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ABSTRACT

The broad transformations that occurred in the political economy of Tidewater Virginia during the years leading up to and following the American Revolution have been of interest for social science scholars for many decades. This interest has sparked engaging scholarship and dialogue concerning Post-Revolutionary class relations. The majority of these studies have emphasized the material differences between the upper and lower class inhabitants. More recent studies (Chappell and Richter 1997; Bushman 1992), however, have taken a more holistic approach to understanding Tidewater Virginia class relations through the inclusion of a substantial portion of the population, the middle class. Although significant differences lie in their approach to understanding the material world of Tidewater Virginia’s middle class, their studies have opened the door to a new discussion of Post-Revolutionary Tidewater class relations.

This study adds to the current dialogue of Tidewater class relations by offering a new method for identifying middle class residents of the region. By reorienting our perception of what exactly class is and how we approach it, we may begin to seek new explanations regarding the material world of the past. Using a tripartite method of abstraction (Ollman 1991; Wurst 1999), this study will examine the architecture and cultural landscapes of two middle class planters of Tidewater Virginia to evaluate current explanations of Post-Revolutionary class relations.
STRUCTURES, FIELDS, AND FARMSTEADS OF EARLY AMERICA:

POST-REVOLUTIONARY CLASS RELATIONS IN

TIDEWATER VIRGINIA
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Rapid transformation was taking place in Tidewater Virginia in the years leading up to and following the American Revolution. The growth of new economic markets combined with changes in agricultural production to dramatically alter the Pre-Revolutionary economy of the region. The proliferation of Protestant churches and religious movements supplemented the decline of the patriarchal system that had been the foundation of the colony's political economy. As the spirit of Republicanism spread throughout the nation, a vitalizing emphasis was placed on the power of the individual to control one's economic and social welfare. The growth of a middling class of planters wedged between the remaining vestiges of gentry and yeoman culture coincided with the historical transformations that were taking place. Middling planters found themselves in a unique situation in which their burgeoning political participation and economic status within Tidewater society began to alter pre-existing power and social relations. These changes (as well as others) required middling planters to adapt their "cultural understandings to the requirements of an ever-changing political economy" (Wolf 1997: xiii).

Historians have looked at the rise of these planters from a variety of standpoints. Alan Kulikoff (1992; 1986) traces the rise of a group of yeoman farmers
in Chesapeake society through systems of opposing class ideologies associated with the growth of agrarian capitalism in America. According to Kulikoff (1986: 9), the gentry and yeoman classes emerged during the second quarter of the eighteenth-century through the efficient use of slave labor and the development of a ruling class ideology. Over the next century, historical transformations and structural changes within the political economy of the Chesapeake region combined to cement the gentry class’s authority over the yeoman farmers (Kulikoff 1986: 261-294). The yeoman class of farmers, ranging from those who utilized their ownership of the means of production for pure subsistence production to those who participated more widely in market productions, remain as a single class category throughout Kulikoff’s framework until their demise in the late nineteenth-century. While Kulikoff’s discussion of class ideologies and his review of the Chesapeake economy is extensive, the focus is on understanding the relationship between the haves and the have-nots, rarely involving any discussion concerning those wedged between.

Middling planters, who by their very label refer to a group of persons bracketed between two classes in society, become homogenized into a lesser class forfeiting their role as emergent capitalists during the late colonial period. Considering the wide variety of occupations and classes within Tidewater Virginia, the formation of a substantial middling planter class must be investigated if we are to comprehend the complexity of class relationships during this time period.

Other historians, such as Richard Bushman (1992: 408), have proposed that “gentility stabilized identity amid the social confusion during the early nineteenth-century.” According to Bushman (1992: 404), as the middling planters began to
separate from the "cruder traditional culture," they participated in the refined spirit of the gentry class to assert their rising status within society. While the outward appearances of genteel culture as well as the circulating literature (etiquette books) had some marginal influence upon the emerging middle class, they do not provide a sufficient nor comprehensive explanation for the complex changes that were occurring during this period of early American history. Put simply, the growth and proliferation of this new class of planters cannot be understood as a superficial yearning by the middling planters to imbibe in the culture of the elites, nor should they be treated as mute players in the ideological contests that occurred during the spread of agrarian capitalism through America. When addressing the rise of a new class of planters in the fluid social environment of Tidewater Virginia during the late eighteenth to early nineteenth-century, it becomes increasingly important to understand the various factors that shaped this progression. To develop a more pronounced understanding of these processes, it is essential to view these changes within the broader spectrum of class formation.

In light of this problem, we must explore new avenues of research that shed light on processes of class formation and power relations. By utilizing research and theoretical perspectives from history, geography, anthropology, and sociology, historical archaeology has developed into an extremely useful analytical tool for interpreting past human behavior. Its ability to approach past human behavior diachronically, combined with its interdisciplinary perspective, provides historical archaeology with a distinct advantage in understanding past processes of class formation (Paynter 1999; 1988; McGuire and Paynter 1991).
This study will analyze the cultural landscapes of two middling planters within Tidewater society in order to understand various processes related to class formation. These landscapes will then be compared with several documented landscapes of the region’s social elites to examine Post-Revolutionary class relations. In the discussion that follows, a brief review of the class concept within the social sciences is given in order to explain how this study will use the term class. Chapter Two will describe the specific theory used to (further) define class members and interpret symbolic behavior found in the cultural landscapes of Tidewater Virginia. Chapter Three will review the landscape approach within historical archaeology and describe how it may be used to address issues related to class. The fourth chapter will focus on the historical transformations that took place within the Chesapeake region to provide context for the actions of upper and middle class planters during the late eighteenth to early nineteenth-centuries. The final chapters will apply several of the concepts reviewed in the introductory chapters to interpret the cultural landscapes of two middle class planters. Architectural interpretations will rely upon contemporary literature (Chappell and Richter 1997; Chappell 1994; Ellis 1997; Upton 1988) regarding Tidewater Virginia’s vernacular architecture. The analysis and exploration of middle and upper class landscapes will conclude with a brief assessment of Richard Bushman’s (1992) emulation model.

The Class Concept

Class analysis has been an enduring interest within the field of social science since the early nineteenth-century (Paynter 1999; Katzenelson 1995). Definitions of
class and conceptual understandings of class formation have been applied through a variety of approaches by different scholars (Katznelson 1995). The term “class” itself is problematic. In mainstream, contemporary usage, class refers to a category of people who live according to certain standards marked by their degree of wealth or affluence within specific communities. Typically, perceptions of class are based on objective categories that measure the degree of one’s affluence, such as net income or the size and cost of one’s home. This type of categorization and measurement of one’s financial abilities relates more to “status” indicators than it does to “class.” A person’s ability to acquire and own certain material items refers to his or her placement within a socioeconomic system, completely devoid of behavioral attributes that may characterize that person. When viewed through this socioeconomic lens, social and cultural understandings of the material items a person may own are not even considered. While a person’s wealth may characterize his or her own financial ability to acquire material items, it does not express the values and meanings found behind those items.

Ira Katznelson (1995: 144) identifies four analytical levels of class formation used in class analysis in the social sciences. The first level, “the structure of capitalist development” allows researchers to understand broad patterns of economic development throughout the world, while the second level, the patterns of social relations determined by capitalist development, refers to the relationship between capitalist modes of production and social organization. At the first level, class is merely a product or constitutive element of the capitalist system and remains a passive byproduct within the broad patterns of economic development. At the second
level, the analyst’s attention is focused on class relations within a single system of
production and the corresponding social organization that develops within residences
away from work. While this second level of analysis seeks to develop a better
understanding of human relationships within the capitalist system, it mimics
contemporary usage by approaching class unrelated to a person’s discrete placement
within the network of ownership relations. Within these levels, “a person’s
consciousness, culture, and politics do not enter the definition of his class
position...Not even his (or her) behavior is an essential part of it” (Cohen 1978: 73).

For historical archaeologists, the first two levels of analysis fall short of our
research goals, but they are nonetheless important analytical vantage points to
consider when trying to understand class. At Katznelson’s (1995: 145) third level of
analysis, in which “classes are formed groups, sharing dispositions,” class becomes a
useful concept that must be approached in terms of relationships with other people.
This level of analysis has much to offer historical archaeologists. By approaching
class as a “social and cultural formation” (Thompson 1965: 365), historical
archaeologists are freed from making static or developmental assumptions about class
relationships, promoting an investigation of process. Second, if we seek to
understand class as a set of people who share common values, beliefs, and interests
we can begin to use the class concept to understand how these people construct
meaning through their experiences. Finally, using class as an analytical tool to
understand social and cultural formations at specific times and places, allows
historical archaeologists to observe class relations at different scales whether it be a
nineteenth-century industrial factory in New England or an eighteenth-century rural community in North Carolina.

Katznelson's (1995: 146) fourth level of class refers to collective action. This type of class formation refers to the conscious participation of individuals in organizations and movements who seek to alter that class's position within the system of production. At this level, conscious participation is what separates class from how it is used in the third level, in which people are said to share common dispositions and participate in class through unselfconscious activities. While all of Katzenelson's levels illustrate the various ways the class formation concept may be approached, it is important to recognize the merits each of these levels contribute to our understanding of class, whether at a macroeconomic level or at the level of collective action. Ideally, research that seeks to illuminate how each of the four levels articulate with each other in specific times and places would foster a much more thorough understanding of class formation. Yet, the immensity of such a project hinders such research from being realized. Thus, what becomes increasingly important is the need for interdisciplinary research and dialogue among different fields, whose methodology and primary field of research are better equipped to address certain questions than others. The question for historical archaeologists, then, is: at which analytical level or levels do we seek to understand class and class formation?

This subject has only recently gained attention by historical archaeologists. In a recent issue of the journal Historical Archaeology, the authors sought to bring class to the forefront of analysis within the field. In the introduction, Louann Wurst and
Robert K. Fitts (1999: 1-6) highlight inconsistencies in the ways historical archaeologists approach class. Wurst and Fitts identify two main conceptual treatments of the class concept through Wright’s (1994; 1997) idea of gradational and relational views of class. The former of these concepts (which parallels modern day usage) treats class as a static entity, in which class can be objectively defined and analyzed through empirical data such as number of acres, income level, or distinctions based on quantity of specific resources. The latter view, relational, treats class as a dynamic process whereby class is used to “designate the nature of the underlying social relations” (Wurst and Fitts 1999: 1). Gradational views of class are typically employed by historical archaeologists who seek to equate certain types of material culture with status, then interpret variation found within the archaeological record as a means to understand class relationships. Although gradational studies such as George Miller’s (1980) research on ceramic pricing considerably enhance our understanding of the relationship between economic status and material goods, and thus variation in the material conditions of life (Paynter 1999), they do not lead us towards a better understanding of class relationships.

Relational views of class are often seen in Marxist approaches that typically emphasize the role of power relationships through the domination and resistance model (Wurst and Fitts 1999: 2). While some studies, such as Beaudry et. al.’s (1991) investigation of class relationships at the Boott Mills Complex, explore various ways in which material culture played an active (and symbolic) role in defining class ideologies, others use the model in ways that mimic outdated acculturation models (such as Quimby Spoehr 1951) and eventuate as gradational
views. These studies usually involve examining the material assemblages associated with two opposing groups (dominant and non-dominant) involved in the capitalist mode of production. When differences are found within the two assemblages, the non-dominant group’s assemblage is interpreted as an active form of resistance. The inverse of this relationship, in which similarities are found within the two assemblages, posits the non-dominant group’s assemblage as a form of active emulation of the dominant group’s values or behavior (Wurst and Fitts 1999: 3). The utility of such an approach lies in its quantification. It would be relatively easy to develop a system of categories that could be associated with each group and simply compare assemblages looking for “active” emulation/domination or resistance. The problem with this model is the same as the main problem that plagued acculturation models. It concludes that people react to similar situations in a fairly uniform, systematic fashion. When viewed in this manner, members of certain classes are believed to find similar meanings in their material culture. This type of “normative” interpretation leaves absolutely no room for social and cultural understandings that combine to create the wide array of meaning people have of their worlds. By reducing cultural understandings to mere epiphenomena, the expressions made through material culture are viewed in light of our own judgments towards what those expressions might mean. This leads to another distortion in interpretation. Without supplying sufficient context that includes historical, social, and cultural processes that contribute in shaping these circumstances, archaeological interpretation becomes a non-interpretive act of quantifying data. When domination and resistance models are applied in this manner, they are more similar to the gradational views of class which
treat the archaeological assemblage as a passive expression of one's class. While Wurst and Fitts identify two significant differences in the conceptual treatment of class by historical archaeologists, it becomes apparent that when historical archaeologists approach class with objective determinants such as wealth indicators or vague number comparisons of pots and pans that are not contingent on context, they automatically limit themselves to a static view of class relationships.

Other relational studies that stem from a Marxist perspective do seek to understand class relations as a “non-static” or dynamic process (see McGuire and Paynter 1991). In these studies, material culture is viewed as a prism of symbols that communicate the competing ideologies of the actors within the forces and relations of production (Paynter 1988). This notion of “competing” ideologies, suggests a dynamic, or relational, view of class in that “class relationships consist of the negotiation of these ideologies in the cultural arena” (Beaudry et al. 1991: 159). This type of approach is useful because it allows for various cultural understandings of material culture. It also transcends a gradational view of class by focusing on relationships rather than measures of wealth.

Beaudry et al.’s investigation of the Boott Cotton Mills industry in Lowell, Massachusetts focused on the symbols, or “discourses” associated with the worker's everyday material culture. Since drinking alcohol was explicitly frowned upon by the mills’ owners, the large numbers of liquor bottles recovered from deposits associated with the factory workers led the authors to conclude the workers were actively resisting the power of the owners through leisurely imbibing in alcohol (Beaudry et al. 1991). The authors further concluded that “it was in leisure behavior and off-time
work, as well as personal dress and comportment, that individual workers expressed
themselves and signaled the affiliations of ethnicity, subculture and class” (Beaudry
et al. 1991: 169). Their interpretation supports a relational view of class by
approaching class through the workers’ relationships with the owners. Yet, as Orser
(1998: 173) points out, Beaudry et al. are negligent in their discussion and
consideration of the range of commodities available for the worker’s expression of
subculture. At the Boott Mills Factory, the worker’s wages were predetermined by
the owners, as were the range and availability of commodities. The men and women
at Boott Mills, or anywhere for that matter, were (and never are) completely free to
choose how to best express their notions of ethnicity, attitudes, or beliefs. There is
always some form of constraint, whether it be a socially defined constraint on
material resources like that at Boott Mills or a physically defined constraint on
natural resources, which forces people to select or use (consciously or not) certain
symbols that may express their ideology.

The preceding discussion highlights components of the class concept that
must be considered by historical archaeologists when approaching class in the
archaeological record. When class is used as an objective category, the historical
archaeologist is likely to learn more about the relationship between the archaeological
record and socioeconomic status. Therefore, when trying to understand processes of
class formation, it is absolutely essential to understand class as a social and cultural
concept to be used by the analyst as a historical category. When class is approached
in this manner, as an analytical tool, different scales of inquiry may be applied to
various historical and material circumstances. Wurst (1999: 9) claims this “process
of abstraction” is critical in maintaining a relational, or non-static, view of class.

Within this framework, Wurst (1999: 9-11) relies on Ollman’s (1993) analysis of Marx’s philosophy of the dialectic to develop three levels of abstraction to be used when understanding class: abstractions of extension, generality, and vantage point.

Abstractions of extension (Ollman 1993) refer to the above-mentioned use of shifting scales of inquiry when analyzing class. Through the deployment of “different spatial and temporal boundaries” (Wurst 1999: 1) the analyst may focus on various levels of class analysis, at the household level or community level. Within this abstraction, class becomes a “complex relation” that may be construed to include any number of people depending on the spatial and temporal boundary of the abstraction (Ollman 1993: 46). Abstractions of generality involve relating class relationships from a specific scale to the more general atmosphere that surrounds them (Wurst 1999: 10). Again, this type of abstraction points to the issue of context. By creating the appropriate backdrop for human action, a researcher can highlight the local to more universal processes that were shaping the specific circumstances. As Wurst points out (1999: 10), there are several levels of generality from which to compare and contrast the particular circumstances, each level having the ability to highlight different aspects of social relations at hand. Combined with abstractions at the level of extension, we may begin to further envision class as an analytical concept, dependent upon the set of relations one chooses to focus on when conducting class analysis.

Vantage point abstractions refer to “drawing abstractions from different sides of the same relation” (Wurst 1999: 10). These abstractions become dependent upon
the first two and have the ability to elucidate various perspectives from the same relations. Abstractions of vantage point, more than the other two, increase the archaeologist’s ability to treat class as a relational formation. By illustrating the perspectives of other classes and how they change through time, class loses any static like quality and may be perceived only as a dynamic process. Furthermore, by working back and forth between each abstraction we may elucidate new perspectives on the same relation giving each abstraction “greater depth and perspective” (Harvey 1982: 2). Ollman’s process of abstraction is an effective analytical tool for exploring class relationships in Post-Revolutionary Tidewater Virginia.

Research Setting and Methods

The Tidewater region of Virginia presents an excellent opportunity to analyze processes involved in class formation from the late eighteenth to early nineteenth-century. Historians and historical archaeologists have studied upper class society in Tidewater Virginia for many decades. These studies have resulted in a broad understanding of the social and material world of the region’s upper class. This knowledge will promote a relational perspective when analyzing the cultural landscapes of middle class planters. As mentioned earlier, the National Era was an important transitional period within America that witnessed a flurry of transformations and activities that affected the lives of every American. The expansion of the middling planter class occurred during this period, presenting an ideal opportunity to study class formation. For this study, the chronological focus
will be from the end of the Revolutionary War through the first quarter of the
nineteenth-century, with specific attention during the latter years of this period.

Before explaining the methodology that is used to explore class formation, it
is important to clarify how this analysis will define the term “class.” Class will be
used as an analytical tool to understand social and cultural formations “of a very
loosely defined body of people who share the same congeries of interests, social
experiences, traditions, and value system, who have a disposition to behave as a class,
to define themselves in their actions and in their consciousness in relation to other
groups of people in class ways” (Thompson 1965: 357). This type of definition
promotes a relational view of class and allows it to be viewed from a variety of
scales.

In order to adopt a relational view of class it becomes necessary to draw an
‘abstraction of extension’ to include those members of a class whose inclusion is not
based primarily on objective indicators, such as number of acres or slaves. A brief
overview of the literature that attempts to define middling planters in any fashion
immediately summons up issues of ambiguity. In their study of Post-Revolutionary
architecture in Tidewater Virginia, Edward Chappell and Julie Richter (1997)
explored this problem and defined middling planters as those who owned 100 to 1000
acres. Kulikoff (1992) chose similar means in categorizing middling planters through
the ownership of a few hundred acres and a few slaves. While studies such as
Chappell and Richter’s extensive survey of Post-Revolutionary housing in Tidewater
Virginia use objective indicators to create a large, invaluable data base for present
and future analysis, such indicators promote a gradational view, and are not
appropriate to the present analysis. The significance of slave and livestock ownership is complicated by the fact that by 1815, 40% of the population in York County owned slaves and livestock yet were landless (Brown and Bragdon 1986).

This study will analyze the landscapes of middling planters who farm their own land and who do not hold office titles. Farm tenancy and land speculation was on the rise following the American Revolution in Tidewater Virginia. Planters who diversified their agricultural practices and their occupations were successful at a time when the regional economy was in a state of decline (Brown and Bragdon 1986). The second variable focuses on behavioral attributes associated with the social and political prestige awarded to those elected to office. In the years preceding the Revolution, those elected to office were typically members of the upper class elected by a body of freeholders. Post-Revolutionary times offered new forms of public authority to lower class members. Office holding in the Post-Revolutionary era brought middling planters in closer contact with the powerful elite and rewarded them with new forms of power in society. Focusing on those planters who farmed their own land and were without the title of office promotes a relational view of class that seeks to investigate how similar dispositions are created through exposure to similar circumstances.

Interpreting the symbolic behavior of middling planters through the material record will require more than an analysis of ceramics and clay pipes. Cultural landscapes, however, are broad encompassing forms of material culture that reflect the symbolic, relational, and functional activities of those who helped create the landscape. Various landscape studies have been performed that demonstrate how
landscapes can be used to understand class relations at a variety of scales (e.g. Paynter 1985; Hood and Reinke 1989; Leone 1984; Delle 1998). The landscapes of middling farmers, the ownership of which played such a substantial role in their success, are excellent sources of information. Specific attention will be given to organization of space on these farmsteads. It is proposed that such an analysis will provide clues towards the diversity of activities that occurred on the farmstead as well as elucidating the symbolic importance of such layouts. Analysis of the architecture of main dwellings and the spatial relationship between outbuildings, fences, and main dwellings will foster a more complete understanding of the material lives and strategies of middling planters during a period of rapid social, political, and economic transformation.

An expansive theory will also be used to further define class members and interpret their cultural landscapes. Bourdieu's theory of practice is attractive for studying cultural landscapes because of the attention given to "the principles lying behind other cultural practices through an examination of and involvement of objects arranged in space and contexts of use" (Hodder 1986: 76). In order to allow for the local processes that order and affect the everyday activities of people's lives, a significant consideration should be given to the interplay of the common set of conditions, daily practices, and motivating conditions of the social players. When studying landscapes as a system of symbols, practice theory can be even more enlightening in regards to the political functions of people's activities. Any rising class's activities can be seen as having a "stake in the struggles" that are present in the capitalist system (Wacquant 1992:13). Symbolic representations, like landscapes,
can then be viewed as "social products" that contribute to making the social world, yet also tend to reconstitute one's class and position within that world (Wacquant 1992: 14). The symbols associated with cultural landscapes and their coalescence with social identity create a useful source for class analysis.

Two archaeological sites will be used in this analysis to highlight processes of class formation. The first site, 44JC240 (Massie Farm Property), is a small rural farmstead located in James City County, Virginia that was extensively investigated during the fall of 1990 revealing various landscape features (Jones et al. 1991). The site was occupied from the mid eighteenth-century until the turn of the twentieth-century. Although initial occupation of the property occurred in the middle of the eighteenth-century, new ownership of the property by Allen Marston at the turn of the nineteenth-century reflects the alteration and construction of a new cultural landscape in Post-Revolutionary Tidewater, Virginia. The second site, 44RD30, is another small rural farmstead located in Richmond County, Virginia that was occupied from 1730-1920 (Higgins et al 1992). While the site includes many landscape features associated with its continual occupation through the first quarter of the twentieth-century, specific attention will be paid to the landscape that was created in the early nineteenth-century by Thomas Dobyns. The cultural landscapes created by these middling planters not only reflect the functional day to day activities that occurred on these farmsteads, but demonstrate how they played a role in class relations during the early nineteenth-century in Tidewater Virginia.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

Historical archaeologists always approach the archaeological record with a theoretical orientation. Although some interpretations may not be filled with the dense and somewhat confusing rhetoric that usually accompanies a theoretical approach, there is always some theoretical focus or angle that the researcher, consciously or not, uses to understand some aspect of archaeological interest. What becomes increasingly important as this process unfolds, is the congruency and explanatory capabilities of one's theoretical approach with the specific research problem at hand. Whether the researcher is involved in deductive reasoning, beginning with a hypothesis over a certain set of data or searching for the general after an investigation of the particular (inductive reasoning), there must always be some sort of coherent fit between the questions asked and the conclusions drawn. Without this fit, or articulation between research questions and theories, the process of interpretation loses its inherent logic, the very logic that allows the researcher to make valid inferences from a sample of data.

When studying class, with its various definitions and levels of analysis, it is important for the researcher to select a theoretical approach that is compatible with
the definition of class and the level of class analysis proposed. As mentioned earlier, this study is defining class as a social and cultural formation of a loosely defined group of people who have dispositions to behave in class ways. This definition will help accommodate a relational view of class that transcends a static view of class, perpetuated through gradational studies. It follows, that the use of this definition and level of class analysis requires a theoretical orientation that seeks to understand common dispositions, experiences, and relationships of groups of persons within a given context. One such theory that has emerged over the past few decades that seeks to identify such factors is practice theory (Wright 1989: 292).

Practice theory, heralded by Pierre Bourdieu, transcends the duality of the structuralist school through his conception of habitus. Bourdieu's concept of habitus allows for the ordering of everyday activities to play an integral role in social reproduction, class ideology and formation, and identity formation (Daniels 1997: 382). The inclusion of this third term is an attempt by Bourdieu to mediate between objectivist and subjectivist approaches. Habitus (1990: 53), as defined by Bourdieu, are “systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them.” While Bourdieu’s dense terminology and dialogue can be frustrating and confusing, the basic premise found beneath the
rhetoric is quite helpful. A person’s habitus can be seen as a cognitive (subjective) or mental schemata that is at once born into the objective world, yet modified as one experiences the world, and will “vary systematically with the point they occupy in objective social space” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 11). Basically, the concept of habitus allows social experiences to become a motivating factor in human behavior. The experiences a person has from childhood to adulthood play a significant role in determining their actions. Yet, these experiences are determined to some extent by the historical conditions one is born into. It is here that Bourdieu has been critiqued for falling into the reductionist trap (Alexander 1995: 128-197; Knauft 1998). By giving primacy to the objective structures of the social world, a person’s habitus may be seen as nothing more than a mere reflection or translation of those structures, thus reducing Bourdieu’s philosophy to a tautology. Yet, according to Bourdieu (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 136) the notion of habitus is designed specifically to avoid such a trap, by implying that “agents will actively determine, on the basis of these socially and historically constituted categories of perception and appreciation, the situation that determines them” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 136). A reductionist reading of Bourdieu’s philosophy overlooks Bourdieu’s emphasis on structural constraint, not determinism. Practice theory seeks to endorse human agency, yet emphasizes a fundamental reading of this agency within the limits of the structural environment in which this action takes place. To fully explore and
understand human creativity, we must first explore the circumstances that prompted and shaped this activity.

To understand Bourdieu's philosophy of the habitus and its relationship with the structural environment(s), it is important to review Bourdieu's notion of fields.

In analytic terms, a field may be defined as a network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions. These positions are objectively defined, in their existence and in the determinations they impose upon their occupants, agents or institutions, by their present and potential situation (situs) in the structure of the distribution of species of power (or capital) whose possession commands access to the specific profits that are at stake in the field, as well as by their objective relation to other positions (domination, subordination, homology, etc) (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 97).

The objective circumstances (fields) that social players are born into and live through, interact with a person's subjective understanding (habitus) of that world. Thus, we can begin to conceptualize these two notions of field and habitus, as relational properties that always function in regards to each other. The field may be conceived as a "relational configuration" that imposes a certain external force upon its agents (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1990: 19). Yet, the very nature and structure of the field is determined in part by the historical genesis of its structure, and the continual conflicts and struggles (habitus) of the social players within that field. The field is not only the setting for action, but also a major determinant in the action.
Bourdieu’s theory of practice is of relevance to historical archaeologists who seek to understand the human behavior and activity in specific contexts. Through the dual notions of habitus and fields, human behavior and activity “can only be accounted for by relating the social conditions in which the habitus generated them was constituted, to the social conditions in which it was implemented” (Bourdieu 1980: 56). As historical archaeologists, we must understand the myriad of material and immaterial circumstances that surround peoples’ lives before exploring a person’s activities and what those activities mean. Bourdieu’s philosophy is not deterministic nor reductionist, it simply demands a thorough understanding of circumstance. As social and cultural human beings, circumstances shape our actions and perceptions of the world. For example, in contact situations between two different cultures, such as the contact between the Native Americans and English settlers at Jamestown in the beginning of the seventeenth-century, we cannot begin to understand the reaction of either culture, without first realizing what their circumstances were prior to contact, and how these circumstances affected the future relationships and developments between the two cultures.

Within practice theory, it is extremely important to recognize the abstraction of multiple fields. A field should not be thought of as a singular or universal setting in which all humans participate. There are economic, religious, political, and other varieties of fields that have their own specific distribution of economic, cultural, and symbolic capital. These fields combine to constrain, modify, or promote certain
actions and activities, or habitus, differentially, dependent upon one’s degree of interest or participation within the field. People’s action can therefore be conceived as “motivated, driven by, torn from a state of in-difference and moved by the stimuli sent by certain fields and not others” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 26).

Additionally, one’s participation within one social field may promote activities and action in other social fields, when the activities and interests of separate fields begin to clash or affect each other. For instance, an artist, whose primary field of participation is within the artistic field, may become politically motivated after censorship laws become enacted in the political field. A change in the amplitude of one social field can affect the relative amplitude of another social field. The point is, an essential component to understanding human motivation and activities, is the degree of participation, or interest, actors have within certain fields and the effect social fields have on human behavior, as these fields articulate. Bourdieu’s concept of multiple and interacting fields is of relevance for historical archaeologists who often provide a universal context for their interpretation of material evidence. By investigating the different degrees of participation humans have in certain fields versus others, we can develop a better understanding of the motivating factors behind a person’s activities.

Bourdieu’s practice theory, with its focus on everyday activities of and the importance of circumstance and interest, can be a useful concept for historical archaeologists who seek to understand human behavior across time and space. How,
then, does practice theory conceptualize class? In accord with the earlier definition of class, habitus are the incorporation of the objectified world and subjectified experiences, "whose immediate self evidence is accompanied by the objectivity provided by the consensus on the meaning of practices and the world, in other words the harmonization of the agents' experiences and the constant reinforcement each of them receives from expression individual and collective" (emphasis added) (Bourdieu 1990: 58). It is through this definition of habitus that we can seek to understand class formation as a group of persons who behave in certain ways.

Habitus are dispositions learned through child development and the incorporation of the objective structures of the world, becoming further shaped through continual exposure to objective conditions. This continuity of exposure to a common set of material circumstances in social space, by members of society, creates a common habitus or lived experience within the social world. Continuing this train of thought, it becomes important to make the distinction between individual habitus and class habitus, for now they appear to be one and the same. Individual habitus are the subjective experiences and dispositions manifested in the individual through constant exposure to a set of objectified structures. The class habitus "could be regarded as a subjective but non-individual system of internalized structures, common schemes of perception, and ...sharing of a world view" (Bourdieu 1990: 60). The relationship between the two is defined by Bourdieu (1990: 60) as that of a "homology," in which there is diversity represented by individual dispositions, yet united in a homogeneity
of social conditions. Therefore, we may understand class habitus as the harmonization of a group of people’s experiences and dispositions within similar social fields and social conditions.

The common set of conditionings experienced by members of a class, which create the class habitus, are also what structures class interests and strategies in the future. This homogeneity of past experiences and analogous circumstances is “what enables practices to be objectively harmonized without any calculation or conscious reference to a norm and mutually adjusted in the absence of any direct interaction” (Bourdieu 1980: 58). Members of a class, like in Katznelson’s third level of class analysis, do not explicitly realize they are behaving in class ways. It is through their common exposure to similar situations that project their interests and activities, towards more or less similar goals. Viewed in this light, the strategies employed by members of a class are not the “purposive and preplanned pursuit of calculated goals, but the active deployment of objectively oriented ‘lines of action’ that obey regularities and form coherent and socially intelligible patterns” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 25). When analyzing class activities, the goal of the researcher is not to identify individual consciously aimed goals, but to identify the common structures found in various social fields and to interpret that relationship, between the class habitus and social fields.

Returning to Wright’s (1989: 286) relational conception of class structure further highlights the efficacy of practice theory when studying class. When
discussing common material interests, Wright proposes we perceive a class as those persons who “objectively face similar dilemmas and trade-offs in the pursuit of economic welfare and economic power.” This conception of common material interests is compatible with practice theory’s conception of class habitus, in which the homogeneity of social conditions and social fields (or objective “dilemmas and trade-offs”) constitute similar (class) dispositions. Moreover, a theory of practice seeks to identify an assortment of pursuits through the incorporation of multiple fields, “in short, the art of estimating and seizing chances...are dispositions that can only be acquired in certain social conditions” (emphasis added) (Bourdieu 1980: 64).

Viewed from this perspective, we can seek to understand dispositions not only in regard to economic pursuits, but within the totality of the social milieu, which incorporates additional social and cultural interests involved in the decision-making process. Therefore, the stakes involved in the struggles between classes must be viewed in light of “the overall volume of the different kinds of capital they possess... and according to the relative weight of the different kinds of capital, economic and cultural, in the total volume of their capital” (Bourdieu 1998: 7). What this statement implies for class analysis, is the need to look beyond mere economic interests and trade-offs, and begin to consider the relative weight and volume of the various kinds of capital that are at stake in the “game.”
CHAPTER III
THE LANDSCAPE APPROACH

Equally important in any theoretical perspective concerning class is the specific methodology used to understand related processes. Practice theory, as mentioned earlier, seeks to understand how similar experiences to analogous situations (or conditionings), within specific social and cultural milieus, structure the strategies and interests of various members of a class. While similar categories of material culture associated with certain members of society, such as ceramics, are common forms of exposure to material conditions, mere count analyses of these items do not typically reveal the experiential qualities of life. To develop a more pronounced understanding of the role material culture plays in shaping and reflecting experience, one needs to consider the various patterns and distribution of its use. It is here that Bourdieu’s philosophy of practice can be very helpful. Habitus are formed through the daily patterned use of material objects. The associations given to these materials occur within a spatial context, which give meaning to their function and use. Day-to-day use of these materials (within given spatial arrangements) generate patterned schemes of perception and “practical mastery involving tact, dexterity and savoir faire which cannot be reduced to rules” (Hodder 1986: 74). Thus, two
significant factors in developing an understanding of class as lived experience through archaeological investigation, are the spatial arrangement of material items and their contexts of use.

Over the past few decades, landscape archaeology has emerged as an effective tool in exploring the relational, symbolic, functional, and ideational activities of people in the past (Stine et al. 1997). Initially, investigations of past landscapes were promoted by preservationists who sought to recreate past settings associated with the elaborate mansions and gardens, such as those at Colonial Williamsburg and Carter’s Grove (Beaudry 1996: 4). More recently, historical archaeologists have used landscape archaeology as a valuable approach to understanding past and present human behavior. The expansion of the landscape approach within the field is explained by the interdisciplinary nature of historical archaeology. Historical archaeologists have utilized insights from architectural history, sociology, anthropology, literature, and cultural geography to refine and expand their knowledge and conceptualization of the cultural landscape.

The term “cultural landscape” is loaded with meaning. A quick review of the use of the term “culture” within cultural anthropology and archaeology over the past twenty years demonstrates a lack of consensus over just what exactly that word means. To add to the confusion, the term “landscape” has been similarly ambiguous, since its inception into the cultural geography school in the early twentieth-century
(Cosgrove 1997). The many definitions and conceptualizations of the two terms, however, have created a concept that can be understood and used in a variety of ways. While some fault historical archaeologists (see Winberry 1997) for the discrepancies in the definition of ‘cultural landscape,’ it is the versatility and the ambiguity of the concept that encourages original and creative research into past human behavior. Just as vernacular architecture has emerged as a means of exploring buildings of “any sort” (Wells 1986: 4), cultural landscapes have become less an agreed-on concept or physical property simply observable with the “eye,” (Cosgrove 1997) than a creative approach to understanding past and present human behavior.

Cultural landscapes are an active and dynamic source of interaction between symbols and meanings created in the past and those formed in the present. The meanings associated with cultural landscapes emerge out of the “way in which spaces are inhabited” (Thomas 1986: 87) and by the particular persons who experience that space. The material landscape can be experienced and interpreted differently by members of that social system. This is what Dell Upton (1988) eloquently demonstrates in his analysis of plantation landscapes in eighteenth-century Virginia. Experiencing the great plantations of eighteenth-century Virginia, slaves and poor whites faced a series of connected buildings that combined to form restricted and non-restricted areas. Access to certain buildings and spaces within buildings, was dependent upon one’s role within the social system. White visitors had restricted access within and between the outbuildings, while slaves often had greater access. Perceptions of the landscape (freedom and restriction) were dependent upon one’s role within that social system. The control of movement within the plantation,
through the designed layout of outbuildings upon the landscape, reinforced the prevailing attitudes of the Virginia planter during the eighteenth-century (Upton 1988: 363).

We can begin to conceptualize the cultural landscape as a physical setting that may be interpreted differentially according to a person’s understanding of the social world. This setting is loaded with symbols that only become signified when internalized. In the course of everyday action, human beings create and recreate the meanings of cultural landscapes. A person’s occupation of physical space and their action within that space, contribute to the symbols found within the cultural landscape. Although many activities of life seem ordinary and routine, some “acts can be undertaken at a discursive or nondiscursive level, and can have unintended consequences as well as being based upon unacknowledged conditions” (Giddens cited in Thomas 1996: 48). Since, cultural landscapes incorporate both “physical and sociohistorical structures” (Orser 1996: 138), the internalization of these structures will contribute to a person’s understanding of the social world. The externalization of that social world will be produced, consciously or not, through assumed practice.

Cultural landscapes provide a good resource to examine issues related to this study. Approaching the cultural landscape as a physical setting that symbolizes class interests and strategies allows historical archaeologists to compare and contrast historical data with the material world produced by class members. Indeed, historical archaeologists have conducted landscape analyses at a variety of scales to investigate class process. In a study of coffee plantations in the Blue Mountains of Jamaica,
James Delle (1998) used extensive documentary sources with limited archaeological evidence to investigate class process. Delle traced the effects of the changing global and local economy on class relations involved in the production of sugar and coffee. His analysis of landscapes provides the framework for understanding change at the local level by “detail[ing] the everyday class relations of domination and surveillance” (Paynter 1999: 187) involved during the transition from slave labor to wage labor on the plantations. Randall McGuire (1990) examines late nineteenth to early twentieth-century town and community landscapes in Broome County, New York to understand the ideological transformations that were occurring within the maturing capitalist system. The spread of consumerism and transformations in the capitalist relations of production in Broome County led to “the formulation of a new ideology of class relations which, rather than naturalizing class inequalities, den[ied] the existence of class” (McGuire 1990: 102). Mark Leone (1983) reduces the scale even further to investigate late eighteenth-century class relations in Annapolis, Maryland. Employing a middle range approach, Leone draws on principles of formal geometry and on documents to interpret Governor William Paca’s formal garden. Leone’s study demonstrated how the formal design of the garden was intentionally manipulated to naturalize and legitimize class authority during the late eighteenth-century.

The analysis of cultural landscapes has enhanced historical archaeologists’ ability to investigate class process at a variety of scales. Just as Ollman’s analytical
abstractions organized class processes at different levels, landscape analyses at shifting scales should similarly highlight processes involved in class relations. The landscapes of middling planters during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth-centuries provide an opportunity to examine class in the new nation. The organization of farm and domestic work at these farmsteads reflect the quotidian affairs of the middling planters. These (seemingly routine) activities are important clues to the social relations on and off the farmsteads. Production at these farmsteads does “not take place apart from cultural understandings of what is needed, where it should come from, how it is obtained, how it should be distributed, and how or why it should be consumed” (Hood 1996: 123). The externalization of these understandings will reflect (to some degree) how class was negotiated through the cultural landscapes of rural Tidewater Virginia.
CHAPTER IV
HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Colonial settlement within the Chesapeake region was based upon the accumulation of land resources. Whether colonists were seeking political freedom, escaping religious persecution, or simply seeking economic opportunities, land and its ownership became the backbone for colonial development within the Chesapeake region. Life in the colonies also represented a chance to escape the inner trappings of a wage labor system developing at home. Yet, most people had to enter into a contractual obligation of servitude in order to pay for their passage to the colony. This contradictory pursuit of escaping wage labor, yet entering into a form of labor servitude, represents just one of the many contradictions imposed on individuals as they became enmeshed in an emerging capitalist system.

The servants shipped under indenture represented a wide variety of occupations that could be included under the categories of gentlemen, farmers, laborers, metal and construction, textiles and clothing, and services (Galenson 1978: 318). This heterogeneous mix of persons, emerging from a dying feudal system that propagated peasant status labels to those not owning land, now had the opportunity to possess land and create a new identity for themselves. As the promise of opportunity was occurring, traditional forms of exchange would soon decline (Kulikoff 1992; Henretta 1991), promoting the spread of capitalist forms of exchange within the
colonies. Although the maturing capitalist system would create vast new opportunities for many of colonists, it would also foster a distinct class-based society that constrained and amplified the power and social roles of certain classes and class members.

During initial settlement of the Virginia colony, aggressive accumulation created frequent tensions and sometimes violent struggles (e.g. Bacon’s Rebellion) between the colonists and the native Virginia inhabitants. After a number of small-scale conflicts, large scale endemic political struggles, and the gradual accumulation of large tracts of land by a few landed gentry, a capitalist land market had developed within the Chesapeake region by the end of the seventeenth century (Kulikoff 1992). This capitalist land market was fostered by an increasing European demand for the colony’s staple crop, tobacco, and the intrusion of English mercantilist policy into the colonies (Nettels 1952). British merchants set the prices and bought tobacco from the plantation owners. Once purchased, tobacco was shipped to the mainland and often redistributed to remote markets emerging across Europe and the Caribbean (Nettels 1952; Price 1964). These two factors, world trade and British mercantile capitalism, began slowly penetrating and transforming the colony’s economic infrastructure as well as the social and power relations within the growing class-based society.

With the expansion of slave labor in the late seventeenth-century and the decreasing number of emigrating servants, the social fabric of the Chesapeake region was dramatically altered. As racial divisions intensified and the gaps between powerful and powerless grew wider (Brown and Derry 1986), a class and caste system began to develop (Henretta 1973: 91). "Black people had become both a
racial caste and a laboring class. Black people were members of caste because they could rarely escape chattel slavery, a status that defined them both as a means of production and as people” (Kulikoff 1986: 12). While whites identified with each other in terms of race, they became differentiated through the web of power relations inherent in the capitalist land system. With increasing emigration and a natural increase in population, wider disparity grew between those persons who used their control over the means of production primarily to generate capital and those who were mainly engaged in subsistence-oriented activities. These groups of yeomen and gentlemen farmers were joined by craftsmen, artisans, journeymen, and others fulfilling an array of occupations stemming from the growth of the colonial economy. As non-capitalist modes of production (e.g. household mode of production and slavery) combined with capitalist modes of production, the class structure of colonial society became somewhat fluid within its lower tiers. Yet coinciding with these changes, gentlemen planters were taking advantage of their privileged economic and political position to widen the gulf between themselves and the rest of the population.

By the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century, the structure of the capitalist land market had fostered a political oligarchy within the Chesapeake region (Kulikoff 1986; 1992). This oligarchy was composed of a small group of land owning gentry who controlled the allocation of land resources and the extension of credit within the colonies. The landed gentry not only owned the majority of the land in the Chesapeake colonies, but held strong political ties to England through their control of political office in the colonies. Through the head right system, these politically connected gentlemen allotted land to those persons whose indentured
contracts had expired. While fulfilling the terms of their indentures, these servants had lived under the patriarchal system on the gentlemen planters' plantations (Isaac 1982). The gentlemen planters not only controlled the allocation of labor on these plantations, but the amount of food and drink received by the servants, creating physiological dependence as well. In addition, within the early stages of the tobacco economy, the majority of British merchants dealt directly with the landed gentry (Price 1964: 506), thereby leaving the small producers dependent upon the gentry to set tobacco prices and for their extension of credit needed for supplies. The landed gentry maintained further control by offering land through credit to those persons not having any land at all, and those wishing to obtain more land or servants. Though their ownership of large quantities of land and wealth constituted a large degree of their authority, it was their "control of credit" that served as a "basis for the dominance of the wealthy" (Isaac 1982: 133). Thus, capitalist development combined with the political structure of the colony provided these gentlemen with various forms of power needed to maintain class authority.

In the early eighteenth-century, the majority of small landowners remained tied to gentry landowners, who maintained control of land, labor, and capital in the maturing capitalist land market. While the gentry's power was rooted in the political economy of the colony, it was reinforced through social and cultural rituals and patterns of behavior in daily life. At home, planters of varying wealth and class maintained the patriarchal authority established by the gentry in the early years of settlement (Isaac 1982; Kulikoff 1992; Coontz 1988). The eldest male was typically the head of the household and master of any slaves that may have lived and worked
on the property. Yet, outside of the domestic environment, small landowners were subject to rituals of deference that ran through business relationships, religious practices, and social engagements. Not knowing whether next year's crop would be successful or not, small landowners granted the proper amount of respect needed to maintain amiable relationships with wealthy gentlemen in their exchanges (Isaac 1982: 56). At the local Anglican Church, which one was required to attend once every four weeks (Isaac 1982: 58), the authority of the gentry was incorporated into the service through ritualized patterns of procession. “‘It is not the Custom for Gentlemen to go into Church til Service is beginning, when they enter in a Body.’” Pride of rank accompanied the gentry even as they took their places within, so that we may picture them tramping booted to their pews at the front. Their exit was made ‘in the same manner’; women and humbler men waited to leave until the gentlemen had gone” (Isaac 1982: 61). This processional order, based on rank, heightened the public’s awareness of gentry authority, yet also combined to contradict the patriarchal values of family life by reducing all those not gentry, male or female, to one rank.

Just as the structure of the political economy of the Chesapeake laid the foundation for gentry authority in the early years of settlement, the changes that occurred within the political economy over the next century altered existing power relations and created vast new opportunities for all. One key factor that figured into the alteration of power relations was the transformation and growth of the market economy. As the eighteenth-century progressed, the growth of remote markets for tobacco in France, Scotland, and Holland transformed merchant-planter relationships in the Chesapeake (Price 1964). The intrusion of foreign merchants (from Glasgow)
in the Chesapeake tobacco economy created new opportunities for the small planter. With the growth of the French market for tobacco, Glasgow merchants "ignored the great planters of the Tidewater and expanded their chains of stores in the interior to tap the supplies of the smaller farmer" (Price 1964: 509). By circumventing the profits to be made by the gentlemen planter, the Glasgow merchants and smaller planters could benefit each other. The increasing demand for tobacco in France allowed the Glasgow merchants to extend more credit to the smaller planters of the Tidewater region, while concomitantly reducing shipping times and costs (Price 1964: 509).

The opportunities for the smaller planter to seize new forms of credit were not limited to that made available by the Scottish merchants. As the population began to increase and landholdings to disperse, British merchants also began seeking new agricultural suppliers. Desiring to improve their land or number of slaves, the smaller planters of Tidewater Virginia grasped the opportunities for credit. By 1776, middling planters, "who composed perhaps three-fifths of the region's families, owed about half the debt owed by Virginians to British merchants" (Kulikoff 1986: 128). While this strategy of borrowing money or mortgaging land could increase one's holdings, a drop in the market or year of bad crops could prove ruinous. These emerging opportunities for credit and new business relationships (associated with the growth of the market economy in the colonies) fostered the development of a new class of planters and merchants. They provided the new class of planters with new forms of capital that promoted the accumulation of land and labor supplies, while encouraging greater market embeddedness. The growth of these new markets and
creditors within the colony created new sets of social relations that added to the fluid class structure developing within the colony.

While the expansion of credit networks and merchant shops began to alter the gentlemen planter's power within the economy, the gentlemen planters worked within the political sphere to uphold their authority. For example, legislation such as the tobacco inspection act of 1730 in Virginia, was an outright attempt to reduce the tobacco outputs of the smaller planters (Kulikoff 1992: 41). Although many of these efforts were met with violent acts of resistance (e.g. tobacco inspection barn fires), the outcome typically benefited those with political ties (Kulikoff 1992: 41). When political action was taken to secure preexisting authority, the smaller planters had to unite when their livelihood became threatened. These circumstances created an antagonistic relationship for the middling and gentlemen planters. While slowly growing as a new class within colony, middling planters sought many of the profit and market opportunities generally open to the gentry. However, when higher taxes and legislation (imposed by the gentry) threatened their agricultural output, it was in their best interest to ally with smaller planters. As the political environment became more complex approaching the Revolution, such decisions became more difficult for middling planters who sought greater political participation and gentlemen allies.

The power and social authority of gentlemen planters was increasingly threatened throughout the eighteenth-century. One social conflict that arose "was not over the distribution of political power or of economic wealth, but over the ways of men and the ways of God" (Isaac 1982: 162). As mentioned earlier, within the Anglican Church the authority of the gentry was upheld through its processional
order of rank. The Anglican Church and its clergy even began to moralize a genteel way of life best represented by the well-established gentry. Beginning in the late seventeenth to early eighteenth-century, however, the Great Awakening began to arrive in Virginia. Carried by New Light Separate Baptists and later Protestant movements, the message of the Great Awakening spoke to everyone with its gospel of piety and reform. It promoted social fellowship and a chance for a new life. “Converts were proffered some escape from the harsh realities of disease, debt, overindulgence and deprivation, violence and fear of sudden death, that were the common lot of small farmers. They could seek refuge in a close, supportive, and orderly community” (Isaac 1982: 164).

Not only was the message carried by the Great Awakening in direct confrontation with the order and message of the Anglican Church, it also contradicted the ritual-filled social world in which they all lived. A planter’s participation in the Great Awakening movement of the eighteenth-century was a rejection of genteel values (e.g. dancing, drinking, and gambling) that had been promoted since the establishment of the gentry in the seventeenth-century. The Baptist movements and the Protestant movements that followed had a lasting effect on the social environment of the emerging nation. While some planters maintained their orthodox doctrine, many left to imbibe in the fellowship of the individual. The system of patriarchy that was filled with patterns of deferential behavior and built upon hierarchal principles was beginning to wane (Isaac 1982).

Seeking to establish a new independent government, many gentlemen planters were forced to supplicate the support of less wealthy planters and merchants, who
thirty years prior had burned tobacco inspection houses in defiance of economic restrictions. To achieve financial and military support during the revolt against England, gentlemen planters had to admit smaller landowners in the political and ideological debates of the Revolution (Kulikoff 1986: 300). The inclusion of less distinguished families in the political sphere worked well in securing support for the War for Independence, yet encouraged the less wealthy to bring a variety of social and political issues to the table. In some instances, small landowners and other less distinguished persons sent petitions to local legislatures regarding freedom of religion and the disposition of Episcopal glebes (Kulikoff 1986: 310). As lower classes were granted membership within the political arena, the gentry’s authority in the social and political world became further diffused.

The American Revolution affected the political economy and social relations of the colonies in a variety of ways. First, breaking away from England meant reducing dependency upon her for manufactured goods. This, combined with an increase in the natural population, accelerated the growth of the domestic economy. While the development of the national economy had its roots prior to the War for Independence, in which the intrusion of foreign markets (besides England’s) induced participation of more and more people into the market economy, the drastic circumstances of wartime required new modes of production. With the proliferation of new markets and a surplus of workers, more and more workers began participating in profit-oriented exchange relationships “facilitating the emergence of wage labor” and farm tenancy (Henretta 1991: 220).
As the tobacco economy of Tidewater Virginia was in slow decline from a decrease in demand and soil exhaustion, more and more Americans were looking for new ways to sustain family resources. Various domestic industries and rural enterprises, such as shoemaking, cabinetry, and textile production, began to proliferate across the countryside. The growth of the wage labor system dramatically altered the strategies employed by farmers, artisans, and all people. Merchants, planters, and artisans of middling status "became aggressive entrepreneurs, reorganizing production to exploit the new market opportunities and labor supply" (Henretta 1991: 220-1). The proliferation of new markets and economic opportunities diffused and branched traditional class lines present before the Revolution. Class relationships were not simply divided upon lines of land ownership. The promise of new opportunity brought various persons in contact with each other who prior to the Revolution had no relation. The dramatic transformation in class structure that had taken place by the turn of the eighteenth-century can be read in Henry Adams's analysis of American society in 1800. "Lawyers, physicians, professors, and merchants were classes...and acted not as individuals but as though they were clergymen and each profession was a church" (Henretta 1973: 210). The circumstances that contributed to the social authority of the gentry class prior to the Revolution had changed dramatically. Middling planters were participating within several areas of the domestic and market economy. The specific types of markets, as well as the relative degree of participation within these markets, strongly contributed to the substance of middle class formation in the nineteenth-century.
Sparked by the spirit of the Revolution and the growth of the domestic economy, middling planters began seeking new opportunities to sustain and increase family resources. One strategy was occupational diversity. Within Tidewater Virginia, the agricultural economy experienced a recession induced by a variety of factors: the fluctuation in market prices of tobacco and grains; the opening of westward lands and out-migration towards the Piedmont to cultivate new land; and an increase in the population which reduced the amount of land available (Brown and Bragdon 1986). These factors encouraged many planters (who remained vested in the region) to participate within the developing wage labor economy of the maturing capitalist system, as well as taking economic risks through entrepreneurial ventures. Many planters of middling status sought external income through occupations as sheriffs, tavern keepers, lawyers, and the clergy (see Chappell and Richter 1998). This strategy of becoming entrepreneurs or diversifying occupations compounded the relational changes induced by greater market opportunities in the preceding years. Middling planters were reorganizing production and lifestyles to adapt to the demands of an ever-changing political economy.

As the growth of wage labor and the market economy was occurring, a new agricultural economy began to emerge. The exhaustive effects of tobacco cultivation on the Chesapeake soil began to take toll in the middle of the eighteenth-century. Coinciding with this dilemma was the opening of commercial grain markets (both in the colonies and across the Atlantic) and the growth of the agricultural reform movement, or scientific agriculture. Thinking in more calculating terms, planters (small and large holders) began reorganizing production on the farm through a
change from extensive to intensive cultivation; the implementation of new
technology; and the reorganization of labor on the land. Prior to the transformation in
agricultural practices, most planters had practiced an extensive form of cultivation
requiring ample land and long periods of fallow (Bushman 1991: 242). New
technology and the exhaustion of Tidewater soils encouraged the move toward
intensive cultivation (continuous cropping). Although the shift to intensive
cultivation required an increased labor supply, new plow technologies (such as the
Carey plow) and agricultural practices were utilized to increase efficiency. The use
of cow manure and clover planting were implemented to increase the life of the soil.
The introduction of the cradle, “a long handled scythe with a framework of long
wooden fingers placed above the cutting blade,” allowed workers to increase their
output by more than three times (Henretta 1973: 18).

Labor shortages were circumvented through hiring out, the task system, and
increased tenancy. New agricultural practices and emerging grain markets appearing
across the Atlantic offered planters new choices in their agricultural strategies.
Planters became informed of these new practices in the latest agricultural journal or
within local agricultural societies. Increasing one’s knowledge of agricultural
practices required literacy and association with the gentlemen planters who formed
the agricultural societies. Middling planters, who were most likely to partake in these
movements, could share ideas with gentlemen planters, further alloying themselves
with their political antagonists.

The spread of agricultural reform that continued through the nineteenth-
century was the effect of commercial and cultural factors (Bushman 1991). The
market economy encouraged new planting techniques, while model farmers considered extensive cultivation "primitive and reprehensible" (Bushman 1991: 242). Progressive farmers also advocated decreasing the labor supply, or decreasing the number of slaves. Increased dialogue between the hierarchical members of society encouraged planters to develop new techniques and participate in the new markets. The agricultural reform movement exemplifies on one scale, how members of society began strategizing and thinking in more calculating terms than before. By the end of the eighteenth-century "risk-taking, and the calculation of risks, became characteristics of the American farmer class" (Brown 1972: 211).

With the expansion of the market economy and the spirit of individualism sparked by the Revolution, the reliance of the household upon the community declined (Isaac 1982: 212-213), increasing internal connections within the family (Coontz 1988). The corporate nature of communities began to dissolve as households began specializing and participating in new markets, reducing their reliance upon their neighbors for trade networks. "The middling classes were freed from the restraints that had formerly been imposed by their obligations to those above and below them, but they were also deprived of the obligations owed to them" (Coontz 1988: 124). The disintegration of the corporate nature of the community further decreased elements of class solidarity from forming.

Thinking more in terms of the individual and the family, gentlemen and middle class planters sought new strategies for familial autonomy. Familial alliances became important strategies for "preserving or combining blocs of capital and for constructing partnerships" (Coontz 1988: 121). Yet, as the need for familial
connections became increasingly more important, the maturing capitalist economy began to induce more and more individuals within the family to participate in new markets and wage labor activities. This antagonistic relationship dramatically altered the structure and nature of family life.

One major transformation involved the change in inheritance strategies by the smaller to middling size property owners. Prior to Revolutionary War, the traditional pattern of inheritance was consistent with the patriarchal system that linked the father to the king. Men passed down property and financial resources to the eldest son or to the widow until the child became old enough to control property (Kulikoff 1986: 200; Coontz 1988). These patterns began to change as landholdings dispersed and inter-family relationships changed. Smaller to middling size planters would often times give their land to one heir, while giving financial assistance to the others (Henretta 1988). With the existence of new economic opportunities for the children, the child who remained faithful to the farm was probably the land heir. Other children sought wage labor opportunities in urban areas or sought further participation in the market economy through craft specialization and economic ventures. Other times, the father dispersed the landholdings between all the children, thus creating an abundance of marginal farms that increased family interdependence as the traditional pattern of corporate communalism began to decline. The changes made in patterns of inheritance by the smaller to middling size farmers further demonstrate the adjustments made within the family as the structure of the capitalist economy began to require more calculating strategies than ever before.
A further consequence of the Revolution was the "deliberate construction of republican state governments designed by using reason and the best principles of political science" (Brown 1972: 213). As the national economy began to flourish, fierce ideological and political debates occurred over the new role of the state in the economic and political future of the country. Prior to the Revolution, local, provincial, and imperial authorities decided economic and political matters. With the creation of a national republican government, "the tripartite politics of the colonial period... had now amalgamated into a single structure of power and authority" (Henretta 1973: 215). The growth of market economic activity within the domestic sphere made the construction of roads, canals, and trade networks indispensable. However, political debate soon entered the situation when deciding who was responsible for funding and building the networks needed to encourage the national common market. This debate quickly developed into a two party dispute in which the "Federalists and Jeffersonians (Republicans) alike knew that the state had a role in building roads and canals but disagreed on who—the federal government, the states, or private businessmen" (Kulikoff 1992: 107) should be responsible.

At the heart of the debate were the effects of new legislation on small independent rural producers whose land ownership provided taxable income for the new government seeking to develop a strong national economy. Seeking to hinder the development and continuation of a political system run by wealthy businessman and capitalists, Jeffersonians favored a political government that would benefit the small independent rural producer. It was felt that "only widespread distribution of land could prevent usurpation of power and destruction of the republic by wealthy
merchants, lawyers, and gentlemen” (Kulikoff 1992: 148). The Federalists, on the other hand, sought the creation of republican government that would “use the power of the state to assist ‘monied men,’ merchants and financiers, and to pursue a ‘capitalist’ path of commercial development” (Henretta 1991: 237).

The future of small independent rural producers was thus drawn into the political atmosphere in the years following the Revolution. Seeking greater autonomy than that allowed by the proposed Federalist legislation, small American farmers had to become more self-conscious as a political class, in order to ensure their forms of power within the growing capitalist economy. Espousing Jeffersonian ideas of “agrarian realism,” small independent rural producers “linked small-scale farming to agricultural improvement that implied greater market embeddedness” (Kulikoff 1992: 148). Seeking to maintain their landholdings and familial authority, many small to middling size planters adopted a labor theory of value to their land in contrast to the land speculators and capitalists who thought location and fertility were land’s only value.

The values placed on land ownership (what was seen by everyone in the early years of settlement as the means to prosperity within the colonies) were now being transformed by the smaller to middling size planter as they became enmeshed in a capitalist economy. To many of these landholders, land was only made valuable through the organization of labor and agricultural knowledge applied to it. Although many of these landholders were resistant to the modernist outlook of capitalist land speculators and merchants, they were by no means “anti-commercial” (Greene 1996: 453). Their adoption of a labor theory of value was meant to portray their pursuits of
self-interest and republican idealism that would lead to autonomy. If the only value of land lay in its location and fertility, these producers could only achieve self-autonomy through the accumulation of more land, which would ultimately require more capital. The adoption of a political ideology rooted in a labor theory of value was an effort by these producers to maintain their hold of power as structural changes within the political economy required increasing ingenuity to maintain familial and political autonomy.

The structural changes in the maturing capitalist system altered the web of power and social relations throughout the early years of settlement to the birth of the nation. The social authority and power of the upper class was dramatically transformed as emerging social, political, and economic outlets for the individual began to appear. The top-heavy class system of the early eighteenth-century was directly affected by these changes. The growth of the market economy created new outlets for social and economic interaction in which former class relations had less meaning. The “single status hierarchy of the rural society of the early eighteenth-century had been transformed into a more elaborate and more differentiated spectrum of power and authority. Unity had given way to multiplicity” (Henretta 1973: 212). The transformations in the broad web of social and power relations that occurred during the National Period ran through a “myriad of tributaries that saturate(d) the social terrain” (Fox-Genovese and Genovese 1983: 208). Evidence for these
transformations can be found in the architecture, material culture, and landscapes of the middling planter within Tidewater Virginia.
CHAPTER V
ABSTRACTING CLASS

Before discussing how two middle class farmers organized their material world in Post-Revolutionary Tidewater Virginia, it is important to highlight aspects of the historical transformations taking place in the Chesapeake using Bourdieu’s theory of practice. Bourdieu’s notion of social fields will serve as a starting point for highlighting aspects of Tidewater social relations in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Reflecting back upon the previous discussion of theory, it is easy to imagine a multitude of social fields that carried their own specific distribution of economic, cultural, and symbolic capital. For instance, we could visualize a political field of the early eighteenth-century primarily consisting of members of the upper class in the colonies and in England. We could also imagine the struggles and strategies involved in this field, as members sought their claims to political power. The types of capital that might be present within this field would range from pure economic wealth (and display of that wealth), family background, education, and cultural capital in its institutionalized form of office titles.

While Bourdieu’s notion of “fields” could be helpful in trying to understand how members of the upper class vied with each other in the political field of the early eighteenth-century, they would not elucidate aspects of the social relations germane to this study. Even if we examined other social fields of the eighteenth-century, such
as the artistic or literary field, we would still be hard-pressed to discover anything about social relations between classes. The question that arises: does Bourdieu’s notion of social fields help us elucidate anything about the social relations between classes during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth-centuries in Tidewater Virginia?

The answer depends upon the questions we ask or how we apply Bourdieu’s notions of social fields and capital. Part of the problem when applying these concepts to address past social relations lies within the types and amount of information left behind in the historical record. We cannot examine the class dynamics of many historical situations simply because we are limited to scant and biased documentary records. For example, the majority of records that highlight aspects of past social relations are left behind in the diaries and journals of upper class members of society. These records simply would not provide the relational perspective this paper is trying to achieve. However, if we seek to address certain issues related to class dynamics in the past through the conscious application of Bourdieu’s notions of social fields and respective capital (where appropriate), we may elucidate aspects of Tidewater social relations that may be helpful to us later on.

In the early years of settlement and well into the eighteenth-century, the gentry class can be viewed as the dominant actors within the political economy and a variety of social fields. These social fields carried their own specific volume of economic, social, and cultural capital not fully open to or intelligible to other classes. An example of the somewhat unintelligible nature of the various forms of gentry
capital can be seen during the growth of Protestant religious practices through the eighteenth-century. Prior to the Great Awakening, gentry authority was incorporated into the ritual of the Anglican Church through patterns of procession and rank. Lower classes and slaves succumbed to the authority of the Church and (in so doing) to the authority of the genteel way of life. However, many of these persons left the Anglican Church to imbibe in the spirit of individualism promoted by the Baptist and Protestant gospel during the Great Awakening. These movements symbolized a rejection of genteel values, values that were somewhat unintelligible to those not fully participating within the gentry-dominated social fields. This is not to say that lower classes or slaves did not have the mental capacity to understand the various forms of capital at stake. It does suggest, however, that various forms of capital associated with the gentry lifestyle (e.g. drinking, dancing, opulent display of wealth) were looked upon by many members in society as having little or no worth. It further suggests a conscious movement by members of Tidewater society to participate in a new social field that carried its own volume of economic, social, and cultural capital intelligible to those involved.

This example of the changes sparked by the Great Awakening demonstrates how we can begin to elucidate perceptions (between classes) of genteel capital that were involved in the religious field of the eighteenth-century. It further demonstrates the idea of people having different perceptions of the various forms of capital (which includes material culture) at stake within social fields. We should keep this in mind when reconsidering Bushman’s emulation model in the concluding chapter.
Although perceptions of genteel capital and the growth of Protestant religion contributed to the abandonment of the Anglican religious field, there were other fields in which individuals remained vested. In agriculture, an effort was made by individuals to accumulate and reproduce the various forms of capital at stake. A brief example will demonstrate the existence of a social field and how participants within the field were involved in a series of struggles over the forces within it. With the expansion of credit networks throughout the Chesapeake region in the early eighteenth-century, smaller planters reduced their reliance upon gentlemen planters and were able to accumulate more land and labor supplies (economic capital). Gentlemen planters, in an effort to safeguard their position, made collective efforts within the political field (e.g. tobacco inspection act of 1730) to reduce the outputs allowed to the smaller planters. The act of using political power to suppress the accumulation of capital by others demonstrates how social fields articulate and affect the forces that operate within separate fields. The smaller planters, with little political pull at the time, could only resort to physical acts of resistance (which would have led to criminal punishment) in order to protect their interests within that field. The various strategies employed by the field’s members were dependent on their position within that field, “that is, in the distribution of the specific capital (land in this case), and on the perception they have of the field depending on the point of view they take on the field as a view taken from a point in the field” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992:101).
As the eighteenth-century progressed, historical transformations occurred with wide-ranging effects on the social field of agriculture. The construction of republican state governments reduced the gentry's dominant control within the political field. Gentlemen planters could no longer quickly pass legislation that would suppress the actions of the smaller farmers, whose prosperity threatened the power of gentlemen planters within the social field of agriculture. This significant change in the power structure of the political field directly increased the power held by the smaller to middling size farmers within the social field of agriculture. Another historical transformation that was occurring was the growth of agricultural reform. Agricultural journals that described ways to increase the productivity and fertility of land quickly circulated. Farmers of all classes had to open themselves up to new ideas about agriculture techniques in order to seize the opportunities made available to them. With increasing land speculation and higher land taxes in the early nineteenth-century, farmers had to manage their land as efficiently as possible or else run the risk of losing their land.

In addition to these changes was the growth of the market economy. The expansion of the market economy had penetrated the structure of daily life on the farm. More and more individuals (of all classes) were induced into the market economy. Patterns of inheritance were affected by the expansion of the market economy, as fathers and widows could not always look to the eldest son to take control of the farm. The historical changes that took place throughout the eighteenth-century dramatically affected the strategies involved in the social field of agriculture.
These changes affected members of all classes, and required new sets of strategies for those operating within the social field of agriculture.

Before analyzing how certain middling farmers displayed class-like dispositions within the social field of agriculture, it is important to make a few more comments regarding Bourdieu’s notions of “field” and “habitus”. When analyzing a specific field, it is extremely important to recognize the existence of multiple fields in operation, and the hierarchical organization these fields have in relation to the overall field of power. While the social field of agriculture brought various forms of prestige and respect those who “played the game well,” a dominant player within that field did not translate into a dominant player within the overall field of power. In this sense, we can view the social field of agriculture as having a dominated position within the power structure of Chesapeake society. When compared to dominant roles and positions within other social fields, such as the political field or the judicial field, the power of an individual within the social field of agriculture would always succumb to the dominant power within the former fields. As we consider issues of class habitus and types of capital present within the social field of agriculture, it is important to recognize the overall picture and the relative nature of the specific field under consideration. Finally, Bourdieu’s notion of the field will be used to address class habitus and how certain members of Tidewater society possessed similar dispositions through exposure to the environment that structured that field. Class habitus, the “subjective but non-individual system of internalized structures (and) common schemes of perception” (Bourdieu 1990: 60), operates only in relation to a field.
Within Tidewater society we will address the social field of agriculture and the class habitus of two Tidewater residents, Thomas Dobyns and Allen Marston.

The first records indicating Allen Marston's occupation of Site 44JC240 appear in the 1800 James City County Records (JCCR), when he paid personal property taxes on three slaves over the age of twelve and one horse (Personal Property Tax Book [PPB] 1800) (Jones et al. 1991:20). In 1801 (JCCR PPB 1801), Marston owned 430 acres of land (which includes Site 44JC240) and held an ordinary license. The ownership of substantial acreage and an ordinary license indicates Marston's occupation as a farmer/tavern or storekeeper. References made by a mid nineteenth-century diarist in James City County refer to a wide variety of purchases at an ordinary near the present day site of Toano (Jones et al. 1991: 20), indicating that Marston's ordinary may have been more similar to a general store. Pursuing commercial interests outside of agriculture brought Marston into contact with various class members and possibly enabled him to purchase such a substantial farm. The acquisition of such large acreage "indicates a relative degree of affluence" for Marston, when the average farm consisted of 230 acres of land in Post-Revolutionary Tidewater Virginia (Jones et al. 1991: 20).

Marston made investments to the farm operations in the early nineteenth-century by increasing the labor force. Between 1802 and 1804, Marston paid taxes on four "free males" and seven slaves over the age of twelve (JCCR PPBs 1804; Jones et al. 1991: 20). Marston continued to increase his slaveholdings during the first quarter of the nineteenth-century. By 1815, Marston held twelve slaves over the
age of twelve (JCCR PPB 1815). The increase in slave labor supply came at a time when the number of taxable slaves in James City County was steadily declining (Brown and Bragdon 1986: 205).

Marston’s accumulation of more slaves can also be seen in response to the gradual accumulation of land through the early nineteenth-century. Between 1812 and 1816, Marston obtained sufficient capital to acquire an additional 400 acres of land (Jones et al. 1991: 21). Marston’s prosperity came at an unusual time when the local and regional economy of Tidewater Virginia was in steady decline. His new level of affluence can also be seen in the personal property tax records of 1815 when he paid taxes on “12 slaves, 18 head of cattle, 3 horses, and at least one item under the listing of ‘gold, silver, or pinchbeck’” (Jones et al. 1991: 2; JCCR PPB 1815).

Allen Marston’s activities on the farm revolved around the management of the slave labor supply in the cultivation of crops and the raising of beef and dairy cattle. Outside the farm, Marston was able to supplement his agricultural income with profits made from his early operations at the ordinary. In addition, from 1809 to 1814, Marston was taxed on a “four-wheel vehicle described as a ‘stage wagon,’ and may have been in the business of carrying passengers or freight” (Jones et al. 1991: 21; JCCR PPB 1809-1814). Thus, Allen Marston, like other middling planters of his time, sought external income through commercial investment. The strategy of occupational diversity enabled Marston to prosper at a time when the regional economy was in a state of decline. In his quotidian affairs, Marston was brought in contact with persons of various wealth, status, and class. At home, Marston was the
patriarch of the household being master to all slaves and head of the family. Away from the farm, Marston operated an ordinary and stagecoach service that certainly placed him in contact with those ranging from the smallest planter to the social elites of the region.

Further north in Richmond County, Virginia, Thomas Dobyns was involved in similar affairs during the early nineteenth-century. The first records indicating Thomas Dobyns's occupation appear in the Richmond County personal property tax lists in 1809 (RCR PPT 1809-1816). At this time, Dobyns's occupation was listed as a merchant at the Totuskey Bridge tract in the county. Henry Dobyns (Thomas's father or uncle) most likely purchased the store Thomas was now operating in a series of property transactions that took place at the turn of the century (Higgins 1997: 19). Thomas was raised in Henry's household and probably became an apprentice to his father/uncle while learning the daily operations of the farm. When Thomas came of age, he took over the store operations, one of nine such establishments in the county (Higgins: 1997: 19), as well as the management of the 131-acre farm on the Totuskey Bridge land.

In the early years of the nineteenth-century, Dobyns accumulated additional acreage surrounding the Totuskey Bridge land. His landholdings totaled 470.5 acres in 1814, and contained improvements valued at $500 (RCT LT 1814-1824; Higgins 1997: 19). Thus, Dobyns (like Marston) was able to acquire a relatively sizable piece of property at a time when the size of most Tidewater farms was in decline. Further
evidence for Thomas Dobyns’s relative degree of affluence can be found in the personal property tax list of 1816, when he was taxed on a luxury item, “a carriage described as being worth more than $150” (Higgins 1997: 19; RCR LT 1809-1816). This carriage may have been used to carry passengers to town as another means of supplementing Dobyns’s income.

In response to the acquisition of such substantial acreage, Dobyns (like Marston) increased the number of slaves on his property from three to ten slaves over the age of sixteen. The relatively high number of slaves owned by Dobyns may also suggest the demands of operating a store on the property. Evidence for the demands of operating a store on the property can be found in the relatively high turnover rate in the Dobyns’s household. In 1817, Dobyns’s household included three white males over the age of sixteen, including himself and two others, George Dobyns and William Gordon. By 1819, George Dobyns and William Gordon were gone, being replaced by Elias Edmonds and John Richard Fleet. The next year, these two departed and were probably replaced as rapidly as the previous workers (RCR PPT 1815-1820).

While detailed evidence concerning the everyday lives of Marston and Dobyns is not readily available through diaries (or sources more informative than tax lists), we can nonetheless perceive how these two middling farmers displayed class-like dispositions. Before discussing how these two men organized their material worlds during the early nineteenth-century, I should point out several common
features shared by the men. First and foremost, Marston and Dobyns understood the emerging opportunities made available to them, and took advantage of them through occupational diversity. Both men sought external sources of income outside the farm through the operation of a store and an ordinary. Although we do not have information concerning Marston’s family and how he came to acquire his ordinary in James City County, we do know how Dobyns came to acquire his. Being raised and apprenticed by a storekeeper, Henry Dobyns, Thomas was raised in an atmosphere that stressed the importance of occupational diversity. His ownership and operation of the farm on the Totuskey Bridge land began with such a strategy, as he was operating a store on the land at an early age. This same value seems to have been incorporated by Marston, as he held an ordinary license in James City County in 1800 during his initial occupation of the farmstead. Marston also pursued commercial interests by running a possible stage coach service. At a time when the Tidewater agricultural economy was beginning to wane (due to a number of factors), both men recognized the benefits of occupational diversity.

Both Marston and Dobyns were able to prosper by diversifying their occupations. Within years of acquiring land, they used financial resources gained in external pursuits to double and quadruple (in the case of Dobyns) their landholdings. At a time when the average farm in Post-Revolutionary Virginia consisted of 230 acres of land in decline, Marston and Dobyns had developed strategies that allowed them to prosper. In response to their prosperity, both men increased the number of slaves under their ownership. This increase also came at a time when “contemporary
writers on the subject of Virginia’s agriculture were warning farmers against ‘the evil’ of keeping more slaves than can be profitably used (Craven 1965: 103). “Progressive” or “reform minded” farmers were advocating the sale of excess labor and making more efficient use of the remaining labor supply.

We can also view Marston and Dobyns’s ownership of a similar number of slaves as contributing to their shared experiences. While the very ownership of slaves suggests both men shared similar views on the institution of slavery, the management of a comparable size of labor force would have presented Dobyns and Marston with a similar set of dilemmas. These dilemmas involved calculated decisions ranging from (but not limited to) how much food to provide the slaves to strategies aimed at increasing slave production (via force or task incentives). Both men were also presented with the dilemma involved in managing slave labor while their commercial pursuits pulled them away from the farm. Although they would have found individual strategies that suited their own moral thoughts and feelings about slave labor management, it is easy to imagine the similarities concerning the management of a comparable supply of slave labor.

The similarities between the activities and economic strategies of Marston and Dobyns in the early nineteenth-century exemplify class-like qualities, or common dispositions within Tidewater Virginia. To highlight these qualities and draw class boundaries around these two planters, we should make note of the strategies pursued by others in the region. During the late eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-
century, the large Chesapeake planters began leasing many plantations to smallholders and other farmers of middling status (Henretta 1991: 230). These tenant farmers would manage the day-to-day operations of these plantations, allowing the large planters to pursue various interests. Besides renting land as means of generating income, many of the wealthy landowners began renting excess labor to turn a profit. The smallholders took advantage of the extra labor supply and often times hired out slaves on a yearly basis. While some wealthy planters lived off the profits received from their land rents, “others remained personally involved with their estates. They became ‘vigilant managers’ who used the market and incentives of hiring-out, tasking, and crop-diversification to enhance their profits” (Henretta 1991: 232).

If we begin to picture the actions of farmers within the Chesapeake region as a social field, we can see various strategies and struggles taking place. Many of the small and middling size planters appear to be taking advantage of the hiring-out system and land rent system, yet remain bound to the land of the wealthy, unable to purchase and work their own land. Meanwhile, wealthy landowners are able to take advantage of the two systems, allowing them to pursue other interests altogether or simply to become more efficient managers of their own property. When the actions of Marston and Dobyns are placed against this backdrop, we can further visualize them as having similar dispositions and what Bourdieu might call “class habitus.”

Class habitus can be regarded as “a subjective but non-individual system of internalized structures, common schemes of perception, and...sharing of world view”
(Bourdieu 1990: 60). Both Allen Marston and Thomas Dobyns grew up and lived in the late eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-century atmosphere of Tidewater Virginia. Having learned the importance of occupational diversity at an early age, both men sought external income that could be reinvested in land. Both men took advantage of the institution of slavery and increased the labor supply at their farms. Neither man took advantage of the task nor land rent system that was prevalent throughout the region. In so doing, they would have been able to pursue commercial ventures or engage in other social fields. But for some reason both Marston and Dobyns did not pursue these alternatives. The strategies employed by these men reflect their learned understandings of the objective world and how they felt the game should be played.
CHAPTER VI

STRUCTURES, FIELDS, AND FARMSTEADS

The class habitus displayed by Allen Marston and Thomas Dobyns allows us to compare the material strategies used by class members in the social field of agriculture in Post-Revolutionary Tidewater Virginia. As mentioned earlier in the discussion, this type of analysis requires more than a simple comparison of the amounts and types of ceramics associated with different class members of Tidewater Virginia. Cultural landscapes, however, are broad encompassing forms of material culture that reflect the symbolic, relational, and functional activities of those who created the landscape. The architecture of primary dwellings and layout of outbuildings on rural farmsteads also reveal a “distinctive set of manners and aesthetics” (Paynter 1999: 190) associated with class members in Tidewater Virginia.

Allen Marston’s farmstead is a small plantation complex in James City County, Virginia, occupied from the mid-eighteenth-century into the early twentieth-century. The William and Mary Archaeological Project Center (WMPAC) investigated the site in the fall of 1990 to mitigate the effects of “the construction of a mixed use residential/commercial project on the property” (Jones et al. 1991: 1). The multiphase investigation of the property resulted in the recovery of hundreds of domestic and agricultural-related artifacts, as well as the identification of six structures and various landscape features associated with Marston’s occupation of the
farmstead.

Thomas Dobyns' farmstead, Site 44RD30, is a domestic complex located in Richmond County that includes the "remains of eighteenth and nineteenth-century dwellings, outbuildings, a well, and trash deposits" (Higgins 1997: ii). The site was initially investigated by the James Madison University Archaeological Research Center until its closing in 1989. Final archaeological investigations and analysis were performed by WMPAC under contract with the Virginia Department of Transportation during the early 1990's (Higgins 1997: ii).

The architecture of the main dwellings and layout of outbuildings at both properties provide insights into the functional and symbolic activities of two middle class merchant/farmers of the Tidewater region. Like many other plantations of Tidewater Virginia, the cultural landscapes created by Allen Marston and Thomas Dobyns contained a variety of domestic outbuildings needed to maintain a working farm. While these landscapes depict the functional activities of a working farm in rural Tidewater Virginia, they also represent how two planters gave "form and substance" (McGuire 1990: 108) to their social and class position.

Before addressing the layout of outbuildings at these farmsteads, it is important to discuss the architecture of Marston's and Dobyns' primary dwellings. Allen Marston lived in relatively modest structure (Figure 1) measuring approximately 625 square feet. The structure was initially constructed with a simple hall and parlor plan with a brick chimney at its southern end. It was built sometime
in the mid-eighteenth-century by a former occupant whose identity remains unknown (Jones et al 1991). At the turn of the nineteenth-century, Marston added a chamber (or service room) and a possible dining room/chamber to the western end of the structure. The building contained a main cellar and small chamber cellar to the west (Figure 1). The frame sat above a masonry foundation set in English bond.

Figure 1. Eighteenth and Nineteenth-Century Floor Plans at 44JC240; a) Eighteenth Century Pre-Marston Floor Plan b) Early Nineteenth-Century Floor Plan Showing Enlargements and Alterations Made by Allen Marston. Source: Jones et al., *Phase III Data Recovery at Site 44JC240, Massie Farm Property, James City County, Virginia* (Williamsburg, William and Mary Archaeological Project Center, 1992) p.53.
The floor plan, brick chimney, and masonry foundation (in addition to plaster recovered in the excavation) suggests Marston, like many of his middling contemporaries, participated in the "housing revolution" that swept through Tidewater Virginia after the Revolution (Chappell and Richter 1997).

Coinciding with a consumer revolution that was sweeping the nation (Chappell 1994), some middling planters sought more permanent and refined dwellings after the Revolution. The refined house provided material comfort and displayed a family's economic status within Tidewater society. The enlargement and alterations made to the eighteenth-century house by Marston in the early nineteenth-century indicate he shared this same desire for privacy and expression of status. In the early nineteenth-century, Marston added two chambers to the rear of the house and enlarged the front room (or hall) to encompass the majority of the structure's total width. The physical reorganization of space represents Marston's concern for separating public and private spaces within his household. By filling the newly enlarged hall with luxury items such as "a sideboard with drawers, a dining table, and calico window curtains" (Jones et al. 1991: 21; JCCR PPB 1808-1814), Marston was able to express his elevated social position to visitors. The changes made to the architecture of the Marston house (combined with the luxury items described in the tax assessment) demonstrate how Marston utilized symbolic capital that "reproduced and reinforced the social relations that constitute the structure of social space" (Bourdieu 1990: 135). Marston reinforced his authority over his servants by moving
service-related activities to the rear of the household while reserving the front room for guests. He reinforced his elevated position in Tidewater society through such forms of symbolic capital. As slaves and common planters “continued to live crowded in one-room or two-room houses well into the nineteenth-century” (Isaac 1982: 305), Marston’s symbolic capital would not have gone unnoticed.

Thomas Dobyns lived in a small two-room structure, measuring sixteen by twenty-four feet (384 sq. ft) with a brick chimney at its eastern end. The dwelling sat above a small cellar on a masonry foundation constructed of “sandstone with oyster shell chinking and brick” (Higgins 1997: 28). While the presence of a masonry foundation and brick chimney suggests Dobyns sought a more permanent and “partially refined” (Chappell 1994: 194) dwelling, the small size of his dwelling is indicative of a simple hall and parlor plan, significantly different from Marston’s dwelling. The simple floor plan constructed by Dobyns also contrasts with what we might expect from a prosperous planter in Tidewater Virginia. In an article relating religious ideologies to vernacular architecture in Halifax County Virginia, Clifton Ellis (1998: 23-24) writes, “scholars of the period have argued convincingly that the wealthy Tidewater planters adopted the forms and motifs of the Renaissance as ideological statements for their status and power in colonial Virginia. Furthermore, the development in Virginia houses of the central passage as a social channel and barrier and the dining room as a setting for the newly popular rituals of display and hospitality represent the gentry’s attempt to distance themselves from middling and
lower planters.” If alterations in housing floor plans were distinct statements of wealth and power throughout eighteenth-century, why might Dobyns, who was one of the wealthiest landowners in Richmond County, choose not to participate (or to emulate gentility) in the housing revolution of the early nineteenth-century? Furthermore, why does Marston, a member of the same class in this study, appear to have participated in the housing revolution?

When trying to understand the differences in floor plans chosen by two planters of the same class, it becomes extremely “important to recognize some element of choice” (Chappell 1994: 220). Allen Marston lived in James City County near the present-day town of Toano, roughly ten miles northwest of the waning administrative center and genteel atmosphere of Williamsburg. Living there, Marston would have made frequent trips to Williamsburg for a variety of personal and business reasons. During these trips, Marston would have observed varying levels of refinement incorporated into the houses in Williamsburg. By the third quarter of the century, successful tradesman in Williamsburg began incorporating refined housing “components” such as the “hall or parlor, dining room, and the chamber” into their homes (Chappell 1994: 185-6). Allen Marston, one of the top landholders in the adjacent county, would have certainly observed these changes in housing accommodations in Williamsburg. After acquisition of the property in James City County, Marston reorganized the floor plan and added a chamber and dining room. While the presence of the late eighteenth-century hall and parlor structure
already on Marston's property increased his financial ability to transform the architecture and floor plan of his house, his experiences in the cultural center of Williamsburg most likely promoted it.

In contrast to Marston's farmstead, Thomas Dobyns's farmstead lay within Richmond County, in the heart of rural Tidewater Virginia. Thomas Dobyns owned 460.5 acres in the 1810’s, placing him as one of the largest landholders within the region (Brown and Bragdon RPP: 190). While certain components (e.g. specialization and segregation of domestic space) were not as quickly incorporated into the houses of many rural planters during the eighteenth-century, by the early nineteenth-century, many rural houses of the Chesapeake were becoming refined (see Chappell and Richter 1998). Thomas Dobyns, however, chose only to incorporate those elements of the refined house that seemed to make the house more permanent. Whether Dobyns felt the need to reserve capital to purchase new land, or if his store operations required a reserve supply of cash, he did not segregate domestic space within the household.

Clifton Ellis's (1998) study of vernacular architecture in Halifax County, Virginia may also shed light on why Thomas Dobyns chose not to privatize domestic space within his dwelling. With the proliferation of Baptist movements in Halifax County during the eighteenth and nineteenth-centuries, the architectural expression of upper class members of both the Anglican and Baptist faith starkly contrasted with their Tidewater counterparts. While upper class members in the Tidewater region
became increasingly concerned with reorganizing and differentiating their living space, the Halifax County elites were less apt to do so. Ellis (1998: 30) claims the reason for such contrasting notions of housing refinement between the elites of the two regions lies within power-related issues: "the Anglican gentry held the institutional power in the (Halifax) county, but the Baptists held social and ideological control."

Ellis’s study offers a unique insight into the dichotomy that exists between Tidewater and Piedmont architecture in the eighteenth-century. However, towards the end of the eighteenth-century and into the nineteenth-century, Anglican power within the Tidewater region was not as pervasive as it had once been. As early as the 1790’s “affairs were greatly changed...Evangelicalism continued to gain converts and transform consciousness...Republicanism had meanwhile been turned around” (Isaac1982: 321). In a period of such rapid transformation, it is hard to imagine social and ideological control being relegated to just one group within society. Social relations were dramatically altered after the Revolution and into the nineteenth-century. If social and ideological control determines to some degree (as Ellis describes) the architectural expression planters choose within their regions, then we can better understand the somewhat unique case of Thomas Dobyns. Although we do not know if Thomas Dobyns was of the Anglican or Protestant faith, we do know the time period in which he was living would offer new choices “as many evangelicals became more genteel, and many of the gentlefolk became more evangelical” (Isaac
The different types of floor plans chosen by Marston and Dobyns suggest that concerns for the segregation and privatization of domestic space were not divided along class lines. It seems more likely that the architectural expression of both planters was dependent upon local processes and individual preferences. The differences in housing accommodations may also suggest participation in different social "fields" that created individual dispositions in regards to their architecture. The geographic location of their farmsteads would have certainly promoted participation in different social fields. Allen Marston would have been in contact with persons of various wealth and status as he made trips to the city of Williamsburg. He would have also observed the advantages that came with the privatization of domestic space as he interacted in the community. Thomas Dobyns, on the other hand, lived in rural Richmond County, whose county seat, Warsaw, would have been the closest town to make purchases or make business transactions. It is likely that Dobyns's interaction within the smaller town of Warsaw did not have the same effect as Marston's experiences in Williamsburg.

It is clear that concerns for the privatization of domestic space were not divided along class lines. In fact, a recent study by Ashli White (1999) reaches a similar conclusion, as well as suggesting alternative means of signifying class. Her study of 226 eighteenth-century property evaluations in Berkeley Parish, Virginia (located between the Tidewater and Piedmont regions) suggests concerns for housing
quality were not strictly divided along lines of class or status. While Bushman (1992) has suggested the concern for permanence and (especially) "refinement" in the dwellings of the middle class can be viewed as emulation of genteel culture or values, the case in Berkeley Parish suggests otherwise. Properties of local elites such as Larkin Stanard, whose wealth and social position "wielded real power," were generally listed as "out of repair" by the property evaluator and not qualitatively better than those on middling estates. If social elites, such as Larkin Stanard and others did not seek to distinguish themselves from middling planters through the maintenance, quality, or size of their main dwellings, Allen Marston's and Thomas Dobyns's house can be seen on nearly equal footing with such elites. Yet, if we compare Marston's and Dobyns's houses with the large plantation houses of the region, such as Stratford Hall, the mere size and grandeur of the large plantations overshadow their houses and symbolize the endurance of a very top heavy class system.

Abstracting class and social relations through the architecture of Marston's and Dobyns's homes helps bring into focus several aspects of the social relations involved in the Post-Revolutionary era in Tidewater Virginia. It also enables us to look more closely at the social relations between the local elite and middling planters. While concerns for housing quality did not seem to merit much significance in expressing authority, power, or status between the local elites and middling planters, in what ways did middling planters seek to signify their class position? Returning to
White’s study of Berkeley Parish offers a new window to explore: landscape and outbuildings. White’s study suggests a very minor correlation exists between dwelling size, number of windows, and expression of class (or status in White’s study). In fact, it was found that “these distinctions were not a sure index or even exclusive to these leading (elite) men... Some top property holders opted not to distinguish themselves with their dwellings” but through other means, such as *outbuildings* (White 1999: 118).

Outbuildings were essential to the planter’s landscape. Especially in the rural areas, “outbuildings were as significant to Virginia’s social landscape as they were to its domestic and economic vitality” (Wells 1993: 14). Serving as a backdrop to the principal façade, the position of outbuildings around the main dwelling provided functional, organizational, and symbolic stages for human activity. Just as the architecture of a planter’s main dwelling served as a social metaphor for Tidewater society, the arrangement of outbuildings “made tangible the local hierarchies of wealth and status” (Wells 1993: 14).

The arrangement of outbuildings at Allen Marston’s farmstead invites another abstraction when trying to comprehend the complexity of class relations within Tidewater Virginia during the Post-Revolutionary period. Like many of his contemporaries, Marston’s farmstead contained a variety of dependencies needed to maintain a working plantation (Figure 2). Several structures (Structures 9, 7, and 11) in the rear of the main house appear to be related to slave housing. Structures 9 and 11 were possibly built of log construction with sills placed directly on the ground (Jones et al 1991).
Structure 11 may have rested upon a masonry foundation and was possibly used as a smokehouse (Jones et al. 1991). Small rectangular pits, assumed to be root cellars, were found in these areas and led the investigators to infer these structures were occupied by slaves. While environmental factors were always a consideration in determining outbuilding locations from the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries (see Linebaugh 1994), the topography at the Marston farmstead suggests another interpretation for the layout of servant’s quarters. Positioned at the top of a small knoll, Marston’s main dwelling stood slightly higher and in front of its
attendant buildings. It is apparent that Marston “intended his landscape (to) be hierarchal, leading to himself at the center” (Upton 1989: 32).

The remaining outbuildings (Structures 3 and 4) are located to the northwest of the main dwelling. The detached kitchen, Structure 3, contained a brick-lined cellar and sat above a masonry foundation. The kitchen was most likely detached for heat, vermin, and odor purposes. Structure 4 is the remains of an icehouse pit that “may have had brick walls...with a tiled or shingled roof” (Jones et al. 1991: 71). The presence of an icehouse on the Marston farmstead indicates Marston’s affluence considering icehouses were generally “prestige items, useful in preserving the harvest of the winter so that luxurious cold drinks and desserts could be served in the summer” (Olmert 1999: 58). Icehouses also required continual maintenance and long hours of work in order to fill. The increase in slave labor on the Marston farmstead may also be seen in response to such a labor-intensive activity on the farm.

Other features that figured prominently in the landscape include two fenced line/enclosures. Lying just off the northeast of the principal dwelling is the remains of a ditch feature that forms a zigzag pattern. This ditch, which could be the result of an intentionally dug moat or animal paths, conforms to a worm fence line pattern associated with the Virginia split-rail fence. The fence line pattern exposed during archaeological investigation suggests the fence was used to enclose livestock within a small circular/oval-like arena just off to the northeast of the main dwelling. This livestock arena also creates a northeastern boundary for anyone approaching the main dwelling. By placing the livestock enclosure to the northeast of the principal dwelling, any visitor approaching Marston’s farmstead from the east would have first
recognized Marston's commitment to raising livestock as a source of income. The other fence line forms an enclosure off the northwestern end of Structure 9. No agricultural-related outbuildings, such as barns or granaries, were identified during archaeological investigation. Typically, such buildings were placed outside the immediate two acres surrounding the main dwelling (White 1999: 114).

Unlike the site layout found at Allen Marston's farmstead, the archaeological investigations at Thomas Dobyns's farmstead did not uncover any slave-related outbuildings in the yard around the main dwelling (Figure 3). Although slave quarters do not always leave archaeological signatures, it appears most of the slave quarters at the site "extended beyond the boundaries of the domestic component, in outlying fields" (Higgins 1997: 79). Thus, when contrasted with the layout at Marston's farmstead, two members of the same class created vastly different landscapes of control.

The farmstead of Thomas Dobyns contained a number of dependencies that related to the agricultural and domestic lives of its occupants. It appears that Dobyns, like Marston and their contemporaries, positioned his outbuildings behind (or to the west) the front of his main dwelling (which opened to the east). Structure 8 was a large structure, measuring 26 by 40 ft., constructed on wooden posts (Higgins 1997: 50). The overall size of the structure in association with the types of artifacts recovered in its location suggests the outbuilding was a "stable or carriage house" (Higgins 1997: 50). Considering Dobyns's ownership of a fairly expensive carriage in the early nineteenth-century, a substantial structure would have been required to house such an important commodity.
Figure 3. Site Plan at 44RD30 showing structures revealed after excavation. Source: Higgins III et al., *Archaeological Data Recovery at Site 44RD30 Associated with the Proposed Route 3 Project* (Williamsburg, William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research, 1997, p. 84).

Structure 5 is located approximately seventy-five feet west of the main house. This structure "consisted of extant cut sandstone piers and brick rubble... The piers supported a frame structure that measured 16 by 18 ft." (Higgins 1997: 28). The precise function of Structure 5 is unknown, although the author speculates it may have served as a "kitchen or storage building" (Higgins 1997: 28). Structure 9, a smokehouse, consisted of a circular brick feature surrounded by a group of postholes (Higgins 1997: 52). Smokehouses "were usually frame structures seated on light
brick foundations; however, examples of simpler, earthfast types have been documented at the Kingsmill plantations from the eighteenth-century” (Higgins 1997: 52). Located to the northwest of the smokehouse was a brick-lined well. Brick-lined wells usually required a considerable financial investment by their owners. However, archaeological investigations at the site suggest at the time Thomas Dobyns occupied the site, the well was in bad repair and soon filled (Higgins 1997: 80).

Structure 1, located along the bluff to the far east of the main dwelling, was the remains of an icehouse structure. Structure 1 “was not of the typical shape, depth, and building material of most icehouses... however its substantially lined pit would have made ice storage practical” (Higgins 1997: 57). The presence of an icehouse at the Dobyns Farmstead suggests Dobyns (like Marston) shared similar tastes for prestige items and similar concerns over the maintenance of such a structure.

At first glance, the number and arrangement of outbuildings at Marston’s and Dobyns’s farmsteads represents a similar strategy employed by many Virginia planters throughout the eighteenth-century and into the nineteenth-century. Camille Well’s (1993: 15) study of eighteenth-century domestic architecture in Lancaster County indicates that “while the number and character of outbuildings varied dramatically among the plantations of eastern Virginia, 60 percent of Gazette-advertised dwellings kept company with at least one and as many as five auxiliary structures.” With five outbuildings located behind the principal dwelling, the landscape created by Allen Marston would have expressed his success as a planter.

While the number of outbuildings at the Dobyns and Marston farmsteads represent their commercial and agricultural success, the case in Berkeley Parish
indicates that the number of outbuildings between elites and non-elites differed only by one dependency (White 1999: 118). Such a minor difference in the quantity of outbuildings found on upper class farmsteads versus middle class farmsteads invites a new window to explore. If members of the upper class or elite (those who typically held office and other posts) were not expressing their authority through higher quality housing or number of outbuildings to members of the middle and lower classes, in what material ways did they signify their power? To begin to elucidate such information, it becomes extremely important to look to wealthiest members of the upper class whom local elites would have most closely identified with.

In the years leading up to the American Revolution, the power and authority of the domestic elite was increasingly called into question. Evidence for this skepticism can be found in the various Protestant movements that began to proliferate in the colonies and in the rise of individualism prior to the Revolution. As members of the gentry became “increasingly detached from other groups both within and outside the colonies” they began to “seek new ideological mechanisms to re-establish, legitimize, and cling to their class influence” (Mullins 1992: 14). In response to the increasing socioeconomic instability, many authors (e.g. Leone, Shackel, Isaac, Deetz) have suggested that “the elite developed a cohesive class identity reflected in the Georgian material culture and social practices” (Mullins 1992: 15). The adoption of Georgian material culture found in the architecture, gardens, landscapes, and everyday items of the Chesapeake elite was an attempt to “demonstrate their exclusive knowledge, and suggest their class power was based in a rational nature, rather than objective socioeconomic domination” (Mullins 1992: 15).
The elite’s attempt to naturalize social and class conditions in Tidewater Virginia through Georgian material culture is most clearly evident in the large mansions erected during the eighteenth-century in the Chesapeake region. Using enlightened knowledge of available architectural treatises and pattern books, members of the Chesapeake elite selected certain elements from classical design to create a style that legitimized their authority in society. With these ideas in mind, the Chesapeake elite constructed houses that were “rigidly symmetrical, harmonic, and sparsely ornamented” (Matthews 1992: 244). The interplay between the symmetrical and harmonious elements of the Georgian design made the imposed order created on the façade seem natural, and innate. Symbolizing the natural hierarchy of society, the architecture symbolized the elite’s desire to reinforce and legitimize their class position.

The Chesapeake elite also applied elements of the Georgian style to the physical landscape. The construction of formal gardens “served two fundamental ideological effects: they ordered nature in a specific way, and they constructed a distinct past for that nature” (Mullins 1992: 15). The landscape became an additional, if not more poignant, medium for naturalizing social conditions. While many of the elite lacked the financial ability to construct large formal gardens that served as an ideological metaphor, they could impose order across the landscape through the symmetrical placement of outbuildings around the main dwelling. The calculated placement of outbuildings around the main dwelling served as an equally strong metaphor for expressing class authority. The symmetrical placement of outbuildings around the main dwelling would have two strong effects upon the
observer. First, by flanking the main dwelling with symmetrically placed
outbuildings, the natural order found in the architecture of the main dwelling would
extend across the landscape to order the physical landscape (or nature) in a specific
form. Second, the order created through outbuilding placement would also impose
order on the human activities that occurred across the landscape. The combination of
the two effects became an extremely powerful metaphor for legitimizing class
domination. Not only would outbuilding placement express the elite’s ability to
impose order upon nature, but it would also express their ability or right to impose
order on human activity.

The Chesapeake elite’s attempt to legitimize their class authority in the years
following the Revolution is clearly evident in the architecture, material culture, and
landscapes found throughout Tidewater Virginia. While the local elite lacked the
financial ability to build the edifices of the colonial grandees, the extent to which they
appropriated elements of the same class ideology in their own landscapes can further
explicate the myriad ways social and class relations were negotiated in rural
Tidewater Virginia. While lower class domestic farms generally lacked outbuildings
altogether, the farmsteads of middling planters such as Allen Marston and Thomas
Dobyns, contained a number of outbuildings that might demonstrate how class
relations were negotiated through the cultural landscape.

In order to evaluate the extent to which the local gentry and domestic elites
appropriated elements of dominant class ideology to their cultural landscapes
(through outbuilding layout), a sample of forty-six Mutual Assurance Policies from
ten counties within Tidewater Virginia were reviewed. The Mutual Assurance
Society, chartered in 1794, began issuing fire insurance policies throughout Tidewater Virginia in 1796. In general, most policyholders were members of the social elite (Gary Stanton: personal communication). Each policy contains a small plan and sketch of the main dwelling and outbuildings to be insured. Often times these sketches will include the function of various outbuildings, their construction material, and measurements between the insured buildings. Excavations at the Nelson House in Yorktown, Virginia (Barka 1978) found the fire insurance policies to be an excellent source for determining outbuilding location and accuracy, generally within a foot or two of the dimensions portrayed on the policy.

Forty-six policies issued from 1796-1805 were selected from eleven Tidewater counties in Virginia (Charles City, Essex, James City, Isle of Wight, King and Queen, King William, Middlesex, Mathews, Richmond, Surry, and Westmoreland). While the temporal range, 1796-1805, was primarily selected for appropriate context and capacity to explicate relevant processes, the latter limit was placed in order to reduce the number of policies to be reviewed. Policy selection began by using the Mutual Assurance Society Policy Index on a web site sponsored by Mary Washington College. The index was found to be an invaluable means to efficiently limit and organize policy selection. A small portion of the available policies (10%) was quickly eliminated if they were publicly owned or were renewals on old policies. The policies were then reviewed on Microfilm at the Library of Virginia located in Richmond.

A selection criteria was then developed to include only those policies that could provide insights into issues germane to this study. Policies were used only
when they contained an illustration of more than one outbuilding (or when the
outbuilding’s function appears to be incorporated into the plan of the main dwelling).

Policies were discarded when: a) they contained no illustration of outbuildings; b) the
policies insured only outbuildings outside a 100 yard radius of the main dwelling; c)
when the policies were bad microfilm copies that hindered a perspective on the layout
of outbuildings; and d) when the illustrations did not give insight into outbuilding
arrangement. A total number of twenty policies were discarded by this selection to
arrive at a working sample of thirty policies. While a greater number of policies
would have been preferred, it was felt that the comparison of two middle class
landscapes with the landscapes of thirty upper class residents of Tidewater society
was enough to explicate relevant processes.

The majority of policies were typical plan illustrations that showed the
dimensions of outbuildings as well as their relative position on the landscape. The
policy illustrations ranged from those that had fairly detailed measurements and
descriptions of the dwellings under policy, to those that contained a vague description
with no measurements at all. In addition, a few of the policies contained a quasi-
three dimensional sketch of the buildings’ facades that somewhat hindered the
analysis of relative position. These policies were used when they contained
measurements between buildings that allowed insight into their relative position.

In order to recognize certain patterns and trends in the arrangement of
outbuildings by the rural elite, policies were grouped into a variety of categories.
Although some of these categories were a result of the illustrator’s inclusion or
exclusion of certain features (e.g. measurements) and the author’s categorization of
those illustrations, these categories were useful for understanding how many of the social elite organized and arranged their outbuildings across the landscape. In particular, these categories were chosen to reflect the degree of outbuilding organization and formal design at these plantations. The arrangement of outbuildings fell into six main categories or types: incorporated (Type I); evenly-spaced outbuildings (Type II); alignment of outbuildings (Type III); evenly-spaced and aligned outbuildings (Type IV); outbuildings organized with bilateral symmetry (Type V); and strong attention to organization (Type VI). Table 1 shows the policy types and number of policies included in each category. Figures 4-11 show examples of policy types.

Type I (n=3) policies comprised ten percent of the sample. Although no outbuildings were illustrated on the policy, it appears the owners had incorporated the outbuildings into the main plan of the house (Figure 4). Figure 4 represents Robert Beverly’s plantation home in Essex County. A kitchen and office flank the main dwelling creating a well-balanced plan. While policies such as Beverly’s do not contain detached outbuildings, it is important to recognize the choice and ability of the upper class to incorporate outbuildings into the plan of their homes.

Table 1. Mutual Assurance Policy Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutual Assurance Policy Type</th>
<th>No. of Policies</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type VI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Type II (n=2) policies contained illustrations of outbuildings with measurements listed in between the outbuildings (Figure 5). Figure 5 represents William King’s (of King William County) policy containing a kitchen and dairy behind a wooden dwelling. While the façade illustration doesn’t allow an examination of the layout form, the measurements clearly indicate William King’s decision to evenly space outbuildings behind the main house. The other policy (Figure 6) included in this category was issued to Robert Baylor of Essex County. Besides the agricultural-related outbuildings that exist outside a one hundred-yard radius, several of the outbuildings are organized through even spacing. A wooden dairy and meat house flank the main house by twenty feet on each side. This policy was not included in the Type V category due to the location of the kitchen and lumber house on one side of the house, which left the organization of outbuildings less symmetrical. The kitchen is placed twenty feet from the dairy and the lumber

Figure 4. Type I Policy
(Mutual Assurance Policy #110 issued in 1796 to Robert Beverly of Essex County).
Figure 5. Type II Policy
(Mutual Assurance Policy #448 issued in 1801 to William King of King William County).

Figure 6. Type II Policy
(Mutual Assurance Property #455 issued in 1801 to Robert Baylor of Essex County).

Figure 7. Type III Policy
(Mutual Assurance Policy #379 issued in 1802 to John Barbour of Isle of Wight County).
Figure 8. Type IV Policy
(Mutual Assurance Policy #23 issued in 1805 to Willoughby Newton of Westmoreland County).

Figure 9. Type V Policy
(Mutual Assurance Policy #27 issued in 1805 to Carter Braxton of King and Queen County).
Figure 10. Type V Policy
(Mutual Assurance Policy #447 issued in 1801 to Robert Pollard of King and Queen County).

Figure 11. Type VI Policy
(Mutual Assurance Policy #605 issued in 1802 to Stephen Bailey of Westmoreland County).
house is placed fifteen feet from the kitchen. The arrangement of outbuildings at Robert Baylor’s plantation demonstrates the calculated placement of outbuildings.

Six (20%) policies were placed in the Type III category. This category is characterized by the alignment of outbuildings along right angle axes. Figure 7 is a Type III category illustration found on John Barbour’s policy. The wood stable is aligned with the left side of the main dwelling. The wood kitchen and office are aligned with each other, but not directly off the main dwelling’s bottom axis. Although this policy does not contain measurements, the illustration clearly demonstrates concerns for outbuilding placement along right angle axes.

Type IV policies (n=8) comprised 26.6% of the policy sample. These policies exhibit concern for even spacing and the alignment of outbuildings along right angle axes. Policies like Willoughby Newton’s, of Westmoreland County, (Figure 8) contain three outbuildings off to one side of the house. Each outbuilding is spaced twenty-seven feet apart and is placed along the same axis. These policies, like the Type V policies, demonstrate the careful calculation and organization of outbuildings across the landscape by the rural elite.

Type V policies (n=8) contained illustrations of outbuildings that were organized through bilateral symmetry. Carter Braxton bought a policy (Figure 9) for his plantation in King and Queen County. A kitchen and office, both measuring 32 by 16 feet, flank the main dwelling by sixty-feet on each side. The outbuildings are perfectly aligned with the main dwelling’s axes to complement the Georgian design of the main dwelling. Other landscapes, like Robert Pollard’s of King and Queen
County, do not appear as well designed as Braxton's landscape but still appear symmetrical. Figure 10 shows Pollard's policy. A kitchen and office flank the main dwelling by twenty feet to each side. Pollard also insured a granary and an unknown structure to the left of the illustration. The position of the office and kitchen suggests Pollard applied the principles of Georgian design to a portion of his landscape, leaving more agricultural-related structures out of the design. These policies, like Type IV, comprised 26.6% of the policy sample, indicating a conscious decision by the domestic elite to organize their landscapes according to calculated principles.

Three policies exhibit strong attention to the organization of outbuildings. The illustrations were often façade illustrations with no measurements. Stephen Bailey insured five buildings at his plantation in Westmoreland County (Figure 10). The overall form of the landscape appears very organized. The main house is flanked by two outbuildings and is positioned in front of two agricultural buildings. Despite the lack of measurements, it appears there is some conscious organization of outbuildings in these policies.

While not all members of the rural elite organized their outbuildings through bilateral symmetry, there appears to be some formal design in each landscape. Type IV and V categories comprised over half of the policies in the sample. These categories represent the most organized landscapes of the entire sample. Types II and III comprise 26.6% of the sample. These landscapes are well-organized and contain evenly spaced or aligned outbuildings. The overall trend recognized in these policies is one of conscious design and organization.
In order to address issues related to Bushman’s emulation model, it is necessary to compare these landscapes with landscapes of Thomas Dobyns and Allen Marston. The organization of outbuildings at Allen Marston’s farmstead (Figure 2) is vastly different than those found on the Mutual Assurance Policies of upper class Tidewater residents. The three slave quarters in the southwestern portion of the farmstead are unevenly spaced and not aligned with each other. The quarters are not placed in line or in rows, but are merely jumbled together in an unorganized fashion. This lack of alignment could have improved surveillance by Marston, as their position allows a view from the main house. If these quarters were placed in rows to the west, such forms of panoptic surveillance would not have been possible. The kitchen and icehouse appear to be aligned with the northern axis of the main house (Figure 2). However, their location does not balance nor organize the landscape. This portion of Marston’s landscape stands in stark contrast to the organization of outbuildings seen in the Mutual Assurance policies.

A visitor to the Marston household would have approached from the east along the fence line. Crossing the knoll, the visitor would have noticed the disorganized arrangement of slave quarters to the southwest. Judging by the landscape, the visitor would be relatively unaware of Marston’s refined qualities. Marston’s landscape is in contrast with the architecture of his house, where upon entering they would have encountered a formal chamber decorated with “calico window curtains” and other luxury items.

A visitor to Thomas Dobyns’s farmstead would have been presented with a similar contradiction. The barn and smokehouse (Structures 8 and 9) appear to be
aligned according to the northern axis of the main house. The kitchen, however, is not aligned according to any axis and lies in the center of the southern axis of the main house. The outbuildings are also not evenly spaced. The resulting effect is an unbalanced landscape, with minor attention to outbuilding alignment. The visitor to the Dobyns farmstead might recognize some trace of refinement in the alignment of his outbuildings, yet be puzzled upon entering his relatively unrefined house.

Contrasting the landscapes of Thomas Dobyns and Allen Marston with landscapes of upper class residents in the Tidewater regions highlights certain aspects of class relations in Post-Revolutionary Virginia. From the analysis of Mutual Assurance policies it appears that members of the upper class actively sought to "demonstrate their exclusive knowledge" (Mullins 1992: 15) through the calculated placement of outbuildings. Although many landscapes lacked the calculated symmetry of the great planters, there was a strong emphasis on outbuilding organization. This emphasis is magnified when the elite landscapes are contrasted with two middle class residents of Tidewater society.

The lack of outbuilding organization and design at the farmsteads of Thomas Dobyns and Allen Marston can be interpreted in a number of ways. A Marxist interpretation of their landscapes might suggest middle class resistance to upper class forms of dominant ideology. This interpretation would be flawed for two reasons. First, a resistance interpretation would suggest Thomas Dobyns and Allen Marston found similar meanings behind their landscapes as occupants of the middle class. Considering the different forms of architecture and outbuilding organization chosen by each planter, such an interpretation is hard to swallow. Second, if Marston and
Dobyns sought to resist dominant ideology through the landscape (a very conspicuous form of material culture), then those same properties would have marked them as dominated.

Bourdieu’s notions of habitus, fields, and capital, however, may shed some light on the subject. We should begin by understanding the relationship between outbuildings and capital. Ownership of outbuildings represented a form of economic capital for all planters in Tidewater Virginia. Ashli White’s study of property evaluations in Berkeley Parish suggested that the number of outbuildings (or quality of outbuildings) that a planter owned did not always signify class or status during the late eighteenth-century. On the other hand, this analysis has recognized elements of class being signified in the organization of outbuildings. Although outbuildings, themselves are forms of economic capital, the application of knowledge to their layout represent forms of symbolic capital. The presence of both forms of capital is crucial in understanding the landscapes of Tidewater Virginia’s upper and middle class.

Outbuildings formed a significant part of the planter’s landscape into nineteenth-century. While these outbuildings played an important role in the activities of a working farm, they also represented a volume of capital at stake in the social field of agriculture. Bourdieu’s (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 98) notion of the field states that “a species of capital is what is efficacious in a given field, both as a weapon and as a stake in the struggle, that which allows its possessors to wield a power, an influence, and thus to exist (emphasis added), in the field under consideration.” During the eighteenth-century, upper class planters established a new
species of capital through outbuilding organization. While many upper class planters imposed order across the landscape using enlightened knowledge of bilateral symmetry and Georgian design, other upper class planters began consciously organizing their outbuildings through calculated placement. It is likely that these planters utilized knowledge stemming from the growth of agricultural reform (e.g. agricultural journals) to organize their landscapes. Whichever form of organization chosen, upper class members appear to have transformed the species of capital at stake in the social field of agriculture. As the landscapes of middle class planters contained equivalent numbers of outbuildings (economic capital), upper class members would have been well aware of their increasing success. Partially in response to this threat and partially in response to the increasing refinement of society, upper class members organized their outbuildings by demonstrating their unique access to knowledge. This strategy was “aimed at discrediting (a) form of capital (e.g. economic capital) and valoriz(ing)the species of capital they preferentially possess” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 99). The organization of outbuildings provided upper class members with a symbolic statement legitimizing their class position within Tidewater society.

As mentioned earlier, the landscapes of Dobyns and Marston contrasted with the landscapes of the upper class. Why were two successful merchant/planters not using such forms of symbolic capital to distance themselves from tenant farmers and the lower classes? Considering their success as planters, they must have been aware of the benefits associated with agricultural reform. They would have also observed the organized landscapes of upper class planters as they made trips throughout the
region. While an organized landscape demonstrated one’s knowledge of certain principles, these principles were not solely available to the elite. They were available to everyone in the atmosphere of the early nineteenth-century. For some reason, Dobyns and Marston (who shared similar experiences) did not feel the need to utilize all of these principles in the organization of their landscapes. The choices made by Dobyns and Marston were a result of their shared experiences within the social field of agriculture.

Allen Marston and Thomas Dobyns were some of the top landowners in the early nineteenth-century. Both planters took advantage of the market economy through occupational diversity and had followed similar trajectories through the space of objective positions within the social field of agriculture. These trajectories and shared dispositions formed elements of a class habitus. The cultural landscapes created by Marston and Dobyns represent material strategies related to their class habitus. To understand the differences in their strategies and those employed by upper class planters, it is important to recognize the differences in the volume and structure of their capital. Referring again to Bourdieu (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 99),

Two individuals endowed with an equivalent overall capital can differ, in their position as in their stances (“position takings”), in that one holds a lot of economic capital and little cultural capital while the other has little economic capital and large cultural assets. To be more precise, the strategies of a “player” and everything that defines his “game” are a function not only of the volume and structure of her capital at the moment under consideration and of the game chances, but also of the evolution over time of the volume and structure of this capital, that is, of his social trajectory and of the disposition constituted in the prolonged relation to a definite distribution of objective chance.

Bourdieu’s statement helps explain the different material strategies employed by these planters in the early nineteenth-century. Marston and Dobyns obtained a
relatively high amount of economic capital in the early nineteenth-century. The
ownership of large acreage and a relatively large slave labor supply placed them in
the upper ranks of Tidewater society in purely economic terms. While they
possessed abundant economic capital, they do not appear to valorize the form of
symbolic capital found on the landscapes of upper class planters. As mentioned
before, the agricultural economy of Tidewater Virginia was in steady decline during
the early nineteenth-century. The “evolution over time” of economic capital during
this period may explain their landscapes. Diverting attention away from extra income
pursuits (like operating a store or running a stage-coach service) to reorganize their
landscapes might have resulted in the loss of economic capital. Such a loss might
have seriously crippled their efforts towards success. The preservation of economic
capital at both farmsteads also suggests a class difference between the two classes of
planters. Upper class planters sought new forms of capital that signified their social
position. Middle class planters, like Dobyns and Marston, did not seek such forms of
capital because they felt no need to signify their own class position. In the early
nineteenth-century, Marston and Dobyns’s class position was not threatened. If
anything, their success in the social field of agriculture contributed to a class position
that was threatening.

By reorienting our perceptions of the actions and pursuits of upper and middle
class planters in Tidewater society through Bourdieu’s notion of the different forms
of capital, we can begin to understand the different material strategies employed.
Upper class planters sought new forms of capital within the social field of agriculture
that reflected their right to power within the field. This new form of capital took the

form of symbolic capital reflected in the organized layout of outbuildings. Some middle class planters, such as Thomas Dobyns and Allen Marston, developed strategies, conscious or not, that sought to preserve economic capital within the waning agricultural economy of nineteenth-century. The layout of outbuildings at their farmsteads reflects the value they placed on economic and symbolic capital. The creation of symbolic capital, through the organized layout of outbuildings, was not utilized by Marston and only partially by Dobyns. Utilization of such capital might suggest the need to differentiate oneself from others in society or the need to emulate those class members who utilized such forms of capital. Marston and Dobyns did not seek to integrate with (or emulate) the upper class planters of Tidewater Virginia. Their landscapes represent how two middle class members "continually struggled to impose a definition of the world that was most congruent with their particular interests" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 14). Their landscapes and particular interests were the result of the structuring environment of early nineteenth-century in Tidewater Virginia and their learned understandings of how to play the game.
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

The "process of abstraction" is a useful analytical tool that has highlighted various material strategies and factors involved in Post-Revolutionary Tidewater class relations. This process involves reorienting our perceptions of class at many different levels to discover some of lived experiences of the past. By recognizing the importance of abstractions, the researcher is able to explore different "windows" that shed light on elements related to class process, class structure, and class formation.

In the preceding discussion, the process of abstraction was used (in conjunction with Bourdieu's theory of practice) to identify class members and explore the material strategies used by those members in the early nineteenth-century. Exploring the architecture of Allen Marston's and Thomas Dobyns's main dwelling highlighted differences between two class members' concerns for privatization of domestic space. Other abstractions brought into focus the role outbuilding organization played between upper class and middle class residents of rural Tidewater Virginia. Such "vantage point" abstractions are important when addressing social and class relations in the past.

The result of the abstractions made in this study allows a brief examination of Bushman's emulation model of refinement and gentility. Richard Bushman's (1992) emulation model, set forth in The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, and
Cities, seeks to account for the broad material changes that occurred in America from 1700 to 1850. In this book, Bushman eloquently explores the coercive impact of genteel culture on colonial and American society. Using extensive documentary and material evidence primarily from New England (especially Delaware) and the Chesapeake region, Bushman examines the role gentility played in the architecture and cultural landscapes of middle class Americans. To Bushman (1992: 256-7), organized landscapes and housing floor plans that incorporated formal parlors and chambers were signs of gentility adopted by the middle class. He also suggests that middle class Americans adopted such signs of gentility simply because they “had no appropriate markings of their own to signify their elevation when they came to power in government or rose to power through wealth. They could only turn to the elites of the preceding regime...their cultural position left them no alternative” (1992: 413).

Statements relating to the “power of emulation” permeate throughout the text of his book and invite a concluding abstraction to relate the material world of Allen Marston and Thomas Dobyns to the general atmosphere created by Bushman.

The accumulation of substantial acreage and numerous slaves by Marston and Dobyns during the early nineteenth-century clearly demonstrates their success as planters and merchants within the waning Tidewater economy. Yet, as they “rose to power through wealth,” neither Marston nor Dobyns appear to have solely “turned to the elites of the preceding regime” when constructing their houses and organizing their outbuildings. Instead, Marston and Dobyns appear to have differentially appropriated refined qualities to their dwellings and landscapes. As members of the same class, Marston and Dobyns created cultural landscapes that seemingly
contradict the degree of refinement displayed in their housing floor plans. The refined or genteel qualities found within Marston's house (e.g. privatization) do not extend across his landscape, as the outbuildings lack any formal design or calculated placement. Thomas Dobyns's relatively unrefined, yet durable, house was surrounded by a relatively organized (although not symmetrical or evenly spaced) arrangement of outbuildings.

Such contradictions in the material world of two middle class planters raises serious questions regarding Bushman's use of the emulation model in Post-Revolutionary America. If middle class planters had no alternative except to emulate the material world of the elite class as a means to separate themselves from the "cruder traditional culture" (Bushman 1992: 404), Allen Marston and Thomas Dobyns do not appear to be taking advantage of such symbolic exercises. Instead, Allen Marston and Thomas Dobyns adopted only those refined qualities that suited them. The adoption of these marks of gentility should not be seen as an attempt by Marston and Dobyns to separate themselves from the lower classes. The ownership of substantial acreage and ownership of a large quantity of outbuildings already served the purpose of signifying their elevation above the less wealthy planters and lower classes in Tidewater society. Instead, the refined qualities found within their architecture and landscapes should be viewed as individual desires for improvement.

The organization of outbuildings and housing floor plans at the farmsteads of Allen Marston and Thomas Dobyns contradict Bushman's emulation model when it implies that middle class Americans adopted forms of genteel material culture as the only means to signify their success within society. When the emulation model is
applied in this manner, it becomes a totalizing argument, thereby reducing every attempt for material improvement to mass emulation. While Bushman’s model is primarily applied in this manner, there are subtle hints of a more proper application hidden within the text of the book. On the topic of middling houses, Bushman (1992: 259-60) writes, “the aim of vernacular gentility, it seems, was less to incorporate up-to-the-minute fashion than to achieve dignity and respectability. Middling people borrowed from the upper ranks of society, but less by exact imitation than by assembling impressions of refinement and propriety from many sources, incorporating elements that suited them.” The farmsteads of Allen Marston and Thomas Dobyns support such an application of the emulation model. Living in two different areas of Tidewater Virginia, Dobyns and Marston adopted different marks and degrees of refinement. These signs of refinement may have originated in the material culture of the elites, but they became personalized in the landscapes and architecture found at Marston’s and Dobyns’s farmsteads.

The final abstraction made during this study suggests the need to move beyond the idea that middle class Americans adopted forms of genteel material culture as the only means to signify their class position within society. It is time to explore how members of various classes appropriated different forms of genteel material culture into their daily lives. The process of abstraction can be an excellent starting point for such a task. Instead of constructing classes through gradational measures, we should look for class at many different levels based on behavioral and relational attributes. We should also explore contexts of use before claiming totalizing processes of emulation.
In conclusion, it is necessary for historical archaeologists to begin reorienting their perceptions of class and see class more explicitly as an analytical tool. By making this step forward, historical archaeologists will be able to explore class relations within households, at the community level, or in broad regions. The interdisciplinary nature of historical archaeology will assist in the exploration of past class relations. We should continue to utilize insights made in vernacular architecture, cultural geography, social and cultural anthropology, and history to broaden our understanding of class.

Finally, a necessary step to understanding class relations in the past is the need for more archaeological data from lower to middle class residents of America. While few sites have been explored in urban areas, the amount of archaeological data from rural sites associated with lower to middle class residents is quite limited. Cultural resource management firms can play a leading role in overcoming this dilemma. By developing sound research strategies that seek to explore class relations in the past through comparative research studies, these firms may broaden our understanding of past class relations.

Although the two archaeological sites used in this study provided sufficient evidence to explore class relations in Post-Revolutionary Virginia, there were limitations to the data. In particular, the excavations at both sites failed to collect any data concerning the agricultural practices of Marston and Dobyns. Considering that both men were not attending to the advice of contemporary writers on the subject of slave labor and land supply, it is important to address their agricultural strategies. Marston and Dobyns may have continued in the practice of intensive cultivation. If
both men were resistant to new types of agricultural practices, then new explanations may be sought regarding their cultural landscapes. Resistance to modernist outlooks on agricultural practices in the nineteenth-century has not been explored. The cultural landscapes and activities of Marston and Dobyns in the early nineteenth-century may have represented such resistance. Information regarding their agricultural practices could have easily been collected through soil sampling and analysis.

Future archaeological investigations of middle class farmsteads should not only take into account the types of outbuildings present, but also how these outbuildings are organized across the landscape. The amount of outbuilding organization may reflect (to some degree) a planter’s participation within the agricultural reform movement. Furthermore, by contrasting agricultural practices and outbuilding organization with the artifact assemblages recovered from these sites, we can begin to seek new explanations regarding the material world of middle class planters. Archaeological investigations of middle class farmsteads whose goal is to determine the status of the site’s occupants fail to recognize the material strategies of middle class farmers. Measures of status can be easily explored through tax lists and other documents. Before assigning status (or claiming emulation) to an assemblage of ceramics, it is important to look at the overall volume of material culture found at the archaeological site. Only then, will we be able to understand how and why members of different classes adopt the various forms of material culture that they do.
Appendix. Mutual Assurance Policies Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Policy #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James City</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Queen</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Queen</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Queen</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Queen</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Queen</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>2209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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