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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this work is to examine material culture recovered from the Charles A. Gilliam site, 44Pg317, within an interpretive, contextual framework. The site represents the remains of a middling farmstead which was owned and occupied by Charles Gilliam, a free African American, and his heirs from ca. 1823 to 1917. This study concentrates on the period 1823-1865 when Charles lived at the site.

Ceramics recovered from the site, and the information provided by the architectural remains are interpreted vis-a-vis the use of historical documents and official records pertaining directly to the Gilliams and other antebellum free African Americans. Nineteenth century photographs are used much as period diaries have been used by other archaeologists to help provide an interpretive context for the architectural remains discovered at the site.

Examination of the ceramics indicated that Charles Gilliam participated in activities that would be expected of a middling farmer. His ethnicity was not reflected in either the ceramics assemblage or the activities which could be inferred from the assemblage. The unfashionable exterior appearance of his house, however, suggests that at least in those parts of Charles' daily life that would have been available for public scrutiny, he was careful to show a face which expressed his differences from his white neighbors.

The differences between the public and private faces which are suggested by the ceramics and the architecture are examined within the antebellum context in which free African Americans were subject to increasing legal and social restraints on activities such as display of material objects which whites considered to be the province of their own power and place within the social structure.
FREE AFRICAN-AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY: INTERPRETING AN ANTEBELLUM FARMSTEAD
INTRODUCTION

During the past 20 years, the number of archaeologists studying sites occupied by African Americans has greatly increased. Like historians before them, archaeologists have found that this subject offers opportunities to pursue increasingly complex themes. For historical archaeologists, those themes range from the desire to "plug the gaps" left in the historic record to attempts to examine the ways in which people living in pluralistic societies maintain a sense of identity while interacting on a day-to-day basis. The focus of this thesis is somewhere in between, a middle ground of sorts which attempts to tie the material and documentary records into each other to produce a "thick description" using methods which are the special domain of historical archaeology (Deetz 1977, Raab and Goodyear 1984, Geertz 1973). To that end, traditional analytical techniques are used not to establish normative patterns, but to examine the ways in which the material being studied differs from that which has been analyzed and presented by other archaeologists. For, as Geertz said more than thirty years ago, "If we are to discriminate what is really essential and characteristic in Balinese village organization we need to take a somewhat different tack and conceptualize that organization not in terms of invariance...but rather in terms of the range of overt structure which it is possible to generate out of a fixed set of elemental components. Form, in this view, is not a fundamental constancy amid distracting and adventitious
variation, but rather a set of limits within which variation is contained..." (Geertz 1959: p. 1010)

Standard tools of analysis are seen here as having value because they provide a starting point from which numerous sites can be examined for differences which require explanation. In this case, the explanation is replaced by interpretation as processual tools are used in "post-processual" (Hodder 1986) ways to examine individual or small-group action within the framework of a larger, pluralistic society.

The focus of this thesis is twofold. First, it shows how an interpretive framework can be used to extend the observations which standard tools of analysis provide, therefore contributing to the larger study of ethnicity as formulated by anthropologists. Secondly, this thesis constitutes an examination of some of the data recovered from an archaeological site in Prince George County, Virginia which was occupied by a single family for almost 100 years (Fig. 1). A contextual approach is used to examine the material culture left by the Charles Gilliam family and the official documentary record left about them in order to examine ways in which one family participated in and coped with the larger, potentially hostile, world which surrounded them (Hodder 1986).

A note about organization is in order here. Methods which are often thought to be the domain of processual archaeology are used in this thesis to provide a starting point towards interpretation, but not to discuss process. Since traditional historiographic and archaeological
Figure 1: Map of Virginia Showing the Location of the Charles Gilliam Site in Prince George County
methods of analysis which were developed during the height of the processual, scientific, movement in each field are being used in untraditional ways, the author decided that it would be best to discuss the methods used, present the results of the analyses, and present a short discussion/interpretive section all within each of the two chapters (Chapters Four and Five) which deal with data presentation. Chapter Four compares the Charles A. Gilliam ceramics assemblage with ceramics assemblages recovered from other 19th century sites and provides a contextual interpretation of the Gilliam assemblage. Chapter Five uses 19th century photographs as sensitive, diary-like, data which help to interpret the contextual meaning of the wooden chimney on the Charles A. Gilliam house. These two chapters reveal differences in the two faces, one public and one more private which Charles Gilliam presented to his fellow Prince Georgians.

\[1\] The post bellum history and archaeology of the site tells the story of Charles Gilliam's daughter, Susan, and is beyond the scope of this thesis. Susan's occupation of the site has been partially interpreted in an earlier paper (Ryder 1991). For completeness, data concerning Susan Gilliam's ceramics assemblage are included in the tables presented in Chapter 4, as well as in the minimum vessel catalogue presented as Appendix 1. Archaeological investigations indicated that no major alterations were made to the house and farmstead during Susan's lifetime and it appears that Susan continued to cook her meals on the hearth of the old wooden chimney until her death in 1917 (Ryder and Schwarz 1990).
The final chapter, Chapter Six, contains a brief summary and examination of the interpretations presented in the previous chapters, provides a discussion of the benefits of the approaches used and suggests directions for further research in which the special data bases and techniques of historical archaeology can contribute to anthropological studies of ethnicity.
CHAPTER 1

HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDIES OF ETHNICITY: A REVIEW

Archaeological research on ethnicity often focuses on the larger problems of acculturation and/or assimilation. However, such foci often proceed from the point of view that there is a loss of the traditional traits which define the ethnic group (often conceived as a minority, nondominant group) being studied. Even using Redfield et al.'s (1936) definition of acculturation in which the process is seen as allowing for change to be two-way so that either one or both groups are changed by the continuous contact, the implication is often one which involves the loss of identity for one or both groups (see for example, Howson 1990: pp. 81-82). For example, historical, archaeological and linguistic studies of African Americans in the United States have often focussed on the search for surviving "Africanisms". These may appear in music, such as the call and response song pattern; in language, as in Gullah; in foodways; and in architecture as in type of construction, 12' rather than 16' unit size and the presence of root cellars (Blassingame 1972, Joyner 1984, Otto 1977 and 1980, Deetz 1977, Kelso 1984, Vlach 1978).
Ethnicity studies often embed a number of related assumptions: 1. that the ethnic group being studied will become more like the dominant group over time with the material culture record reflecting this through increasing percentages of objects that can be attributed to the dominant culture and a corresponding decrease in the proportion of objects that are clearly part of the "original" culture, 2. that similarity of material culture is reflective of amount of interaction, 3. that cultural tradition is the primary element of ethnic group behavior and 4. that the ethnic group is passive (Hodder 1979, McKee 1987, Hall 1990). McGuire (1983) has pointed out a situation in which such assumptions could cause misidentification of an occupant's ethnicity; while Hodder (1979) has effectively demonstrated the "...inadequacy of the assumption that similarity in material culture reflects degrees of contact and interaction." The assumption that the ethnic minority plays a passive role within the social system makes it difficult to address the symbolic potential of material culture or the possibility that objects produced by the dominant group can be used in ways which are reflective of ethnic behaviors, including self-definition in opposition to other groups and resistance to loss of identity within the larger structure (Hodder 1979). Other limitations of this approach include lack of recognition of the dominant group as an ethnic group; an inherent assumption that change in material culture can be equated with loss of or change of ethnic identity; and the evidence available from modern plural societies in which ethnic groups interact daily yet maintain ethnic identity, expressing it in a variety of ways which are situational and often involve the use of non-traditional material culture (Praetzellis,
Recognition of these limitations led Barth (1969) to redefine ethnicity as a categorical ascriptive group that

"classifies a person in terms of his basic, most general identity, presumptively determined by his origin and background. To the extent that actors use ethnic identities to categorize themselves and others for the purpose of interaction, they form ethnic groups in this organizational sense." (Barth 1969:13).

Barth went on to suggest that anthropologists should focus on those aspects of ethnicity that relate to between-group relationships and the explanation of the formation, stabilization and maintenance of ethnic boundaries through time as well as how and why they change or disintegrate. It has been argued that archaeologists cannot directly observe beliefs, values and actions (Binford 1962 and 1965), and this point holds true for observation of behaviors such as ethnic boundary-maintenance. However, Hodder (1979: 452) has resolved this dilemma by suggesting that ethnicity is a "mechanism by which interest groups use culture to symbolize their within-group organization in opposition to and in competition with other interest groups." Since material culture is contextually conditioned and subject to both individual and group manipulation and interpretation, then material culture is not a passive reflection of society. Individuals and groups "use a variety of means, including material cultural symbolism, to create new roles, to redefine existing ones and to deny the existence of others" (Hodder 1986:}
p. 8). Since material culture can be used to express ethnic boundary
maintenance and transformation, these subjects can be studied
archaeologically when a contextual approach that examines variability
as well as similarity is applied.

McGuire (1982) has suggested that if historical archaeologists are to
contribute to the study of ethnicity then they should move beyond
simple studies of the material correlates of ethnicity to a focus on the
emergence, stabilization and change in ethnic boundaries and, since
material symbols of ethnicity are not likely to occur in the
archaeological record due to a number of factors such as scarcity within
a cultural inventory, long use lives, and lack of preservation, the
archaeologist must seek the "material correlates of ethnically specific
behaviors" (McGuire 1982:163). Furthermore, he suggests that the
domain of the historical archaeologist which allows for the
examination of two sets of data, the documentary and the material,
offers a special advantage in the study of ethnic boundary maintenance
by being able to offer time depth to such studies, so that relationships of
different ethnic groups can be examined through time.

As McGuire (1982) points out, archaeologists studying African-
American sites have tended to focus on food remains, ceramics and
architecture as potential material culture markers of ethnicity and a
number of studies have tentatively identified differences in the
material culture pattern found on 19th century African-American sites
from that found on 19th century white sites (e.g. Otto 1977 and 1980,
Deetz 1977, Ferguson 1980, Baker 1978 and 1980). However, for all of these studies, documentary evidence was used to hold ethnicity as a constant, and Otto (1980) pointed out that it is presently difficult to determine whether or not observed differences in material culture truly represent ethnicity or ethnic behaviors or are a result of the low economic status of the African Americans who occupied the sites. Baker (1980) has suggested that the remedy for this situation is to study sites occupied by whites of low economic status. Otto (1980:4) strongly states that for the most part ethnicity of the site's occupants is better determined through documentary research than through material culture studies.

As noted most recently by Singleton, most historical archaeologists have conducted studies of African-American sites which attempt to fill gaps within the documentary record by looking for surviving Africanisms and/or concentrating on detecting information concerning the day-to-day lives of slaves (Singleton 1988). These studies have shown a number of interesting trends which seem to be correlated with ethnicity and social, economic or legal status. For example, at Cannon's Point, the comparison of the faunal assemblages recovered from planter, slave and overseer sites indicated that slaves were more dependant on wild species to supplement their diets than were either the overseers or the planters (Otto 1977). Otto suggested that this reliance on wild sources of meat was a dietary necessity due to the poor quality of the food supplied to slaves on the plantation and interpreted this as a function of racial/legal status. This correlation between
heavier dependance on wild sources of meat and slaves has been observed in other studies (e.g. McKee 1987). At Cannon's Point, Otto also noted that both the slave and overseer faunal assemblages contained bones which were cleaved open and stewed. Saw marks which would indicate that meat was divided into joints or portions in preparation for roasting were absent from the faunal assemblages of both slave and overseer sites. Instead, the bones of large animals which were recovered from these sites had axe and knife marks, indicating that the meat was not divided into regular portions, and that it had been stewed. This pattern was interpreted to mean that slaves and overseers had less free time which could be used for food preparation and therefore needed to rely on more "one-pot" meals which could be quickly put together and then left untended (Otto 1977).

Although the observed correlations described above constitute an important contribution to an understanding of the day-to-day existence of African-American slaves, which is not always easily accessible in the documentary record, such studies often do not address the use of material culture as a manipulable set of symbols which reflect ethnic behaviors including self-definition in opposition to other groups. By broadening the data base to include documentary and other material cultural evidence such as that provided by ceramics analyses focussing on form, decorative style and spending patterns it becomes possible to address this issue. For example, following Chang's (1977) reference to the use of food as a social language in Chinese culture, Praetzellis, Praetzellis and Brown (1987) describe a dinner held by some of
Sacramento's Chinese merchants in which the traditional Chinese elements were mingled with items of Euroamerican culture:

An account of the annual dinner held by some of I street's Chinese merchants will serve to illustrate the relationship fostered by the merchants with influential outsiders. The dinner took place in a room behind a store, set out with Chinese paintings, sculptures, and hangings. The table was set with a cloth, knives, forks, and celery in glasses "very much like ordinary tables." The correspondent [from the Sacramento Daily Bee] had hoped for the pleasure of eating with chopsticks, but there were none to be seen. Twenty-six courses, including birds' nests, were served. Champagne was brought on several times, and "the brands were all different and all first class" (Praetzellis, Praetzellis and Brown 1987:46)

Their explanation of this display places the foodways in evidence not in an economic or ecological context, but rather in one in which the object is advancement of the merchants' interests through a subtle use of foodways:

The Sacramento banquet was evidently considered an important occasion and was part of a long-standing Chinese tradition. In this case, the ostentatious display of ethnicity in artifacts and food was subtly combined with innovations such as champagne and silverware to create the desired impression among the American guests. The dinner ritual communicated that, although Chinatown was alien and unknowable to outsiders, it was under the sway of a class of people who apparently shared some American values. (Praetzellis, Praetzellis and Brown 1987:46)

This analysis, prompted by the discovery of imported English ceramics and bottles in the archaeological assemblage of Chinese merchants, is derived from documentary sources, still, it provides a dynamic example
of manipulation of both traditional and non-traditional material
culture in facilitating interaction between two different ethnic groups
while at the same time reinforcing the identities of each group. Such
detailed descriptions of events are rarely available within the
documentary record. The challenge for the historical archaeologist is to
find ways in which the material recovered from an archaeological site
and the documentary record can be studied as complementary data sets
which can examine this issue (Deetz 1977, Hodder 1986, Hall 1990). In
order to do so, analysis needs to be placed in a framework which
recognizes that material culture can operate as symbol or text containing
multiple meanings which are capable of being manipulated. The
documentary record is seen as a separate data base also capable of
containing multiple, manipulable meanings. When viewed in this
way, the historical archaeologist is able to read back and forth between
the two data bases. The variability between what each says or doesn't
say is examined. In this way each significantly extends the
interpretation of the other by illuminating embedded but unvoiced
meanings.

For example, Martin Hall (1990) has attempted to do this by comparing
historical accounts of foodways at the Cape of Good Hope with faunal
remains recovered from assemblages attributed to officers and those
attributed to slaves at Cape Town's Castle:

Again, Mentzel [who lived at the Cape and for 8 years was a
tutor to children of prominent colonists, wrote the memoirs
referred to here some 40 years after leaving the Cape] betrays
his consciousness of the "low-Other" by contradicting himself.
On the one hand, he describes the "vast quantities of fish" that are caught from small boats with dragnets at night and which are used as food for slaves. But on the other hand, he states baldly that few fish are available to relieve the tedium of mutton.

Read in conjunction with the archaeology of the Castle, Mentzel's text interprets the fish assemblage, and the fish assemblage interprets Mentzel's text. For although the fare on the officers' table contains - in the common shoal fish - the fare of the slave doss-house...differentiation is achieved by the small quantities of game fish only obtainable by line from the Indian Ocean, on the opposite side of the peninsula from Cape Town... which, together, make up about a fifth of the assemblage from the officers' kitchen, but which were not found at all in the Grain Store [slave assemblage]. Indeed, at one point in his text, Mentzel only recognizes such species...

(p. 25)

Mentzel's failure to mention the shoal fish which were fed to slaves instead of mutton is seen as indicative of the type of culinary differentiation which helped to separate and therefore define the officers and slaves in relation to each other.

Although there are 19th c. sites for which no documentary evidence exists and where identification of the ethnicity or socio-economic status of the occupants is dependant on the materials recovered from the archaeological record, for the most part it is possible to establish ethnicity and/or economic and social status from the documentary record. Those studies which go beyond attempts to establish basic correlations of material culture and ethnicity or socio-economic status and attempt to examine the ways in which ethnic groups interact via material culture have the greater potential for contributing to the anthropological study of ethnicity.
This thesis uses data recovered from 44Pg317, the Gilliam site, and various documentary records to examine the way in which one family used material culture to negotiate their way within an extraordinary social situation during the antebellum era.
CHAPTER 2

FREE AFRICAN-AMERICANS IN THE ANTEBELLUM SOUTH

As free African Americans living in the antebellum south, the Charles Gilliam family found themselves in a situation that has been variously characterized as anomalous, anachronous and ambiguous. As exceptions to the social order, one where racial slavery was the norm, the existence of a population of free African Americans in the south during the antebellum era was often perceived to be a threat to the stability of the status quo (Schwarz 1987, Parish 1989, Johnson and Roarke 1984, Berlin 1974, Ryder 1990).

Berlin (1974) argues strongly that during the antebellum period the free African-American population was viewed as a threat by the majority of white southerners who supported the system. This threat operated on several levels. The most obvious was that free African Americans were thought to be potential inciters of slave insurrections such as Gabriel's Plot of 1800 and Nat Turner's Revolt of 1831. At yet another level, the rationalization that African Americans were incapable of participating in society without the benefit of white discipline in the form of slavery was directly contradicted by the presence of materially successful free African Americans. Perhaps the most threatening level, however, was the potential undermining of white control if African Americans were
granted a semblance of equality with whites. Free African Americans were a direct contradiction of the ideology which supported the power relations in effect under the system of racial slavery, especially since they could be viewed as directly competing with whites for jobs in skilled and unskilled categories (Berlin 1974, Johnson and Roarke 1984, Parish 1989, Schwarz 1987).

The tensions and contradictions inherent in the white master/black slave relationship have been thoroughly discussed by a variety of authors (see for example, Genovese 1976, Morgan 1975, Berlin 1974, Jordan 1968, Parish 1989, and others). Two of the main attacks on slavery to which southern slaveholders had to answer were: 1. its incompatibility with American ideals which proclaimed individual rights and liberty to be foremost concerns\(^2\) and 2. Evangelical Christianity's belief in the equality of all men. The paternalistic system of slave ownership which was characteristic during the 19th century forced whites to acknowledge the humanity of African Americans, while at the same time allowing them to justify or circumvent the contradictions noted above. Likewise, Southern notions of the connection between the Revolution and ownership of slaves, which had to do with personal liberty to own property, and selective use of Old

\(^2\) Parish (1989) has noted "the notion of a democracy run by aristocrats is not so very far from the Jeffersonian ideal; perhaps the antebellum South was still adhering to that ideal, or something like it, while the rest of the United States was diverging from it." p. 131
Testament sources to demonstrate that African Americans were in fact "inferior" to whites, were ways of using ideology to cover these inherent contradictions (Genovese 1976, Parish 1989, Berlin 1974). In other words, some people were more equal than others. As the antebellum era wore on, Southerners became more aggressive in their claims of racial superiority to African Americans so that by the 1850's the distinctly racist component of Southern ideology in support of slavery had taken a more important place in Southern justification of the system (Parish 1989).

Free African Americans were clearly a contradiction of the racist portions of the ideology which held that slavery was a necessary evil, that blacks were better off materially and happier under conditions of slavery than they would be if free, and that wholesale manumission of slaves would result in a class of destitute vagrants subsisting through thievery (Berlin 1974). A large part of the racist ideology was designed to differentiate between African Americans and whites. By playing up the "differences" between the two races, and asserting the superiority of whites over blacks, whites could adhere to the semblance of white solidarity. Class differences between elite and poor whites seemed to be less visible and therefore less divisive when whites of all classes could, together, look down upon African Americans. Free African Americans were often skilled tradesmen and women who had purchased their own freedom, thereby giving the lie to the happy slave/unhappy freeman myth—if they were so happy then why did they work so hard to become free?—, and also challenging white superiority by successfully
competing with white tradesmen for jobs. In fact, during the latter half of the antebellum period most of the slave states were pressured by the white mechanics unions into passing laws preventing African Americans from competing with whites (Parish 1989, Berlin 1974, Johnson and Roarke 1984).

The participation in the system of racial slavery by free African Americans who themselves owned slaves has been explained in several ways. As a means of preventing relatives from being sold away, especially later in the Federal period when the initial wave of manumissions was halted by restrictive legislation, African American ownership of slaves is viewed as a protective measure which could be used to assure that families were not split up. Another explanation notes that since it was not likely that white persons would be willing to work for African Americans and since there were not enough free African-American laborers in most communities to go around, many free African-American landowners had little choice other than to own slaves or hire slaves owned by whites. It has also been noted that ownership of slaves by free African Americans could have been viewed as an indicator of support for or acquiescence to, the system. Free African Americans who owned slaves may have believed that they were providing assurance to their white neighbors that they were not a threat to the system, although it is equally possible that their presence had just the opposite effect, since the exertion of authority in the power structure was supposed to be a white perogative (Schwarz 1987, Johnson and Roarke 1984, Jackson 1943, Berlin 1974, Parish 1989).
The Jeffersonian ideals of equality which had fueled the American Revolution and which were very much a part of the prevailing ideology during the early Federal years led to the manumission of numerous slaves. However, the large population of slaves and free African Americans in Virginia left many whites with the growing fear that the power structure would be reversed. Gabriel's Plot in 1800 and Nat Turner's rebellion in 1831 sparked numerous movements to restrain the growing freedom of those African Americans who were free. Restrictive laws which were passed made it more difficult for masters to free their slaves, made freedom conditional upon leaving the state within 12 months of manumission, limited the movement of free African Americans and limited their right to purchase slaves. After 1832, when the slave code was revised as a result of Nat Turner's August 1831 revolt, free African Americans could no longer purchase slaves who were non-family members. By 1858, free African Americans were even prevented from purchasing family members. As a result of these restrictions, many free African Americans left Virginia and resettled in other states such as Ohio and Pennsylvania (Jordan 1968, Lutz 1957, Berlin 1974, Ryder and Schwarz 1990).

Social controls designed to assure that the power structure not only remained intact, but was acknowledged by the free African-American population were enacted in the form of racial deference codes in many cities of the South (Stampp 1956, Berlin 1974, Johnson and Roarke 1984,

"In Richmond, for instance, a free Negro could be whipped for being insolent to a white...Several cities forbade free Negroes to walk on the city square, to smoke in the street, and even to carry a cane—a symbol of white authority that could not be allowed blacks. In many cities, free Negroes who merely acted 'in an indecent manner in the view of a white person' could be jailed or whipped." (p. 320)

Johnson and Roarke (1984) describe several incidents of racial harassment which occurred in Charleston during the summer of 1860 when white fears were extremely high.

"A free man of color named James Hicks, a nurse who was about fifty years old, 'had his watch & chain taken from him in a Mob raised in Market St.,'...Whites in the mob evidently considered Hicks's fashionable attire an act of insolence and racial insubordination—a watch and chain were the proper accoutrements of white folk...

"...a young free man of color named James Glover... 'was taken to the Guard House at the instance of Dr [Henry W.] DeSaussure for standing in a Drug store with his Hat on.' DeSaussure would have been within his rights to beat Glover for this act of insolence, but exercised restraint and sent him to jail instead, where he would appear before Mayor Macbeth accused of a crime punishable by whipping and imprisonment." (p. 249)

The social ambiguities which resulted from the purposely vague content of the racial deference codes alone were astounding. Although the codes clearly spelled out certain actions which were in violation, insolence to whites was also included in most codes. As the examples
described above indicate, insolence was a matter of perception which often changed with the political climate.

The delicate social situation in which free southern African Americans found themselves during the antebellum era is clearly indicated by the preceding discussion. However, some of these ambiguities existed in official realms at least as early as the Federal period. For instance, even though Virginia had a blood percentage law, official documents such as personal property tax records and U.S. Census records for Virginia were not consistent in how individuals of African-American heritage were listed from year to year. The 1803 Prince George County, Virginia personal property tax records lists fifty people as "free negro" and 11 as "mulatto". In 1804, Charles Gilliam was listed for the first time. He was designated "free negro" even though he was the offspring of an African-American woman and a wealthy white planter, so that he could legally have been designated "mulatto". In 1805, there were no listings for "mulattos" in the Prince George County personal property tax records and the designation "free negro" for that year presumably includes people who would have been listed as mulatto in previous years (Schwarz nd., Ryder and Schwarz 1990). The collapsing of the two categories, "mulatto" and "free negro" into a single category during the year 1805, when during previous years they had been separate in Prince George County records, is an indicator of the sort of official ambiguity which free African Americans faced.
Free African Americans living in the antebellum south were often encouraged or forced to leave the state in which they had been enslaved as a condition of freedom, although most of the slave states had mechanisms which allowed exceptions to be granted. As the antebellum era wore on and the restrictions on free African Americans were increasingly tightened, many people who had obtained exceptions were once again faced with the decision as to whether or not to stay in the south. On the eve of the Civil War, the William Ellis family in South Carolina apparently agonized over the question before deciding to stay (Johnson and Roarke 1984). In Virginia, Charles Gilliam made the decision to stay, even though his brother George had migrated north in 1831 where he successfully changed his ethnic identity to white. According to the 1870 US Census, George Gilliam was a medical doctor and pharmacist with personal property amounting to $35,000 and real estate amounting to $60,000 (Schwarz, pers comm 1989). The success of George Gilliam relative to his brother Charles whose estate was valued at under $1000 upon his death in 1865, points to the advantages inherent in being able to change ethnicity. Johnson and Roarke (1984) have suggested that some African Americans who had been free during the antebellum years, and who stayed in the south after the Civil War may have experienced a downturn in economic status. This question will be examined in the next chapter using the documentary evidence to compare Charles Gilliam's economic situation to that of his surviving children.
CHAPTER 3

44PG317, THE CHARLES GILLIAM SITE

In 1817, an elite white planter named Reuben Gilliam died. His four children by a slave were named in his will and they each inherited 125 acres. Unfortunately that will is now lost and the only record of the inheritance is the plats which were recorded when the estate was divided. These plats show that each child received approximately 125 acres along Bullhill Creek (Fig. 2). One of those children was Charles Gilliam. It is not known if any personal property was included in the inheritances. Throughout the 1820's Charles owned slaves. Although the number of slaves that he owned fluctuated from year to year he owned at least 2 slaves for most of this period. All of these slaves were over the age of 16. From 1832 to 1839 Charles owned no slaves; however, in 1850 he again owned 1 slave over the age of 16 (Prince George Personal Property tax records). Given the restrictions placed on free African American ownership of slaves after Nat Turner's revolt of 1831, it is likely that the slave owned in 1850 was a relative and that Charles' lack of slaves during the 1830s is more indicative of his legal status "Free Negro" than his economic situation.

The 1824 Prince George County personal property tax lists provide information that can be used to determine Charles' economic standing
Figure 2: 1823 plat showing division of Reuben (1) M. Gilliam's land between Charles A. Gilliam and George T. Gilliam.
Source: Prince George County Survey Book 1: p 351
relative to other residents of the county. Compared with other free African Americans who were taxed during that year, Charles was in the 19% of the taxable "Free Negro" population who owned slaves. This compares with 52% of the taxable white population who owned slaves. Thirty-five percent of the total taxable population owned 2 or more slaves. If number of slaves owned is a reliable indicator of wealth,\textsuperscript{3} Although archaeologists have typically used the number of slaves owned to determine socio-economic level (for discussion see Adams and Boling 1989), whether or not this is a reliable indicator for the economic level of free African-Americans has yet to be evaluated. Factors which may decrease the reliability of using the number of slaves owned as a measure of wealth for free African-Americans are ownership of slaves for non-economic purposes such as owning relatives, difficulties in obtaining hired labor due to the fact that white laborers were often unwilling to work for African-Americans and, after 1831, legal restrictions on the purchase of slaves by free African-Americans. It is possible that free African-Americans within a given economic group may have owned more slaves than their white counterparts because they owned relatives. Likewise, while whites may have used hired labor for some tasks rather than investing in slaves, free African-Americans may have invested more heavily in slaves than their white counterparts because they could not obtain enough hired labor to meet their needs. For the period prior to 1831 poor and middling free African-Americans may have had incentive to invest a higher portion of their income in slaves than did whites within these
then Charles appears to have been in the top 1/3 economically for the total taxable population for Prince George County during this time period--that is, he was solidly middling. Other indicators such as the amount of land that he owned and the amount of taxes that he paid support this assessment of his economic level.

The fluctuating number of slaves that Charles owned during the 1820's is difficult to explain. It is interesting to note that his brother George owned fluctuating numbers of slaves during this time period also. It is tempting to look for a relationship between Nat Turner's 1831 revolt and the fact that Charles did not own slaves during the time period 1832-1839 and that George Gilliam left Virginia for Pennsylvania sometime between 1831 and 1832. It is possible that both feared the social ramifications of continuing with the lifestyle they had enjoyed during the 1820's and made varying degrees of changes in order to cope with the social fallout of the revolt, although this cannot be

economic categories. After 1831 restrictions were placed on African-American ownership of slaves. For example, free African-Americans were not allowed to purchase non-relatives. These restrictions would have effectively lowered the number of slaves a free African-American could own by making it illegal to replace aging slaves or those who had died. Presumably then, the number of slaves owned by free African-Americans after 1831 would have decreased as slaves died and could not be replaced.
documented in the absence of personal papers. It is also entirely possible that George simply saw a better opportunity to be had in the free states where he was not known and could therefore change his ethnic identity to one which was more favorable, as he is known to have done by 1870 when he was listed as white (U.S. Census, 1870).

In 1846, Charles used his 125 acres at Bullhill Creek as collateral for a loan which he obtained from a Peter Birchett, Sr. (DB 24: 307). Unfortunately, the trust deed has been lost and no personal papers have been found which would indicate the reason for the loan, but it is likely that the money was borrowed in order to purchase additional land, for Charles owned an additional 188 acres at Otterdam by 1850. Additionally, he had two laborers, George Keys, age 18, and Thomas Livesay, age 26, living with him in 1850 (US Census for 1850). Also living at Bullhill Creek that year were N. age 45 (probably his wife), and his children Mary age 14, Susan age 12, Maria age 8, Mary age 13 and Henry age 15. His daughter Octavia is not listed, although she was probably accidentally listed as one of the two Marys.

According to the agricultural censuses for the years 1850 and 1860, Charles managed to raise the value of his farm at Bullhill Creek from $1000 in 1850 to $1500 in 1860 by improving an additional 25 acres. His production of wheat rose from 50 bushels in 1850 to 150 bushels in 1860 and Indian corn went from 200 bushels produced in 1850 to 300 bushels produced in 1860. He owned 2 horses in both 1850 and 1860, but had increased his stock of swine from 3 to 15 and had added 2 milch cows by
1860. Also, he finished paying his debt to Peter Birchett in 1856 and the lien on his 125 acres at Bullhill Creek was removed (D.B. 24: 307).

On February 16, 1865 Charles Gilliam, "...being of sound mind, but of feeble health, and feeling the uncertainty of human life..." wrote his will (W.B. 1: 1). In it, he left his property to be divided equally among his children. "...I give and bequeath to each and every one of my children, who may survive me, an equal portion of my property, real, personal and perishable..." Each child received 28 and 11/50 acres at Bullhill Creek. Susan received the parcel containing the house and several outbuildings. Charles appears to have divested himself of the property at Otterdam before his death.

Charles also left special legacies for four of his children. These special legacies reveal something about Charles' self-perception and perhaps about the social milieu in which he moved:

"...To my son Henry I bequeath my watch which I have been accostomed (sic) to wear, and the bed on which I have been accostomed (sic) to sleep. To my daughter Susan I bequeath my watch chain, To my daughter Maria I bequeath my silver spoons_ To my daughter Mary, I bequeath my patent lever watch..."

He also indicated that the remainder of his property could be valuated by

"...any two or three competent neighbors who may be selected by my executor...".
He named his friend John W. Batte as his executor and signed his own name to the document. The will was witnessed by his neighbors, George L. Munt who also signed, and by Thomas A. Munt who left his mark, an "x".

From the will it is apparent that Charles was literate and owned some fine items. He was apparently not concerned about the social ramifications of wearing his watch, although a number of accounts have been published which indicate that there was some danger of antebellum African Americans being perceived as insolent for the simple act of wearing a watch, hat, carrying a cane or otherwise "stepping out of place" (Johnson and Roarke 1984, Berlin 1974). It may be that his connections with the white Gilliams protected him in this regard, or perhaps the white neighbors in the community were not as concerned about such matters as were whites in other areas.

When Charles' will was proved on September 14, 1865 his estate was determined to be worth less than $900. This devaluation from that indicated by the 1860 agricultural census was probably a direct result of the Civil War. The Bullhill Creek property was located in an area heavily occupied by Federal troops during the last year of the Civil War which may have contributed to lowered productivity. It is also possible that Charles' neighbors underestimated the value of his personal property or that some of his property was distributed to his children before his death.
Octavia did not keep her property for long, apparently selling it to her uncle Reuben (2) prior to 1866 (DB 28: 191). Henry sold a 6 acre parcel comprised of woodland to Reuben (2) in 1866 (DB 28: 130) but kept the remaining portion. In 1898 Henry (est.), Maria, Susan and Mary Ann still owned their parcels (Land Book 1897-99: 66).

Agricultural Census information collected for Mary Ann for the years 1870 and 1880 show that her farm was valued at $250. She had received 1/5 of Charles' property and its value in 1870 and 1880 was slightly less than 1/5 of that shown for Charles' property on the 1860 Census.

In 1890, Mary Ann, Susan and Maria who had all retained their 28 11/50 acre inheritances were each taxed $.56. In each case, land was valued at $5 per acre including buildings for a total taxable value of $141.10. In each case the buildings contributed $25.00 towards the value. Henry had apparently died by that time as his property was listed as Gilliam, Henry Est. By 1899 Maria had apparently sold her portion of the inheritance. Mary Ann's valuation for tax purposes remained 141.10. Although her land value had dropped from $116.10 to $84.66, her buildings had increased in value from $25.00 to $56.44. Susan's valuation for tax purposes had increased from $5 per acre including buildings in 1890 to $7 per acre including buildings in 1899. Like Mary Ann, the value of her buildings increased while her land dropped. However, Susan's 28 11/50 acres, declining from $116.10 to $112.88, did not drop nearly as much as Mary Ann's. The fact that Susan's buildings were valued the same in 1890 as Mary Ann's but were valued higher in 1899 would be
most easily explained if Susan had made improvements, additions or added more buildings to her property during this time period. It would also appear that Mary Ann decreased her tilled acreage. However, excavations at 44Pg317 which is situated on Susan's portion of the inheritance did not produce any evidence that Susan had made alterations or additions to her buildings that would have resulted in increased value. Another possible explanation is that the road frontage was increased along Susan's property but not Mary Ann's.

In 1903 Mary Ann sold her parcel, leaving Susan as the last of Charles' heirs to own and reside on the property he had inherited from Reuben (1) in 1817. Susan's death certificate, recorded in 1917, indicates that she never married. Her occupation was listed as "domestic." A spider (legged skillet for hearth cooking) and a pot hook recovered from 20th century contexts at 44Pg317 indicate that Susan continued to cook her meals over an open hearth throughout her lifetime. Archaeological evidence also indicates that the wooden chimney on her house was never replaced by brick.

Although Charles' children appeared to hold their own throughout the 1870's, 1880's and 1890's—that is, their properties did not decrease substantially in value from what they had been worth when inherited, the fact is that each received a substantially smaller amount of property at Charles' death than he had received when his father, Reuben (1) died. By dividing his property into 5 equal shares among his children, Charles made sure that each would have the means to survive. But, none was able to match his accomplishments, probably because their
individual inheritances were not substantial enough to produce surpluses which could be reinvested. Charles' children were apparently not able to purchase additional lands or make substantial improvements to the land and structures they did own (Ryder 1991).

Excavation at 44Pg317 (Fig. 3, Plate 1), indicated that Charles' house, Structure 2, was a large "L"-shaped log structure with a wattle and daub chimney which was never replaced with brick during the century that the structure was occupied (Ryder and Schwarz 1990). Measurements along the two longest walls were recorded as follows: 38' along the southern wall and 37' along the western wall, while the two shortest walls measured 16' (northernmost wall) and 13'(easternmost wall). No clear evidence was located which could be used to determine the number and sizes of rooms contained within the structure although it is likely that the structure was divided into three or four rooms. Postmolds indicative of a lean-to shed were noted adjacent to the western wall.

In some places, the sills rested on brick piers, while in others they rested on wooden posts set in the ground. There was some evidence that the structure was sinking, as several obvious attempts had been made to shore it up using dry laid brick as well as wood posts. This problem was the result of a perched water table overlain by fine sandy loam. An informant who remembered seeing the house before it was torn down in the 1920's described the structure as being a 1 and 1/2 story ell-shaped log house with a shed off one side and a chimney off the back. The
Figure 3: 44PG317 Schematic Site Map
Plate 1: 44Pg317 Structure 2, The Charles Gilliam House
excavated structure fits this description. Two additional structures were excavated: a small kitchen, structure 3, located to the rear of the house and another small dwelling, structure 1, which was probably used as a slave cabin (Fig. 3). Both of these structures also had wooden chimneys.

All three structures were probably built by Charles after he inherited the property but before the final division took place in 1823, as the vast majority of the artifacts recovered from the site dated to the 2nd quarter of the 19th century or later. Certainly at least two of the structures were standing in 1823 when the property was divided. The large structure was the residence of Charles from 1823 until his death in 1865. His daughter, Susan, continued to occupy this structure until her death in 1917. After Susan's death, the property was sold to the Army Quartermaster Corps and incorporated into the then new facility at Camp Lee. According to an informant, the house, though still sound, was demolished by the Army during the 1920's.
CHAPTER 4

THE GILLIAM CERAMICS ASSEMBLAGE

Nineteenth century archaeological sites in the Eastern United States typically contain a large number and wide variety of ceramics. For that reason, archaeologists have devoted considerable effort to the study of ceramics assemblages in order to assist them in the interpretation of early American life. In order to provide some level of comparability among assemblages, archaeologists studying 19th century African-American sites generally perform routine sets of analyses on ceramics. These analyses include form and function studies, examination of ratios of decorated to undecorated wares, statistical scaling of relative expense, and stylistic studies.

Form and function studies such as Otto's (1977) examination of the ratio of hollowwares and flatwares at planter, overseer and slave sites located at Cannon's Point Plantation, St. Simons Island, Georgia are often used in an attempt to determine if differences in foodways existed for the free whites and African-American slaves who occupied the sites located on the plantation, and if such differences could be determined through ceramics analysis. Otto found that there was a higher proportion of hollowwares on slave sites than on planter sites. This was interpreted to mean that the slaves were utilizing different food preparation
techniques and consuming different types of food, specifically more
stews and other "one pot" meals, than the planters, but so were the
overseers, who were white. Otto therefore concluded that such analysis
had not pointed to racial differences, but had indicated social
differences. He suggested that slaves and overseers had less time for
food preparation than did the planters. They therefore relied more on
"one pot" meals which could be quickly prepared and left untended.
Adams and Boling (1989) have used this technique to compare 19th
century assemblages from a variety of different sites representing a wide
range of ethnic, social, economic and legal statuses. They have reached
similar conclusions concerning the poor ability of ceramics alone to
point to ethnicity.

Miller (1980 and 1991) has analyzed both the price-fixing lists and the
discount lists used by importers and exporters of Staffordshire ceramics
for the period encompassing the last quarter of the 18th century through
the 3rd quarter of the 19th century. In so doing, he has developed a
method which can be used to scale the relative cost of ceramics from
sites dating to this time period. Once scaled, within-collection
comparisons can be made between functional categories such as cups
versus plates or bowls in order to detect consumption patterns. As
pointed out by Adams and Boling (1989), index values of collections
have been compiled and compared by authors hoping to detect patterns
that may be indicative of ethnicity, social status, economic status and
even occupation. Although these studies have tentatively identified
some patterns, they tend to be along social and economic dimensions rather than ethnic ones.⁴

Another type of analysis attempts to examine the expression of ethnicity via style. For example, Askins (1990) has noted that decorated ceramics

⁴ One issue has been raised recently by Miller (1990b) who notes that current estimates indicate that far less than 1% of income is spent on ceramics. If this were also true for the 18th and 19th centuries (and the deflated/deflating price of these ceramics throughout the century suggests that it was) then it is possible that archaeologists are placing far too much importance on this category of material culture as a potential indicator of fine gradations of economic status, thereby lessening the usefulness of the CC Index as a tool for determining economic status. Within gross economic categories such as "middling income", personal preference or some other social criterion may have been a stronger factor in selecting ceramics than cost. Sheppard (1988) has noted that not all ethnic groups place the same value on household furnishings, some such as the Pennsylvania Germans place value on reinvesting profits into the family business or farm. Documentary research has suggested that this pattern may also be true for some free African-Americans living in the Antebellum South (Johnson and Roark 1984). Comparison of CC Index values for a wide variety of sites may therefore still be relevant for detecting ethnic behaviors associated with spending. This use of the Index is more likely to contribute to studies of ethnicity than uses which focus on the identification of economic status.
appear to be correlated with social identity and class, since different decorative patterns on the ceramics appear to be preferred by different classes and neighborhoods. In some cases, these may also correlate with ethnicity. However, this type of study is best suited to urban situations where whole neighborhoods can be examined.

The ceramics from the Gilliam site were analyzed using the methods discussed above. The purpose of conducting these analyses was to provide a method of organizing the data that was compatible with the data presented by Adams and Boling. While inter-site comparisons can provide insights, in order to fully interpret the Gilliam site ceramics, it is necessary to consider the ceramics within the social and historic contexts in which they were purchased and used by the Gilliam family. Rather than focussing on static concepts such as status and patterning, these data are compared and contrasted in order to produce an interpretation of how the Gilliams' interactions with their social environment is observable via their ceramics, and how that perceived interaction differs from, or is similar to, that of the occupants of the sites studied by Adams and Boling.

A minimum vessel count was completed for all recovered ceramics and is presented in Appendix I. Ceramics were first sorted according to ware type, eg. stonewares, pearlwares, porcelain, etc. Once the basic sorting was completed, sherds within a type were examined for similarities to other sherds of that type. All like sherds were lumped together and counted as one possible vessel. Only those sherds in which marked
differences occurred were counted as separate vessels except in cases
where two sherds were obviously from the same part of a vessel and
therefore represented different vessels, as in the case of cup handles.
Where possible, sherds from a single vessel were mended, although for
the most part individual vessels were made up of numerous loose,
unmendable sherds.

In certain instances, body sherds could not be attributed to one specific
vessel, but did not represent a separate vessel. In these cases a note
listing the sherd's Excavation Unit number was placed in the
minimum vessel count along with a statement listing all the vessels
with which the sherd could be associated. This occurred most often in
cases where decoration was either nonexistent or confined to rims as in
shell-edge, annular and molded rim wares. In several instances, body
sherds were obviously different from rim and base sherds, either in
terms of decoration, paste, glaze, or firing conditions. These sherds
were counted as separate vessels.

Upon completion of the minimum vessel count, artifacts were divided
into three general groupings. Coarsewares were divided into those
wares likely to have been produced during the antebellum era and
those produced in the later 19th century, probably after Charles' death.
In the case of locally-made salt-glazed stonewares, the most common
coarseware type, this division was based on observed differences
between vessel forms, with straight sided forms being attributed to the
late 19th century and rounded, globular forms attributed to the
antebellum era (Ramsey 1976). Finewares were divided into those likely to have been produced and purchased by Charles Gilliam before the 1850's, those likely to have been produced and purchased by Charles Gilliam during or after the 1850's, and those that were likely to have been purchased by his daughter, Susan Gilliam, sometime after Charles' death in 1865. Based on these groupings, three types of ceramics analysis were conducted. These were:

1. Analysis of ware: This analysis was conducted to determine the percentages of coarse wares and fine wares. Since fine wares were more expensive than coarse wares and would have been used at the table rather than in food preparation and storage, for which coarsewares were more commonly used, this type of analysis may indicate whether or not social dining was a significant factor in the lifestyle of the site occupants. In the case of slave sites, this type of analysis has been used to infer whether or not the slaves were responsible for their own food preparation and procurement (Adams and Boling 1989). Cheek and Friedlander (1990) have noted that the total ceramic assemblage recovered from 19th century urban sites occupied by African Americans contains a smaller proportion of local stoneware vessels than that observed for nearby sites that were occupied by whites and they have stated that this may be indicative of ethnic behaviors.

For the purposes of this analysis, vessels were grouped into two categories. Those vessels which were probably present on the site during Charles' lifetime, and those which would not have been present
until after his death in 1865. Table 1 shows the breakdown of vessels by ware while Table 2 indicates the percentage of coarsewares and finewares present on the site for the period ca. 1823 to ca. 1865 and for the period ca. 1866 to 1917 when Charles' daughter, Susan Gilliam, occupied the site.

Coarsewares comprised 23% of Charles' assemblage with finewares comprising 77% (Table 2). Porcelain, traditionally thought of as a high status marker was recovered from 44Pg317, although only 8 individual vessels could be attributed to Charles' occupation with any degree of confidence. Seven of these vessels are tea service. The eighth is a salt or pepper shaker. Porcelain represents 9% of his total ceramic assemblage (Table 1).

2. Analysis of form: This analysis was conducted to determine the relative percentage of ceramic table ware forms on a given site. For example, it is useful to know what the relative percentage of plates are to bowls, or serving platters are to tureens, because this can be indicative of the foodways practiced by the occupants of a site. For example, Otto (1977) has postulated that a higher percentage of bowls to plates would indicate that the occupants were eating relatively more soups and stews than roasts. Adams and Boling (1989) have suggested that a wider variety of vessel forms may indicate that more complex meals were prepared and served. Storage forms such as milkpans, crocks, jugs and bottles made up 17% of Charles' assemblage while plates comprised 50%
### Table 1: Vessels by Ware

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1823 to 1866</th>
<th></th>
<th>1866 to 1917</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware/Trans.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graniteware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Percentage of Coarsewares to Finewares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1823 to 1866*</th>
<th></th>
<th>1866 to 1917</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coarsewares</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finewares</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The stoneware which could be attributed to this time period appears to be primarily "seconds". Most pieces show evidence of either being fired poorly, poorly thrown or were otherwise defective. Additionally, these pieces were all locally manufactured.
(Table 3). Bowls, both large and small, only made up 9% of his assemblage.

Table 3: Vessels by Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1823 to 1865</th>
<th>1866 to 1917</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crock, Jug, Bottle</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milkpan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bowl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Serving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Miller's (1980, 1991) scaling technique- this analysis was conducted in order to provide a way of comparing ceramic assemblages among sites. The analysis is based on 18th and 19th century Staffordshire price-fixing indexes and therefore may make it possible to evaluate the relative cost of the ceramics from a given site and compare that with ceramics from other sites. This type of analysis is seen here as being indicative of consumer choice.
For the purpose of this analysis the ceramics assemblage was divided into three groups. The first two groups cover all ceramics recovered from the site which would have been purchased during Charles' lifetime. The third group was made up of those ceramics which would have been purchased by Susan Gilliam at some time after Charles' death in 1865. This last group was not scaled because tables for decalcomania and wares purchased after 1880 are not available.

There were two reasons for dividing those ceramics that would have been purchased during Charles' lifetime into two groups with the first group dating to ca. 1823-1850 and the second from 1850 to 1865. First, there was a distinct change in the assemblage in the number of undecorated ceramics purchased during the second period (Tables 4 and 5). Over half of the ceramics dating to the first period are decorated wares, including various edged and printed wares. Those ceramics which dated between ca.1850 and ca.1865 were largely undecorated. Since these ceramics make up a large percentage of the collection, it appears that sometime after 1850 Charles began to purchase more ceramics than he had during the previous period and more of those ceramics which he purchased were undecorated. Additionally, based on evidence gathered from price lists and bills of sale for ceramics, Miller (1980: 4) suggests that during the mid 1850s taste and prices appear to have changed from favoring transfer printed wares to favoring undecorated ironstones. In other words, the undecorated wares appear to have become more fashionable. Certainly, the time period 1850-1865
appears to correspond to a change in Charles' consumer behavior which may have been related to increased need for ceramics, or possibly increased financial security and the desire to use fashionable tablewares.

**Table 4: Decorated Finewares versus Undecorated Finewares Excluding Porcelain 1823 to 1850**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. Plates</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. Cups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. Bowls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Dec.</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undec. Plates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undec. Cups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undec. Bowls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Undec.</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Decorated Finewares versus Undecorated Finewares Excluding Porcelain 1850 to 1865.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. Plates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. Cups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. Bowls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dec.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undec. Plates</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undec. Cups</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undec. Bowls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undec.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secondly, during the time that Charles occupied the site, the situation for Virginia's free blacks was becoming increasingly difficult. The years immediately preceding the onset of the Civil War have been demonstrated by a number of historians to have been particularly difficult for free blacks because of increased social isolation. Activities which could increase white suspicion of blacks were many, including being linked with the abolitionist movements, competition with whites in the marketplace, or simply appearing "insolent" by possessing and displaying items denoting a status above their socially accepted rank. Concerns about not appearing threatening to whites led some blacks to restrict display of certain possessions such as gold watches, carriages, etc. (Jordan 1968; Morgan 1975; Johnson and Roark 1984). Whether this concern would reflect in the ceramic record is questionable since the ceramics would be on display in the residence of the owner rather than in public space. However, since most people purchased their ceramics from local shopkeepers, at least the purchase of status ceramics could have social ramifications.

Tables 7 and 8 show the cc values which were calculated for the periods 1823 to 1850 and 1850 to 1865. These were calculated using the method explained in Miller's 1980 paper. In some cases, two sets of calculations were made. The first set was made using the tables from the 1980 paper, and the second set was made using the revised tables (Miller 1991). This was done to facilitate comparison with earlier assemblages such as those presented by Adams and Boling (1989) which used the 1980 tables, while allowing for comparisons with future assemblages which will
presumably use the 1991 tables. Where only one set of values is presented, it can be assumed that the listed index value was the same on both the 1980 and 1991 tables.

**Table 6: Decorated Finewares versus Undecorated Finewares Excluding Porcelain. 1866 to 1917**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Decorated Wares</th>
<th>% of Undecorated Wares</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. Plates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. Cups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. Bowls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Dec. 7 30

| Undec. Plates | 8 | 50 | 35 |
| Undec. Cups   | 8 | 50 | 35 |
| Undec. Bowls  | 0 | 0  | 0  |

Total 16 70

Undec.
Table 7: CC Index Values for Plates, Cups and Bowls, 1823 to 1850

CC Index values for plates (Pearlware and Transitional Whitewares\(^5\) only) using 1833 from 1980 tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>No. Recovered</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Printed</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) The term "Transitional Whiteware" is used here to indicate the early whitewares of the 2nd quarter of the 19th century which retain many characteristics of pearlwares.
### CC Index Values for Plates (Pearlware and Transitional Whitewares Only) using 1833 from revised tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>No. Recovered</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Printed</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 11, Average Value: 1.69

No cups from this time period were found.

### CC Index Values for Bowls (Pearlware and Transitional Whitewares only) Using 1833 from 1980 tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>No. Recovered</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small CC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Blue</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Annular</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 4, Average Value: 1.47
Table 8: CC Index Values for Plates, Cups and Bowls, 1850 to 1865

CC Index Values for Plates (Ironstone and Whiteware) using 1855 from 1980 article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>No. Recovered</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain***</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 29 43

Average Value 1.48

***The printed value was used here as no plain value was given. This follows Miller's statement in the 1980 article that plain white Ironstone came in at about the same price as printed wares (Miller 1980).
CC Index Values for cups (Ironstone) Using 1858 from 1980 paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>No. Recovered</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 6 30
Average Value 5****

****This figure is significantly lower at 2.54 if the revised tables are used. In the revised tables, the 1846 chart is the closest applicable.

CC Index Values for bowls (Ironstone) Using 1855 from 1980 paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>No. Recovered</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1 2
Average Value 2

As shown here, the cups recovered from Charles' occupation of the site were more than twice as expensive as the bowls recovered from this site, but the plates were the cheapest finewares of all. Even if the revised tables are used to calculate the value for cups, this pattern does
not change. Cups are still the most expensive, followed by bowls and then plates.

**Interpretation**

Coarsewares comprised 23% of the Charles Gilliam assemblage with finewares comprising 77%. Adams and Boling calculated the average percentage of coarsewares on Georgia slave sites at 15.7%, coarsewares on tenant sites made up 7.3% and coarsewares on planter sites averaged 7.6% of the ceramic assemblage. All three types of site contained a substantially lower percentage of coarsewares than that calculated for Charles' occupation at 44Pg317. However, the figures arrived at by Adams and Boling are somewhat deceptive since the slave sites on small plantations contained only 8.5% coarsewares while the slave site on the middle sized plantation contained 22.8% coarsewares. Given the small number of assemblages used to compute the average for the slave sites, the high percentage of coarsewares on the middle sized plantation skews the slave site average toward the high end and is probably not representative. Adams and Boling suggested that the high percentage of coarsewares recovered from the slave site on the middle sized plantation could be explained by more responsibility for food preparation and storage on the part of these slaves than those on the other plantations.

Charles Gilliam owned and operated a farmstead, was the head of household of a large family and had slaves and/or laborers living on the property during most of his lifetime. Therefore, it seems reasonable
to assume that he would have needed more vessels for food storage and
preparation than would a slave or tenant who may not have been
responsible for providing for as many other persons. It is interesting to
note that all the coarsewares recovered from 44Pg317 were poorly
thrown, poorly fired or contained other evidence of manufacturing
flaws. Charles was apparently purchasing "seconds" from a local potter
in order to meet his storage and food preparation needs.

Porcelain, traditionally thought of as a high status marker, was
recovered from 44Pg317, although only 8 individual vessels could be
attributed to Charles' occupation with any degree of confidence. Seven
of these vessels are tea service. The eighth is a salt or pepper shaker.
These represent 9% of his total ceramic assemblage. This is similar to
the <7% average which Adams and Boling noted for the Georgia sites
which they studied (Adams and Boling 1989). The number and types of
porcelain vessels owned by Charles Gilliam seem consistent with an
interpretation which views these as representative of the sort of
occasional formal social and family dining which might exist for a
middling farmer. Neither fine-grain status distinctions nor ethnically
specific behaviors can be inferred from a comparison of these data.

Storage forms such as crocks, jugs and bottles made up 17% of Charles'
assemblage while plates comprised 50% (Fig. 4). Surprisingly, bowls,
both large and small, only made up 9% of his assemblage. This is in
sharp contrast to both the planters' and slaves' kitchens examined by
Adams and Boling. According to Adams and Boling, bowls made up
Figure 4: Percentage of Vessels by Form, The Charles Gilliam Site, 1823 to 1865
from 15.8% to 28.5% of the planters' assemblages, and from 24.1% to 35.8% of the slaves' assemblages (Fig. 5). Plates made up from 23.2% to 37.6% from planters and from 24.8% and 40.4% for slaves (Adams and Boling 1989).

Otto has suggested that the higher ratio of bowls to plates shown on slave sites is related to use of cooking methods emphasizing stewing rather than roasting (Otto 1977, 1984). Likewise, it has been suggested that pewter plates which would not show up in the archaeological record may have been used (cf. Martin 1989). This possibility could apply to other forms as well as plates. Charles may have consumed relatively more roasts and fewer stews than even the planters examined by Adams and Boling, or he may have possessed and used bowls made of materials such as pewter, tinwares and wood rather than ceramics. None of these wares is likely to show up in the archaeological record as frequently as the more easily broken ceramic wares.

Seventeen percent of the total assemblage consisted of storage forms such as crocks, jugs and bottles. These are all forms which could be used for preparation of pickled fish, meats and vegetables; preparation and storage of lard, butter and cheese; and fermenting of ciders, vinegars and homemade beers. Adams and Boling did not break the coarsewares down into vessel form so it is not possible to compare this category of Charles' assemblage with the assemblages that they examined. Although a single milkpan was recovered from the site, dairying appears to have been an activity that Charles adopted late in life since it
Figure 5: Vessel Forms, Comparing Charles Gilliam with Kings Bay Planters, Sawyer, and Slaves
was not until 1860 that the Agricultural Census indicated that he owned milk cows.

The types of storage vessels recovered from the Charles Gilliam site seem to reflect activities consistent with those of a middling farmstead, although broader comparisons with other assemblages would be helpful. Adams and Boling appear to have included storage forms of all types within the miscellaneous category in their analyses of form, however, since this category also includes serving vessels, it is not possible to determine whether or not storage forms which would be reflective of the activities discussed above were recovered from the sites which they examined. Likewise, it is not possible to determine whether the percentage of the Charles Gilliam ceramics assemblage which was made up of storage forms was different from or similar to the assemblages which Adams and Boling examined. It can be stated that the number and forms of the storage vessels which can be attributed to the Charles Gilliam occupation do not indicate any unusual activities that might suggest that his farmstead also served as a brewery, tavern, inn or store for example. Most of Charles' storage vessels were coarsewares, many of which were "seconds", this suggests that they were used primarily for utilitarian purposes rather than display purposes. The fact that Charles chose cheaper wares, and "seconds" at that, for his utilitarian vessels may say more about his frugality than about his status or ethnicity.
The following discussion refers to bar charts which show the average cc values for plates, cups, and bowls from both occupation periods being discussed as compared with the data presented by Adams and Boling (Adams and Boling 1989).

As shown in the chart (Fig. 6) for ceramics dating between 1823 and 1850, the plates from the Charles Gilliam site have an average value similar to the Kings Bay Slave Average, the Kings Bay Planter Average, and Black Lucy's Garden. These values are generally higher than those at the sites occupied by laborers (both black and white) and tenant farmers, but they are lower than those for the merchants, a tavern keeper, slaves (other than those at King's Bay), big planter, and the glass worker. However, between 1850 and 1865, the value for plates recovered from the Charles Gilliam site had dropped and was more similar to the values computed for laborers and tenant farmers.

This change in Charles' spending patterns can be interpreted in a variety of ways. He was purchasing "fashionable" plates, and a lot of them, but he appears to have been spending relatively less on his plates than he had in the past. It is tempting to suggest that Charles spent less on plates during the later part of the antebellum period because of the increased social isolation which free African Americans experienced as their activities were increasingly restricted by the white, dominant, population. Perhaps Charles had fewer opportunities for social dining, or perhaps he feared that the purchase of finer tablewares would be perceived as a threatening display of "insolence" by his white neighbors.
Figure 6: Comparison of Average CC Values for Plates
This interpretation fits nicely within the context that can be inferred from the social deference laws of the time. However, the fact that Charles had increased his landholdings with the addition of 188 acres at Otterdam by 1850 and had significantly increased the production of the Bullhill Creek farmstead by 1860 suggests another explanation for the purchase of less expensive plates. An explanation which seems to better fit the social and historical context focuses not on the price of the plates, but on the number of plates purchased during this time period and the fact that even though they were not as expensive as plates purchased during the previous period, they were "fashionable". Charles purchased more plates, suggesting that he needed more table service, not less as would be indicated by reduced opportunities for social dining. He had also increased his debt load by mortgaging the Bullhill Creek property and purchasing the Otterdam property.

During the decades when Charles purchased the plain white ironstone plates, he doubled his landholdings, increased the value of his Bullhill Creek property by increasing productivity, and paid off the mortgage on the Bullhill Creek farm. His purchase of relatively cheaper plates may reflect a more frugal spending pattern brought about by the increased debt and a sense of expanded, rather than restricted, economic opportunities.

The plates which Charles purchased during this time period were cheaper, but they were "fashionable". Stylistically, he was "keeping up with the Joneses." The number of plates suggests that more people
were dining at Charles' table than before. To a certain extent, this is to be expected given the size of his family, the ages of his children and the fact that he had laborers living with him. Still, the number of plates seems high even for a large family. The choice of fashionable, but relatively cheap plates and the increase in number of plates purchased during this time period suggests that social dining was an important part of Charles' life during the late antebellum period.

The average cc index value computed for bowls (Fig. 7) dating between 1823 and 1850 from the Charles Gilliam site was similar to those computed for the merchants, the glass worker, the Kings Bay planter average, and the Kings Bay slave average. These values are higher than those computed for the laborers, tenant farmers, the free black, the slaves from both Harmony Hall and Cannon's Point, and the big planter at Cannon's Point. Only the Walker Tavern bowls and those dating between 1850 and 1865 from the Charles Gilliam site are higher.

No cups dating between 1823 and 1850 were recovered from the Charles Gilliam site, but for the period between 1850 and 1865 the average value of cups from this site was considerably higher than that for any of the sites presented by Adams and Boling (Fig. 8). In addition to the cups used to compute this value, Charles also had some porcelain tea service which was not included in the cc computation.

Relatively more plates were broken at the Charles Gilliam site than at any of the sites presented by Adams and Boling, but they were also
Figure 7: Comparison of Average CC Values for Bowls
relatively cheaper plates. On the other hand, relatively few cups and bowls were broken at the Charles Gilliam site, but they tended to be more expensive, especially the cups. It could be that the more expensive items were handled more carefully than the plates, leading to less breakage.

When the cc values for finewares are compared, it is obvious that cups and plates from the Charles Gilliam site occupy the opposite ends of the scale. This dichotomy becomes even more blatant when this site is compared with others of similar economic status, with cups from the Gilliam site being half again as expensive as the next highest value (Fig. 8). It is possible that this extremely high value for cups is a reflection of Charles' connections with the white Gilliams who were members of the planter elite. Or it could be that Charles couldn't afford enough porcelain tea service to meet his needs and therefore purchased the next best thing. The planters had less porcelain than Charles, and less expensive cups of other ware types. The fact that both the porcelain and the ironstone cups and the bowls were purchased during the same time period as the fashionable ironstone plates discussed above and when Charles' economic opportunities appear to have been expanding suggests that social dining occupied a more important place in Charles' later life than it had when he was a younger man.

Charles' economic status was most similar to that of the small planters examined by Adams and Boling. However, the differences between his ceramics assemblage and the assemblages presented by Adams and
Figure 8: Comparison of Average CC Values for Cups
Boling allow some interesting interpretations concerning Charles' activities to be made. His food preparation and storage vessels were "seconds", so that his cheapest ceramics were as cheap as they could get. He had relatively more porcelain than either the slave sites or the planter sites examined. When compared with the other free African Americans for which data has been presented, the cc value for his plates are similar, but Charles had both bowls and cups that were much more expensive. He appears to have invested in fashionable though inexpensive plates. Along with the fact that his cups were more expensive and he had more porcelain, this information suggests that social dining and/or tea drinking may have formed a more important part of Charles' life than for the occupants of any of the sites studied by Adams and Boling. The proximity of his brothers Reuben and William along with the local free African-American populations in Prince George County and nearby Petersburg would have provided ample opportunity for social entertaining.

The relatively high value of Charles' tea service and other cups, along with the relatively lower value of plates suggests the possibility that Charles entertained guests primarily for tea and coffee, although the number of plates suggests that guests were also entertained at dinner. As a literate, successful farmer, Charles may have enjoyed a status of some importance within the local free African-American community.

In summary, the ceramics assemblage suggests that within the private realm of Charles' kitchen and table, there was little to distinguish him
from the white planters of similar means studied by Adams and Boling. Ethnically-specific foodways do not appear to be reflected by the assemblage. The assemblage does indicate that some level of social prominence and its associated obligatory hospitality may have accrued to Charles, especially later in his life. Based on the historical context, it can be inferred that this prominence was among other free African Americans.

While ethnically specific behaviors within Charles' home may not be archaeologically visible as demonstrated by the ceramics analysis, the "face" which his house presented to the public may very well have been reflective of his family's ethnicity. In the following chapter, it is argued that Charles Gilliam made choices concerning his architecture that may have been designed to prevent his economic and social stature from appearing threatening to his white neighbors. Charles' ceramics were undistinguishable from those of white planters of similar means, but his house made a very different statement.
CHAPTER 5

19TH CENTURY PHOTOGRAPHS AS SENSITIVE DOCUMENTARY DATA

As described in the previous chapter, the ceramics recovered from the Charles Gilliam site indicate that within the privacy of his home, Charles engaged in behaviors similar to those of the white planters examined by Adams and Boling. He owned and displayed "fashionable" material possessions like those of the white planters examined by Adams and Boling--within the privacy of his home. However, the external facade which his house presented to the public appears to tell a different story.

This chapter addresses Charles' log house with its "unfashionable" wooden chimney and seeks to understand how this publicly visible element may be reflective of Charles' attempts to negotiate the ambiguous social role in which he as a successful African-American farmer was engaged. To this end, the extensive photodocumentary record of domestic architecture created by George and Huestis Cook (on file at the Valentine Museum in Richmond, Va.) during the second half of the 19th century was used to obtain comparable data concerning the frequency of use of wooden chimneys during that time period and to ascertain who lived in them. Examination of the photographs taken by Charles' contemporaries was seen as an important step in
understanding the contextual meaning embedded in Charles' continued use of wooden chimneys at the Bullhill Creek farm.

A benefit of using the body of work compiled by the Cooks is that the photographs can be "read" against the archaeological data concerning the Gilliam site architecture in the same manner as that used by Hall (1990) to "read" Mentzel's diary and letters against the slave assemblages in South Africa. The photographs, taken as a whole, provide insights into the Cooks' perceptions of the Virginia countryside, the domestic architecture which it contained and the people who lived there. This chapter presents the results of the photographic survey. The data presentation is followed by an interpretive section in which the photodocumentary record and the architectural remains recovered from 44Pg317 are discussed vis-a-vis each other.

Numerous examples of 19th century domestic structures are standing at present or are documented in sources such as Kocher and Dearstyne (1954), McDaniel (1982), O'Dell (1976, 1983) and Scott (1950), but with the exception of McDaniel's 1982 study of 19th and early 20th century African-American life, these sources tend to be biased toward more durable forms of architecture than that represented by the structures at the Charles Gilliam site. O'Dell (1983) states that log structures using non-masonry chimneys were common in Tidewater Virginia throughout the 18th and 19th centuries and were occupied by both blacks and whites of the tenant and yeoman classes, as well as by slaves. However, O'Dell's sources date to the late 18th and first decade of the
19th centuries and may not accurately reflect the socio-economic status or ethnicity of the owner/occupants of this type of structure later in the 19th century.

The Cook Collection photographs depicting dwellings in Virginia were examined in order to determine whether or not dwellings with non-masonry chimneys were common during the 19th century and whether the people who lived in them were of lower economic or social status than those who lived in dwellings with masonry chimneys or if the survival of these types of chimneys could be tied to ethnicity of the owner/occupants. These photographs provide evidence for the variety of architectural styles in use throughout Virginia from just prior to the Civil War to the turn of the century. Approximately 500 photographs were examined. Of these, 58 were photographs of rural, low to middling income dwellings and therefore met the criteria used for inclusion in the present study. Notes were taken on these photographs indicating the approximate date the photograph was taken, the construction technique, type and location of chimney or chimneys, the apparent ethnicity of the owner/occupants, and the apparent economic status of the owner/occupants if that could be inferred from the material culture evidence presented in the photo. Inferences concerning the economic status of the owner/occupants were subjective, based on intensive examination of the collection as a whole and on factors such as the size of a dwelling compared to others in the study group, the level of apparent structural maintenance which had been performed on the dwelling and a combination of lesser factors
such as type of clothing worn by the occupants and use of mules rather than oxen for plowing.

Of the fifty-seven photographs included in the study, twenty-two (39%) of the structures were clearly occupied by African Americans while only eight (14%) were clearly occupied by whites. Ethnicity of the owner/occupant was unknown for 27 (47%) of the structures.

Only 14% of the dwellings depicted had non-masonry chimneys. In each case where a non-masonry chimney was in use, the occupant was clearly African American. Half of these dwellings appeared to be occupied by blacks of very low economic and/or legal status— that is, they were either slaves, tenants or yeomen; but for the other half, the income level of the occupants was judged to be middling. Two photographs were marked to indicate that the occupants of the dwelling pictured were slaves. Both of these dwellings had brick chimneys. Five of the structures in the photographs were either tenant or slave cabins associated with middling to upper class farms. Ethnicity of the occupants was unknown for these dwellings, all of which had masonry chimneys. The photographic data are summarized in Table 9.

Fifty-one percent of the dwellings were occupied by persons estimated to be of middling economic status, while 49% were of low economic or legal status if tenants and slaves are included. Thus, the study group was almost evenly split between dwellings owned or occupied by persons of low and middling statuses.
Table 9: Chimney Type by Ethnic and Economic Status (from Photographic Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity and Estimated Economic/Legal Status of Owner/Occupant</th>
<th>Masonry Chimney or Stovepipe in evidence</th>
<th>Wooden Chimney or Catted Chimney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, mid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, low</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, slave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, mid</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown, mid</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown, low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation tenant or slave</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further examination of the data shows that of the 22 structures occupied by blacks, 36% had non-masonry chimneys and the economic level of the occupants of these structures appears to be split evenly between low and middling. All of the structures occupied by whites and the structures occupied by persons of unknown ethnicity had brick chimneys.
Another interesting point in the data is that none of the 5 dwellings located on plantations had wood chimneys, nor did the dwellings whose occupants were identified as slaves. Archaeological evidence, while scant also shows that houses of overseers and slaves located on plantations tended to have brick chimneys. Kelso has excavated a late 18th century slave cabin with a wooden chimney at Monticello, although this appears to have been replaced by structures with masonry chimneys during the late 1st quarter of the 19th century (Kelso 1990). A white owned structure with a catted chimney has been recorded in King and Queen County. This structure was separate from the main dwelling and was used for dining only. The chimney of this structure was maintained during the 20th century by an African-American handyman. The main dwelling's chimneys were masonry (Edward Chappell pers. comm.).

Although it probably wasn't unusual for Charles to live in a house with a non-masonry chimney, it wasn't all that common either. For example, only 8 (approximately 14%) of the 58 structures depicted in the photographs had non-masonry chimneys (Fig. 9). This can be interpreted in several ways. It is possible that the photographers involved were biased toward more formal forms of architecture and took fewer photographs of structures with vernacular elements. To a certain extent, this is evidenced by the number of photographs in the collection which did not meet the criteria for inclusion in this study. The majority of the photos depict dwellings of the upper classes, and in
Figure 9: Chimney Types By Status and Ethnicity
many cases several photos were taken of these types of dwellings, each from a slightly different vantage point. The interiors of these dwellings also tended to be fairly well documented, further inflating the number of photographs which did not meet the criteria for inclusion in this study. This observation may explain why only 58 of the photographs did meet the criteria for inclusion in this study, but it does not satisfactorily explain the low number of dwellings in the study which did have non-masonry chimneys since virtually all of the included dwellings were vernacular forms. Nor does the discrepancy appear to be related to economic status or "picturesque" qualities since 28 (48%) of the depicted dwellings appeared to be occupied by people of low economic status (including tenants and slaves) while the remaining 30 (52%) appeared to be occupied by people of middling status. Thus, the study group was almost evenly split between dwellings which were either small or in some state of disrepair and those which were comparatively larger and well maintained.

Another explanation for the relative lack of dwellings with non-masonry chimneys is that use of that particular construction technique had declined sharply by the Civil War. Since the most often quoted sources for the contention that numerous dwellings with this type of chimney existed in Virginia date no later than the first decade of the 19th century it is possible that in the 40 years between that time and the earliest of the photographs examined this form experienced a decline in popularity as a construction technique [For instance, wooden chimneys were banned in the City of Richmond in 1744 (Mordecai 1946) and again
in 1788 (Richmond City Common Hall Records Book 1]). Since this seems to be the most likely explanation, it would appear to be reasonable to assume that by the end of the Civil War, wooden chimneys whether using mud and stick, frame or catted technologies for the most part would appear only on dwellings owned or occupied by people of the lowest economic status. Although the sample is admittedly small, the figures do not bear out this assumption since 1/2 of the dwellings depicted appear to be occupied by persons of middling economic status as was the case with Charles Gilliam, and no dwellings with non-masonry chimneys were occupied by whites. The study does suggest that had Charles been white he probably would have lived in a dwelling with a masonry chimney. It is interesting to note that Charles' brother, George, who left Virginia in 1831 and changed his ethnicity to white, had lived on a neighboring parcel in a frame house constructed on a brick foundation and with a brick chimney (Ryder and Schwarz 1990).

Documentary research has shown that Charles Gilliam was not poor, and the archaeological evidence shows that he lived in a house with a wattle and daub chimney. When combined with the results of the photo survey, it would appear that at least in the case of African Americans, economic status did not necessarily determine what type of chimney was attached to the dwelling, and that after the Civil war, ethnicity rather than economic status, was a stronger determining factor for continued use of non-masonry chimneys on dwellings.
Interpretation

Archaeologists and historians who have studied domestic structures with wooden chimneys have produced several different readings of these items of material culture and the architecture to which they are attached. Such readings often, but not always, focus on the assumption that this type of architecture was meant to serve a temporary, impermanent, possibly expeditious function, or were selected to economize on materials and labor (Carson et al. 1981, O'Dell 1983, McDaniel 1982). Using archaeological and historical evidence, this section explores the alternate possibility that during the mid to late 19th century wooden chimneys could symbolically express social distance between African Americans of middling income and their white counterparts.

Cary Carson et al. (1981) have suggested that some 17th century Virginia domestic architecture was intended to be "impermanent" due to the combination of a cash crop (tobacco) which was labor-intensive, but potentially extremely profitable or risky. This difficulty along with the increase of tenancy, economic stagnation after 1680, and high mortality combined to produce

"...excellent reasons not to plan too far ahead or build things to last. Better to put profits back into production and spend disposable income on material comforts that could be enjoyed immediately." (p. 169)

"Once they had developed a fairly reliable livelihood and reestablished a self-sustaining family and community life, most of them expected as a matter of course to fence fields, plant orchards, breed livestock, raise barns, and build houses for the longer term." (p. 178).
They link the switch from tobacco to diversified cash crop farming with rebuilding using more permanent materials and techniques stating that in some parts of Virginia (Their example is Surry County) this rebuilding took place as late as the period 1800-1840.

However, Fraser Neiman (1986) has offered a different interpretation. He presents evidence which indicates that the "impermanent" construction techniques used at the Clifts Plantation in Westmoreland County, Virginia and at other sites resulted in a structure that stood and was occupied by *gentry* for three generations. This suggests that the construction techniques were not really all that "impermanent", and that an explanation other than expediency or economic hardship must be sought in order to understand the persistence of certain elements of this "impermanent architecture" (such as wooden chimneys) into the 20th century.

"...it is difficult to believe that the richest gentlemen in the entire colony, men like Col. Thomas Pettus and William Drummond, built post-in-the-ground houses because they could not afford bricks or sills. The problem with this part of the argument lies in its ethnocentric and uniformitarian assumptions, implicit in much historiography, about people's ideas and aspirations...We are here being asked to believe that the things we value, our standards, architectural or otherwise, are necessarily things of importance to people in other eras or places" (p. 306).

Neiman reads the increasing use of brick in domestic architecture during the 18th century as a symbolic representation of the desire on the part of the gentry to set themselves apart from the lower classes.
"Meaningful social intercourse requires structure, that is, prescriptions defining both social roles and acceptable behavior for individuals who occupy them. Men increasingly relied on their physical work to provide it. This happened in two ways. First, when the shared backcloth of assumptions about who belonged where in social space came apart, men looked to artifacts to communicate both to themselves and to others their place in society and their identity with other men whom they counted as their peers. Thus in the architectural sphere, bricks...assumed important roles to these twin ends. Such items identified their owner as a gentleman" (p. 311).

The economic/expediency interpretation suggested by Carson et al. has been used to explain the persistence into the 20th century of wooden chimneys on log houses in Virginia, Maryland and much of the South by scholars such as O'Dell (1983) and McDaniel (1982). In his study of Chesterfield County, Virginia architectural history, O'Dell, quotes Washington's letter of 1791 in which he described his trip from Mount Vernon to Savannah. O'Dell notes that these structures were typical residences of low (economic) status freeholders, tenants, and slaves:

Excepting for the towns there is not within view of the whole road I traveled...a single house that has anything of an elegant appearance—they are altogether of wood and chiefly of logs...; generally the chimneys are of split sticks with dirt filled in between them (Washington 1925, cited in O'Dell 1983 p. 98).

It should be noted that O'Dell includes this and other late 18th century quotes in his chapter devoted to the one room plan farmhouse averaging 400-450 square feet. According to O'Dell, examination of the 1860 Land Tax Books from Chesterfield County---adjacent to Prince George--- indicated that at that time, approximately 1/3 of the free population of the county lived in dwellings of this size and the people
who resided in these houses comprised the lower third (economically) of the population.

"In the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth centuries, those white farm families at the bottom of the socio-economic scale lived only barely above a subsistence level...Consumer items were meager, including little more than a few pieces of crude furniture, one or two sets of clothes per person, a sparse assortment of cooking and eating utensils and some necessary farm tools. Few of these families owned a conveyance other than a farm wagon and many did not even possess a horse or mule. Both parents and children were illiterate, with no realistic prospect of receiving even a simple education or of moving on to some more lucrative occupation... While many middle-income farmers owned one or two slaves, white families at the lower third of the economic scale could not afford to purchase labor...Total investments---which included the house and any outbuildings, farm structures, wells, dams etc.---were typically valued at between $25 and $100, with an average (in 1860) being about $50...The dwelling itself usually comprised half or more of the total value of these assessed improvements" (p. 100).

O'Dell does not discuss any structures with wooden chimneys among the medium or large farmhouses of Chesterfield since none were extant at the time of his survey. In fact, he assumes that log houses with wooden chimneys were the sole domain of the poor. Yet, his survey of the small one-room farmhouse did not locate any extant structures which had wood chimneys either, and the tax records do not record such details. His assumption is based on a 20th century reading of some 18th century descriptions of the rural landscape, without taking into account who the writers of those descriptions were, or how and where they fit into the larger social fabric.
It is entirely possible to read Washington's letter as a statement concerning the lack of "fashion-consciousness" on the part of rural dwellers, in direct contrast to the "elegant" taste shown by some town dwellers. All that can be said for certain concerning Washington's letter is that log houses with wooden chimneys were very common in rural areas along Washington's route during the late 18th century. There is no mention of economic status, only fashion status or lack of elegance. The other accounts cited by O'Dell are provided by Thomas Jefferson (1787), a gentleman architect and fashion leader/setter and J. F. D. Smyth (1784), an upper-middle class English doctor living in Williamsburg. Certainly Washington and Jefferson can be categorized as 18th century persons wishing to be viewed as gentlemen set apart from the lower classes and Smyth, an upper middle class Englishman, cannot be expected to view the house which he described through the same eyes as an American farmer of low or middling status.

McDaniel (1982) takes a slightly different tack. He views log houses with wooden chimneys as the typical dwelling erected by landowners to house their slaves and he suggests that many postbellum African Americans continued to occupy former slave houses. Yet he, too, seems to view these structures as the dwellings only of the poor. Certainly the economic/expediency reading is on just as shaky a footing for 19th century log cabins with wooden chimneys in the long settled and metropolitan precincts of eastern Virginia as Neiman shows it to be for 17th and 18th century "impermanent architecture", particularly when
the availability of cheap, mass produced brick during the latter half of the 19th century is taken into account.

The evidence compiled from the photographic survey indicates that for African Americans a log dwelling with a wooden chimney was not the typical residence of the poor. In fact, according to the results of the photographic survey, poor African Americans were more likely to live in a dwelling with a masonry chimney than were African Americans of middling economic status. The documentary and material cultural evidence indicates that the Charles Gilliam family was solidly middling. Economically, they were better off than 2/3 of their fellow Prince Georgians; therefore, they do not fit the description provided by O'Dell for persons living in log houses with wooden chimneys. Additionally, half of the structures with wooden chimneys depicted in the 19th century photographs, as well as the Gilliam house, are 2 to 3 times as large as O'Dell's small one room farmhouse, or any of the structures studied by McDaniel. This indicates that perhaps something other than economic necessity was involved in the selection of chimney types.

The long history of wooden chimneys associated with domestic architecture in Virginia and the fact that the Gilliam house stood for 100 years before it was dismantled by the Army, argues against an interpretation which views these structures as temporary. However, if the historical context in which antebellum free African Americans and postbellum African Americans lived and interacted with their white and black neighbors is added to this picture, an interpretation can be
posited which takes into account contemporary ideas concerning the symbolic role of material culture. In this type of interpretation, material culture is viewed as a potentially powerful, manipulable symbol which can be used to mediate the ways in which persons from different ethnic groups interact with one another (Barth 1969; Hodder 1979 and 1986; McGuire 1982 and 1983; Praetzellis, Praetzellis and Brown 1987, Neiman 1986).

Both documentary and archaeological evidence suggest that considerable ambiguity existed in the statuses of free African Americans in the south during the antebellum years. Jeffersonian ideals of equality that had fueled the Revolution were still very much alive during the early Federal period, and in the years following the revolution, many slaves were freed. But the large population of African Americans in the south left many whites in fear of slave rebellions. In Virginia, Gabriel's plot of 1800 and especially Nat Turner's rebellion in 1831 sparked numerous movements to restrain the growing freedom of African Americans resulting in a caste of persons whose legal, social and economic status was ambiguous at best. In some areas, laws were passed which allowed for the public punishment of African Americans who dared to ride in a carriage in public or otherwise display material objects which were indicative of higher status than the dominant white population thought appropriate. The aftermath of the Civil War, Radical Reconstruction and Jim Crow affected not only those African Americans who had been slaves prior to the war. Some well-off and middling Southern African Americans who were free before the war
tended to experience a decline in economic and social status after the war (Johnson and Roarke 1984, Schwarz 1987). With this information in mind, let's examine O'Dell's (1983) interpretation of George Cook's photograph of the Vietor children (Plate 2):

"George Cook's photo of the Vietor children shows three well-dressed Victorian youngsters posed in front of the one-room log cabin of the Daniel Lomax family. One wonders what prompted Cook—then one of the South's leading photographers—to use the dwelling of a local black family as a backdrop for this portrait. Did it simply appeal to his sense of the picturesque, or was it meant to be an ironic social comment?...Whatever his intentions, he could not have juxtaposed two more contrasting images: one representing the secure world of the upper-middle-class suburbanite, the other illustrating the poor living conditions of a former slave family..." (p97).

O'Dell's interpretation does indeed describe what an American is likely to see and think about when viewing this picture, if that American hails from the late 20th century. But what about a Southern white American living during the last quarter of the 19th century when Jim Crow was rising in the wake of Reconstruction? This is the social context in which Cook created the photograph of the Vietor children. Perhaps, when viewed in this light and as part of a larger body of work produced by Cook during the last half of the 19th century, this photograph can tell us something about George Cook's expectations concerning the social and material cultural world in which he lived, and those expectations are more likely to have been shared by his contemporaries than are the expectations of O'Dell, the author of this thesis, or most other persons living during the late 20th century.
In order to pursue this perspective, it is necessary to review the main characteristics of the Cook Collection photographs which met the criteria for inclusion in this study. First, although the photographs examined for this study included dwellings occupied by poor and middling white families as well as those of poor and middling African Americans, none of the dwellings depicted which were occupied by whites had wooden chimneys. One hundred percent of the dwellings with wooden chimneys depicted by Cook were occupied by African Americans. Forty percent of those dwellings which were clearly shown to be occupied by African-American families had wooden chimneys. Secondly, one half of the dwellings with wooden chimneys were occupied by African Americans who were not poor. Does this pattern
within the collection indicate that in the late 19th and early 20th centuries no dwellings with wooden chimneys were occupied by whites, or is it indicative of Cook's perception of who should live in what sort of dwelling?

If Cook did not take photographs of dwellings with wooden chimneys occupied by whites because there were no dwellings of this type occupied by whites then we are left with the possibility that wooden chimneys had come to symbolize an ethnic status (not necessarily an economic status) that many whites would have considered to be low. If we make the alternate assumption, that late 19th and early 20th century white families occupied houses with wooden chimneys but Cook chose not to photograph them then we are left with the possibility that Cook chose to ignore the dwellings of those whites whose chimneys violated his perception of what the social order ought to be and how it ought to look.

In either case, we are left with the strong possibility that just as bricks provided a material which 18th century gentlemen could manipulate to provide tangible visible (symbolic) evidence of their distance from the lower classes (Neiman 1986), 19th century wooden chimneys in rural Virginia served a similar function by symbolically expressing the social distance between whites and some African Americans living in Virginia.
The fact that African Americans of middling economic means appear to have been more likely to live in a house with a wooden chimney than poor African Americans begs an explanation. Putting a wooden chimney on a large house may have been a way that some African Americans lessened the possibility that they would be viewed by their white neighbors as a threat to the existing social order.

Perhaps George Cook was making a social comment, but when viewed in light of the other photographs in the Cook Collection at the Valentine Museum, rather than being an ironic one concerning the discrepancy in wealth between the Vietor family and the Lomax family, it seems more likely that his "comment" was meant to show his perceptions concerning the existing social order and how unthreatening it could look as long as everyone stayed within their appropriate places. In this photograph, the white, fashionably-dressed Vietor children occupy the foreground. The mid-ground is filled by the unfashionable wooden house with its log chimney, almost as part of the picturesque landscape dominated by the Vietor children. The African-American occupant of the structure is a shadowy, almost unrecognizable figure located at the extreme right edge of the photograph, well behind the Vietor children. We are left with little doubt as to Cook's perception of the social order.

Use of wooden chimneys by mid-to-late 19th century African Americans of middling means signalled some degree of acceptance of the social order by using a construction technique that was becoming
increasingly old-fashioned. By not keeping up with the (white) Joneses who had made the shift to brick, middling African Americans could lessen the social fallout which would have been associated with the perception that they were aspiring to a similar social and economic level as their middling white neighbors.

Size of dwelling is often considered to be a good status indicator, with larger dwellings being indicative of higher status. The size of Charles' house was indicative of at least middling economic status for either whites or blacks but the photographic data indicates that the chimney was probably indicative of a social status that most whites would consider to be low. Like the relationship between Mentzel's diary and the food remains recovered from slave assemblages (Hall 1990), the photographs interpret the chimney on Charles' house which in turn interprets the photographs.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

In the previous chapters, the ceramics and architectural remains of the Charles Gilliam site have been examined with respect to the historical context in which they were owned and used by Charles Gilliam during the antebellum period. A two part approach has been used to create a "thick description" which shows how Charles' external, public face (represented by his house) and the internal, private face (represented by his ceramics assemblage) may have been used to manipulate his social environment.

It is tempting to suggest that like the Chinese merchants discussed by Praetzellis, Praetzellis and Brown, Charles Gilliam was entertaining whites to tea and coffee and was using fine ceramics to show that he wasn't so different from them. Unfortunately, there is no documentary evidence to support such an interpretation. Charles' position as a farmer means that he probably would have conducted business transactions on territory other than his own. Unlike the Chinese merchants he would probably have taken his produce to market rather than marketing it from his home. It is possible that his position as a relative of the wealthy white Gilliams enabled him to be a middleman facilitating interactions between whites and free African
Americans in the community, but there is no supporting evidence to indicate that he acted in that capacity.

Careful reading between the documentary data set (comprised of the photographic evidence along with the descriptions of the way the social deference codes were implemented) and the archaeological data set (comprised of the chimney and the ceramics assemblage) suggests that it is more likely that Charles publicly acknowledged a difference between himself and his white counterparts in order to avoid the appearance of insolent behavior. Given the situation posed by the social deference codes and the increasing hostility of white southerners towards free African Americans during the late antebellum period, it doesn't seem likely that Charles would have made a practice of having members of the white community over for tea and serving them from better teawares than they themselves owned. Such behavior probably would not have been prudent. It is more likely that he was serving other members of the free African-American community off his tea wares and by so doing he was displaying material goods appropriate to his status as a successful middling farmer within a private, small group context.

Samuel Mordecai, a white Richmonder, who wrote his memoirs in 1856 and 1857 devoted a chapter to Richmond's "colored aristocracy". His description of Nick Scott is enlightening because it contains an unvoiced, but implicit, assumption concerning the different types of
behavior that were appropriate to white aristocrats and African-American "aristocrats":

"Nick Scott, another member of the colored aristocracy, kept his coach for many years, without pride or insolence or imposition, and he took his seat on the box, thus setting an example of humility to his children." (Mordecai 1946: p. 357).

Had Nick Scott been white, it is unlikely that Mordecai would have felt compelled to praise such "humility" as appropriate aristocratic behavior.

Within the privacy of a gathering of other members of the free African-American community in his home, Charles could safely acknowledge his position and display the material wares appropriate to that position. Outside, where the eye of the dominant population was ever watchful for insolent slights, he had to be more careful in his presentation of himself. Perhaps it was simply a matter of stepping off the sidewalk when a white person approached. Or perhaps, like Nick Scott who could keep his carriage as long as he humbly rode on the box rather than inside, it was acceptable for Charles to have a large house as long as it displayed humility. Log walls and an unfashionable wooden chimney may have served such a purpose.

During the antebellum period, whites defined themselves in terms of their difference from ("in opposition to") African Americans. Part of that self definition depended on the ideology of slavery and on the existence of African Americans as a recognizable "other". Free African
Americans violated a part of that definition in that they were not enslaved.

Laws which restricted slave ownership by African Americans were designed to bolster the existing power relationship between the two groups by prohibiting African Americans access to a power which whites regarded as a God-given right. At the same time, racial deference codes prohibited African Americans from engaging in behaviors which whites perceived to be insolent. Although white perceptions of insolence could and did change with the political climate, the examples discussed in earlier chapters of this thesis indicate that African-American behaviors or displays of material goods would be considered insolent if they were viewed as being "too white".

By engaging in "white" behaviors or displaying "white" material goods, African Americans could appear to close the social distance between themselves and whites, thereby lessening their "otherness". Those African Americans who appeared to be less "other" by virtue of freedom, behavior, and material success posed a threat to the very oppositions which whites had used to define themselves as a separate group. Social deference codes ensured that free African Americans behaved in ways which demonstrated their "otherness" from whites. The ways in which the codes were worded and enforced indicates that both whites and African Americans of the late antebellum period were aware of the potential for material culture to be used as a symbol which could undermine or reinforce the existing power relations between the
groups and therefore either support or threaten the identity which whites had created for themselves.

This symbolic potential has been investigated in this thesis by placing the material culture recovered from the Charles Gilliam site within a contextual framework. Methods of analysis which are traditionally used by researchers searching for "patterns" have been used to provide a starting point so that the Charles Gilliam data could be examined with respect to data reported from other 19th century sites. However, pattern analysis is seen here as a descriptive device for ordering data. As such, pattern analysis properly functions neither as theory nor model since the identification of regularities in the data, while necessary in order to recognize variation, does not lend itself to explanation or interpretation.

Pattern-type data has been used here in order to enhance the possible interpretations by underscoring the differences between the data sets being examined. This approach was suggested by the uniqueness of the site, its occupants and the condition of their lives, and the desire of the author to provide an interpretation in which Charles Gilliam was seen as an active participant in the social framework of which he was a part.
APPENDIX 1

MINIMUM VESSEL COUNT

Stoneware
1. Milk crock, bristol slip with cobalt decoration, molded "Daisy and lattice" pattern. (1840-1930) EUs 83, 98(2), 101(2), 180(3), 193(3), 196, 268.

2. Local saltglaze jug, red body, interior glaze black and fired poorly, second. (pre-civil war) EUs 98, 101(2), 182, 193(3), 196, 328.

3. Local grey saltglaze jug, cobalt decoration. (pre-civil war) EUs 4, 98, 101, 102, 193, 329.

4. Saltglaze crock, light grey with cobalt decoration. (probably pre-civil war) EUs 15, 66(3), 179, 193.

5. Lead glaze stoneware, vessel form unidentifiable, grey body with green glaze. (pre-civil war) EUs 89, 98, 193, 281.

6. Bristol slip beer bottle, 3 sherds, EUs 89, 98, 101, may or may not belong to the same bottle. (mid 19th cent)

7. Saltglaze stoneware crock, brown with cobalt decoration, hand thrown. (pre-civil war) EUs 1(4), 23, 98(4), 154, 193(4).

8. Local saltglaze stoneware base sherd, crock, red body, second. (pre-civil war) EU 198

9. Local saltglaze stoneware base sherd, crock, red body, second. (pre-civil war) EU 298.

10. Local saltglaze stoneware lip of a bottle. (mid to late 19th cent) EU 189.

11. Local grey saltgaze jug or crock with cobalt decoration (probably pre-civil war) EUs 52(3), 98, 101.

13. Local saltglaze stoneware base sherd, crock or jug, second. (pre-civil war) EU 286.

14. Local saltglaze stoneware crock or jug. EU 123.

15. Bristol slip stoneware body sherd, vessel form unidentifiable. EU 104.


17. Local saltglaze stoneware crock or jug, cobalt decoration. EU 101(4).

18. Local grey saltglaze, vessel form unidentifiable, cobalt decoration, second. (pre-civil war) EUs 98,337.

19. Local saltglaze stoneware crock. (probably post civil war) EU 101,103.

20. Local grey saltglaze stoneware crock, hand thrown with cobalt decoration. (pre-civil war) EUs 66,98(7),141(2),142,193.


22. Local grey saltglaze crock (post civil war) EUs 52(41),53(13), 55. (mends whole)

23. Bristol slip whiskey jug, albany slip interior, stamped #2. (post civil war) EU 52(66) (mends whole)

Each of these are all separate vessels. There are two miscellaneous body sherds that could go to any of the grey salt glaze stoneware vessels 3,11,18,19,20.

Minimum vessel count stoneware: 23 vessels
crocks 6
jugs 4
crock or jug 6
bottle 2
unidentifiable 5

Earthenware
1. Lead glaze earthenware milk pan or jar base., 1st half 19th c. EU 101

2. Unglazed earthenware rim, vessel form unidentifiable, late 19th c.. EU 304

3. Unglazed earthenware body, vessel form unidentifiable, locally made, late 18th or early 19th c.. EU 107

4. Flower pot late 19th c.. EU 193,256

Minimum vessel count: 4

Yellowware (1840-1940) All probably late 19th c.
1. Mixing bowl, annular. EUs 193,217

2. Bowl, annular. EUs 98,101,196

3. Bowl, annular. EUs 98,101,179,193

4. Plate. EU 193

One yellowware base sherd, EU 196, that could go with vessel #1 or #3.

Nine body sherds, EUs 98(2),111,101(2),4,196,104,334, that could go with vessel #1,3,or 4.

Minimum vessel count yellowware: bowls 3

plate 1

Porcelain
1. Cup with handle, molded, hand painted over the glaze. EU 98(3)

2. Cup with handle, flow blue floral design. EUs 99,98(4),139(2),140 (1835-1910) This particular cup is probably late Victorian. 1880-1890 floral motif was very popular on flow blue at this time.

3. Cup with handle, guilded annular decoration. EUs 23(2),154(2), 193

4. Cup handle, matches vessel #3. EU 52

5. Cup, plain (thick). EU 8,98(5),101

6. Cup, hand painted over the glaze. EU 98
7. Cup, polychrome decalcomania (floral). EU 193

8. Cup, polychrome decalcomania (floral) with gilded edge. Matches vessel #9 (saucer). EUs 142, 143

   There are two different handle sherds, EUs 8, 193, that could go with vessels #1, 6, 7, 8.

   There are four plain cup body sherds, EUs 23, 98(2), 193, that could go with vessels #2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8.

Saucers

9. Saucer, polychrome decalcomania (floral), gilded. EUs 98, 144, 230 (matches cup vessel #8)

10. Saucer, molded (spiral fluting). EUs 98(4), 101(2)

11. Saucer, molded edge. EUs 7, 98, 193

12. Saucer, plain. EUs 185, 337

13. Saucer, plain. EU 198

14. Saucer, plain. EUs 23, 1, 154(2), 193

15. Saucer, plain. EU 98

16. Salt or pepper shaker, underglaze blue. EU 98

   There is one rim sherd, EU 52, that may go to any of the plain saucers. (It is a chip and hard to ID)

   There are five saucer body sherds, EUs 1, 98, 132, 193, that could go with vessels #9, 11, 12, 13, 14, or 15.

   There are eight plain porcelain saucer foot sherds, EUs (144, 194 mend), (22, 232 mend), 1, 98(2), 154, 193, 311, that could go with vessels #9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.

   There are four flat base sherds, EUs 98, 101, 193(2) that could go with any of the nine possible saucers.

   Of cups and saucers that go together, vessels #8 and #9 match. Vessels #6 (cup) and #7 (cup) could match vessels #12, 13, 14, 15 (saucers).
Minimum vessels: Cups 8
Saucers 9
1 salt or pepper shaker

Pearlware
1. plate, blue shell edge. EUs 4,285 (1780-1830)
2. plate, blue shell edge. EU 229 (1780-1830)
3. plate, blue transfer print. EU 193 (1787-1840)
4. plate, blue willow transfer print. EUs 4,8,101 (1795-1840)
5. plate, blue willow transfer print. EUs 55,98,101,193 (1795-1840)

There are at least two blue willow plates, maybe more, it was very hard to distinguish. There is one blue willow base sherd, EU 104, which could belong to either of the plate rims. Twenty-four body sherds, EUs 55(2),193(4),8,104,102,101(4),224, 98(2),66(2), 4,7,75 260,251,9 could also go with vessels #4 or 5.

6. bowl, annular, large mixing. EU 209
7. plate, plain. EU 193
8. bowl, plain. EU 196
9. base sherd, turned holloware (bowl?) (early sherd possibly even late creamware) EU 208

Minimum vessel count: pearlware
plates 6
mixing bowl 1
other bowl 2

Transitional (1820-1830)
1. bowl, blue transfer print. EU 141(2)
2. plate, blue transfer print. EU 98,101,275,107
3. plate, molded edge. Eu 98,194
4. plate, plain. EUs 98(3),101,196,232,193(2),244,342,4,355

5. plate, plain. EUs 98,101,193(4),326,349

6. plate, plain. EUs 98,193,201

7. plate, plain. EUs 143(2),144

Minimum vessel count: plates 6
   bowl 1

Graniteware (1840-1885+)
1. pitcher, molded. EUs 54,55,98,193

2. cup, molded, with handle. EUs 52,98,143,194,217

3. cup, polychrome, annular, with handle. EU 98 (Edge banding 1923)
   (looks like hotelware)

4. cup, plain with handle. EUs 7,90,98(2),101(2),105,142,193(2)

5. cup, molded. EU 101,143,157,193

6. cup, plain. EU 98

7. cup, plain. EU 188

8. cup, plain. EUs 98(2),124

9. plate, makers mark,"Royal Patent Ironstone George Jones". EUs 98(8),189

10. plate, plain. EUs 98(2),193

11. plate, plain. EUs 98,101(2),193,244

12. saucer, plain. EUs 8,93,193,198

13. saucer, plain. EUs 95,98(2),192,193,256,257

14. saucer or plate, molded edge. EU 66

The following could belong to any of the vessels identified:
   1 plain base sherd EU 98
1 base sherd, makers mark EU 188
1 base sherd, makers mark EU 265
1 base sherd, makers mark EU 193
1 handle sherd, molded EU 193 (vessels #5-8)

Minimum vessel count graniteware: pitcher 1
  cups 7
  saucers 3
  plates 3

Ironstone (1840-1885+)
1. tureen, molded handles and makers mark. (mends whole) EUs 52(37),53(4),55(15)
2. tureen (mends) EU 52(12),53(3)
3. cup. EU 4(2),101
4. cup, molded. EUs 98,196,304
5. cup, plain. EU 193(2)
6. cup, plain. EUs 98,139(2),196
7. cup, plain. EUs 154(2),193(2)

There are four handle sherds, EUs 98,186,193,295, that could go with any of vessels #4-7.
8. creamer?, plain. EU 98
9. plate, plain. EUs 98,193(2)
10. plate, plain. EU 101
11. plate, plain. EUs 98(2),193,194,218
12. plate, plain. EUs 7,95(2),98,102,144,193(2),265
13. plate, plain. EUs 90,143,193(5),257,268,323
14. plate, plain EUs 98(2),101,144(2),157,193
15. plate, plain. EUs 98,101(3),188,193(3),195
16. plate, plain. EUs 498(2),193(2),230,233
17. bowl, plain. EUs 89,98(2),193,217
18. plate, molded edge. EU 98
19. plate, molded edge. EUs 144,280
20. plate, molded edge. EU 188
21. cup, plain. EU 98
22. cup, plain. EU 98,101

There is one plain ironstone base sherd, EU 189, and three base sherds with makers marks, EUs 4,98(2), that could go to any of the ironstone plates. vessels 10-16, 18-20

There are also three rim sherds, EUs 9,193,328, and six plain body sherds, EUs 98(3),89,194,207, that may go with any of the 22 vessels.

Minimum vessel count Ironstone: tureens 2
cups 7
small pitcher or creamer? 1
plates 11
bowl 1

Decorated whiteware
1. plate, flow blue, molded edge with gilding. EU 282,1(2),193(2)
2. bowl, flow blue, molded edge with gilding. EU 7,52(16) (mends completely)
3. plate, blue shell edge. EU 98 (1830-1860)
4. plate, blue shell edge. EUs 4,98,101 (1830-1860)
5. plate, blue transfer print unidentifiable pattern. EU 200 (1830-1860+)
6. plate, blue transfer print unidentifiable pattern. EU 102,141 (1830-1860+)
7. plate, blue transfer print, "Blue Willow". EU 242,274,285 (1830-1860+)

8. planter, polychrome glaze, molded basket weave. EUs 98,189

9. planter?, bamboo decoration, decalcomania. EU 98

10. bowl, polychrome decalcomania. EU 4,98,101(2),124,154

11. Holloware/gravy dish, polychrome decalcomania. EU 98,103,141(5)

12. plate, polychrome decalcomania. EUs 101,193(2),198

13. plate, polychrome decalcomania. EUs 9,98(2)

14. saucer, small (possible child's toy or butter pat), molded edge, decalcomania. EUs 14,55

15. bowl, polychrome decalcomania. EU 4

Plain whiteware body sherds, Group A, EUs 87,98(9),101(2),123(2),141,142,143,144(2),192,193(6),196,248,332, could go with vessels #1,10,11,12,13,14. This was decided on the basis of paste, glaze, and thickness. Vessel #15, however, belongs with Group B body sherds, which are listed with plain whiteware.

Plain whiteware
1. saucer or plate, group A body sherds (listed above). EU 193

2. saucer or plate, molded, group A body sherds. EU 194

3. saucer, plain, group A body sherds. EUs 98,118

4. saucer, group A body sherds. EU 157

5. plate, group A body sherds. EUs 1,123,144,154(3)

There is one base EUs 7,98,103,188 that could go to vessels #1-4.

6. plate, group A body sherds. EUs 4(2),7,9,93,98

7. plate, group B body sherds. EU 98

8. plate, group B body sherds. EU 98
9. plate, group B body sherds. EU 98

10. plate, group B body sherds. EU 66,104,185,193

11. plate, molded, group B body sherds. EU 7

12. plate, group B body sherds. EU 142,144

13. plate, group B body sherds. EU 89

Group B body sherds, EUs 8,89,98(5),101(4),102,103,141,142,145, 185,193(7),194,198,208,264,292,299,330(2)

There are five bases, EUs (101,52 mend), 52,7,98,193, that may belong to any of vessels #7-13.

14. plate, group C body sherds. EU 98,101

15. plate, group C body sherds. EUs 4,81,193,198

There is one whiteware base EUs 108,232,328 that could go with either vessel #14 or 15.

16. plate, group C body sherds, polychrome decalcomania. EU 193

17. plate, group C body sherds. EUs 55,98(2)

18. plate, group C body sherds. EU 98

19. plate, group C body sherds. EU 193

20. plate, group C body sherds. EU 193

21. plate, group C body sherds. EUs 66,101,187,188,196

Group C body sherds EUs 4(2),8,66,98(18),101(2),105(2),127,142(2) 193(10),194,229(2),259,260,299.

22. cup. EUs 98,101

23. plate. EUs 4,55,90,98,101,105,133,193,209,229,233,265,266

There are eight base sherds with partial makers marks, EUs 102, 98,256,101,193, that could go with any of the whiteware vessels #1-23.
24. body sherd to unidentifiable vessel type, does not match any of the other whiteware vessels. EU 188

25. body sherd that could not be attributed to any of the whiteware vessel shapes. (gravy boat?) EU 98
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