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ABSTRACT

This study seeks to determine whether social relationships can be derivable from the material culture obtained through historical archaeology.

To explore this possibility, documentary and archaeological research was undertaken on a mid-nineteenth to mid-twentieth century domestic site located on Shirley Plantation in Charles City County, Virginia. The historically defined social relationships between master/slave and owner/tenant farmer are examined in terms of material culture correlates.

The results indicate that historically defined social relationships are suggested in material culture. The documentary and archaeological data bases, however, tend to emphasize complementary aspects of these relationships, because they represent different analogs of human behavior.
SLAVES AND TENANT FARMERS AT SHIRLEY PLANTATION:
SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS AND MATERIAL CULTURE
Introduction

During the summers of 1979 and 1980, the archaeological field school of the College of William and Mary in Virginia, excavated a number of historic and prehistoric sites on Shirley Plantation, Charles City County, Virginia. In 1979, one of these excavations concentrated on a reputed nineteenth-century slave cabin, with only its free standing chimney remaining above ground. The following summer, work continued on the site in the area directly south of the chimney. In addition, a survey was conducted in the surrounding field. This located another six refuse areas. Because most of the material recovered indicated a much later than antebellum occupation, documentary research was extended to include not only antebellum slave, but also postbellum and twentieth-century tenant farmer occupations. Using the archaeological and historical data obtained from these investigations, the question to be addressed in this thesis is whether historically defined social relationships can be derived from material culture.

The scope of Chapter One is two-fold. First, because the structure and surrounding area were originally occupied by slaves, a discussion of previous works and goals in Afro-American archaeology is included. An explanation as to why
a different approach was taken in this paper will follow. Second, the theoretical framework used in this paper is presented to evaluate whether social relationships can be derived from material culture by using the data from historical archaeology.

Chapter Two presents the historical documentation pertaining to antebellum slave, and postbellum black and white tenant farmer occupations. These have been obtained from both primary and secondary sources. For purposes of this study, the historical document will be treated as just another artifact of human behavior. The documentary information to be used to answer the question at hand is not extracted until Chapter Four.

The descriptive site report of the archaeological work conducted on the structure and surrounding area during the last two years is presented in Chapter Three. This chapter deals solely with the work done, what was found, and the analysis of the artifacts recovered. In addition, a comparative structure is examined. Again, conclusions concerning the theoretical question will not be discussed until the following chapter.

The summary and conclusions will be synthesized in Chapter Four. It is here that pertinent information is drawn from Chapter Two and Three to examine if social relationships can be extracted from these two data bases, which represent different medias of material culture. Finally, the theoretical model and its potential to contribute to a
better understanding of past, present, and future social and cultural processes is assessed.
Chapter One
Approaches to Afro-American Archaeology

I. Introduction

The structure and the surrounding area excavated were supposedly first occupied in the mid-nineteenth century by slaves. In the late nineteenth to mid-twentieth centuries, black and later, white tenant farmers resided on the premises. Because of the slave occupation, it is necessary to present an overview of the previous work done on Afro-American archaeological sites. The specific problems and goals of these prior studies are offered for consideration. But, for reasons that will become clear, these conventional objectives are not the main focus of this thesis. Instead, a new framework utilizing the methodology of social archaeology is employed to examine the archaeological and historical data. This framework is delineated in the second portion of this chapter.

II. Previous Work in Afro-American Archaeology

Afro-American archaeology has dealt with a variety of sites. While those with slave occupations have received the most attention, free black habitations, black communities, and black cemeteries have also been excavated. The impetus for most of these examinations was the search for African cultural survivals and the delineation of daily lifestyles.
The archaeology of sites with slave occupations began in 1968, under the direction of Charles Fairbanks. In excavating a slave cabin on Kingsley Plantation, in Duvall County, Florida, Fairbanks pursued the two previously stated objectives (Fairbanks 1972). He concluded that these excavations provided information on specific aspects of slave life during that period (1813-1843), and that no definite elements of African material culture could be identified. This was thought to be a result of the fact that slaves arrived in this country with nothing but their chains, and left their cultural survivals in the form of language and other behavioral traits. These would not be retained in the archaeological record (Fairbanks 1972:90). When Fairbanks and Robert Ascher excavated a slave cabin on Rayfield Plantation, Cumberland Island, Georgia, in 1969, similar conclusions were drawn (Ascher and Fairbanks 1971).

In 1973, Fairbanks and John Otto undertook excavations at Cannon's Point, a plantation on St. Simon's Island, Georgia. The purpose was not only to delineate lifestyles and seek African cultural survivals, but also to determine if in fact status differences could be derived from the archaeological record. Comparing planter, overseer, and slave refuse, Otto found that the archaeological record generally reflected social status differences rather than ethnic or legal differences (Otto 1975:360).

Other sites with slave occupations which have been excavated include additional work by Fairbanks on the Butler...
Island, Hampton, and Sinclair plantations, all located in Georgia. A master's thesis has been written on the ethno-history of a slave community on the Couper Plantation, also in Georgia (McFarlane 1975). In Virginia, Kelso (1976) and Noel-Hume (1966) have examined slave sites.

Northern free black habitations and communities also have been studied. In 1945, a site occupied by a free black woman during the first half of the nineteenth century was excavated (Bullen 1957). Black communities which have been investigated include Parting Ways in Massachusetts. This study demonstrated that African cultural survivals are reflected in architecture, settlement patterns, and pottery (Deetz 1975; 1977). Robert Schuyler's report on Sandy Ground, a black oystermen community, discusses the evolution of a community and its economic collapse (Schuyler 1972). At Weeksville, Bert Salwen and Sarah Bridges (1974) examined the growth and decline of a mid-nineteenth century black community in New York through ceramics (Salwen and Gyrisco 1979).

III. The Slave Quarters at Shirley Plantation

As excavations began at the slave quarters on Shirley Plantation, it was decided that the conventional objectives would be pursued in order to expand the geographic range of daily lifestyles and possible African cultural survivals. Otto's work at Cannon's Point offered a well-researched comparative study which offered many hypotheses on status differences (Otto 1975).
The Cannon's Point Plantation raised long staple cotton as its cash crop, had roller gins and handpacking as its technological adaptation, was located in the sea island and coastal fringes, and had an antebellum period of occupation (1789-1861) (Otto 1975:7). Otto predicted that his findings would have a higher confidence level on long-staple cotton plantations, rather than analogies to other cash crop regions. He believed cash crop requirements would create differences in plantation activities, which would then be reflected in the material remains. Otto stated, however, that the extent of these differences can not be determined because of the lack of comparative data (Otto 1975:6-7).

It was felt that Shirley Plantation would provide excellent comparative material as it was quite different in terms of its operation, location, and occupations. In the nineteenth century, the major cash crops of Shirley were wheat and corn. Instead of the sea island ecological setting, the plantation is located in the Tidewater region of the James River. The plantation has seen extensive postbellum occupation, which continues to the present day.

Regarding actual slave occupations, Cannon's Point had only black slaves occupying its slave cabins, while Shirley had black slaves and later free black and white tenant farmers residing in the same structures. Besides the problem of extensive postbellum occupation of the Shirley cabins (1840's-1940's), the structures were located on a plow zone. With the destruction of the structures in the
1940's, the areas were then reclaimed by the plow zone as extensive farming ensued. As a result, no stratigraphy was present making the separation of the material culture from each occupation impossible. For these reasons, it was decided that the conventional goals of Afro-American archaeology were not appropriate for this material. However, it was still felt that this material could be used to test a few of Otto's hypotheses regarding status differences, and possibly to expand the temporal and geographic range of his findings.

If similarities were found in the percentages, etc., of the material culture found at the Cannon's Point slave sites in Georgia (1789-1861), and those found at the Shirley Plantation slave/tenant farmer (black and white) sites in Virginia (1840's-1940's), then it would be possible to suggest overriding economic factors are present which obliterate ethnic differences through time and space. If differences were found, it might signify ethnic differences, as the white tenant farmer did have an overall effect on the material culture recovered. However, it might also be attributed to ecological differences, or technological innovations which occurred in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Unfortunately, the material from the Shirley slave/tenant occupations can not, as of yet, be compared to the Cannon's Point material. Cannon's Point percentages are based on the comparison between planter, overseer, and slave; and Shirley must be examined in its own entity before it can be compared
and contrasted to plantations from other ecological zones and time periods. Comparable excavations from the planter site at Shirley have yet to be undertaken.

The above stated problems combined to necessitate the asking of new questions and pursuing of new objectives for this site.

IV. Theoretical

Only recently have archaeologists begun to recognize and utilize the quantity and quality of information pertaining to social systems, that can be derived from archaeological data. Traditionally, archaeologists have been concerned with the more "mundane aspects of social systems, such as chronology, history of technology, and subsistence" (Redman et al. 1978:2). The recently expanding field of social archaeology proposes, through the use of increasing methodological expertise and meaningful interpretation, to extend the range and types of information pertaining to social systems that can be derived from archaeological data (Redman et al. 1978:1-9).

Archaeology can contribute to the social sciences. In the past, archaeologists have tended to concede the advantage to anthropologists in the examination of social systems. Grahame Clark (1957:219) stated that,

Prehistorians may well envy their anthropologist colleagues ability to study directly the social organization of the living "primitive" peoples with whom they are concerned, but they need not despair at recovering at least some information on this crucial matter.
When comparing information on social systems that can be derived from anthropology and archaeology, it becomes apparent that both draw inferences based on controlled observations. "No social anthropologist or archaeologist has ever seen a social structure" (Redman et al. 1978:5). Archaeology is unique in that it can study behavior patterns, as well as the long term processes of socio-cultural evolution and change in more societies, as it expands the geographic range and time depth (Redman et al. 1978:5-6).

While social archaeology is not new, its recently delineated five component methodology is. Social archaeology: 1) employs the use of explicit models, often borrowed from other disciplines; 2) involves the integration of single cause and multivariant explanations for a more comprehensive view; 3) utilizes an expanded data base which includes ethnoarchaeology and experimental archaeology; 4) researches both the importance of individual, as well as normative factors in society, and; 5) employs quantitative techniques and simulation models (Redman et al. 1978:9-14).

Historical archaeology can make especially insightful contributions to social archaeology, as a more thorough investigation of social systems can be attempted systematically by utilizing both archaeological and documentary data. Historical archaeology affords the unique opportunity to examine social systems through the material culture of two complimentary data bases -- archaeology and history. Both sources are treated as culturally sensitive material, that
is, shaped by man according to culturally dictated plans (Deetz 1977:10). While archaeology has utilized this approach for some time, this paper will analyze the historical document in a similar fashion -- as a culturally sensitive artifact which reflects human behavior, and possibly social relationships. While the archaeological artifact is treated as an expression of the maker's mind, the historical artifact (document) represents an individual's written projections, and should be examined as such (Glassie 1975:10-11).

The purpose of this paper is to determine whether historically and sociologically defined social relationships, and their changes through time, are reflected in the material culture obtained through the means of historical archaeology. To date, little has been done concerning social relationships and their material culture correlates. Through a consolidation of historically and sociologically defined relationships, archaeological data, and historical documentation, it will be determined whether social relationships are represented in material culture. If so, how? If not, why?

In keeping within the framework of social archaeology, the explicit model chosen to extract social relationships has been borrowed from sociology, and has been modified to fit the goals, problems, and data of historical archaeology (Redman et al. 1978:9).

Over the past two decades, the role of material culture in sociology has become increasingly utilized as it affords "a means of examining some of the more subtle hypotheses.
regarding peoples lives with greater objectivity and precision" (Laumann and House 1970-337). Still, it has been noted that sociological studies of material culture are usually in search of stereotypes (Rathje 1979:2-3). Therefore, it will be interesting to examine a sociological model from a new perspective -- by utilizing the data base of historical archaeology.

Sociologist Pitirim Sorokin identified three ideal types of social relationships; familistic, contractual, and compulsory (Sorokin 1941:167; 1957:445). These three types are used to examine the social relationships between the master and slave, as well as the owner and tenant. The transformation from slave to tenant farmer, in terms of changing social relationships is also studied. By using archaeological and historical data, the model will help to determine if the various types of social relationships are inherent in the data. In order to identify or extract any archaeological or documentary correlates that might be present, each relationship will be briefly discussed.

Sorokin's familistic relationship is characterized by the individual ego being merged into a "we". It is defined as all-embracing in extensity, high in intensity, purely solidary in direction, and durable. There is no detailed external delineation of duties, and it exhibits the internal freedom of the individuals and the external appearance of its limitations. In other words, those characteristics found among members of a family, or among real friends (Sorokin
A contractual relationship is limited in extensity. High or low in intensity depending on the contracted sector of activities, it is limited in duration and solidary within the contract sector only. Although the relationship is freely entered into, the other party is important only as an agency or instrument for utility or profit. Egos are not merged into a "we"; rather, each feels and acts as an individual party. Distrust with regard to the sincerity and honesty of the other party is inherent in this type of relationship, and therefore, the relationship is defined meticulously. The parties remain, to a considerable degree, strangers and outsiders to one another (Sorokin 1957:447-449; McKinney and Loomis 1957:18).

Compulsory relationships are divided into three types, but all are antagonistic in nature; the coerced party has no freedom, while the coercing party has total freedom. In a pure compulsory relationship, parties remain total strangers, and often, not only strangers and outsiders, but a negative value. The coerced are regarded as an instrument, and the coercing party as an instrument of oppression. There is no mutual fusion and no "we" feeling excepting the purely external and mechanical. Pseudo-familistic, the second form of compulsory relationship, occurs when the dominant party takes over the appearance of the familistic relationship. In reality, the interests and welfare are not considered at all. The third type of compulsory relationship is pseudo-
contractual. The weaker party enters into the contract seemingly by their own will, but in fact, does not have a choice (Sorokin 1957:450; McKinney and Loomis 1957:18-19).

While these three represent ideal types, most relationships are a combination of familistic, contractual, and compulsory. Nevertheless, in various social relationships, it becomes apparent that one type is predominant at all times. The totality of the network of social relationships of various groups is not the same, varying from group to group, and changing within the same group. It is important to recognize also that the relationship the institution or group originated under is not always its existing nature (Sorokin 1957:451).

The model presented will be used to determine if one can extract the historically defined social relationships between master/slave and owner/tenant based on the data obtained through historical archaeological means. In addition, the transformation from slave to tenant farmer will be examined to see whether this has material culture correlates. Each relationship needs to be looked at as to its historical origin and its "existing" nature in order to predict possible material correlates.

Slavery, by definition, originated under a pure compulsory form -- antagonistic, with the parties remaining strangers, and the opposing group assigned a negative value. Still, because planters "provided for" their slaves in the form of food, clothing, and housing, etc., a paternalistic
attitude was said to have developed, emphasizing familistic tendencies. This paternalism is in reality, strictly for the planter's benefit. Thus, it is a predominantly pseudo-familistic relationship, and remains in its existing nature, a compulsory relationship.

The owner/tenant farmer relationship originated under a contractual form. It is freely entered into, with the opposing party considered as an instrument for utility and profit. However, it has been suggested that the postbellum tenant farmer system was a continuation of a modified slavery system (Myrdal 1962:221). Through debt peonage, the tenant farmer actually became entrapped in a pseudo-contractual relationship based on the indebtedness of the tenant to the owner (Myrdal 1962:228). This would then make the owner/tenant farmer existing relationship predominantly pseudo-contractual, and therefore, compulsory in form.

A domestic structure and its surrounding area previously occupied by black slaves, free black tenant farmers, and white tenant farmers, is examined to determine if these social relationships are reflected documentarily and archaeologically. While the historical and archaeological records are different analogs of human behavior, they should not be expected to always concur (Ferguson 1977:7). They may each provide different types of information regarding the possible delinea­tion of social relationships.

It is hoped that this approach will not fall into what Deetz (1968:48) has termed "the realm of ultimately sterile
methodological virtuosity." Instead, its purpose is to aid in the expansion of the range and types of information that can be extracted from material culture.
Chapter Two
Historical Documentation

I. Introduction

The historical documents referred to in this chapter are considered artifacts of material culture. As artifacts, they represent expressions of the maker's or writer's mind, and as such, reveal much information about their creator (Glassie 1975:10-11). These primary sources represent the biased views and observations of the dominant white male planter or owner as they report on slave and tenant farmer activities. Even though the farm journals and account books used in this study are less likely to be falsified than other documents (Otto 1975:5), certain biases and limitations are inherent in this data base. These will become apparent in this chapter.

The following is a synthesis of plantation farm journals, account books, and various secondary sources from which additional and comparative material was derived. This information serves to present an accounting of slave and tenant life on Shirley Plantation, as seen through the eyes of the master/owner, over a 126 year period (1816-1942). This includes the changes from antebellum to postbellum to twentieth century, when black, and later, white tenant farmers supplanted slaves as the predominant labor force.
Because the structure excavated was built under the mastership of Hill Carter, the historical research was begun when the plantation came under his control in 1816, and ended with the destruction of the structure in the early 1940's. Although Hill Carter kept copious records in the form of farm journals and account books, this prolific recording was virtually discontinued following his death in 1875. After 1875, only sporadic recording of bits and pieces of information remain to account for plantation activities during the late nineteenth and early to mid-twentieth centuries.

II. Antebellum

Hill Carter arrived from New York, March 20, 1816 and "took possession" of Shirley Plantation (Shirely Plantation Farm Journals; 3-20-1816). One year later, the estate was divided and Hill Carter received 106 negroes to his share (SPFJ; April 1817). While the farm journals record 23 negroes being sold in 1818, and an additional 23 in 1821 (SPFJ: 1818 and 1821), the Personal Property Tax Records for Charles City County, Virginia, indicate that Carter possessed only 44 slaves over the age of 16 by 1822 (Charles City County, Virginia 1822b). The amount of land owned by Hill Carter on his Shirley Tract also changed frequently as he was continually buying, selling, leasing, deeding, and trading parcels (Lynn 1967:106). The Land Tax Records for Charles City County, Virginia, indicate that in 1822, Carter owned 740 acres. By 1858, a map of the plantation shows
1081 acres (Charles City County, Virginia 1822a; Lynn 1967: 106).

The principal cash crop at Shirley in the nineteenth century was wheat, with corn as a profitable second major crop. Other crops grown included oats, clover, peas, cotton, and various garden products, which, because of staggered growing seasons, kept the slaves occupied at all times. Livestock in the form of cattle, hog, sheep, goats, pig, mules, and fowl were also raised and used by both Carter's family and slaves. By diversifying his plantation activities, Hill Carter made efficient use of his slave labor (Lynn 1967: 105).

The Shirley Plantation Farm Journals proved to be an excellent source of information concerning the working schedules of Hill Carter's slaves. It is interesting to note that in 59 years of the daily listings of plantation and slave activities, Carter never once referred to his work force as "slaves". Instead, they were "the people", "negroes", or he called them by name. The tasks described daily were usually segregated into those performed by men, those performed by women, those performed by children, and those performed by everyone.

Men were specified for tasks such as, "getting rails for fences, working in the ditches, beating out corn, clearing the swamp, cradling, reaping, thrashing, cutting wood, shearing sheep, working on the public road, working at the mill, planting corn, digging up flood gates, getting
ice, killing animals (hogs, beef, etc.) salting, hanging up
bacon, hauling manure, etc." (SPFJ 1816-1861).

Those tasks relegated to women included: "cleaning up
fields, beating clover, picking out cotton, clearing swamp,
making 'People's' (sic) clothing, repairing roads, working
in their houses, spinning, planting corn, beating or knocking
clods, scattering manure, beating our cribs of corn, getting
onions out of the field and weeds out of lots, hoisting corn
into lofts, water furrowing and leveling lots, cockling wheat,
minding birds off the corn, cutting stalks, scattering lime,
etc." (SPFJ 1916-1861).

Children were seldom mentioned with regard to working
tasks. Young boys usually did "women's work," and frequently
worked alongside the women as they scattered lime, cleaned
up fences, and minded birds off the corn, etc. Young girls
were mentioned only in connection with harvest times.

During these harvest times (wheat -- mid-June; corn --
begining of October; oats -- mid-July), "all hands" were
utilized; "Began harvest cutting with 14 cradles in wheat
fields and 45 hands in all including children and broken
down women." (SPFJ 5-10-1853). "Began to pull fodder with
24 or 25 good hands including the small boys and girls equal
to 16 or 18 good hands" (SPFJ 6-10-1853).

The slaves were busy year round. Days off were
restricted to Sundays and Holy Days. [December 25-29 of
each year, were the only consecutive days of vacation time
alloted.] (SPFJ: 1816-1861). On foul days, tasks included:
"making hampers, brooms, and mats etc. as usual on rainy days" (SPFJ: 1-13-1841). Work also continued through temperature extremes. "Clear and hot as hell thermom 98° in the shade, cutting and shucking" (SPFJ: 6-30-1856). Also, "clear and hottest ever came from heaven. Several of the hands gave out in consequence" (SPFJ: 7-1-1843). At the other extreme, "Thermom at sunrise 1° below 0 being lower by 1 degree than I ever saw it before, cutting and hauling wood" (SPFJ: 1-10-1856). Even when a cholera epidemic struck the plantation in 1849 killing 31 slaves, tasks continued as usual (SPFJ: 6-27 to 7-11-1849).

With regard to specific living conditions of the slaves, the farm journals make infrequent references to their provisions. These include allusions to housing, food, clothing, medical care, and punishment. However, in an article published in the Farmers Register (1834:565), Hill Carter expressed his philosophy on slave treatment when he addressed the farmers and overseers of Virginia:

> It is all important for the morals as well as the comfort of the slaves, (to say nothing of the policy and humanity of the thing), that they should be well clothed and fed; for they will steal if they are not well fed, and the very best remedy for hog stealing is to give the rogues a plenty of pork to eat. Negroes should have some of the luxuries of life too, such as fowls, eggs, etc. with which to buy coffee and sugar, a garden and fruit trees, all of which will save the master's fowls, fruit, etc., and will serve to attach them to their homes.

It is not known whether Carter followed his own advice. Still, it is interesting to note that when Carter found his slaves stealing hogs, he did not provide them with more
pork. Instead, "Billy Tanner, wife and child; Billy Jackson; wife and child to be sold as punishment for stealing hogs of my neighbor" (SPFJ: 4-15-1841).

Numerous insights to the slaves housing situation come from accounts of the construction of new slave quarters. Such references are interspersed throughout the journals, but unfortunately, information as to form, size, number of occupants, and specific location is not provided. Occasionally there are references as to general location, or for whom the cabin was built. "Carpenters finished the 2 new quarters for Big Phill and Billy Tanner" (SPFJ: 8-26-1831). Between 1825 and 1844, the construction of 25 cabins are mentioned in the journal. Many entries such as "hauling timber and poles for a new quarters" (SPFJ: 3-25-1839), indicating a wood structure, provide the only clues as to the pre-1843 cabins. Because poles usually are mentioned and bricks are not, the suggestion is that these pre-1843 structures were built out of poles and timber, with probably mud and stick chimneys.

The documentation also indicates that the construction of the pre-1843 cabins was carried out by Hill Carter's plantation carpenters -- who were most certainly black slaves. When specialized work was required, Carter hired others to carry out the task: "white workmen began Hay House" (emphasis mine; SPFJ: 5-11-1822). After these men were released on the 24th of the same month, "My carpenters began to shingle the Hay House" (emphasis mine; SPFJ: 5-24-1822). Also, in 1863 when ten of his "best negroe men"
ran off, one was listed as the carpenter, indicating the slave status of the carpenter at that time (SPFJ: 7-14-1863).

In 1843, dividends from a legacy and commissions as trustee of an estate supplemented Shirley's revenues. Soon thereafter, Hill Carter had nine double slave cabins built costing $500 each (Phillips 1963:232). It is suggested here that the structure excavated was one of these. An entry in 1857 describing the damage to the plantation, provides a further description of these structures, "snow drifted into the negro quarters through the shingles and filled the lofts" (SPFJ: 1-19-1857). These descriptions correspond to the excavated structure; a double 20' X 40' cabin, a story and a loft in height.

Although it is probable that Hill Carter's plantation carpenters were responsible for the construction of the pre-1843 cabins, the post-1843 structure probably were built by other carpenters. There is no mention of the building of the nine double slave cabins in the farm journals. Moreover, the fact that they cost $500 each tends to support the conclusion that outside help was acquisitioned. Thus, they may have been constructed by white carpenters. This becomes significant if African cultural survivals are being sought. In general, planters tended to provide standardized housing built by craftsmen in order to discourage any African style housing (Otto 1975).

Repairs to cabins were frequently mentioned. Whitewashing was a chore that was infrequently noted in the journal,
"whitewashed all of the quarters being the second time" (SPFJ: 10-10-1832). This was an interesting entry as it most likely had to do with the cholera epidemic that struck Virginia plantations in 1832. Numerous articles were published at this time advising planters that the slave quarters, and the houses of the rich and poor, should be thoroughly cleaned and whitewashed as a preventative measure against the cholera (Savitt 1978:233).

Facts regarding slave diet are difficult to obtain from either documentary or archaeological sources. While the documents indicate what types of foods were being provided, their quantities are infrequently recorded. From Hill Carter's statement (Farm Register 1834:565), it appears that his slaves were obtaining food resources by the usual means: a) provisions from the planter; b) private gardens and livestock, and; c) participation in the local market. Although it is not mentioned, it is certain that Carter's slaves were supplementing their diets with outside resources. Carter's rations to his slaves included: meat (beef, pork, sheep, goat, and fish); various grains (corn, wheat, and oats); and nonstaples such as molasses. Amounts of each are impossible to determine due to sporadic listings in the journal.

Pork appeared to be the most frequently provisioned meat. Hogs usually were slaughtered in December in three intervals. Generally, over 100 hogs would be slaughtered and salted, and in January, hung up in the smokehouse (SPFJ:
1816-1861). Because of its availability, low cost, and supposed nutritional value, pork was the primary meat afforded Virginia slaves (Savitt 1978:90).

Cattle also were slaughtered, but not nearly to the same extent as hogs. Although they were slaughtered throughout the year, many times it was concentrated in the late Fall when the pork supply ran low (SPFJ: 10-28-1825; Savitt 1978:93). Beef provided not only a change from pork, but also served to prevent anemia (Savitt 1978:93).

Other meats were distributed as well. Sheep and goat are infrequently mentioned as provisions (SPFJ: 12-11-1838; 3-13-1856). Fish appeared to be an occasional supplement being obtained commercially, "meat gave out a week ago, bought 8 barrels of Herring and began to serve them" (SPFJ: 10-24-1824), as well as from plantation sources, "Old Haines setting a ware to catch fish" (SPFJ: 3-10-1839), and "Sunday. Began to serve out meat and fish today" (SPFJ: 3-10-1839). Fish, a major source of nutrients, provided a change from pork (Savitt 1978:95).

Grains such as wheat, corn, and oats were distributed to the slaves. Wheat, usually in quantities of 60 bushels a year amounted to about 5 unmilled quarts per day for his slave force of over 100 (SPFJ: 8-24-1824, 8-8-1827; Savitt 1978:94). At most Virginia plantations, wheat was usually eaten in the form of cakes and pancakes, which required milk. Fortunately, this was not as popular as corn meal, because enriched bolted flour without the germ or bran, had far
less food value than cornmeal (Savitt 1978:94).

Corn was given in varying amounts, usually from 220 to 235 barrels per year (SPFJ: December 1824). Carter also provided corn for the slaves' hogs, "Gave the negroes of short corn of new crop to feed their hogs about 25 barrels including rotten corn." (SPFJ: November 1823). Oats generally were supplied only after the harvest each year.

Non-staples were occasionally distributed. "Began to serve out molasses" (SPFJ: 4-17-1836). While this may appear to be an extraneous provision, five tablespoons of molasses supplies almost half of an adult female's minimum daily requirement of iron, not to mention the 250 needed calories. Molasses added significantly to many slave diets (Savitt 1978:84).

Slaves at Shirley Plantation were not totally dependent on rations. As was common on many plantation, slaves were allowed to have gardens, livestock, and trade in the local market. This is supported by Carter's published statement (Farm Register 1834:565), as well as journal entries such as the one referring to the provision of corn for the "negroes hogs." Hunting and collecting most likely supplemented their diet, although this is not indicated in the documentation.

Hill Carter supplied his slaves with sewing supplies, cloth and material, and clothing. In the account books, slave names are listed with the amount of cloth received recorded next to each name (Shirley Plantation Account Books: 1853). Clothing expenses for slaves were frequently divided
into summer, winter, and houseservant (SPFJ: 1823). Nap and cotton were issued per slave per year, and shoes, blankets, and hats were also given out. While there are frequent references to "women making people's clothes" (SPFJ: 12-8-1823), there are also references to commercially purchased clothing, "gave out 3 new great coats to Anthony, John Washington, and Joe Tanner" (SPFJ: 1-10-1822). Clothing, especially in winter, was essential, as blacks suffered more frequently from exposure and frostbite than did whites (Savitt 1978:84).

The most important article of clothing in terms of health and disease were shoes. They served to prevent frostbite, hookworm, scratches, etc., and at the same time provided warmth (Savitt 1978:84). Leather, tacks, and wooden soles were purchased from which it is assumed that shoes were being made (SPFJ: 1823, expenses). Shoes were also being purchased from the Penetentiary Store (SPFJ: 11-5-24). It was a common practice of planters to have shoes distributed when the weather turned cold -- in order to reduce the frequency of repairs and replacement (Savitt 1978:85). This was true at Shirley as shoes were given out in late November-early December, but "ordered them not to put them on till given permission" (SPFJ: 11-6-1824).

As on all plantations, there was a general concern with the health and welfare of the slaves. This depended on conditions in and around the slave quarters, as well as the circumstances under which the slaves were working. Problems
such as overcrowding, and poor sanitary facilities encouraged disease. With the crowded living arrangement, individual problems became family problems, which in turn became "community" problems (Savitt 1978:48-50).

The documentation suggests that Hill Carter may have been using various "home remedies" to treat slaves with minor health problems. Inscribed on the inside covers of the farm journals are treatments for everything from influenza to miscarriages. It was a fairly common practice for planters to administer these home treatments as doctors were far away and difficult to obtain.

One entry indicates that Carter administered aid to his ailing slaves, "John Tim died of violent pneumonia yesterday from not having been bled early in the disease -- in fact they should be copiously bled immediately that they are attacked" (SPFJ: 1-3-1847). For major health problems, such as the cholera epidemic which struck Virginia plantations in 1832, doctors were obtained. Carter wrote, "left home with my family for the Springs having engaged Dr. Pendleton to live at Shirley for 6 months for fear we should have the cholera here" (SPFJ: 8-20-1832).

While planters wanted to protect their investments, and whites feared the spread of disease from the slave cabins, inoculations, and after 1800, vaccinations gained popularity and acceptance in Virginia (Savitt 1978:220). Carter periodically vaccinated the slave children, recording which "took" and which did not, "vaccinated by children and all the negroe
children, but some of the negro children failed" (SPFJ: 5-17-1828).

Every year in the August, September, and even October months, "ague and fever" (seasonal malaria) struck the slaves. The number of slaves that had become sick were listed daily in the margins. Hill Carter and his family would head to the Springs in August, then return in October, and report on the plantation sicknesses of the past month, "12-14 people sick with ague and fever...50 cases in September. Old Bill the house servant died during our absence and 2 babies died also." (SPFJ: 10-8-1836).

Diseases and afflictions such as bilious fever, dropsy, consumption (tuberculosis), pneumonia, cholera, pleuricies, influenzas, whooping cough, worms, and venereal disease, were all listed in the journals as having affected, and even killed some of the slaves at Shirley. One entry even suggests a case of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, "Bibbame overlayed her baby only one month old" (SPFJ: 12-12-1825). The particulars correspond with the findings from several studies on Sudden Infant Death Syndrome. In two studies, 85% and 63% of the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome cases were between the ages of one and four months, with the majority of these deaths occurring during the colder months of the year (October-March). It has been suggested that many of these "overlayings" were in fact cases of this disease (Savitt 1978:124).
Probably the most traumatic disease to hit Shirley slaves was the cholera epidemic of 1849. As was mentioned previously, Carter prepared for the 1832 epidemic by having a doctor reside on the plantation. Although this epidemic never hit Shirley, the one in 1849 did. Cholera, a waterborne disease, is contracted through drinking water, fish and other sea animals or vegetables collected from the water, or fruit and vegetables and other food which obtain nourishment from water (Savitt 1978:226). The epidemic struck in June and July of 1849, and in a period of 15 days, killed 31 slaves. In the journal, these slaves are listed by name, sex, and age. In all, 13 men (18 or over), 5 women, and 13 children died (SPFJ: June 27-July 11, 1849).

In addition to diseases, farm accidents occurred as well. Overturned carts, runaway carts, drownings, etc., all contributed to medical problems. For example, "carriage horses run away with Tom upset the carriage, broke the harness and hurt the driver very much but the carriage was not injured" (SPFJ: 2-19-1838), or "Emanuel was drowned today and put Daniel in his place" (SPFJ: 5-17-1823), or even, "John Jacobson carpenter cut his foot very badly with an adz" (SPFJ: 9-13-1848).

Prior to the Civil War, Hill Carter had a number of slaves attempt to run away. These were listed by name in the journal, and, in the account books, receipts are found for the search, capture, lodging, and return of these runaways (SPAB: 5-6-1829).
Most of the runaways listed left from late May to late June, which corresponds to harvest time. Every one of the slaves that had been listed as a runaway was eventually returned. Only twice were indications given as to why some slaves left, and both had to do with stealing; "Phill the Miller had made way with 40 or more blls of corn... and then ran off after robbing the barn at Curles...being engaged in the latter with some of the Curles negroes" (SPFJ: 10-5-1837). The other had to do with stealing from a neighbor (SPFJ: 4-6-1829). No punishments were ever recorded for the returned runaways.

Between 1841 and Civil War times, either there were no runaways, or else they were no longer being recorded in the farm journals. The Civil War, however, brought on many changes.

III. Civil War

During the Civil War, plantation activities continued as usual, with the exception of the times that the Yankee army occupied the area. The Yankees arrived and took possession of Shirley on June 30, 1862. The farm journal describes the event; "nothing done, the negroes all running helter skelter owing to the Yankee army occupying the plantation" (SPFJ: 6-30-1862). With the widespread destruction that occurred on the plantation, the days following were spent cleaning up and repairing.

The next three years witnessed a general mass exodus of the slaves from the plantation into Yankee hands. In 1862,
15 men, a woman and her two children, had "run off to the Yankees." The entry of July 6, 1863 read, "nearly all the men have gone off, no women yet since last year. This makes thirty men and boys and 1 woman and her 2 children, in all 33 negroes have gone off to the Yankees" (SPFJ 7-6-1863). In 1864, a total of 47 more slaves ran off, "Making 80 up to this date and 20 dies owing to the war" (SPFJ: 6-17-1864).

The slaves that did remain were "worthless" in Carter's mind, "Began harvest with 4 cradles and 10 broken down women and men, a poor business" (SPFJ: 6-20-1864), or "Harvesting slowly the hands are few and a lazy, worthless demoralized set, good for nothing" (SPFJ: 6-27-1864).

The runaway problem, uncooperative laborers, and later, Emancipation depleted Carter of his working force. Thus, means were obtained to keep the plantation in operation. Tenant farmers and part-time hired workers were taken up to maintain the plantation.

IV. Postbellum and 20th Century

To compensate for the labor force lost as a result of the Civil War, Hill Carter began to hire labor. Between 1849 and 1852 a total of six hands were hired, but in August of 1863 alone, seven people were employed. This reflected the slow depletion of the slave labor force. After Emancipation in 1865, an additional three men were hired, and for the first time, women were hired as well; "Betty, Julia, Nancy, and Lucy began to work at 25¢ a day." (SPFJ: 11-27-1865). Family tradition reports that former
slaves who had remained, or who had returned, were hired on (C. Hill Carter, Jr., personal communication). Interestingly, the names of the women hired, corresponded to the names of former slaves.

Plantation activities continued under this new labor system: hogs and cattle were killed, wheat, corn, oats, and Irish potatoes were planted and harvested; rails were hauled and fences mended, although everything was undertaken on a drastically reduced scale.

In 1866, Hill Carter gave his son Robert Randolf Carter his portion of Shirley Plantation. From this point on, it appears that Robert Carter was responsible for everything that went on at the plantation. His labor force was composed of both permanent laborers and "extra labor," hired during harvest times. It is probable that this permanent labor force, for whom he was providing "rations," were living in the structures built and used as slave cabins.

In the Account Books of 1882 Robert Carter had drawn a contract regarding work and provisions:

We the undersigned hereby acknowledge to have received from Robert Randolf Carter the amounts set opposite our respective names in full claims against him up to this 31 of March 1882.

The twenty names that follow have all been signed with X's and include 16 men listed by first and last name, and four women listed by their first name only. Eleven of the men have last names that correspond with the last names of former slaves. This could possibly be indicative of the rehiring or hiring of former slaves or their relatives.
Also, if this were true then these former slaves were living in the same structures with a new legal status -- that of free black.

Opposite this set of names are categories which correspond to "Day Lost; Cash; Corn; Coffee; Meal; Oil; and Sundries," implying that supplies were being distributed, similar to antebellum times (SPAB: 1882). This suggests that these permanent laborers were residing in the former slave cabins.

A map survey of Shirley drawn up probably in the late 1860's early 1870's (C. Hill Carter, Jr., personal communication), denotes seven standing cabins in row formation (Figure 1). It is also known that these were occupied in 1888 when Robert Randolf Carter died:

We see the traces of his wise administration everywhere in the magnificent plantation - in wheat fields hundreds of acres in extent, luxuriant corn lands, well kept stock and in commodious cottage "quarters" to each of which belongs a garden of fair extent, neatly tilled (Harland 1897:75).

Permanent labor was supplemented with "extra labor." On another 1882 list, 49 names were listed by both first and last name regardless of sex. While many of the last names do correlate with those of former slaves, three of the first and last names correspond exactly. C. Hill Carter, Jr. reports that many of the returning former slaves found it offensive to live in the former slave cabins, and for this reason, chose to live outside the plantation and work as "extra labor" (personal communication). Opposite each of these names are "Days," and it appears that these
FIGURE 1

1867-1874 MAP OF SHIRLEY
laborers were not provided the rations as were the permanent workers (SPAB: 1882).

Documentary evidence as to specific plantation activities, operations, and occupations, is virtually nonexistent after Robert Carter's death. Still, it is assumed that activities continued, and the former slave cabins were occupied during the late nineteenth, and early to mid-twentieth centuries.

Following Robert Randolf Carter's death in 1888, his wife Louise Humphries Carter inherited the plantation. Upon her death in 1960, their daughter Marion Oliver Carter received Shirley. She named C. Hill Carter, Jr. heir to Shirley upon her death in 1950.

C. Hill Carter, Jr. (personal communication) provided additional information on the structures occupants. Growing up on the plantation, he recalls three cabins standing in the fields. During the 1920's a black tenant farmer family named Johnson resided in the structure excavated. Later, in the 1930's, a white tenant farmer family, also named Johnson, replaced the former residents. Finally, in the early 1940's, when the structure was destroyed for wood for a new barn, a black man named Bob Ghee was its one occupant. The chimney remained until its destruction in 1980.

Documentation that applies directly to the area investigated archaeologically is difficult to obtain. Various maps which depict the seven structures on them do exist. From these it is known that the cabins are aligned in an east-west fashion, and are located a mile east of the main house.
From the location of the roads, etc., it appears that the structure excavated was the one with the most eastern extent (Figure 1).

Discovering the precise date of construction is virtually impossible from the documentary sources. On another map originally drawn in 1820, two "updates" made in 1843 and 1858 make it difficult to distinguish when the cabins were added. However, other documentation suggests that these cabins were probably added during the 1858 revision (the discussion involving snow in the lofts - SPFJ: 1-19-1857).

One undated black and white photograph was found, possibly depicting one of the double cabins (Figure 2). As can be seen, this apparently corresponds to a sill and pier form structure. The location of the door suggests a double cabin, as doors were offset towards the gable ends. The shadow indicates an overhanging roof, as well as the southern orientation of that facade.

Following, is a descriptive report on the archaeological work done, providing additional information on the slaves and tenant farmers discussed above.
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I. **The Excavations**

Twelve weeks of archaeological fieldwork were conducted during the summers of 1979 and 1980 examining the nineteenth and twentieth century slave and tenant farmer occupation at Shirley Plantation in Charles City County, Virginia. A structure, its immediate surrounding area, as well as the entire field in which the structure is located, were tested in various intensities.

**Geographical Setting**

Shirley Plantation is located in Charles City County, Virginia, on the north bank of the James River. It lies approximately 25 miles southeast of Richmond and 35 miles southwest of Williamsburg, along Route 5 (Figure 3). The structure and area investigated are located in a plowed field, almost a mile east of the main house (Figure 3A).

Actual excavations occurred in three areas, while controlled surface collections were taken in the surrounding field (Figure 4). Area One corresponds to the chimney and its associated structure; Area Two is located immediately south of the chimney, and; Area Three excavations were south of Area Two.
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Excavation Procedures

In each of the excavations a datum was established; a grid in ten by ten foot units was superimposed, and the AGNU system was applied to establish horizontal provenience. The units were troweled. Occasionally however, a shovel, and/or pick ax was needed because of the compactness of the soil. All dirt was screened through 1/4 inch hardware cloth, with the artifacts recovered bagged according to horizontal and vertical provenience. Measurements were made in feet and tenths of feet. All squares excavated were mapped and photographed as each level was uncovered.

Area One (44CC124)

Archaeological investigations in 1979 began in the area surrounding a free standing chimney. This chimney was reputed to have belonged to a slave quarter. The purpose of this excavation was to locate architectural features that might identify the type of structure, its size, etc. A second goal was to recover any tangible evidence of its former occupants. If the structure was in fact a slave cabin, then the material recovered could be used to obtain information about daily slave life at Shirley Plantation, which could later be used for comparative purposes.

The datum, a tin can set in concrete, was set northeast of the chimney, and the ten by ten foot grid was superimposed. After these preliminaries, extensive clearing ensued as bushes, wheat, small trees, and snakes were removed from the area within the grid system. The exposed surface area, a
total of 2400 square feet, was mapped and photographed (Figure 5).

Two 2 X 2 foot test pits were opened to establish the stratigraphy for the site. Figure 6 illustrates the cross-site stratigraphy. Level One corresponds to the living surface, a loosely packed loamy grey-brown soil. Most of the cultural material was found in this level. Level Two is the old plow zone upon which the house was constructed. The soil is a mottled light brown orange in color, tending towards a clay-like texture. The few artifacts found were concentrated towards the top of this layer. Dark orange subsoil characterizes Level Three, which is sterile of cultural debris. However, due to light plow activity through the site, it was decided that the material recovered would be treated as one assemblage, with only horizontal control maintained.

While 24 squares were cleared (100U-200X), only four (200A, B, C, and G) were excavated to subsoil. A trench two by ten feet in dimension was put in 200 J-K along the east side of the chimney in order to determine if a root cellar was present. Another trench was put in on the east side of the chimney (200 P-Q) for the same purpose. The hard packed condition of the soil made the search for soil stains useless. As a result, twelve trenches with arbitrary dimensions were opened in order to locate the brick piers used as supports for the sill and pier frame structure.
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Area One Features

The features uncovered include a free standing chimney, twelve brick concentrations corresponding to possible brick piers, a possible brick hearth, and wood remains—possibly flooring or siding.

Feature 1 (Figure 7)

A complete free standing double hearthed chimney. Located in 200 H-J, it measures 24 feet in height, and exhibits a roof line shadow. The bricks are predominantly hand made, deep red in color, with a few scorched black, and are laid in common bond. The mortar appears to be Portland Cement. Two stove pipes have been added, one on each side of the chimney.

Feature 2 (Figure 8A)

A virtually complete brick pier found in 200 G-H, directly north of the chimney. It measures three stretchers in length, and one and a half stretchers in width. The bricks run in an east-west direction with wood fragments found parallel to the pier. The bricks rest on sterile clay.

Feature 3 (Figure 8B)

A concentration of brick and mortar were discovered in 200 A-B. The main concentration was contained within a somewhat rectangular shape that measured 2.8 feet wide and 4.8 feet long. It also runs in an east-west direction, and corresponds to a brick pier.
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Feature 4 (Figure 8C)

Brick and mortar were found in abundance in 100 U-V. Five bricks in semi-course run lengthwise north and south. Other bricks were protruding from the soil. Brick pier.

Feature 5 (Figure 8D)

Scattered bricks in, and protruding from 100 V-W, suggest the location of a previous brick pier.

Feature 6 (Figure 8E)

Scattered bricks in, and protruding from 100 W-X, suggest the location of a previous brick pier.

Feature 7 (Figure 8F)

Four bricks found in 200 C-D were aligned in a rough north-south direction. The location and orientation suggests a brick pier.

Feature 8 (Figure 8G)

A brick pier was located in 200 J-K. Virtually complete, it measures three stretchers long, a stretcher and a half in width, and three bricks in depth. The pier is oriented in an east-west direction.

Feature 9 (Figure 8H)

Three complete bricks, none in course, were found in 200 Q-R, corresponding to the location of a brick pier.

Feature 10 (Figure 8I)

Two complete bricks were found in 200 W-X, correspond-
ing to the location of a brick pier.

**Feature 11** (Figure 8J)

Brick rubble and two complete bricks were found in 200 V-W, corresponding to a brick pier.

**Feature 12** (Figure 8K)

A complete brick corner pier was found in 200 U-V.

**Feature 13** (Figure 8L)

A partial brick pier with some bricks in course was discovered in 200 N-P. This pier is particularly important because it demonstrates that holes were dug into the subsoil in order to lay the piers. This is seen in the stratigraphy.

*The distribution, concentration, and conditions of features 2-12, indicate that the majority of the brick piers were probably destroyed by the plow. Of the four virtually complete brick piers, three had been protected by the presence of the chimney.*

**Feature 14** (Figure 9)

A brick concentration, possibly corresponding to a hearth was found in 200 H-J. This feature lies on the east side of the chimney and is vaguely rectangular in shape.

**Feature 15**

Wood remains with cut nails intact were discovered running parallel to the foundations (east-west) in 200 A, C, and G. These were also found running perpendicular in 200 B.
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It is suggested that these are remnants of flooring or siding.

**The Structure**

It appears from these excavations and findings that the structure is of sill and pier frame construction. The brick piers, spaced at ten foot intervals, indicate a 20 X 40 foot cabin, with the central double hearthed chimney dividing the interior into two 20 X 20 foot living units. The roof line, visible on the chimney, reveals that the structure was a story and a half (loft) in height.

Further discussion on the architecture follows the section of artifact analysis. The distribution of artifacts are used to ascertain the locations of the windows and doorways specific to the house. In addition, comparative material is considered.

**Area Two**

In 1980, excavations were concentrated on an area directly south of the chimney and Area One excavations (Figure 10). Seven 10 X 10 foot squares were opened in order to define distributional patterns corresponding to windows and doorways, etc. of the structure excavated the previous year. A second objective was concerned with collecting additional artifactual material to add both quantitative and qualitative data to the already existing data base.

Area Two was cleared of the remnants of the previous
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year's wheat crop. As this area is located in the current plow zone, no stratigraphy was present, and artifacts found were treated as one assemblage, with only horizontal control maintained. The profile of Area Two is shown in Figure 11.

Excavations began with the opening of the four southernmost squares (100 B, C, D, and E). In order to assure that subsoil had been reached, these squares were divided into quads, and taken down and additional .5 tenths of a foot. Towards the end of the excavation, the three northern squares were cleared and taken down to subsoil.

Area Two Features

Only one feature was found in the Area Two excavations. In the southern portion of 100 C, a soil stain was uncovered at the base of the plow zone. The stain was roughly semicircular in shape (six feet in length, varying in width), and extended into the square from the southern wall. It represents a pit of some type. As the feature extended below the plow zone, stratigraphy was present. Figure 12 is the profile of this feature. Level One corresponds to the plow zone. Level Two is composed of red, black, and white mottled gritty soil with burnt wood present; Level Three is an orange clay with gray-brown mottling and iron stains, and; Level Four contained sterile orange clay. Artifacts found in Feature One are as follows:
Generally, the artifacts represent a mid-nineteenth to mid-twentieth century occupation.

**Area Three**

Excavations were undertaken in Area Three during the 1979 field season (Figure 13). Thus, the 1979 Area One datum and grid system apply. One 10 X 10 foot, and two 2 X 2 foot units were opened south of Area Two in order to examine a soil change that was evident in the plow zone. It was hoped this area might have been used as a refuse disposal area. Again, because of Area Three's location in the plow zone, no vertical stratigraphy was present.

A 2 X 2 foot test unit was opened corresponding to the north-west corner of 201 C-D. A dark ashy soil with orange mottling was present down to the sterile orange clay sub-soil.

A second 2 X 2 foot unit was excavated in the northwest corner of 201 E. While the immediate presence of the dark
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[Diagram showing test units and area three excavations]
ashy subsoil was not evident, it appeared as soon as the surface was scraped. This test unit was later expanded to a 2 X 6 foot trench by extending an additional two feet into 201 E, as well as two feet into the northeast corner of 201 L. Surprisingly, there was vertical stratigraphy in this unit. Level One consisted of brown plow zone; Level Two was a lighter brown plow zone; Level Three contained a very dark soil with a charcoal and ash lens present, and; Level Four was sterile orange clay corresponding to subsoil (Figure 14).

The ten by ten foot unit opened in Area Three corresponds to 201 J-K. The surface was a dark gray ashy soil similar to the 2 X 2 foot test unit in 201 C-D. It continued to subsoil with orange mottling throughout. The artifacts recovered indicate that burning had occurred. At the base of the plow zone, plow scars and other soil stains were found. With the exception of the investigation of Feature Four, time did not allow further excavations in this area.

Area Three Features

Several features were found in Area Three, including two soil stains, an ash lens, and remnants of a barbed wire fence.

Feature 1

A cedar fence post with barbed wire attached was found in the southernmost side wall of the 2 X 6 foot test trench located in 201 E-L.
Feature 2 (Figure 15)

A circular stain of gray ashy soil, approximately one foot in diameter, was discovered in the 10 X 10 foot square (201 J-K). It possibly corresponds to a posthole. Not excavated.

Feature 3 (Figure 15)

Located in the southeast corner of the 10 X 10 foot square, was a roughly rectangular grey ashy soil stain measuring 2.6 feet by 1.0 feet. Possibly posthole. Not excavated (201 J-K).

Feature 4 (Figure 15)

A circular grey ashy soil stain was found in the northern portion of 201 J-K. Semicircular in shape, it is interrupted by the northern bulk. The feature measures 3.4 feet by 1.6 feet, and is .84 feet in depth from the base of the subsoil (2.39 feet from the surface). Two fragments of pearlware were found, and at the bottom, one large cut bone, and a half of a brick were found.

Feature 5

Located in the 2 X 6 foot test trench (201 E-L) was an ash lens which covered the entire square.

Area Three Interpretation

It appears from the excavations in Area Three that no trash pit, per se, is evident. Although an incredibly large quantity of artifacts were recovered from this area, it
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seems to be a result of a steady accumulation of sheet refuse. The artifacts represent a mid-18th - mid-20th century occupation. A disposal of trash in that area, in combination with the down hill slope and intense plowing, all contributed to the formation of an area of sheet refuse in the plow zone. The burning of trash also occurred here as is attested to by the large quantity of burned artifacts recovered. It was also discovered that the refuse area is much more extensive than is indicated by the surface appearance.

**The Field Survey**

In addition to the Area Two excavations undertaken in 1980, the field school conducted a controlled surface collection in the fields surrounding Areas One, Two, and Three. Designated Field Seven, it was known from documentary sources to have contained seven cabins, oriented linearly in an east-west direction. It was hoped that through the distribution of the artifacts collected, the refuse areas of the six other cabins would be revealed. As the excavations had been concentrated around the structure with the longest occupation, it was felt that any refuse areas discovered would provide comparative material indicative of earlier occupations. Also, a controlled surface collection might indicate areas of craft specialization.

Field Seven (Figure 4) is a rectangular field measuring 220 X 800 feet (176,000 square feet). A datum was established in the north-east corner at the intersection of two roads. This provided the northern and eastern boundaries. A 10 X 10
foot grid system was laid out over the entire field. Surface collections were made according to provenience to maintain horizontal control. The road east of the field was collected, appearing on the maps as a significant concentrations. Not collected was the road north, as well as the previously excavated structure and its immediate area (Wamsley 1980:1).

Cooper Wamsley, a student at the College of William and Mary, analyzed the Field Seven material. Artifacts collected from the 1607 10 X 10's were divided into four categories including, ceramics, glass, metal, and brick. Although brick was recorded as to its presence or absence, it was not collected (Wamsley 1980:2).

In order to determine significant concentrations, an average frequency which discounted barren units was calculated. Ceramics (4.6), glass (6.1), and metal (3.4), were rounded off to five, six, and three, respectively. Any concentrations within a 10 X 10 foot unit greater than these averages were considered significant and were included in the distribution maps (Wamsley 1980).

After concentrations were determined, they were placed on distribution maps. Each category, corresponding to composition, was placed on a separate map in order to isolate any areas of craft specialization (Figure 16 A-D). A general composite map was made which superimposes all of the categories onto one map. It was from this map that the eight refuse areas were discovered (Figure 16E).
Refuse Areas

The concentrations found support the historical documentation as they indicate seven cabins aligned in a linear fashion. Ceramics from the defined refuse areas (composite map), were pulled for further analysis, and are discussed in the following section. Generally, they represent a mid-nineteenth to early twentieth century occupation.

II. Artifact Analysis

All artifacts excavated from Areas One, Two, and Three, as well as those collected from Field Seven, were washed, labeled, and cataloged according to provenience. The following, is a report dealing with all of the artifacts from the three excavated areas, as well as the ceramics collected from the eight refuse areas identified in the Field Seven survey. Representative and unusual artifacts were later photographed.

The artifacts analyzed are placed into the same general categories as those used by John Otto (1975). By using this classification scheme, Otto was able to obtain information on social statuses. As this paper is concerned with social relationships, it was decided that his system might best elicit other types of social information. Also, it will aid in future regional and cross-regional comparisons.

The categories utilized are functional in scope. Ceramics, glass containers, metal containers for food, cutlery, bodily protection, recreation and status consumption, horse equipment and vehicles, architectural artifacts, and food resources are
analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. A total of each category according to area is presented in Table 1. Each of the categories are further subdivided and discussed in terms of the artifacts which make them up.

Selective artifacts are then used for distributional studies of the Area One excavations. These are done to locate doorways, windows, and other architectural features. Based on these findings, another structure (standing) on the plantation is examined for comparative purposes.

**Dating Problems**

The almost 100 year occupation and the plow zone disturbance combined to make the dating of artifacts difficult. No relative dating based on stratigraphic levels was possible. Due to the lateness of the site, most artifacts recovered were mass produced items from England or the United States--and many of these items are still being produced today. For example, ironstone was imported from England beginning in the 1850's, and yet it is still being manufactured today in the United States and England. While the manufacturing dates are interesting to note, they are by no means a reliable indicator of when the items were obtained or used. The possible discard status of some of the artifacts presents temporal biases, as these items would be obtained and used by the occupants once they became "outmoded." Moreover, when Mrs. Carter arrived at the plantation in the 1960's, she found the employees eating off Canton porcelain dishes (1800-1830). To add to the confusion, the current
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Area One</th>
<th>Area Two</th>
<th>Area Three</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>2,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Containers</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>6,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Containers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutlery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily Protection</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Status Consumption</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm/Horse Gear</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>5,517</td>
<td>4,926</td>
<td>3,276</td>
<td>13,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10,650</td>
<td>8,617</td>
<td>4,258</td>
<td>23,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
farmer occasionally eats his lunch at the site and tosses his sardine cans, orange juice bottles, and plastic utensils, etc. around the area.

**Ceramics**

Otto established that ceramics and their distribution according to type and form can be an indicator of social status (Otto 1975:360). However, due to the nature of the site and area investigated, form was not identified, and type was frequently impossible to determine.

As the areas investigated were located in the plow zone, the average sherd size was relatively small. In fact, the largest sherd recovered was three by four inches in diameter, while most were less than an inch and a half in diameter. In addition, over half of the sherds recovered were undecorated white earthenwares. Both problems served to make mending, and the determination of form, a tedious if not impossible task, and one which was abandoned early in the analysis.

A typological problem arose as well. As the sherds were sorted and resorted into their supposed respective categories, it became apparent that the commonly used diagnostic characteristics of types were not sufficient to separate the sherds with readily reproducible results. This was particularly the case in the distinction between pearlware, whiteware, and ironstone/granite china by using the paste, tint, or glaze as their defining characteristics. Previous studies dealing with nineteenth century ceramics
have also noted this problem (Miller 1980:2; Hanson and Hsu 1971:75). It was decided for the purposes of this study, that instead of the arbitrary hair splitting, any sherd with a white refined earthenware body would be classified together under the category - white refined earthenwares. This includes pearlware, whiteware, and ironstone/granite china. In order to support this classification and make the reader more aware of the problems involved, a brief history of each is presented.

In 1779, Josiah Wedgwood introduced a new earthenware called "pearl white." This early pearlware had a creamware fabric, and a blue tinted glaze. Although Wedgwood claimed a harder fabric, comparisons have demonstrated that no differences in either density or color exist between pearlware and creamware. The blue tinged glaze (cobalt) gave the appearance of a seemingly white fabric, and also tended to collect in the crevices. Unfortunately, archaeologists have long used this blue "pooling to the crevices" as a diagnostic characteristic of pearlware. More confusion arises as pearlware was called "whiteware" by several manufacturers (Shaw 1968:215; Sussman 1977:105).

In 1800, Josiah Spode introduced bone china, a white porcelain composed of a mixture of kaolin, feldspar (cornish stone), as well as burned and powdered cattle bone (Fontana 1962:91). Based on its sparkling white characteristics, it has been proposed that bone china might have been a factor in the general overall whiter body (Miller 1980:17). These
hard white and semiporcelains were supplanting pearlware by the 1820's, and are difficult to date (Noel-Hume 1969a:130).

Ironstone China was developed and patented in England by C. J. Mason and Co. in 1813. Also called "White Granite," its body was a mixture of powdered iron slag, calcinated flint, cornwall stone, clay, and a slight portion of oxide of cabalt (Fontana 1962:92). In addition, the 1840's saw a revival of the popularity of "blue pooling" - this time in ironstone, rendering that diagnostic characteristic virtually useless (Miller 1980:17). Ironstone resembles the later more refined pearlwares and whitewares to the extend that their separation is many times arbitrary.

Mason's patent expired in the early 1850's, at which time many other English potters began to make ironstone. "Mason's Ironstone China, Warranted Ironstone China, Royal Ironstone China, Royal Semi-Porcelain, and Semi-China" appeared as maker's marks on the bottoms of ceramics during the mid to late nineteenth century (Fontana 1962:92).

After the mid-1800's, due to ironstone's relative inexpensiveness and durability, it began to be exported by England all over the world. By the mid-1870's, American potters began to make ironstone as well, although English wares were still used as the predominant type for sometime (Fontana 1962:93).

The ceramics found in the three excavated areas, and those recovered from the eight identified refuse areas in Field Seven, are presented according to type, quantity, and
percentage in Tables 2A and 2B. Recently, it has been sug­
gested that ware types should not be used at all (Miller
1980). Instead, it is proposed that surface decorations,
rather than ware type, should be used for classification.
Ceramics in the nineteenth century were described by
decoration more than ware type. Therefore, potters, merchants,
and customers, were purchasing ceramics more on the basis of
surface decoration than on ware type (Miller 1980:1-2).

In addition to the ware type classification (Table 2A
and 2B), Miller's levels of surface decoration are presented
as well (Tables 3A and 3B). While he uses these categories
for economic scaling, this thesis will use them for descrip­
tive purposes only. Thus, unlike Miller, whiteware and iron­
stone/Chinas are included in Level One. The first level
corresponds to undecorated sherds; the second to minimal
decoration; the third to painted, and; the fourth to transfer
printed (Miller 1980:3-4). Due to the large percentage of
unidentifiable undecorated earthenwares recovered, it was
decided that these categories would be the best way to
analyze the sherds found. Two additional categories are
included as porcelains and stonewares constituted a large
percentage of the total. These are kept separate to avoid
the earthenware classification, but are necessary for com­
parative purposes.

**Level One: Undecorated Earthenwares**

The undecorated earthenwares recovered consist of
creamware, and white refined earthenwares (pearlware, white-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Area One Quantity</th>
<th>Area One Percentage</th>
<th>Area Two Quantity</th>
<th>Area Two Percentage</th>
<th>Area Three Quantity</th>
<th>Area Three Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annularware</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger-Painted Pearlware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue/Green Edge Pearlware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print (Black &amp; Blue)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print (Polychrome)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Paint (Polychrome)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Paint (Cobalt)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Glazed Pink Earthenware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Lead Glazed Red Bodied Earthenware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Area One</td>
<td></td>
<td>Area Two</td>
<td></td>
<td>Area Three</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spongeware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Refined Earthenware</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>79.97</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>47.48</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>57.72</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Lead Glazed Earthenware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lead Glazed Earthenware</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Export Porcelain (Canton)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thick Bodied White Porcelain</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin Bodied White Porcelain</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Painted Polychrome Porcelain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print Polychrome Porcelain</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Area One</td>
<td></td>
<td>Area Two</td>
<td></td>
<td>Area Three</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip Coated Stoneware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Glazed Stoneware</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Salt Glazed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower Pot Fragments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned Sherds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>100.03</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2A
Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annularware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue/Green Edge Pearlware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print (blue/black)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print (polychrome)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpaint Polychrome</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Glazed Pink Earthenware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone/Graniteware</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Glazed Blue Earthenware</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Export Porcelain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2B
Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thick Porcelains</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin Porcelains</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip Glazed Stoneware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Glazed Stoneware</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware Vase Fragments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3A
Surface Decorations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area One</th>
<th>Area Two</th>
<th>Area Three</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earthenwares</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level One</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Two</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Three</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Four</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Porcelains</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level One</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Two</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Three</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Four</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stonewares</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip Coated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Glazed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkaline Glazed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 158, 7.25%


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earthenwares</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level One</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Two</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Three</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Four</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Porcelains</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level One</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Two</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Three</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Four</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stonewares</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip-Coated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Glazed</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkaline Glazed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ware, and ironstone). Of the 2178 sherds collected from the three excavated areas, 1271 (58%) were undecorated earthenwares. In the Field Seven survey, 1195 or 70% of the total were in this category (Figure 17 A-C).

The Area One excavations recovered 603 undecorated earthenwares, comprising 80% of the total. In Areas Two and Three, undecorated earthenwares were less prevalent composing 47.4% and 43.0% respectively. It appears that lower percentages occur as one moves away from the structure. Unexpectedly, the eight refuse areas contained percentages ranging from a low of 61.3% in Refuse Area 1, to a high of 88.3% in Refuse Area 6, representing a heavy reliance on these undecorated earthenwares in pre-1940 times.

It is apparent from maker's marks located on the bases of the vessels, that these refined white earthenwares were being supplied not only by England, but by American potters as well. Three maker's marks from the three excavated areas bear this out.

1. Anchor Pottery (Figure 18A): Trenton, New Jersey. This mark appears after 1894 (Godden 1963).
2. Edward Clarke (Figure 18B); Burslem, England. In operation from 1880-1887 (Godden 1963:147).

Level Two: Minimal Decoration

Minimal decoration includes shell edging, spongeware, banded wares, mocha wares, and finger trailed slipwares
FIGURE 17
REPRESENTATIVE EARTHENWARE CERAMICS

A-C  Undecorated Earthenware
D-K  Minimal Decoration
   D-F  Shell Edged Pearlwares
       G  Spongeware
       H-K  Annularwares
L-N  Painted Wares
O-R  Transfer Printed Wares
FIGURE 18
MAKERS MARKS ON CERAMICS

A. Anchor Pottery; New Jersey
B. Edward Clarke; Burslem England
(Figure 19 D-K). As can be seen, these composed 160 of the sherds recovered from the three excavated areas (7.3% of the total). From the eight Field Seven Refuse Areas located, sherds with minimal decoration comprised 57 or 3.4% of the collected sample.

Shell edging was popular on pearlware from 1780 to 1820, but also continued on the later refined white earthenwares (South 1972). The three excavated areas had 48 (2.2%) sherds with blue and green shell edging. Thirty-five (2.1%) shell edged sherds were recovered in the eight refuse areas.

Spongeware was present only in the three excavated areas where 22 (10%) were found. This technique utilized a sponge for quick application of a colored slip (Fleming 1923:8).

Banded wares were the most frequently encountered ceramic type in the minimal decoration category. Seventy-five (3.4%) were found in the three excavated areas, and 19 (1.1%) were recovered in the eight refuse areas. These were produced as an inexpensive utilitarian item for the home and for export, appealing to people participating in a folk society. Horizontal bands were applied by either dipping the object in a slip and tooling out the bands, or, blowing bands on while the object is revolving on a lathe (Otto 1975:189; Godden 1963:108-109; Noel-Hume 1969a:131).

Mocha is characterized by a brown fernlike ornament on an otherwise banded ware. This is created from a mixture of tobacco juice and urine (Noel-Hume 1969a:131). Seven of these sherds were found in the three excavated areas, while
FIGURE 19

REPRESENTATIVE PORCELAINS, STONEWARES AND EARTHENWARES

A-B Chinese Export Porcelains
C-E Stonewares
  C Salt Glazed
  D Alkaline Glazed
  E Slip Coated
F-J Earthenwares
  F Flower Pot
  G Blue Lead Glazed
  H Rockingham
  I Lead Glazed Red Bodied
  J Pink Lead Glazed
only three were recovered from the eight refuse areas.

Fingerpainted wares are produced when colored slips are swirled on the vessel with the fingers, resulting in a marbled design (Noel-Hume 1969a:132). Only six of these sherds were found, all located in the three excavated areas (Figure 17 D-K).

**Level Three: Painted Wares**

This level is composed predominantly of flower and motif designs. Hand painted designs, usually floral, were popular in the early nineteenth century (Otto 1975:189). Both blue and polychrome (orange, green, brown, and blue) were heavily favored in the export trade (Watkins 1968:142-143; Whiter 1970:139-140). Hand painted designs in cobalt and polychrome were regarded as peasant styles (Otto 1975:191-192; Noel-Hume 1969b:395). After 1835, directly stenciled patterns (floral) in bright polychrome colors became very popular among the poorer classes (Otto 1975). Fifty-two (2.3%) and fifty-seven (3.4%) respectively were found in the three excavated areas and eight refuse areas (Figure 17 L-N).

**Level Four: Transfer Print**

Transfer printing reached the height of its popularity from 1790-1850, although it continued into postbellum times. Appearing first on creamware, then on the later refined earthenwares, it was generally used on items intended for daily use (Otto 1975:190-191). Copper plates were engraved with the design and covered with ink. Paper was applied and
used to transfer the design onto the bisque item. The design was then attached by heating, and the glaze was applied before the final heating (Coysh 1970; Otto 1975:190).

This was the most common design technique found at the excavated sites, as well as in the field survey. From the excavated areas, 160 or 7.3% of the sherds recovered contained transfer printed designs. Seventy-two (4.3%) sherds with transfer printing were found in the eight refuse areas. The heterogeneity of the transfer print designs suggest a possible discard status. The wide range of patterns indicate that these were obtained individually rather than by the set. Forty-three patterns representing approximately 49 items were recovered in the three areas. In the eight refuse areas, 52 patterns representing 69 items were found (Figure 17 O-R).

Other

Earthenwares which do not contain any of the above design elements are relegated to this category. Included are red bodied earthenwares, with black and white lead glazes (15) located in Area Two; pink lead glazed earthenwares (17) found in Areas Two and Three; Rockingham ware (7) in Area Two; orange lead glazed earthenwares (4) in Area One and Two; blue lead glazed highly refined earthenwares (24) in Area One and Refuse Area 1; Delft (2) was found in Area Two and in Refuse Area 3, and; fragments of a flower pot (6) were recovered in Areas One and Three (Figure 19 F-J).
Porcelain

Porcelain is included as a separate category, although it is also divided into surface decorations. Undecorated, painted designs, and transfer prints were all found on porcelains (Figure 19 A-B).

Level One: Undecorated Porcelains

White undecorated porcelains were separated by thickness. In the three areas, 60 or 3%, and in the eight refuse areas 47 or 2.7% of the sherds consisted of a thicker porcelain body. These sherds possibly represent a better grade of utility ware (Kelso 1968:19). One sherd with a maker's mark was found:


The undecorated sherds composed only 1.1% (24) of the ceramics found, and only 2.7% (46) of the sherds recovered from the eight refuse areas. A total of 212 Level One sherds were found.

Level Two: Minimal Decoration Porcelains

None found.

Level Three: Painted Porcelains

Recovered from Areas Two and Three, as well as Refuse Area 4, were a total of seven polychrome hand painted porcelain fragments. Chinese export porcelains (Canton) were found in large quantities with 61 fragments (2.8%) from the three areas, and 24 sherds (1.46%) from the eight refuse
areas. It is known that Hill Carter was importing Canton in sets (SPAB: 1853). However, the diversity of forms and the low quantity of sherds per form, suggest that the occupants were receiving these items individually rather than by the set. Canton was found in the forms of plates (52 fragments), teacups (2 fragments), platters (6 fragments), and lids (one fragment), in the three excavated areas. The refuse areas yielded 19 plate fragments, three platter fragments, and two bowl fragments. A total of 89 Level Three sherds were recovered (Figure 19 A-B).

Level Four: Transfer Printed Porcelains

Transfer print was used on porcelain as well. Eight sherds from Areas One and Area Three were recovered. All were of the thicker variety of porcelain.

Stoneware (Figure 19 C-E)

Stoneware sherds were the third most frequently recovered ceramic type. They comprised a full 10.3% of the ceramics in the field survey, and 7.23% of those found in the three excavated areas. Slip coated stoneware was the least common with only five sherds found in Areas One, Two, and Three, and seven fragments collected from the eight refuse areas. These were fragments of beverage bottles.

Salt glazed stoneware was abundant with 153 (7.0%) recovered from the three excavated areas, and 174 (10.3%) found in the survey. These were in the forms of storage jars, jugs, and bottles. The large percentage of salt
glazed stoneware recovered may be a result of the distance of water sources from the quarters. Stoneware provides the most durable and water resistant ceramic for the job.

**Glass Containers**

Glass fragments were the most frequently recovered artifacts from the three excavated areas. A total of 6736 highly fragmented pieces of beverage, medicine, and food containers were found. Table 4 gives a breakdown of the types of glass found (see Figure 20).

**Beverage Bottles**

Most of the bottle glass fragments were machine made. In 1903, the Owen's machine was invented to achieve uniformity and mass production with less cost (Purser 1979:38).

By far, the majority of the glass fragments were clear in color (74.7%). Because of the plow zone location of the site, this glass was highly fragmented making the separation of bottle and jar glass difficult.

Olive-green bottle glass comprised 4.5% of the glass found. These bottles commonly held ales, wines, beer, cider, and porter (Otto 1975:224).

Brown bottle glass was prevalent. A total of 425 of these fragments or 6.3% of the total glass collected were recovered. Brown bottle glass was commonly used for Clorox bottles, cooking oil bottles, and of course, the modern beer bottle.

The 171 fragments of light green "Champagne" bottles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>AREA ONE</th>
<th>AREA TWO</th>
<th>AREA THREE</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olive-Green Bottles for Ale, Wine, Beer, Cider Porter, etc. (Otto 1975:224)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-Green &quot;Champagne&quot; Bottles</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Vials and Bottles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut and Pressed Glass Bowls and Covered Dish Fragments</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stemmed Goblets and Wine Glasses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut and Pressed Tumblers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decanters, Carafes and Cruets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary Bottles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milkglass Containers</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Glass; Beer Bottles, Clorox, Cooking Oil</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Bottle Glass</td>
<td>3143</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>5032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>AREA ONE</td>
<td>AREA TWO</td>
<td>AREA THREE</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Bottle Glass</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned Glass</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 20

GLASS FRAGMENTS

A Liquor Bottle Neck
B Wine Glass
C Cruet Stopper
D Milk Glass Fragment
E Stopper
F Pressed Glass Dish
G Pressed Glass Tumbler
H Soda Pop Lip
I Vial
J Pharmaceutical Neck
K Whiskey Flask
(Otto 1975:228) found comprised 2.5% of the total. Miscellaneous bottle fragments included light blue, lime green, etc. and accounted for an additional 528 pieces.

**Medicine Bottles**

Unlettered panel bottles and free blown cylindrical vials were found. The characteristic necks, lips, and stoppers were recovered from the three areas. The light green cylindrical vials had pontil marks on their bases. A total of 24 medicine bottle fragments were collected.

**Glass Tableware**

Although some molded decorative tableware was found, most tableware items were of pressed glass. Popular between 1830 and 1880, this technique involves pressing glass into a contact mold. Both drinking glasses and tableware were made of pressed glass (Davis and Corbin 1967:38-39).

Fragments from a stemmed goblet, a stemmed wine glass, a cut carafe stopper, a pressed glass tumbler, a milk glass dish, and a few other dishes were recovered from the three excavated areas.

**Culinary Bottles**

Several glass jars, including a baby food jar, a "Best Foods" jar, and fragments from Mason canning jars were found. The Mason screw top canning jar was patented in 1858, while the wide mouthed screw top jars were patented in 1892 (Purser 1979:38). A machine made milk bottle neck and lip, post 1904 was also recovered (Purser 1979:38).
Several pieces of a large thick ribbed clear glass were found in Areas One and Two and have yet to be identified as to function.

Other

A total of 93 fragments of milk glass were collected. Most were canning jar seals, although some were the previously mentioned tableware items. One possible milk glass cream jar base was also found. Two modern "Tropicana" orange juice bottles were collected from the surface of Area One. Five fragments of clear glass lamp chimneys with ribbed edges were recovered in Area Two. In addition, 43 burned pieces of glass were found in Area Two, further indicating the possible burning of trash in that area.

Four complete bottles/jars were found:

1. A complete wide mouthed screw top clear glass jar. It stands 125.2 mm in height, and 82.3 mm in width. The jar has straight sides. On its base is the following seal:

   H4463
   5 (Area One)

2. One complete octagonally faceted wide mouthed screw top clear glass jar. "Best Foods Registered" appears on the base. Found in Area One.

3. One complete baby food (?) jar. It measures 61.1 mm in height and 4.80 mm in width. Discovered in Area One.

4. One complete clear glass whiskey flash. Found in Area One, 3  9 appears on its base.

Three bottle caps were found as well. All were screw top, and had a man with a white beard on the top. These probably belong to a liquor bottle of some type. All were
located in Area One.

**Metal Containers**

Whole tin and aluminum cans were recovered from the three excavated areas, although most were recent. Seven whole or partial Betsy's sardine cans, one pork and beans can, one Armour potted meat food product, and three modern beer cans, were all collected from Area One. Four partial unidentifiable cans were found in Area Two, while no cans were discovered in Area Three. Two keys to tin can containers, and two pull tops from steel/aluminum cans were recovered in Area One.

**Cutlery**

Several iron utensil handles were discovered; one in Area One, four in Area Two, and one in Area Three. Two spoon bowls were found in Area Three, while four knife blades; two in Area Two, and two in Area Three, were uncovered. In Area One, two plastic utensils were also found.

**Bodily Protection**

**Clothing and Footwear**

Archaeological evidence for the manufacture of clothing includes a pair of scissors located in Area Two, and two thimbles found in Areas One and Two. An iron was recovered in Area One, while its handle was later found in Area Two.

Clothing fasteners consist of buttons, snaps, hooks and eyes, and buckles. A total of 97 buttons were found ranging from utilitarian, to decorative, to military. Their
breakdown according to composition is given in Table 5 (see also Figure 21). Possible functions have been suggested. The two and four hole shell and porcelain buttons were probably used on shirts (South 1964:132; House 1954:268). The four and five hole bone buttons most likely belong to trousers or underwear (South 1964:121; Olsen 1963:552; Watkins 1970:74-75). Heavier four hole iron buttons were probably used on trousers and other outer garments. Large brass buttons came from overcoats, while the smaller brass buttons may have come from waist coats or vests (Otto 1975:250).

Additional clothing fasteners include hooks and eyes, snaps, and buckles. Their respective quantities are provided at the bottom of Table 4. Several smaller, more delicate buckles were probably used for underclothing and light garments. Three simple "half-buckles" for use on belts or suspenders were found in Area One (1), and Area Two (2). Five additional buckles (three from Area Two, and two from Area Three) are also most likely from belts. In Area Two, a very large (90 X 52 mm) buckle was found. It is reputed to belong to a shoulder strap that holds the cartridge case on a military uniform (Russel Darden, personal communication).

Evidence of shoes and belts was found as a total of 83 leather fragments were recovered. Forty five pieces of shoe leather were found in Area One, including six fragments complete with tacks. Three pieces of a leather heel were
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPOSITION</th>
<th>AREA ONE</th>
<th>AREA TWO</th>
<th>AREA THREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hole</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hole (Type 22)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Porcelain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hole (Type 23)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Thich w/Drilled Eye in Shank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hole</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hole (Type 23)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulbous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Front Brass Set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holder - Sleeve Link (?)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Front</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oval Ruby Decoration Eyes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexagonal Design on Round Face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faceted, Eye Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Holes - Rouletting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hole (Type 23)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooden Back - 2 Holes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hole (Type 19)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hole (Type 20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSITION</td>
<td>AREA ONE</td>
<td>AREA TWO</td>
<td>AREA THREE</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Metal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brass</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 27 (Civil War)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropomorphic w/Wooden Back Shank</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iron</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hole (Type 21)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Shanks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plastic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hole - Red/Brown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hole in Shank</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misc. Clothing Fasteners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snaps-Copper Alloy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latches</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 21
CLOTHING FASTENERS

A-C  Shell Buttons
D-F  Black Glass Buttons
G-H  Wooden Buttons
I-K  Plastic Buttons
L   Anthropomorphic-Brass and Wood
M-N  White Porcelain Buttons
O-Q  Copper Alloy Buttons
R   Copper Alloy Eye
found in addition to the two pieces of rubber heel. Belt leather was represented by 16 fragments. An additional 22 unidentifiable pieces of leather were recovered; fourteen from Area One, and eight from Area Two.

Recreation and Status Consumption

This section involves those items dealing with tobacco consumption, games and toys, and personal possessions.

Tobacco Consumption

A total of 72 pipe fragments were recovered. The reed-stem variety was the most frequently found with 45 (62.5%) fragments. White pipe clay fragments were second with 18 fragments, while five local pipes were found. Four black ebonite/vulcanite stems were recovered as well (Table 6; see also Figure 22).

Reed-Stem Variety

Of the 45 reed-stem pipe fragments recovered, most (36) were unglazed (Table 7). These pipes were most likely manufactured in either the Akron, Ohio area, or in Pamplin Virginia.

In the 1850's, the area around Akron, Ohio was the pipe manufacturing center of the United States (Hamilton and Hamilton 1972:8). It is believed that the Pamplin Smoking Pipe and Manufacturing Company was established in 1878 by William Merrill of Akron, Ohio (Omwake 1967:23).

It has been suggested that mold marks appearing in the bowl indicate the place of manufacture (Murphy and Reich 1972:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Area One</th>
<th>Area Two</th>
<th>Area Three</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Pipe Clay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Stem Variety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebonite/Vulcanite</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6B  
Reed Stem Pipe Fragments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Area One Glazed</th>
<th>Area One Unglazed</th>
<th>Area Two Glazed</th>
<th>Area Two Unglazed</th>
<th>Area Three Glazed</th>
<th>Area Three Unglazed</th>
<th>Total Glazed</th>
<th>Total Unglazed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type K*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type G*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powhatan Original</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropomorphic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigwam Shaker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Bowl Fragments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Fragments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Types based on Hamilton and Hamilton (1972).
FIGURE 22
PIPE FRAGMENTS

A  White Pipe Clay
B-C  Reed Stem Variety
E-F
H-J
D&G  Ebonite/Vulcanite Stems
94). Of the 13 fragments with the stem to bowl joint, four of them exhibit these mold marks. One Type K (Hamilton and Hamilton 1972), exhibits a brown salt glaze and an "M" in the bottom of the bowl. This is reportedly from the Akron Smoking Pipe Company of Mogadore, Ohio. The three remaining pipes with mold marks; an unglazed Type G (Hamilton and Hamilton 1972), with an "X" in the bottom of the bowl, and unglazed Type G (Hamilton and Hamilton 1972), and a light brown unribbed and unglazed pipe, both the the "raised dot," all contained marks associated with the Pamplin Industry (Sudbury 1975:19-24).

Two of these reed stem pipes, red in color, have "ORIGINAL" impressed into their octagonally shaped stems. These were manufactured as late as the 1950's (Sudbury 1977). Anthroporphic features are found of two other pipes; one is a tan ribbed stem with a protruding face, possible that of an indian, while the other is a smaller gray ribbed pipe with possible side burns or hair remaining.

White Pipe Clay Pipes

Surprisingly few white pipe clay fragments were found in the three excavations. The ten stem fragments all had bore diameters that were 4/64". Two pipe fragments exhibited maker's marks; one had "DAVIDSON-GLASGOW" impressed into the stem, while the other had only part of the maker's mark left "ASPAR". The "DAVIDSON-GLASGOW" stem was manufactured in Glasgow Scotland, the most important center for pipe making in the nineteenth century (Walker 1971:23). This stem post
dates 1862 (Humphrey 1969:17-18). Nine of the ten fragments were recovered from Area Two, the one remaining from Area One. Eight bowl fragments with no identifiable characteristics were recovered.

Local Pipes

Pipe fragments of local manufacture were found. Five stems, one in Area One, and four in Area Two were recovered. All were of a thick coarse clay, predominantly red in color.

Ebonite/Vulcanite Pipes

Four ebonite or vulcanite pipe stems were recovered from Area One. The ends or bits of the mouthpieces exhibit two different orafices, wide and narrow. The wide holed bit has a flat and straight stem, while the narrow holed bit is bent. One of each type was found, and the remaining two were unidentifiable.

Games and Toys (Figure 23)

Dolls, marbles, and other toys were found in varying quantities. A total of eight porcelain doll fragments; two from Area One, three from Area Two, and three from Area Three. From Area Two, two earthenware doll fragments were recovered as well. While china and porcelain dolls have long been attributed to English Staffordshire potters, most of them were manufactured in Sonneburg, Germany. Dolls were made "moveable" by stitching cloth at the knees and elbows, and later by ball and socket joints or by stringing them with rubber or wires (Cole 1962:213). Many of the fragments
FIGURE 23

DOLL AND MARBLE FRAGMENTS
found were such appendages, and one shoulder fragment recovered, exhibited a socket type joint. Two doll fragments had their countries of origin impressed into them; one "GERM", and the other "NIP". All dolls brought into the United States after 1892 were required to have the exporting country on them (Cole 1962:213). One additional small white porcelain figure head was found in Area Two. It possibly belongs to a chessman, or small figurine.

Nine marbles made of clay, stone, and glass, were recovered; two pink and two light gray marbles in Area One; two stone marbles- one opaque brown, the other gray in Area Two; and three glass marbles including one hand made (Area Two), and two machine made (Area Two) were found (Randall 1971:102-105).

One copper alloy "wagon wheel," and one copper alloy toy axle were recovered in Area Three.

Personal Possessions (Figure 24)

Quite a few personal possessions were recovered from the excavations. Included are; two hair combs, one bone and the other plastic (Area One); a bone handle to a tooth brush (Area One); two jew's harps (Areas One and Two); a plastic eye glass frame (Area Two); one brass watch back (Area Two); two Indian Head pennies (1902- Area One; unidentifiable - Area One); a pocket knife (Area One); two metal bands to pencil erasers (Areas One and Two); the top of a cigarette lighter (Area Three); the lip/neck of a canteen (Area Three); and a copper alloy knob to a small box(?) (Area Two). One
FIGURE 24

PERSONAL POSSESSIONS

A Scissors
B Lip to a Canteen
C Jew's Harp
D Bone Handle
E Plastic Eyeglass Frame
F Indian Head Penny
G Fish Medallion
H Thimble
I Metal Joint of Pencil Eraser
J Stopper ? (Engraved)
unusual item recovered was a highly decorated engraved stopper (?), possibly to a cologne bottle. Cork is still remaining in the aperture

Ornamental items found include an iron brooch with mint leaves (Area Three), and several "medallions." One copper alloy coin (probably an Indian Head penny), was found with a hole punched through the middle of it (Area Two). This could possibly have been worn around the neck.

A copper alloy token with a hold drilled through the top, was most certainly worn (Area Three). The front had a bust and the words, "COL. JAMES FISK JR.," while the reverse exhibited a train and the words, "RELIEF FOR CHICAGO." James Fisk Jr. (1834-1872), was a financier in the United States. In 1867, Fisk, with the help of his business associates, managed to obtain the Erie Railroad from Cornelius Vanderbuilt. Upon becoming vice-president and comptroller of the railroad, Fisk used corporate funds to corrupt city, state, and federal officials. The climax brought about the gold conspiracy of 1869 and Black Friday. The token was probably struck in 1866, when Fisk wanted the Michigan Southern to give him the Chicago Terminal (Fuller 1928:121).

A surprisingly few number of beads were found. Only 17 beads composed of clay, glass, wood, and porcelain were recovered. Table 7 gives the breakdown according to composition, shape, color, and size. It is interesting to note that no more than two of the same bead were found.
TABLE 7
Beads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Area One</th>
<th>Area Two</th>
<th>Area Three</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink (1.7mm X 1.7mm)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Brown 6 Ribs (Oblong)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( .41mm X .49mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Beehive Shape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( .56mm X .78mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Opaque Rectangular Two Holes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.35mm X .5 mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed Bead - White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( .24mm X .37mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed Bead - Lavender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( .24mm X .37mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavily Faceted Hexagonal Black Bead</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White - Translucent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( .85mm X .67mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink/Orange Opaque</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.62mm X .69mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pale Blue Faceted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( .81mm X .75mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faceted (.6) Aqua Opaque</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( .55mm X .67mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Green Glass</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( .59mm X .34mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Translucent Stepped</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.72mm X 1.13mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>Area One</td>
<td>Area Two</td>
<td>Area Three</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cream Colored – 4 Sets of Overlapping Double Diamonds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Barrel Shaped</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1.64mm x .91mm)

(2.13mm x 2.13mm)
FIGURE 25

BEADS
While beads could have been used in necklaces, earrings, or embroidery work (Otto 1975:275), it seems strange that there are not more of each type. Possible, they were worn individually (Figure 25).

Farm/House Equipment and Vehicles

Items found that are involved with horse gear include; four harness or bridle rings (three from Area Two, and one from Area Three); one copper alloy horse boss (Area Two); and two horse shoes (one from Area Two, and one from Area Three). The keyhole appearance of the horse shoes suggest that they were used on mules.

General farm equipment includes: a broken plow share (Area Two); an ax (Area One), a hoe (Area One), and an iron pipe (Area One). A large hook was found in Area Two, and was customarily used to fasten an ox chain to a yoke (Maxie 1980:18). Many links of irregularly stretched chain were also found; five chains of varying lengths were recovered in Area Two, while two were found in Area Three. Large quantities of barbed wire were also collected. In the 124 fragments from Area One, the 189 in Area Two, and the 65 in Area Three, both hog and cattle barbed wire was recovered. Barbed wire for fencing cattle is two barbed and spaced at six inch intervals, while that for fencing hogs is spaced only three inches apart (Maxie 1980:18). A total of 33 washers, some with brass rivets, were recovered. These are similar to examples of vehicle parts (Watkins 1968:169-170). Several large pieces of highly corroded unidentifiable iron
was collected (eight from Area One, and five from Area Three). Their size suggests some type of heavy machinery.

Handicraft items found were: five and a half files (three from Area One, and two and a half from Area Two); a vice handle (Area Three); a wrench (Area Two), and; a crank (Area One).

Architectural Artifacts

Building Hardware

A total of 11,054 nails, ranging from wrought, to cut, to wire were recovered (2896 from Area One, 4899 from Area Two, and 3259 from Area Three). An estimated 92% of those found were of the cut with machine head variety, indicating that the structure was probably constructed after 1830 (Fontana 1962:54). Wire nails were an estimated 6%, while wrought comprised the remaining 2%. These were estimated percentages based on 10 bags of nails from representative areas of each of the three excavations. A total of 1587 nails were examined.

A total of 2440 window glass fragments were recovered. All were found in Area One.

Bolts and nuts were found (19 from Area One, eight from Area Two, and four from Area Three), as were screws (seven from Area One, and three from Area Two). Large nails (42 from Area One), spikes (ten in Area One, four in Area Two, and two in Area Three), and staples (88 in Area One, one in Area Two, and eleven in Area Three), were recovered.
Hinges include: broken strap hinges (one from Area One, and one from Area Two), and a broken iron hinge—possibly a portion of an "HL" hinge (Area Two). Hand forged strap hinges were employed through the middle of the nineteenth century, while the "HL" hinges were commonly used on large doors (Watkins 1968:165).

House Furnishings

Furniture hinges, escutcheons, keys, and other miscellaneous items were recovered. Included are, a hinge (25 mm X 50 mm) which probably belonged to a cabinet or small chest (Area Two); a smaller hinge probably for use on a small box (Area Two); a copper alloy key hole escutcheon (Area Two); four keys (one from Area One, and three from Area Two) which could have been used on chests or trunks, and; a copper alloy pulley, possibly from a clock (Area Two). A threaded wick cap for a kerosene lantern was found in Area Two. Oil lamps, due to the high cost of sperm whale oil, was considered a luxury, and most people relied on fireplaces and candles for their lighting (Otto 1975:150). Evidence of the use of candles was found as fragments of a candle holder were recovered from Area Two. Many large pieces of a cast iron stove were collected in Area One (9), and in Area Two (1). A cast iron handle from a skillet was found in Area One.

Miscellaneous Artifacts (Figure 26)

Evidence of firearms was found associated with the
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MISCELLANEOUS ARTIFACTS

A  Piece of Flint
B  Reworked Gun Flint (?)  
C  Shotgun Shell
D  .58 Caliber Paper Cartridge
E  .22 Caliber Shell
F  Percussion Cap
G  Ramrod Holder
structure in the form of flint and bullet fragments. Five pieces of flint (two in Area One, and three in Area Two) were recovered. Bullets and bullet casings found include: twenty .22 caliber shells (five in Area One, eleven in Area Two; and two in Area Three); twenty-six shotgun shell fragments (ten in Area One; fourteen in Area Two, and two in Area Three); two .58 caliber paper cartridge bullets, and one Williams Cleaner were found in Area One, and; one .52 caliber sharp (Area Two) was recovered as well. A few fragments of lead shot (three in Area One, and six in Area Two), were found. In addition, a copper alloy ramrod holder (Area Two), and three Maynard primer caps (one in Area One, and two in Area Two) were found (Smith 1980:13).

Aboriginal artifacts were recovered from the three excavations. A total of thirteen quartzite flakes were found (seven from Area One, and six from Area Two). One unusual, possibly aboriginal artifact, came from the Area Two excavations. It appears that the basal portion of a projectile point was reworked into a gun flint.

Summary of Artifact Analysis

Ceramic Artifacts

Otto suggests that it may be possible to use frequencies of transfer-printed and banded wares to predict social standing. Based on the Cannon Point (1781-1861) materials, he suggests that a high percentage of transfer-printed wares, and a low percentage of banded wares would indicate high social status; while a low percentage of transfer-
printed wares, and a high percentage of banded wares would indicate low social status (Otto 1974:219-220). Therefore, at this structure, one would expect to find high percentages of banded wares, and low percentages of transfer print. However, at the Area One, Two, and Three excavations, this was not the case. Instead, transfer printed earthenwares consisted 7.3% of the sample, while banded wares made up only 4% of the total.

In addition, the diversity in styles, types, designs, and even qualities of the ceramics recovered reflect the lower socio-economic status of the structures inhabitants. While they did possess dishes from sets, (i.e. transfer print and Canton), these dishes were 'odd' in that only one or two pieces from a set would be present. Many times planters would provide their slaves with pieces from broken or outmoded sets. This is possibly suggested in the variety of transfer print and/or the Canton forms present. Both transfer print and Canton are usually associated with a high economic status, and it is suggested that many of these are possibly discarded items from the planter. However, it also may be a result of the purchasing of individual dishes. George Miller (1974), found differences in purchasing patterns, with wealthier persons purchasing entire sets, while tenant farmers were buying dishes by the piece (Miller 1974:209).

By using Miller's categories (1980) strictly for descriptive purposes, it was determined that the highest
percentage of ceramics belonged to the Level One classification - undecorated earthenwares. Banded wares were found to be the most frequent type of the minimal decoration, Level Two sherds. Painted wares composed the lowest percentage of all levels. Transfer printing was the most common design technique found at the excavations, as well as the field survey. Finally, porcelains and stonewares were found in relatively high percentages.

Non-ceramic Artifacts

In the analysis of glass artifacts, Otto found that opaque dark green bottle fragments were more common at the slave site than at the planter or overseer sites (Otto 1975:285). Whether this is true at Shirley can not, as of yet be determined, as comparable material from the planter site has yet to be excavated. However, opaque dark green bottle glass was the third most frequently recovered type of bottle glass. The highest percentages of bottle glass found were clear or brown in color, and could have held a variety of liquids.

Many decorative glass artifacts, such as the cut glass carafe stopper and stemmed wine glass fragments, are usually associated with high status people. While glass medicine bottle fragments have been found in relative abundance at other slave sites (Otto 1975), few were recovered in these excavations.

Otto suggests that four or five hole bone and four hole iron buttons at early nineteenth century sites, may be
reflective of lower status occupants (Otto 1975:285). However, at these excavations, white glass and copper alloy buttons were the most frequently recovered, and might possibly reflect lower statuses in the mid-nineteenth to twentieth centuries.

In conclusion, the artifacts recovered tend to represent the lower socio-economic status of the occupants of the structure. Many artifacts possibly represent discards from the planter, and may contribute to the general heterogeneity of styles and qualities. However, the extent of the occupants reliance on the planter's discards can not be assessed until comparative excavations are conducted at the planter's site.

III. Faunal Analysis

Faunal remains ought to provide reliable information on the relative roles of wild and domestic animals in the diet (Otto 1975:289). A total of 501 bones or bone fragments were recovered from the Area One and Area Three excavations. The faunal remains from the two areas were analyzed together as one assemblage by Michael Barber. The faunal analysis of Area Two is currently being undertaken by Barber, and will be forthcoming. The following is a brief summary of Barber's findings from Area One and Two (Barber 1980a).

Of the 501 bones recovered, 148 elements (29.54%) were identified beyond class - usually to the species level. The mammalian populations were the most prevalent with 440
(87.8%) of the elements belonging to this class. Fifty-nine bird bones (11.78%) were found. The remaining bones were reptile (one), and fish (one). Species diversity indicates ten species of mammals, four species of birds, one species of reptile, and one species of fish (Barber 1980a:2).

Domestic species were most prevalent in the mammalian assemblage. Ox, swine, and sheep composed 105 of the 132 bones of this class. Barber reports that these three were the mainstay of American meat on the nineteenth to twentieth centuries. However, sheep was later supplanted by chicken (Barber 1980a:2).

Beef only comprised 2.03% (three elements) of the total. While this could be indicative of a small sample size, it may also be representative of the occupants inability to obtain high value beef. The animal recovered was older than three to four years, which suggests its primary function as a draft power or dairy animal. Only after its live energy output was lost did it provide meat for the occupants (Barber 1980:2-3).

Swine bones numbered 89 elements (60.13%), representing the most prevalent type of animal recovered. Elements from all parts of the body suggest that swine was raised and butchered on the site. The quantity of bones found further indicate that it was probably the primary meat consumed by the structure's inhabitants (Barber 1980a:3). Pork was supposedly the primary meat of the slave diet (Fogel and Engerman 1972:110-111).

Sheep was another important domesticated animal. Re-
covered, were 13 elements, with ten of those being from the head area—possibly a result of differential preservation and small sample size (Barber 1980a:3).

Seven species of wild mammal were found as well. Beaver (one element), woodchuck (four elements), muskrat (one element), rabbit (five elements), squirrel (two elements), opossum (13 elements), and rat were recovered. All are game animals, with the exception of the rat, and can be hunted in the area. While the opossum was the most frequently recovered, it is only active at night, and would suggest night hunting in the off duty hours for the structures occupants (Barber 1980a:3-4).

In the Aves species, chicken (9 elements) was most frequently found. Turkey (two elements), goose (one element), and passenger pigeon (one element) were also recovered. One vertebrae from a non-poisonous snake represents the reptiles, while the plate of a common sturgeon was the only fish element collected (Barber 1980a:4).

Barber concluded that, of the 16 species collected, 14 were food items. Mammals were the most popular, with swine the leading animal collected. The most prevalent game animal was opossum. This, coupled with the absence of high value beef, reflects the inhabitants lower socio-economic status (Barber 1980a:4-5; Barber 1980b:4-5).

IV. Artifact Distribution

In order to discover the location of doorways and other aperatures of the excavated structure, the distributions of
ceramics and window glass were plotted (Figure 27). Window glass recovered from the Area One excavations were recorded. Of the 2440 fragments found, 2278 (93.3%) were collected on the northern half of the structure. In particular, squares 200 A and B (1866 fragments), 200 G and H (168 fragments), and 200 N and P (118 fragments), were the locations of significant concentrations of window glass.

Ceramic distributions for all three excavated areas were plotted. However, for the purpose of this study, only the Area One and Area Two distributions are relevant. As can be seen (Figure 29), the northern side again exhibits large quantities, especially in squares 200 A, G, and N. On the southern side, 100 X 200 D, K, R, and X have relatively few sherds. This is probably a result of differential excavation, as the squares were excavated to different depths. All of the squares excavated (excluding 100 H, and K), in Area Two were taken down to subsoil.

Based on the window glass and ceramic distributions, it can be suggested that apertures of some kind were located at 200 A-B, 200 G-H, and 200 N-P on the northern side; and 200 C-D on the southern side. As window glass is not present on the southern side, it is suggested that this aperture might have been a doorway. The large quantity of window glass on the northern side suggests the presence of windows at 200 A-B and 200 N-P. Possibly a doorway existed at 200 G-H.
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V. Architectural Comparisons

In summary, the structure excavated was a cabin of sill and pier construction, consisting of wooden sills resting on brick piers. The spacing of the piers at 10 feet, indicate a 20 X 40 foot structure. The central chimney is of red brick and Portland cement construction. The visible roofline shadow reflects its story and a half height. Window glass found in and around the structure attests to the presence of windows. Wood fragments found suggest plank flooring, while the pieces of corrugated tin are possible indicative of a tin roof.

As was stated earlier a secondary documentary source reveals that a total of "...nine double slave cabins..." were constructed sometime after 1843 (Phillips 1963:232). However, on the basis of the archaeology I would suggest an 1850-1858 date of construction. The location of seven of these structures was ascertained from a map - those oriented linearly in Field Seven. The two additional cabins were not on this map.

During the summer of 1979, a structure hidden in the foliage along the road to Shirley Plantation, was brought to my attention by Edward Ayres (Figure 4). While this cabin is not on current Shirley property, it was in the nineteenth century. It is proposed that this is one of the two "undiscovered" standardized double slave cabins. The structure has been examined and analyzed by Edward Chappell, the Director of Architectural Research at Colonial
Williamsburg, and by Denise Jones, a graduate student at the University of Pennsylvania. The following, is a summary of Chappell's (personal communication), and Jones's (1980) findings. This cabin will be used as a standing analogy of the structure excavated. Thus, many of the conclusions drawn in the following chapter will be based on this structure.

The plan of the standing structure (Figure 28), shows a two room structure with central chimney. Measurements of the piers indicate a 20.2 X 40.4 foot structure. Each living unit is 20.2 X 20.2 feet. Two piercings are located on the south side, one door per room, while the northern facade exhibits a central door and two windows, located in the center of each room. There are two central windows, located on both gable ends, with one situated directly above the other (Figure 29; Jones 1980:5).

A solid interior wall is present from the chimney to the southern wall. However, the central positioning of the door on the northern facade, prevented the same treatment on the other side of the chimney. Instead, a board and batten wall from the corner of the chimney angling outward to the first studs on either side of the door, created a lobby entrance (Jones 1980:7). Chappell (personal communication) remarked that this "lobby entrance" would indicate the front of the house, as it prevented visitors from entering directly into the living areas. These board and batten doors also provide the only internal access from room to room. In the loft area, a single wall bisects the house,
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and there is no evidence of connecting doorways between the upper floor rooms (Jones 1980:7).

Exterior walls consist of two sets of sheathing: an interior layer of flat boards nailed flush to the wall studs, and an outer layer of clapboards, identified by Chappell (personal communication) as "common agricultural siding." This is opposed to domestic siding commonly employed on domestic structures. The interior framing is exposed, and at one time was whitewashed (Jones 1980:14).

The nails in the outer wall are, for the most part, square cut nails, with machine cut heads. Wire nails are apparent in places. The hinges, probably not original, are square hinges of the modern variety. Strap hinges similar to those on barns and outbuildings, support the partition door as well as one door on the southern facade. No locks are present as wooden handles are all that remain on the exterior doors (Jones 1980:14).

The chimney is 63 inches in width, and 42.5 inches in depth. It rises five and a half feet straight up, and narrows to a set of three tiers, each one a brick high. Just above the attic floor, the flue is cut back in its depth by four inches on each side. The hearth measures 36 inches in width, 16 inches in depth, and has a total area of 576 square inches (Jones 1980:9).

A second examination of the structure by Chappell revealed different phases of development. In the mid-nineteenth century, the structure was a two unit house with
separate doorways facing away from the now present road. No doorways existed in either the first or second floor partitions (Figure 30). The framing was exposed and whitewashed. After the Civil War, the structure was converted into a single family living unit. Chappell feels this change from a two family dwelling to a one family living unit, is reflective of changing labor conditions, as tenant farmers replaced slaves. The northern partition was removed, and a doorway was cut into the new front wall. A lobby entrance, constructed with board and batten walls was then set up. The left stair was cased, while the left doorway was converted to a window. This window was later changed back into a door. New weatherboards covered the original exterior sheathing. In the twentieth century, the cabin was converted into a hay barn. The siding was removed from the upper rear wall, and an open manger and shed was added in the rear (Edward Chappell, personal communication).

The structure exhibits many irregularities. Jones concluded that due to the variety in spacing between the studs and joists, the irregular widths of the wall and floor boards, the dimensions of the piercings, and the location of the framing members, measurements were judged by eye. As long as they were close enough to be functional and achieve visual symmetry they were fine. Jones states, "The carpenter simply converted a concept of a living space, namely two square rooms of a general size sharing a central chimney, and made it a reality" (Jones 1980:13).
1. two room structure
2. interior wall removed
3. lobby entrance
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More importantly, Jones further remarks that this floor-plan was present in non-plantation regions inhabited by white small land owners (Jones 1980:13; Glassie 1968:78-79). Double pen houses were often used in the Virginia Tidewater region as slave cabins, and it has been suggested that the central chimney form may closely follow patterns of black settlement (Wilson 1975:74; Jones 1980:13). Because Virginia planters housed their slaves in house types that were commonly occupied by poor whites, it served to reflect their economic, social, and political dominance over the entire population (Jones 1980:13).

The artifact distributions previously discussed were superimposed over the standing cabin (Figure 31). The distributions suggest that this probably was one of the nine cabins built after 1843. The locations of window glass etc. suggests that the standing and excavated structure had the same orientation. Two windows and a central door were located on the northern facade, while two doors were present on the southern side- offset toward the gable ends. If this orientation is correct then the front (lobby entrance) of the excavated cabin was oriented away from the then existing road. The ramifications of this are discussed in the next chapter.
FIGURE 31
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Chapter Four
Summary and Conclusions

I. Documentary and Archaeological Evidence of Social Relationships

In review, the two primary questions posed in this thesis are: 1) Are historically defined social relationships derivable from the material culture obtained by historical archaeological means, and 2) If so, how? If not, why? Other questions were asked regarding the transformation from one social relationship to another, and its reflection in material culture. These are all attempted to be answered in this chapter.

Based on the documentary and archaeological evidence from this particular site, it appears that historically defined social relationships are suggested in the material culture. The two data bases, however, tend to emphasize different aspects of these relationships.

While it is known that slavery originated under a purely compulsory relationship, plantation records emphasize a more familistic relationship between master and slave. These are indicated in the paternalistic attitudes and statements conveyed and written in the farm journals. Hill Carter's consistent use of the terms "negroe" or "people," as opposed to "slave" suggest their human status, rather
than property status. In addition, Hill Carter's slaves are never classified with the farm animals in the food or grain allotments--and are even allowed to "own" pigs and gardens, which further serves to reinforce their human characteristics. Food, clothing, and shelter are provided, and precautions taken (vaccinations) to ensure their good health. Thus, most of the "surface documentary" material reflects the paternally familialistic qualities that existed on the plantation between master and slave.

The tenant farmer/owner relationship arose under contractual terms, but again tends to take on familialistic qualities in the documentation. Both black and white tenant farmers were living in the former slave cabins, receiving provisions such as cash, corn, coffee, meal, oil, and various sundries. It is even suggested that the same people were involved, as former slaves returned to the plantation as tenant farmers. Overall, there appears to be a paternalistic attitude throughout the documentation.

The archaeological evidence on the other hand, tends to emphasize the pseudo-familistic (compulsory) aspects of the slave/master relationship. Familistic attitudes are reflected in the evidence that Carter was in fact furnishing provisions. A closer inspection, however, reveals exactly what was provided.

The archaeology indicates that Hill Carter housed his slaves in standardized 20' X 40' sill and pier frame structures. Each family resided in one half of the cabin (a 20'
X 20' living area). From the standing cabin, it is evident that common agricultural siding was used as opposed to domestic siding (Edward Chappell, personal communication). Jones (1980:13), noted that the piercings had been set by eye to achieve functional and visual symmetry. Poor construction materials and workmanship were frequently employed on these types of cabins and stress their temporary nature (Otto 1975:133).

While the planter/owner provide some ceramic, glass, and metal items, the archaeology reveals that many of these might have been discards from the planter. While the diversity of patterns in the transfer prints could have been a result of the purchasing of individual pieces, the Canton was known to have been purchased by the planter in sets. The relatively high percentage of these and other high status items, suggest that these might have gradually filtered down from the planter/owner to the occupants.

The documentary evidence indicates food was provided for both slave and tenant farmer, but the archaeology reveals that it was not the only source of subsistence. It is apparent, based on the faunal analysis, that the hunting and collecting of wild resources provided a substantial supplement for the occupants diets. Beavers, woodchuck, muskrat, rabbit, squirrel, and opossum were all exploited in addition to the provisioned beef and pork (Barber 1980b).

To answer the secondary question of the transformation from slave (compulsory) to tenant farmer (contractual), and
whether it is reflected in the material culture, again we see that it is suggested. The change is evident in the documentary data as it is stated that the transformation from slave to tenant farmer occurred. The archaeology also tends to reflect the transition. Edward Chappell suggested that the transformation of the two family slave cabin into a one family living unit reflects the changing labor conditions.

II. Paternalism and Dehumanization

Because the historical documentation tends to stress familistic qualities through the paternalistic attitudes afforded the slave by the master and the tenant by the owner, it is necessary to take a closer look at paternalism to determine whether it really is familistic in nature.

Paternalism is a topic that has been dealt with extensively by historians. Genovese (1972:6) states that in any historical setting, paternalism defines relations of superordination and subordination. Regarding slavery paternalism had little to do with the master's good will. Instead, it was a result of the necessity to discipline and morally justify the oppression and exploitation inherent in slavery. Although paternalism encouraged affection and kindness, it also promoted cruelty and hatred (Genovese 1972:3-4).

After the closing of the African slave trade in 1808, paternalism once again became popular as masters had to concentrate on the reproduction of their own labor force
(Genovese 1972:5). As a result, slaves appreciated in value and more care was afforded than commercial consideration would have justified (David et al. 1976:354).

A give and take relationship arising out of the mutual obligations, duties, and responsibilities, implicitly recognized the slaves humanity (Genovese 1972:5). Slaves developed their most powerful defense against the dehumanization inherent in slavery by accepting a paternalistic belief and accepting class rule (Genovese 1972:7). However, dehumanization existed and served to separate the master/owner from his labor force.

Dehumanization creates a value system for people and serves to maintain social boundaries (Nathan Altshuler, personal communication). The historical documentation attests to the presence of dehumanization. Comments such as, "broken down women and men" emphasize their machine-like status. It is manifested archaeologically in the possible orientation of the house away from the road, as well as in the use of agricultural siding. Hannah Arendt (1958:38) stated that the only way to be a person is in public. By orienting the house away from the road, the occupants were not considered to be "in public," and therefore, not human. This is further reinforced by the use of agricultural siding—commonly employed in farm structures and outbuildings—representing a "glorified farm pen." Specific artifacts suggest that the occupants were possibly receiving discards that were not considered acceptable at the main house.
As was stated previously, a compulsory relationship, by definition, relegates the opposing party to a negative value, and considers each other an instrument—the slave/tenant farmer an instrument of utility, and the master/owner, an instrument of oppression (Sorokin 1957:450). So, it appears that some of these relationships are suggested in the material culture.

Ruth Benedict sums up dehumanization best:

...one of the earliest human distinctions, the difference in kind between 'my own' closed group and the outsider...Outside the closed group there are no human beings. And this, in spite of the fact that from an objective point of view each tribe is surrounded by peoples sharing in its arts and material inventions, in elaborate practices that have grown up by a mutual give and take of behavior from one people to another (Benedict 1934:7).

Masters and slaves each tried to disguise the full degree of their mutual dependence (David et al. 1976:353).

Paternalism did not end with the abolishment of slavery. Following the Civil War, Black Codes were instituted by eight of the southern states which afforded the blacks little freedom. Many times free in name only, the apprentice, vagrancy, and other provisions of the Code forced blacks into positions where they would once again be under the control of their former masters—or for that matter, any white man who was ready to exploit their labor (Myrdal 1962:228). As can be seen from the documentary evidence, this was probably the case at Shirley, as slaves returned to become tenant farmers. Therefore, many tenant/owner relationships did not originate under purely contractual
terms - but instead, under pseudo-contractual (compulsory) terms.

This compulsory relationship was further enhanced through debt peonage, "...a condition of compulsory service based on the indebtedness of the laborer to his employer" (Myrdal 1962:228). If losses run high at the end of the year and the tenant farmer finds himself indebted to the planter, then the planter is allowed to claim any assets of the tenant farmer in order to cover the debt. Because the tenant has to live on credit much of the year, and because he receives the "advancing" of food, clothing, and other necessities, he becomes entrapped in the vicious circle (Myrdal 1962:246).

It has been said that the plantation tenant farmer is the problem of an antiquated paternalistic labor institution in a region whose economic life is historically derived from slavery and, psychologically is rooted in the minds of the people (Myrdal 1962:221 & 245). This pattern of common exploitation, where everyone oppresses the one under him, is a slavery system - be it pure, or modified, as in the case of the tenant farmer (Myrdal 1962:221). In fact, it has been suggested that the plantation system, regardless of its labor force, fails to meet social and economic efficiency and justice (Myrdal 1962:249).

Therefore, a closer examination of paternalism reveals its compulsory nature, and indicates that the documentary evidence does suggest the compulsory aspects of the master/
slave and owner/tenant farmer relationship. However, as the
documents were predominantly from the planters viewpoint, his
care for the slaves abounds--masking the fact that paternalism signals a compulsory relationship. The archaeology
provides a different, but by no means more complete orientation and viewpoint, as it contains its own set of biases. As
can be seen, both are needed to provide an overall picture.

III. The Theoretical Model

By using the theoretical model from sociology, the
method of social archaeology, and the data of historical
archaeology, it has been possible to demonstrate some of
the interrelationships among beliefs, behavior, and material
culture. Moreover, it has shown that at least in some
cases, historically defined social relationships are sug-
gested in material culture. This study has further served
to point out that the different medias of material culture,
(in this case documentary and archaeological), each reflect
and emphasize different aspects. Therefore, each must be
fully considered, separately and in conjunction, to obtain
a better understanding. This examination intends to aid in
expanding the range of information derivable from material
culture.

Now that the hypothesis has been suggested, it is
offered for further testing and consideration. In addition,
archeologists working on prehistoric sites ought to be able
to suggest possible social relationships based on settlement
patterns, and the diversity of artifact styles, types,
This thesis has stressed the importance of material culture and how it affects and reflects our daily lives. The different medias of material culture need to be examined as all can contribute different types of information. No matter how insignificant that information is, it serves to make the picture more complete. If enough insight into the past and present can be obtained, then predictive models can be set up and tested to determine the best course of action in the future.
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