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The “slave village” occupies an important place in New World plantation archaeology, though one in which the variation of experience and the internal social organization have yet to be thoroughly addressed. Through archaeological investigation, this dissertation explores the social dynamics and institutions created by enslaved people to negotiate their domestic circumstances.

In many plantation settings, enslaved people lived in dedicated villages or the rear-yards of plantation houses. Their domestic boundaries were prescribed, but the life they created within those boundaries was by and large a product of their own sense of sociability, domesticity, and ingenuity. The ways in which people created, divided, and decided on the everyday tasks of life, and positioned themselves in relation to others, reveals much about the domestic strategies they created to navigate and negotiate the conditions of enslavement.

I develop this research through an archaeological investigation of three related sites in northern Jamaica. Each site represents domestic spaces of enslaved people tied to Good Hope estate, a 2000-acre sugar plantation that operated from the mid 18th through the early 19th century. Upwards of 500 enslaved people labored at Good Hope at any one time, living between these three separate sites. While most of the enslaved labor force lived in a central primary village, the second smaller village and the urban quarters housed the plantation’s enslaved domestic servants. Archaeological investigation of these three sites provided the data necessary to understand enslaved domestic life as it concerns household organization, consumer choices, the implications of labor roles, physical and social mobility, and the degree to which the plantation’s laboring population organized itself into a distinct enslaved community.

This pursuit of community, as a social process, developed and maintained through everyday dwelling, guides this research. By revealing the “enslaved community” as constrained from the outside, though socially constituted from within, this dissertation develops methods, measures, and socio-cultural insight into how forcefully aggregated populations develop social institutions to navigate the often horrific conditions imposed from the outside. Together, this study demonstrates how slavery was an attempt to dehumanize, but failed in that project. Innovative and strategic measures allowed a systematically exploited group of people to reclaim humanity through a social world carved out by and for enslaved people in the dwelling space of the plantation regime.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction:

“They lived in there,” Gus, a long time resident of the estate, told me, pointing to a 7-acre depression in the ground. This simple statement defined 90% of our knowledge of the enslaved population of Good Hope plantation in 2013. While one of the largest sugar plantations in late-18th-century Jamaica, written records tell us of its agricultural productivity more than the lives that went into it. The history of Good Hope and countless other plantations is recorded in account books, letters, and buildings. Together with these records, great houses, factories, warehouses, ruinous mills, and occasional overseer’s houses are all that remain of one of the most profitable enterprises in Atlantic World history. Yet behind each hogshead of sugar sent from Jamaica to Europe, were countless hands that planted, cut, carried, crushed, boiled, cured, packed, and carted “under the lash of a cruel taskmaster, [so] that the sons and daughters of a land of liberty might sweeten their tea at a reasonable rate” (C.F.B. 1818:214).

Under conditions of enslavement, life below the overseer was only half the story. Outside of plantation work, enslaved people labored to support themselves, their families, and others. Their domestic life remains a hidden dimension to our understanding of plantation slavery in Jamaica and elsewhere. In plantation villages, with populations ranging from several dozen to nearly 500, enslaved people constructed their own form of society within an oppressive slave society. Through their own small-scale agriculture, husbandry, household
maintenance, kin groups, market activities, and social networks, they charted both similar and unique paths to navigate and negotiate the conditions of enslavement. These social worlds, created and maintained by enslaved people, survive not in written accounts, but rather in the material record.

Through archaeological investigation, this dissertation explores the social dynamics and institutions created by enslaved people to negotiate their domestic circumstances. In Jamaica, as with many plantation settings, most enslaved people lived in dedicated villages or the rear-yards of great houses. Their domestic boundaries were prescribed, but the life they created within those boundaries was by and large a product of their own sense of sociability, domesticity, and ingenuity. The ways in which they created, divided, and decided on the everyday tasks of life, and positioned themselves in relation to others, reveals much about the domestic strategies they created to navigate and negotiate the conditions of enslavement.

As Gus pointed toward the former village, he asked what it was like. “How many houses?” “What did they eat?” These are the common questions of descendent communities today. On a fundamental level, this dissertation is about the enslaved people of a plantation, a region, and a time. It addresses the common questions asked by many local people today – did they raise animals, what did a family look like, what did a house look like, where are they buried, who did what job, what did the children do, how many people arrived on a ship, how
many were born here? In too many studies, these are the important facts that get
left behind.

From research aimed to explore my collaborators’ questions, I develop my
own questions that form the foundation of this dissertation: in what ways did
enslaved people organize themselves in plantation villages, what institutions did
they create to negotiate enslavement, and are “enslaved communities,” in fact,
characterized by community-level organization? This pursuit of community, as a
socially constituted institution developed and maintained through everyday
dwelling practices, guides this research. By revealing the “enslaved community”
as constrained from the outside, though socially constituted from within, this
dissertation develops methods, measures, and socio-cultural insight into how
forcefully aggregated populations develop social institutions to navigate the often
horrific conditions imposed from the outside.

Community:

The archaeology of plantation slavery has witnessed significant growth
since its conception in the late-1970s. Since the 1980s, the island of Jamaica has
emerged as a significant region of study, though one whose investigation is
based on only a handful of significant fieldwork projects (Armstrong 1990;
Within this community of scholarship, topics of cultural retention (Armstrong
1990; Armstrong and Hauser 2004), plantation organization and surveillance
(Delle 1998, 2014; Bates 2007, 2014; Armstrong and Kelly 2000), and market participation by enslaved people (Hauser 2008; Galle 2011; Reeves 2011, 2015; Bates 2016) have dominated regional archaeological studies, leaving much to be understood about the daily lives of enslaved individuals and the social worlds they created within plantation villages.

Simply put, the objective of this dissertation is to understand what it is archaeologists mean by “enslaved community.” Community implies a sense of coherence, commonality, or something shard, the exact nature of which is often glossed over by casual use of the term. Defining social collectives has been a mainstay anthropological inquiry, and yet “community” signifies a boundedness that is not understood to the extent of societies, chiefdoms, clans, households, lineages, task groups, individuals, and other social units.

Implying that a group of enslaved people forms a community by their common condition of enslavement might be a problematic organizational principle in itself. In casual use, the label “community,” and its contemporary moral connotations, masks many of the realities of enslavement. Moreover, a shared group experience rhetorically glosses the damages done to individuals. One resolution to this is an understanding of community as socially constituted from within, under physical and social constraint from the outside. These constraints varied by occupation (e.g., field labor, domestic service, skilled trades), racial status (e.g., “mulatto,” “negro,” “octoroon), urban or rural settings, and time. In many cases, different conditions of enslavement divided more than
they united, complicating a definition of community defined by the common experience of being enslaved in a particular time and place.

If not a shared circumstance, then what is community? Community has been defined in many ways, but the definition taken here stems from an interaction-based approach. I follow Canuto and Yaeger (2000:5) in defining community as:

“... an ever-emergent social institution that generates and is generated by supra-household interactions that are structured and synchronized by a set of places within a particular span of time. Daily interactions rely on and, in turn, develop shared premises or understandings, which can be mobilized in the development of common community identities.”

The question at the heart of this study is, did enslaved communities exist or is this concept a product of modern archaeological and historical inquiry? And if archaeology can uncover a social world among enslaved people that suggests a larger collective, what are the social, economic, and material relations among enslaved people that created such a community?

Two major themes help guide this pursuit of a clear understanding of community social organization. One significant theme explored across the chapters of this dissertation, as mentioned above, is the social implications of occupation, or one's labor role in a society. In plantation contexts, and for capitalist modes of production in general, the creation of profitable commodities depended upon the successful coherence of specialization defined by separate occupations. For large-scale sugar production, the division of labor could range
from 18 to 37 different occupations, all mechanically working toward the same end. At Good Hope alone, the occupational hierarchy included 27 different enslaved occupations. The role occupations played in shaping the body, routines, and domestic circumstances of enslaved people was undoubtedly significant, but for domestic circumstances, remains unrealized. Therefore, as it concerns the social world created by enslaved people, I investigate the question: to what extent did occupation shape differing, and possibly divided, conditions of enslavement?

The second theme explored throughout this study is social inequality. As a marker of interpersonal relationships, social inequality is an important proxy for understanding the complexity and organization of individuals in stratified societies. In this dissertation, I explore inequality on the household scale as one archaeologically visible signature of inter-household relations. The recognition of socio-economic status within and outside the household reveals much about the social organization of a given society. An enslaved society, as constituted at the community level, is no exception.

**Archaeology:**

How can archaeology address community, inequality, and other critical frameworks used in this dissertation? Through archaeological survey and targeted stratigraphic sampling, I approach a plantation’s enslaved population using two scales of analysis – the community and the household. In doing so, I
define and explore material variation between households, and compare this variation between three spatially segregated “villages” of enslaved people associated with Good Hope plantation. This approach allows one to tack back and forth between larger aggregations, and the social units that may or not define social dynamics on a larger community scale.

In many ways, this dissertation builds upon an emerging tradition in landscape archaeology, which combines the theoretical influences of post-processual thought, with the methods of settlement archaeology, and analytical approaches at the intersection of behavioral, spatial, and consumer practice (Varien 1999; Gallivan 2003, 2016; Norman 2009a, 2009b; Reeves 2010, 2011, 2015). Many of the questions asked in this study, concerning aggregated settlements, household organization, and the social basis of community will be familiar to those working in both historic and prehistoric contexts, perhaps in a more processual tradition. Yet when combined with a more humanizing body of sources, and a theory of dwelling born from existential philosophy, this approach works to transcend old divides in archaeological thought.

Organization of this Dissertation:

This dissertation is written in 11 chapters, organized in two parts. Beyond this introduction, Part I (Chapters 2 – 5) lays the groundwork in theory, method, historiography, and archaeological fieldwork for the analytical and interpretative chapters of Part II. Chapter 2 outlines the method and theory used in this
dissertation to approach the question of community. Specifically, I explore theoretical constructions of inequality, occupation, and dwelling as three overlapping theoretically considerations necessary to understanding community as a social institution. I briefly track the genealogy of an archaeological approach to community, before discussing the interaction approach taken here. I then connect these theoretical considerations to an appropriate methodology for addressing community at both the household and village scale.

In Chapter 3, I outline the historical background of the archaeological sites explored in this dissertation, with an emphasis on Good Hope estate and its place in Jamaica and the Atlantic World. I take the reader from house, to field, to workshops, and roads, walking she or he through the buildings and landscapes that gave shape to the plantation. After a discussion of Good Hope’s role within a network of nine sugar estates and two cattle pens, I provide a biographical sketch of John Tharp, Good Hope’s Anglo-Jamaican proprietor from 1767 through 1804. Together, this historical background equips the reader with the necessary geographic and historical context to evaluate the remainder of this study.

In Chapter 4, I shift the discussion from sugar planter to enslaved laborer. I begin by reconstructing the slaving activities of John Tharp using archival records, documented voyages, and Jamaican advertisements for the sale of enslaved people. I take the reader to the point at which people were captured, restrained, and brought to the coast through economic and political maneuvering.
between British ship captains and the West African elite. I detail the specific ships, routes, and port cities from which most of Good Hope’s enslaved laborers departed, before arriving in Jamaica. At this point, the reader will follow a group of enslaved people from port to plantation. The chapter then transitions into a demographic study of the 484 enslaved people that lived and labored at Good Hope in 1804, exploring the dynamics of age, language, race, gender, and labor that they encountered.

In Chapter 5, I introduce the three archaeological sites that form the empirical foundation for the dissertation. I cover the methods of excavation, site strata, artifacts, and chronology for each site. I provide site plans, context dates, and a summary of technical information that will be useful to the reader before moving to Part II of the dissertation.

In Chapter 6, I begin the process of reconstructing both physical and social characteristics of Good Hope's enslaved population from the archaeological record. I start from the bottom-up, defining the basic “household cluster” – a three-part unit consisting of house, yard, and garden. I explore the variation in housing form and organization, and the degree to which houses aggregate in distinct clusters. I then develop a series of methods for uncovering swept-earthen yards involving geostatistical analysis and measures of soil compaction, alongside ceramic size and frequency. I use these measures to define the nature of household organization within Good Hope’s villages. To illustrate these efforts, I collaborate with a local artist and preservationist to
develop reconstructive illustrations, graphically conveying the particulars of housing form, variation, and settlement organization.

Chapter 7 builds upon the findings of Chapter 6 to map and measure the existence of a material-basis to social inequality within Good Hope’s enslaved population. I explore the distribution of costly, non-essential goods in relation to household location and form uncovered from the previous chapter. Understanding inequality as a form of social complexity, I reveal dynamics and organization operating on the supra-household level. Ultimately these findings render distinct community forms of interaction among enslaved households in Good Hope’s villages.

In Chapter 8, I address the physical mobility of enslaved people within and beyond the village, the plantation, and around the region. I suggest that in the large-scale plantations of the Caribbean, groups in power used divide-and-conquer strategies to exert control over a large enslaved labor force. This was accomplished in many ways, but most of all, this was accomplished through the control of movement. This idea shifts the static nature of surveillance studies by exploring the infrastructure of movement throughout the island – Jamaica’s highly developed network of roads. Using Space Syntax analysis (Hillier and Hanson 1984), I demonstrate how the control of movement was designed into the plantation landscape in an effort to limit community organization.

Chapter 9 takes a comparative look between the archaeological signatures of Good Hope’s two separate, though contemporary villages. I look to
the record of architecture, investment choices, and indications of material status between domestic servants and the remainder of the enslaved population. In doing so, I uncover new insights into the lives of enslaved domestic servants inside and outside of plantation labor and reveal contradictions to popular conceptions of house servants as holding higher status within a plantation’s enslaved population. This provides an alternative view of consumer practices among enslaved people, which holds deep implications for understanding community hierarchy.

Chapter 10 continues with the theme of occupation by exploring domestic service at the urban extension of Good Hope estate – John Tharp’s Falmouth town house. I describe the methods and findings from my archaeological investigation of the town houses rear yard, where domestic servants from Good Hope periodically lived and worked. I compare these findings with Good Hope’s domestic servants’ village to demonstrate the difference between urban and rural enslavement. I explore the activities of urban domestic servants and the material ways they negotiated community boundaries. Chapter 11 serves as the conclusion to this study, summarizing the findings of this dissertation.

Together, these 11 chapters target the little known domestic worlds of enslaved people and various forms of life constructed and maintained outside of formal labor. The findings here reveal the enslaved community for what it is: not a homogenous entity, but a socially complex collection of persons, forcefully brought together as an aggregated settlement; a group that created and
maintained the social process of community under conditions of enslavement. These are insights that only an archaeological study of domestic spaces can provide. Though before this material record is explored, we must first lay the foundation of methodological and theoretical tools used to uncover this world.
CHAPTER 2: METHOD & THEORY

Introduction:


Theoretically, my project diverges from most of this regional work to build upon notions of dwelling as conceived by Martin Heidegger (1971) and Merleau-Ponty (1962), further theorized by Tim Ingold (1993, 1995, 1996, 2000), and considered within an interpretive research program by Basso (1996), Thomas (1996, 2008), and Gosden (1999). In this body of literature, I join a growing number of scholars operationalizing and theorizing interpretive notions of dwelling through data-driven, analytically robust landscape archaeology (Moore and Dekle 2010; Moore and Thompson 2012; Bassett 2015; Gallivan 2016). To this end, I argue that a dwelling approach provides a useful theoretical framework for understanding variation of experience in village settings, toward a better
understanding of types and levels of social formation that can be characterized as “community.”

Over the course of this project, theory and method became comingled. A dwelling approach focuses on the articulation of everyday aspects of domestic life; more so than any one practice. As will be seen throughout this dissertation, an archaeological approach to dwelling deals with the combination and coherency of tasks, and relationships between scales of society, more so than any single measure of social phenomena across a historical group. Therefore, method cannot be divorced from theory. Methods of excavation and analysis must be designed to tack back and forth between scales such as the household and the village, measuring variation at both levels. Likewise, a dwelling approach must consider how people orient themselves, not only *in-the-world*, but in relation to other groups of people. As Gallivan (2016:11) notes, “in this approach [dwelling], meaning is gathered from a landscape as people perform shared tasks that orient them to specific places and one another.” Ultimately, I suggest that uncovering how small social units (e.g., individuals, households, etc.) orient themselves to one another is most revealing of community-level social formation. These and other methodological considerations will be discussed later in this chapter.

Ultimately, the reader will find that three themes are addressed to understand variation of enslaved experience, and the ways this variation relates to community-level social formation from within a village setting. This includes a focus on *occupation*, or one’s ascribed or self-defined labor role with a larger
division of labor. Specifically, this dissertation focuses on the significance of enslaved occupations, the different experiences of plantation labor, and the affordances of one’s work as it pertains to domestic life and social position. The second and perhaps most significant interpretative theme woven throughout this dissertation is *inequality*. Inequality, in its various manifestations, occurs on many levels of society. While most studies of inequality in plantation slavery focus unequal relations between planter, managerial, and laboring classes, I focus specifically on inequality between groups of enslaved laborers. As mentioned above, these themes are considered together primarily in domestic settings. Therefore, the third theme of this dissertation framing these ideas is *dwelling*. I include dwelling as a theme because it is simultaneously a theoretical approach and series of interpretive focal points. A focus on domestic life, and the inherently social and socializing aspects of domesticity, is key among those. Considered together these themes of occupation, inequality, and dwelling render a more nuanced understanding of community. But first, a combined approach such as this warrants a more thorough discussion of its individual parts.

**Occupation:**

From the late 1940s through the 1970s, the study of work developed as a significant object of study for American sociologists and anthropologists. Prior to this movement, work as a concept largely remained within the realm of classic Marxist thought, and concerned the capitalist system more so than the worker.
The study of occupations stems from the idea of “work” itself as a social concept. Any need, however basic, is fulfilled through work either performed, divided, and/or assigned. In societies with long-term divisions of labor, many needs for work take the form of occupation, situating the working individual within a field of relations both inside and outside of that position. As sociologist Donald Treiman (1977:1) observes, “… occupational roles locate individuals in social space, thereby setting the stage for their interaction with one another.” This is particularly true for societies that organize occupations hierarchically, and ascribe prestige to rank within that hierarchy, independent of the individual in the position. This concept is known as an “occupational prestige system” (ibid.).

Each chapter to follow explores the occupational prestige system associated with plantation slavery in both implicit and explicit ways. In 18th and 19th-century Jamaica, enslaved occupations were allocated in rigorous and formulaic ways, holding implications that resonated in all aspects of an enslaved person’s life. As will be shown in chapters 6–8, this was not only a matter of direct consequences of labor type (e.g., the strenuousness of jobs), but perhaps more significantly, a result of the indirect implications of one’s occupation (e.g., time outside of labor, social contact/segregation, and physical mobility).

To enslaved people, many of the constructed divisions associated with labor roles had implications beyond the assigned task. On a large-scale sugar plantation like Good Hope, the division of labor could range from 20 to 35 different enslaved occupations working simultaneously. During planting and harvest of sugar cane, labor roles shifted, but the number of tasks largely
remained the same. Each occupation held slightly different affordances by nature of the work. Beyond the physical toll on the body, the indirect implications of different work assignments effected enslaved people’s time outside of formal labor in variable ways. It was this time, typically late evenings and Sundays, which most enslaved people devoted to subsistence, domestic needs, socializing, religious devotion, and household production for market participation. Simply moving between village, provision grounds, and the market was time consuming.

**Inequality:**

Inequality is dependent upon the process of *differentiation*. Differentiation is the process by which a group values, or makes relevant, perceived differences in a society (Ames 2007:488). Through differentiation, inequality is made real and perpetuated through a system of recognition by which perceived differences are unevenly privileged. This “behavioral expression of differences” defines what anthropologists distinguish as *social inequality* (Berreman 1981:8).

Inequality is a central component of all human societies, regardless of their scale or organization. Even in “egalitarian” societies, inequality exists through privileges based on age, gender, skill/ability, among other perceived differences. As such, what defines a society as egalitarian is not the *presence* of inequality, but rather the *implications* of inequality (Fried 1967; Berreman 1981; Feinman and Neitzel 1984). In egalitarian societies, inequality might equate to immaterial divisions such as prestige positions, access to spiritual
communication, and membership in specific labor groups. To the contrary, if a society’s inequalities equate to unequal access to necessary resources (e.g., food, water, land), anthropologists and sociologists classify this as a stratified society. Stratified societies, in this sense, have “social distinctions with economic implications” (Fienman and Neitzel 1984:62).

This dichotomy between egalitarian and non-egalitarian (i.e. ranked and stratified) societies is often oversimplified, leading to an essentialized picture of social organization. As Gallivan (2003:46) observes, societies in classification systems based on degrees of inequality typically “harbor considerably more variation than can be accommodated by social categories.” In this way, a major shortcoming of any totalizing classification of society is the often-meaningful complexities or variation highlighted in public, yet flattened at the household scale.

Archaeology offers a key body of evidence for deciphering the basis, implications, and variations of inequality in past societies (Paynter 1989; McGuire and Paynter 1991; Gallivan 2003; Wason 2004; Ames 2007). This is particularly true in stratified societies, in which material resources can be mapped, measured, and – most importantly – compared as social-economic expressions at different levels of that society. In fact, a multi-scalar approach to socio-economic variation is perhaps the greatest strength of archaeological inquiry to these enduring, and increasingly relevant questions.

Stratified societies, such as the plantation society of 18th- and 19th-century Jamaica, are marked by multiple dimensions shaping rank. Wealth, prestige, and
power are arguably at the core of this type of stratification (Weber 1946), the combinations of which are most revealing of the human experience of inequality. For the most part, archaeologists investigating stratified societies specifically study wealth in the form of property, possessions, or material associations, to infer the nature of prestige, power, and other social dynamics. This understanding of prestige and power, ranked by empirical measures of wealth, thus allows archaeologists to address status, or the ways in which prestige and power are attached to relative positions in society.

Most archaeological studies of plantation inequalities in the Caribbean and American South have focused on power relations (e.g., Delle 1998, 2014), rather than other dynamics of inequality. This has created simplistic class-based groups as analytical units for anthropological scrutiny. Within a Marxist tradition, this includes the elite, managerial, and laborer classes, which in plantation contexts, equate to planters, overseers, and the enslaved population respectively. However, these social units of analysis have effectively homogenized each of these pre-conceived groups, discounting their internal dynamics in favor of the relations existing between them. The inequalities that manifest between these three groups are made clear in historic records, with archaeological evidence providing little beyond independent confirmation of socio-economic gaps.

From an archaeological perspective, the internal dynamics of these groups is arguably far more revealing of creation and maintenance of social inequality and its widespread implications on the human level. The reproduction of social inequality, and its constructed divisions, is often a hallmark of complex
societies characterized by unequal power relations (Paynter 1989). However, power and inequality did not exist as a one to one relationship, and inequalities played out in small ways with large implications. Such was the case with the forms of inequality that existed between groups of enslaved people. Some had power, imbued directly through structural inequalities within the plantation’s occupational hierarchy, while others’ inequalities manifested in material status, attained through indirect affordances of labor roles (e.g., access to physical mobility and time outside of labor) and kinship networks (e.g., household size). Such is to say, in plantation contexts, social complexity existed not only in power relations between planter, manager, and enslaved laborer, but between groups and individuals within each of these categories as more fundamental inequalities. Understanding inequality and other social dynamics between enslaved people in plantation contexts, is one way I seek to understand community as a type or level or social organization among aggregated enslaved households.

**Dwelling:**

Conceived by German philosopher Martin Heidegger, dwelling is theoretically an existential framework for understanding the embeddedness of an individual in their setting. Heidegger coins this embeddedness as one’s *being-in-the-world*. Dwelling, I propose as a theoretical construct, bridges the dimensions of labor roles, domesticity, and inequality by making explicit the relationship between one’s *everyday activities*, their ascribed or achieved position in a society, and the social worlds they co-construct and inhabit. In this way, a focus
on the dwelling activities of enslaved people allows one to investigate the internally created social organization of a large group of people forcibly brought together under varying conditions of enslavement. Above all, dwelling provides a useful language (Gallivan 2016), and a series of focal points to render the social worlds constructed and maintained through practical engagement with one’s surroundings. Such is to say, notions of dwelling dissolve the contemporary boundary between the social and the technical dimensions of everyday life, revealing the highly social nature of practical aspects of domestic life.

Within a dwelling framework, I embrace Ingold (1993:156) in defining “landscape” as “the world as it is known to those who dwell therein, who inhabit its places and journey along the paths connecting them.” Deviating from the stasis of an earlier Heideggerian dwelling, this understanding of landscape observes human dwelling through the rhythmic motions and movement of everyday life, emphasizing a task or activity-centered engagement in-the-world (Ingold 2008). Archaeologically, human dwelling is therefore defined by the patterns of micro-mobilities – and their material signatures – that comprise physical and social “place,” as created, maintained, and negotiated by practically-engaged agents.

Adopting such a definition within the colonial realities of plantation societies, my project both draws upon and complicates contemporary narratives of dwelling by considering the constraints, control, inequalities, and active manipulations of dwelling practices rather than strictly narratives of logistical subsistence and place-based human ecologies. In doing so, I draw from the
relational notion of the “taskscape,” or “practical operation, carried out by a skilled agent in an environment, as part of his or her normal business of life” (Ingold 1993:158), to define and consider the plantation as a distinctive "enslaved taskscape." I operationalize this archaeologically by focusing not only on household sites, but the coherence of activity between residential quarters and formal labor roles in plantation production. Therefore, daily occupational and domestic tasks will become the interpretive foci, which will speak to the inseparably social aspects of daily "technical" activities.

To date, neither "taskscapes" nor "dwelling" have been readily embraced within studies of plantation slavery, and with few exceptions (De Cunzo 2004), historical archaeology at large. In creating a theoretical framework of dwelling in the plantation landscape, and defining a notion of "enslaved taskscapes," I am responding to criticisms characterizing dwelling studies as nothing more than the description of a "honeyed domesticity" (Sharr 2007:89 citing Adorno 1986). I will do this through an investigation of the differential dwelling implications for enslaved "tasks" imposed by the sugar plantation occupational hierarchy. Archaeologically, I suggest that this manifests in the material signatures of socioeconomic inequalities within the enslaved population, as embedded within the everyday motions, tools, and conditions of household and community life.

A concern for "dwelling" provides a different approach to a comparative archaeology. Expanding upon the ideas of a “taskscape,” I suggest a task-based comparison rather than a strictly object-based spectrum of social-economic condition. By focusing on the task, or activity-centered, baseline for comparison
between, for example, Good Hope’s two villages segregated by enslaved occupation (Chapter 9), we can unbound the so-called “social sphere” of life existing solely in personal adornment, objects for entertaining, and other items seemingly in the service of outward display. This is not to suggest that those items did not play a role; rather, they are but one part of a coherence of activity that defined lifeways within the village. This coherence of activity is best identified in archaeological evidence for domestic chores and routines in support of everyday life. As such, the range and intensity of domestic activities can be considered an index for time outside of occupational work, providing an alternative baseline for lifestyle comparison beyond social status alone. Together, I suggest that these concerns for occupation, inequality, and dwelling dovetail with one another, and render a better understanding of the socio-cultural basis to the collective known as community.

Community:

At the core of this dissertation the question is: what exactly do we mean by an enslaved community? Is community real – a lived social fact – and does it accurately define the collectives of enslaved people that once inhabited plantation villages? Since the early 20th century, archaeologists have defined community is several ways. Many of these definitions rely on ethnographic classifications that tie a people to a place as a socio-political, economic, and/or ideologically bound entity. Therefore, most definitions of community are inherently, and often implicitly, sociospatial (Birch 2013).
In their thoughtful work on the *Archaeology of Communities*, Canuto and Yaeger (2000:2-3) distill four archaeological approaches to community commonly employed since the mid-20th century: 1.) structural-functionalism, 2.) historical-developmental, 3.) ideational, and 4.) interactional. As with theoretical shifts in general, each new approach both built upon and reacted to the former paradigm.

Structural-functionalism provided an early model for understanding communities as both a social unit, and appropriate scale of analysis for understanding the systemic reproduction of culture (Murdock 1949; Arensberg 1961; Redfield 1955). In this framework, community was defined as “a co-residential collection of individuals or households characterized by day-to-day interaction, shared experiences, and common culture” (Yaeger and Canuto 2000:2). Fundamental to this approach was the acknowledgment of community as a collection of smaller social units, understood in explicitly *etic* terms. While commonly accepted in the mid-20th century, this approach to large, seemingly bound co-residential collectives had its genesis in late-19th/early-20th century sociological and anthropological concerns for social collectives more generally (e.g., Durkheim 1938[1895]).

As one of the early theorists of community, Bronislaw Malinowski shifted early discourse on community away from idealist, or psychic, terms and toward the operation, organization, and role of the collective in a systemic whole. His approach complicated Durkheim’s (1895:127) social realism that understood community in terms of a “collective consciousness,” a notion that unified individuals in larger collectives by way of thought, perspective, belief, other
ideal qualities. Through his participatory fieldwork, Malinowski understood community as closely linked to “village.” More importantly, as a distinct “village-community,” he used the idea of “community” to give socio-cultural significance to the spatial unit “village.” Among the Mailu, for example, he described the “village-community” as “the most important social division,” representing “real political, economic, and sociological units of the Mailu tribe” (Malinowski [1915] 1988:124). As a social unit, this situated the village community between the clan and the tribe, linking kinship groups to society. In doing so, he suggested that “the most important social division among the majority of native peoples” are as follows: individual, family or household, clan, village community, tribe (ibid. p. 120). This laid the groundwork for archaeologically visible manifestations of community as a type or level of social organization, “situated between domestic household groups and societies writ-large” (Birch 2013:6; see also Gerritsen 2003; Williamson and Robertson 1994).

Reacting to the static nature of this model, though remaining firmly grounded in its community definition, a historical-developmental approach emerged in the 1950s. Pioneered by Eric Wolf (1956) and Sydney Mintz (1956), this reaction “stressed the roles of external and historical forces in conditioning a community’s internal structure, arguing that distinct conditions would create different kinds of communities” (Canuto and Yeager 2000:2 citing Wolf 1955). Unlike the structural-functional model, historical-developmentalists accounted for both origins and change for community by way of outside forces.
While Eric Wolf is responsible for much of this direction, Sydney Mintz shaped the ideas of many of the anthropologists, archaeologists, and historians working in the Caribbean and/or African Diaspora for generations. Of particular significance to Mintz was the origin of contemporary peasant culture found throughout many rural communities in Jamaica, Puerto Rico, and other former sugar islands (Mintz 1959a, 1959b, 1969). Stressing historical contingency and processes of cultural transformation, Mintz drew from history, linguistics, ethnography, material culture, foodways, and the arts to map long-term change and continuity in Caribbean peasant cultures.

By the 1970s, his historical-developmental approach had matured to convincingly rebut explanations of Caribbean culture as African survivals (e.g., Herskovits 1941) through a model of creolization (Mintz and Price 1976). Influenced by structural linguistics, the creolization model sought and mapped continuities in underlying logic (analogous to grammar) persisting through material change (analogous to vocabulary). The manner in which multiple cultural traditions came together was a process of transformation anew, rather than wholesale transfer or acculturation. In this way, West African practices persisted across the Middle Passage, but not as a one-to-one transfer from Old World to New.

The creolization model was, and remains, highly influential to the study of communities throughout the Caribbean and African Diaspora. As it concerns the socio-cultural origins of community structure, Mintz developed a series of new understandings through the application of a creolization model. For example,
similarities in household organization between West African societies and those found in the Caribbean in the past and present were viewed as a creolized Caribbean creation conditioned by multiple outside influences (Mintz 1974), rather than a direct African survival (e.g., Herskovits and Herskovits 1947). Most significantly, the house-yard form, discussed throughout this dissertation (Chapters 6, 7, 9, and 10), was now understood as the "nucleus within which the culture expresses itself, is perpetuated, changed, and reintegrated" (Mintz 1974:232). This highlighted the extended kin group – and its material form – as the most important social unit in the creation and transformation of community dynamics.

By the 1990s, this marriage of community with processes of cultural creation became increasingly important for those working with both past and present communities. With the post-processual movement of the late-20th century, community became a concept distinctly tied to group identity. In this ideational approach, "identities, including group membership, are based in part on qualities that people see themselves as sharing with others, as well as criteria they perceive as distinguishing themselves from others" (Canuto and Yeaher 2000:2; see also Anderson 1991). Building upon functionalist definitions of a bound notion of culture, and highlighting distinctions defined by culture-history, community became a framework for understanding the in-group.

Archaeologically, an ideational understanding sees community as a social collective, in part, constructed and reinforced through common material culture. In this approach, community is an emic reality, highlighted by social, economic,
and political contingencies between past and present iterations of a particular historical group. Today, an ideational approach is commonplace for those working in “community archaeology” as opposed to an “archaeology of communities” (Canuto and Yeaher 2000:12), the approach taken in this dissertation. From an ideational perspective, the former approach, archaeology yields considerable authority in the historical, material, and geographical definition of community identity. Toward this end, the discipline can be successfully mobilized to support the social, political, and economic interests of historically marginalized or exploited groups.

In the late 1990s, archaeologists working at the intersection of landscape archaeology and practice theory developed a new approach to community. Borrowing from earlier ethnographic definitions, which highlighted social interaction as the primary basis of the community (Murdock 1949; Redfield 1955), archaeologists developed an “interactional” approach (Canuto and Yeaher 2000:3). As the research program adopted in this dissertation, an interactional approach “asks how people create communities through their relationships” (ibid.). This underscores community as “a fluid entity, constructed through the social interactions and practices of its members” (Murphy 2011:65).

As mentioned in the introduction to this dissertation, an interactional approach defines community as:

“... an ever-emergent social institution that generates and is generated by supra-household interactions that are structured and synchronized by a set of places within a particular span of time. Daily interactions rely on and, in turn, develop shared premises or understandings, which can be
mobilized in the development of common community identities” (Canuto and Yaeger 2000:5).

This dissertation adopts this definition of community to define, measure, and understand the collective by implicit aspects of self-organization on an inter-household scale. In many ways, this frames community as synonymous with community-level social dynamics. For a group of people largely silenced by the historical record, an archaeological approach is limited in defining ideational elements, or the emic perspectives of what it meant to be an enslaved person in this society. Therefore, uncovering community – if it existed – among silenced groups is a process of defining social units within aggregated settlements, and more importantly, the socio-cultural connections that form the basis of aggregation. Were they exclusively imposed from the outside, or did elements of community-level social organization emerge from within? This begins with an understanding of the historical context.

First and foremost, the enslaved community of a given plantation, factory, house, urban center, or region is by all accounts an “imagined community” (Anderson 2001). It is a historical collective shaped into a single image on the basis of modern perception (Horning 2000). Archaeologically, this essentializing through the label of “community” has only recently come to the foreground as a significant interpretive assumption, remedied by calls for multi-scalar research (Hicks and Hauser 2007) and the recognition of enslavement as a continuous and varied process (Nelson 2016).
Equating a materially bound village, or other residential collective, to a socially constituted community is a highly problematic and common assumption in archaeology in general. As Gallivan (2003:111) observes, “Often, archaeologists treat sites as communities even though community spaces as defined by residents stretch beyond a site’s boundaries.” Likewise, not every aggregation of houses is a community. This has traditionally misguided implicit archaeological labels of “community” as a historical fact, a universal unit of social formation (Redfield 1955), defined by its homogeneity, and bound by its archaeological residues. This “natural community” concept accepts the preconceived collective as a real, static, and otherwise “natural unit of comparative social science” (Isbell 2000:245).

Addressing enslaved life on multiple scales reveals underlying variation that is typically smoothed out when the community, if present, is assumed to be a natural, homogeneous collective. Therefore, moving from regional, to inter-community, to inter-household understandings of enslaved life, reveals the “slave village” for what it is, an “imagined geography” (Said 1979). While the practicalities of archaeology limit its geographic scope, socially constituted community almost certainly extended beyond the village. Many emic definitions of a given community, particularly indigenous communities, often included forests, agricultural fields, rivers, mountains, and other resource-driven or “natural” elements integral to their conception of their community (Basso 1996; Isbell 2000). In this way, the universe of interactions from everyday dwelling that gather the community as a social collective can be both human and non-human.
While perception of many non-human forms described as “natural” is limited to an ethnographic present or detailed written records, other forms are more approachable in an archaeological record. In the chapters to follow, non-human elements that mediate such interaction include consumer items, houses, yards, gardens, roads, and topography.

Today, community serves many important purposes to both the investigator and the identifying group that knows itself as a community. This dissertation looks to empirical understandings of community formation in the service of both contemporary descendent communities and anthropological archaeology in pursuit of community-level social dynamics. In this way, this study seeks to advance our understanding of the connections, conditions, and behaviors that define relationships between the nested social units that form what we call communities. As will be seen in the chapters to follow, individuals play an important role as actors within plantation villages, but the individual is complicated by archaeological evidence that reveals more significant social units in historical practice.

I suggest that this understanding of community, and the distinctions, divisions, differential experiences that defined an enslaved population as a community, will allow us to humanize a group of people systematically dehumanized by their legal status. This humanizing act will not be achieved through contemporary, or even historical, notions of group identity, but rather through evidence of historical interactions, innovations, and negotiations. In this way, this dissertation seeks to define a community by the social practices,
processes, and behaviors within, rather than the conditions that bind and define from the outside.

**Methodology:**

The theoretical scope of this project requires a multi-scaler perspective to understand the relationships between social units (e.g., households), and the various forms of commonality, difference, and social coherence that exist at the village scale. To simply study plantation slavery at one scale runs the risk of oversimplification. As Isbell (2000:233) observes, "Archaeologists often tend to excavate one household (or make one stratigraphic cut) and expect the results to typify the entire site," and in doing so, "cut themselves off from the sources of variation" that define “contrasting” households, wares, clusters, etc.. Therefore, sampling village sites at both the household and community scale is necessary to demonstrate the meaningful variation that might have articulated in dynamic ways to define community-level social organization. This acknowledges heterogeneity, more so than homogeneity, as the reality through which complex interaction played out between individuals, and between households. Together, this methodological approach questions if and how households created and maintained community, or if community is a false designation in this context altogether.

Much of my fieldwork between 2013 and 2016 was methodologically organized around a non-site approach (Dunnell and Dancey 1983; Dunnell
1992), combined, in turn, with targeted unit sampling. While the former allowed me to address the village (or community) scale, the latter provided information on the more quotidian aspects of household life, and how the household conformed or deviated from community-wide trends.

**Conclusion:**

To date, many studies of aggregation and community social formation have sought the *reasons* for aggregation, and ultimately, the “mechanisms through which aggregation is accomplished” (Birch 2013:11). The objective of this dissertation is different. By studying a large-scale enslaved population brought together by force within the institution of slavery, the horrific reasons are known. By shifting this focus, I seek to understand the social institutions and dynamics created from within situations of forced aggregation. In-group social organization is a powerful and archaeologically visible facet of the human experience. Understanding this within the context of enslaved populations and plantation villages is a largely underdeveloped avenue of inquiry. Through the method and theory outlined here, this dissertation charts one path forward to understanding the social constitution of community among enslaved people, and village-level societies more broadly.
CHAPTER 3: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Overview:

Good Hope Estate was established in 1744 as a 1,000-acre plantation surrounding a prominent bend in the Martha Brae River in Trelawny Parish, Jamaica. Under a land grant conveyed to Col. Thomas Williams, the property was cleared of trees, connected to one of the parish’s public roads, and developed with an infrastructure for sugar cultivation. In 1767, the plantation and its already large enslaved labor-force were purchased by John Tharp (1744–1804), a 23-year old Anglo-Jamaican planter who would later serve as the Custos of Trelawny Parish, and by the late 18th century, become the largest slave owner in Jamaica. Most of the plantation’s infrastructure and built environment as it exists today is a product of Tharp’s “improvements” to the landscape (Nelson 2016), with a particularly ambitious building campaign from 1790 to 1802.

As a resident proprietor, John Tharp yielded significant successes and influence, quickly becoming one of the island’s wealthiest landowners. His period as an absentee owner between 1792 and 1800, splitting time between a London townhouse and Cambridgeshire estate, was short lived after a marital scandal brought him back to Jamaica (Pearsall 2008). Minus these absent years, from the 1770s through 1804, Good Hope served as the place of residence for Tharp as he oversaw the affairs of his sugar estates and cattle pens in Trelawny, St. Ann, and St. James Parish.
By the 1790s, this included seven contiguous sugar estates and two cattle pens along the Martha Brae River in Trelawny, and two additional sugar estates in neighboring parishes. A probate inventory taken after Tharp’s death records over 2,800 enslaved individuals on these estates (Tharp Papers R.55.7.123.11), 484 of which were living and working at Good Hope estate (Tharp Papers R.55.7.123.2).
Following Tharp’s death in 1804, the plantation remained in operation under a succession of attorneys and relatives through full Emancipation in 1838. In 1840, Good Hope and two adjacent Tharp plantations were purchased by Frederick Robert Coy, an English-born sugar proprietor (Hart 1994). Coy employed both newly freed Jamaicans and East Indian laborers (Castello 1877), and in doing so, continued sugar and rum production at Good Hope through 1878. Between 1880 and the late–1890s, the plantation rapidly declined under the heirs of Coy, falling into a state of overgrowth and disrepair. In 1898, the property was purchased by Captain Alexander Oppenheim who converted Good Hope into a grazing pen, maintaining 300 heads of cattle annually between 1901 and 1908 (Ford and Cundall 1908). The property changed hands once again in 1912 to John F. Thompson, a banker and developer from New York. Initially using the land for logwood growth, Thompson would later revitalize the deteriorating property, converting Good Hope into an exclusive resort in the early years of the island’s tourism industry. The resort, known first as the Good Hope Dude Ranch then the Good Hope Hotel, operated from the early 1920s through 1960s, catering to wealthy European patrons, British royalty, and the island’s late-colonial leadership (Ogilvie 1954). In the 1970s, the plantation became a residence and private retreat. Today, Good Hope remains in private hands, and is currently leased for citrus fruit farming. Additionally, it is now accessible for heritage tourism and outdoor recreation to Jamaican and American clientele.
An important theme explored in this dissertation is the strong relationship that existed between social and occupational hierarchies in plantation Jamaica. In most cases, one equated to the other among the island’s planter, merchant, managerial, free artisan, and enslaved classes. Unlike vocations of landed status in England, social mobility in 18th- and 19th-century Jamaican was not determined strictly by birthright. Climbing the social ladder from the lowest free positions was a realistic trajectory on the island, and often achievable through the affordances of one’s occupational mobility. Likewise, and as will be seen in Chapter 9, a close relationship between occupation and status also existed among Jamaica’s enslaved population, but not in straightforward ways. Together, social mobility, or lack thereof, was a defining characteristic of the island’s society at the turn of the 19th century, and one that involved the instruments of landscape, vocation, material possessions, and the everyday tasks of domestic life.

Moving through the ranks to the top echelons of merchants and planters was a clear and accessible path to free white society. For Good Hope, as with most British Caribbean plantations, occupational hierarchy was a harsh institution constructed and tuned to the demands large-scale sugar agriculture. At the top, the plantation owner – known historically as a proprietor – directly profited from those beneath him with as little involvement in the daily affairs of the plantation. By the 1770s, approximately 1/3 of the island’s plantation owners were absentee proprietors, living in England or Scotland off the wealth generated by Jamaican plantations (Higman 2005:18). Among the largest and most profitable plantations,
the proportion of absentee ownership was far greater. While Good Hope was at the pinnacle in terms of size and profitability, it was somewhat atypical in that for most of its existence, it was occupied by a resident proprietor. This quality, in large part, determined the hierarchy of occupations among both the managerial and enslaved class beneath the proprietor (e.g., presence of domestic servants for a resident proprietor). Between the late 18th and early 19th century, this headseat was occupied by John Tharp.

*John Tharp:*

From 1766 to 1804, the ownership of Good Hope belonged to John Tharp (1744-1804), an Anglo-Jamaican planter born in Hanover Parish in northwestern corner of the island. The young John Tharp received his education in England at Eton under Edward Bernard from 1758 to 1760 (Ball and Venn 1911:195). In January of 1761, at age 18, he was admitted to Trinity College Cambridge; however, Trinity records indicate that he never actually enrolled for study *(ibid.)*. With significant inheritance in Jamaica from both his father and grandfather, Tharp opted to return to the island to begin running his sugar plantation, Bachelor’s Hall. Soon after returning, Tharp married into the ownership of a large and profitable sugar plantation, known as Potosi, in the nearby Trelawny Parish *(Tharp Papers R.55.7.122.(b).6)*. With this combination of inheritance, profits from sugar produced at Potosi, and spousal wealth, Tharp – at age 25 – purchased the nearby Good Hope estate in 1769 *(Tharp Papers R.55.7.122.(a).4)*.
Soon thereafter, Good Hope became Tharp’s place of residence, where he orchestrated a campaign of expansion over the next 35 years. By his death in 1804, he owned nine sugar plantations and two cattle pens in Trelwany and St. Anne, amounting to approximately 18,897-acres of wealth producing land (Hart 1994:25-26). Aside from the second largest landowner in Jamaica behind his friend Simon Taylor, Tharp was the largest slave owner on the island from the
1790s through 1804. Upon his death, this amounted to just under 3,000 enslaved men, women, and children across his pens and estates (Tharp Papers R.55.7.123.11; see also Conolley 2012).

When Tharp purchased Good Hope in 1769, the property had been successfully producing sugar for nearly two decades. Named and established in 1742 by Col. Thomas Williams, the plantation began modestly with 1,000 acres on one side of the Martha Brae River (Tharp Papers R.55.7.122.(a).2). By 1755, Williams had constructed a small framed great house on a prominent hill overlooking the river and original driveway to the West. He eventually willed Good Hope to his son, Thomas Williams the younger, who expanded the property to include two adjacent plantations, Wales and Lansquinet (Tharp Papers R.55.7.122.(a).3). Mortgaging Good Hope after this purchase, Williams fell heavily into debt and eventually sold the conglomerate of plantations to John Tharp in 1769 – a total of 3,089 acres (Hart 1994:13). To finance this £53,000 purchase (£3,375,570.00 or $5.2 million USD today), Tharp sold Bachelor’s Hall, his less profitable plantation in Hanover, and conveyed his wife’s partial ownership of Potosi to Williams (ibid.). At this time, Good Hope already possessed an infrastructure for sugar production and residence (Tharp Papers R.55.7.122.(a).4), including the small great house and a sugar boiling house – both of which stand today encased in Tharp’s 1790s additions. By the early-1770s, Tharp, still in his 20s, had built up the real estate of Good Hope to over 2,000 acres and expanded ownership and production to four neighboring plantations (Tharp Papers R.55.7.122.(a).7).
Through his new capital and new family connections by marriage, Tharp quickly began to build a transatlantic network of merchants, business partners, artisans, and gentry peers. This included dedicated sugar merchants with high commissions in the ports of London, Bristol, and Glasgow (Tharp Papers R.55.7.122.(o).2,3,6). By the mid 1770s, Bristol would become his most profitable export connection, where he dealt sugar to his merchant and industry advisor William Miles (see Morgan 1985). Expanding his products of sugar, rum, and beef to the internal economy of Jamaica by the 1780s, Tharp partnered with his
nephew merchant, Alexander Campbell (Tharp Papers R.55.7.125.2). Based in Jamaica’s port town of Falmouth, Campbell profited from exclusive partnerships with Tharp’s seven Trelawny sugar estates, supplying his plantations with both European and American commodities (ibid.). With the formation of Tharp & Campbell, an enterprise moving directly between Africa and Jamaica (Morgan 1985), this partnership eventually extended into the supply of enslaved laborers to Jamaica from the region of modern-day Nigeria. His slaving activities appear to have lasted from 1781 to 1802, at which time he supplied enslaved people to his and neighboring plantations at considerable profit (Hart 1994:23).

Following the American Revolution, Campbell aided Tharp in establishing connections to the newly formed United States. By the 1790s, Tharp was sourcing most of his construction lumber and imported provisions for his enslaved laborers from Lewis Simond & Co., a trading house in New York City, in direct exchange for the rum produced on his plantations (Barton 1826). Likewise, Tharp’s reputation for livestock was well known among the American elite. In a letter from Samuel Vaughan to George Washington, Vaughan informed the soon-to-be president that “Mr Tharp is going to send a ship to Marselles [Marseille, France] on purpose to endeavor to procure one or two [she-Asses], “to begin breeding a supply for the West Indies (Twohig 1987:91 [Vaughan 1788]). As a planter, expansionist, Atlantic world consumer, patron of British architecture (see Nelson 2016), and animal breeder, Tharp’s transnational connections covered the Caribbean, Eastern United States, the West Coast of Africa, France, and England.
In character and activity, John Tharp was typical of 18th- and 19th-century gentlemen proprietors in Jamaica, though atypical in his level of expansion, investment, and connection to both local and global Atlantic society. By the 1790s, Tharp owned the means of production for virtual every step of the transatlantic sugar trade. From salaried foreign merchants, to cattle pens, to personal slaver ships, to the very roads which carried his product from plantation to port, his level of self-sufficiency ultimately allowed him to become one of the wealthiest individuals in the British Atlantic world. In the year 1792 alone, *The Glasgow Currier* reported Tharp’s annual income from his Jamaican plantations at over £60,000.00 (Petley 2014:454). In today’s currency, with inflation, this equates to approximately £3,361,800.00 or $5.1 million USD annually. In the 1790s, his Jamaican-derived wealth was only exceeded by fellow Anglo-Jamaican, William Beckford, at £70,000.00 annually (*ibid.*).

A Plantation Network:

From the late 1760s through the 1840s, Good Hope served as the center of gravity for the conglomerate of neighboring sugar plantations and cattle pens that made up the Tharp Estates. Beginning with three sugar plantations in 1769, John Tharp used capital from plantation profits to build geographically and commercially connected real estate in Jamaica’s Trelawny Parish. By his death in 1804, this amounted to 11 properties, nine of which were adjacent to one another, lining the Martha Brae River. The nine properties included seven sugar plantations and two cattle pens, forming a larger network of sugar, rum, beef, and
timber production. This proximity allowed common, connected infrastructure, as well as internal exchange of people and supplies among the conglomerate in the service of specialization and self-sufficiency.

From Good Hope, two generations of Tharps orchestrated the movement of people, supplies, and commodities between plantation and port, and for his two cattle pens, between pen and plantation. Accounts Produce records reveal that Tharp used the 467 heads of cattle at his larger pen, Windsor, to resupply livestock to his nine sugar estates (Tharp Papers R.55.7.125.2), while he used his smaller Top Hill pen to fatten older livestock from his estates for local sale (Higman 1996:226). Archaeologically, butchered and burned cow bone found in Good Hope’s primary slave village – Village I – represent the majority taxa of the overall faunal assemblage (Ohman 2015a). This, and a lack of records indicating purchase or import of beef, suggests that older cattle from the estates were also used to provision Tharp’s enslaved communities.

The separate estates, although neighboring one another, took up a swath of land so large that it crossed several distinct environmental zones on the island. Whereas sugar production was concentrated towards flatlands near the sea, cattle pens were placed in marginal, hilly, and wooded lands deeper into Jamaica’s interior. Good Hope occupied a middle ground of sorts between these two extremes. Despite lacking proximity to ports, this middle ground at the foothills of Jamaica’s mountainous regions represented desirable conditions for sugar agriculture (Higman 2001). What it lacked in logistical convenience, it made up for in field drainage and fast flowing rivers, improving cane irrigation
while accommodating the elevations and velocity necessary for the construction of water mills – Jamaica’s most reliable energy source.

Finding the common denominators among Tharp’s strategies for expansion is clear. The settlement pattern of his adjoining estates, all lining the Martha Brae River, is highly focused on the desire for water energy. Each sugar plantation in Trelawny utilized an undershot water mill, taking advantage of the localized water velocity and the natural slope of the semi-mountainous terrain to channel a controllable stream to the mill via gutter aqueducts. These gutter aqueducts were roughly a meter wide, excavated directly into the earth, and lined with cut limestone blocks. The path taken by this system followed a gentle slope beginning at a diversion dam in the river and ending upon the mill. With his plantations lining the river, one after the other, moving progressively down slope from the mountains to the sea, Tharp combined this system into several larger gutter networks. Each plantation’s gutter relied upon the water supply and velocity from the previous uphill gutter. The largest of these was constructed in the 1790s as suggest by a keystone to the gutter dated 1796. The system began with a dam at Good Hope, and ran approximately 1 mile parallel to the river to power the plantation’s undershot mill. From here, the gutter continued under and above ground, running through a large tunnel underneath a mountain, over the Martha Brae River via a canal bridge to Lansquenet and Potosi – his two plantations downriver from Good Hope. In all, this system ran for 4 miles, though interconnected with a larger 7-mile gutter system.
A profitable plantation relied upon its connection to the coast as a gateway to the Atlantic economy. After cane juice was processed into granular sugar, dried, and packed, barrels of sugar then had to be moved to the island’s ports for transatlantic shipment. In 1771, John Tharp purchased 150 feet of riverside in the parish capital, Martha Brae, to construct a wharf for import and export to and from his three estates (Hart 1994:19). After building considerable sugar-producing real-estate between Good Hope and the coast, in 1775, Tharp began leasing even more docks in the port town of Falmouth (Tharp Papers R.55.7.122.(g).3). Approximately 7 miles from Good Hope, this Falmouth wharf was used in conjunction with Tharp’s existing wharf in Martha Brae through the early-1790s. In 1792, Tharp shifted all import and export to Falmouth, at which point he constructed a large townhouse overlooking his wharf. This townhouse is one of three archaeological sites investigated in this dissertation.

From the early 1770s through the 1790s, John Tharp amassed landholdings in Jamaica that amounted to nearly 17,000 acres. This number would increase in years preceding his death in 1804 to over 22,000 acres across two parishes.

Environmental Setting:

Good Hope estate occupies 2,000 acres of semi-mountainous terrain, comprised of large expanses of agricultural fields surrounding several miles of narrow river basin. Approximately 11.2 km (7 miles) into the island’s interior, the
plantation sits at the edge of the karst rolling landscape known as Jamaica’s Cockpit Country, in an area best characterized as a subtropical dry forest. The karst terrain consists of dramatic knolls and small bowl-shaped valleys, together resembling an open egg-carton-shaped landscape. The small deep valleys, referred to as “cockpits,” give the region its name.

The plantation is centered on a fast moving section of the Martha Brae River. This provided three major advantages to sugar cultivation. As with all but one of Tharp’s sugar estates, the plantation relied upon the river to power its undershot water mill. During harvest the mill ran continuously. Enslaved laborers fed cut sugar cane through the mill’s vertical rollers, pressing the sugar juice from the stalk. Due to the unreliability of wind and the physical demand on livestock, waterpower exceeded all other energy sources for mill technology. After cutting, sugar cane must be pressed within hours before the juice begins to spoil. Therefore, a centrally located water mill with field radiating out provided the optimal model for cane cultivation (Higman 1987, 2001; Bates 2014; Nelson 2016). The second advantage of centering the plantation of a river was drainage. Cultivation of sugar can require significant rainfall, but with proper drainage. Cane stalks will easily saturate and spoil in standing water. Therefore, centering fields on a major river ensured effective hydrology and proper runoff to both irrigate and remove excess water. The third advantage lay in the water itself. Sustaining upwards of 500 enslaved laborers required a potable water source. While frequent rains provided for many of the island’s enslaved populations,
Good Hope’s water source was plentiful, ever-present, fast-moving, and drinkable due to the limestone aquifer.

**Architecture and Organization:**

Reading the layout of Good Hope’s plantation landscape is necessary to understanding how a minority of planters and managers could exert control over thousands of enslaved individuals toward commercial ends (Figure 3.4). For the past two decades, plantation organization has served as an important body of evidence for studying the social dynamics of the colonial society behind the buildings, fields, and roads. While some have looked to plantation layout as a instrument through which the perception of surveillance on living spaces enforced self-discipline (Delle 1998, 1999, 2014; Epperson 1999, 2000; Randle 2011), others have found a more formulaic negotiation between managerial visibility of working spaces, the costs of walking distance, and the centralization of industrial production (Higman 1987; Bates 2007, 2014; Nelson 2016).

The organization of Good Hope closely aligns with formulaic designs, which give preference to centralized production and distance over concerns for visibility of domestic spaces occupied by enslaved people. This is consistent with the findings of Bates (2014) at the nearby and contemporaneous sugar plantation, Stewart Castle.
Figure 3.4: Plan of Good Hope estate, showing building location and historical function. Map by author.

The concern for central placement of the mill and boiling house is perhaps best highlighted by the network of roads and intervals (paths between cane fields), which emanate from the plantation’s production center in a radial plan. Under this common design for Jamaican sugar plantations (Higman 2001), the distance between cane fields and mill is minimized to ensure that the crop does not spoil in transit between harvest and sugar extraction (Nelson 2016). Unprocessed cut cane could spoil within 24 to 48 hours of harvest. Therefore, the movement between field and mill, in part, determined the quality of the sugar produced. As
will be discussed in Chapter 8, the particularities of sugar agriculture required highly orchestrated moving parts, in which the mill and boiling house served as the plantation’s center of gravity.

Main House Complex

Unlike the plantations of mainland North American, the social center of the Jamaican estate did not typically equate with the physical center of the property. At Good Hope, the mansion or “great house” occupies the high ground of a peripheral area (Figure 3.5), with visibility to and from the major road. Other sloping and high grounds were used for guinea grass to feed the plantation’s cattle, or provision grounds cultivated by the plantation’s enslaved population.

Figure 3.5: Front elevation of the Good Hope Great House. Photo by author.
High ground allowed planters to elevate themselves from mosquito-ridden areas, and position their houses to catch cross breezes in the tropical heat (Nelson 2016). This was typically negotiated with visibility of the great house from major roads, and allowed planters – absentee and resident – to maximize the potential audience for one’s wealth and status to those traveling through the plantation.

Many Tharp-era (1767–1804) outbuildings survive along the south and west elevations of the great house. This includes a large carriage house situated on the approach to the house, a kitchen and laundry, and a two-story privy containing the great house’s original Williams-era (1744–1766) cornerstone. A more unusual outbuilding, a counting house constructed by John Tharp, sits at the center of this complex at a slightly higher elevation. Records indicate that several Tharp-era outbuildings no longer survive, including a fowl house, laundry, and large fishpond at the western end of the complex.

Between 1794 and his death in 1804, Tharp had a masonry wall constructed, fully enclosing the great house complex (Figure 3.6). This likely occurred during the Second Maroon War in 1796, a guerilla war largely fought in the Cockpit Country surrounding Good Hope. The wall likewise separated the great house complex from village of enslaved domestic servants located immediately behind the great house rear yard. This village, referred to here as “Village II,” was one of three sites explored archaeologically in this dissertation. I will discuss this further in Chapters 5 and 9.
In regards to siting, the Good Hope great house sits atop a large hill overlooking former sugar cane fields and distant mountains. For the most part, the great house lacks visual communication with most structures on the plantation, with viewsheds limited to the plantation warehouse, hospital, and doctor’s house. The great house sits on a slight slope, giving it a two story eastern elevation and single-story western elevation.

Architectural evidence establishes a reliable relative chronology for the great house itself. Today, two gable-end wings, oriented North-South, are connected by a central block oriented East-West. While this central block houses the entrance passage, orienting the entire house East-West, it is likely that this
arrangement was a transformation of the 1790s. Subtle differences in elevation, masonry, and interior carpentry suggest that the south gable-wing is much earlier (ca. 1755), and might have served as the great house under the plantation’s first period of ownership (Nelson 2011, 2016). By the 1780s/1790s, this two-room building had expanded out into at least nine rooms, and a new approach to the house from the east had been constructed. By 1794, the great house faced south toward the public road, which continues to run through the center of the plantation today.

*Slave Village*

While no known written records on the slave village survive, a 1794 survey plat of Good Hope depicts its precise location and a representation of the internal organization (Figure 3.7). Approximately 50 small dwellings, labeled “Negroe Houses,” with adjoining house gardens, are drawn beneath numerous coconut trees and surrounded by a series of low stone walls. A road intersects a portion of the village, asymmetrically dividing it at its western edge. Roughly 28300 m² (or 7 acres) in size, the village is situated in close proximity to the plantation’s industrial core, with blacksmith, carpentry, cooping, and plumbing (i.e. lead working) workshops located on or near the village perimeter.
Little is known about the earliest enslaved population on the plantation, and archaeological evidence suggests that Good Hope’s earliest village (1744–1766) was located elsewhere on the plantation. This slightly later village was likely established shortly after John Tharp purchased the plantation in 1767. As mentioned above, Tharp was actively involved in the British slave trade and continued to expand Good Hope’s enslaved population through his death in
1804. By the early 19th century, annual returns record an average of 414 individuals living in the village in any given year. This number peaked in 1803, and rapidly declined in the years preceding Emancipation in 1838. As the enslaved population grew, plantation maps from 1806 indicate that the footprint of slave village expanded southeast, reclaiming former sugar fields.

The siting of the village gives preference to proximity over surveillance. As a walled-in settlement, movement was channeled in and out of the village through four thresholds depicted in the 1794 plat. Each threshold directed people toward the industrial core of the plantation just downhill from the village. The village itself occupies a large bowl-shaped cockpit. Prior to 1794, Tharp constructed a road that intersected the village, wrapping around its southern perimeter. What Tharp and his managers lacked in surveillance of the village, they made up for in Good Hope’s network of roads. As the road traverses the perimeter of the village, it provided an elevated vantage point into the house-yards of the plantation’s enslaved population. As will be discussed in Chapter 8, plantation overseers spent very few working hours in their homes. For most of the day, their time was spent on horseback or walking along plantation roads, patrolling labor, productivity, and plantation spaces on the move.

Overseer's House and Slave Hospital

The overseer’s house, slave hospital, and two possible bookkeepers’ cottages stand facing one another to form a small administrative complex north
of the slave village. The overseer’s east-facing entrance directly aligns with the hospital’s west facing entrance to ensure visibility of the hospital’s coming and goings (Bassett 2014). Upon the same axis, two of eight identical masonry cottages survive today. An 1804 probate inventory for the plantation refers to these eight buildings as “the white people rooms” (Tharp Papers R.55.7.123.2).

In all likelihood, this row of one to two-room, single-story buildings housed the plantation’s handful of bookkeepers and white wage-earner tradesmen.

While it is unsure exactly when the overseer’s house was constructed, it is likely the oldest building in this complex. Two stories tall, the building contained spacious living quarters above a series of secure rooms serving as the plantation’s storehouse. Presumably, provisions and tools for the nearby enslaved population were kept here in locked rooms, accessible by a doorway beneath the building’s lobby entrance. From the late 18th century through 1815, at least one overseer and John Harewood, the mixed-race son of John Tharp, occupied the house. Although some have described Harewood as Good Hope’s overseer (Ogilvie 1954; Hart 1994), account records note that he actually served the more lucrative position of plantation manager (Tharp Papers R.55.7.125.2).

Adjacent to the house, ruins of the overseer’s kitchen can be found to the north, and other unknown foundations are found to the south.

The masonry shell of the slave hospital, constructed in 1798, partially stands and has recently been stabilized. The hospital is the only building at Good Hope for which an original architectural drawing survives.
Figure 3.8: Rear elevation of the Good Hope Slave Hospital. Photo by author.

This record indicates that the building was designed by Thomas Paterson, a Scottish wage-earner mason living at Good Hope (Tharp Papers R.55.7.125.2), and delineated by his wage-earning carpenter, Alexander Campbell (Bassett 2014). While the building began as a hospital serving all of Tharp’s estates, the building combined and shifted several functions over the course of the early 19th century, ranging from healthcare, to a lock-up, to a school, and eventually an Anglican church bearing the name St. Peter’s (Bassett 2014).
Mill, Sugar Works, and Store House

The first record of a mill at Good Hope comes from a 1760's map of Jamaica by Thomas Craskell (1763), indicating that a water mill was in use by this time. By the late 18th century, both a water mill and a cattle mill served Good Hope, the latter supplementing the former during dry periods. As with many sugar estates, the water mill was assisted by an aqueduct that ensured a reliable and controllable water velocity. Taking advantage of the natural topography, the aqueduct took the form of an in-ground “gutter,” which supplied not only Good Hope, but also Tharp’s downriver water mills at his Lansquenet and Potosi estates.

The water mill at Good Hope is situated across the Martha Brae River from the sugar works (Figure 3.9). Once cane stalks were fed through the mill rollers, sugar juice was carried by gravity in a wooden gutter over the river bridge, pouring directly into collection vats in the boiling house. The boiling house as it stands today contains three components. The earliest is a long projection to the north, which likely served the plantation prior to 1767, under its first period of ownership (Nelson 2011:154). John Tharp expanded the works as a combined boiling house and rum distillery sometime between 1770 and 1790. In 1802, the works was expanded yet again, and outfitted to increase capacity.

After sugar juice was processed into granular sugar, cured, and packed, the barrels of sugar and puncheons were kept in a storehouse in the center of the plantation.
Figure 3.9: Good Hope’s undershot water mill. Photo by author.

Figure 3.10: Good Hope’s “sugar works,” or boiling house. Photo by author.
This two-story masonry warehouse structure, constructed in 1790, stands just up the road from the works, north of the overseer’s house. The doublewide doors and elevated masonry ramp allowed barrels to be rolled in and out, directly to and from carts. Across the road, a building of unknown function, constructed between 1794 and 1806, might have served as an administrative office for the plantation.

Conclusion:

This view of Good Hope, its historical and geographic context, and the individual places and faces that defined the plantation has been admittedly brief. A narrative of events, personalities, feats of engineering, and Good Hope’s place in the Atlantic world is a book-length treatment on its own. As a preface to an archaeological study, this chapter has hopefully introduced the reader to the historical setting in which the enslaved population of Good Hope estate lived and labored. On another level, this has hopefully given the reader an understanding of the scale of production at Good Hope, and other large-scale sugar plantations. The infrastructure and labor required to profit from sugar cultivation was immense in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries. As the demand for sugar increased among British markets in the late 18th and early 19th century (Mintz 1985), so did the labor needs of the Caribbean plantations fueling the industry. British planters shifted to an unprecedented scale for New World plantations. While the buildings and landscapes from this period of expansion and “improvement” remain (see
Nelson 2016), little survives of the significant and by all accounts horrific human element of this industry. However, in the chapter to follow, production records, and “property” inventories, provide one avenue for telling the human story of sugar production.
CHAPTER 4: THE ENSLAVED PEOPLE OF GOOD HOPE

Introduction:

Since the early 1970s, demographic studies have proven to be a fruitful and comparative source of information for understanding enslaved life in the British Atlantic. The island of Jamaica is certainly no exception with important contributions from British Caribbean historians (Craton 1971, 1978; Higman 1976, 1984; Dunn 1977, 1993, 2007) and scholars of accounting history (Fleischman et al. 2004). While this work has established an important foundation, such studies have largely been carried out for the sole purpose of population reconstruction. The more extensive of these historical studies have used demographic datasets for comparative studies of enslaved mortality, valuation, labor output, and large-scale demographic changes through time. While certainly insightful, such studies have tended to detach enslaved laborers from the daily experiences of enslavement, translating life to numbers, though failing to bring numbers back to life.

I seek to shift the focus of enslaved demographic studies by acknowledging and responding to two problems in particular: 1.) The enslaved community of a given plantation is often treated as a homogenous group, or unit of analysis – living, eating, dressing, buying, and selling the same way; and 2.) Demographic studies have typically focused on large-scale (inter-island & intra-island) temporal patterns, often neglecting the day-to-day creation, maintenance, and individual experience of demographic conditions.
In this way, this chapter seeks to shift the interpretation of enslaved population datasets to a narrative of landscape and tasks, arguing that "taskscapes" (Ingold 1993) provides a valuable avenue for the study of comparative colonialism, and particularly plantation slavery. In doing so, I will provide insights into the ways in which different conditions of labor, and the task-based gendering, “aging,” and "speaching" of plantation spaces created an enduring and reinforcing basis to differentiation within the enslaved population. Ultimately, I demonstrate that such divisions created different opportunities for social and physical mobility, market participation, access to non-provision foods and other goods, purchase of freedom, among other active means of negotiating one’s social and economic place within the plantation system.

The majority of enslaved people arriving at John Tharp’s wharf in Martha Brae, and later Falmouth, were sold to nearby plantations. Yet, many remained within the Tharp network of production, which encompassed nine plantations, two pens, and virtually every corner of the Triangular Trade. For those who were kept to increase the labor force of Good Hope, they departed for the plantation shortly after their arrival at Tharp’s Falmouth townhouse. Upon their first steps into the New World, enslaved men, women, and children encountered unfamiliar people, flora, fauna, weather, sights, and sounds (Nelson 2016). Removed from a former life and inserted into another, this deafening experience of unfamiliarity was amplified by the categories and divisions of personhood into which they were forced.
The physical organization of Good Hope’s plantation landscape played an important role in constructing and perpetuating these imposed categories on its enslaved occupants. The mountainous terrain was used to structure planter, managers, and enslaved people in both a physical and symbolic hierarchy. The enslaved community of Good Hope occupied the bottom of this hierarchy, and likewise, the low-lying elevations of the estate.

This essentialized view of the enslaved community defines the plantation hierarchy as a three-tier system, when in fact, further divisions existed within the enslaved population. Such divisions were part and parcel to not only the plantation system, but more generally the colonial process of enslavement. Planters and managers used a strategy of divide and conquer in order to control an enslaved labor force that sometimes numbered in the hundreds. This involved creating and perpetuating divisions along race, gender, age, and occupation that both differed from and occasionally amplified lines of divisions familiar to many West African groups (Norman 2014).

The primary objective of this chapter is to unessentialize the “enslaved community,” so far as to render this group not as a single entity, but a composite of individuals with their own complexities, identities, interests, and social dynamics. I do so through records of the Middle Passage, slave advertisements, and historical demography as they pertain to Good Hope and the slaving activities of John Tharp. Together, this chapter allows the reader to engage with the evidence in the chapters to follow through an understanding of a populated past, as oppose to an anonymous, homogenized collective – i.e. “the enslaved
community.” In many ways, this is a privilege of the plantation records at hand, and is not typical of African diasporic contexts. However, this effort should not be viewed as particularistic, or merely local, as I have found that many of the profiles rendered here personify common trends throughout plantation Jamaica, and sugar plantations in general. Therefore, the pages to follow will help resurrect a population of individuals on the basis of names, birthplace, age, engendered labor, health status, valuation, and occupation.

To do so, is it necessary to view slavery not as a natural fact, nor naturalize the institution through terms like “slave” (Cameron 2008). Rather, we must step back and view slavery as an ongoing process of enslavement (Marshall 2014; Nelson 2016). This view of life-long enslavement is one that encompasses capture and containment, commodification and trade, trans-Atlantic shipment, creation and marketing of identities of value, physical and social reintegration into new environs, positioning and repositioning within a division of labor, and the recreation of life within the infrastructures of enslavement. To achieve this level of understanding, we must start from the beginning.

Enslavement:

John Tharp was actively involved in the Atlantic slave trade from the 1780s through the first years of the 19th century (Tenison 1971; Morgan 1985; Hart 1994; Besson 2002). At least two slaver ships, The Gascoyne and The Tharp, were operated under his patronage, making regular trips between Jamaica and
West Africa (TSTD 2014). He was most active in the slave trade with the ship bearing his name, with which he traded along the Gold Coast, and later the Bight of Biafra (ibid.). Correspondences with his Bristol merchant, William Miles (Tharp Papers R.55.7.122.(o).2), suggest that Tharp was particularly interested in obtaining enslaved laborers whom he could sell to neighboring planters at a significant profit. With each trip, Tharp appears to have resupplied Good Hope and his other plantations in waves of 10 to 50 individuals (Tharp Papers R.55.7.123.11). Therefore, by connecting Tharp’s slaving records with the documented birth places of his enslaved labor-force (Tharp Papers R.55.7.123.2), it is possible to reconstruct the process of enslavement at Good Hope from beginning to end.

**Tharp’s Slaving Activities: 1784-1786**

For the African-born enslaved people of Good Hope, many arrived in Jamaica on-board *The Tharp*. A London-registered vessel owned by John Coghlan, *The Tharp* was put into service as slaver ship throughout the 1780s (TSTD 2015a). Constructed in Philadelphia in 1758, the 120-ton ship appears to have received its new name in 1783 after lucrative financing by the then 39-year old Jamaican planter, John Tharp (ibid.). While the ship appears to have made several trips a year between West Africa and Jamaica, two of those trips recorded in the Voyages Database provide considerable insight into the scale and sources of Tharp’s slaving activities, and the enslaved individuals who ultimately ended up at Good Hope estate.
In 1784, Tharp’s ship was sailed by a Captain Duncan Fisher to the coast of what is now Ghana, first stopping in the port of Anomabo (also spelled ‘Annamaboe’), followed by Cape Coast Castle (ibid.). From the mid-18th through the early-19th century, both Anomabo and Cape Coast Castle were British administered forts, and a mere 16 km apart along the modern-day Ghanaian coastline. Together, the two facilities accounted for approximately 62% (26% Cape Coast, 36% Anomabo) of the people sold into slavery along the Gold Coast (Shumway 2014:54). These two ports represented a major point of departure for individuals captured and enslaved in the wider region. Historian Akosua Perbi (2004:37-38) observes that Ghana’s slave trade operated through a network of interior trade routes passing through at least sixty-six market towns before reaching the coast. As captives moved from town to town, they frequently changed hands between several merchant middlemen, before their march to the sea.

After arriving at each port, Captain Fisher purchased and loaded the hull of *The Tharp* with a human cargo of men, women, and children captured from the interior. On board the 1784 voyage of *The Tharp*, this included individuals belonging to the Asante (also spelled ‘Ashante’), Fante, and Akim (also spelled ‘Akyem’) ethnolinguistic groups. With these groups in particular, it is likely that a major source of these captive individuals stemmed from the alliances and territorial conflicts in this region. In fact, most of the enslaved people who embarked from Captain Fisher’s first stop, Anomabo, were captured and brought
to the Gold Coast’s interior markets by the Asante, then sold to the Fante, who in turn acted as “intermediaries” in trading them to the British-occupied coast (Sparks 2014:92). Along with this purchase, Captain Fisher would have traded for enough food and water provisions to last the middle passage to Jamaica – a 70 to 95-day voyage. Chief among these food items was likely millett, or “millie,” a nutrient-rich grain grown in what is now southern Ghana for slaver ship provisions (Shumway 2014:54).

Between Anomabo and Cape Coast Castle, Captain Fisher loaded enough captive people and supplies to make a profitable voyage to northern Jamaica. Records show that his cargo amounted to approximately 450 enslaved individuals (TSTD 2015a). Onboard The Tharp between the Gold Coast and Jamaica, people remained chained below decks for upwards of three months, coming topside only periodically in small groups (Nelson 2016). The conditions were horrific enough to kill 10 people before the ship arrived in Jamaica at Tharp’s docks. On a second voyage commissioned by Tharp later that year, 23 enslaved people would die along the 79-day passage from the Gold Coast to Tharp’s wharf in Martha Brae, Jamaica. On the last recorded voyage of The Tharp between the Gold Coast and Jamaica in 1786, 62 people would die along the 95-day middle passage (TSTD 2015b).

Tharp’s Slaving Activities: 1786-1802

Most of Tharp’s early slaving activities focused on the Gold Coast (Ghana), but in 1786, following most British traders, he shifted his slaving
ventures to the Bight of Biafra. From the mid 1780s through 1802, Tharp contracted Liverpool slave trader and privateer Caleb Fletcher to sail shipments of enslaved people to his wharf in Martha Brae from the port of Bonny in modern-day Nigeria (Tharp Papers R.55.7.128.(c); Hart 1994:30 citing Furness 1980). In several letters to Tharp between 1802 and 1804, Fletcher specifies two entire shipments of ‘Ebo’ slaves sent to Tharp (ibid.). If these two shipments were comparable to his 1784, 1785, and 1786 cargoes, this amounted to upwards of 750 to 880 enslaved ‘Ebo’ individuals arriving at the Tharp plantations and surrounding estates in the late 18th- and early-19th century. A complete list of all 486 enslaved individuals at Good Hope in 1804 supports this probability (Tharp Papers R.55.7.123.2), revealing that the majority of African-born enslaved people on the plantation either identified, or were identified, as “Ebo.”

By 1800, many of the enslaved people living at Good Hope had departed from the coast of modern-day Nigeria. As previously mentioned, the Tharp records illustrate that between 1785 and 1802, the majority of Tharp’s African-born enslaved laborers departed upon the Middle Passage from the port of Bonny. Situated on the Niger Delta, the port was controlled by the Kingdom of Bonny under the economic influence of the British slave trade (Eltis 1987; Thomas 2013). For the years in which Tharp acquired enslaved people from Bonny, the port reached its height of power before declining in the years following the abolition in British slave trade in 1807 (ibid.). For those enslaved people arriving at Good Hope between 1785 and 1802, Bonny was the threshold through which they transferred from West African enslavement to British
enslavement, in the hands of Tharp and his merchants. Yet records of operation and British interaction at the port allow for a deeper understanding of the long journeys of enslavement before people left the coast of West Africa to ultimately arrive at Good Hope.

The detailed accounts of British ship captain John Adams, a contemporary of Tharp’s captain Fletcher, paint a vivid picture of the process of enslavement between 1786 and 1800 at the port of Bonny. Here, the British trade in captive slaves was controlled by elite West African merchants operating near the mouth of the Niger River (Oriji 2011). One such royal merchant was King Otoo of the Owerri, who bought and sold enslaved people, and other commodities, among the West African middlemen in Bonny (ibid. pp 209-210). Accepting an invitation to Otoo’s palace, captain John Adams (1822:36), expressed “extreme surprise” when he, “found the king rigged out in the European style, and wanting nothing to complete the dress but a shirt and a neckcloth.” Adams continued in observing the King’s silver-laced satin waistcoat, buckled shoes, wide-brim feathered hat and stockings of Portuguese fabric. To King Otoo, like many West African middlemen, merchants, and royalty, the British Atlantic was not a foreign abstraction, but a social, political, and economic network in which they were involved and manipulated toward their own interests (Norman 2009).

While the West African elite charged tariffs to British slavers, most of the interactions and transactions in the region occurred between British captains and the lesser middlemen of Bonny. Under a system of credit in the form of commodities, captains advanced trade goods to the Bonny middlemen. In turn,
these middlemen traveled up-river to interior towns to trade for captive people gathered and enslaved by a larger network of individuals acquiring prisoners and raiding interior settlements (Equiano 1794; Thomas 2013). These direct transactions between captains and coastal middlemen, under the authority of the West African elite, were common. Coastal “castles” were used as monumental transition points more so than holding spaces in many ports (Nelson 2016). The port of Bonny, however, did not possess a castle, but rather a thriving coastal market of goods and people. As Bonny middlemen moved captive people from interior settlements to the coast along the Niger River, they began a process of enslavement. Individuals were separated from kin, restrained, stripped of clothing and possessions, and commodified before boarding British ships (ibid.).

Arrival in Jamaica:

The Tharp and Gascoyne arrived in Jamaica via a small wharf on the Martha Brae River, only a few miles from Good Hope. From here, most of the enslaved men, women, and children were sold to neighboring plantations at a considerable price. This value was calculated to the individual through stereotypes and perceived qualities along lines of age, sex, racial category, skill, and birthplace. The advertisement in the Supplement to the Cornwall Chronicle for this 1784 voyage described above illustrates this marketing of ethnolinguistic identity by Tharp. The ad reads,
“Martha Brae, Jan. 27 … For SALE … Wednesday the 4\textsuperscript{th} of February [1784] on board the ship THARP Captain Fisher – 440 Choice, Young Fantee, Ashantee, and Akim NEGROES By Tharp & Campbell” (Hart 1994:30; Besson 2002:72).

Likewise, an advertisement for a second shipment onboard the Gascoyne, in which Tharp lost 23 people along the Middle Passage, markets ethnicity in a similar way, but with the added “Coromantee” ethnolinguistic group. The December 1784 ad reads, “425 fine Young Coromantee, Fantee, and Ashantee Slaves” (ibid.).

For those who Tharp and his nephew Alexander Campbell did not sell, he kept and “seasoned” to repopulate Tharp’s nine plantations and two cattle pens. From Martha Brae, and later Falmouth, the newly arrived enslaved people were marched uphill between five and 20 miles to one of Tharp’s estates. For those sent to Good Hope, the seven-mile journey sent them through the formal entrance of the estate. As they entered Good Hope, their first sight was the countless rows of sugar cane bordering the road. They passed four cane fields before seeing the Great House towering above the road on a large hill to their right. As they continued forward, they walked through more cane fields before passing a warehouse packed with barrel after barrel of sugar and rum. These barrels would soon retrace these newly arrived enslaved individuals' steps back to the docks in Falmouth. Moving downhill from the warehouse, they reached a fork in the road. To their right, they saw the boiling house, the Martha Brae River, and countless other enslaved people moving sugar cane from field to mill, uncured sugar from boiling house to packinghouse.
At this fork, plantation managers led them along the road to the left. As they were forced uphill, the windows of a large masonry building peered down upon them. The overseer’s house marked the transition from the public road to Good Hope’s massive network of private roads. They continued up the hill, passing the carpenters shop. At the top of the hill, they reached another intersection. To their right was the plantation’s blacksmith shop. To their left was a massive two-story hospital for the plantation’s enslaved. And directly in front of them was a village of countless thatched roofs.

As they reached the village and the managerial complex, they began a long process of social and physical acclimation known as “seasoning” (Nelson 2016). After the first few weeks, the newly arrived enslaved people were forced into both familiar and unfamiliar categories of race, gender, language, and age-based associations. Many of the new forms of identity were dictated by their new task, or occupation, while others categories were simply perceived upon arrival. New categories of race, and affordances of gender would persist, while language and tasks would shift with age. These were categories of imposed identity that would shape much of the differential experience of enslavement.

Demographics of Good Hope:

Good Hope’s “slave inventory” records a snapshot of this new identity for all 486 enslaved laborers on the plantation in 1804. In this list, individuals are listed by name, age, birthplace/country, occupation, health, and value. While ill suited for temporal trends, the inventory provides a detailed look into the lives of
the divided conditions of enslavement at late-18\textsuperscript{th}/early-19\textsuperscript{th} century Good Hope. Twenty-two pages in total (Tharp Papers R.55.7.123.2), this record provides the quantitative and qualitative foundation for the remainder of this chapter. Written by Good Hope’s planting attorney William Greene, this comprehensive census allows one to pick up where the records of the transatlantic slave trade leave off.

**Language:**

As suggested in Tharp’s advertisement, one of the first divisions that internally divided the enslaved population of plantations like Good Hope was an ethnolinguistic background. The linguistic diversity of Jamaica was relatively extensive with a range of languages forcibly brought together into extreme conditions of densely aggregated settlements. Upon arriving in the West Indies as an enslaved laborer, Olaudah Equiano (1794: 55) observed “… soon after we were landed, there came to us Africans of all languages”. Good Hope was no exception. In 1804, at least 14 different language groups (related and unrelated) were likely spoken at Good Hope within the same seven-acres of the plantation’s “slave village” (Figure 4.1).
Figure 4.1: Ethnolinguistic affiliations represented in 1804 “slave inventory” for Good Hope estate.

While the vast majority of African-born laborers of Good Hope belonged to the same language family, dialects would have limited intelligibility to a great extent. By the mid 18th century, a creole language, closely related to contemporary Patois, was firmly established in Jamaica (D’Costa and Lalla 1989:4). Mintz (1971:491), following Cassidy (1971), has characterized the process of language transformation upon arrival in Jamaica as “swift,” with the rapid creation of short-lived pidgins, and a quick mastery of the dominant and distinct creole language for a given area. Even today, Jamaican Patois varies considerably from one area
to another. As one Jamaican informant recently described to me, “Fourteen different parishes, fourteen different ways of talking”.

While picking up the local “way of talking” in the 18th century might be viewed as “swift” from Mintz’ historical perspective, the immediate barrier was without a doubt an incomprehensibly alienating experience for years after arrival. This was particularly true of Good Hope’s speakers of minority languages, unrelated to the estate’s dominant language groups (e.g., Portuguese Canga (0.4%, n=2) and Congolese (1.6%, n=8)). In one of the few early slave narratives for the Caribbean and Virginia, Equiano (1794:59) described this sense of isolation,

“… not one soul who could talk to me. I was a few weeks weeding grass, and gathering stones in a plantation; and at last all my companions were distributed different ways, and only myself was left. I was now exceedingly miserable, and thought myself worse off than any of the rest of my companions; for they could talk to each other, but I had no person to speak to that I could understand. In this state I was constantly grieving … wishing for death rather than any thing else.”

As described here, the combination of linguistic division and the widespread distribution of plantation task-labor created only chance conditions to form bonds and relationships through common language and other facets of identity for newly arrived enslaved laborers. Alternatively, as Equiano (ibid.) describes for the rest of his “companions” or “countrymen,” plantation occupations could also bring ethnolinguistic commonalities together through settings in which Jamaican creole and an alternative language were likely used interchangeably. Such
alternative linguistic circumstances are apparent for the Congo-born enslaved laborers of Good Hope. Of the eight individuals, six remained together on a daily basis through their enslaved occupation as carpenters, working together in the estate’s workshop and its frame-construction projects. The seventh, Belly, served as a plantation blacksmith in a near-by workshop, and perhaps upon the same construction projects. For Dianas, the eighth Congo-born individual – a field laborer – the language of daily life was far removed from the remaining seven Congolese speakers. The process of “seasoning,” or the time spent adjusting to Jamaica, was not simply a matter of health for Dianas and enslaved laborers in similar circumstances, but also a period of alienation through forced emersion.

Many of Good Hope’s enslaved laborers spoke differing though related languages. Aside from Jamaican-born laborers, the most populous group was the plantation’s “Eboe” population, representing approximately 18% of Good Hope’s enslaved laborers. As a place-centered “way of talking,” Good Hope’s form of creole was likely influenced by 18th-century Igbo dialects, more so than any other West-African language. This, however, must remain as speculation, as linguistic population density is certainly not the only influence in the formation of a creole language.

**Age:**

Perhaps most striking for the enslaved populations of Jamaica were the large numbers of enslaved children. While certainly true for Good Hope, when
compared with other late-18\textsuperscript{th}/early-19\textsuperscript{th}-century Jamaican plantations, the estate posed relatively low numbers of children. For example, 31.9\% of Good Hope’s enslaved laborers were under 20 years of age, compared to 43.7\% of nearby Worthy Park (Craton 1971: 10). Admittedly, such a comparison obscures the true reality that this percentage represents 158 enslaved individuals under the age of 20 living and working at Good Hope, with 104 of those under the age of 10.

Enslaved children remained with their mothers for the first 12 to 14 months, at which point they were given to the care of the plantation nurses (see Roughly 1823:118-127). In the years surrounding 1804, children of this age at Good Hope were given to and divided among five enslaved women: Diana, Betty, Luna, Esther, and Cuba. Enslaved childcare was an activity centered in and around Good Hope’s "slave hospital," and was closely associated with medical practice (Sheridan 1985), more so than its associations with education today. For the enslaved women listed above, each were given the title of nurse, and charged with weaning and "attending" children.

Patterns of age within Good Hope’s 27 enslaved occupations reveal that enslaved life was not fixed to single tasks, but rather, one aged through plantation occupations (Figure 4.2). For Good Hope’s enslaved children, field labor began at age 6, and enslaved individuals worked through labor positions into their 50s and 60s if surviving the extreme labor conditions of sugar production. This was common on both sugar estates (Higman 1984:189) and coffee plantations (Dell 1998:73, 2000:179) throughout the British Caribbean.
Figure 4.2: Average age of enslaved laborers within occupations, or tasks, at Good Hope. To the far left, (−) represents non-working enslaved children, and to the far right, “invalid” represents non-working adults.

The distribution of labor at Good Hope, a large-scale sugar estate, was far ranging, and generally speaking, the common denominator of most task-based labor groups was age. This was particularly true for manual labor occupations such as field gangs (40.8% of the plantation's labor), with greatest age variability occurring in skilled trades positions.

Age was perhaps most significant to the valuation of enslaved laborers by the planter class. Plotting age against value reveals a polynomial trend in which
individuals between the ages of 20 and 30 were most valued, with greater overall variation with increasing age (Figure 4.3). Within this dehumanizing trend, the value of life at Good Hope, upon a measure of productivity, hit zero at age 65. It was at this point that enslaved men and women were identified simply as “invalid.”

Of Good Hope’s enslaved laborers, 19 (3.9%) are listed as “invalid”. This encompassed both men and women, ranging 51 to 85 years of age, no longer laboring on the plantation.

Figure 4.3: Scatter plot measuring the relationship between ascribed monetary value and the age of an enslaved laborer.
One exception was a man named Cook, 30 years of age, listed as “invalid” due to deteriorating health conditions affecting one of his feet. Of the elderly “invalid,” all were given a title of “Old” preceding their name (e.g., “Old Cupid,” “Old Fanny,” “Old Will”). This title appears in both non-laboring and several laboring individuals aged 50 years or greater. The latter included two washerwomen (O. Princess and O. Rachel) and one great house domestic (O. Lucia) – all three between the ages of 50 and 52.

This combination of working and “invalid” individuals suggests that the prefix “Old” did not reflect retirement from the enslaved workforce. Similarly, with 68 individuals aged 50 or older at Good Hope (14.0%), only 21 (30.9 % of aged ≥ 50; 4.3% of total) were given the prefix “Old”. The fact that less than half of the individuals of this age range held this title might suggest that it was honorific, or marker of prestige among the plantation’s population. Alternatively, this might suggest that “Old” did not designate biological age, but rather perceived age. Enslaved individuals of Good Hope aged differently, at different rates, and inevitably, the stress of aging was directly related the nature of one’s occupation. In this way, age marked a perceived, more so than objective, measure of generational division within the enslaved population. Such perceptions of aging are inseparable from the differential stress through which enslaved individuals aged.
Gender:

Exploring this further, the pattern seen in the process of valuation suggests something more. Value was closely related to age, but with greater age came greater, and somewhat symmetrical variation on either side of this trend. When divided among male and female laborers, however, the trend reveals a clear asymmetry between sex, with ascribed value deviating – on average – during an individual's mid-20s (Figure 4.4). This illustrates that enslaved men were valued not only higher, on average, but also with slightly greater variation, and held value for longer periods of their lives. This factor of the imposed sexual division of labor, and others, helped shape the gendering of occupations, and their affordances and associations, on the plantation.

Figure 4.4: Scatter plot measuring the relationship between ascribed monetary value and the age of an enslaved laborer, divided by male and female laborers.
When considered as types of labor (including attending positions, skilled trades, manual labor, and domestic service), enslaved men occupied the vast majority of supervisory/attending positions, as well as skilled trades (Figure 4.5). Enslaved women comprised approximately 66% of the plantation’s manual labor, representing the majority of field tasks such as clearing, planting, weeding, and harvesting.

**Good Hope’s Distribution of Enslaved Labor Types: 1804**

*Figure 4.5: Distribution of enslaved male and female labor at Good Hope estate in 1804. Labor types categorized by “Attending” positions (e.g., livestock, watchmen, drivers, nurses), “Skilled Trades” (e.g., blacksmith, carpenter, mason, cooper), “Manual” labor (e.g., field gangs, grass cutters), and “Domestic” labor (e.g., house servants).*
As mentioned previously, enslaved men and women of Good Hope held positions into their early 60s. For men, such positions were primarily skilled trades and watchmen. The latter position, a security guard living in isolation, was one typically reserved for enslaved men in their old age ($\bar{x} = 49.9$ years old). Enslaved women of old age were typically placed in washing, domestic, or nursing ($\bar{x} = 61$ years old) positions.

In this pattern, most women held highly demanding and physically tolling manual labor positions throughout their life at Good Hope, more so than enslaved men. At Good Hope, and many similar sugar estates, skilled trades and attending positions (e.g., livestock, stables, watchmen) were primarily male occupations, and enslaved women were continually held in more inferior and physically demanding positions through the end of their life. This finding reinforces Dunn’s (1993) observations for 18th/19th-century enslaved women on nearby Mesopotamia sugar estate in Westmoreland parish. In positions of skilled labor, enslaved men had greater opportunity to job themselves out for personal income. Such an occupational affordance is recorded in the Good Hope account books (Tharp Papers R.55.7.125.2), in which the plantation’s enslaved masons (i.e. 22 men) were continually paid for their work on Sundays throughout much of the late-1790s.

Writing in 1793, Jamaican planter Byran Edwards details the living conditions and domestic practices of the island’s enslaved laborers. He provides a vivid description of a plantation village, with individuals eating from calabash.
dishes, and sleeping in post-in-ground, wattle and daub dwellings with earthen floors and thatch roofs. Edwards concludes this chapter, however, by noting,

“This account of their accommodation, however, is confined to the lowest among the field negroes: tradesmen and domestics are in general vastly better lodged and provided. Many of these have larger houses, with boarded floors, and are accommodated (at their own expense, it is true) with very decent furniture: – a very few have even good beds, linen sheets, and musquito nets, and display a shelf or two of plates and dishes of Queen’s or Staffordshire ware” (Edwards 1793: 135).

This description highlights both the differential affordances of enslaved occupations, as suggested by Good Hope’s account books, and the materiality involved in amplifying, sustaining, and manipulating such differences. These, however, were almost certainly a product of the ingenuity of enslaved people in supporting themselves under horrific circumstances, rather than some being “better provided” for as Edwards suggests.

The affordances of different occupations could be simultaneously advantageous and detrimental under different considerations. For example, planters viewed domestic servants as higher status enslaved individuals in a less physically taxing labor position. Handler et. al (1986) have suggested, however, that the tendency to fill this position with female laborers might be one reason (aside from rum consumption) why burials of enslaved women have shown relatively higher percentages of lead content than men on Newton plantation, Barbados. Perhaps comparable to Newton’s distillers and enslaved plumber, house servants at Good Hope would have been in frequent contact with lead-
glazed ceramics, pewter, and other sources of environmental lead. Such frequent contact had direct impacts on the physical quality of life, likely keeping many domestic servants in and out of the Good Hope slave hospital.

Relatively few enslaved laborers at Good Hope had access to regular movement beyond plantation boundaries through their occupation. Though few in number, physically mobile enslaved occupations offered a relative and temporary reprieve from the surveillance and control of the planter class, and the ability to extend social networks and economic activities beyond the estate (Hauser 2008; Smith and Bassett 2015). Of the plantation’s 88 laborers with physical mobility, including cartmen, mule men, and construction-related skilled trades traveling from plantation to plantation, all 88 were male. One occupation not included in this was domestic service. These individuals will be discussed further in Chapters 9 and 10.

With the recovery of pierced-coin adornment in burial grounds of Bridgetown and Fontabelle, and none in the rural burial grounds of Newton Plantation, Crain et. al (2004: 76) have suggested that the urban enslaved had greater economic opportunities than their rural counterparts. By extension for Good Hope, this was likely true of rural enslaved laborers regularly moving to and through urban centers by nature of their occupation, when compared to property-bound tasks. Affordances such as these, both created and maintained a stratified enslaved society, with differential means of access and agency
operating in relation to the differential conditions of enslavement within a single, enslaved taskscape.

**Resistance and the Enslaved Taskscape:**

The enslaved taskscape simultaneously divided and united the large-scale labor forces of Caribbean plantations like Good Hope. Tasks were not only divided up spatially, but also temporally in labor groups working throughout the night in boiling houses, watchmen outposts, and other tasks not dependent on natural daylight (Higman 1984: 182). By the late 18th and early 19th century, enslaved laborers were given Sunday and “one day in a fortnight” to attend to their personal crops and other domestic tasks (Cooper 1824: 7). However, as previously mentioned, many planters like Tharp chose to pay enslaved laborers for their work on Sundays rather than let them attend to their own, or communal, grounds (Tharp Papers R.55.7.125.2). At all costs, enslaved laborers of Jamaican sugar estates appear to have been kept in smaller groups, distributed widely under near-continuous labor.

In his study of enslaved marronage and revolt at Mapps Cave, Frederick Smith (2008: 130) observed that major enslaved revolts in Jamaica and Barbados often occurred on or around plantation holidays, such as Easter, Crop Over, New Years, and Christmas. For the year-round, sometimes 24 hour labor regimes of Caribbean sugar production, such holidays represented the few times in which the enslaved taskscape completely, and temporally, ceased.
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Architectural historian Louis Nelson suggests that enslaved Jamaican holidays and festivals, such as the annual Jonkonnu, were temporary periods of “racial and spatial inversion” (2011: 190). Symbolic, or “surrogate,” acts of violence, such as the ritual destruction of a model headdress of the planter’s great house, Nelson argues, served as a temporary release from white authority (ibid. p. 191).

Distributing hundreds of enslaved laborers across the plantation landscape upon fixed schedules, the enslaved taskscape served as both a productive measure and an effective means of control by a small planter and managerial class. The temporary halts of the spatially and temporally distributed taskscape created periods of vulnerability, in which planters had significantly less control over large-scale assembly and organized resistance. In this way, the enslaved taskscape was both a strategy of surveillance and control, the time-space gaps of which provided a venue for mass resistance through both symbolic and actual acts of violence. In many cases, however, the two were intimately intertwined through the violent destruction of the plantation’s built environment, which both represented and recursively structured the composition of the enslaved taskscape.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, this chapter has hopefully revealed the “enslaved community” not as a homogenous group – living, eating, dressing, buying, and selling in the same way – but a highly differentiated group, divided and unified in
different ways. Using the enslaved population of Good Hope sugar estate in late-18th/early-19th-century Jamaica, I have sought to demonstrate the differential experience of enslaved laborers, and the different means of agency existing within divided conditions of enslavement. The mechanism by which enslaved people were divided and thinly distributed across the plantation landscape – what I have termed the “enslaved taskscape” – served as a highly organized means of large-scale control by a small managerial class. Distributions of this taskscape were forcibly spatial and temporal, preventing a critical mass of organized assembly. Consequently, plantation holidays (i.e. temporary periods of stagnancy in the enslaved taskscape) became the few opportune periods for strategic violence and organized rebellion by enslaved laborers.

Racial, gender, linguistic, and generational divisions were made real through the demographic divisions of daily tasks of plantation labor. From birth, children lived within divisions that were reinforced each year through an individual’s mobility (or lack thereof) through Jamaica’s enslaved occupational stratification. In many ways, it is difficult to isolate the ways in which these lines of division affected the lives of enslaved individuals; as these categories were far from bound, separate spheres of daily life. Rather, this chapter has shown that patterns of gender, language, and age were entangled together in complex ways within the forced groupings of daily tasks related to occupational divisions of the plantation system. Understanding the ways in which divisions were constructed, perpetuated, and occasionally resisted through the assembly of individuals in forced daily activities allows one to see how the plantation system naturalized
and controlled intra-enslaved differences. Such divisions created different possibilities of social and physical mobility, market participation, access to non-provision goods, and other active means of defining one’s experience within the harsh realities of a new life under plantation slavery.
CHAPTER 5: THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF GOOD HOPE

Introduction:

The Good Hope Archaeological Project (GHAP) began in 2014 as an archaeological survey of the residential spaces of enslaved people in plantation Jamaica. In collaboration with my community partner, Falmouth Heritage Renewal, I designed the project around three goals. The first was to locate the village and/or house sites of Good Hope's enslaved population using cartographic evidence and surface survey. The second goal was to sample domestic sites at both the household and village scale to determine if and how the former gave shape to the latter. Finally, the third goal sought to explore these sites comparatively – household-to-household, village-to-village, town to country – to explicate the ways in which enslaved people, under different conditions of enslavement, interacted with one another on a daily basis. Together, these three goals defined the basic fieldwork program for three related sites, in an effort to reveal the internal social dynamics that define an “enslaved community.”

This chapter summarizes the archaeological fieldwork that formed the foundation of this dissertation. With the exception of Chapter 8, each chapter in the remainder of this study relies upon archaeological evidence excavated between 2013 and 2016. Each site represents a series of houses associated with the enslaved people of Good Hope estate. In 2014, the project began with a surface survey of domestic sites based on detailed maps from the 1790s and 1810s, depicting areas labeled “Negroe Houses.” Seasons one (2014) and two (2015) of the project used sub-surface sampling to investigate two separate
village sites at Good Hope, while season three (2016) investigated the lives of enslaved people living in the urban extension of Good Hope, Tharp’s town house in Falmouth. Together, the three seasons of excavation successfully located domestic occupations for enslaved people at each location, and their associated dwellings, yards, walls, and other landscape features. Alongside the built environment, the project uncovered over 22,600 artifacts from the 18th and 19th century, animating these spaces in ways that speak to the lives of the nearly 500 enslaved individuals living and laboring in any given year between 1775 and 1838.

**Village 1:**

As mentioned previously, Village 1 housed an average of 414 people in any given year between 1775 and 1838, representing the residential spaces of most the plantation’s labor force. The demographic composition of the village was defined by occupation, and consisted of all enslaved field laborers, tradesmen, drivers, hospital workers, livestock keepers, grass cutters, cartmen, boiling house laborers, and unworking elderly and youth. Domestic servants were housed in a separate village behind the great house some distance away (Village II).

The investigation of Village I began in 2013 with site reconnaissance using digital overlays of historic maps. Labeled “Negroe Houses” on a 1794 map, the village site was located near the plantation’s industrial core in a bowl-shaped depression known locally as a cockpit. Extant walls define the former boundaries
of the village, while the site remains overgrown and undisturbed. Oral history of
the village confirmed that the space was briefly used for grazing cattle in the
1940s, while a smaller portion was used as a shallow garden from the late-1990s
through the early 2000s. This suggested that the site remained largely
undisturbed, particularly the southwestern corner.

In May of 2014, a datum was established with iron bar set in poured
cement near the village road. Using identifiable landmarks from the 1794
Schroeter plantation survey plat, a local grid was established over the southwest
corner of the 28,300-m² village as depicted in that year. The excavation was
divided into two areas, split on either side of the intersecting village road.
Excavation Area 1 encompassed a large section of the village as indicated by the
plat on the east side of the road. Excavation Area 2 encompassed the total area
of the village (and beyond) as indicated on the west side of the road.

Using a total station, shovel-test-pits (STPs) were placed at 6-meter
intervals, organized in nine transects in Area 1 and six transects in Area 2
(Figure 5.1). An alphanumeric system was used to identify STP contexts,
comprised of an area number, a transect letter, and an STP number within that
transect. For example, “1-R–04” signifies the fourth consecutive STP in Transect
R of Excavation Area 1. Each alphanumeric designation is preceded by the Good
Hope Village site number, “1236.” All STPs were 50 centimeters in diameter and
100% screened through 1/4” mesh. Following methodological standards
previously used on the island by DAACS, STPs were not excavated
statigraphically, but rather as single assemblages.
Figure 5.1: Overlay of STP locations on top of 1794 map of the Good Hope’s Village I.

Sediments were recorded in profile by stratigraphic layer, with each layer characterized by depth, sediment texture, mussel color, inclusion type, inclusion size, and inclusion percentage.

Together, a crew of seven excavated a total of 184 STPs yielding over 12,000 artifacts, and in some places, revealing the locations of house and garden walls, brick paving, and terraced platforms (Figure 5.2). Artifacts were washed and bagged by STP and material type on-site.
Figure 5.2: Archaeological site plan of Good Hope’s Village I, illustrating STP survey of the southeast corner of the village. Map by author.

The heaviest artifacts, including large bricks and metals, were catalogued into the DAACS database remotely from Jamaica, while the rest of the material was catalogued into the digital database at the College of William and Mary and the DAACS lab at Monticello.

Geostatistical analysis of survey data revealed the presence of distinct size-sorting patterns in ceramics, rendering the taphonomic signature of regular yard sweeping around and between house sites (Bassett 2016b). Swept spaces
articulated the sample area’s eight uncovered dwellings into four distinct domestic loci (Figure 5.3). Two loci suggest clusters of two to three houses, while the other two suggest isolated houses not connected to other dwellings by swept yards. Each house and housing cluster possessed a series of low, dry-laid stonewalls likely outlining common and individual house gardens. These patterns, and the manner in which they were uncovered, will be discussed further in Chapter 6.

Figure 5.3: Site plan reconstruction based on geostatistical analysis of survey data, illustrating 1-x-1m unit sampling locations.
In 2015, fieldwork continued in Village I at the Phase II level of investigation. Guided by the findings of the 2014 STP survey, a crew of five excavated four targeted 1-x-1-meter test units in the center and peripheries of house-yards. Using boundaries revealed by swept yard patterns (to be discussed in the chapter to follow), the targeted 1-x-1 meter units sampled three of the four house clusters uncovered in the survey. This approach allowed me to 1.) Stratigraphically test the swept yard signatures uncovered in 2014; 2.) Sample individual houses and housing clusters for intra-site variation among households; and 3.) Assess for change through time at each house location.

Stratigraphic sampling confirmed spatial patterns seen in the 6-meter-interval STP survey, while revealing meaningful spatial and temporal variation among houses. Each house site shared common strata, ranging from five to seven cultural layers sitting atop a clay subsoil (Figure 5.4). Layers were composed of either loamy sand, clay loam, sandy loam, or silty clay loam. Interfaces between these layers were distinguished through changes in sediment color and inclusion type/size. Granule, pebble, and cobble-sized limestone was the most common inclusion-type, ranging from 5% to 55% of the volume of each stratum. Site-wide strata ranged from 25 cm to 45 cm deep, before reaching a dark yellowish brown subsoil (10YR 4/6). Structural features (e.g., cooking pits and post holes) typically penetrated an additional 20 cm into subsoil.

In Village I, the crew uncovered seven features across four 1-x-1-m units. Over half of these were cooking related, including three open-air hearths and one ash pit. The remaining three features were architectural, including one posthole
and two dry-laid walls. Two of the four cooking hearths yielded significant faunal and ceramic material, likely representing primary deposition capped by intentional fill. The lone post-hole lacked a postmold, and was filled with both stabilizing stone and mortar from a set of foundations through which the post once stood. As with the hearth fill, the post was intentionally removed. This, along with temporal fluctuations in yard boundaries suggests that constructed space was not fixed in the village, and both architecture and activities periodically shifted. Prior to stratigraphic sampling, countless other features were uncovered in the STP survey. These included house foundations, prepared floors, brick bat paving, garden walls, and other features too numerous to describe here.

**Feature 5.4:** Profile drawing of Unit 4 in Good Hope’s Village I.
Faunal remains varied little between households, yet collectively change through time. Over the course of the late 18th century, enslaved people living in Village I prepared and consumed a wide range of domestic animals including goat, sheep, pig, cow, and turtle (Ohman 2015a). Around the turn of the 19th century, this shifted to a fairly uniform diet of beef. This aligns with a provisioning strategy developed by Tharp around this time. By 1800, Tharp owned two cattle pens in the region. Just upriver, Windsor Pen served as a breeding estate to raise working livestock for Tharp’s plantations, while the much smaller Top Hill Pen served as a fattening pen, where older livestock were sent before redistribution back to the plantations as beef provisions for enslaved people (Shepherd 1991).

Artifactual evidence uncovered from the 184 STPs and four units exceeded 14,000 individual objects. To uncover meaningful variation among a finite range of materials, I catalogued and analyzed all artifacts at the attribute level. This yielded detailed datasets, such as maximum ceramic sherd size, which produced socially meaningful variation typically lost at the object level of analysis. As expected, creamware, pearlware, and early-whiteware represented the most common ware-types found across the site (Table 5.1). Ceramics found in fewer numbers include British stonewares, Chinese porcelain, Staffordshire slipware, and locally made coarse earthenware. Other non-ceramic materials included cooking pots and utensils, green wine-bottle style glass, leaded and
unleaded glass tableware, architectural materials, specialized trade tools, gardening implements, personal adornment items, among other objects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERAMIC WARE-TYPE</th>
<th>TOTAL COUNT</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coarse Earthenware</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean Coarse Earthenware</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse Earthenware, unidentified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slipware, North Midlands/Staffordshire</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, Chinese</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain, English Bone China</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcellaneous/English Hard Paste</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Earthenware</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canary Ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delftware, Dutch/British</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone/White Granite</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware, refined</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Earthenware, modern</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Earthenware, unidentified</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin-Enameled, unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Ware</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Stoneware</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham Type</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosso Antico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware, unidentifiable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Salt Glaze</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Quantitative summary of ware-types excavated from Village I.
Village II:

For the second half of the 2015 season, the project focused on the small village for enslaved domestic servants just north of the Good Hope great house. I will refer to this smaller village as “Village II” in the remainder of this dissertation. Conveniently, surviving boundary walls and one remaining house foundation aligned with those illustrated on both a 1794 and 1806 map depicting the village. This minimized the need for comprehensive reconnaissance survey, and helped determine the extent of the sample area. As with Village I, the project used a 6-meter interval STP survey to locate subsurface deposits, establish a site chronology, and record spatial variation across the extent of the village. Approximately 31 STPs arranged in two overlapping cruciform patterns covered the extent of the walled-in site. In an artifact-rich area surrounding two house foundations in the southeast corner of the site, STP intervals were filled-in with a grid arrangement. A single 1-x-1m-test unit was placed in the yard periphery of the best surviving house foundations. This provided a household and stratigraphic sample of the artifact-rich "toft-zone" (Hayden and Cannon 1983:126), or peripheral area of swept accumulated debris representative of the range of household activities.

Within the “toft-zone” surrounding the foundations, the team excavated a gilt-decorated livery button bearing the family crest of John Tharp. The heraldry, designed by Tharp himself, depicts the demi-goddess personification of “Hope,” holding an anchor.
**Figure 5.5:** Archaeological site plan of Village II, showing its relationship to the Good Hope Great House. Map by author.

**Figure 5.6:** A map of the Good Hope Great House and domestic servants’ village, dated 1806. Private collection, Good Hope estate.
The same self-fashioned seal also appears on his plantation maps and above the gate of his country manor in Cambridge, England. This particular button was cast for Tharp in England, and likely arrived in Jamaica on the front of a waistcoat or topcoat for one of his enslaved domestic servants. Known historically as livery, male domestic servants wore a formal servant’s uniform, which almost always possessed the master’s crest. The finding of a livery button in Village II with the Tharp family crest provided a “smoking-gun” artifact that helped confirm Village II as the domestic servants' village.

As with Village I, the crew created detailed records of all above ground architectural and landscape features. This included the village boundary wall, one intact stone foundation mortared in course, one dry-laid rubble foundation, one dry-laid cut stone foundation, and a burial ground marked by low rectangular cut stone monuments. Of these features, the stone foundations mortared in course...
course represented the best surviving dwelling of an enslaved person on the plantation. Likewise, the burial ground situated in the corner of the village represents an incredible survival, and like the village, is considerably smaller than the burial ground for the rest of the enslaved community at Good Hope. This suggests that enslaved domestic servants were not only segregated from the rest of the enslaved community in life, but also in death.

Unlike Village I, Village II occupies a natural terrace on the slope of a large hill. The site contains six distinct stratigraphic layers sitting directly atop limestone bedrock (Figure 5.8).

**Figure 5.8**: Wall profile of 1-x-1m test unit from Village II. Drawing by author.
However similar to Village I, sediment color defining strata ranged from dark brown (7.5YR 3/2), to very dark greyish brown (10YR 3/2), to dark yellowish brown (10YR 3/4). Along with color changes, granule to cobble limestone inclusions ranged from 5% to 50% of layer volume, defined distinct transitions between strata. Therefore, despite their separation and different topographies, the sediment characteristics were virtually identical between Village I and II.

Arifactual evidence from Village II represented a diversity similar to the assemblage found in Village I. The crew uncovered creamware, pearlware, and whiteware in large quantities, alongside Staffordshire slipware, delftware, Chinese porcelain, English porcelains, British stonewares, and locally made coarse earthenware. The site also yielded a larger number of clothing buttons, mirror fragments, and other personal adornment and presentation related items. A more unusual find included a locally made sheet copper oil lamp, virtually identical to one found by Armstrong (1990:177) in the slave village at Drax Hall in St. Anne Parish. Identified as a form common to many parts of the Gold Coast (ibid. p. 175), and contemporary Ghana, the oil lamp was likely a product of household production by enslaved people, and sold in the Falmouth and/or Montego Bay markets. As will be discussed in later chapters, items for gardening and food preparation were noticeably absent from Village II, while evidence for consumption of food and drink was widespread. Faunal remains included more taxa of animals than those found in Village I, including sea bass, frog, guinea fowl, and duck, in addition to cow, goat, pig, and chicken (Ohman 2015b).
Table 5.2: Quantitative summary of ceramic ware-types excavated from Good Hope’s Village II.

Together, Village II represents an undisturbed small-scale village, which exclusively housed enslaved domestic servants. The rich archaeological evidence provided a view of the domestic lives shaping and shaped by a single occupation. Comparison of this assemblage to household and village-wide patterns in Village I will speak to both common and unique characteristics shared by this subset of the enslaved population. In Chapters 9 and 10, it will provide the
opportunity to test the trope of the “high status” domestic servant, occupying the top of the socio-economic hierarchy within an enslaved population, and other domestic differences shaped by occupation.

Taken together, the investigation of Village I and Village II provided a comprehensive view of the domestic spaces of enslaved people on a large-scale rural sugar plantation. Yet in 18th and 19th-century Jamaica, this was only half the story. Enslavement was not unique to plantation contexts, but instead, fulfilled virtually every labor need in this society. This included the production, market, and domestic needs of port towns along the coast. For Good Hope and neighboring plantations, this port was Falmouth, approximately seven miles north. Here, the very same domestic servants who occupied Village II, periodically traveled to and resided at the seaside Tharp House. An 1804 document provides us with their names (Tharp Papers R.55.7.123.1.2). As Charlotte, Jenny, Marry Anne, William, Hercules, Nancy, Sarah, Harry, Prince, Diana, Cuffee, Hamlet, Louisa, Old Lucia, Jor, Monica, and Sophia moved from Good Hope to Falmouth, they likewise moved from rural to urban slavery. As a comparative view of the same individuals residing in two locations, archaeological investigation of the Tharp House provided the opportunity to isolate the unique and shared qualities of urban enslavement, and the means through which enslaved people extended their social world between town and country.
**Tharp House:**

In 2016, the Good Hope Archaeological Project shifted its focus to this comparative urban dataset. While not within the formal boundaries of Good Hope, Tharp’s Falmouth town house and its associated wharf complex operated as an integral part of the plantation. As previously mentioned, Tharp used the town house as a second residence while seeing to business and civic affairs in Falmouth, the capital and principal port of Trelawny Parish. While in residence, at least eight domestic servants traveled with him from Good Hope to Falmouth to support the domestic needs of his urban house.

The archaeological investigation of the Tharp House focused on the walled-in open lot immediately behind the house. As previous studies have shown (Wesler 2013; Nelson et. al 2014; Nelson 2016), enslaved people in Jamaica’s ports typically occupied small dwellings or a range of quarters in the rear yards of urban houses. Today, the rear yard of Tharp’s town house contains several remnant outbuildings and a central partition wall, dividing the yard into two distinct spaces. An 1840s-map depicting the space suggests that the masonry partition dates to the period of slavery, as do at least two additional outbuildings not visible on the surface.

As with Villages I and II, the archaeological team used a shovel-test-pit (STP) approach to determine the organization of people and activity across the yard through time. Excavation of both sides of the central partition suggests that the wall was original to the construction of the townhouse.
This begs the question: with open workspace at a premium in urban settings, why divide an open yard? To answer this, and pinpoint both the working and domestic activities of enslaved domestic servants, I established an STP grid that covered both sides of the wall. In total, excavation of 45 STPs, at 3-meter intervals, produced approximately 4,476 artifacts dating from the mid-18th to the mid-20th century (Bassett 2016a:2).
As expected, the project uncovered the subsurface remains of the two additional outbuildings dating to the Tharp-period (1790–1838), each located on opposite sides of the yard's partition wall. Analysis of the outbuilding deposits revealed that the building located in the south yard was historically used as a kitchen, while the larger building in the north yard was residential, likely serving as quarters for the enslaved house domestics.

Site strata varied significantly across the yard, ranging from 25 cm to 70 cm of cultural deposits sitting atop a sandy loam (7.5YR 3/2) subsoil. Individual
STPs contained between two and seven distinct layers of sandy loam and sandy clay with brick and limestone inclusions. In deeper layers (> 45 cm), granule to pebble-size limestone inclusions made up 70% to 90% of the volume per stratum, yet yielded historic material. Combined with the irregular subsoil depth across the site, this suggests that the Tharp House complex sits atop reclaimed land constructed in the mid-18th century.

The approximately 4,476 historic artifacts uncovered from the site ranged from mid-18th to early-20th century material. The clear majority of these items dated to between 1775 and 1840. The 1,006 ceramics excavated from the yard represent 10 different ceramic forms, and approximately 19 ware-types representing a large variety of British, Dutch, Chinese, and locally made ceramic vessels.

Despite 20th-century disturbance from selective concrete paving, and bioturbation from crab holes, the excavation revealed intact spatial integrity for artifacts and their associated contexts. This was verified between predicted and actual window glass distributions relative to the standing architectural record.

To the contrary, stratigraphic mixing proved to be widespread across the site, primarily as a result of crab activity. And while stratigraphic layers were visible and recorded, their associated artifacts were distributed across strata. Therefore, the site is best characterized archaeologically as having a low degree of vertical integrity, but a high degree of horizontal integrity.
### Table 5.3: Quantitative summary of ceramic ware-types uncovered in the Tharp House investigation.

Analysis of this space (Chapter 10) must approach this material quantitatively through spatial assemblage studies (e.g., STP assemblage, Site assemblage, North Yard assemblage, South Yard assemblage) and continuous spatial distributions by STP. Chronological control should likewise rely upon the
artifacts themselves (as spatial assemblages), rather than dating stratigraphic
contexts. In this way, the shovel-test-pit (STP) methodology was optimally suited
for this site, and these taphonomic findings negated the use of stratigraphic
testing through units.

Chronology:

A comparative approach to archaeology requires strict controls. For inter-
site comparison, arguably the most important control is control of time. To
uncover meaningful social variation between the three sites addressed in this
dissertation, time must be ruled out as a contributory factor in the material
variation between the two or more datasets in question. In this way, establishing
contemporaneity between the three sites, and contexts within those sites, is
perhaps the most important task before any reliable comparisons can be made.

At Village I, Village II, and the Tharp House, I drew upon three
independent lines of evidence to establish site and context chronologies:
documentary evidence, Mean Ceramic Dating, and superposition. While a single
dating method must always be used with caution, multiple independent lines of
chronological evidence help reinforce the relative dating tools of historical
archaeology. Of these tools, those relying on the known production dates of
ceramics (South 1977), and the regression trends of pipe stem bore diameters
(Harrington 1954; Binford 1962) have proven to be the most reliable.

Given the large number of ceramics recovered during the project, the use
of Mean Ceramic Dating (MCD) provided the most reliable method for
establishing a general chronology for each site. Most ceramic ware types found in Jamaica during this period are associated with well-documented beginning and end dates of manufacture, aiding significantly in the dating of individual shovel-test-pits (STP) and stratified contexts. In many ways, the representation and variety of ceramic ware-types found on all three sites is typical for not only late-18th/early-19th century domestic sites in Jamaica (Higman 1998, Wesler 2008, Neiman et al. 2010, Delle 2014; Bassett 2015), but sites associated with the British Atlantic generally (Smith et al. 2008). The MCD method uses the median of these beginning and end dates of production to calculate an average date weighted by the quantities of the given ware-types per assemblage (South 1977). At Good Hope and the Tharp House, each site yielded high numbers of creamware, pearlware, and whiteware, which in combination with small numbers of earlier and later wares (e.g., Staffordshire Slipware, Delftware, Chinese export porcelain, dry-bodied stonewares, ironware, yellowware) produced tight and reliable median dates for each spatial and stratified assemblage.

In Villages I and II, stratigraphic excavation provided an independent line of evidence to verify dates produced from MCDs. All 1x1-m units were excavated by natural stratigraphic layers, with each unit ranging from five to seven sequential layers. Except for one layer from a single unit in Village 1 (Unit 3, Layer 3), all stratigraphic contexts contained a sufficient sample size of ceramics to establish a chronological sequence using MCDs. For every test unit, the sequence of MCDs matched the superposition of the respective layers. These two independent lines of evidence made clear the reliability of MCDs as a dating
method for these sites, and highlight the integrity of the stratigraphy for more thorough analysis.

**Village 1**

Calculation of Mean Ceramic Dates (MCD’s) by STP assemblage (with ceramic samples ≥ 4 sherds) suggests that Village I was occupied from the third-quarter of the 18th century through the third-quarter of the 19th century, with the greatest intensity of occupation occurring between the 1790s and the 1830s. A beginning date in the 1770s suggests that the Williams-era (1744 – 1766) slave village was located elsewhere on the estate. Very few mid-18th-century ceramics were found in the survey, and those that were recovered concentrate in the western extreme of the site near the blacksmith’s shop.

As an alternative approach, Neiman and Smith (2005) and Galle (2010) suggest that the Mean Ceramic Dating methodology can be refined to give less weight to ceramic ware-types with relatively long ranges of manufacture (e.g., Chinese export porcelain, Delft, whiteware). This refined formula, known as Best Linear Unbiased Estimator Mean Ceramic Dating, or BLUE MCD for short, was used to calculate dates alongside normal MCDs for Village 1. Comparatively, BLUE MCDs produced a tighter date range, confining the occupation to a half-century period between the late 18th century and the first three decades of the 19th century. If accurate, this might suggest that the village was abandoned shortly after Jamaica’s Emancipation in 1838.
Figure 5.11: Grouping of MCD’s within Good Hope’s Village I. Graph by author.

The difference between the MCDs and BLUE MCDs is likely a product of the large quantities of transitional whiteware found in the village. Transitional whiteware is a somewhat liminal stage in the history of mass production of British refined earthenwares. This non-category represents the fluid transition between pearlware and whiteware in the first to second quarter of the 19th century. By reducing the influence of whiteware as a single category, BLUE MCDs are likely to push the occupation range of the village slightly earlier. Likewise, retaining the
long date-range influence of whiteware with normal MCDs pushes representations of occupation dates much later. Considering these two dating formulas with known historical occupations and categorical issues surround whiteware, it is very likely that the true date range rest between the results of the two formulas.

The higher intensity of occupation seen in the grouping of dates from the 1790s-1830s reflects periods of ownership by John Tharp (from 1767 – 1804) and the Tharp Family (1804 –1839). The drop between 1830 and 1840 was likely a product of Emancipation (1838), and the subsequent large-scale reduction of the village population. In 1840, the plantation was purchased by the Coy Family, who resumed sugar production. Between 1840 and 1860, the gradual rise in the intensity of the village's occupation (reflected in the regular MCDs) is possibly due to efforts by Coy to increase the labor population, using a combination of newly freed Jamaicans and indentured East Indian laborers. The last known dates of sugar production at Good Hope were in the late-1870s just before Coy's death. After a period of abandonment, Good Hope was converted into a cattle pen in the late-19th century, which might explain the gradual rise in late-19th century.

The village appears to have been reoccupied in the 1930s and 1940s, at which point two tightly dated domestic signatures can be seen in Excavation Area I of Village 1. While not reflected in either MCDs or BLUE MCDS, confidence in dating these two households is based upon concentrations of Wood's Ivory Ware, the production date of which (limited to this particular form
and maker's mark) ranges from the 1930s through the 1940s. Also, a Pyrex-like bread pan with aquatic overglaze decoration from the McKee Glass Company (makers mark: "MCK," from Philadelphia) dating to the 1930s and 40s was also found in this area. A nearly complete medicine bottle with an Owen's maker's mark (an American glass company) recovered in this area also has a range of production limited to 1920 through the 1940s.

In 2015, I excavated four 1-x-1m-test units in Village I, in part to refine this chronology at the individual household level. To summarize, four test units in three domestic loci produced nearly identical occupation ranges, beginning in the 1780s with domestic assemblages running through the 1840s. Within this range, the most intensive domestic occupation of the house-yards ranged from the early 1790s through the 1830s. Each test unit yielded a common stratigraphic sequence of five discrete layers, the bottom three of which dated to the period of slavery. Units one and two, sampling the same domestic loci produced an additional two layers, predating the uniform five across the site. These contained small amounts of creamware and Staffordshire slipware, suggesting limited earlier (1760s/1770s) use of this portion of the site.

Village 2:

As with Village 1, the quantity of ceramics recovered from Village 2 supported phasing through mean ceramic dating (MCD). MCDs produced a shorter period of occupation than Village I, ranging from the 1770s through
roughly 1830. The 1790s marked a peak period of domestic activity in Village II, likely reflecting the years of domestic support leading up to John Tharp’s death in 1804. This, however, illustrates that domestic service did not cease upon Tharp’s death, but continued through occupation by planting attorney William Greene, and by the 1820, William Tharp.

The superposition of dated strata provided an independent verification of chronological sequence. All MCDs correctly arranged stratigraphic layers, confirming the validity of the MCD method and the integrity of site strata. Frequency seriation provided a more detailed look at this relationship between time and ceramic, as ordered by superposition.

**Figure 5.12:** Grouping of MCDs within Good Hope’s Village II.
Frequency seriation involves arranging artifacts based on their stylistic similarities, and measuring the degree to which this ordering reflects change through time (Ford 1962; Dunnell 1970; O’Brien and Lyman 1999). Frequency seriation of ceramic ware types produced perfect unimodal, or battleship-shaped, curves across unit layers (Figure 5.13). This suggests that domestic servants kept up to date with larger market trends by continually purchasing or acquiring fashionable ceramics during the period of occupation.

Together, dates produced by both the STP survey and unit testing confirmed contemporaneity between Village I and Village II. Both sites were occupied from the forth quarter of the 18th century through the end of the second quarter of the 19th century. After this point, Village II was abandoned and the occupation of Village I continued through the early-20th century. Individual houses sampled stratigraphically likewise confirmed contemporaneity between individual houses across the two villages. In both cases, the period of simultaneous existence for all sampled houses ranged from the mid-1790s
through the 1820s. Therefore, any comparative analysis on the household scale between Villages I and II must be confined to this period.

**Tharp House:**

Unlike Villages I and II, a detailed written record exists for the Tharp House complex, significantly aiding in establishing the site’s history. From the documentary record alone, a general site chronology can be pieced together as follows (Bassett 2016:5-9):

1.) Stothart-period (mid-1700s–1775)  
2.) Tharp-period (1774-1804)  
3.) Tharp Estate Period (1804-1840)  
4.) Coy and Wharf Office Period (1840–1871)  
5.) Customs House / Government Office Period (1871-2008)

Of these five phases, only the first three were expected to hold domestic deposits. This was confirmed by the archaeology, though only Periods 2 and 3 represented intensive domestic use of the rear-yard.

Calculation of MCD's by STP assemblage (with ceramic samples ≥ 4 sherds) demonstrates that the Tharp House yard was occupied from the third-quarter of the 18th century through the mid-19th century, with the greatest intensity of occupation occurring between the 1790s and the 1830s.

Two distinct periods of heightened domestic occupation can be seen in the clustering of Mean Ceramic Dates (Figure 5.14). The first occurs between 1795 and 1805. This aligns with John Tharp's construction of the townhouse, and runs through his death in 1804. The second intensity occurs in the 1820s, under
the management of William Tharp. While the wharf complex continuously sustained human activity, the significance of this pattern demonstrates a key range of intensive use of the townhouse rear yard as a domestic support space – 1790 through Emancipation in 1838. In many ways, this serves as a useful proxy for understanding the occupation of the townhouse as a residence, as well as date ranges in which enslaved domestic servants occupied the rear yard.

Ceramics predating creamware (1767-1795) fell in the extreme minority, and do not appear to define an earlier domestic presence on the site. Likewise, ceramics post-dating Pearlware were not found in sufficient numbers to suggest domestic occupation of the site after 1850. Overall, this archaeological chronology aligns well with the historically documented sequence of ownership. A material-based approach, however, articulates the nature of this chronology in terms of site use and occupation intensity.

**Figure 5.14:** Grouping of MCDs from the rear yard of the Tharp House in Falmouth. Graph by author.
Together, this date range establishes contemporaneity between servants’
quarters behind the Tharp House and Good Hope’s Village I and Village II. As
mentioned previously, the precise range of simultaneous existence of residential
quarters across all three sites is approximately 1795 through the 1820s. A
comparative approach to the three space will require confinement of the three
datasets dated contexts within this range.

**Conclusion:**

The archaeology of domestic life within a plantation village or rear yard is
revealing of many silent aspects of the enslaved experience. The material culture
of day-to-day domestic life illustrates the human dimension of plantation labor,
which often gets lost in the essentialized picture of an “enslaved community.”
Variation in the possessions, habits, and constructed spaces of enslaved
households represent a major contradiction to totalizing narratives of enslaved
people rendered as a distinct population, community, or otherwise homogenous
experience. Archaeological evidence illustrates that widespread difference
existed, as did some commonalities.

The three sites in question revealed comparable archaeological material,
representing domestic occupation of each site over the course of the late-18th
and early-19th century. In some ways, the Good Hope villages and Tharp House
yard illustrate the hallmark qualities of a British Atlantic site of this period. What
distinguishes these sites, however, is the unique variation found along
dimensions of space, time, and form that reveal social worlds within a world so to
speak. These artifacts and features present more humanizing dynamics of a population systematically dehumanized by the society in which they found themselves. To this end, the material culture animates an otherwise static understanding of the “enslaved community,” to reveal the complex forms of social organization, consumerism, and innovation created by enslaved people within plantation society.
CHAPTER 6: RECONSTRUCTING THE VILLAGE

“... we must have a spatially bounded universe with a series of populations in it, and that we must draw samples from those populations in such a way as to recover data on the nature and sources of variation. And that’s no more, and no less, than what I like to call The Basic Paradigm of Good Archaeology (Flannery 1976:8).”

Introduction:

Understanding variation in the archaeological record is the basic approach to understanding the lives of those who left that record behind. Careful control over space, time, and form allows the archaeologists to define the sources of variation as they emerge from one or more of these three interrelated dimensions (South 1972; Deetz 1977). The previous chapter focused on one of these dimensions – time – to control for material variation, or lack thereof, that occurred as product of the temporal span of each domestic area. With a careful temporal control in place, this chapter focuses on the remaining two dimensions – space and form. As I will illustrate, the intersection of space and form is perhaps the most meaningful variation to be found as it concerns the social worlds constructed by enslaved people. Therefore, this chapter on settlement organization is a necessary and insightful point of departure. From this step, we may then climb further up the “ladder of inference” (Hawkes 1954:161-162), towards the social institutions and dynamics that might have defined a village of enslaved people as an “enslaved community.”
**Historical Context of Housing:**

In 1804, approximately 484 enslaved individuals lived and labored at Good Hope estate. As discussed in the previous chapter, the vast majority of Good Hope’s enslaved people lived in a 28,000 sq.-meter (or 7 acre) village near the center of the estate – Village I. Annual “Increases & Decreases” records for Good Hope (Tharp Papers R.55.7.123.1) indicate than an average of 414 enslaved individuals likely lived in Village I at any given time between the 1790s and the 1830s. On the other end of the plantation, between eight and 15 enslaved domestic servants occupied five to six houses immediately behind the great house.

Between these two locations, the enslaved people of Good Hope constructed and occupied their own built environments under varying conditions of enslavement. Externally imposed constraints varied from field, to trade labor, to domestic service. Yet born from these conditions were internally defined social worlds built and maintained by enslaved people. Archaeological evidence of their dwellings, their gardens, and their yards render this constructed world visible, and paints a new picture of the various community-level dynamics created under conditions of enslavement.

**Architectural Variation at Good Hope:**

The study of village settlements is necessarily multi-scalar, transcending landscape and household archaeologies. As Flannery (1976:5) first observed,
villages must be excavated “as if they were villages.” This involves appropriate sampling methods at both the community and household scale, to understand how the latter aggregates to create the former. While this significance is understood in socio-economic terms in this dissertation, others may find equally meaningful social, behavioral, or symbolic connections between the enslaved household and the plantation village. Yet no matter the interpretation, the starting point is the same. If the household represents the most basic social unit, then understanding the household requires an equally basic material unit as a point of departure: the “household cluster.”

As discussed in Chapter 2, the dwelling approach taken here underscores the household as a practically engaged, socially constituted residential unit. This activity-centered perspective highlights the importance of those constructed household elements beyond the dwelling that define the integrated domestic unit, or “household cluster.” The “household cluster” is defined as “the house and all the surrounding storage pits, burials, middens, and features that can be reliably associated with that same household” (Flannery 1976:5; see also Winter 1976; Kent 1987; Gallivan 2003; Jongsma and Greenfield 2003). One body of evidence illustrative of the “household cluster” that defined an enslaved person’s domestic unit comes from a 1794 survey plat of Good Hope. Drawn for plantation-owner John Tharp for his brief absentee administration, the detailed map depicts approximately 50 village houses separate and unarticulated from one another – each house an isolated unit with a small garden, surrounded by a fieldstone wall. While this map provides direction as to what defined the basic “household
cluster” in Good Hope’s village, archaeological evidence reveals a different story, one that moves beyond stylized representations to express an integrated three-part cluster.

The most significant deviation from 1794 representation was the almost universal construction and maintenance of outdoor living space beyond a dwelling’s walls. In Good Hope’s Village I and II, swept earthen yards surrounded each house, and were likely constructed and maintained to support domestic tasks and establish relationships among dwellings. Internally, swept yards separated individual dwellings within extended households, and defined usable space between house and planted land. Adjacent to yards, low stone walls defined small garden plots that provided for the household, supplementing larger provision plots beyond the village boundaries. As the fundamental domestic unit, the house, yard, and kitchen garden formed an almost universal “household cluster” of an enslaved person’s built environment at Good Hope. Elaboration, extension, and/or exclusion of one or more of these three elements created variation among the households that defined Good Hope’s enslaved population. As such, this constructed variation became one of the many mediums through which social relations were established and negotiated between households of enslaved people.

Houses:

Building materials uncovered during archaeological investigations suggest that construction varied from household to household. Boarded, nog (or "Spanish
Wall"), and wattle dwellings stood side by side within the boundaries of Village 1. These findings are consistent with archaeological evidence for nog and boarded houses at Marshall’s Pen (Delle 2014:166), and detailed records from Montpelier Estate (Higman 1998). The latter record provides an important snapshot of the architectural variation found in a typical village on a Jamaican sugar estate. For "Old Montpelier" in the 1820s, this breakdown of house construction consisted of 64% wattled, 21% boarded, 2% shingled, 4% nog, and 9% stone (Higman 1998:152).

Figure 6.1: Reconstruction of a thatched and boarded house Good Hope’s Village I based on archaeological evidence from this dissertation. Photo by K. Harding.
Among the eight dwellings from the sample area of Good Hope's Village I, evidence suggests that board houses roofed in thatch dominated other housing types.

In Village II, mortared stone foundations for a small dwelling now stand near the entrance to the site. This represents the only foundations encountered with rough-cut stones mortared in courses. In other examples from Villages I and II, house foundations were typically dry-laid, and commonly took the form of a rubble terrace to level uneven ground. To create these forms, cobble to boulder-size stones were stacked to the preconceived footprint of a house to support a sill, or around an earthfast frame of corner and ridge posts sunk into the ground. The mortared foundations from Village II represent a remarkable survival of the latter, with the hollow casts of principal posts, studs, and a doorframe still intact. These voids reveal that the corner and ridge posts were sunk 1 to 1.5 feet into the earth, around which limestone foundations were laid in rough courses to just below the height of the floor. Studs were then inserted in regular intervals between the principal posts, connecting the roof frame to the foundations. An additional one to two courses of limestone were then laid to anchor the studs, and provide support for a wooden floor. Two narrow slots were left open in the foundation to provide ventilation beneath the floorboards. Stratigraphic testing of the dwelling's yard suggests that this house was built in the late 18th century, and remained occupied through the 1830s. And while this dwelling appears to represent a significant investment, other houses of this period follow this form within a small range of variation.
While house size can only be estimated for most dwellings, two extant foundations in Good Hope’s villages suggest that the plantation’s housing for enslaved people fits within island-wide trends. Among such dwellings excavated and reported on in Jamaica over the past 60 years (Table 6.1), one common denominator emerges. As with the two extant stone foundations at Good Hope, house footprints are typically defined by multiples of three feet. This measure represents the standard English yard and suggests that most houses were likely constructed by, or with the aid of, skilled enslaved tradesmen fluent in English building measures. From this 3’ x 3’ building block, housing ranged from 9’ x 18’ (162 sq. ft.) to 30’ x 30’ (900 sq. ft.). This echoes recent findings for contemporaneous free-black housing in the nearby town of Falmouth (Nelson 2011). While the 18th-century sample is limited, four examples from Good Hope, Drax Hall, and Seville suggest that late 18th-century housing was generally smaller the 19th-century housing, and of a more standard size (Figure 6.2). The period from 1800 through Emancipation witnessed a much wider variation in house dimensions, with dwellings generally becoming larger, yet retained the 3’ x 3’ building block. Two measurable examples from Good Hope, one late 18th century and one early 19th century, are closer to the lower extreme of this range. These two examples align with period descriptions from Bryan Edwards (1793:163) and John Stewart (1823:266), who observe that most housing for enslaved people in Jamaica falls between 10’-15’ x 15’-20’ (Table 6.1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Buildings</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drax Hall</td>
<td>Late-18th c.</td>
<td>16.6' x 29.3'</td>
<td>486.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Armstrong 1990:101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Hope</td>
<td>Late-18th c.</td>
<td>14.5' x 15.8'</td>
<td>229.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bassett 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Late-18th c.</td>
<td>13.0' x 19.5'</td>
<td>253.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Armstrong 1992:55-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seville</td>
<td>Late-18th c.</td>
<td>16.3' x 22.8'</td>
<td>371.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Armstrong 1992:55-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drax Hall</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>11.4' x 19.5'</td>
<td>222.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Armstrong 1990:112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Hope</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>12.2' x 21.1'</td>
<td>257.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bassett 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roehampton</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>16' x 24'</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Higman 1998:150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>9' x 18'</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>12' x 24'</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>15' x 18'</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>15' x 21'</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>15' x 25'</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>15' x 28'</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>15' x 30'</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>18' x 18'</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>18' x 21'</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>18' x 25'</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>18' x 27'</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>18' x 30'</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>18' x 36'</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>21' x 28'</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>21' x 34'</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>25' x 25'</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>25' x 30'</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>27' x 30'</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Montpelier</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>30' x 30'</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Higman 1998:149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island-wide Estimate</td>
<td>Late-18th c.</td>
<td>15-20' x 15'</td>
<td>225-300</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Edwards 1794:164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island-wide Estimate</td>
<td>Early-19th c.</td>
<td>10-15' x 15-20'</td>
<td>150-300</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Stewart 1823:266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Dimensions of all published slaving housing excavated in plantation contexts in Jamaica to date.
Figure 6.2: Scatter plot of house length and width (ft.) for slave housing excavated in plantation contexts in Jamaica.

Functional analysis of artifact assemblages from Village I and Village II reveal several common characteristics among dwellings at Good Hope. Targeted unit excavation at sampled house sites yielded tightly dated, stratified contexts associated with each house. Using Douglas Armstrong’s (1998) categories for functional analysis, and controlling for time between 1780 and 1830, each 1x1m unit assemblage was characterized using five functional categories, each of which contained three to five sub-categories. Most relevant to this chapter is the “Architectural” category, which includes all construction, hardware, finishing, and otherwise decorative material associated with the physical dwelling. Among the four separate household loci investigated, architectural material represented the majority of artifacts recovered in each.
Comparison of the range of artifact classes suggest that houses in both village sites were built from the same set of architectural materials. This suggests that most variation in housing occurred as a product of craftsmanship, rather than access to building materials. This is most evident in stone foundations. As previously mentioned, semi-cut limestone blocks laid in courses were used for at least one house in Village II. Craftsmanship in these foundations suggests that this, however, was an investment in aesthetics more so than structural integrity. At least two houses in Village I mimicked this aesthetic of cut stone by plastering over rubble foundations to create a smooth plane. This practice is still used in many parts of rural Jamaica, and is amplified by scoring the smooth plane to the appearance of ashlar masonry.

Good Hope's probate records indicate that enslaved tradesmen crafted some building materials specifically for the plantation's enslaved community. An 1804 inventory for Good Hope's blacksmith shop reveals a stockpile of door hardware referred to as "negro door hinges" (Tharp Papers R.55.7.123.2). This special genre of hardware, listed separate from plain “door hinges,” likely indicates locally crafted iron strap hinges for use by enslaved people on their houses. Seven of these noticeably thinner strap hinges were recovered archaeologically from Good Hope’s two villages.

Other specialized building materials, such as casement windows, were either acquired from the plantation or the local market. While most windows were likely covered with jalousies, or fixed wood louvers set in a frame, archaeological evidence from Villages I and II demonstrate that at least one house from each
had glass, or glazed, windows. Turned lead, in the form of window came, excavated from Village II suggests that the few glass windows in each village were likely casement windows hung on iron hinges. Both louvered and casement windows allowed light to pass through when fixed or closed during the island’s frequent rain storms.

Yards:

The distribution of ceramics within the village sample area reveals a pattern shared among many African diasporic domestic contexts – the practice of yard sweeping (Westmacott 1992; Gundaker 1993; Heath and Bennett 2000; Gundaker and McWillie 2005). For Good Hope’s households of enslaved people, the maintenance of domestic space extended beyond the house interior to the exterior space surrounding the quarter. Widely practiced among contemporary Jamaican households, yard sweeping is a task typically carried out multiple times a day. Historically, sweeping occurred with hand-brooms made from tightly-bound palm fronds, or “broom-thatch,” which postured one to bend at the waist and sweep across the yard from center to periphery. The practice removed debris, vegetation, and loose sediment to the yard’s edge, creating a clean exterior living surface for domestic tasks and social gathering.

The aesthetic of the swept yard was amplified by the compaction of earth, formed through the combination of sweeping loose sediment and daily use of the yard’s surface. By keeping floors and surrounding yards swept, Good Hope’s enslaved households left a distinctive archaeological pattern. Other
archaeologists working in plantation contexts have looked to artifact densities to uncover a swept-yard pattern (Armstrong 1990, 1991; Heath 2000; Wilkie and Farsworth 2005). For example, Wilkie and Farnsworth (2005:192) used total spatial artifact densities to illustrate how “the intensity of utilization of space is greatest at distances of five meters and farther from the house.” This distance likely represents focal points of household domestic and social activity, which in plantation villages rarely occurred in around the house itself. Rather, cooking, washing, gardening, and socializing typically occurred outside, while indoor space was reserved for sleeping and storage. This division of indoor and outdoor activity is an important characteristic of community-level interactions, which will be discussed further in Chapters 7 and 9.

Relying on spatial values based on presence/absence, such as density, can be problematic for deciphering human spatial behavior. In the case of yards, a density of 0, or a relative absence of material evidence, is often the basis for identifying swept space. Rather than relying on the absence of evidence, attribute-level analysis of ceramics provides an alternative, continuous measure. Specifically, measuring maximum sherd size for historic ceramics, within the range of contemporaneity (1795–1820) for all dwellings in the sample area, reveals a distribution indicative of yard maintenance. This can be rendered geostatistically through a quantative method known as Ordinary Kriging. This method establishes a continuous measure of a common value across the sample grid, relating each sample to the 0-4 adjacent samples through contour smoothing (Conolly and Lake 2006). This produces a smoothed heat-map
measure of values across the sampled space. When measured through Ordinary Kriging, the distribution of average ceramic sherd size reveals a pattern of small debris size within the yard area, surrounded by larger debris size at the yard periphery. This taphonomic signature was formed as large ceramic sherds were swept to the yard periphery, while smaller ceramics were consistently left in place under the broom.

Figure 6.3: (Top) Spatial distribution of average ceramic sherd size, with blue indicating small ceramic size, yellow to orange indicating medium size, and red indicating largest size. (Bottom) Interpretation of geostatistical results, illustrating swept yard location (based on kriging) and garden wall location (based on subsurface features).
Detecting yard maintenance through artifact size patterns, or “size-sorting” (Wandsnider 1996:341), has had previous success in other archaeological contexts. Examples include Samson’s (2010:276) "systematic sweeping accumulations," Samford et al.’s (1986) "sweeping-up effect," and Bon-Harper (2009, 2010) and Neiman et al.’s (2014) use of an “artifact-size index.” In both villages at Good Hope, larger ceramic sizes define the boundaries of these swept spaces, creating a substantial domestic footprint surrounding each dwelling. While yards were clearly visible in size-sorting pattern throughout Village I, evidence for yard sweeping Village II is most clear surrounding the two foundations nearest the road.

In the summer of 2015, the first objective of stratigraphic testing was to assess the spatial yard patterns derived from the 2014 STP survey. As discussed above, these were based on average sherd size, with smaller ceramic sizes in yard centers, and larger ceramic sizes swept to the periphery. To test this vertically, I placed 1x1m units in yard centers (seen here in the example of units 1), and on the threshold of the yard peripheries (seen here in unit 2). Both units shared the same stratigraphic sequence, and confirmed a consistent and measurable difference in average ceramic size across stratigraphic layers between the yard center and the yard periphery. Moreover, the difference between the center and periphery of the yard highlights 25mm as the size threshold in which ceramics either get swept up, or left behind (Figure 6.4). Through experimental archaeology, I tested this in contemporary Jamaican house-yards using palm frond hand brooms (Figure 6.5).
Figure 6.4: Stratigraphic comparison of average ceramic sherd size in yard center and yard periphery

Figure 6.5: Experimental yard sweeping with ceramic sherds of various sizes.
The results of this experiment confirmed a size threshold of 25mm as a consistent pattern for what gets left behind.

As a new approach to detecting swept yards, I found that the combination of soil compaction, measured against ceramic size and frequency provides, a useful measure of sustained yard use and maintenance through time. Using a pentrometer, I measured the average soil compaction in each stratigraphic layer. Each average was derived from eight measurements in two different profile walls for each unit. This method, commonly used elsewhere to detect compact living surfaces, proved to be successful in detecting compact yard spaces. This was true in two different ways depending on whether you are excavating in the yard center, or yard periphery. In each case, the yard is detectable through high levels of soil compaction. At the yard center, the intensity of the yard's occupation can be seen when you measure levels of soil compaction against ceramic frequency (Figure 6.6). While these ceramics are tiny, their higher frequency correlates with higher levels of soil compaction, as an index of the higher levels of activity expected inside the yard. At the yard's edge, where spatially I detected larger swept debris, higher soil compaction correlates with higher average ceramic size across layers for the period of occupation (Figure 6.7). Together, these measures confirm vertically, what we can see spatially, while allowing us to see intensities of yard occupation as datable contexts.

With this independent confirmation of yard location and extent, yard size can be approximated for each discrete household area. The two single-structure households possessed yards ranging from 153 m² (1651 ft²) to 215 m² (2320
ft²). This range holds true for individual house-yards articulated together to form a larger compound. The two three-house compounds within the study area held combined yard space that ranged from 435 m² (4692 ft²) to 867 m² (9334 ft²).

**Figure 6.6:** A measure of soil compaction (kg/cm²) against ceramic frequency in test unit at a yard’s center.

**Figure 6.7:** A measure of soil compaction (kg/cm²) against average ceramic sherd size in test unit at a yard’s periphery.
In the case of the latter, combining yard space allow the individual houses to maximize swept yard space by using what would otherwise be boundary space defining yard space for single-house units.

House-yards and their organization have been viewed in many ways since Sidney Mintz (1974:232) first observed, "Together the house and yard form a nucleus within which the culture expresses itself, is perpetuated, changed, and reintegrated." Building upon this, Armstrong (1991:52) defined the house-yard in archaeological terms at Drax Hall, noting that, "... within slave communities, house structures alone are not the primary residence unit. Rather, the house and surrounding yard combine to form an inside-outside house-yard activity unit and a distinctive house-yard pattern of activities and material use." Armstrong (2011:87-88) later built upon the study of house and yard at Seville, observing a shift to large communal yards shared by multiple households, and the importance of common yards as spaces of "social interaction and discourse." At Good Hope, archaeological evidence suggests that activities in house yards ranged from food prep, to cooking, to house repair, to social gathering organized around eating, drinking, and smoking. Notably, the sample area yielded no evidence for yard burials, as seen at Seville (Armstrong and Fleischman 2003).

Yards also provided the necessary space for both subsistence and surplus. As few activities beyond sleeping and storage took place indoors, swept yards surrounding dwellings housed most household tasks. This leaves a distinctive archaeological signature, in which a peripheral ring of material culture represents the range of activities for a given household.
Figure 6.8: Reconstructive drawing of domestic activities in the swept-yard of the lone house in Loci 3 of Village I, based on archaeological evidence. Drawing by K. Harding.
While basic subsistence tasks, such as cooking, gardening, and dwelling repair are well represented in this artefactual range, a small-scale economy of market participation is likewise evident. Locally produced items for household use and exchange in local markets appear frequently in these yard deposits. For example, identical locally-made sheet copper oil lamps, likely made by and for enslaved people, have been found in both Good Hope’s and Drax Hall’s villages (see Armstrong 1990:177). Likewise, locally-produced earthenwares known as Yabba, or Afro-Caribbean Ware (Hauser 2008), is also well represented in Good Hope’s yard assemblages. These items, as well as surplus food, textiles, rope, baskets, and other organics that do not survive archaeologically were all produced in these yards. As Delle (2014:18) observes, "yard spaces were loci of production for the local markets." Domestic tasks could be divided among an extended household, freeing time for production activities and participation in local markets. For Good Hope, this local market was the well-known "Bend-down Market" of Falmouth, Jamaica, where goods for sale were, and are still today, referred to as "yard provisions."

The house-yard evidence at Good Hope reveals two types of housing arrangement: 1.) several houses arranged around a common yard; and 2.) a solitary house with its own yard. The former – multiple houses sharing a common yard – closely aligns with the findings of other archaeologists in Jamaica, including Delle (2014:166) at Marshall's Pen’s first village, Armstrong (2011) at Seville’s later village, and Higman (1995:168-171) at Montpelier and Sherwood.
Figure 6.9: Reconstructive drawing of yard sweeping in the yard of the dwelling in Loci 4 of Village I, based on archaeological evidence. Drawing by K. Harding.

Figure 6.10: Reconstructive drawing of a swept-yard cooking scene in Loci 1 in Village I, based on archaeological evidence. Drawing by K. Harding.
Variations between single house and housing cluster arrangements was almost certainly linked to the household composition of those occupying the structures. In a major demographic study of household composition, Higman (1995:168) found that creole, or Jamaican-born, skilled tradesmen and their "dependents" were the most common occupants of housing clusters, with no single demographic correlated with single houses. Consistent with findings from Good Hope, housing clusters at Montpelier were limited to two to three dwellings per extended kin group. However, unlike Good Hope, isolated houses for the general enslaved population were segregated from groups of clusters, likely representing a later expansion of the village.

Walls & Gardens:

Artifactual evidence in Village I and surviving yard architecture in Village II illustrates that many yards themselves were actually subdivided and partitioned. This suggests that yards were not only spaces that combined (i.e. people, activities, resources), but also spaces that divided. In Village II, a single course of dry-laid stone surrounds the surviving house foundations, in what appears to subdivide the space around the house into a distinctive inner and outer yard, creating nested spaces. A small opening in this stone partition aligns with the east-facing doorway of the quarter, indicating that one had to pass through multiple thresholds before reaching the house interior. This inner yard yielded a relative dearth of artifacts, while the outer contained most of the household assemblage, suggesting differential maintenance practices between the two.
Figure 6.11: Plan of inner and outer yard recorded in house-yard in Village II.

Figure 6.12: Reconstructive drawing of a swept-yard cooking scene in Loci 1 in Village I, based on archaeological evidence. Drawing by K. Harding.
Artifacts present in this inner yard, however, were noticeably different, often representing different types of activities.

As it concerns artifacts as a spectrum of activities and status, it should be noted that archaeology is limited to recovery to largely inorganics objects such as ceramic, stone, metal, and glass. The enslaved people of Good Hope undoubtedly used calabash bowls, wooden plates, and other organic wares and utensils. Therefore, it is necessary to define a baseline of common goods shared across the site, measurable through archaeological recovery. For houses in Good Hope’s villages, common tableware – creamware, pearlware, whiteware – were almost universally shared across the site (see Figure 7.6). Deviation from these common tablewares was almost always through finer items, which were highly concentrated. I therefore understand these deviations as “non-essential goods” within this particular context, conveying status through both their use and an as index of their associated activity.

When multiple households shared a common yard, as seen in Village I, non-essential status goods like teawares were commonly found in the space immediately surrounding the house, and not in the house nor the communal yard as other tablewares were. As with the yard architecture of Village II, this suggests a defined middle ground between the communal nature of the common yard and the privacy of the house interior.

This practice of an inner yard appears to have allowed for a degree of household autonomy within larger kinship compounds, and the ability to operate as both a small or larger residential unit depending on the activity. For example,
for social display—as suggested by the distribution of teawares immediately around houses—it might be more advantageous to operate as a smaller unit, in an inner yard, identifiable to a single household. On the other hand, with the domestic division of labor—the day-to-day cooking, washing, childcare, etc.—it might be more advantageous to operate as a larger kinship network of multiple households in the space of the common outer yard.

Interpretatively, one can consider this to be a spatial organization composed not of a binary house and yard; but rather, it is useful to think of this as a ternary complex of house, inner yard, and shared outer yard. These served different, yet related, purposes. An inner yard served as a buffer between the privacy of the house interior, and the public nature of the common yard. Sandwisched between the public area of the outer yard and the private nature of the house interior, it is likely that this inner yard served as a “publicly private” space to filter more restricted access to the home. Likewise, as items of display like tea and stemwares tend to cluster in this inner space, this “publically private” space allowed for publically visible exclusivity within larger contexts of the extended household, and village at large.

*Walls:*

Alongside each house-yard, evidence for household gardens, as with yards, manifests through their remnant boundaries. As illustrated in the 1794 plantation plat, each dwelling in Village I possessed an adjacent house garden, bound by stonewalls.
Figure 6.13: Reconstructive drawing based on Village I site plan, subsurface wall feature, artifact distributions, and other archaeological evidence. Drawing by K. Harding.

By connecting the occurrence of dry-laid, stacked stone features in STPs and test units, the resulting pattern illustrates how house, yard, and garden created residential units, formed in aggregate upon available village land.

While boundary walls defining the extent of Village I appear to be relatively consistent through time, stratigraphic testing in house-yards compounds suggests that stonewalls defining and subdividing individual house-yards and gardens only occur after 1800. In the late 18th century, enslaved households at Good Hope began bounding and subdividing their allotted space with low, dry-laid fieldstone walls. Such walls were likely not substantial enough to keep animals in or out, and appear to represent a visual demarcation more so than a
physical barrier. An organic superstructure such as a fence, however, might have topped the stone wall. No evidence for such a superstructure was found. As such, these walls likely served to define garden land as a resource restricted to a single house or collective of houses. It is no coincidence that the proliferation of these stone boundary walls coincides with major population increases in Good Hope’s village. In this way, the practice might suggest conflict surrounding land tenure practices among households of enslaved people.

In Village II, the absence of garden plots represents a significant deviation from the house, yard, and garden model. For enslaved people, house gardens were simultaneously social, economic, and utilitarian, transcending strict functional categories. The small plots of land were used to grow supplemental provisions, spices, and medical herbs that were needed more regularly than produce in the provision grounds some distance away. In both gardens and provision grounds, meeting the needs of the household and growing a surplus for market required a significant investment in time and labor. Unlike those living in Village I, archaeological evidence in Village II suggests that domestic servants spent very little time in and around their dwellings. In fact, comparison between the two village assemblages suggests that the single house-yards of Village II was likely only used for sleeping and eating, rather than the range of household activities seen in Village I. This absence of agricultural and other household activities beyond necessities illustrates the different demands of enslaved domestic service. Whereas enslaved occupations housed in Village I, such as field and trade labor, required significant physical demand, Village II
assemblages suggest that domestic service required greater demand in enslaved peoples’ time. This comparative view of activities, resources, and domestic conditions between Village I and II will be discussed in depth in Chapter 9.

Conclusion:

The objective of this chapter was to make sense of a large material record of artifacts, landscape features, surface, and subsurface remains to lay the groundwork for more advanced measures and interpretation in the chapters to follow. Archaeological evidence from Good Hope’s Village I and Village II provided the material basis for an in-depth reconstruction of the plantation’s two aggregated villages. Excellent preservation at each site allowed for detailed spatial, stratigraphic, and functional analysis to render a comprehensive picture of the constructed environment built by and for enslaved people.

These analyses uncovered two household patterns. The first form was a single-dwelling household, composed of a house, private yard, and private garden as a three-part integrated household cluster. The second consisted of a grouping of dwellings, articulated through inner yards and communal swept yards, and shared garden space. Together, these neighboring forms demonstrate the varied nature of household composition and organization within Good Hope’s enslaved population.

The multi-dwelling form suggests an extended household organization, likely shaped by cognatic and fictive kin relations (Besson 2002; Ensor 2013). By the turn of the 19th century, Good Hope’s locally born “Creole” enslaved
population had grown to represent approximately 58% of the plantation’s labor force. This shift away from high mortality, toward a more sustained population, likely allowed nuclear families to expand and recognizing larger kinship networks with each new generation. Shared garden space among these compounds suggests new forms of domestic collaboration among larger households. Communal infrastructure allowed extended families to develop more flexible options in the domestic division of labor. Likewise, people could combine small agricultural plots and pool their risk during times of stress. However, as the presence of contemporaneous single-dwelling arrangements suggests, this was not a universal phenomena.

Smaller nuclear households of one to five people organized their life with the same elements (house, yard, and garden), but as an isolated unit. The unarticulated households might represent recently arrived, African-born individuals, lacking extended kin based relations to other enslaved people at Good Hope. Additionally, or alternatively, single-house households might suggest varied aspirations and beliefs in what constitutes a household or decision-making unit.

While housing forms varied across space, the presence of walls varied through time. The construction of low, dry-laid stone walls surrounding gardens and subdividing yard space were not constant, but appeared around the turn of the 19th century. These were not substantial enough to physically deter people or animals, but rather, served as visual and physical markers. This suggests a
major transition around 1800, in which land tenure might have been a source of inter-household conflict.

In summary, the material record of the Good Hope villages suggests widespread variation from household to household. The findings of this chapter have produced a significant step upon a “ladder of inference” (Hawkes 1954), from which the social and dynamics and institutions created by and for the enslaved people might be revealed. On one level, this reconstruction of life in Good Hope’s villages illustrates the highly varied domestic conditions of enslavement, and provides an unessentialized picture of the “enslaved community.” Yet if and how community existed, as “an ever-emergent social institution that generates and is generated by supra-household interactions…” remains in question. This requires more layers of evidence, mapped on to our new understanding of household and village organization among Good Hope’s enslaved population.
CHAPTER 7: COMMUNITY INEQUALITY

Introduction:

Archaeological evidence described in the previous chapter highlighted the household, and extended household, as the most significant social unit in Good Hope's village. Households spanning one to three dwellings operated as the primary collective through which enslaved people lived their domestic lives. Forcefully brought together, enslaved people chose to organize themselves in both small and extended family groups, likely defined by cognatic kinship. Scaling out from this family unit, we see significant efforts among enslaved people to improve circumstances for their household group under conditions of enslavement. This concern for the interests of the family and extended family collective defined a material basis for unequal household relations across Good Hope's village, creating complex community characteristics.

This chapter explores the plantation village as an aggregated settlement, composed of single and extended households, and the forms of community-level organization enslaved people created and maintained among these family groups. In doing so, I build upon previous archaeological studies using intra-site analysis to understand the internal social dynamics or aggregated settlements (Kujit 2000; Stone 2000; Tringham 2000; Riggs 2001; Hodder and Cressford 2004; Knight et al. 2004; Rodning 2009), and larger efforts to theorize this type of social formation (Birch 2013). Simply put, rather than focusing on the vertical control of society, this chapter seeks to develop a better understanding of the
“horizontal structures of organizational complexity” within that society (Birch 2013:4; see also Crumley 1995; Blanton et al. 1996; McIntosh 1999).

For Good Hope’s Village I, I suggest that groups of enslaved people created and intensified organizational complexity through time, elevating the status and interests of the household or extended household above concerns for larger collectives. This intensified concern for the household, in turn, amplified social inequality among groups of enslaved people within the plantation village. This created social dynamics that shaped supra-household interactions among the plantation’s enslaved population, inside and outside Village I’s walls, and gave shape to distinctly community-level dynamics.

Of these dynamics, a material basis for social inequality between aggregated households is the most visible archaeologically. Inequality, as a form of social production and maintenance, defined new dynamics of interaction within the village. While social inequality set household against household in some cases, it defined an organizational structure more characteristic of complex community structure. And while unequal household relations are just one form of organizational complexity, they shed light a larger series of social mechanisms through which enslaved people organized their lives within the institution of slavery.

Structural Inequality:

Within an enslaved population, differentiation was in part defined and practiced by planters and managers. This was one strategy among several in
which a small minority of white elite sought to divide and conquer a black majority, breaking up enslaved people in a dehumanizing classification system. This form of structural inequality privileged, and made real, socially constructed categories along lines of age, race, gender, and ethnolinguistic identity (Delle 2000, 2014; Dunn 1977, 2014), defining many of the demographics discussed in Chapter 4. Grouping individuals into ever smaller groups defined a person as either young, working age, old, invalid, male, female, black, mulatto, quadroon, Igbo, Coromantee, Congo, Creole, among other divisions in countless combinations. This strategy is consistent with a process of power relations known as “dominance,” in which a “dominant group always has an effect on the dominated, and in which the autonomy of the dominated is restricted in order to be consistent with the interests of the dominant group” (Howson 1990:89).

As a power relation, planters and manager used these structural categories and stereotypes in formulaic combinations. This allowed the managerial class to finely tune the perceived identity of an enslaved individual, and situate that identity within the production needs of the plantation. Through this filter of labels, people became property, and quantifiable units holding increasing or diminishing value according to labor requirements for the commodity – in this case sugar and rum. The privileges of this differentiation were awarded on the basis of supply and demand, in which certain ethnic, racial, and gender stereotypes were demanded above others for plantation service. Above all, youth, skill set, and Jamaican-born identities were categories in greatest demand by the late 18th century (Higman 1984). With these categories
came differential conditions of enslavement. As will be seen later in this chapter, these variable conditions had many implications for the domestic lives of enslaved people outside their formal labor roles.

**Intra-Community Inequality:**

Beyond plantation power relations, differentiation was also recognized internally within the enslaved population on the basis of status and prestige. Age, gender, and occupation had a deeper resonance among enslaved people in Jamaica. These categories were recognized and unevenly privileged in many West African societies, as much as they were in Jamaica. While imposed by the planter and managerial class, such privileges almost certainly held different meanings and associations for enslaved people. As a common denominator of differentiation, their recognition in plantation Jamaica fostered both transferred and new forms of social dynamics within enslaved communities.

Through occupational allocation, domestic arrangements, and gendered tasks, it follows that many widely practiced West African systems of power paralleled those seen in plantations societies (Norman 2014). As enslaved people were forcefully integrated into a plantation population, understanding privileges of rank would not have been entirely foreign. As Neil Norman (2014:226) observes among New World plantation power dynamics, “enslaved and bonded people were drawn into strategies that amplified, extended, and nucleated previously existing settlement systems.” This tension between status
as defined by the slave-owning class and prestige as practiced within the enslaved community will be addressed further in Chapter 9.

In summary, differentiation was widely recognized among both the planter elite and enslaved people. Age, gender, language, constructed gradations of race, plantation labor roles, and kinship created both divisions and commonalities. As will be seen throughout this chapter, and in the chapters to follow, inequality in its various forms existed among enslaved people. The archaeology of Good Hope’s villages illustrates a material basis for this inequality, and that unequal access to resources and uneven distribution of non-essential goods played an important role in defining and reinforcing community-level dynamics. But how, and from what source, did goods and resources flow and circulate unevenly among enslaved individuals?

**Occupations**

The material products of local craftsmanship and the recovery of specialized tools suggest that the plantation village was, in part, created and maintained by a highly skilled labor force. Plantation records indicate that approximately 60 enslaved tradesmen (or 13% of Good Hope’s enslaved population) supported the plantation, and lived within Village 1. In 1804, this included 4 blacksmiths, 12 coopers, 19 carpenters, 20 stonemasons, 3 sugar boilers, 1 rum distiller, and 1 lead worker. Archaeological evidence for these Village I demographics include masons’, blacksmiths’, and lathing hammers,
carpentry and stone chisels, measuring dividers, among other specialized tools found within seemingly domestic contexts.

Beyond the skilled labor force, the majority of individuals living in Village I worked as field laborers by day, and attended to their domestic lives in the evenings and on Sundays. During these non-working hours, both skilled and the general work force created and maintained Village I through a task-based division of labor at the household level, divided not only along the lines of sex and age (Higman 1998), but also by occupation. The level of craftsmanship expressed in village household architecture and skilled maintenance of domestic tools best illustrates this allocation of domestic labor.

As described in Chapter 5, household architecture was somewhat heterogeneous in detail, though several common denominators demonstrate a local vernacular. Archaeological evidence suggests that most houses were either wood-framed or earthfast buildings sitting on uncut rubble limestone foundations, sided with wooden boards. For some houses, framing of this type required joinery from a specialist, with specialized tools – likely one or more of the plantation's 19 enslaved carpenters. Likewise, the steady supply of wrought nails and hinges regularly discarded and replaced suggest that workshop occupations, like the nearby blacksmith shop, regularly extended their skillset to enslaved people. Such services as cooping, stone cutting, smithing, and carpentry were not necessarily purchased in the same way as ceramics, adornment, and other costly objects, but like these objects, appear to have been unevenly distributed. Such skills and crafts were likely sourced from the plantation itself and negotiated
through other forms of community-level social relations in which occupation, in part, played a significant role.

One recovered stone mortar, likely carved by one of the plantation’s 20 enslaved stonemasons, held evidence for not only extensive use to point of splitting, but also extensive and specialized repair with iron barrel hoops. This reinforcing repair would have required specialized materials, tools, and knowledge only possessed by one of the plantation’s 12 enslaved coopers. Apart from evidence of tradesmen living throughout the village, this and similar findings suggest that enslaved tradesmen of Good Hope used their skill set, to not only labor on the plantation, but extended that acquired skill to improve and maintain conditions for, and within, an enslaved community. Catering to the village in this way offered a specialized service, and the opportunity for uneven distribution of that service on terms of reciprocity or even income.

Figure 7.1: Carpenter’s hammer found in a domestic context in Good Hope’s Village I.
Figure 7.2: (Left) Carved limestone mortar split in half, with oxidized stains from a former repair using iron barrel hoops (indicated in white dotted lines). Photo by author. (Right) Reconstructive illustration of enslaved woman crushing cassava in a mortar repaired/reinforced with iron hoops. Drawing by K. Harding.

Some enslaved occupations afforded the possibility of small monetary payments for plantation tasks outside of set working times. This was particularly true for skilled tradesmen, all of whom resided in Village 1. Good Hope’s account book lists eight entries of payment to Good Hope’s “Mason Negroes” (R.55.7.125.1) in the amount of 4 to 5 pounds sterling, collectively, per job. A small description beside the payment indicates that it was made “for work done
on Sunday,” the time legally set aside for enslaved people to attend to personal provision gardens and other household needs. At Good Hope, this paid Sunday-work appears to have typically been project-based, in which uninterrupted construction or repairs was desired to the extent of making monetary reimbursements for the little time that was considered their own. In 1796, four weeks of this payment were made to the plantation’s enslaved masons for repairs to the Good Hope bridge, the linchpin of mobility through the estate. Likewise, for four additional weeks, the masons were paid smaller amounts for unspecified projects, traveling to and laboring on Pantrepan, a nearby Tharp-owned sugar plantation.

**Figure 7.3:** (Left) Spanish silver Reale, dated 1785, excavated from the yard of House 4 in Good Hope’s Village I.

**Figure 7.4:** (Below) Masonry bridge crossing the Martha Brae River at Good Hope, constructed ca. 1780. Repaired by Good Hope’s enslaved masons in 1796.
Beyond the profits of their labor, enslaved tradesmen and drivers were in occupations in which they came in more frequent contact with the planter, white tradesmen, and managerial staff. The vast majority of the 450 to 500 enslaved individuals at Good Hope rarely interacted with the plantation’s free and salaried population on a sustained basis. Yet those in so-called “elite” enslaved positions regularly did so by the necessities of their work. Greater levels of interaction allowed for the greater possibilities in the way of small privileges. As historian Justin Roberts (2013:254) notes, “… being a skilled and supervisory slave, a sick nurse, or a domestic could give slaves more regular contact with white managers,” which in turn, “slaves could use to gain trust and favors and acquire provisions and goods.”

At Good Hope, these positions of greater interaction and trust were primarily defined on the basis of gender. Beyond nurses and domestics, occupations that required frequent communication with planters and managers were reserved for enslaved men. Drivers and head tradesmen typically served as intermediaries between the overseer and the remainder of the laboring population. In 1804, this included seven enslaved drivers and 10 head tradesmen. It was through these individuals that daily tasks were allocated and enforced, village-wide announcements were made, and goods and provisions were distributed.

For these individuals, the means to bottleneck and finely control everyday supplies as they flowed into the village was a powerful thing with a deep resonance. As Norman (2014:221), following McIntosh (1999) observes, “in African settings, elite political leaders often manage the circulation of resources
and things rather than the accumulation of them.” As such, these authoritative enslaved occupations represent some of the few ways in which West African systems of power and status were amplified in plantation contexts.

**Other Sources:**

By the first decade of the 19th century, plantations in the British Atlantic were forced to become internally self-sufficient in their labor. Only the former colonies in North America, such as Virginia, had become reproducing populations with an enslaved labor force sustained through natural increase (Dunn 2014:24). Jamaica remained quite the contrary throughout its history of enslavement. With staggering mortality, and severely low birth rates (Dunn 1993), the island’s large enslaved population was only sustained through continuous replacement. Yet, in 1807, the British Parliament abolished the Atlantic slave trade, cutting off the supply of newly enslaved people from West Africa. This act forced planters and managers to take new ameliorative measures, and sustain their labor force in different ways.

One such measure at Good Hope and surrounding plantations appears to have been monetary incentives paid to mothers per birth. In May of 1819, the Good Hope account books list one of these compensations as a single, collective payout to enslaved mothers. This transaction, made by Good Hope’s attorney, simply reads, “paid cash to Mothers for increase.” The amount listed is 48 pounds sterling (Tharp Papers R.55.7.150.1). Good Hope’s account books for the year 1819 also record “cash paid damage to negroes,” a small transaction.
paid from the plantation account to the plantation itself. This form of accounting is likewise an indicator of payment made to Good Hope’s enslaved labor force (ibid.). This record might suggest payment for damage to houses, provision grounds, livestock, or other belongings that enslaved people reinforced as in their possession.

Together, these characteristics define the multiple ways in which differentiation and unequal access to resources was practiced on the level of the individual. Yet despite a clear historical basis for inequality, using the individual as a social unit is a problematic point of departure for the study of enslaved people in Jamaica, or any given plantation society. The a priori assumption of the individual as the decision-making unit, the self-motivated consumer, and the lone ego neglects the social processes by which individuals formed and negotiated relationships in society. The cooperative, or collective, represented a much more powerful social unit to many enslaved people while negotiating the conditions of enslavement. Therefore, prior to understanding inequality within Good Hope’s Village, it is necessary to define the social unit whose actions are seen archaeologically. Therefore, we must ask, what defined notions of the collective for enslaved individuals at Good Hope?

Collectives:

In the sugar-producing island of the Caribbean, collectivity could be identified on the basis of a wide range of characteristics, including occupational identity, ethnolinguistic identity, gender, age, or race (Chapter 4). However,
within the confines of the Good Hope slave village, the archaeological remnants of household spaces render the plantation’s enslaved peoples’ notions of the collective quite clear. As discussed in Chapter 6, housing clusters informally arranged around central, shared yards suggest that kinship likely served as the basis for cooperative living. This finding is consistent with anthropological observations of contemporary descendent communities living in Martha Brae, five miles from Good Hope. Here, anthropologist Jean Besson found that many descendants traced their genealogies through the land itself. Known among Jamaicans as “family land” (Besson 1988:42), descendants traced back to a single formerly-enslaved ancestor occupying the land at the time of Emancipation. Through this system, the ancestor is recognized in unrestricted terms, and can traced along either patrilineal or matrilineal lines. The flexibility of the “family land” system manifests in a large non-unilineal kinship group occupying a shared yard surrounded by individual households of extended relations.

Within the archaeologically sampled area of Village I, as seen in the previous chapter, house-yard compounds ranged from one to three houses articulated to one another by a shared central yard. Spatially, this mirrors the contemporary findings of Besson (1984, 1987, 1988, 2002) among nearby descendant communities following the land tenure practice of “family land.” In the case of the contemporary Martha Brae village (Besson 2002), this includes direct descendants of Good Hope’s enslaved population.
Beyond the “Social Sphere”: An Activity-Centered Approach

As suggested in Chapter 2, the notion of dwelling bridges the dimensions of labor roles, domesticity, and inequality by making explicit the relationship between one’s everyday activities, their ascribed or achieved position in a society, and the social worlds they co-construct and inhabit. It follows that a focus on the activities of enslaved people allows one to investigate the internally-created social organization of a large group of people forcibly brought together under varying conditions of enslavement.

In Village I, or the primary village, the most common activity identified archaeologically was cooking. This is true for many archaeological sites, as the task of cooking typically leaves a clear and lasting material signature. It is the single activity that usually occurs multiple times per day, and typically over longer durations of time, on a near continual basis. Charred organics, durable hearths, ash pits, sturdy utilitarian vessels, specialized implements, and refuse middens are but a few common indicators of cooking activity at any given site. In Village I, given the near continuous use, cooking activity areas tended to be what has been described archaeologically as “specific activity areas” (Yellen 1977; Kent 1987; Neiman 1993), or areas spatially dedicated to a single task. This distinction is opposed to “general activity areas” (ibid.), which define multi-purpose areas used for a variety of short-term tasks. Whereas most swept yards around houses can be characterized as a “general activity area,” cooking appears to have occupied a dedicated, “specific activity area” in all cases.
As described in Chapter 5, faunal, coal-fuel, and cooking implement evidence suggests that meals in Village I were primarily slow-cooked as stews over long periods of time. In housing clusters sharing common yard space, cooking occupied a central location, almost equidistant to each household. Therefore, among dwellings articulated together by shared yards, cooking appears to have been a shared task within an extended household domestic division of labor. Among these household compounds, no single dwelling possessed its own hearth. In the one house not connected to others by a shared yard, representing a smaller single-dwelling household, cooking activities occupied a peripheral location. In either circumstance, its relegation to a “specific activity area” is likely due to the near continuous activity that cooking would have required to feed extended households through the day. In this way, the hearth – whether communal or single-dwelling – represented one of the only “universal household activities” found among households in Village I (Flannery and Winter 1976:36). As will be discussed in Chapter 9, this universal feature of Village I was virtually absent among households in Village II.

Cooking spaces were not only centers of gravity for domestic activity, but also social spaces in which multiple individuals congregated in the coherency of activity necessary for meeting household needs. Concentrations of smoking pipes and alcohol bottles around cooking areas in Village 1 support this notion. Therefore, these and possibly other “specific activity areas” should be viewed not only in terms of their utilitarian function, but more significantly as highly social, and socializing, anchor points in the domestic division of labor. It is at these
spaces that people joined in common or related activities (chopping root crops, boiling water, preparing meat) – points at which tasks became gendered and age-specific through their everyday enactments. The activity-centered congregation necessary at these spaces provided a basis for socialization in an atmosphere in which “off time” was highly limited, and indeed the most valuable commodity. Dividing this time among an extended, kin-based house compound allowed individuals to use their labor to not only further their interests, but the interests and conditions of the collective kindred.

Figure 7.5: Reconstructive illustration of cooking and socializing in the communal swept yard of Loci 1 in Village I, based on archaeological evidence. Drawing by K. Harding.
Mapping Difference: The Spatial Construction of Inequality

Spatial distributions of ceramic ware-type and form provide useful indications of patterns of access, purchase, and use from household to household (Figure 7.6).

Figure 7.6: (Top) Distribution of refined earthenware tableware across the sample area of Village I, illustrating presence and fairly even distribution across the site. (Middle) Distribution of relatively expensive, non-essential teawares across the site, illustrating clear concentrations in Area 1 and Area 2. (Bottom) Distribution of relatively expensive, refined earthenware chamberpots across the site, illustrating clear concentrations in Area 1 and Area 2.
Confining these ceramics by ware type (creamware, pearlware, and transitional whiteware) allows for greater control over time, to reveal spatial phenomena prior to the Emancipation, and during the established range household contemporaneity (see Chapter 5).

When mapped, densities of common tablewares such as plates, platters, and bowls are fairly consistent across village households. However, when relatively expensive, non-essential goods such as teawares (teapots, teacups, etc.) are mapped, spatial densities suggest a more confined and uneven pattern of household use. Testing this pattern with a different expensive ceramic form (refined earthenware chamber pots) reveals an almost identical pattern of high densities confined to a smaller number of households. For ceramic forms, costly non-essential goods concentrate around Household Area 1 and Household Area 2. Interestingly, these two household areas correspond with the two multi-dwelling extended households in the sample area. This suggests that differential access to material goods, and a possible material basis for inequality existed among Good Hope's enslaved population on the household scale. Moreover, material inequality appears to be connected to household composition.

Yard Size:

The concentration of expensive, nonessential goods closely correlates with houses commanding the largest yard space within the sampled area of Village I. Among nearby descendant community members in Martha Brae (a
post-Emancipation village 5 miles from Good Hope), anthropologist Jean Besson (1988:42) observes, “… manifestations of land scarcity are differentially felt among the village population,” further noting that “internal stratification is most clearly seen in the motley of land tenures typifying the yards within the village.”

As discussed in Chapter 5, yard area appears to be a function of the number of dwellings per household in Village I. Therefore, it is difficult to determine if the connection between large yard size and the concentration of more expensive goods is a matter of causation or correlation. In either case, a greater area of usable domestic space was both a highly visual signpost of ownership, and a more practical medium through which an extended household could expand, dedicate, and use space toward domestic ends to its fullest extent.

**Slope:**

As previously mentioned, Good Hope’s Village I occupies a large bowl-shaped depression known as a "cockpit" in the karst landscape of northern Jamaica. With few level areas, most households occupied slopes, limiting the use of surrounding yard space to activities that could be conducted on uneven surfaces. When measured against the village topography, the frequency of expensive teawares and refined earthenware chamberpots not only correspond with multi-dwelling households, and household commanding greater yard space, but also those households occupying the few level spaces available within the village boundaries. This pattern is not a product of post-depositional vertical
movement through alluvial processes, as this would also be reflected in the distribution of common tablewares (Figure 7.6). Common tableware show a more even distribution among households across the site. By all accounts, this concentration of non-subsistence goods reflects proximity to their household deposition.

The parallel distribution of these two relatively expensive, non-essential items illustrates how level terrain was valued more than elevation among higher-status households. In this way, the physical landscape (or household location in relation to the physical landscape) appears to have been appropriated as a medium of status construction and reinforcement within Good Hope's enslaved community. This was not isolated to a detached social sphere, as an equation of high status to high elevation would suggest, but rather a marker of status that mapped onto the everyday practicalities of dwelling within Village I. Bound on all sides of the cockpit depression by a fieldstone wall, space within the village was finite. Those who could lay claim to level terrain, through their status, position, or intergeneration transmission, could take advantage of the domestic benefits of living on little to no slope. Cooking, eating, sleeping, washing, farming, husbandry, and socializing all took place within the confines of the house-yard. Carrying these tasks unimpeded from the physical terrain appears to have been a privilege of households that commanded status in relation to others.
Figure 7.7: Multi-dimensional graph illustrating the concentration of costly, non-essential ceramics (% columns) along a profile view of the topography of the 'M' STP transect in Village 1 (solid black line), with household locations mapped along this topography (horizontal bars).

Change through Time:

While each of these households existed simultaneously, material signatures of inequality changed through time. A spatial approach to unequal household relations, or mapping inequality, has many advantages to the modern observer. It allows the archaeologist to see a domestic landscape shaped by the variable conditions and intentions of two or more adjacent households. This, however, should be seen as the *sum total view of inequality* among households, where time is collapsed in favor of a snapshot of space. This is a necessary shortcoming of measuring any spatial variation at the community scale. One
remedy for this is a mutliscalar perspective, in which one considers these patterns as they also manifest temporally on the household scale.

A comparison of Household Area 1 (Unit 1) and Household Area 3 (Unit 4) in Village 1 helps decipher the temporal dimension to inequality among Good Hope’s enslaved population. To remind the reader, Household Area 1 is located close to the road and consists of three dwellings sharing a common swept yard and gardens. Household Area 3 consists of an isolated single dwelling, garden, and swept yard, not connected to any other yards or dwellings. The two households occupying these areas were contemporaneous, with domestic signatures ranging from the late 18th through the early 19th century. Stratigraphic sampling of each household signature occurred in the toft zone, or accumulated refuse along the swept periphery, of each yard. As discussed in Chapters 2 and 5, the swept debris of the toft zone represents the range of household activities taking place in the household cluster, and represents a unique consideration for sampling among many African diasporic swept-yard households. Along these zones, each household area held nearly identical strata, allowing for convenient comparison of through time.

Ceramic vessel category, defined by hollow versus flat wares, is one comparative method that speaks to temporal change in consumer practices. Vessel category has previously been used to demonstrate the long-term societal shift from hollow to flatwares from the 17th through the 19th century in Plymouth (Deetz 1973) and the Chesapeake (Deetz 1993, 1996), as Euroamerican
foodways shifted from communal to individual serving and consumption. On sites associated with enslaved occupants, ratios of vessel category have been used as a reliable measure of relative status when comparing contemporaneous households (Kelso 1984:177-178; Otto 1984; Adams and Boling 1989; Armstrong 1990). From the late-18th century through the mid-19th century, the use of flatwares generally suggests a greater emphasis on more costly segmented preparation of food (i.e. higher quality cuts of meat, greater vegetable/crop count per serving, etc.). To the contrary, a higher proportion of hollowwares would suggest a primarily stew-based meal, accommodating lesser cuts of meat, and fewer food items per serving (Schulz and Gust 1983; Crader 1990; Deetz 1996).

In Good Hope’s Village I, a comparison of the change through time at Household Area 1 versus Household Area 2 reveals two different temporal trajectories in consumer practice from the 1780s through Emancipation. For both Area 1 and Area 3, both households began by exclusively using bowls and other hollow forms around the 1780s (Layer 6). By the early-1790s (Layer 5), both households began purchasing or acquiring more diverse ceramic forms, representing 20% flatware and 80% hollow forms in both assemblages. In the opening decade of the 19th century (Layer 3), a shift occurred, in which different households began practicing different consumer habits. The extended, multi-dwelling household in Area 1 shifted to primarily eating from a majority flat ware assemblages (plates, platters, etc.). This percentage of flatware continued to grow through Emancipation, at which point 60% to 70% of the household’s ceramic assemblage consisted of flatware.
Figure 7.8: (Top) Ratio of hollow to flatware through time in Household Area 1. (Bottom) Ratio of hollow to flatware through time in Household Area 3.
To the contrary, the single-dwelling household of Area 3 continued to practice alternative consumer habits. Rather than an upward trajectory of greater proportions of flatware through time, the Area 3 household continued to purchase or acquire – and eat from – a majority hollow form assemblage of ceramics through Emancipation. Among their assemblage, flatware never exceeded 49.1% of their ceramics used on a daily basis.

Discussion:

A clear material basis for social inequality existed among Good Hope’s enslaved population. As a series of social practices framed by variation in consumer habits, enslaved people performed material expressions of socio-economic difference most explicitly at the household scale. These expressions defined the kin-based household as the most important social unit establishing and reinforcing notions of rank among enslaved people within a plantation village setting.

Importantly, social inequality among Good Hope’s enslaved people was not a constant. Rather, stratigraphic testing revealed relatively equal socio-economic signatures among households from the 1770s through the 1790s. From this starting point, we see a gentle rise in inequality through time, intensifying after 1800. Interestingly, this moment also corresponds with the widespread appearance of wall building within Good Hope’s Village I, discussed in Chapter 6. As this walling-in suggests, land became a far more important
resource in the late-18th and early-19th century, and enslaved households appear to have mutually recognized property rights for house, yard, and garden spaces. This transition to inequality at the village scale, seemingly tied to land and the resources it afforded, appears to represent the genesis of the “family land” concept. This notion is an extra-legal concept, widely practiced among descendant communities today, defining communal property rights through claims of ancestry to an original land-owning ancestor (Besson 2004). Even today, this informal land-tenure system gives shape to the characteristic extended household cluster sharing a common swept yard, with household groups arranged informally in aggregate, creating and maintaining community-level social organization.

**Conclusion:**

Together, the presence of material expressions of unequal status and the recognition of differential access to resources, suggests that by the turn of the 19th century, Good Hope’s forcefully aggregated settlement increasingly took on community-level social dynamics. Enslaved households not only set themselves apart through their consumer practices, but also recognized a land-tenure system in which those with material status also held access to prime, domestically-useful level land within the crowded, sloping village. Such negotiations could only occur by a system of inter-group recognition, in which households were organized in relation to other households under mutual recognition of status. Considered
together, this suggest more than mere aggregation. This suggest a level supra-household social interaction in which enslaved kin groups began socially orienting themselves to elements of place, and more significantly, to other households. By 1800, this defined inter-household social organization at a distinctly community-level.

***

The level of social organization among a plantation’s enslaved population, outlined here, likely posed a serious concern to the planter and managerial class. On the one hand, community-level organization of this kind provided a level of domestic support in regards to subsistence, health care, domestic repairs, and other element of self-reliance. This took the economic pressure off of planters to provision the total domestic needs of the enslaved community. On the other hand, organization at this level likely posed a threat to the small minority of planters and salaried managers running the plantation. This concern transcended village boundaries. In fact, by the late-18th century, this concern was all around.

This enslaved community was neither static nor bound to the walls defining Village I. Good Hope’s enslaved population covered two villages, 17 watchman huts scattered throughout the sugar cane fields, three managers’ houses, and the rear yard of the town house in Falmouth. Moreover, enslaved individuals frequently moved beyond the village and formal plantation boundaries for their occupation, their market activities, and to socialize and communicate with enslaved people on neighboring plantations (Smith and Bassett 2016). Such
is to say, enslaved people stayed on the move for much of their waking lives, traveling from field to field, workshop to site, village to market, great house to townhouse.

As community dynamics emerged, so too did the need for complex mechanisms of controlling larger groups. As will be discussed in the chapter to follow, the small minority of planters and managers at Good Hope, neighboring plantations, and in Falmouth did not practice a strategy of total, panoptic surveillance (e.g., Delle 1998; 1999). Rather, they sought to break up the larger collective through a strategy of divide and conquer. Surveillance occurred on a smaller, more dynamic scale. Surveillance and division worked in tandem through the manipulation of the enslaved community’s mobility.
CHAPTER 8: PLANTATION ROADS AND THE CONTROL OF MOVEMENT

Introduction:

“… it seems as if the whole island had been suddenly animated, while the flux and reflux is carried on without impediment by innumerable current from the heart to the extremities, and from these again to the center of motion. The many excellent roads, already formed, are the vital principle which has infused all these symptoms of vigour, agility, and health, into the whole mass, and roused it into active life.”

-Edward Long (1774:465-466), The History of Jamaica

By the early-18th century, an elaborate and costly system of roads connected every Jamaican plantation to the sea. For the planter elite, sugar, rum, and cattle needed to move from plantation to coast, or internally between plantations, safely and rapidly in order to secure a profit. Before the second quarter of the 18th century, shipping to the sea was relatively easy, as most plantations occupied the rich, alluvial grounds of the island’s coast (Higman 2001). In these cases, individual plantations typically operated their own wharfs, shipping commodities directly from their coastal estate. By the mid-18th century, as more land patents were granted and larger tracts of land subdivided, plantation settlement rapidly moved from flat coastal landholdings to the semi-mountainous interior terrain (Higman 1987, 2001). Lacking coastal property, these plantations increasingly relied upon an emerging and growing urban form for the island – the port town. Through enslaved labor, interior planters commissioned surveyors and engineers to connect their plantation to the nearest port. In most cases, this was simply a connection to the nearest existing road (Figure 8.1).
Figure 8.1: “The Development of Roads in Jamaica” (image: Hauser 2008:72, Map 3.1)

Thus, through connections to the sea, the numerous interior plantations created, in aggregate, a system of roads that traversed the entire island by the late-18th century.

By this time, any given plantation was connected to every other plantation on the island by way of road. This networked landscape, however, was not simply a utilitarian construction, but as will be argued here, a highly socialized infrastructure of control, mediating the movement of enslaved people beyond and between plantation boundaries. In the pages to follow, I will investigate Jamaica’s roads as physical infrastructures of planter control and sites of negotiated power in three sections: 1.) Crossroads and Walls, 2.) Runaways and Marronage, & 3.)
Roads and Revolt. Together, these complementary components will render the ways in which 18th and 19th-century roadways in Jamaica cannot be understood through any singular narrative. Rather, Jamaica’s infrastructure of movement must be viewed from both the position of the road builder and the experience of the road traveler. Developing insights from Magaña (2011:164) and others, this approach will reveal the roads of plantation Jamaica as sites of both social “reiteration” and “disruption,” in an effort to regulate and restrict the reach of enslaved community networks.

Movement, Mobility, and Infrastructure:

With the ontological shift from a world in stasis to a world in motion, a central tenant of the mobilities paradigm (Sheller and Urry 2006), the physical infrastructure of movement has taken a center stage. Within this research program, infrastructures have emerged as a significant object of study for understanding the relationship between social and material dimensions of human movement. Scholars working across disciplines have looked not only to roadways, urban grids, sidewalks, airports, bike lanes, among other conduits of movement, but also the related modes of transportation that traverse such infrastructure (Jackson 1994; Czeglédy 2004; Truitt 2008; Henderson 2013). “Automobility,” perhaps the most powerful critique, is one example that ties together both, questioning the wholesale adoption of the personal automobile as the locus of design considerations ranging from urban planning, national
investments in transportation, and more fundamentally, everyday life through household consumerism and geographic connectivity (Sheller and Urry 2000).

More recently, roads have attracted critical attention within mobilities studies beyond the topic of automobility. In 2012, a special thematic issue of the journal *Mobilities* entitled “Roads and Anthropology” published a series of geographically and theoretically diverse articles united by their common conceptualization of roads as an object of study (Dalakoglou 2012; Dalakoglou and Harvey 2012; Harvey and Knox 2012; Kernaghan 2012; Kleager 2012; Neilson 2012; Pedersen and Bunkenborg 2012). These scholars provide a significant direction forward, but offer little time depth, speaking largely from the ethnographic present. As this chapter will demonstrate, the study of the infrastructure of movement is significant not only for contemporary studies, but also serves as a key entry point and common ground for the historical disciplines looking to past movement.

Lacking the ability to directly witness, measure, or represent an animated world, scholarship looking to deeper histories can speak indirectly to the animated past through the materialities of the historic built environment. Such indirect insight allows one to infer not only the routes of past movement, but perhaps more significantly, the affordances, design intentions, perceptions, and connectivities shaping the entangled politics of differential movement (Lelièvre and Marshall 2015). To operationalize this, the archaeologist and historian, among others, can look to the infrastructure of earlier movement to map the flow of long-dead bodies in motion, and the implications and motivations of
interruptions, “frictions” (Truitt 2008:4), and “turbulence” (Rockefeller 2011:571) in the far-from-smooth flow of human mobility. Through the rich documentary record of many colonial settings, "frictions" in the flow of movement are indeed recoverable through plantation records, period maps, travelers’ accounts, militia records, among other records of inequalities and conflicts occurring in motion. As 18th-century Jamaican planter Byran Edwards (1796a:149) notes in his history of the British colonies, "Let it not be forgotten, however, that I have had to conduct my readers through a path – not strewed with roses, but – perplexed with briars, and hitherto almost untrodden." While largely a metaphor for historiography, it is equally true in the literal sense.

**Jamaican Roads – Historical Context:**

As the port town grew in significance as a global shipping point, it increasingly acquired an urban character. Organized in a grid of streets and alleys, movement to and through became concentrated, channeled, and paced. Arriving aboard mule and ox-driven carts, goods from plantations flowed through and out of the port in barrels of sugar, rum, and coffee, among other minor exports. For the reverse, goods flowed into the port aboard ships, and on the backs of livestock, beds of carts, and upon the arms and heads of enslaved laborers supporting both formal and informal markets (Hauser 2008). Likewise, the Jamaican port became the point of “seasoning,” marketing, and sale of human cargo before being forcefully marched to nearby plantations (Nelson 2016). By the third-quarter of the 18th century, the port became the established
seat of government, with troops and colonial administrators taking council and quarters within dedicated buildings in town limits. Officers, troops, and appointed officials moved from parish to parish through port towns that acquired the status of Parish capitals. By the 1780s and 90s, post offices emerged in major ports to circulate mail, outbound in packet ships, and internally upon roads on the backs of mules (Higman 2005). Movement of goods, correspondence, and people became central to island commerce and sociability. For movement along a rapidly growing road network, port towns became centers of gravity attracting, channeling, and distributing people and commodities in unequal ways. As vividly described through the eyes of one Jamaican planter in the late-18th century:

"The different wharfs are now a scene of bustle and confusion: the boats passing to and from the different shipping, the wains that are continually clattering along the roads, the noise of the cartmen, the cracking of their whips, and the strings of negroes that are seen passing and repassing upon a variety of avocations; and, last of all, the groups of white people whom curiosity, friendship, or trade, assemble together; afford an agreeable scene of tumult and variety, to which the hurry and confusion of the attending wagons and carts, with the disorder of the cattle, the drivers, and the boys, do not a little contribute" (Beckford 1790:320).

Jamaica had indeed become “animated” by the late-18th century as Edward Long (1774:465) observed, though as suggested by Beckford above, this animated movement was far from continuous and smooth. Each developing form of movement for the port town rapidly gave shape to a physical infrastructure created for connection to and between plantations, ports, landlocked communities, and outlying resources. Segments of road were intentional, though as a networked whole, a given route between two or more
places was piecemeal, varied, and chosen among a range of options. Planters commissioned road segments in different ways, for different purposes, and for the most part, without centralized regulations. When regulations were passed, such as the establishment of “waywardens” to maintain existing roads (Delle 2014:124), they typically supported the financial and social interests of the road building planter elite. Such was the case for Jamaica’s “public” roads in the late-18th and early-19th century. After a series of proclamations by the Assembly of Jamaica (Hanson et al. 1811), “public” roads became both privately constructed and maintained. Many individual road segments achieved this “public” status after connections to existing roads were established. As a result, transportation taxes were simply redistributed back to plantations to maintain a network of roads that was both publicly accessible and supportive of private gain. This gave plantation investors and proprietors considerable design authority and control over the island’s internal movement, defining where people moved to, through, around, and in relation to what.

In many cases highly contextual, some roads moved through a plantation, some to a plantation, others around. In this way, the particular form and place of connectivity for road segments related to individual motivations, ideas of movement, and even forms of control. Roads could be carried close to key buildings of a plantation, displaying a planter’s wealth and labor control, serving as surrogate representations of absentee or resident proprietors. Likewise, road segments could navigate through terrain that concealed certain aspects of the plantation system to abolitionist writers, government officials, tax collectors,
missionaries, and other traveling spectators. In some cases, as described in *The Jamaica Planter’s Guide*, many of the island’s roads “… have no other apparent view but to excite the attention of the traveler…” (Roughly 1823:258).

The network of roadways, as the physical infrastructure of movement within Jamaica’s plantation society, serves an important body of evidence for understanding the changing ways in which the 18th and 19th-century was “animated” through orchestrated movement. Intentions, influences, and consequences of terrestrial connections were varied, and entangled social and economic practices together in complex ways. Together, this form of material influence provided the literal grounds for controlling movement for some, and negotiating this control for others.

**Crossroads and Walls:**

From the 18th to the 19th century, Jamaica’s enslaved population had grown from 173,000 in 1760, to 276,000 in 1790, to over 354,000 in 1808 (Roberts 2013:15). Far outnumbering a small white planter and managerial class, plantation owners designed and exercised practices in the construction of built environments to extend their control beyond their physical abilities. Archaeologist James Dell (1998, 1999, 2011, 2014) has suggested that a built environment of overseers’ houses with strategic viewsheds to work spaces and villages allowed a small managerial class to use surveillance, fear, and self-discipline to exert their control. Yet stepping beyond the plantation boundaries, this narrative falls apart, forcing one to look to the roads themselves.
Movement beyond the plantation proper by enslaved people was frequent in both structured and illicit ways. For enslaved individuals with occupations requiring travel (Higman 1984, 2005), or those attending weekly markets in port towns (Hauser 2008, 2011), movement along the island’s roads involved foot traffic over long distances, limited to single days and occasionally nights. In the case of northern Jamaica’s Good Hope estate, archaeological and historical evidence from the plantation’s villages suggests that enslaved laborers made weekly 14-mile trips (seven miles each way) to the market in Falmouth. Traveling to Falmouth, they loaded their heads and arms with surplus goods from their provision grounds to sell or barter. Before evening, they made the return-trip entirely uphill with their purchased or traded items back to Good Hope. While this market travel was permitted and indeed encouraged by planters as a form self-sufficiency (Hauser 2008), enslaved laborers also quietly traveled to neighboring plantations to visit family and attend events (Smith and Bassett 2016). As historian Justin Roberts (2013:266) recently observed, “Planters recognized that their estates were part of a “neighborhood” of plantations,” noting further that, “there was little a planter could do to prevent nighttime and Sunday journeys around the neighborhood.” While little could be done to contain this movement, the management of the neighborhood’s roadways allowed planters to manipulate direction, quality, and experience of travel in ways that effected physical and perceptual dimensions of movement.

In this regard, movement beyond the plantation boundaries appears to have been equally confining and controlled, though in different ways. As
previously discussed, fieldstone walls border most 18th and 19th-century roads in Jamaica and early descriptions indicate their confining intention. On top of roadside stonewalls, travelers commonly found planted “penguin” (*Bromelia penguin*), a sharp bush introduced to the island to “prevent intruders, whether bipeds or quadrupeds” (Scotus 1861:176-177). “Penguin” was planted as an 18th/19th-century version of barbed wire, serving as a means for keeping people to the roads and out of fields (Beckford 1790:167; Stewart 1809:81; Williams 1827:343). Similarly, broken 18th-century bottle glass (Figure 8.2) was used in port towns instead of penguin, keeping people to highly visible streetscapes and out of lots, yards, and cemeteries.

**Figure 8.2:** Broken 18th-century bottle glass mortared into the tops of the Jewish cemetery of Falmouth, Jamaica. Photo by author.
In this way, roadways – even in close proximity – separated as much, if not more so, than they connected (Pedersen and Bunkenborg 2012). Movement was channeled to specific destinations and offered few opportunities to deviate without the threat of bodily injury. Limiting mobility through material infrastructures channeled and physically distributed the population in ways that closely equated social position with particular conduits of movement (Czeglédy 2004). As Bernard Herman (1997:43) observes for similar conditions in South Carolina, “As people moved through … the plantation countryside, they encountered an array of landscape experiences that both affirmed and contested social relationships within the larger community.”

In Jamaica, travelers’ accounts and planter diaries suggest that fear remained a constant instrument in these in-between spaces (Nelson 2016). Intersections became predictable points of interaction, and known sites in which individuals traveling upon a network of roads had to pass. After brutally executing an enslaved laborer for attempting to run away in 1764, Jamaican overseer Thomas Thistlewood records in his diary that he severed the head and, “Put it upon a pole and stuck it up just at the angle of the road in the home pasture” (Hall 1999:30). Designing “paths of observation” for road traffic (Ingold 2000:229), the severed head on display – as Magaña (2011:164) suggests for contemporary display of severed heads along the US/Mexico border – served not as social “disruption,” but rather, as “reiteration.” Such reiterative practices were the case for not only human remains displayed along roads (Figure 8.3), but the
Figure 8.3: Severed heads of enslaved laborers on poles at the crossroads of a Jamaican plantation, ca. 1760. (image: Brown 2012).

ensemble of walls, barbed glass and vegetation, and other mechanisms limiting the options of movement to prescribed paths of travel to, from, and through plantation society.

Roads: Infrastructure of Enslavement within Plantations

The plantation landscape has provided important avenues and grounds for unification of disparate threads of thematic concerns, including comparative colonialism, African diaspora, resistance, and the spread and connectivity of a global capitalistic system. Among these themes, one particular topic has emerged as highly important to our understanding of New World plantation landscapes, the complex role of surveillance and control (Delle 1998, 1999, 2011; Epperson 1999; Singleton 2001; Bates 2007; Randle 2011). Plantation
surveillance emerged as a prominent conversation in landscape archaeology through the intersection of plantation archaeology’s maturation by the 1990s, the influence of post-structuralist theories of observation (Foucault [1975]1977), and significant theoretical contributions within a wider ‘spatial turn’ in the social sciences (e.g., De Certeau 1984; Lefebvre 1991). Methodological development within this ‘spatial turn’ (e.g., Geographic Information Systems (GIS), civilian GPS, LiDAR) has greatly influenced the archaeological investigation of plantation landscapes, providing new means of investigation centered on mapping technologies and their spatial representations.

Thus far, surveillance has largely depended upon visibility as mapped, or in other words, viewsheds and lines of sight illustrating inter-site visibility. Here, I provide an alternative understanding of surveillance within plantation landscapes, one that de-centers inter-visibility of working and living places, and highlights surveillance and control of movement as central to plantation landscapes. In doing so, I build upon others treating “trails, paths, and roads … as built environment, amenable to description, classification, analysis, and interpretation in much the same way artifacts or architecture are treated in traditional archaeology” (Snead et al. 2011:2). Using Space Syntax analysis, highly detailed cartographic records, historic “travelers’ accounts,” and landscape documentation from my fieldwork in Jamaica, this section addresses plantation surveillance and planter control through a relational landscape approach, elevating the status of the historical and environmental context, while identifying the plantation as a carefully orchestrated landscape of movement.
In the late-18th century, Good Hope occupied 2,000 acres of semi-mountainous terrain, comprised of large expanses of agricultural fields surrounding several miles of the Martha Brae River. The plantation was centered on the mill and sugar works for production purposes. From this processing complex radiated an elaborate network of roads, paths, and intervals that gave shape to and connected near and distant agricultural fields, buildings, and quarter sites. In 1794, Tharp commissioned John Henry Schroeter, a military surveyor and captain of the nearby Fort Balcarres, to produce a map of Good Hope estate in its entirety – buildings, roads, fields, etc. (Figure 8.4). Schroeter was a highly talented surveyor with apparent expertise in mapping roadways, as evident in his 1790 map for Tharp of a carriage route in St. Ann, Jamaica to his cattle pen and ‘change of air house,’ Chippenham Park (Higman 2001:23). Schroeter’s completed survey plat of Good Hope stands as a highly detailed record of the internal plantation organization, with accurate spatial representations of roads, paths, building outlines, waterworks, and agricultural fields. The accuracy of the plantation map was verified through digital overlay, and historically speaking, in Schroeter’s illustration of variation of the magnetic meridian and true azimuth (Buisseret 1996:128-129; Higman 2001:23-25). Such an unusual quality speaks to the precision at which the plantation was recorded, with the map likely serving planting logistics, boundary disputes, and as an engineering blueprint during extensive building and improvement on the plantation in the 1790s (Nelson 2016).
More importantly, this map of Good Hope depicts all buildings, fields, roads, and the two villages occupied by the plantation’s enslaved community. The primary village is labeled “Negroe Houses” and bound on all sides by a fieldstone wall, with several narrow openings to the adjacent road and one large
entrance near the overseer’s house. Clearly distinguished on the map, access was channeled in and out of the village in particular ways. Once outside the village walls, movement was channeled further via a wide, elevated road flanked by fieldstone walls (Figure 8.5). Here and beyond, movement was carefully orchestrated and policed through the constructed landscape of movement – channeling, connecting, confining, observing.

Space syntax analysis provides a useful set of tools for the study of social processes embedded within spatial configurations. Introduced by professional architects in the mid-1980s (Hillier and Hanson 1984) to simulate the social dynamics of architectural design, the approach has been more recently adopted by archaeologists seeking to reverse engineer past social spaces (Cooper 1995; Figure 8.5: Reconstructive illustration of enslaved people leaving Village I for plantation labor through defined thresholds to the intersection road – paths of movement based on archaeological evidence. Drawing by K. Harding.)
Ferguson 1996; Van Dyke 1999; Dawson 2002; Cutting 2003; Stuardo 2003; Clark 2007, Fisher 2009). Aside from Clark (2007), most of these studies have been confined to prehistoric architecture, and principally relied upon topological analysis to investigate access (or lack thereof) and relative depth of rooms. This investigation goes beyond social space as a series of walls and thresholds, and applies techniques from space syntax’s more recent application to urban analysis to address the configuration of space on the scale and context of a 2,000-acre sugar plantation (Figure 8.6).

**Analysis:**

In an analysis of *integration values* – a quantitative measure of the relative integration (i.e. connectivity) of spaces within a given plan – the configuration of late-18\(^{th}\)-century Good Hope illustrates clear flows of connectivity to a central area distributed on both side of the river (Figure 8.7). This area with greatest integration values precisely corresponds with the production center of the plantation – water mill, cattle mill, sugar works (boiling house), trash houses, and limekiln. These high integration values are in part, a function of the *relative* connectivity of roads, paths, and intervals within the estate’s plan. Therefore, as one reverse-engineers Good Hope’s planned organization, the highest density of intra-plantation movement unquestionably occurred *to and through* the plantation’s production center. Though perhaps of more significance to this study is an observation of integration as it relates to access.
Figure 8.6: Space syntax, axial analysis of integration values for roads, paths, and intervals of Good Hope estate. Red indicates highest integration values of roads while blue indicates least integrated roads. Map by author, using UCL Depthmap Space Syntax software.

Figure 8.6 illustrates that the most integrated space on the plantation was simultaneously one of the least immediately connected spaces on the plantation. In other words, while Good Hope’s production center (mill, works, etc.) was the space in which the greatest amount of daily movement occurs to and through, this access to and through this space was strategically bottlenecked to two narrow points of access. Adding another dimension to this observation, these two bottlenecks correspond precisely with the two known buildings associated with
Figure 8.7: Detail of integration values for roads and intervals of Good Hope, illustrating that the area with the highest integration value, is also the least accessible due to strategic ‘bottlenecks,’ corresponding with surveillance buildings. Map by author, using UCL Depthmap Space Syntax software.

surveillance from the plantation’s supervisory class – the Overseer’s house and the Outpost building (Figure 8.7).

The articulation of Good Hope estate was clearly configured around productive flows of movement to a central space, yet a central space confined by limited routes of access. Such a configuration cannot be divorced from the people and contingencies of plantation Jamaica. The extensive network of roads,
intervals, and paths joining and defining fields, processing sites, and domestic buildings existed within a particular environmental and historical context. The late-18th and early-19th centuries were periods of expansion and transformation for the Jamaican plantation system. West Indian sugar peaked in quantity of export between the 1790s and the turn of the 19th century, as the number of enslaved laborers on the island reached over 256,000 (House of Commons 1789:152). The vast majority of enslaved Africans in Jamaica lived and worked within rural plantation settings, an environment that varied from flat coastal lowlands to dramatically sloping interior highlands. Good Hope, roughly eight miles from the coast, occupied a transitional area between these two extremes. Agricultural fields comprised much of the available flat land while the great house, doctor’s house, overseer’s house, and slave village were built upon narrow hilltops and slopes.

Movement in such topography was clearly difficult and appears to have necessitated the construction and leveling of numerous roads and intervals. For the slave village east of the production center, individuals were largely confined to planned roads for any given place-to-place movement within the plantation. One such careful route is the single path that must be taken to reach the sugar works, mill, trash houses, and all other sugar production buildings from the slave village. From the village, steep topography and careful design forced movement toward the overseer’s house, with a sharp switchback (Figure 8.7, ‘Bottleneck’ A) within feet of the house itself as one progressed further down the hill toward the works (Figure 8.8).
Figure 8.8: View of the overseer’s house from the forced bottleneck / switchback in route to the plantation’s production center from the slave village, or vice versa. Photo by author, 2013.

Across the river, the western half of the plantation – almost entirely comprised of agricultural fields – was not monitored from any single location. Quite the contrary, tall sugar cane and variation in topography limited lines of sight to the intervals between fields and the two rows of cane one was standing between. In this way, enslaved laborers could easily hide and move between the countless rows of cane, rendering constant surveillance impossible from anywhere on the estate. As revealed by space syntax analysis, roads from Good Hope’s cane fields (a.k.a “intervals”) did not meet at the mill, nor did they meet at an area with highest integration values. But rather, intervals met at a radial
intersection one step removed from the production area (Figure 8.7, ‘Bottleneck’ B). As with the road in front of the overseer’s house, movement was bottlenecked to a single space upon which an outpost building monitored movement from each interval (Figure 8.9). Common for sugar estates with large labor forces, outposts like these were typically occupied by enslaved “watchmen” – similar in status to a slave “driver” (Higman 1984:175). This further suggests that surveillance was not a matter of expansive viewsheds, but rather a kind of visual tollgate distributed across the plantation system.

Figure 8.9: Modern day citrus-fruit workers pass by the Outpost building (to the right) at Good Hope’s “Bottleneck B” radial intersection, constructed in the 18th century. Photo by author, 2013.
Roads, Runaways, & Maroons:

In some cases, roads were avoided, though for the most part – by the late 18th century – unavoidable. A mosaic of roadways and intervals (i.e. roads between sugar cane fields) blanketed the island with countless linear viewsheds and visibly prominent intersections. Runaway ads, published in the major newspapers of each parish (Chambers 2013a, 2013b), reveal that many captures occurred on or near roads. Captured along vulnerable intersections, bodily descriptions within these ads record a brutal strategy of visible identification of runaways, recognizably indexing previous attempts. Cropped ears and noses, and skin brands are commonly cited as violent inscriptions upon captured runaways to visibly mark an individual and deter others.

Such was the case of one individual, captured in 1792 and reported in Jamaica’s Cornwall Chronicle as, “SCIPIO, an Eboe Bruchee, new Negro, marked THARP” (Chambers 2013a:285). Enslaved by John Tharp of Good Hope in the neighboring parish, Scipio covered considerable ground before his capture along the roads of St. James Parish. Traveling west on the border of the Cockpit Country jungle, it is likely that Scipio was seeking the location of the remote maroon communities in the vicinity. However, the seclusion of the maroons was far deeper.

A fundamental feature of Jamaica’s maroon communities was their unconnected nature. Accounts suggest that northern Jamaica’s maroons traveled on foot through gullies, discrete paths, and other subtle conduits of movement, avoiding roads frequented by European planters and militia. These movements
are difficult to trace, but recent approaches by historians have begun to shed light on the value of tracing the spaces, actions, and modes of movement. In his innovative project, *Slave Revolt in Jamaica, 1760-1761: A Cartographic Narrative*, Vincent Brown (2012) maps the sequence of events surrounding the largest slave insurrection of the British colonies in the 18th century. He maps the skirmishes, sightings, responses, and first hand accounts onto the physical landscapes, “to discern some of their strategic aims and to observe the tactical dynamics of slave insurrection and counter-revolt” (ibid.). Using this method to follow the movement of maroons in late 18th-century Jamaica, reveals much about alternative mobility throughout the island.

In many ways, maroon communities carved out their own infrastructures in stark contrast to British modes of travel. Writing in 1796, Byran Edwards (1796:lxxiv) observed:

"The place called the Cockpits before mentioned, could be reached only by a path down a steep rock 150 feet in almost perpendicular height. Strange as it may appear, this obstacle was surmounted by the Maroons without difficulty. Habituated to employ naked feet with singular effect, in climbing up trees and precipices, they had acquired a dexterity in the practice, which to British troops was altogether astonishing and wholly inimitable."

Likewise, in his historical overview of the maroons of Jamaica, Richard Price (1996:6) suggests that, "Paths leading to the villages were carefully disguised, and much use was made of false trails replete with dangerous booby traps."

Attempting to access the Jamaican maroon town of Nanny, one early-18th-century soldier found "the only path leading to their town ... steep, rocky, and difficult, and not wide enough to admit the passage of two persons abreast"
As with planters nearer to the coast, control of movement via infrastructure – however discrete – allowed Jamaica’s maroon to manipulate the mobility of the “other” in strategic ways.

This inaccessibility to English travel gave maroon communities considerable autonomy and power, which culminated in two major Maroon Wars – one in the 1730s, the other in the 1790s. In the latter, known as the Second Maroon War, roadways played a significant and decisive role. Describing British soldiers’ attempts to locate maroon paths, Robert Renny (1807:56) recorded that, "Confidential Negroes, called Black-shot, Mulattoes, and Indians ... were added to the regular troops ... and were of great service in tracing the haunts of the Maroons, and in discovering their settlements and provision-grounds." When questioned for his use of dogs in the Second Maroon War, William Cobbett (1818:929) similarly noted their use for “tracing the footsteps, and discovering the haunts of the maroons...” By all accounts of the early 1790s, the movements of Jamaica’s maroon communities were far from controllable without the knowledge and visibility afforded by the infrastructure of British roads.

Reporting in 1795, London’s “Foreign Intelligence” on Jamaica published that, “The Commander in Chief [Gen. Walpole] having obtained the most correct information of every road, tract, and path, leading to the Maroon Town, conceived the idea of blockading them in their own country” (Balcarras 1795:958). Several months later, Jamaica’s militia commandeered upwards of 1,000 enslaved laborers from nearby plantations to construct a system of roads to and around the same maroon communities (Edwards 1796b:59). The island’s
militia used these roads to transport infantry and supplies, besieging maroon soldiers in their towns by cutting off access to nearby springs and provision grounds. After a stalemate, reported as a British victory, Jamaica’s maroons were given property rights to their community land under the stipulation that they construct and maintain roads to their settlements (Hanson et al. 1811). Following the construction of several roads, however, maroon community leaders were “sentenced to transportation,” and exiled to Nova Scotia (Hanson et al. 1811:167).

In the years following the 1796 treaty, maroon conflicts in Trelawny and St. James Parish occasionally resurfaced. Parties of militia were frequently sent out to maroon territory using the roads constructed after the above-mentioned treaty. By this time, maroon soldiers had redefined their guerrilla warfare to focus on the newfound predictability of British movement: road-bound travel. Roads became the front lines of warfare as maroon soldiers ambushed British militia during their marches to the interior. Recorded in an 1801 painting by J. Merigot, commissioned by General Walpole (Barringer et al. 2007:288), the artist illustrates this roadside warfare of maroon tactics (Figure 8.10). This strategy included scattering British soldiers from the roads into the forest, losing them in rough and unfamiliar territory where they died of wounds, exhaustion, exposure, thirst, or “fever” [malaria] (Long 1774; Scotus 1861:210). Visibility of roads was central to the maroon defensive, and the primary obstacle of British militia marches to the interior.
In his early-19th-century *History of the Maroons*, Robert Dallas (1803:188) observed, "On the approach of the troops, the Maroons retreated within the defile [narrow gorge], and remained on a position where, unseen themselves, they could observe the motions of the body acting against them." Whereas the formal battle march of the British along interior roads was linear, visible, and predictable, maroon strategies of movement were fast, disorienting, and to British soldiers, seemingly incomprehensible. This perplexity of movement is vividly captured in the proceedings of the 1796 Assembly of Jamaica:

"With amazing agility they ran, or rather rolled, through their various firings and evolutions. ... they fire stooping almost to the very ground; and no sooner
is the piece discharged, than they throw themselves into a thousand antic gestures, and tumble over and over, so as to be continually shifting their place; the intention of which is to elude the shot, as well as to deceive the aim of their adversaries, which their nimble and almost instantaneous change of position renders extremely uncertain" (Edwards 1796:xxxiii).

For the warfare of Jamaica’s maroons, roads were not traveled upon, but across, around, and over in tactic ways. This reappropriation of roads removed the advantage of British numbers, and redefined the road traveler to fear what British road building sought to overcome: invisibility and unpredictability.

The interior roads became something fundamentally different for different travelers as British officers and maroon leaders volleyed for sovereignty over the island’s deep interior. For Jamaica’s colonial administration, the maroon roads were instruments of political integration through connectivity and accessibility. And yet for the maroon communities, these roads ironically provided predictability and visibility to the movement of British enforcers of political authority, and facilitated their continued resistance to political integration.

Roads & Revolt:

By the 1820s, on the eve of Emancipation, British road building had reached nearly every nook and cranny of the island. Tollgates, guardhouses, walls, and neighborhood patrols monitored virtually all activity on both rural roads and urban streets. Police and road patrolmen were established in many of the major ports, and a system of written permission for any enslaved laborer traveling upon the island’s roads was enforced through confinement, torture, and
bail by their enslaver (Hanson et al. 1811). By this time, roads had not only become violent landscapes of control, but acknowledged symbols of planter authority, integral to the economic and social interests of Jamaica’s plantocracy. This is perhaps best illustrated in Adolphe Duperly’s 1833 depiction of Jamaica’s Christmas Rebellion. Seen in Figure 8.12, Duperly records the destruction of the main road leading to Montego Bay, one of the island’s largest ports, by a large and highly organized group of enslaved laborers. This re-depiction of an 1824 painting (Figure 8.11) underscores the meaningful implications of such an act to contemporary British observers. In this depiction, Historian Tim Barringer (2007:356-357) questions why, “… rebels are portrayed as attacking the means of distribution rather than the actual process of cultivation.”

The framing of this question, however, fails to recognize the more fundamental attack that the widespread destruction of Jamaica’s roads achieved. It was not only an attack on the logistics and economics of a finely tuned, machine-like process. For enslaved people, it was a physical disruption of the infrastructures that wove the island’s plantations into a coherent landscape of control through limited mobility, and more often, sheer immobility. This control of movement significantly restricted the ability of individuals and households to negotiate and maintain membership in multiple, dispersed communities throughout the region.
Figure 8.11 (Top): “Montego Bay from Reading Hill, 1824” by J. Hakewill (image: Barringer et al. 2007:356, Fig. 79). Figure 8.12 (Bottom): “A View of Montego Bay, Taken from Reading Hill. The Rebels Destroying the Road; and Reading Wharf in Flames, 1833” by Adolphe Duperly (Barringer et al. 2007:356, Fig. 78)
Conclusion:

Speaking to colonial administrators and Jamaican planters in the 1770s, Edward Long emphatically pleaded the need to, "... enforce any measure, which may bring the roads used for carriage of produce to market, into as perfect a condition as possible; for these are the main springs, which give motion, and due regularity, to every other part of their commercial machine" (1774:482). The imagery of Long’s machine metaphor suggests not a plantation of stationary buildings and fields, but a plantation of moving parts. The moving parts extended beyond the plantation proper to include the connective tissue between them. And yet, roads were far more than a means of effectively carrying produce. This technical need of roads provided the literal grounds for extending planter control, and navigating such control in strategic ways.

As discussed here, the social and historical embeddedness of Jamaican roads limited the options of movement for many, more so than facilitated it. As large-scale infrastructural investments, roads, in part, allowed a small managerial class to orchestrate the movement, or lack thereof, of the island’s enslaved laborers. As illustrated with the actions of maroon communities and the Christmas Revolt, however, such control was a constant negotiation in which enslaved and former enslaved people also exercised strategies for moving around (Smith and Bassett 2016), re- appropriating, and in some cases actively destroying the very same infrastructure. In this way, roads were simultaneously sites of social “reiteration” and “disruption” (Magaña 2011:164), each social process experienced or exercised through movement.
Ultimately, by focusing on the largely unrecognized role of Jamaica’s 18th and early-19th-century roadways, it has been my objective for this chapter to add to a growing body of scholarship that seeks to animate and investigate contexts of inequality and control by implicating the infrastructures of movement. Control over community and inter-community level organization was as much a material interaction as it was an interpersonal interaction between planters and the enslaved. Yet as previously discussed, some moved further than others due to the nature of their enslaved occupation. Occupations were deeply implicated in the uneven mobility throughout the region, which shaped many aspects of life outside of plantation labor. For one occupation in particular, domestic service, the fundamentally different nature of their enslaved work shaped an entirely different domestic life, inside and outside of plantation boundaries.
CHAPTER 9: ENSLAVED OCCUPATIONS & THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF DOMESTIC SERVICE

Introduction:

In the early 1790s, Jamaican planter Bryan Edwards (1793:125) observed that among the island’s plantations, “The cottages of the Negroes usually compose a small village.” Each house, Edwards (1793:126) notes, is slightly different and “commensurate to the desires and necessitates of their inhabitants, who build them according to their fancy in size and shape.” The typical form is “an admirable shelter,” supported by “hard posts driven into the ground,” with a floor “of natural earth,” and “a roof thatched with palm.” As to the contents within each home, Edwards (1793:126) found “a small table, two or three low stools, an earthen jar for holding water, a few smaller ones, a pail, and iron pot, [and] calabashes of different sizes.” The author continues by noting,

“This account of their accommodation, however, is confined to the lowest among the field negroes: tradesmen and domestics are in general vastly better lodged and provided. Many of these have larger houses, with boarded floors, and are accommodated – at their own expense, it is true – with very decent furniture: a few have even good beds, linen sheets, and mosquito nets, and display a shelf or two of plates and dishes of Queen’s or Staffordshire ware” (Edwards 1793:127).

Bryan Edwards’ description of a typical house and village for enslaved laborers is in no way unique. Much of his observations echo those of other chroniclers in Jamaica (Dallas 1803; Stewart 1823). Nevertheless, in the last passage above, Edwards highlights a major distinguishing factor. He infers the existence of high and low status among a plantation’s enslaved people, and
suggests that architecture was one important medium through which they conveyed their position “at their own expense.” While this account suggests that investment in dwellings was an important marker of social standing, it is necessary to ask what other motivating factors influenced the construction of an enslaved household’s built environment?

Using archaeological evidence from Good Hope’s two villages (Figure 9.1), this chapter assesses the variation in housing found among a single enslaved community, and the significance of architectural expression to enslaved households. Archaeological assemblages from Village I and Village II are used to explore this significance. In doing so, this chapter builds upon a canon of foundational work concerning the architecture of enslaved people in Jamaica (Armstrong 1990; Delle 1998, 2014; Higman 1998; Armstrong and Kelly 2000; Nelson 2011, 2016; Nelson et al. 2014). Yet more specifically, this study continues and advances our understanding of the relationship between housing variation and social differences within a laboring community (Kelly 1989; Armstrong 1990, 2011; Reeves 1997, 2011, 2015; Higman 1998). Ultimately, the findings of this chapter highlight variation in building practices, within a range of options, as an important lens for understanding intra-community social relations, and the significant role played by kinship, labor roles, household composition, and an urban versus rural setting in shaping architectural and consumer choices.

Over the past three decades, a growing number of historical and archaeological studies of plantation slavery have shown the important role occupation played in shaping the enslaved experience. Some suggest that social
status, as defined by the material conditions of life, held a close correlation with a plantation's occupational hierarchy (e.g., Higman 1984; Delle 2014). Such can largely be summarized as follows: high-status domestic servants, middling tradesmen, and low-status field laborers. Others, largely historians, have shown this to be an incorrect over-simplification (Fox-Genovese 1988; Genovese 1976; Hooks 1992).

Figure 9.1: Map of Good Hope showing locations of Village I and Village II, with detailed views of each taken from 1794 Schroeter map of Good Hope. Map by author.
Over the past 20 years, archaeologists have attempted to answer this question through intra-site household comparisons within village contexts. In the Bahamas, Wilkie and Farnsworth (2005) found a distinct land-tenure process whereby the houses of enslaved drivers were distinctly sited upon the high ground of the village, overlooking the houses of field laborers. Moreover, material goods within and around the drivers' houses were noticeably wider in range, suggesting a greater degree of purchasing power. This included somewhat exclusive access to firearms among enslaved people. By all accounts, archaeological studies have simply scratched the surface in understanding the deep implications of occupations in plantation context. As discussed throughout this dissertation, the nature of one’s labor role shaped many aspects of life outside of formal labor, including physical mobility (Chapters 4 and 8), opportunities for monetary income (Chapter 7), and the ability to exchange specialized labor for goods and domestic support (Chapter 7).

Domestic service was one occupation clearly distinguished from others by both period and contemporary observers. The labor requirements were fundamentally different, though little is known regarding their life outside of plantation labor. Likewise, to what degree their occupation shaped their supposed high status among enslaved people remains in question.
Enslaved Domestic Service:

Enslaved domestic service has received relatively little attention in archaeological literature when compared to the overall body of studies on plantation slavery. This is primarily for three reasons: 1.) The material signatures of domestic service are typically attributed to the elite households being served; 2.) The spatial, or household, domain of the enslaved servant is often one in the same with the house in which they labored, complicating identifications of these individuals’ domestic lives in the archaeological record; and 3.) Domestic service was not an enslaved occupation shared across all plantations, and was only widely employed on plantations with a resident proprietor. Together, these three characteristics make the archaeological study of enslaved house servants difficult, if not impossible, in many plantation contexts.

In this regard, Good Hope is perhaps a more extreme example in which domestic service was widely practiced across the plantation’s planter, managerial, and even wage-earner classes. In 1804, plantation records indicate that approximately 31 domestic servants labored within Good Hope’s houses. While the majority of these individuals worked in and around the great house, five supported the domestic needs of the overseer and one salaried tradesman.

While at least two domestic servants worked in the overseer’s house as a fixed position, salaried tradesmen could also hire an enslaved person from the plantation, paid through salary deduction. In 1796, account records indicate that Richard Cole, a white salaried blacksmith working at Good Hope, paid for “1
years hire of a Girl allow him” (R.55.7.125.1). For this expense, 15 pounds sterling was deducted from his and apprentice son’s combined annual salary of 185 pounds. While detailed accounts for Good Hope are limited, early-19th-century records suggest that Cole renewed this expense each year. An 1804 inventory of the enslaved people of Good Hope listed a 43 year-old “Chamba,” or Chagga, woman named Jenny, from the northeast region of modern-day Nigeria, working at “Mr. Cole’s House.” It is worth noting that Jenny was likely not trained as a domestic servant, but simply an enslaved individual that Cole could afford to hire annually at 15 pounds. The domestic needs of Mr. Cole’s small house were limited. A probate inventory for 1804 suggests that his household items of value were limited to an ordinary bedstead and a candlestick; however, these might have been simply provided by Tharp.

As a resident proprietor, occupying the Good Hope great house for most of his life, John Tharp kept between 22 and 25 enslaved laborers at the great house. Of those listed as great house laborers, 11 (including two cooks) were classified as house servants, directly attending the needs of Tharp and his family. Such a large domestic labor force was both a defining practice and common caricature of the wealthy Jamaican planter in the 18th and 19th century. Jamaican planter Edward Long (1774:281) observed, “From twenty to forty servants is nothing unusual” for the white inhabitants of the island.

At the Good Hope great house and its surrounding outbuildings, the 26 enslaved individuals (a mere 5.4% of the plantation’s labor force) laboring at the
great house were further subdivided by dedicated tasks. In 1804, 10 individuals were listed under specialized occupations. These specialized positions include two mule men, 1 saddler, and 1 cow boy laboring in the Carriage House, one fisherman maintaining the fish pond, one attendant to the fowl house, one pastry cook in the kitchen, one grass cutter keeping the lawn, and one young carpenter. This level of specialization in the domestic work force was typical of Jamaican plantations (see Long 1774:281), and estates of equivalent size in Great Britain (Higman 1989). While most British servants were of comparable cultural and socio-economic background, occupational status was one of a short list of commonalities among the enslaved servants in Jamaica.

In 1804, the majority of great house laborers, approximately 17 people (65.4%), are listed as “Creole,” a word designating Jamaican-born. This runs contrary to the popular notion that the vast majority of enslaved people working in and around great houses were locally born. In fact, this percentage is only slightly higher than the plantation’s total locally born enslaved population (58.4%, n=283). Below this demographic, three (11.5%) great houses laborers are classified as Eboe, two as (7.7%) “Coromantee,” two (7.7%) as “Moco,” and two (7.7%) as Papaw. Four individuals are further identified under Jamaica’s system of tiered race, defined by degrees of whiteness. This includes three teenagers – two girls and one boy – listed as “mulatto,” designating the offspring of one white and one black parent. The fourth, a 38-year-old woman named Charlotte, is listed as “quadroon,” designating one white parent and one “mulatto” parent. As Delle (2014:94) notes, this racial structure “… recognized eight races of African-
“Mulatto” and “quadroon” respectively defined the top two tiers of this racial hierarchy, and both likely represent the offspring of the plantation’s white planter, managerial, and wage-earning staff (ibid.). Of the enslaved population, all working-age women at Good Hope listed as “mulatto” or “quadroon” were domestic servants. This “subjective division” of occupation along lines of age, gender, and race defined what Delle (2014:90) highlights as the plantation’s “social division of labor.”

Archaeological evidence indicates that enslaved domestic servants occupied a separate village immediately behind the great house from the 1770s through the 1830s. Labeled here as “Village II,” the domestic servants’ village was a fraction of the size of Village I, and likely only housed a dozen individuals at any one time. The overall form of Village II mirrors Village I in many ways. Fieldstone walls marked definite boundaries in space, channeling movement in and out of the village in intentional and predictable ways. As with the relationship between Village I and the overseer’s house, Village II was nearly adjacent to the great house, but mountainous terrain and masonry walls limited visibility between the two spaces. Surveillance of domestic space was virtually non-existent. Rather, Tharp and his family monitored the movement of enslaved domestics through formal work alleys and limited points of entry walled-off from the great house complex.

Yet beyond planter-laborer relations, a more fundamental difference existed among enslaved people. By the nature of their occupation, house
domestics lived radically different working lives than tradesmen, field laborers, and other enslaved individuals. The degree to which different work shaped different domestic lives altogether is a separate question – one in which only a comparative archaeology can answer.

Activity-Based Comparison:

As mentioned in Chapter 2, a dwelling approach provides a series of focal points for archaeological analysis and interpretation. Of these, a focus on domestic activities, or tasks, provides a glimpse into how time outside of formal plantation labor was spent. For virtually all enslaved people, time outside of their labor role was extremely limited (Roberts 2013). How they organized and invested that time, as seen through activities and domestic tasks in and around household spaces, provides an important glimpse into the “taskscapes” they created and maintained (Ingold 1993; Moore and Dekle 2010; Moore and Thompson 2012; Gallivan 2016). Understanding these “taskscapes,” what activities they included, and the type of domestic life they supported, provides the comparative basis to notions of dwelling. It is only through a look at the socio-domestic lives captured in people’s dwelling activities, that we can begin to understand how categories like occupation influenced virtually every aspect of an individual’s life, inside and outside of formal labor.

Between Villages I and II, the tasks of basic necessities – such as food procurement and preparation – provide an informative starting point. In Village II,
evidence for cooking is virtually absent. While faunal material illustrates that domestic servants were eating in the village, food preparation appears to have occurred elsewhere. In fact, many of the domestic activities seen archaeologically in Village I, are absent in Village II. This evidence suggests a different organization of domestic life all together.

Faunal evidence from Village I and II, analyzed by Alexis Ohman (2015, 2016), illustrates differential access to different food items between the two villages. Whereas households in Village I consumed a uniform range of species – namely cow, pig, and goat, the faunal diversity of house domestics was nearly double and included guineafowl, duck, fish, and chicken, on top of cow, pig, and goat (Figure 9.2). Some of this range might have been sourced from the great house kitchen, and could represent leftover food items from Tharp and his family. Alternatively, the range of birds and fish might have been sourced directly from the great house fishpond and fowl house, given the proximity between these outbuildings and Village II. As evidence for food preparation was absent from Village II, while indications for food consumption were widespread, it is likely that access to excess or leftover food from the great house was one affordance of occupation for house domestics. Whether this was by “privilege” or necessity is a more significant question.

Food ways and other domestic practices are visible in the swept periphery of house-yards, previously described as the “toft-zone.”
As with Village I, the debris swept to the edge of the yard on a daily basis left a distinct and varied material signature of the range of household activities that occurred in and around the household. Interpolation of average ceramic sherd size revealed a distribution of swept yards, with house sites surrounded by distinct toft-zones (Figure 9.3). Sewing appears to have been one domestic skill widely practiced among the residents of Village II as indicated in household toft-
zones. Contrary to Village I, in which no sewing-related objects were recovered, a full range of buttons – bone, shell, copper alloy, gilded, molded – were found in Village II. These buttons and a single copper thimble were recovered in the periphery of a swept house-yard, tightly clustered within the same 1x1m-unit. Sewing was a desirable service, and one that could be deployed at any time of day, for both personal domestic and market needs.

Figure 9.3: Swept-yard pattern from Village II, as determined by size-sorting patterns seen in the distribution of average ceramic sherd size.
Extending this skill beyond formal plantation labor was an asset that could be deployed for income, barter, or reciprocity within the enslaved community. This is similar to findings in Village I (Chapter 7) that indicate enslaved coopers extended their occupational skill to the enslaved household to repair a barrel-shaped cassava-crushing mortar. Therefore, while enslaved domestics were able to take advantage of time outside of formal labor, this time and other domestic resources were severely limited. The affordance of occupation allowed those in Village I to create and maintain social and economic interactions at the community and regional scale. In Village II, archaeological evidence suggests that domestic servants likely only participated in small-scale and localized social and economic interactions with other enslaved individuals. This, however, varied as enslaved domestics traveled and resided between Village II and their urban quarters behind Tharp’s townhouse in Falmouth. The variation between urban and rural enslavement will discussed further in Chapter 10.

**Asymmetric Architecture: Household Composition and Building Investment**

The investment, elaboration, and degree of permanence in architectural spaces represent important characteristics in the self-fashioning of the household unit. This material expression is true to the extent that the anthropology of household architecture has acquired a canonized literature of its own (Rapport 1969, 1982; Bourdieu 1970; Glassie 1975; Johnson 1993, 2010; Toy and Melhuish 1996; Buchli 2013; Waterson 2013).
Through his work on domestic dwellings, Ian Hodder (1990:40) described the house as “the locus for the reproduction of the individual.” Echoing Bordieu’s (1970) Berber House study, this view suggests that activities, behaviors, and identity in a household are, in part, perpetuated across generations by the layout and composition of a house itself. This form of materiality highlights the home not simply as a reflection of values, perceptions, and cultural ideals, but a form integral to shaping those characteristics. This is most apparent with houses that span generations, in which “… the roles of household members continue even when individual members die” (Banning 2003:5).

In the quote that began this chapter, Jamaican planter Bryan Edwards (1793:127) described a typical dwelling found in a plantation village. This common form, he confesses, was "... confined to the lowest among the field negroes," noting that, "tradesmen and domestics are in general vastly better lodged." This account appears to highlight social distinctions among enslaved people along lines of plantation labor roles. From the planter’s view, these distinctions manifest in material differences, notably in housing, "at their own expense" (1793:127).

In this final section, I use evidence from Good Hope to suggest that this variation is not a product of unequal access to market goods and resources, and that architectural elaboration is not a reliable spectrum upon which socioeconomic status can be measured across an enslaved community. Rather, I
argue that architectural elaboration is just one investment strategy commonly employed by a particular form of household composition.

As discussed in Chapters 6 and 7, evidence for multiple dwellings articulated together through common swept yards suggests that many enslaved people organized themselves into extended households under multiple roofs. The clustering of houses within the village was made meaningful through shared spaces, such as a central common yard and collective gardens. This finding supports the notion that contemporary households in rural Jamaica, commonly organized around “family land” compounds shared among extended cognatic kin, had its genesis in the period of slavery (Besson 2002).

House-yard compounds possessed up to three dwellings, interconnected by a central communal yard shared among multiple dwellings (e.g., Village I, Household Areas 1 and 2). The other form of dwelling arrangement found at Good Hope was the solitary house with its own swept yard and garden (e.g., Village I, Household Areas 3 and 4; and households in Village II). Two of these solitary houses were uncovered in Village I, with material assemblages more similar to the solitary housing arrangement of Village II. Of these similarities, the presence of window glass in solitary houses provides compelling evidence for a greater emphasis on architectural elaboration among smaller households.

Recent work by Matthew Reeves (2015) suggests that the ratio of nails to window glass is a consistent metric for measuring architectural refinement in slave housing. As seen here, solitary houses in Village I and II reveal a uniform
presence of window glass, in contrast to the near absence of window glass among larger multi-dwelling households (Figure 9.4).

Differences in material choices likewise manifest in other household goods found in each village. Moore's (1985) ceramic scaling for decorative attributes provides a useful measure of expense associated with refined earthenwares of the late-18th century through the 1830s (see also Kelly 1989, Armstrong 1990, Reeves 2015).

Figure 9.4: Graph of the ratio of window glass to nails, per household assemblage. Each column represents a separate 1-x-1m test unit, place in each household area.
While controlling for time between 1780 and 1830, the larger household compound in Village I shows greater investment in decorated ceramics than the domestic assemblage of domestic servants’ in Village II (Figure 9.5). This difference manifests in the top two pricing tiers of decoration – hand-painted and transfer-printed wares.

**Figure 9.5:** Ceramic scaling (i.e. the ratio decorative attributes of greater or lesser expense) between the multi-dwelling household in Village I and a solitary household of domestic servants in Village II.
Figure 9.6: Ceramic scaling between the multi-dwelling household in Village I and a solitary household of domestic servants in Village II, confined to just Pearlware (Left) and single, contemporaneous layers (Right).

This consumer pattern remains the same even when one confines the sample to just Pearlware in both contexts, and also when the sample is confined to single contemporaneous stratigraphic layers (Figure 9.6). This suggests that by the early 19th century, larger kinship compounds in Good Hope’s primary village were spending more on expensively decorated ceramics (a non-essential item benefiting the household) than those individuals with solitary houses in both Village I and II.
As for Village II, one distinct area of investment stands out when compared to larger extended household clusters in Village I. Using Doug Armstrong’s (1998) categories for functional analysis, and again controlling for time between 1780 and 1830, domestic servants in Village II appear to have invested directly and indirectly in items related to personal adornment, more so than households in Village I. In a functional analysis, this is seen in the overall percentage of artifacts in the “personal and community activities,” in large part due to the quantity of buttons (Figure 9.7).

**Figure 9.7:** Functional analysis of domestic artifact assemblages, illustrating the percentage of “Personal & Community Presentation” artifacts and “Tools” artifacts within their 1-x-1m unit assemblages.
As a point of comparison, the blue represents the overall percentage of artifacts falling in the “tools” category, which includes household activities, sewing, animal tack, yard equipment, etc. As expected, these items fall in the minority in domestic servants’ contexts.

Related to this notion, archaeologists and historians working in Virginia and the Caribbean have previously observed material variation between unrelated individuals and larger-kin-based households. For example, at Thomas Jefferson’s Monticello, Neiman (2008) found that enslaved people in kin-based housing constructed communal subfloor pits for common storage, while those living in unrelated barracks-style housing constructed individual storage pits for individual needs. In similar fashion, Jillian Galle (2011) suggests that investment in items of personal display like metal buttons reflects the signaling system of unmarried or unrelated individuals. In such cases, choices in material goods reflect multiple unrelated individuals living in close proximity, with more ephemeral social bonds and the need to invest in oneself to negotiate the conditions of enslavement, more so than any larger social unit (such as the extended household). At Montpelier in Jamaica, Higman (1998:182) found a correlation between durable housing (i.e. stone) for individuals versus flexible housing materials for larger extended kin groups. In the latter, flexible materials like wattle, board, and dry-laid walls easily accommodated changing garden boundaries, pens, and house location following ever-changing household relations between and among kin groups. Taken together with the findings from Good Hope, this suggests that both building and consumer practices were
significantly shaped by choices related to household composition, and concerns for the social unit, more so than a single recognizable proxy for social status.

Discussion:

Contrary to the conventional narrative of enslaved domestic service, this archaeological evidence suggests that the occupational hierarchy did not have a direct correlation with material wealth by any single measure (e.g., ceramics or architecture), particularly after the turn of the 19th century. Comparison between domestic servants in Village II and field laborers and tradesmen in Village I illustrates how kinship networks and time outside of plantation labor might have played a more important role in shaping material conditions than the labor position itself. As a locally born creole population expanded in the late-18th/early-19th century, larger kinship groups likewise emerged. At Good Hope, this emerged unevenly. This was seen in Good Hope’s larger village through individual houses joined by common yards, forming extended household clusters. Importantly, these kinship groupings afforded the possibility to pool resources among kinsmen and create a greater household division of labor, which in turn, would have created more collective time to devote to provision grounds, raising animals, market participation, among other contributing factors towards the betterment of life. These alternative means of access to resources, and variation in consumer decisions, point to a more significant division among enslaved people than occupations alone.
In their foundational work on household archaeology, Wilk and Rathje (1982:620-621) distinguish between two important concepts for understanding the relationship between houses and social collectives: the “dwelling unit” and the “household.” The “dwelling unit” signifies the nature of co-residence, or the quantity and social composition of those living under one roof. The “household,” on the other hand, is defined as “the social component of subsistence,” born from “… a domestic strategy to meet the productive, distributive, and reproductive needs of its members” (Wilk and Rathje 1982:618). While expressed in explicitly functional terms, the distinction between these concepts highlights the fact that those living under one roof do not necessarily constitute a household (Bender 1967; Goody 1972), nor is an entire household necessarily confined to one roof. This distinction is important for household archaeology, as Wilk and Rathje (1982:620) note, “archaeologists do not excavate households; they find the material remains of dwellings.” Inferring the nature of the household from the material remains of a dwelling or dwellings is an analytical and interpretative act.

When considering architectural investment in domestic buildings, it follows that one must first consider the social unit a building, or buildings, house. The findings from Good Hope are useful in constructing a model of architectural investment as it relates to this relationship between the dwelling unit and the household. Data from Good Hope suggests that when the dwelling unit, or those housed under a single roof, corresponds with the entirety of the household unit, the dwelling itself becomes a significant medium for investment choices and expendable resources. In such cases, the physical house represents one of the
most significant and visible material forms identifiable to the entire social unit. To the contrary, when the household exceeds the dwelling unit, occupying multiple adjacent buildings, investment choices appear to be more flexible and distributed, focusing on items that benefit the larger collective of related dwellings such as sets of expensive ceramics.

In Good Hope’s Village II, or domestic servants’ village, individual houses appear to have housed the entirely of the household. In some cases, this might even represent a household of one. Consequently, household architecture in Village II represents more costly investments than most houses found in Village I. The exception to this proves the rule. The single-dwelling household tested in Village I paralleled the patterns in architectural investment found in Village II – as measured through window glass. Together, this framework allows one to reconsider single-spectrum proxies for measuring socio-economic status, and view architectural elaboration as one choice within a range of options, beneficial to a particular form of household composition (Table 9.1).

Conclusion:

Understanding variation in household life for enslaved people, and the connections and collectives those spaces maintain, is one way to render such social variation. At Good Hope, two separate village settings reveal two distinct patterns of living.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Field/Trades (Multi-dwelling Household)</th>
<th>Field/Trades (Single Dwelling Household)</th>
<th>Domestic Servants (Single Dwelling Household)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swept Yard?</td>
<td>Yard</td>
<td>Yard</td>
<td>Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Garden?</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>No Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Investment</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatware vs. Hollowware ca.</td>
<td>Flatware</td>
<td>Holloware</td>
<td>Flatware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Quality of Ceramics</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Local vs. African-born</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal Diversity (Food Access)</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Flexibility” of Architecture</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Semi-flexible</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9.1:** Summary of household types from Good Hope’s Village I and Village II, ca. 1800.

Through the infrastructures of plantation slavery, planters created varying conditions of enslavement, manifesting in different priorities for different segments of the enslaved community. For some enslaved people, such as domestic servants in Village II and solitary houses in Village I, investment choices appear to have focused on a smaller household unit. In these cases, the *dwelling unit* corresponded with the *household unit*, and small numbers of people channeled their time and resources into elaboration of their dwelling. At Good
Hope, this was most visible archaeologically in those houses with glass windows. Among extended family compounds, however, consumer practices appear to have focused on larger household units through more portable material goods shared among multiple dwellings, such as finer ceramics.

The comparison between Village I and Village II also revealed that the socio-economic hierarchy within the enslaved community did not map onto the plantation’s occupation hierarchy. On a social spectrum domestic servants appear to have occupied a middling position relative to tradesmen and perhaps other occupations in Village I. In many ways, those in Village I appear to have spent far more time outside of plantation labor, devoted to household production and market activities. In the 1820s, one abolitionist writer in Jamaica observed,

“It has been the common lot of agricultural slaves to endure more labour than other bondmen, it has, on the other hand, been their advantage, not only to be less exposed that domestics to the caprice and ill temper of a master, but to have a far greater stability of situation, as surer possession of their families, and of the property they have been permitted to acquire” (Barclay 1827:263).

The labor conditions for enslaved domestics found here do not appear to be confined to Jamaica, nor the sugar plantations of the Caribbean. Domestic service was almost universally practiced among wealthy and many middling planters throughout the slave-holding colonies of the Atlantic World. While traveling throughout North American between 1827 and 1828, British Captain Basil Hall describes a circumstance similar to that of Jamaica in the rice-
plantations of South Carolina. Interviewing one plantation-owner on the outskirts of Charleston, Hall (1829:216) writes,

“Domestic slaves, he told me, were better fed and clothed, and generally better treated, than those employed out of doors; but, what was odd enough, he added, that every where the slaves preferred the field-work, chiefly, as far as I could learn, from its being definite in amount, which left them a certain portion of the day entirely to themselves. This privilege has become, virtually a right in many places; and so fare, is a spark of freedom in their dark night of bondage; whereas the house slave, from being liable to every call, early and late, sometimes fancies himself less free.”

At Montpelier, the plantation of President James Madison, Matthew Reeves (2010:5) notes that household comparisons such as this,

“… allows for consideration of the impact that labor roles had on slaves’ everyday lives, but also move beyond simplistic causal relationships (such as the direct link between labor role and material lives of individual households) toward and analysis of the interplay of community life on labor structure.”

Social status was only part of the story of enslavement. Accepting the material-basis for social status as the lone baseline for comparison for the enslaved experience neglects other meaningful aspects of daily life, which equally shape the quality of life. Time outside of occupational labor renders an alternative narrative for the comparison of lifeways – one implicated in, and to be considered alongside, the value of social status in enslaved communities. In doing so, I suggest that others seek alternative proxies beyond material wealth to understand slavery on a comparative basis. When considered in tandem, multiple comparative avenues illustrate how the enslaved experience varied under different conditions of enslavement, as did their consumer choices. In this
study, such was the case when considering the time outside of formal labor and the support networks and collective action afforded by larger household units. While relative status equated to an improved quality of life in some respects, the “stability of situation” garnered other resources and affordances for those laboring in field or trades positions. For the latter, it was through their own ingenuity, organization, and resourcefulness that they were able to self-ameliorate in small ways to improve the horrific conditions of enslavement.
CHAPTER 10: URBAN ENSLAVEMENT

Introduction:

At Good Hope, as with all Jamaican sugar estates, the plantation did not end at its planted boundaries, but relied upon its connection to the sea. This connection was made possible through the port town of Falmouth, seven miles north at the mouth of the Martha Brae River. In Falmouth, Tharp constructed a large wharf for import and export, complete with warehouses, docks, a store, and connected to Good Hope by a network of roads.

Site Location:

Falmouth is located on the north coast of Jamaica in the parish of Trelawny, 35 km east of Montego Bay (Figure 10.1). Historically, Falmouth is known as one the Caribbean’s wealthiest port towns in the late-18th and early 19th centuries, having served as a commercial hub for the sugar estates of the island’s northern parishes. Today, the historic town holds the largest number of surviving 18th/19th-century structures in the British Caribbean, and is recognized for its atypical survival of civic, religious, commercial, and domestic buildings dating from the 1790s through the late 19th century. Falmouth has been the site of ongoing field schools in historic preservation and tangible heritage, and the subject of recent scholarly and developmental works concerning its rich material culture (Lyew-Ayee & Conolley 2008; Wesler 2008, 2013; Bassett & Conolley 2013; Nelson et. al 2014; Nelson 2016) and the implications of its expanding heritage tourism industry (Brady et al. 2010; Kerswill 2013; Stupart 2013).
The Tharp House complex is situated upon a formerly coastal lot at the eastern extent of Falmouth (Figure 10.2). The lot, known historically as “Tharp’s Wharf,” is a complex of warehouses, docks, townhouse, ancillary buildings, and commercial spaces. Today the townhouse and boundary walls remain standing, with little evidence of the large warehouses and docks that once extended east along reclaimed land into the harbor. The northerly and eastern extent of the complex now abuts the recently constructed cruise terminal. The southern extent of the site is marked by the masonry shells of the Hampden Wharf warehouses.
The only original adjacent landmark is Seaboard Street, which defines the western extent of Tharp’s Wharf.

The archaeological project focused on the rear yard of the townhouse component of the wharf complex. The rear yard is bound by original masonry walls extending E-W from Seaboard Street to the Tharp House, and N-S from the cruise terminal to Tharp Street (Figure 10.3). The interior of the yard is largely composed of open space, with a masonry partition wall running E-W, dividing the yard in half. In the remainder of this chapter, these two halves will be referred to as the North Yard and South Yard.
Historical Background:

In 1774, John Tharp, the Anglo-Jamaican proprietor of Good Hope, purchased the seaside lot in the recently established town of Falmouth. Tharp acquired the property to establish a new wharf complex, replacing his less convenient and increasingly inaccessible wharf in Martha Brae (Besson 2004; Bassett 2016). From the late 1770s through the late 1780s, the wharf complex was strictly commercial in nature, and contained only docks and warehouses. By the early-1790s, Tharp had become increasingly involved in Parish politics, civic improvements, among other urban interests. Between 1791 and 1793, he constructed the townhouse that now occupies the site (Nelson et al. 2014), and the outbuildings that once occupied the rear yard (Figure 10.3). This transformed the property into the combined commercial-residence that became increasingly typical of Jamaica (Nelson 2016), South Carolina (Herman 2005), and other Atlantic ports by the mid to late-18th century.

Following John Tharp’s death in 1804, the Tharp House and Wharf were transferred to his heirs, along with 22,000 acres of Tharp property in the parishes of Trelawny and St. Ann (Hart 1994). Operation of the sugar estates, pens, and wharf continued through William Greene, the resident attorney at Good Hope. Shipments of sugar and rum gradually declined, though the wharf remained the departure point for commodities to British and American markets. The importation of enslaved Africans ceased, and a new cooperage for manufacturing barrels was constructed on an adjacent lot (Bassett and Conolley 2013).
By the mid-1810s, management of the Tharp estates passed to William Fairclough, until William Tharp – a nephew of John Tharp – took over the estates in 1818. Each of these individuals resided at Good Hope during their management of the Tharp estates, and made periodic use of the townhouse in Falmouth.

Accounts Produce from the Tharp Family Papers indicate that large quantities of goods flowed in and out of Tharp’s Wharf each year, serving John Tharp’s nine sugar estates and two cattle pens. For export, hogsheads of sugar and puncheons of rum produced on the Tharp estates were warehoused and shipped to London, Liverpool, Bristol, New Castle, Glasgow, and New York from

---

Figure 10.3: Plan of the rear yard of Tharp’s town house, dated 1844, taken from 1844 map of Falmouth. Map courtesy of Falmouth Heritage Renewal.
the 1790s onward. For import, lumber and provisions arrived primarily from Bristol and New York (Bassett 2016). Household goods to resupply his properties were temporarily warehoused before distribution to the estates, and on at least three documented occasions, enslaved people were docked and sold to nearby plantations (Besson 2004; Nelson 2016).

By 1793, the waterfront lot was outfitted with a large gentry townhouse, from which Tharp oversaw shipment of sugar and rum (Figure 10.4). Tharp’s highly skilled enslaved masons and carpenters constructed the house as a scaled-down version of the Good Hope great house, yet somewhat different in plan (Nelson et al. 2014:102; Nelson 2016). Between the early 1790s and the late 1830s, John Tharp and his nephew William sporadically occupied the town house, maintaining a social, political, and economic presence in local affairs throughout the last half-century of slavery on the island.

On each occasion, between eight and 11 enslaved domestic servants traveled with Tharp from Good Hope to support the domestic needs of his Falmouth townhouse. As Tharp traveled on horse, donkey, or in a covered carriage known as a “Catherine,” a procession of domestic servants clad in formal livery followed. In an account written years later, one local resident recalled,

“At Good Hope Mr. Tharp lived in feudal magnificence in a castellated mansion, on the summit of a hill, with small cannons mounted on the battlements, where he dispensed a splendid hospitality, living in princely style, whence he issued, ever and anon, to visit his other estates, or to travel to some greater distance, which he did with a retinue reminding one of all he read of the feudal barons, of old and their retainers, save the arms and peculiar costume” (Anonymous 1877:3).
This feudal-like “retinue” of domestic servants was typical of Jamaica’s planter elite. As Edward Long described, “In manner of living, the English here differ not much from their brethren at home,” except for their “greater profusion of dishes, a greater retinue of domestics, and in wearing more expensive cloaths” (Long 1774:32; see also Nelson 2016:157). Tharp frequently traveled throughout his small empire of sugar estates and cattle pens, but typically only resided at Good Hope and his Falmouth town house. For Tharp and his peers, proper residence in either town or country required domestic attendants.
As he moved from rural plantation to port town, his domestic servants traveled with him to cook, clean, and support other domestic needs around the clock for him and his family. By the late-18th century, urban domestic servants in Atlantic port towns typically resided in detached quarters in rear yards (Zierden and Herman 1996; Herman 2005). In major ports like Falmouth and Charleston, SC, urban quarters were commonly organized in a range of identical rooms facing an interior work yard (Herman 2005; Nelson et al. 2014), where tasks were carried out in support of the townhouse. In this arrangement, enslaved domestics lived in cell-like units, which likely housed one to two individuals. These one to two-occupancy rooms both accommodated and reinforced the limited household organization of most domestic servants, mirroring living arrangements found in Good Hope’s Village II. As described in Chapter 9, domestic servants were in large part physically and socially separated from the rest of the enslaved population, limiting their ability to form or participate in larger kinship groups. As the previous chapter described, this significantly influenced their consumer choices, as well as their social and economic activities outside of formal labor.

Little is known about the daily activities of enslaved domestic servants beyond what can be generalized from historic records. As in Good Hope’s Village II, house servants lived a near continuous working life of attendance to others, but also a private domestic life, attending to themselves. Daily activities and the movement of people and objects throughout the townhouse yard left a revealing signature of life and labor for these individuals. Understanding how domestic
servants’ labor role shaped their domestic life in Falmouth, compared to Good Hope, is a question that only an urban archaeology of these spaces can answer.

**Tharp House and the Archaeology of Urban Slavery**

In 2016, I extended the scope of the Good Hope Archaeological Project (GHAP) to the urban extension of the plantation – the rear yard of Tharp’s Falmouth townhouse. From a comparative standpoint, this provided a rare glimpse at the social and economic transitions an enslaved person experienced as they moved from country to town. As described above, Tharp’s domestic servants frequently traveled from their quarters in Village II to a range of rooms behind Tharp’s Falmouth townhouse. Archaeological survey of the townhouse rear-yard reveals distinct patterns of material culture illustrative of both their working and domestic lives while in Falmouth.

**Overview of Findings:**

Archaeologically, the Tharp House rear yard is best characterized as a 1790s-1830s domestic ancillary space where enslaved servants lived and worked not only in support of the adjacent townhouse, but also themselves. The wealth of arifactual material recovered from the yard speaks to two periods of intensive domestic use: 1795–1805 and 1820-1835. Historically, 1795-1805 aligns with the period of ownership under John Tharp. The second period of intensive domestic use aligns with ownership under William Tharp, John Tharp’s
nephew and successor. Under both periods of occupation, persistent patterns of specialized use of the partitioned rear yard are visible archaeologically.

**South Yard:**

In the South Yard, artifact distributions reveal a flow of movement from a centrally located outbuilding to a rear service stair that aligns with the central passage of the townhouse’s upper story. Domestic artifacts form a ring around a square-shaped space in the South Yard’s center, where an 1844 map indicates a building once stood. Given the amount of faunal remains, cooking pot fragments, and formal tableware surrounding this structure, one can positively identify this as the townhouse’s detached kitchen. From here, the service route began, running east to the townhouse wall, where a window now masks a former doorway. Artifact concentrations along this route indicate that the dining service for the townhouse was comprised of mostly Royal Pattern Creamware (31.3% of ceramic assemblage, n=315) and Chinese Export Porcelain (2.2%, n=22) through the 1790s, and Shell-edge and transfer print Pearlwares (37.3%, n=375) after 1800 (Figure 10.5). Throughout this time, tea service likewise played an important part in domestic service at the townhouse (Figure 10.6), and followed a similar route from the kitchen to the rear access of the central passage.

The pattern of artifacts along seemingly linear routes beginning at the kitchen and ending as the townhouse’s rear passage clearly illustrates the function of the South Yard. By all accounts, the South Yard was constructed and used as a domestic work yard from the 1790s through Emancipation (1838).
**Figure 10.5:** Spatial distribution (Ordinary Kriging) of Pearlware (1775-1830). Map by author.

**Figure 10.6:** Spatial distribution (Ordinary Kriging) of teawares, indicating service route between kitchen and service stairs.
Understanding the enslaved experienced in formal workspaces such as this requires a different conceptualization of the archaeological record. While dining sets, teawares, and other service objects found in the South Yard undoubtedly belonged to Tharp, their spatial deposition reflects his life in limited ways. In these workspaces, one must shift away from assigning objects to consumers, buyers, or owners. Rather, patterns dictate that we must view the work yard assemblage as a record of “object handlers” (Arcangeli 2015:89).

On a daily basis, the majority of consumer and household items used by the planter elite were carried, arranged, stored, and otherwise handled by enslaved servants. Deposition in the ground therefore reflects the activities, accidents, and movement of those who served, more so than those being served. As an archaeological record, this provides a sum-total view of the working lives of enslaved domestics in urban settings. While a tangible record is bias toward activities requiring large amounts of material accessories, such as formal dining, this record nonetheless speaks to the range of daily tasks.

In the South Yard, house domestics spent a significant portion of their day preparing food and beverages for Tharp, his family, and his guests. Evidence suggests that this required frequent travel beyond the walls to nearby markets (Figure 10.7). The diversity, quality, and butchery of cuts represented in faunal remains suggest that house domestics acquired food items from town vendors, butchers, and fisherman on a daily basis. Approximately 17% of mammal bone was sawn (Ohman 2016), in contrast to the overwhelmingly chopped, cracked, or simply disarticulated cuts of meat found at Good Hope.
This high percentage of sawn butchery suggests that specific cuts of meat were carefully chosen and purchased from a butcher or specialized vendor. Falmouth boasted a well-known meat market a few blocks from Tharp’s townhouse. Around the turn of the 19th century, local legislation relocated meat vendors to a dedicated space, separated from the primary market due to smells (Hanson et al. 1811). Moving from yard to market, domestic servants chose and procured these cuts of beef and pork for Tharp’s table several times a week while in residence.

Another distinguishing characteristic of the Tharp House faunal assemblage was the presence and diversity of tropical fish. Surgeonfish, Jack, Pufferfish, Soldierfish, Sea Bass, and Barracuda were all found in the yard’s assemblage of food items (Ohman 2016), representing the only utilized meat source truly local to Jamaica. Local fish were not salted or preserved like cod, and could not keep for more than a day. To prevent spoilage in the tropical climate, these fish would have been sourced from local reefs just offshore, purchased, and prepared in the townhouse kitchen within hours (ibid.). This expediency helps explain why fish are virtually absent from Good Hope’s villages, which are located seven miles from the sea. While in Falmouth, domestic servants were responsible for procuring fish either directly from fishermen or from the local fish market. As with other perishable meats, this required daily movement from yard to and through town.
Figure 10.7: Annotation of 1844 map of Falmouth, illustrating the routes from town house to primary 1.) “Bend-down” market and 2.) dedicated meat market.

North Yard:

Spatial analysis of the North Yard reveals a distinctively domestic signature in the northwest corner, separate and apart from the townhouse service route. While present in the 1790s, this domestic signature is amplified after 1800, and begins to wane by the 1830s. The location of this signature is consistent with an L-shaped building in the yard, recorded on an 1844 map (Figure 6), and partially standing today. Size-sorting patterns suggest that a former building in this corner was regularly swept out, pushing larger domestic debris to its periphery. Given the diversity of household items combined with concentrations of faunal remains, this building clearly served as detached living
quarters. The yard space surrounding these detached quarters functioned as a “house-yard” in the traditional sense. Here, evidence suggests people socialized and carried out tasks for small-scale domestic needs. As a bound space, the function of the North Yard is clear in this context. Physically separated from the work yard, the North Yard housed living quarters and provided domestic space for enslaved house servants.

The North Yard assemblage contains the range of household items expected for residential space. Though equally abundant, the South Yard assemblage contains a narrower range of object types, suggesting more specialized use of space (Kent 1987; Wandsnider 1996). These separate signatures highlight the nature of the masonry partition wall dividing the rear-lot into a North and South Yard.

Through a single gated access to Seaboard Street, domestic servants moved between the Tharp House complex and the town of Falmouth, where they purchased goods from merchants, free blacks, and enslaved people at the nearby “Bend-down” market (Figure 10.7). Many of these goods were eventually deposited in the yard by loss or refuse. Beyond supplies for the townhouse, enslaved domestics also purchased personal items: ceramics, a toy marble (Figure 10.8), tobacco pipes, and clothing buttons. These are just a few personal items found surrounding the living quarters in the North Yard.
Figure 10.8: Marble uncovered from the residential quarters of the North Yard. Photo by author.

From Rural to Urban Slavery: A Comparison

In northern Jamaica, urban slavery was a radical departure from the built environment seen on rural plantations. Housing for enslaved people was in most cases designed into the house lot and consistent with the materials and elevation of other buildings surrounding it. In Falmouth (Wesler 2013; Nelson et. al 2014; Nelson 2016), as with many port cities around the British Atlantic (Herman 2005), most enslaved people lived and labored among a collection of outbuildings in a wall-bound rear-yard. At the Tharp House, as described above, workspace and
domestic servant housing – both common elements surrounding rural great houses – were collapsed into a square yard with a central partition, located directly behind the great house.

On the south side of the masonry partition wall, a small work yard was organized around a central detached kitchen. Spatial distributions of artifacts suggest that the service route of house domestics moved from an east-facing door of the kitchen, toward the back of the town house, and up an external staircase to a central passage connected to entertaining rooms, bedrooms, and a large dining room (Bassett 2016a). The north side of the yard's partition wall was for the most part open, and flanked by an L-shaped building to the west. Artifact assemblages suggest that this long L-shape building was residential in function. Likewise, the narrow massing of the structure suggests a formal range of one-room quarters facing the open yard. Given neighboring examples of early-19th-century domestic quarters (Nelson et al. 2014; Nelson 2016), this building would have housed the eight to 11 domestic servants brought from Good Hope to support the town house.

As these spaces suggest, the built environment of urban slavery had both its differences and commonalities to the rural plantation. Each had the common elements of a work yard and residential “village” so to speak. Behind the townhouse, these spaces were collapsed into a single, self-contained space, yet remained separate through masonry walls. Such walls, both boundary and partition, were common elements to the infrastructure of urban enslavement around the Atlantic by the early-19th century (Zierden and Herman 1996; Herman
As McInnis (2005:194) observes in Charleston, SC, “The architecture of the backlot both ordered and regulated the relationships between master and slave and between slaves.” These regulations extended to the quarters themselves, giving enslaved domestics little autonomy over the residential spaces they inhabited.

Despite this level of control, domestics carved-out their social space among these infrastructures of enslavement. The landscapes of the enslaved were not separate and apart from those of planters, artisans, and merchants. Rather, black landscapes wove through, underlay, and creatively navigated the dominant white landscape (Upton 1984, Nelson 2011; Smith and Bassett 2016). These spaces were not so much constructed as they were shaped through practice. In many ways, they mirrored domestic spaces created and maintained in Good Hope’s Village I and II. In Falmouth, these constructed spaces began not in the quarter, but in the yards just outside.

In Good Hope’s Village I and Village II, households of enslaved people maintained earthen yards, swept daily to create space for their domestic and social needs. As described in previous chapters (Chapters 6, 7, and 9), the practice of yard sweeping is found throughout the African diaspora, and is still commonly practiced among descendent communities today (Westmacott 1992; Gundaker 1993; Gundaker and McWillie 2005). Looking to the past, swept yards left subtle archaeological signatures, decipherable through artifact distributions (Samford et al. 1986; Armstrong 1990; Heath 2000; Bon-Harper 2009, 2010; Neiman et al. 2014; Bassett 2015, 2016). Among households in Good Hope’s
two villages, size-sorting patterns, rather than density patterns, are arguably more revealing of yard extent and maintenance (Bassett 2015, 2016). For swept yards, this signature was produced by site maintenance in which larger artifacts were swept to the periphery of the yard, while smaller objects were left in place under the broom.

Comparable to Good Hope’s swept yards, ceramic size-sorting analysis of the Tharp House rear lot reveals that domestic servants maintained both their living and working space as swept earthen yards (Figure 10.9). This pattern illustrates that one or more individuals frequently swept from the yard center to the periphery on both sides of the central partition wall, likely on a daily basis. In both the North and South yards, larger ceramics concentrated against the boundary walls and central partition, while smaller ceramics remained in the yard interior. South of the partition wall, refuse from the kitchen and other parts of the formal work yard were swept clear. In this area, enslaved domestics labored to maintain their workspace. North of the partition wall, these same individuals labored to simultaneously maintain and construct space outside of their formal labor roles, exclusively for their needs.

An additional parallel was found between Good Hope’s domestic servants’ village (or Village II) and the North Yard. As with Village II, evidence for food preparation is virtually absent in the North Yard, while evidence for food consumption is widespread. Mirroring procurement patterns between Good Hope’s Village II and the great house kitchen, enslaved domestic servants likely utilized the primary townhouse kitchen in the South Yard for their cooking needs.
Further evidence for this is found in the food itself. The same range of food items from the South Yard was also found in the North Yard, with the exception of the diversity of fish. This suggests that enslaved cooks either intentionally prepared food in excess to feed house servants, or domestics consumed left over food items from formal dining. Supplementing this, enslaved servants might have purchased or bartered for food items in the same local markets through which they acquired items to prepare Tharp’s meals (Figure 10.7). In either scenario,
domestic servants brought food from the South Yard kitchen to the North Yard, and ate their meals around their quarters. This practice parallels the patterns found in Good Hope's Village II in virtually every way.

While laboring in the townhouse, enslaved domestic servants also appear to have attended local markets more frequently. This is not simply represented in tasks requiring market participation, such as food procurement for the house, but also reflected in their consumer goods. One clear indication of this is found in the quantity of smoking pipes between Village II and the rear yard of the Tharp House. The crew uncovered over 50% more smoking pipes in the Tharp House yard than in Village II.

Patterns in clothing buttons also demonstrated interesting differences between town and country. While the quantity of buttons between the two sites was nearly identical, buttons in and around domestic quarters at the town house were, on average, 3 mm larger (Table 10.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STP</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Button Type</th>
<th>Manuf. Tech.</th>
<th>Button Eye</th>
<th>Shank Style</th>
<th>Diameter (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cu Alloy</td>
<td>Flat Disc (FD)</td>
<td>Stamped</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cu Alloy</td>
<td>1 Piece</td>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>Two Holes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>1 Piece</td>
<td>Cut/Carved</td>
<td>Four Holes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cu Alloy</td>
<td>Flat Disc (FD)</td>
<td>Stamped</td>
<td>Unid.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>34.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>1 Piece</td>
<td>Cut/Carved</td>
<td>Four Holes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cu Alloy</td>
<td>FD, concave back</td>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>35.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>1 Piece</td>
<td>Cut/Carved</td>
<td>One Hole</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>19.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>1 Piece</td>
<td>Cut/Carved</td>
<td>Four Holes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>17.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cu Alloy</td>
<td>1 Piece</td>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>Two Holes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.1: Quantitative summary of clothing buttons found in and around domestic quarters at the Tharp House.
This might suggest a greater concern for visibility among the larger population density of a port town.

As in most Atlantic port towns, international markets drew those from the rural periphery to urban centers (Norman 2009). European items produced for a global market, such as refined earthenwares, tobacco pipes, clothing items, and household furnishings appeared alongside “yard provision” vegetables and locally made ceramics, brooms, lanterns, and more in Falmouth’s markets. Prominent merchants, such as Tharp’s relative and business partner Alexander Campbell (Bassett 2015), operated out of ground-level stores, with residential space above selling mostly European goods (Nelson et al. 2014; Nelson 2016). These shops lined the appropriately named Market Street from one side of town to the other. A larger weekly market, however, operated in Falmouth’s Water Square, surrounding the town’s large masonry reservoir (Figure 10.7). Here, free blacks and enslaved laborers bought, sold, and bartered for both locally produced and European goods (Hauser 2008), selling to both black and white clients (Nugent [1839]1907).

These markets and occupations undoubtedly drew enslaved people to port towns; however, the opportunity to interact with neighboring enslaved communities did as well. Enslaved communities were not shut off from one another, and interactions with kin, “countrymen,” and other peers occurred on a regional scale.
Conclusion:

With little room or autonomy over a space of their own, enslaved people fashioned elements of the white urban landscape into an interconnected black landscape (Upton 1984), which stretched from rural plantation to urban port. This network of places wove through the infrastructures of enslavement, upon both formal and informal roadways (Smith and Bassett 2016), connecting yard to yard, quarter to market, and person to person.

In many ways, comparisons between town and country are somewhat misleading. For many enslaved people, town and country were not as separate as we perceive today. Those living in Good Hope's Village I traveled to Falmouth to attend the Sunday market, in some cases weekly. The affordances of an urban setting were not completely inaccessible to rural enslaved laborers. Rather, they simply occurred less often.

Archaeological material as an index of people's time, tasks, and activities reveals the social world constructed by practically engaged individuals. In this way, permanent of temporary residence in an urban landscape was a fundamental difference in dwelling. Movement beyond property boundaries, participation in local markets, and interaction with enslaved people from neighboring plantation communities was not an exclusive affordance of urban slavery. Many of those living in Good Hope's Village I performed the same tasks. Rather, urban settings concentrated these activities into a much smaller area, amplifying the regularity and duration of mobility, market participation, and inter-enslaved community interactions. Variation in the material practices between
town and country is likely, in part, a function of frequency of market access rather than strictly purchasing power.

As enslaved domestic servants moved from Village II to Falmouth, they moved from rural to urban slavery. Urban settings increase frequency of market participation and interaction with other enslaved people from neighboring plantations, as well as urban-based free blacks. Through pipes, buttons, and other material goods, domestics and others made the community boundaries Good Hope’s enslaved population permeable. Goods, services, information, and individuals traveled in and out of what has thus far been called Good Hope’s enslaved community. In these settings, the degree of inter-community integration was significant. In some cases, this led to widespread, synchronized rebellion across the region. One such rebellion, involving the enslaved communities on three of Tharp’s nine estates, provided the tipping point that eventually led to Jamaica’s Emancipation. Though less dramatic, countless other everyday actions played out through these networks. In this way, the community-level dynamics of Good Hope’s enslaved population were not bound in space or exclusive to Good Hope. Plantation communities interacted on a regional scale.
CHAPTER 11: CONCLUSION

Introduction:

The 10 chapters of this dissertation have taken us from historical record, to archaeological reconstruction, to the uncovering of social complexity, to distinctly community dynamics among an enslaved population. Through these chapters, the household emerged as the basic social unit through which enslaved people organized their lives. Under variable conditions of enslavement, individuals and households defined their lives outside of formal plantation labor in complex ways. Archaeological investigation of this so-called domestic sphere – Village I, Village II, and the Tharp House rear yard – revealed much about the social dynamics and institutions developed by and for enslaved people to navigate the conditions of enslavement. At any one time, for nearly 500 individuals, these conditions varied considerably, as did their means of negotiating these circumstances.

Variation in the Enslaved Experience:

The enslaved population of a given plantation was not a homogenous group – living, eating, dressing, buying, selling, and dwelling the same way. As a natural, a priori unit of analysis, the “enslaved community” effectively homogenizes significant internal diversity to a non-existent average of the highs and lows of the true community. More fundamentally, this imposition of
sameness fails to recognize the differential experience of enslaved laborers, and different means of agency existing within divided conditions of enslavement.

The household and community-scale approach taken in the dissertation demonstrated that the enslaved experience varied as one scales in and out. In Village I, neighboring households represented different socio-economic positions, seemingly tied to the relative size and organization of kin groups. Extended families, forming multi-dwelling compounds, held prime land within the village boundaries, while smaller single-dwelling households occupied less desirable land. Moreover, variability in consumer practices mapped onto this land-tenure system, with costlier non-subsistence goods concentrating in more desirable land occupied by large extended families.

Plantation occupations played a significant role in creating internal variation within a plantation’s enslaved population. Despite common assumptions and planters’ perceptions, domestic service was neither better for, nor more desirable to, enslaved people. The archaeological record suggests that domestic servants held considerably fewer opportunities to improve or combat the conditions of enslavement than other occupations. Domestic service was an around-the-clock labor role, and the archaeology of their dwellings reflects this. Few activities beyond sleeping and eating took place in the domestic servants’ village, and even fewer economic opportunities were available as a function of time outside of plantation labor. Unlike most enslaved households in Village I, house domestics had neither gardens nor evidence for household production.
beyond small-scale tasks, such as sewing. Even then, it is not apparent if the quantities of sewing material reflect the presentation and maintenance of the self, or participation in the region’s informal economy.

This finding of significant variability of experience, socio-economic status, and consumer practice within one plantation’s enslaved population has major implications for archaeological and historic conceptions of the “enslaved community.” Rendering a plantation’s enslaved population as a social unit, defined by the common experience of being enslaved in one place, collapses a high degree of variation into an overall misleading representation of the population. As mentioned above, this is particularly problematic for comparative uses of the “enslaved community” as a unit of analysis. In these cases, many patterns at this scale may not be reflective of any one household or individual, but rather a non-existent average of the highs and lows of a plantation’s social hierarchy.

The same could be said for any use of the community scale without a thorough understanding of its sum parts. Such is the reason for a multi-scalar approach. While the individual is rarely captured in an archaeological record, the household – if present – provides a significant social unit through which larger collectives are created and maintained. With low internal variability, the community stands as an appropriate unit of analysis. However, with a high degree of variation within a community – real or imagined – it is best understood from an inter-household perspective, moving from unit to unit to understand the
whole. For it is at this scale that community social dynamics are created, maintained, and negotiated. This ultimately highlights “community” as a level of social organization in which individual households socially orient themselves in relation to elements of place and one another, through the practicalities of dwelling.

From Degrees of Status to Variable Decision-Making:

For decades, historical archaeology has relied on material measures indicative of relative status. Whether through household architecture, personal adornment, tablewares, or other consumer goods, indications of social inequality have often been assessed through single-measures of a particular good across a population. Chapters 7 and 9 illustrated the problems in a single-measure approach, and how multiple dimensions need to be considered alongside one another. As an example, parallel patterns in land-tenure practices (i.e. access to level yard space) and concentrations of costly, non-essential ceramics revealed that the uneven distributions of goods in Village I was not simply variation in consumer practice, but a system of status recognition and maintenance among households at the community-level (Chapter 7).

As a counterpoint, Chapter 9 illustrated how the type of non-essential good that is unevenly distributed is often a reflection of a different social process altogether. A comparison between the household assemblages of Village I and Village II revealed that this was not simply a comparison between domestic
servants and the general enslaved population. Though often related to occupation, the comparative approach to the two villages demonstrated a more fundamental difference in household scale and organization. The nature of occupational allocation along lines of tiered race, gender, and local birth removed domestic servants from kin-based living arrangements common to Village I. This created smaller single-dwelling households of one to two, likely unrelated, individuals in Village II. This type of organization had significant implications for household decision-making and consumer practices.

Ultimately, the archaeological record at the household-level illustrated how different household circumstances fostered different investment decisions, by different segments of Good Hope’s enslaved population. Small groups of unrelated individuals, such as domestic servants in Village II, chose to invest in a material world identifiable to either themselves or the small group. To the contrary, larger multi-dwelling households in Village I chose to invest in more portable and flexible items usable and identifiable to multiple dwellings. The fundamental differences in the types of material investment negate the reliability of any single-measure of material status across Good Hope’s enslaved population. For smaller single-dwelling and likely unrelated households, investments were made in items of personal adornment, smoking pipes, and the house itself – all reflections of either a person or small group of people. In larger multi-dwelling extended households, investments were not made in adornment or architecture, but in large sets of ceramics with costly decoration, variations in form (e.g., teawares and chamberpots), and small-scale tools for household
production (e.g., gardening hoes, specialized building tools, etc.). The latter investment decisions reflect goods that benefit the entire multi-dwelling household, and could theoretically be shared or identified to the entire group. This suggests that enslaved people began to form and maintain extended kin groups by the late period of slavery (ca. 1800-1838). These family groups were, in part, maintained through a domestic division of labor, pooled resources, the recognition of land rights, and collective consumerism.

Variation in consumer choice, related to household organization, was not simply a matter of variation between Village I and II. The smaller single-dwelling household in the sample area of Village I – surrounded by large multi-dwelling households – reflected the same consumer choices as the single-dwelling households of Village II. This was most noticeable in the investment in household architecture, as measured through window glass and the relative durability of the house itself through time. Likewise, beyond the two villages, domestic servants reproduced patterns in personal adornment and smoking pipes found in Village II, in their quarters seven miles away at the urban Tharp House.

Together, these trends highlight the importance of understanding the socially constituted “community” at both the community and household scale. While some variation can be smoothed out at the larger scale to truly reflect village-wide patterns, other understandings of community must be deciphered by moving to inter-household comparison. It follows that in many cases, consumer choice and consumer access are equifinite in the ground, leaving the same
pattern for different social processes. Social inequality cannot be measured nor compared across a population using a single-material measure alone. These dynamic processes must be understood across the multiple media through which they are constructed and performed.

A Mobile Population:

For most large-scale Caribbean plantations, it might be more accurate to understand larger-scale social collectives of enslaved people as “multi-sited communities” (Bernbeck 2008). At any given time, Good Hope’s enslaved population was dispersed throughout a 2000-acre plantation and beyond. During working hours, individuals and small task-groups moved from field to mill, workshop to construction site, Good Hope to Falmouth, and plantation to plantation among Tharp’s neighboring estates. At non-working hours, some 400 to 500 enslaved people resided between two villages, 20 outlying watchmen huts, managers’ houses, the doctor’s house, and Tharp’s Falmouth townhouse. Their own domestic tasks took them from house-yard to provision grounds, and village to Falmouth for Sunday markets. In Falmouth, field laborers, tradesmen, and domestics alike communicated, exchanged goods, and socialized with a regional enslaved population in brief moments of aggregation. Here, people created and maintained relationships with both enslaved and free black individuals living and working outside of Good Hope.
Constantly on the move, the enslaved people of Good Hope negotiated individual connections to many groups through market activities, kin-networks, ethnolinguistic identities, their occupations, their religious devotion, or simply common goals. As Audrey Horning (2000:226) observes, “Communities consist of individuals who may maintain allegiance to a variety of communities, moving across seldom fixed boundaries and involved in a continual process of identity negotiation and renegotiation, answering both to internal and external forces.” Within the boundaries of Good Hope alone, archaeological evidence of construction and repair by skilled tradesmen suggests that domestic servants living in Village II maintained connections to Village I despite their physical remove.

Social organization and dispersed social networks were often difficult to maintain due to active and passive attempts by planters to divide and conquer. While enslaved people frequently moved within and beyond plantation boundaries, this flow of movement was channeled, manipulated, and otherwise controlled in significant ways. Most enslaved people used the same roads upon which sugar, rum, cattle, and plantation supplies were moved from country to town and plantation to plantation. Planters and managers made strategic use of this fact by creating a physical and mental infrastructure in which a small white minority could control the enslaved black majority. With few exceptions (e.g., Delle 1998), overseer houses were rarely situated to provide surveillance over plantation villages or any other residential space. Overseers and bookkeepers constantly moved around the plantation, peering into villages, fields, buildings,
and other fixed points on the landscape. Managers practiced control through a divide and conquer strategy, as nearly 500 enslaved people were divided up into smaller and smaller task groups in separate workspaces throughout the plantation. The infrastructure of intervisibility was far more focused on these spaces of labor (Bates 2015; Nelson 2016). Though perhaps less overt, and more effective, was the surveillance and control over the arteries of movement that connected them.

As illustrated in Chapter 8, roadways were some of the largest investments made by the planter class, and were finely engineered to serve production in multiple ways. The first is obvious. Roads allowed the movement of commodities. The second was less overt, and more strategic. During working and non-working hours, roads channeled the enslaved black majority in intentional ways. This began in the walled-in villages with limited points of exit. From here, people moved on finely graded lime-marl roads across otherwise untraversable steep terrain. On many of Good Hope’s roads, fieldstone walls similar to those surrounding Villages I and II bound the shoulders of the road, limiting transverse movement. Atop these roads, connecting Good Hope to Falmouth, planters and managers had Penguin planted, a local prickly plant meant to serve as organic barbed wire. In this way, plantation roads limited the options of movement more so than facilitated movement. While some enslaved people found creative ways to circumvent planned roadways through alternative routes (Smith and Bassett 2016), others had no other option due to severe limitations on time outside of formal labor. In providing expedient access from
place to place, road travel was often a non-negotiable characteristic of everyday life.

Planters and managers elaborated upon this infrastructure by siting key buildings upon prominent intersections and “bottle-necks” of movement. At Good Hope and other plantations, overseer houses are almost always positioned on or above the intersection of two or more of the plantation’s main roads. Likewise, watchmen posts or guardhouses, such as the two at Good Hope, stand watch over deliberate bottlenecks of movement. These provided a visual tollgate approach to the control of enslaved people’s movement through the plantation. This strategy allowed planters and managers to sever the known threats of self-organization by enslaved people on the community and inter-community scale.

*Time and Community Formation:*

In both Village 1 and Village 2, archaeological evidence illustrates that individual houses outlived their initial occupants, and persisted across multiple generations. In some cases, such as the household in Loci 3 of Village 1, the house and yard appear to have been occupied continuously for close to a century. The successive occupants continued to use the space in similar ways, with noticeably different practices from those houses surrounding it. For example, occupants of this house used a subterranean cooking pit near the yard periphery, whereas other houses cooked above ground in centrally located, non-fixed hearths. By the turn of the 19th century, this cooking pit was filled or allowed to fill
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in, and cooking practices shifted to aboveground hearths. Despite this shift in technique, the spatial designation of this former pit as a cooking activity area persisted for close to 100 years. As others have suggested for standing architecture, the structure of house-yard was instrumental to the reproduction of household dwelling practices beyond individual lives.

These spatial continuities suggest that dwellings, yards, and cultivated land were transmitted inter-generationally, likely through kinship. Archaeological investigation at multiple scales reveals that the kin-based household was the most significant social unit through which enslaved people organized their life and time outside of plantation labor. Households of this nature were both large and small, ranging from one to three dwellings, and organized as swept-yard compounds. These represented households ranging from one to upwards of 15-18 individuals.

This ability to form larger kinship networks was not uniform through time at Good Hope, nor Jamaica writ large. The high mortality rate and low life expectancy of newly arrived enslaved people in Jamaica limited the possibility of creating a self-sustaining, reproducing population (Higman 1984; Roberts 2013; Dunn 2014). The political and moral unrest leading up to the 1807 abolition of the British international slave trade forced planters to take ameliorative actions to target the reasons for this lack of sustainability (Roberts 2013; Derksheide 2014). Around 1800, one such action at Good Hope included relocation of provision
grounds from the plantation’s marginal flood plains to more expansive fertile land adjacent to Village I.

This greater proximity and access to land corresponded with major shifts in the archaeological record. While the overall enslaved population decreased at Good Hope after 1800, acquisition of non-subsistence consumer goods increased among individual households. This parallels findings by Lynsey Bates (2016:100), who suggests that enslaved people “with access to greater amounts of acres with favorable conditions consistently acquired costlier imported vessels.” This suggests that greater ability to produce sustenance and surplus for the household allowed for greater market participation among the enslaved people of Good Hope. Evidence for increased household production and market participation after 1800 also manifests in new types of goods and activities appearing in the archaeological record. Almost all locally made Caribbean coarse earthenwares excavated from Good Hope’s villages were found in domestic contexts dating between 1800 and 1815. Use of this ware type, found throughout Jamaica’s plantation villages as a market item (Hauser 2008), suggests either greater local production or increased procurement of non-food items from local markets.

Likewise, more time-intensive household production activities begin occurring in the years after 1800. On the edge of Village I, one of the two largest house-yard compounds in the sample area built a small-scale farrier operation, shoeing draft and transport animals. Many enslaved people kept cows and
donkeys for sustenance and mobility. Donkeys, which faunal evidence indicates were used for both transport and consumption, required shoeing to protect their hooves against northern Jamaica’s karst landscape. The small-scale farrier, adjacent to road intersecting the village, likely supplemented shoeing demand at the blacksmith’s workshop for plantation needs, as well as the demand among enslaved owners of draft animals. With access to the time and tools needed to accomplish this task, the small farrier operation likely generated extra income for the entire extended household unit. Access to this time outside of plantation labor would not have been available without a larger household division of labor performing basic domestic needs.

Another important shift in Village I occurred at this time. Around 1800, enslaved households began building boundary walls demarcating yards and gardens. As described in Chapters 6 and 7, this shift suggests both conflict and a tangible form of resolution for land-tenure among neighboring households. This move to walling-in occurred on the village-wide scale across all dwellings within the sample area. Therefore by 1800, access to land became one medium through which enslaved people likely furthered the interests of the household unit.

In many cases, walling-in demarked communal garden space on a large scale, shared among a limited number of dwellings. These larger communal garden plots spatially corresponded with multi-dwelling household compounds. This suggests that around 1800, enslaved people either formed or intensified
existing land-tenure practices, in part, to improve their ability to sustain themselves and increase household production. Larger kin-groups began combining their limited land rights into larger garden plots, likely to share logistics among a larger kin-based division of domestic labor. This collectively would have freed up more time among individuals within the group to devote to leisure, sociability, market activates, or dwelling improvements.

Together, this move toward larger social units, logistical complexity, increased household production, and increased market participation did not occur evenly throughout Good Hope’s enslaved population. As suggested above, time was one of the most important resources to enslaved people (Roberts 2013). Specifically, greater time outside of plantation labor allowed enslaved individuals to devote what few waking hours they had to improving the physical, and perhaps psychological, conditions imposed by slave-owners. Established families, or extended kin-groups, within Good Hope’s enslaved population appear to have had the upper hand in improving their domestic lives. While kin-groups were present throughout Good Hope’s history, these groups appear to have intensified in scale and economic ability after 1800. Small, single-dwelling households persisted alongside extend family compounds throughout this time. The documented expansion of the locally born “Creole” population of enslaved people likely influenced the growth in relevancy and scale of the extended household unit.
The Enslaved Community:

Together, these conclusions provide several answers to the central questions of this dissertation: What was an enslaved community? Can a plantation's enslaved labor population be accurately understood as a community? And if so, to what end?

Through historiographic and archaeological discourse, the community collective is made real, and thus treated as real in most analyses. However, this dissertation has revealed elements of social formation – namely a material basis to inequality – in which forcefully aggregated households socially oriented themselves to neighboring households. This could not be accomplished at the household level, but involved a level of inter-household status recognition that was organized and institutionalized at the village-wide scale. I argue that inter-household interactions of this type, and at this scale, defined community-level social organization among a group of people aggregated, or brought together, not by will, but by force.

Community social formation was, in part, necessary to accommodate the expansion of small nuclear households into larger extended family compounds through time. As Mark Varien (1999:6) observes among community-level social formation in the American Southwest:

“Communities consisted of many households that lived in close proximity and had regular face-to-face interaction. This regular face-to-face interaction resulted in the need for some decision-making above the level of the household, especially with regard to the shared use of local social and natural resources.”
Within the confines of the walled villages, households of enslaved people negotiated space as a finite resource. The development of a land-tenure system that dovetailed a material-based system of status recognition was likely just one village-wide negotiation encompassed within a series of community social dynamics that emerged by the turn of the 19th century. Variation in household size, organization, and investment decisions was widespread, and enslaved people created community-level institutions and practices to articulate this variability.

As mentioned in the beginning of this dissertation, I advocate that this understanding and approach to a forcefully aggregated settlement has applicability and implications beyond plantation Jamaica, and plantation-slavery in general. These understandings can be applied to virtually any group brought together as a residential collective by force, whether enslaved, displaced, isolated, indentured, or imprisoned. In these settings, the notion of “community” takes on a different dynamic. Understanding these dynamics allows us to define the complex ways in which people negotiate and navigate institutions of power and control from within. It follows that some of the most powerful strategies are played out not through the quick acts of resistance, but through long-term counter institutions and social-economic strategies created and intensified through time. Ultimately, this dissertation demonstrates how these innovative and strategic measures allowed a systematically exploited group of people to reclaim
humanity through a social world carved out in the dwelling space of an oppressive regime.
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