary.</td>
<td>48.59 48.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fieldstone foundation</td>
<td>Mid-nineteenth century</td>
<td>Test Unit 1</td>
<td>Southwest corner foundation for circa 1865 hospital “deadhouse,” likely served earlier as garden outbuilding.</td>
<td>48.81 47.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rodent hole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trench 1-Unit 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48.44 48.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Possible postmold, 0.55x0.55 foot, rectangular</td>
<td>Twentieth century</td>
<td>Trench 1-Unit 11</td>
<td>Remains of a tent support used during weddings in the garden.</td>
<td>49.91 49.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rodent run</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trench 1-Unit 11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49.81 49.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Root stain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trench 1-Unit 6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48.69 48.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Part of historic ground surface</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trench 1-Unit 6</td>
<td>Initially identified as a feature but later determined to be part of late eighteenth-/early nineteenth-century ground surface.</td>
<td>48.59 48.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Root stain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trench 1-Unit 11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49.56 49.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rodent run</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trench 1-Unit 11</td>
<td>Feature 5 overlies Feature 9. Likely part of the same feature.</td>
<td>49.66 49.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Root stain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trench 1-Unit 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.01 49.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sandy fill deposit</td>
<td>Mid-nineteenth century</td>
<td>Trench 2-Unit 16</td>
<td>Fill deposit associated with leveling of garden around 1850.</td>
<td>48.96 48.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Shallow circular depression, 0.65x0.65 foot, possible postmold</td>
<td>Late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Trench 2-Unit 16</td>
<td>Possible post associated with a wood-frame dwelling identified on 1796 assurance map, spatially related to Features 19 and 20.</td>
<td>48.66 48.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Brick rubble foundation of garden walk, 45x6 feet</td>
<td>Mid-nineteenth century</td>
<td>Trenches 4 and 6 Units 18 and 19, Shovel Tests 3, 4, and 8</td>
<td>Remains of 1850 garden walk along north edge of garden, spatially related to Features 16 and 26.</td>
<td>49.86 48.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Possible planting bed</td>
<td>Mid-nineteenth century</td>
<td>Trenches 4 and 6</td>
<td>Former planting bed for circa 1850 pleasure garden. Spatially related to Feature 15.</td>
<td>49.56 49.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Possible planting bed, 18x2 feet</td>
<td>Mid-nineteenth century</td>
<td>Trench 5</td>
<td>Former planting bed for circa 1850 pleasure garden. Spatially related to Feature 14.</td>
<td>49.46 48.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEA. NO.</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
<td>TOP/BASAL ELEVATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FEET AMSL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brick rubble foundation of garden walk</td>
<td>Mid-nineteenth century</td>
<td>Trench 5</td>
<td>Remains of the 1850 garden walk along the north edge of the garden, spatially related to Features 13 and 26.</td>
<td>49.76 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Possible postmold, 0.9x0.35 foot, rectangular</td>
<td>Twentieth century</td>
<td>Trench 6</td>
<td>Located in twentieth-century fill deposit (Feature 24). Probably associated with Features 18 and 23.</td>
<td>49.76 49.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Possible postmold, 0.55x0.4 foot, rectangular</td>
<td>Twentieth century</td>
<td>Trench 6</td>
<td>Located in twentieth-century fill deposit (Feature 25). Probably associated with Features 17 and 23.</td>
<td>49.76 49.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Shallow circular depression, 0.65x0.65 foot, possible postmold</td>
<td>Late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Trench 2-Unit 17</td>
<td>Possible post associated with a wood-frame dwelling identified on the 1796 assurance map, spatially related to Features 12 and 20.</td>
<td>48.66 48.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Shallow circular depression, 0.65x0.65 foot, possible postmold</td>
<td>Late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Trench 2-Unit 17</td>
<td>Possible post associated with a wood-frame dwelling identified in the 1796 assurance map, spatially related to Features 12 and 19.</td>
<td>48.66 48.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Irregularly shaped; possible rodent burrow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Trench 2-Unit 17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48.26 48.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Irregularly shaped; possible rodent burrow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Trench 2-Unit 17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48.46 48.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Possible postmold, 0.55x0.4 foot, rectangular</td>
<td>Twentieth century</td>
<td>Trench 6</td>
<td>Probably associated with Features 17 and 18. May be associated with tent supports used during weddings in the Lee-Fendall garden.</td>
<td>49.26 49.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Modern mechanically excavated trench</td>
<td>Twentieth Century</td>
<td>Trench 6</td>
<td>Deep trench containing historic artifacts and modern plastic and Styrofoam.</td>
<td>50.01 48.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Modern mechanically excavated trench</td>
<td>Twentieth Century</td>
<td>Trench 6</td>
<td>Deep trench containing historic artifacts and modern plastic and Styrofoam.</td>
<td>50.16 48.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Brick rubble foundation of garden walk</td>
<td>Mid-nineteenth century</td>
<td>Trench 9  Unit 20</td>
<td>Remains of the 1850 garden walk along the east and south edges of the garden, spatially related to Features 13 and 16. 75x3 feet</td>
<td>49.43 48.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Builder’s trench for garden walk</td>
<td>Mid-nineteenth century</td>
<td>Trench 9  Unit 20</td>
<td>Builder’s trench for the construction of the garden walk, appears to be spatially related to Feature 26</td>
<td>49.13 48.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were twentieth-century postmolds probably associated with tent supports used during weddings at the Lee-Fendall garden. One feature appears to part of the buried historic ground surface. The remaining 11 features appear to be related to the historic house garden designed by Louis Cazenove in 1850.

The most important finds are:

- the remains of the former circa 1850 garden walk, which extended at least along the north, east, and south perimeters of the garden;
- the corner of a fieldstone foundation of an outbuilding related to the circa 1850 garden and repurposed as a “deadhouse” during the Civil War when the Lee-Fendall House served as a Union military hospital;
- a garden planting bed, likely associated with the circa 1850 garden;
- more than 2,300 artifacts, the majority dating to the early to mid-nineteenth century.

**Analytical Units**

Although all of the material excavated during the study is from the same property, it nonetheless falls into several spatial and temporal groupings. To organize the analysis and discussion of the material, several Analytical Units (AU) have therefore been defined (Table 4). Each AU corresponds either to an area of the site or to a group of related features, such as the brick walkway. In essence, AUs are formal devices to combine information from discrete excavation contexts associated with the principal historical events that shaped the archaeological record.

**Table 4: Summary of Analytical Units (AU)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AU</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION, DATING, HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION</th>
<th>LOCATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Circa 1784-1843 Ground Surface</td>
<td>Shovel Tests 1, 5, 9, 17, and 19 Units 2, 3, 16, and 17 Trench 7, 8, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buried historic ground surface found across the yard that appears to date to the occupation of the property by the Fendall and Lee families prior to 1843.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Fill Deposit and Topsoil Associated with Circa 1850-1870 Garden Regrading</td>
<td>Shovel Tests 1, 2, 3, 9, 13, and 17-19 Units 1-7, 10, 12, and 16-19 Trench 7, 8, 10, and 11 Feature 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local fill deposit and topsoil imported to the site by Louis Cazenove for the purpose of regrading the yard to construct his pleasure garden.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pleasure Garden Topsoil</td>
<td>Shovel Tests 3, 13, 18, and 19 Units 2, 5, 7, 9-11, 16, 17, and 20 Trench 4-7 Features 13, 16, 26, and 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The late nineteenth-century ground surface associated with the garden following Louis Cazenove’s renovation of the yard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Garden Walk</td>
<td>Features 14 and 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brick rubble bed associated with the circa 1850 garden designed by Louis Cazenove.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Historic Planting Bed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A soil deposit located adjacent to the garden walk, possibly associated with the circa 1850 garden designed by Louis Cazenove.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Various criteria were used to define analytical units, including spatial proximity, similarity of feature form, similarity of soil characteristics, stratigraphic relationships, and deposit dates. The greatest analytical attention was focused on the interpretation of deposits that could be most clearly associated with the site’s primary period of significance (1850 to 1870).

**STUDY RESULTS**

**Analytical Unit A: Circa 1784 to 1843 Ground Surface**

Excavation of three trenches and four test units at the Lee-Fendall House Garden revealed a buried historic ground surface lying approximately 1 foot beneath the modern grade. The soil from the circa 1784-1843 surface consisted of brown (10YR 4/3) silty clay loam. Five shovel tests were also dug to this level. The excavation produced an assortment of artifacts that date to the occupation of the site by the Fendall (1784-1827) and Lee (1828-1843) families.

Like the modern garden, this late eighteenth- to early nineteenth-century ground surface is not entirely even. The grade is highest in the north and west halves of the property at approximately 49.70 feet amsl. The ground surface descends gradually to the south and east, bottoming out at approximately 47.80 feet amsl.

From the various units, trenches, and shovel tests excavated across the site, 189 artifacts were collected (Table 5). This material spans the period from the late eighteenth through the early nineteenth centuries. Of the ceramics recovered, the majority were manufactured before 1840 (Figure 19). Pearlware (1775-1840) is the most numerous of the historic ceramics collected, followed by whiteware (post 1820) and creamware (1762-1820). Several pieces of a mocha dipped yellowware bowl (1827-1940) were also found (Figure 20). In addition to the ceramics, several other diagnostic artifacts were recovered. Eight machine-cut nails (post 1790) and 12 machine-cut nails with wrought heads (1790-1815) were found in the deposit along with a pressed glass button (post 1840). The *terminus post quem* (TPQ) for the deposit is 1840, based on the button. All these indications point to the deposits having accumulated over several years or even a few decades starting in the late eighteenth and into the first half of the nineteenth century.

During the Fendall occupation (1784-1827) the rear of the property was occupied by at least five wood-frame outbuildings (Figure 21). Based on the 1796 assurance map, these outbuildings included a two-story wooden stable, a wooden office building, a two-story wooden dwelling, a wooden pigeon house, and a wooden rabbit house. During the survey in 1986, George Washington University field school students and Alexandria archaeologist Donald Creveling identified a single posthole located in the southeast corner of the garden. They attributed this posthole to the wooden rabbit house as shown on the 1796 map. During the 2010 excavations small brick and mortar flecks were found within the buried ground surface in all parts of the yard. No specific concentrations were identified, and the flecks seem to be evenly distributed across the ground surface. This material likely derives from the construction of the Lee-Fendall House in 1785.
FIGURE 19: Selected Artifacts from Analytical Unit A

a) Oriental Porcelain, Underglazed Blue (Cat. No. 49-1)
b) Creamware, Undercoated, 1762-1820 (Cat. No. 47-1)
c) Pearlware, Underglazed Handpainted, Blue, 1715-1820 (Cat. No. 28-2)
d) Pearlware, Transfer-Printed, Blue with Stipple, 1800-1840 (Cat. No. 2-2)
e) Pearlware, Shell Edge, Blue, 1800-1840 (Cat. No. 83-1)
f) Whiteware, Transfer-Printed, Blue, 1820-1915 (Cat. No. 73-3)
g) Pipe Stem (Cat. No. 90-14)
h) Pipe Stem (Cat. No. 86-8)
FIGURE 20: Mocha-Dipped Yellowware Bowl, 1827-1940 (Cat. No. 73-1), from Analytical Unit A
FIGURE 21: Section of the 1796 Declaration of Assurance for the Lee-Fendall House

SOURCE: Mutual Insurance Company 1796
Table 5: Artifacts from Analytical Unit A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse red earthenware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottle/jar glass</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Olive green</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated (1762-1820)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vessel glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated (1775-1840)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-printed (1800-1840)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Melted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted, blue (1775-1820)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pressed glass tableware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell edge, blue (1800-1840)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated (1820-present)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Wine Bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-printed, blue (1820-1910)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated (1827-1940)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mammal, unidentified</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha (1827-1940)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bone, unidentified</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-paste porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-paste porcelain, embossed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Window glass</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental porcelain, underglaze, blue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Machine-cut (post 1790)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray salt glaze</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Machine-cut/wrought (1790-1815)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Albany slip (1800-1940)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined earthenware, misc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified metal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay tobacco pipe stem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Button, pressed glass (1840-present)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the 2010 excavation a line of three circular postmolds (Features 12, 19, and 20) was identified in Units 16 and 17 of Trench 2. Trench 2 was located on the south edge of the garden, perpendicular to the south garden wall (see Figure 18). The postmolds were identified at 48.6 feet amsl and extended into both the circa 1784-1843 ground surface and the underlying subsoil. The three molds are spaced at even 2.5-foot intervals and are approximately 0.65 foot in diameter (Figure 22). All three are over half a foot in depth and contain no artifacts. Judging from the care that was taken to place each post at the same depth, it appears that these were structural. Their small diameter and shallow depth suggest that these posts were not load-bearing piers; however, they are spaced too closely together to be considered as part of a fence line. Most fence lines built during this period were spaced between 6 and 8 feet apart. It is possible that the posts were associated with a wood-frame building, serving as secondary supports for the structure. If this is the case, these features were likely associated with a wood-frame dwelling identified in Philip Richard Fendall’s 1796 assurance map.
FIGURE 22: East Profile of Trench 2 Showing the Three Postmolds

Legend
A Very dark grayish brown (10YR 3/2) silt loam; planting bed
B Brown (10YR 4/3) silt loam mixed with brownish yellow (10YR 6/8) silty clay lenses; early twentieth-century surface
C Yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) loamy silt mixed with brownish yellow (10YR 6/8) silt inclusions; ca 1850 fill
D Brown (10YR 4/3) silty clay loam; buried late eighteenth- to early nineteenth-century ground surface
E Brownish yellow (10YR 4/8) silty clay; sterile subsoil
F11 Strong brown (7.5YR 4/6) very fine sandy clay loam; sandy fill deposit
F12 Dark grayish brown (10YR 4/2) silt loam; postmold
F19 Dark grayish brown (10YR 4/2) silt loam; postmold
F20 Dark grayish brown (10YR 4/2) silt loam; postmold
☐ Unexcavated
Analytical Unit B: Circa 1850 Garden Fill and Ground Surface

A circa 1850 fill deposit was identified across the Lee-Fendall House Garden. The deposit consists of brown (10YR 4/3) silt loam mixed with brownish yellow (10YR 6/8) silty clay. It sits atop the buried 1784-1843 ground surface and is likely associated with the regrading of the property by Louis Cazenove in preparation for constructing his pleasure garden. Since artifacts dating to as late as 1880 were found in the fill, it must have been close to the surface throughout the 1850 to 1880 period. Most likely it was capped with a shallow layer of topsoil.

Analytical Unit B was identified in nearly all of the trenches, test units, and shovel tests excavated across the house garden (see Figure 18). The top of the fill sits at approximately 49.7 feet amsl in the north end of the garden, near the Lee-Fendall House. Across the rest of the garden, the fill is found at an average 48.5 feet amsl with a slight 1- to 2-inch variation across the site. The level of the fill is also slightly higher in the vicinity of the black walnut and gingko trees in the southeast corner of the garden. In that location the deposit sits at 50.4 feet amsl.

The fill was imported to the property by Cazenove in order to level the rear of the lot for his garden. Based on the composition of the soil, Cazenove likely imported it from local sources in Alexandria. It consists of local subsoil mixed with more humic material, identical to the aforementioned underlying 1784-1843 ground surface. Furthermore, the majority of the artifacts recovered from the deposit date to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, supporting the notion that the fill was composed of redeposited yard soil.

A total of 859 artifacts was recovered from the fill deposit (Table 6). The majority of the artifacts were manufactured prior to 1840 (Figure 23). The early artifacts include 108 sherds of refined ceramic manufactured before 1820 (72 creamware, 36 handpainted pearlware) along with two pieces of white glazed delftware (1640-1800), a sherd of white salt-glazed stoneware (1720-1805), and a piece of red bodied slipware (1670-1850). Other early historic artifacts include 50 machine-cut nails with wrought heads (1790-1815) and a Connecticut Copper coin with the date 1788. Several prehistoric artifacts were also found in this fill deposit. They include two chalcedony flake fragments and a chalcedony late-stage biface (Figure 24).

The TPQ for the deposit is 1880, indicating that the fill deposit also served as the ground surface for Cazenove’s pleasure garden from 1850 to at least the 1880s (Figure 25). Common mid- to late nineteenth-century ceramics were recovered, including ironstone (post 1840), soft-paste porcelain (post 1830), and a piece of decal over glazed whiteware (post 1880). In addition, a plain small china button (post 1850) and a five-cent piece with the date 1867 were recovered from the level. Other artifacts recovered from the level include nearly 200 pieces of window glass, over 30 animal bones, and over 100 sherds of bottle/container glass. Some recreational items were also recovered, including 12 pieces of white clay tobacco pipe bowls and a pipe stem.

Cazenove Outbuilding/”Deadhouse” Foundation – Feature 2

The southwest corner of a Cazenove-era outbuilding foundation (Feature 2) was identified during the excavation of Test Unit 1. The foundation was discovered underneath 0.9 foot of garden
FIGURE 23: Selected Late Eighteenth- to Early Nineteenth-Century Artifacts from Analytical Unit B

a) Delftware, White Glaze, 1640-1800 (Cat. No. 51-6)
b) Stoneware, White Salt Glaze, 1720-1805 (Cat. No. 69-6)
c) Creamware, Overglaze Handpainted, 1765-1810 (Cat. No. 44-11)
d) Whiteware, Undecorated, Post 1820 (Cat. No. 87-3)
e) Pearlware, Shell Edge, Blue, 1800-1840 (Cat. No. 27-2)
f) Whiteware, Transfer-Printed, Blue, 1820-1915 (Cat. No. 69-3)
g) Pipe Bowl, Embossed with "T[D]" (Cat. No. 44-27)
h) Connecticut Copper Coin, 1788 (Cat. No. 62-2)
FIGURE 24: Prehistoric Biface and Flakes Recovered from Analytical Unit B

a) Late-Stage Biface, Quartz (Cat. No. 48-28)
b) Flake Fragment, Chalcedony (Cat. No. 22-2)
c) Flake Fragment, Quartz (Cat. No. 51-20)
FIGURE 25: Selected Mid-Nineteenth-Century Artifacts from Analytical Unit B

a) Soft-Paste Porcelain, Decal Overglaze, 1832-2000 (Cat. No. 89-12)
b) Whiteware, Decal Overglaze, 1880-2000 (Cat. No. 45-11)
c) Ironstone, Undecorated, Post-1840 (Cat. No. 1-3)
d) United States 5-cent Piece, 1867 (Cat. No. 44-22)
e) Plain Small China Button, Post-1850 (Cat. No. 89-24)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric Artifacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flake fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ottle/jar glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-stage biface</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceramics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emerald</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware (1640-1800)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Olive green</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated (1762-1820)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted (1765-1810)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vessel glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tumbler, fluted, clear</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated (1775-1840)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Curved, clear</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-printed (1800-1840)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pressed glass tableware, clear</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted (1775-1820)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Wine Bottle</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell edge (1775-1840)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponged (1820-1840)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embossed (1775-1840)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped (1790-1890)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mammal, large</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mammal, unidentified</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated (1820-present)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Bone, unidentified</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-printed, blue (1820-1910)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Shell, unidentified</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted (1820-present)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped (1820-1900)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Window glass</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain paneled (1830-1870)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decal-decorated (1880-2000)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Machine-cut (post 1790)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone (1840-present)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Machine-cut/wrought (1790-1815)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-paste porcelain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-paste porcelain (1830-2000)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Salt glazed drain pipe (post 1810)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental Porcelain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated (1660-1860)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clay tobacco pipe bowl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underglaze, blue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decorated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Albany slip (1800-1940)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clay tobacco pipe stem</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff salt glaze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Button</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray bodied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-pc. Construction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray salt glaze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>China (post 1850)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Albany slip (1800-1940)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White salt glaze (1720-1805)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Connecticut Copper (1788)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red bodied slipware (1670-1850)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5-cent piece (1867)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unglazed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Unidentified metal</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined earthenware, misc.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rivet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
topsoil in the southeast corner of the property. It consists of mortared fieldstone, 1 foot wide, sitting on top of the circa 1850 fill deposit (Figure 26). A large quantity of disarticulated brick and mortar rubble was recovered overlying the feature, suggesting that the brick may have also been part of the foundation but has since been scattered as a result of constant planting over the last several decades.

A systematic series of probes at 1-foot intervals tested the vicinity of the foundation to identify the presence of additional structural remains of the outbuilding. Based on those results, the outbuilding appears to have a 12x12-foot footprint (see Figure 18), similar to the “deadhouse” identified in the 1865 U.S. Army map (see Figure 9). Just as the U.S. Army used the existing Lee-Fendall House as a hospital, they probably used an existing outbuilding as the “deadhouse.”

After the war Sanborn Fire Insurance maps show a similar outbuilding, with approximately the same footprint, in the garden’s southeast corner. On the 1891 map the outbuilding is absent, however, suggesting that it was demolished sometime prior to that date (Figure 27). Later maps indicate that the structure was rebuilt, likely on the same foundations (Figure 28). Those maps show the outbuilding with one story and frame siding. A 1908 photograph of the garden (Figure 29) indicates that the building appears to consist of wood-frame siding similar to the weatherboard siding covering the Lee-Fendall House. The structure’s entrance is on the north elevation, and the building has a shingle-covered steeple roof. It is unclear whether the shingles were wood or slate because of the poor resolution of the photograph.

Sixty-seven artifacts were recovered from the soil overlying the fieldstone foundation (Table 7). Twenty-two ceramics were recovered, including creamware (1762-1820), pearlware (1775-1840), whiteware (post 1820), stoneware, and redware flower pot fragments. Other artifacts include bottle and jar glass, window glass, tile, and nails. Nails recovered from around the feature vary in type: three handwrought (pre 1820), eight machine-cut (post 1790), and one wire (post 1880).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware, undecorated (1762-1820)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Window glass</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated (1775-1840)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Handwrought (pre 1820)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted (1775-1820)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Machine-cut (post 1790)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wire (post 1880)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated (1820-present)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colored glaze (1820-present)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tile</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware, buff salt glaze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware, unglazed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unidentified metal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle/jar glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Bottle, brown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit Jar, aqua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Artifacts from Feature 2, Analytical Unit B

Archaeological Investigation for the Lee-Fendall House Garden
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FIGURE 26: Plan View of Cazenove-Era Outbuilding Foundation (Feature 2)
FIGURE 27: Lee-Fendall Property in 1891

SOURCE: Sanborn 1891
FIGURE 28: Lee-Fendall Property in 1902

SOURCE: Sanborn 1902
FIGURE 29: Detail of the Garden in 1908 Showing the Outbuilding

SOURCE: Alexandria Archaeology 1908b
Judging from the artifacts and historical documentation (i.e., the photograph and maps), the fieldstone foundation appears to be the remains of a garden shed or storage building erected around 1850. By 1891 the building had likely been demolished, but it was later rebuilt on the same foundations. That building is pictured in the 1908 photograph and remained in use until the early twentieth century.

*Analytical Unit C: Late Nineteenth- to Early Twentieth-Century Garden*

Overlying the circa 1850 fill and garden ground surface was a thin layer of grayish brown (10YR 5/2) to brown (10YR 4/2) silt loam topsoil. This surface is only a couple of inches below the current garden grade and likely represents the ground surface of the property during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The residents of the Lee-Fendall House during that period included the brother and three sisters of Mary Elizabeth Fleming. From 1881 until 1903, the four siblings occasionally resided at the house. One of her sisters, Myra G. Civalier, was known for hosting numerous garden parties on the property during the 1890s. The extent to which the other siblings used the garden is less known.

From 1903 to 1937, Robert Downham owned the property. Downham and his family resided at the Lee-Fendall House from 1907 to 1931. During that time Downham was a haberdasher and liquor dealer in the City of Alexandria. During the 1986 excavation of the house privy, a large quantity of liquor bottles and other artifacts associated with the Downham family occupation were recovered.

This deposit was identified in nearly all trenches, test units, and shovel tests excavated across the house garden (see Figure 18). The top of the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century deposit sits at an average of 49.5 feet amsl across most of the garden. In the north end, near the Lee-Fendall House, the average height is slightly higher, at 50.1 feet amsl. The level of this deposit is also slightly higher in the vicinity of the black walnut and gingko trees in the southeast corner of the garden. In that location the deposit sits at 50.7 feet amsl.

During the present survey 561 artifacts were recovered, representing all periods of the site’s occupation (Table 8). The presence of such a wide diversity of late eighteenth- through early twentieth-century material is likely the result of bioturbation from the planting and replanting of trees, shrubs, and flowers in the garden over the last century. The installation and removal of such plantings appears to have drawn material from underlying, earlier deposits into more modern soils. Root networks and rodent burrows observed during the excavation also worked in much the same way, thus further disturbing the context of this late nineteenth- to early twentieth-century deposit. The vast majority of rodent burrows and root stains excavated during this study were identified in this and the underlying soil deposit.

A small number of the artifacts recovered from this deposit were manufactured before 1840. They include 41 pieces of pearlware (1775-1840), seven creamware (1762-1820), and one piece of Westerwald (1675-1775). In addition to the ceramics, other early diagnostic material includes 21 machine-cut nails with wrought heads (1790-1815) and a single wrought iron spike (pre 1830).
Table 8: Artifacts from Analytical Unit C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceramics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Glass</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware, undecorated (1762-1820)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bottle/jar glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated (1775-1840)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Emerald</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-printed (1800-1840)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Olive green</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted (1775-1820)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell edge (1775-1840)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped (1790-1890)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottle/jar glass base (post 1904)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated (1820-present)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Vessel glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-printed, blue (1820-1910)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Finial, clear</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted (1820-present)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Curved, clear</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decal-decorated (1880-2000)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Curved, milk glass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embossed (1820-2000)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pressed glass tableware, clear</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware, undecorated (1827-1940)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wine Bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone (1840-present)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-paste porcelain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mammal, large</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-paste porcelain (1830-2000)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mammal, unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental Porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rodent, unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown salt glaze</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Window glass</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Albany slip (1800-1940)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, brown slip</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Machine-cut/wrought (1790-1815)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerwald (1675-1775)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red bodied slipware (1670-1850)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tile</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spike, handwrought (pre 1830)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unglazed</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Cotter pin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined earthenware, misc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clay tobacco pipe stem</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified metal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Marble, limestone (1850-1880)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Porcelain doll part</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the other artifacts were all commonly available during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Figure 30). Thirty-eight sherds of whiteware (post 1820) were recovered along with yellowware (1827-1940), ironstone (post 1840), and soft-paste porcelain (post 1830). Sherds of some utilitarian stoneware storage vessels and a large quantity of red terracotta flower pot fragments were also present in this deposit. Other diagnostics artifacts include a limestone marble (1850-1880) and two pieces of a machine-tempered clear glass bottle base (post 1904).

The most numerous artifact type recovered in the late nineteenth- to early twentieth-century deposit was bottle glass. Two hundred seven pieces of clear, emerald, olive green, aqua, and yellow glass were found. The quantity of bottle glass is an interesting discovery. This deposit
FIGURE 30: Selected Artifacts from Analytical Unit C

a) Whiteware, Transfer-Printed, Brown, 1820-1915 (Cat. No. 6-3)
b) Whiteware, Decal Overglaze, Post-1880 (Cat. No. 52-4)
c) Ironstone, Embossed Rim, Post-1840 (Cat. No. 79-9)
d) Hard-Paste Porcelain, (Cat. No. 80-11)
e) Clear Glass Finial (Cat. No. 55-4)
f) Limestone Marble, 1850-1880 (Cat. No. 59-5)
contained the highest quantity of bottle glass at the site. Since the Downhams were liquor dealers, it is perceivable that the bottle glass can be attributed to their occupation of the Lee-Fendall House. Other glass artifacts include a finial, nine pieces of clear curved vessel glass, and one piece of milk glass. Five pieces of flat glass tableware and a single sherd of wine bottle glass were also recovered.

**Brick and Mortar Deposit – Feature 1**

A linear brick and mortar deposit (Feature 1) was first observed during the excavation of Test Unit 2. It is located in the south-central portion of the garden, just north of the existing brick garden walkway (see Figure 18). The feature was located directly underneath the existing ground surface and cuts slightly into the underlying stratum (AU C). Eventually an additional test unit (TU 15) and trench (T3) were opened adjacent to Test Unit 1 to further inspect the deposit.

Feature 1 measured approximately 5.5 feet east-west across the excavated area and up to 3.0 feet north-south (Figure 31). The deposit was only 0.1 foot thick and contained large quantities of brick and mortar fragments. The fragments were small, measuring from 0.25 to 1 inch in diameter. Thirty artifacts dating to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were recovered from the feature: 24 pieces of clear, brown, aqua, yellow, and cobalt machine-made bottle/container glass; three pieces of whiteware (post 1820); one ironstone fragment (post 1840); and two sherds of window glass.

The artifacts recovered from the feature are indistinguishable from those found in the surrounding late nineteenth- to early twentieth-century ground surface (AU C). The high quantity of brick and mortar distinguishes the feature from the surrounding soil; however, small fragments of architectural material were commonly found across the site during the excavation of Analytical Unit C.

Feature 1 likely represents a dense concentration of small architectural debris associated with the renovation of the Lee-Fendall property around 1902. During that time a brick wall along the south boundary of the garden was erected and a nearby outbuilding in the southeast corner of the garden was rebuilt. Both construction projects would have produced large quantities of architectural debris.

**Analytical Unit D: Garden Walk**

Remains of Louis Cazenove’s pleasure garden walking path were identified across the north, east, and south edges of the Lee-Fendall House Garden (see Figure 18). A series of probes, shovel tests, test units, and trenches was used to identify the buried historic garden walkway and find its limits. Because the identity of the various parts of the path were not recognized when they were first encountered, they were given several different designations. In the north end of the garden, the garden walk was designated Features 13 and 16. The same path was identified in the east and south portions of the property and was designated Features 26 and 27. Once it was realized that all the features were related, they were collectively defined as AU D. The walkway was identified at a mean elevation of 49.6 feet amsl. AU B and D sit at the same stratigraphic level, suggesting they are contemporary with each other. Judging from the excavations, the
FIGURE 31: Plan View of the Brick and Mortar Deposit (Feature 1)
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walkway appears to follow the perimeter of the Lee-Fendall garden, roughly mimicking the path of the modern brick walkway.

Features 13 and 16 were identified in the north end of the garden in a series of three trenches (Trenches 4-6) and two test units (TUs 18 and 19) excavated in the rose garden adjacent to the Lee-Fendall House. The walkway consists of brick and mortar rubble deposited in a trench 1 foot deep extending east-west across the north side of the garden, parallel to the Lee-Fendall House (Figure 32). Overlying the brick rubble were several inches of pea gravel. The limits of the north walkway were further delineated through a series of probes and shovel test excavations. Judging from those results, the north portion of the walkway appears to measure approximately 6 feet wide and at least 45 feet long. The path runs east-west along the south half of the rose and perennial flower beds. Once in the flower bed, the path curves to the southwest and then appears to continue to the west edge of the garden. Features 13 and 16 sit atop subsoil; cutting through both the circa 1850 fill (AU B) and the underlying late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century ground surface (AU A).

Features 26 and 27 represent the remains of the circa 1850 walkway in the east and south portions of the garden. Initial discovery of these features was made during the excavation of Trench 9 and Test Unit 20. Feature 26 consists of the same brick and mortar rubble identified in the north portion of the garden; however, this deposit sits on a solid articulated bed of cobbles and fieldstone (Figure 33). Overlying the rubble is a thin layer of small stones. Feature 27 does not contain the same quantity of brick and mortar; rather it appears to be the builder’s trench associated with Feature 26. Like its counterpart in the north end of the garden, Feature 26 sits in a 1-foot-deep trench. The brick and rubble fill measures only 3 feet wide, but with the builder’s trench the width extends to over 5 feet.

The limits of Feature 26 was further delineated in the south and southeast portions of the garden through probe and shovel test excavation. The path along the east and south sides of the garden extends for at least 75 feet. Along the east side of the garden, the path runs parallel with the existing garden wall. At approximately 32 feet from the south garden boundary, it turns to the southwest, passing just along the south side of the gingko and black walnut trees. Beyond the black walnut the path continues southwest until it runs under the modern brick walkway. No other evidence of Feature 26 was found beyond the existing walkway, suggesting the original walk may run underneath the existing path in the south end of the garden. Shovel Tests 6, 18, and 19 were excavated in the northeast corner of the garden along with Test Unit 20 in an effort find whether the two sections of the circa 1850 walkway joined. No evidence of an intersection was found.

Artifacts from AU D are generally similar to those found in the circa 1850 fill and garden deposit (AU B). One hundred forty-three artifacts were recovered (Table 9). Large quantities of brick and mortar were removed from Features 13, 16, 26, and 27; however, none of it was retained. Still, architectural material was the most common class of artifacts recovered from the walkway. They include 41 machine-cut nails with wrought heads (1790-1815), five machine-cut nails (post 1790), two handwrought nails (pre 1820), and 23 pieces of window glass.
FIGURE 32: Circa 1850 Walkway In the North End of the Garden (Feature 13)
FIGURE 33: Circa 1850 Walkway in the East End of the Garden (Feature 26)
Only 36 historic ceramics were found, including 17 pieces of whiteware (post 1820), four of pearlware (1775-1840), two of ironstone (post 1840), and one sherd of yellowware (1827-1940). Other artifacts recovered from the walkway consist of 18 pieces of glass, nine fragments of animal bone (mostly sheep and cow), and two fragments of white clay tobacco pipe stem.

Table 9: Artifacts from Analytical Unit D, Features 13, 16, 26, and 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceramics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Glass</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottle/jar glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated (1775-1840)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-printed (1800-1840)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Olive green</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted (1775-1820)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vessel glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated (1820-present)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tumbler, fluted, clear</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-printed (1820-1910)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Curved, clear</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped (1820-1900)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pressed glass tableware, clear</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware (1827-1940)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone (1840-present)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-paste porcelain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware, brown bottle (1820-1900)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mammal, large</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mammal, unidentified</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unglazed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Window glass</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay tobacco pipe stem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Handwrought (pre 1820)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified metal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Machine-cut (post 1790)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Machine-cut/wrought (1790-1815)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation**

The remains of Louis Cazenove’s garden walkway at the Lee-Fendall House reflect construction techniques recommended in contemporary garden design manuals. One such manual (Kemp 1850a) instructs the reader to begin building a path by first digging a linear trench 12 to 18 inches below the grade of the garden surface. The manual further instructs that all but the top 3 inches should be filled with rubblestone, flints, coarse gravel, cinders, or any other angular and irregularly shaped substance. The placement of such materials at the base of the path facilitates drainage of water and allows for a firm surface to be placed on top. The manuals further indicate that the surface overlying the rubble should consist of fine gravel.

The remains of the walk identified in the Lee-Fendall garden consist of broken brick and mortar, irregularly deposited in curvilinear pits approximately 12 inches below the grade of Cazenove’s historic pleasure garden. Lying on top of the brick and mortar is a thin layer of fine gravel. The curvilinear layout of the walkway further suggests that Cazenove paid close attention to the garden design manuals of his day. The books indicate that serpentine, or curvilinear, paths are
the most desirable when laying out a pleasure garden, and that paths should not turn unless given a reason, such as a tree or other obstruction. It appears that Cazenove took heed of this principle. In the east portion of his garden, the path extends in a straight line north to south before turning abruptly to the southwest to avoid running into his outbuilding in the southeast corner of the garden (AU B, Feature 2). A similar southwest turn of his garden path was observed during the excavation in the northwest corner of the garden; the purpose of the turn is still unresolved as archaeological evidence was not found to suggest that a turn was warranted. Perhaps Cazenove used trees, shrubs, or some other planting or garden accessory in this area to make the turn in his walkway appear natural.

Louis Cazenove’s walkway likely extended around the four sides of his garden. Archaeological evidence of the path was discovered on three of the sides during the recent investigation. No evidence of the path was discovered along the west side of the garden. This is likely be the result of limited sampling in this portion of the garden as trenches were only placed near the southwest edges of the garden. However, comparing the known locations of the path to the 1986 probe tests by Alexandria Archaeology provides some indication of where the path might have been located in the west and southwest portions of the garden (Figure 34). The results of the 1986 probe tests showed high concentrations of brick and mortar in the north and south sides of the garden. These locations match perfectly with where remnants of the path were uncovered during the recent excavation. Additional high concentrations of brick and mortar were also found in west portions of the garden, suggesting that the path also extended through that area.

Aside from the location of Cazenove’s garden path, one other question arose from the discovery of the brick and mortar rubble. Where did Louis Cazenove acquire the rubble needed to lay the foundation of his garden path? It is possible that he imported the rubble along with the soil he used to regrade the back of the lot. The presence of so much mortar with the brick suggests that the rubble was once the remains of a demolished building in a nearby lot somewhere in Alexandria. Cazenove may have purchased the demolished remains from a neighbor and brought them to his property.

The other possibility is that the brick and mortar path foundations may have been from a demolished brick building already located on the Lee-Fendall property. Evidence of a dry-laid cobble and fieldstone foundation were found underlying the brick and mortar rubble along the east edge of the garden (Feature 26). Unlike the brick and mortar, the fieldstone and cobbles appear articulated and purposefully placed. Furthermore, none of the cobbles were found mixed with the brick and mortar rubble, suggesting that the two were not dumped in the linear pits during a single episode.

The presence of handwrought, machine-cut, and machine-cut/wrought nails suggests that the demolished building was likely constructed sometime between 1790 and 1815. Five wood-frame outbuildings were located on the Lee-Fendall property in 1796; however, those structures are probably not the source of the vast amount of brick and mortar that compose the circa 1850 garden path foundation.

For further insight into the history of improvements at the Lee-Fendall House, the City of Alexandria tax assessments were reviewed. There was a substantial increase in the value of the
FIGURE 34: Map Showing the Conjectured Path of the Garden Walk Based on the Results of the 1986 Probe Tests and the 2010 Excavation

SOURCE: Carvelho & Good, PLLC 2010
property in 1803, suggesting that substantial improvements were made to the property over the previous two years. These improvements might have included renovations to the Lee-Fendall House and the carriage house (located on the northeast corner of the property off Oronoco Street). Other improvements likely took the form of the new construction of one or more brick outbuilding in the yard of the property. These new outbuildings remained on the property until it was sold to Edmund J. Lee in 1828. That year the property value decreased, suggesting that some of the property improvements were demolished or fell into extreme disrepair. By the time Louis Cazenove purchased the house in 1850, the Lee-Fendall property was in very poor condition. As Cazenove began renovations, the materials of any demolished or partially destroyed outbuilding on the property were likely salvaged, much of which certainly would have been used for the foundation of his pleasure garden walkway.

Analytical Unit E: Planting Bed

A possible circa 1850 garden planting bed (Features 14 and 15) was identified in the north-central portion of the garden (see Figure 18). It was identified during the excavation of three trenches (T4-T6) in the existing rose bed. The possible planting bed is roughly linear and measures approximately 18x2 feet, running parallel to the north portion of the garden walkway (Feature 13). The planting bed consists of 0.45 foot of dark grayish brown silt and underlies the late nineteenth- to early twentieth-century garden surface (AU C).

Excavation of the feature in Trenches 4 and 6 produced 31 artifacts dating to the early to late nineteenth century (Table 10). Ceramics include some creamware (1762-1820), pearlware (1775-1840), whiteware (post 1820), and yellowware (1827-1940). Several pieces of clear, olive, aqua and solarized bottle glass were also found. Other notable artifacts recovered from Feature 14 include sheep/goat bone and a fragment of a clay tobacco pipe bowl.

Table 10: Artifacts from Analytical Unit E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>COUNTER</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPE</th>
<th>COUNTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceramics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Faunal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware, undecorated (1762-1820)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware, undecorated (1775-1840)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mammal, medium</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, undecorated (post 1820)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mammal, unidentified</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware (1827-1940)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rodent, unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-paste porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware, unglazed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Window glass</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined earthenware, misc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nail, machine-cut/wrought (1790-1815)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glass</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle/jar glass</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clay tobacco pipe bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive green</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unidentified metal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Solarized</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumbler, ribbed, clear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tumbler, ribbed, clear</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressed glass tableware, clear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Flotation samples were also taken from the feature for analysis, but no preserved seeds were found.

_Mechanically Excavated Trenches – Features 24 and 25_

The width of the possible nineteenth-century planting bed (Feature 14) was likely larger than what is presently represented in the archaeological record. During the excavation of Trenches 4-6, two mechanically excavated trenches (Features 24 and 25) were observed cutting through the north and south sides of the former planting bed (Figure 35).

The first mechanically excavated trench (Feature 24) was located between the possible planting bed (Feature 14) and the remains of the circa 1850 garden walk (Feature 13). It measured approximately 3 feet wide and extended to 2.2 feet below the ground surface, or 48.2 feet amsl, cutting through both the circa 1850 fill (AU B) and the earlier ground surface (AU A). The trench also cut through two strata of sterile subsoil underlying the late eighteenth- to early nineteenth-century ground surface. The second mechanically excavated trench (Feature 25) was located north of the possible planting bed. It measured approximately 2.5 feet wide and extended to a depth of 48.4 feet amsl.

Both trenches had perfectly straight vertical sides and a flat bottom, suggesting that they were dug using mechanical excavating equipment. The soil from the trenches consisted of a mix of dark brown silt and olive yellow silt loam fill. Ninety-nine historic artifacts were recovered from the two mechanical trenches. The materials are a mix of late eighteenth- to early twentieth-century domestic artifacts along with a moderate amount of brick, coal, and mortar. A large quantity of clear plastic sheeting was also discovered at the bottom of the trenches along with some pieces of Styrofoam, which became commercially available in the 1940s.

Trenches such as these are often dug near houses for the purpose of installing utility lines; however, no evidence of such utilities was found at the bottom of either trench. On the other hand the trenches may have been dug to remove obsolete utilities from the property. The VTHP has no record of such work ever taking place at the Lee-Fendall House. Without further insight, Features 24 and 25 remain a mystery.
FIGURE 35: West Profile of Trench 6 Showing Features 24 and 25

Legend
A  Very dark brown (10YR 2/1) silt with wood chip surface layer
B  Dark grayish brown (10YR 4/2) silt
C  Brownish yellow (10YR 6/6) silty clay loam
D  Brown (10YR 4/3) silt loam mixed with brownish yellow (10YR 6/6) silt loam with brick and charcoal
E  Olive yellow (2.5Y 6/6) silt
F  Brownish yellow (10YR 6/8) silty clay loam
F13 Dark grayish brown (10YR 4/2) silt; Feature 13 ca 1850 walk
F14 Dark grayish brown (10YR 4/2) silt; Feature 14 possible planting bed
F24 Dark brown (10YR 3/3) silt mixed with olive yellow (2.5Y 6/8) silt loam with brick, mortar, and charcoal; mechanically excavated trench
F25 Dark brown (10YR 3/3) silt mixed with olive yellow (2.5Y 6/8) silt loam with brick, mortar, and charcoal; mechanically excavated trench

Brick