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ABSTRACT

In this study, archaeological data from six contemporary archaeological sites in Tidewater Virginia are compared for variability in economic status. Variability in material culture is an indicator of social inequality. The purpose of this thesis is to examine the archaeological record of these six sites and determine how successfully a Marxist perspective can interpret social inequality from this record.

The ceramic remains from the sites are examined in terms of the types and functions of the vessels they represent. Findings suggest that the function of the vessel is a more accurate gauge of status than the ware type.

A comparison of the quantities of locally-made smoking pipes versus the imported variety may also speak to status variability. Faunal remains from the sites suggest that wealthier people consumed a higher ratio of beef and venison, while poorer folk consumed a greater proportion of pork.

A comparison of the architectural remains implies that ancillary buildings and dwelling house refinements may be more important than building materials in determining status.

A look at an historical document, the muster (census) of 1624/25, reveals that although Martin’s Hundred, as a plantation, was better off than the colony average, most of the wealth was centered in one household.

Finally, it is found that the application of a Marxist perspective is unrewarding in interpreting the social interaction of inequality and the class dialectic in the second quarter of the seventeenth century.
INEQUALITY IN EARLY VIRGINIA: A CASE STUDY FROM MARTIN’S HUNDRED
Chapter I
Introduction

In his celebrated 1982 volume on Martin's Hundred, Ivor Noël Hume wove a fascinating narrative of early seventeenth-century life in Tidewater Virginia, intertwined with archaeological sleuthing, murder, war, and intrigue reminiscent of an Agatha Christie mystery novel. Unlike most works dealing with archaeological subjects, the book is engaging, conjuring images of massacre and mayhem at early Martin's Hundred. The characters Noël Hume portrays - Harwood, Kingston, "Granny" - tend to be like those in a good conundrum, worldly and well-to-do, noteworthy in the Martin's Hundred story because of the array of artifacts they left behind. The armor, silver inlaid tableware, gold threads, and other personal accouterments, do, however accidentally, leave an impression that the majority of immigrants from the mother country were members of the fairly well-heeled English gentry. But the archaeological evidence of the Martin's Hundred community, obtained during more recent field work at Carter's Grove, mainly the 1990 and 1991 surveys and the full-scale excavation of site 44JC647, reveals the quite different economic status of many residents in the first half of the seventeenth century.
It was in this period, between 1625 and 1650, that a community developed at Martin's Hundred. David Muraca's MA thesis explored the development and settlement logistics of this community (Muraca 1993), and it is from his observations that an examination of the nature of this phase, specifically its economic and social characteristics, can be made. Noël Hume has skillfully described what appears to be the upper-echelon of Martin's Hundred during this period, with his detailed description of Sites A and B, but he makes little mention of sites representing people on the other end of the economic ladder. If the archaeological record of these artifact-poor sites is properly analyzed for positive and negative evidence, rather than viewed as uninteresting anomalies, these less complex sites can serve as valuable foils to the wealthy locales most frequently excavated in Tidewater during the last twenty years.

Background

Many of the more recent theoretical contributions to historical archaeology have come from the perspective of critical theory, often based, in varying degrees and with
varying success, on neo- or structural Marxism\(^1\). Stated simply, Marxist analysis of Chesapeake historical archaeology suggests that the ideology\(^2\) of the region in the eighteenth century masked or obscured the real nature of social relations among members of society (McGuire 1988). The ideology made it appear that economic differences in society, the result of independently derived wealth, were hierarchical, inherent, and akin to the order of nature (Leone 1988).

The axioms of Marxist theory are material and social inequality that create a struggle between the superordinate members of society, who are attempting to maintain control of wealth and social status, and their subordinates, who are resisting this control. Scholars of North American Historical Archaeology subscribing to this approach try to illustrate how this inevitable struggle is manifest in the historical and archaeological record of eighteenth and nineteenth-century America. For example, Barbara Little and Paul Shackel (1989) use plate sizes in eighteenth-century artifact assemblages in Annapolis to address the invention

---

\(^1\) Although not prevalent in American historical archaeology until the 1970s, the use of Marxist thought in archaeology is not new, dating back to the 1940s and 1950s in the work of V. Gordon Childe (1947; 1956).

\(^2\) Ideology is the "given" or set of ideas or notions used in everyday life that form consciousness (Althusser 1971; McGuire 1988). McGuire also equates ideology with culture.
of etiquette by the elite for the purpose of excluding the non-elite. Mark Leone (1984, 1987) reinterprets the landscape of an Annapolis garden to say something about the symbolism of gardens and how they were used to establish and maintain social position. Robert Paynter uses both archaeological and documentary evidence in eighteenth-century New England to explain strategies of domination and resistance among the core elites, regional elites, and primary surplus producers.

These scholars generally confine their work to the eighteenth century because of a pattern of thought that emerged during the first part of that century. Described by James Deetz (1977) as the Georgian world view, it is the belief that man can discover order in, and bring order to nature, thereby controlling it. Although generally agreeing with Deetz about the Georgian concept, Marxist archaeologists, particularly Mark Leone (1988), want to know what factors affect the rate of spread of Georgian material culture, as well as the variability in its manifestation in different communities and on different objects. It has been suggested by Little and Shackel (1992) that interest in the period may be related to French philosopher Michel Foucault's suggestion that the rise of institutional
structures during the Enlightenment or Georgian period of the eighteenth century enabled the elite to control their subordinates better through surveillance at the work place. Workers in a factory were far easier to watch and control than those making products in their own homes. The institution of factory manufacturing is linked to the Enlightenment as is the subsequent rise in the importance of consumer goods, interest in science, and the emergence of the Georgian world view. Neo-Marxist archaeologists have attempted to show, primarily through artifacts (Little and Shackel 1989), landscape (Leone 1984, 1987), and architecture (Leone, Potter and Shackel 1987), how the eighteenth-century elite maintained their dominance, either overtly or covertly, over the masses and how the masses resisted, either overtly or covertly, this domination. "Suppression of conflict is the key to the operation of ideology and both suppressed class conflict and internal contradiction are part of structural Marxist and neo-Marxist analyses" (Leone 1982:748).

The Chesapeake region in the second quarter of the seventeenth century, the focus of this thesis, was quite a different place than it would be 100 years later. The institutions such as schools, hospitals, and manufacturing
plants that arose during the Enlightenment were not yet in existence. Settlers of the early Chesapeake, especially the illiterate who made up a significant proportion of the indentured workers, brought with them customs, beliefs, and a world view anchored in medieval Europe. As Deetz (1993) rightly cautions, it would be a grave mistake to project our modern feelings and assumptions about cosmic cause and effect on them and to expect their reactions to the social and economic situations in the mid-seventeenth century to mirror our own. People living in the first 50 years of English settlement, had a concept of housing, material wealth, mortality, and social structure quite unlike that which would emerge toward the end of the century. This does not necessarily imply, however, that class struggle, dominance and resistance to domination, and the manifestation of power in social relationships did not exist. These elements of society have existed in some form or another since hills were fortified and cities walled.

This thesis proposes that social inequality, i.e. "...differential access to material and social resources within a society" (McGuire 1983:93), in the form of status variability is manifest in the archaeological record of the Chesapeake. By analyzing artifacts, architecture, faunal
remains, and settlement logistics at five second-quarter seventeenth-century sites at Martin's Hundred and one in Hampton, Virginia, this thesis will explore the pre-industrial basis for the struggle between the upper and lower classes of society. It will examine how, if at all, these relationships survived in the archaeological record of the region. Finally, it will address how successfully these alleged survivals can be interpreted in the light of the neo-Marxist approach, or whether there is a fuller alternative explanation of status differences in the early colonization of Tidewater.

The link between the historical record and social interaction is critical to the Marxist approach to historical archaeology in the Chesapeake. The artifacts recovered from a site convey meaning and the archaeologist must know what contemporary meaning they were intended to convey. But it may not be possible, either from seventeenth or eighteenth century sites, to infer accurately the meanings of archaeological assemblages that are the static remains of a dynamic system (Binford 1981).

Also inherent in the Marxist approach is a dialectic of some sort. The conflict between the classes must be
manifest in the archaeological record; domination must be accompanied by resistance. This thesis will show that although material variation is quite clear in the archaeological record of the early Chesapeake as represented by the sites at Martin's Hundred and Hampton, the link between the artifact assemblages and social interaction is less than clear, and the other side of the Marxist coin, resistance to domination, is not represented. Whether archaeological interpretation along Marxist themes is a viable way of explaining variation in the material record is questioned through the following research design:

Research Design

Six contemporary but materially diverse sites will be the primary focus of this essay. Five of the sites were part of a particular plantation complex, Martin's Hundred. Four of these were excavated under the direction of Ivor Noël Hume in the 1970s and one was excavated in 1991 under the direction of the author and Marley R. Brown III, the Director of Archaeological Research for the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. The fifth site, located in Hampton, Virginia, was also excavated under the direction of
the author and Brown in the late 1980s. Data from this site appear as a control or foil to the Martin's Hundred sites.

Three of the sites discussed, sites A, B, and Hampton, can be considered "high status" sites, i.e. the quantity and diversity of the artifacts recovered from them far exceed that of the other, poorer sites. The purpose of this essay is not to determine which sites represent the higher echelon of society and which the lower, but how status is represented in the archaeological record and the implications of material diversity in the mid-seventeenth century. Material culture usually varies with social status and variations in social status mean social inequality (Edwards and Brown 1993).

Chapter II will describe each of the sites examined, their physical setting, the features and architectural remains uncovered, and artifacts unearthed. The data limitations of each site will also be taken into consideration.

Chapter III will attempt to place the initial exploration and colonization of Virginia and these sites in the context of expanding horizons and the expanding problems
in Europe that led to the conquest of new territories in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It will also briefly address the local history of Martin's Hundred and Hampton.

Chapter IV will compare artifacts, faunal and architectural remains from each site with special emphasis on the ceramics recovered. Interestingly, a traditional approach to ceramics, is the examination and analysis by form and ware type, did not prove to be an especially productive way to compare the six sites. It was necessary to combine ware type with vessel function in order to address economic or social differentiation among the sites.

Chapter V will discuss the similarities and differences among these sites and draw conclusions in light of the thesis proposed.
Chapter II
Descriptions of the Sites/Data Limitations

This chapter is purely descriptive; it serves to acquaint the reader with the physical characteristics of each of the five sites, the circumstances under which each was excavated, the features located, structural remains found, and the character of the artifacts recovered. More detailed information is provided on the two most recently excavated sites, Hampton and 44JC647 because the author was directly involved in the excavations and preparation of the site reports. Some detailed information on the sites excavated during the Noël Hume period (1957 to 1982) is lacking, principally because no site reports were ever written on the excavations.

All of the sites described below have enough in common that a valid comparison of location, architecture, and archaeological material can be made: all six sites were fully excavated; all were being used during the second quarter of the seventeenth century; and all ceramics from the respective sites have been mended and cross-mended and the minimum number of vessels have been identified. The ceramic vessels from the sites were identified either by
William E. Pittman, who worked under the direction of Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume for a number of years, or by the Noël Humes themselves. Finally, the five sites at Martin's Hundred and the Hampton site are within the same geographic area.

The Martin's Hundred Sites

44JC647

The historic site 44JC647 (Carter's Grove Site 8) was located on a 230-acre parcel known as the Greene Tract, adjacent to and east of the Carter's Grove mansion. A partial survey of the Greene Tract was conducted in the early 1970s under the supervision of Colonial Williamsburg's former Resident Archaeologist, Ivor Noël Hume. Noël Hume discovered ten seventeenth-century sites (Figure II-1) on the tract at this time; however, since none was under direct threat, the survey was not completed. When plans for developing portions of the tract were entertained by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation in the early 1990s, a site identification survey was conducted by the Department of Archaeological Research under the direction of Marley R. Brown III and the direct supervision of Staff Archaeologist
Sites Located in the 1970s

Muraca & Wagner
David Muraca. The survey identified 18 sites, both historic and prehistoric, within the parcel (Moodey 1992).

Early in 1991, a site-examination survey of the tract sought to further identify and define the bounds of the sites in addition to making recommendations for their dispensation. One of the sites recommended for intensive excavation was 44JC647 which lay within a portion of the tract conveyed to the Williamsburg/James City County school system (Figure II-2). Although no features were uncovered during the site examination survey, the presence, size, and location of the site were indicated by a concentration of artifacts that suggested a small house lot probably occupied during the second quarter of the seventeenth century (Moodey 1992).

Full-scale excavation of 44JC647 and an adjacent Native American archaic period site, 44JC633, began on June 1, 1991, and was completed in mid-September of the same year. The purpose of the excavation at 44JC647 was two fold. First, a historic site related to an important early seventeenth-century plantation instrumental in the development of the Virginia colony was situated where plans called for the construction of a new elementary school.
Deemed significant during the two prior surveys, the site required full-scale excavation. Second, the paucity of artifacts found during the initial surveys suggested that the site was probably occupied by people living at the lower echelon of Martin's Hundred society. Careful full-scale excavation could help archaeologists better understand this economic and social group who lived during a period usually characterized in the archaeological record by relative wealth.

As is the case with most of the seventeenth-century Chesapeake sites, 44JC647 is located in an area used extensively for agriculture during the last century, if not before. Cultivation created a 40cm (15.6") plowzone layer covering the site. After this layer was carefully examined and fully tested, it was removed by machine to reveal a small site with several features: remains of a small earth-fast structure, three "refuse" pits, and a slot fence (Figure II-3). The structure had been erected around six large structural posts forming a rectangle measuring 7.5m (24.6') east-west by 5.0m (16.4') north-south. A lean-to off the eastern end, suggested by two smaller post holes, measured 3.2m (10.5') by 2.1m (6.9'). The building appeared to have been traverse-raised (built end to end) because the
distance between the sets of north and south post holes does not vary, but distances between the ends and central posts do. No evidence of a fireplace was found during excavation of the building, but it was most likely located on the same end as the lean-to. Only one of the post holes appeared to have undergone any repair; that suggested the building was not occupied for a long period.

A little more than 64 square meters (76.8 square yards) of the yard on the south side of the structure was enclosed by what was probably a low fence no more than a meter and a half tall, similar to those described by Noël Hume at Site A (Noël Hume 1982). The fence was defined by the trench dug for the upright palings that were bound together by a horizontal board or tied together with vines or rope. The fence extended south from each end of the house 7 to 8 meters (23-26 feet), but only seemed to attempt enclosure at the east end. A 5.3 meter (17.4') gap between the east and west fence lines may have been closed by a gate and alternative fencing that left little or no archaeological evidence. The fenced area on the south side of the little house was probably used for gardening and other domestic activities. The fence served to keep free-ranging animals out of the area.
Three pits were located near the structure. Feature 1150, about 1.2 meters (3.9') in diameter and located 8.6m (28.2') southeast of the structure, was only .2m (8") deep and contained very few artifacts or other archaeological material. A few burned nails and other indications of intense heat within the pit suggested some domestic industrial use. The two other pits were located just off the southwestern corner of the structure and were probably dug for clay for making daub used in the construction of the house. Both pits predate the construction of the slot fence. Chemical analysis of the soil from one of the pits indicated a high phosphorus content. That suggested that the pit had been used as a receptacle for either human wastes or decaying animal tissue. Soil chemistry of the pits also showed high calcium values, probably generated by decaying animal bone and oyster shell. The cross-mend of a clay smoking pipe stem between the two pits suggested they were filled in simultaneously. Artifacts from the pits will be discussed in Chapter IV.

In summary, site 44JC647 consisted of only one small house, a fenced yard, and three refuse pits. It was not
paled in and there was no immediate water source (well). It appeared to have been occupied for less than 20 years.

A detailed description of the excavation of site 44JC647 may be found in *The Archaeology of an Early Seventeenth Century Houselot at Martin's Hundred, Virginia* an unpublished manuscript by the author on file at the Department of Archaeological Research, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Site A

Site A (Figure II-4) was a large, complex, fenced compound consisting of nine earthfast structures, ten refuse pits, human burials, and hundreds of feet of slot fence lines; all dated to the second quarter of the seventeenth century. Located on high ground near the eighteenth-century Carter's Grove mansion, the site may have functioned as an administrative center for the re-occupation of Martin's Hundred after the 1622 war (Noël Hume 1982). The site was found during a survey of the Greene Tract in the 1970s by William Kelso, as were the other sites with alphabetic designations, and excavated later the same decade under the direction of Ivor Noël Hume. Although not threatened, the
site was excavated in 1976 in order to make way for Colonial Williamsburg's bicentennial exhibits, that were eventually relocated because of the extensiveness of the site. Two structures at Site A are assuredly dwellings: Structure A, a 6.1m (20') by 6.1m (20') pit house at the south end of the site, and Structure B, a 12.2m (40') by 5.5m (18') dwelling about 22.9m (75') north of Structure A. The other structures may have been storage buildings, though several others, such as C and D, could have also served as dwellings (Noël Hume 1982).

Site A seemed to be nearly surrounded by slot fence ditches, but it did not appear to be palisaded or fortified in any way, although a cannon ball was recovered from the site (Noël Hume 1982). Slot fencing, common on seventeenth-century sites in the Chesapeake, probably stood only a meter or so high and served only to mark property boundaries and keep free-ranging animals out of living space (Noël Hume 1982; Edwards, et al. 1989). No wells were found at the site, although fresh water might have been readily available from nearby springs.

A sample of the artifacts recovered from Site A include delft tiles, iron and brass fireplace tongs, a silver-plated
knife, Venetian glassware, a double-handled draw knife, silver wire, gold thread, gold clothing points, assorted armor fragments, and ceramic sherds representing 118 vessels. An assemblage represented by items such as these would be considered high status by any standards.

Site B

Site B (Figure II-5) was as poor in archaeological features as it was rich in artifacts; it consisted of one small (11.9m [39'] by 5.8m [19']) earthfast structure defined by 11 rather oddly spaced structural posts, a possible shed, two refuse pits and an infant burial. It was located on high ground about 150m to 180m (500 to 600 feet) east of Site A and proved to be one of the richest small early seventeenth-century sites excavated in Tidewater. Some of the artifacts recovered include a portion of a basket hilt sword, a Krauwinkle casting counter, numerous pieces of armor, silver inlaid knives, gilt spurs and 194 identifiable ceramic vessels. Site B, too, was found during the 1971 survey of Carter's Grove and excavated by Noël Hume in the late 1970s. As with the other Martin's Hundred sites, it had no immediate water supply and it did not appear to be paled in (Noël Hume 1982).
Site B
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MARTIN'S HUNDRED SITE D

Figure II-5

Figure II-6
Site D

Site D (Figure II-6), located nearer the James River, was poorest in features of all the Martin's Hundred sites; it consisted of one enigmatic 4.6m (15') by 7.6m (25') structure and a rubbish pit. The site was also located during Kelso's 1971 survey (Luccketti, n.d.), and "had yielded the best-quality English ceramic fragments of any of the Martin's Hundred sites" (Noël Hume 1982:265). Even though only 23 ceramic vessels could be reconstructed from the sherds recovered, one was a very rare manganese delft salt. No fence lines, palisades or wells were discovered in the vicinity of Site D.

Site E

Site E (not illustrated) was discovered during the 1971 survey of Carter's Grove. Located west of the Carter's Grove mansion, the site consisted of one 3.7m by 4.3m (12 by 14 foot) structure that had apparently been destroyed by fire. Very few artifacts were recovered from its single refuse pit and no fence lines or palisades were uncovered (Noël Hume 1982).
Hampton

Site 44HT55 (Figure II-7) was identified in 1979 by Virginia Department of Transportation archaeologist Howard MacCord while examining the right-of-way for the potential widening of Settler’s Landing Road. It was examined at the Phase 2 level by Mark Wittkofski, staff archaeologist for the Virginia Division of Historic Landmarks. He determined that Phase 3 excavations would be required should the site become threatened by road construction (Wittkofski 1980). Subsequent road construction did not affect 44HT55 and it was left undisturbed until the owner of the site, Hampton University, decided to develop the parcel in 1987. After Phase 2 examination by the Tidewater Cultural Resource Center at the College of William & Mary, Phase 3 excavations were begun by Colonial Williamsburg’s Department of Archaeological Research on October 27, 1987 by Project Archaeologist Thomas Higgins under the general direction of the author and Marley R. Brown III.

The Hampton site consisted of five earthfast structures, three of which may have existed simultaneously;
eight refuse pits; more than 45 meters (150') of slot trenches; a well; and an encompassing pale. The site was large and complex, perhaps similar to site A at Martin's Hundred. Structure C was the first and largest building constructed at the site; it measured 12.2m (40') east-west and 6.1m (20') north-south. Although it was the first building on the site, none of the post holes showed any sign of repair, which suggested that it stood less than 20 years (Carson, et al. 1981). Structures B, D, and E were constructed after Structure C was razed.

Structure A at the Hampton site was a 4.9m (16') by 10.7m (35') earthfast structure with a brick and tile cellar on its east end. The cellar was probably .9m to 1.2m (3' to 4') below grade and contained both interior and exterior entrances. The structural posts were repaired once during the lifetime of the building, which suggested that it was in use for more than twenty years. Artifacts recovered from the Hampton site do indicate that while it probably had its beginnings around the same time as the Martin's Hundred sites, it was occupied for at least twenty years longer. See Edwards, et al. 1989 for a fuller discussion of the site.
The above discussion should place the five sites in perspective regarding their physical descriptions. The next chapter will attempt to place them in historical perspective in relation to each other and to show how they fit into the larger scheme of world economics.
Chapter III
Historical Overview
The Setting

English colonization of the New World was the intellectual brainchild of Richard Hakluyt the Elder and his cousin Richard Hakluyt the Younger. They envisioned a nearly utopian settlement that would not only supply England with much needed resources but would establish a harmonious community of Native Americans and Englishmen living in freedom and happiness. These immigrants would largely come from the ranks of the underprivileged in England that Hakluyt the Elder described as "valiant youthes rusting and hurtfull by lacke of employement" (Taylor 1935:319), who would be confidently led by British aristocrats. Queen Elizabeth chose her confidant, Sir Walter Raleigh, to implement the task. Unfortunately, as every high school history student knows, the first attempt, made at Roanoke Island between 1585 and 1587, ultimately failed. A poor relationship with the local Native American population, lack of proper leadership, and an unwillingness on the part of the majority of the settlers to work have been seen as major reasons for the abortive initial attempt (Morgan 1975).
The Englishmen, who sailed up the Powhatan (James) in the spring of 1607 past the marl cliffs at Martin's Hundred on their way to Jamestown Island, shared some of the same expectations of the Roanoke backers. Unfortunately, they also had some of the same problems. The Jamestown colony nearly failed almost as quickly as Roanoke. Disease and starvation brought on by an unfamiliarity with the environment, fear, laziness, or as Earle (1979) suggests, sickness from drinking saltwater, caused the first settlers to abandon Jamestown in the spring of 1610. Having retreated partway down the river, the bedraggled lot met reinforcements with fresh supplies coming upriver and subsequently returned to the fort, preserving Jamestown's place in history as the first permanent English settlement in the New World.

The initial settlement of Virginia was a capitalistic endeavor. Lacking the funds and political backing necessary to underwrite the great effort needed for such an undertaking, King James I granted huge tracts of land to the Virginia Company of London. The Company was composed of private investors who were hoping to make a sizable return on their investment in exchange for sponsoring the exploitation of commodities England needed, such as silk,
iron, and timber. The enterprise would provide jobs and opportunity for the ever-growing ranks of underemployed English crafts people and workers (Craven 1949).

Unfortunately, all Company efforts at turning a profit failed miserably. No one reason can be singled out for the disastrous circumstances between 1607 and 1618. Martial law, cruel punishments, lack of incentive for workers, too many gentlemen, too many specialized craftsmen, too many indigents shanghaied from the gutters of London and bars of Bristol, and a really contemptible attitude toward the Native American population combined with the extractive nature of the industries the Company wanted to operate where there was nothing worth extracting, to spell trouble. The result was a very high death rate, desertion, and a general lack of productivity (Morgan 1975).

To make coming to America more attractive to potential colonists, and, by that, to save the faltering Virginia Company, sweeping reforms were begun in 1618 under Sir Edwin Sandys' leadership. The most important of these reforms were the abolishment of Sir Thomas Dale's extremely harsh Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall and the establishment, among other things, of a legislative assembly with
representatives elected by the inhabitants of the various plantations. Although the laws it made had to be approved by the Company, it was the first representative body in the New World.

The Virginia Company also gave 100 acres to all "ancient planters," those in Virginia before Thomas Dale's departure in 1616. The new bylaws instituted the attractive "headright" system by which 50 acres of land would be given to each person paying his own passage to Virginia or to anyone paying passage for another. A man who payed passage for himself, his wife, and two children, for example, would then receive 200 acres. Large tracts of land were often granted to wealthy sponsors who would pay passage for many people and have them work off the debt by planting for him. A very modest quitrent of one shilling was charged annually for each 50 acres. Another deal, one that made Martin's Hundred possible, was the establishment of "particular" plantations in which investors would receive 100 acres for each share of stock bought in the company and 50 acres for each transportee. The tenants would pay off the cost of their passage to the investors by sharecropping, that is, by giving one half their profits to the investors for seven years. After that, they would be free to make their own
way. To reduce the tax burden on the settlers, public officials were given tracts of land varying from 50 to 300 acres and several sharecropper tenants to work the land. The new reforms also established what amounted to a company store, headed by the cape merchant, to sell goods to the inhabitants and to preempt trading with privateers (Craven 1949).

Although these reforms must have made Virginia much more attractive to both investors and settlers, the graft and corruption associated with the previous eleven years and the devastating effect, both physically and psychologically, of the 1622 war with the Powhatan, caused so much squabbling and infighting within the company that King James revoked the charter in 1624 and made Virginia a royal colony. Although not officially sanctioned by His Majesty, the general assembly and the headright system continued, the latter having some success at populating the land. Another effect of the headright and particular plantation systems may have been the reinforcing of tensions between the masters and indentured servants because of wide-spread ill treatment of servants by their sponsors. Cases of severe punishments, deprivations of basic rights, and treating
indentured people as commodities are frequent in the surviving records of early Virginia (Morgan 1975).

Meanwhile, about the same time as the reforms were occurring, an important economic development was taking place. In 1617, the first load of West Indian tobacco was on its way to England. While Europeans had been using tobacco for medicinal purposes since the last part of the sixteenth century, they began smoking it for enjoyment in the early seventeenth century. A major breakthrough in the new industry came when John Rolfe, a Virginia planter and husband of Powhatan's daughter Pocahontas, was able to successfully cultivate the better tasting West Indies strain of tobacco in Virginia. Tobacco production quickly became the only successful enterprise in Virginia -- not the industry the founders had imagined or the kind of industry they wanted, but a quick moneymaker nonetheless. In Jamestown ..." the market-place, and streets, and all other spare places planted with Tobacco ... the Colonie dispersed all about, planting Tobacco" (Arber and Bradley 1910:535). The whole colony, despite efforts of the Company and later the crown to control production, was engaged in planting the "noxious weed."
Martin's Hundred

As mentioned earlier, one of the Virginia Company's reforms provided for what were called "particular" plantations, granted to groups of investors and operated directly by the investors. They were like little colonies within the colony. Martin's Hundred was one of them.

The particular plantation of Martin's Hundred was probably chartered in 1618 by the Virginia Company of London for a group of investors known as the Society for Martin's Hundred. Granted 20,000 acres, the Society could administer it any way they pleased to attempt to make money on the initial investment. The next year, some 220 men and women, presumably hoping to make money for themselves and the Society, arrived at Martin's Hundred. Any optimism they may have had was dashed four years later, at the time of the first Anglo-Native American War. Seventy-eight of the 140 inhabitants of Martin's Hundred were killed by the Native Americans on March 22, 1622, and the remaining 62 were captured or fled the hundred, seeking safety in Jamestown. Martin's Hundred sustained a substantial 22% of the 347 fatalities recorded throughout the colony (Noël Hume 1982).
By 1623, about 50 settlers had returned to Martin's Hundred, but by the time a census (muster) was taken of the whole colony in February 1625, nearly half the 50 returnees had died of disease and only 27 people inhabited the plantation (see Appendix A). The Society's investment was apparently a poor one.

Fortunately for historians, besides the names and often ages of the individual settlers and their servants, an inventory was taken of their provisions, arms, buildings, and other personal property. Unfortunately, the muster-takers were inconsistent in what was counted from place to place. The Martin's Hundred muster seems to be fairly complete.

The 19 men, five women, and three children counted at Martin's Hundred on February 4, 1624/25 appeared to be well-provisioned, according to the muster. Only two years earlier, one of the unfortunate 23 who died over the winter, Richard Frethorne, had complained in a letter to his parents in England of a shortage of food and other supplies: ..."I have nothing at all, no not a shirt to my backe, but two Ragges nor no Clothes, but one poore suite, nor but one pair
of shooes, but one paire of stockins, but one Capp... I am not halfe a quarter so strong as I was in England, and all is for want of victualls, for I do protest unto you, that I have eaten more in one day at home then I have allowed me here for a Weeke..." (Kingsbury 1935:58).

Perhaps in anticipation of another attack from the locals, the little community at Martin's Hundred in 1625 was well-armed, with a full set of armor for almost each man, 26 matchlocks, 27 fixed pieces, 29 swords, a cannon, 91 pounds of powder, and 361 pounds of shot. The ordnance and most of the other weaponry were under the control of Henry Harwood, the "governor" of the settlement.

By the time of the dissolution of the London Company, it appears that the focal point of the hundred had been moved from the prewar location at Wolstenholme Town near the river to Site A up on the bluff near the present-day Carter's Grove Mansion. During the 1970's, Ivor Noël Hume located Site A at Carter's Grove. The three houses listed in Harwood's muster may have been at this site, along with most of the arsenal. The other four or five houses listed for Emerson, Addams, Jackson, and March were probably dispersed around this administrative center.
Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine whether site 44JC647 was the site of one of the houses described in the muster, but both artifacts and documents indicate a slightly later construction date. The presence of a locally-made smoking pipe bowl fragment in the fill of one of the structural posts for the little house would tend to support a second quarter of the seventeenth century construction date. The domestic pipe phenomenon, for various reasons discussed elsewhere in this report, probably did not occur until the beginning of the second quarter of the seventeenth century. Although it is not usually a sound practice to base conclusions on negative evidence, it does seem peculiar that no armor or gun parts were recovered from the site although all households listed in the muster had both. There was, however, a fragment of a sword found at 44JC647 and all musterees had swords as well.

Very little specific information is available about the individuals that lived at Martin's Hundred after the 1625 muster. James City County records were destroyed during the Civil War. Land patents, records of the headright system, which did survive the burning of Richmond, are somewhat helpful in they at least name some individuals who patented
land at the hundred during the remainder of the century, but sufficient detail in location is wanting.

Judging from the site identification and examination of evidence, there are at least eleven sites dating from the second quarter of the seventeenth century to the beginning of the eighteenth. There appears also to have been a community at Martin's Hundred during the seventeenth century with house sites chosen that were neither too near nor too far from the next neighbor. This development is traced carefully in David Muraca's 1993 monograph "Martin's Hundred: A Settlement Study."

It is indeed too bad that a more precise history of site 44JC647 cannot be written. Perhaps knowledge of whom the individuals were that lived in the little house could shed light on why they lived there for what appears to be a very short period. Not having the privilege of knowing such details, we must rely on other sources for information.

James Deetz (1987), while studying pipe stem bore diameters from Flowerdew Hundred, a contemporary particular plantation in Prince George County, found that the abandonment of small homesteads in the seventeenth century
may have been associated with a marked decline in tobacco prices in the 1640s. Repeating Deetz's experiment at Martin's Hundred has shown that a group of sites, A, B, 2, 11, and 8 was abandoned at approximately the same time in the mid-seventeenth century as similar sites at Flowerdew. A fuller description of Deetz's application at Martin's Hundred will be addressed in Appendix 2.

Clustered farm sites at both Flowerdew and Martin's Hundred may have used up the easily accessible land between 1625 and 1650, making it necessary for farmers to move to greener pastures. This spent land, combined with falling tobacco prices, may have led some tobacco cultivators to quit and return to England or to find new, richer land in northern counties where larger tracts were being patented in the second half of the seventeenth century.

Martin's Hundred ceased to be an entity by the early eighteenth century when Martin's Hundred Parish joined York-Hampton Parish in 1713 (McIlwain 1925:[IV]316).

Hampton
Several weeks before Capt. Christopher Newport, Capt. John Smith, George Percy and their party formally established the English foothold on North America at Jamestown, they enjoyed the hospitality of their newly found neighbors at Kicotan, a Native American village having "eighteen houses pleasantly seated upon three acres of ground" (Smith 1608:37). Recognizing the strategic importance of the Kicotan area, especially Point Comfort, from which the mouth of the James could be guarded against the Spanish threat to the south. The English built three forts and all of the native inhabitants were driven away by 1610 (McCartney 1983).

Both Thomas Dale and William Strachey wrote that two to three thousand acres of land had already been cleared by natives at Hampton. This was probably located on both sides of the Hampton River. Some of this cleared land was undoubtedly included in the 3000 acres reserved by the Virginia Company on the east side of the Hampton River which was to be used to provide a place for persons coming to Virginia at Company expense. It was also to be used to house the military contingent protecting the area from enemy attack, be it derived from land or sea (McCartney, ibid.)
In 1619, at the first meeting of the House of Burgesses, the name Kicotan was changed to the Corporation of Elizabeth City. At that time, and until 1637, Elizabeth City also included the area now known as Norfolk and Virginia Beach. Elizabeth City was the largest of the four Virginia Corporations with a population of 324 in 1624.

The Muster of 1625 sheds some light on the specific history of site 44HT55, as the Hampton site is designated by the state. It fortunately separates those persons living on the east side of the Hampton River from those living on the west, but, of course, it does not give exact locations of the farmsteads.

The first surviving mention of a lease or patent on the east side of the river near HT55 is the lease of 50 acres to Lt. Thomas Flint in 1626. This seems to be the area currently occupied by the Veterans Administration. Two patents and two pages later in Patent Book I, 50 acres is leased to Reverend Jonas Stockden who is listed as residing on the west side of the river in 1625. The boundaries of his lease are specific: “50 acres on the eastern side of the Southampton River, within the Company's Land at Elizabeth City, abutting on the south side a creek parting this land
from that of Lt. Flint, north on another creek, west on said river and east on the main woods" (Nugent 1979).

The next lease in the area near HT55 was to Christopher Windmill, Planter, on September 20, 1628, for 60 areas abutting south on the plantation of Lt. Flint's, on the north by Jonas Stockden, and on the west by the Hampton River. Another lease, made on the same day as Windmill's, was awarded to Walter Heyley for 50 acres which abutted to the south on Stockden's land, and on the north towards the head of the river. The east and west boundaries are not mentioned. Two months later, Windmill was granted another lease, this time for 50 areas bounded on the south by a creek going towards the land of Walter Heyley, west on the river, and east on the main land (Nugent 1979). This may be the parcel on which the Hampton site was located.

By 1632, Windmill had died and his lease had been conveyed to Francis Hough, his wife's new husband. Hough assigned the northern 60 acres to Joseph Hatfield in October of 1632, and the southern 60 acres to Henry Coleman in 1633. The Hatfield lease was apparently part of a 116-acre parcel patented by Henry Poole in 1642. Poole sold the tract to Richard Hull on October 15, 1655. Although the locations of
these land leases and patents are tenuous, it is likely that site HT55 was owned by one or more of these individuals. Whether any of them ever lived on the property is not known.

Summary

This discussion of world events in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries is important if we are to understand some of the processes going on at a smaller scale at plantations such as Martin's Hundred. It has been argued (Craven 1949; Morgan 1975; Braudel 1982) that England needed to colonize in order to rid itself of a portion of a growing population of underworked poor who were becoming a social problem in the late sixteenth century. Colonization is, of course, almost always accomplished or led by the elite of the homeland and it almost always requires the exploitation of someone -- usually the native population. In the case of Virginia, however, it became evident very quickly that the native population was better annihilated than exploited on a long-term basis. It was necessary, then, to exploit the surplus lower class English men and women until servitude by virtue of race began in the late seventeenth century. Indentured servants were treated like property and were often traded among the masters, beaten, poorly housed, and
overworked, especially in the Company and near-post-Company period (Morgan 1975).

Thus, colonization, which gave rise to modern capitalism/consumerism, had at its roots the exploitation of the lower echelon of English society. Since many of the trends and events leading to modern capitalism in America had their beginnings in the Chesapeake, so perhaps may the beginnings of resistance to the domination of the capitalistic elite also have its beginnings in this area. Could this resistance to the oppressiveness of the Virginia Company account at least partially for its downfall?
Chapter IV
Comparative Analysis

In this chapter, several categories of artifacts, faunal and architectural remains and the Muster of 1624/25 will be examined for information each may hold, directly or indirectly, about the status of the men and women who lived at each site. Based on a method similar to that used by James Deetz (1988) at Flowerdew Hundred several years ago, a comparison of imported smoking pipe stem bore diameters will establish contemporaneity among the sites and address the pattern of settlement at Martin’s Hundred.

Domestic pipes, or rather the ratio of domestic to imported pipe stems recovered from a site, may have a direct correlation with site status. Although the relationship of domestic pipes and the status of a site’s occupants was approached indirectly in Susan Henry’s 1976 article, their relationship to imported pipes has not been explored. Might the presence of locally-made clay pipes in high ratios to the imported variety suggest resistance behavior on the part of subordinates in early Virginia?
Ceramic vessels recovered from the sites will be analyzed in terms of how ceramic types and forms were perceived by their owners and how this perception may bear on status differentiation. Both Ann Yentsch (1990, 1991a, 1991b) and Dennis Pogue (1993) have recently addressed this issue in regard to seventeenth-century ceramics. Yentsch's vessel-use categories will be used to compare the material recovered from the five sites.

Unfortunately, the analysis of the faunal remains from the sites is crude and very general. Again this data limitation is due to a lack of analysis originally done on the earlier Martin's Hundred sites. Nevertheless, status can be addressed by looking at statistics that can still be compiled: presence/absence in the case of deer remains and estimates of numbers of individuals for cows and swine.

Little has been written regarding the relationship between status and architecture since Carson, Barka, Kelso, Stone, and Upton produced their definitive work on earthfast Chesapeake architecture in 1981. Even with twelve more years of excavation, there still appears to be little correlation between wealth and the size or construction technique of houses in the early seventeenth century. This
study suggests that there may be a relationship between status and ancillary structures, and status and window treatment.

The Muster of 1624/25 was a census ordered by the king shortly after the takeover of the colony by the English government in 1624. Although not frequently used as a source of information about the material culture and archaeological record of sites dating to the period, the muster does provide a basis for comparing plantations and households within plantations since information gathered from each includes houses, livestock, food provisions, and armaments. Here, the Muster will be used to compare Martin’s Hundred and Hampton east of the Hampton River with each other and the rest of the colony.

Artifacts

Clay Smoking Pipes

Next to ceramics, the next most frequently studied artifact recovered from seventeenth and eighteenth century historical sites in the Chesapeake is the clay smoking pipe. On sites dating from the second quarter of the seventeenth century to the first decade of the eighteenth century, two
types of pipes are usually present: molded pipes of European manufacture and hand-fashioned or molded pipes thought to be of local origin. The European pipes are generally white or off-white in color and are most frequently decorated, if at all, with roulettes and stamps, while the local variety are red to buff in color and may be decorated with roulettes, stamps, hand-drawn figures or any combination of these techniques. Some red or so-called terra cotta pipes were manufactured in England during the same time period, but it is unclear whether these pipes were made for local English consumption or were exported in any quantity (Oswald 1975). For the purpose of most analyses involving these terra cotta pipes, it has generally been assumed that they were made in the Chesapeake exclusively for local sale and use (Henry 1976; Noël Hume 1982; Emerson 1988; Deetz 1993). The imported variety will be discussed first.

Imported Clay Pipes

The white clay smoking pipe is easily one of the most ubiquitous artifacts found on historical sites dating from the early seventeenth century well into the nineteenth. Manufactured in Europe, principally in England and the Netherlands, since the late sixteenth century, these pipes
were first used to take tobacco medicinally (Morgan 1975). The early pipes had very small, bulbous bowls and short stems with bores as large as 11/64th inches in diameter. Presumably, the bowls were small because the weed was so harsh and expensive in the early days of tobacco smoking, that only a small amount could be smoked at a time. As tobacco became cheaper and more readily available during the seventeenth century and smoking became a recreational pastime, manufacturers began to produce pipes with larger bowls and longer stems. As the stem length and quality of the product increased, the size of the wire used to punch the hole in the pre-fired wet clay mold decreased. This decrease in bowl size, for some unknown but fortuitous reason, proceeded at a constant rate over time, a fact discovered by J.C. Harrington while working at Jamestown in the 1950s (Harrington 1954). This observation, combined with the fact that clay pipes are inherently fragile and cheap, provided the most significant analytical tool yet contributed to historical archaeology: pipe stem dating.

Harrington Histograms (Figure IV-1) which plot the stem hole diameters in 64th-inch increments can be used to date

---

3 Although pipe stem lengths could be ordered in three sizes, short, medium, and long in the eighteenth century (Noël Hume 1982), the length of the stem did increase somewhat over time.
sites and features as well as to provide indications of site duration. When line rather than bar graphs are used to plot bore diameters of pipes from a given site or feature, the steepness of the curve suggests the length of site occupation. The steeper the curve, the shorter the duration and the more gradual the curve, the longer the occupation (Stone 1977). Lewis Binford (1962) developed a straight line regression formula using the bore diameter phenomenon to provide a mean date of site occupation. Although the formula is useful in dating deposits from the mid-to-late seventeenth century to the late eighteenth, its accuracy is questionable for both the early seventeenth century and the

![Figure IV-1](image)
early nineteenth (Noël Hume 1982; Deetz 1987). Furthermore, Binford Mean Dates only furnish a single date and provide no information regarding duration of occupation. Harrington Histograms, which are graphical representations of each bore diameter are more informative, especially when comparing numerous sites.

Although the analysis of imported pipe stem diameters can tell us little about the status of a given site and cannot be used to compare the statuses of several sites, the subject of this essay, it was the method used to determine the contemporaneity of the sites under discussion. How this process was accomplished is explained fully in Appendix 2.

Domestic Smoking Pipes

Nearly as common as the imported type on sites dating to the last three-quarters of the seventeenth century, the domestic or terra cotta red-clay pipe has been a source of controversy for some time. As mentioned earlier, Susan Henry's study contends that they are a phenomenon of the highly fluctuating tobacco-based economy in the Chesapeake; the locally-made pipes supplemented regular imports during
hard times. She also attempted to place the various stylistic variations in some sort of chronology, but seventeenth-century sites excavated at Hampton and in Williamsburg have shown that features that were filled in a relatively short time span contained a variety of stylistic domestic pipe types (Lester and Hendricks 1987; Pittman in Edwards, et al. 1989).

Matthew Emerson's 1988 Ph.D. dissertation attempts to prove the hypothesis that the domestic pipe phenomenon is a product of an African-American cottage industry developed during the last half of the seventeenth century. His assertions are based on the decorative motifs found on many of the pipe bowls that appear to correspond to those found in West African art (Emerson 1988). Although African Americans have been a part of the settlement of Virginia since the first black slaves were sold at Hampton in 1619, they made up only a tiny fraction of the population until the very last quarter of the seventeenth century. It is difficult to imagine such a small, dispersed group producing such a high quantity of goods with an obviously organized distribution system.
The once-popular notion that domestic pipes were manufactured by the local Native Americans for trade to the English (Noël Hume 1969) is even more unlikely. Although some of the designs common on such pipes may also be prevalent in the Native American assemblage, it is implausible that most of the pipes, which are molded, would have been marketed by the local natives, yet another small, dispersed group. The discovery at Flowerdew Hundred of a domestic pipe accidentally manufactured without a bore hole (Deetz 1993) suggests that the pipes were probably being made in several places all over Tidewater and that no one ethnic group ought to be given credit for their manufactory. Until a definite well-provenanced pipe kiln is found in Tidewater, the controversy will continue.

Neither white clay imported pipes nor the terra cotta local ones alone can be used to determine the status of the occupants of a given site. However, one may address the notion of status through a comparison of the ratios of domestic to imported pipes recovered from closely contemporary sites. The following chart (Figure IV-2) shows the percentage of domestic versus imported pipes found at the Martin's Hundred and Hampton sites (sites D and E are
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omitted from the comparison because only one pipe stem was recovered from site D and only 12 from site E).

As the chart shows, only JC647 contained a higher percentage of domestic pipe stems and bowls. The high status sites, A, B, and Hampton, all had at least twice as many imported stems and bowls as domestic ones. At site B, the most elite of the group, only 4.4% of the pipes recovered were locally manufactured. This comparison involves too few sites to make any kind of generalized statement regarding status and domestic versus imported pipes; however, it does suggest there is a connection. It may be an interesting phenomenon to explore in future comparisons.

Ceramics

Of all the various groups of artifacts recovered from any archaeological site, the ceramic assemblage is doubtlessly the most often subjected to intense analysis. Over the past 25 years, ceramic analysis has progressed from the Noël Humes’ extensive work on ware type and vessel form identification (Noël Hume 1969) to Stanley South's Mean Ceramic Dating techniques (South 1977), to George Miller's
Pricing Indexes (Miller 1980), to more recent complex analyses which seek meaning in the form, possession and use of various kinds of ceramic vessels (Beaudry, et al. 1983; Little 1988; Little and Shackel 1989; Yentsch 1990). Anne Yentsch has even sought to engender ceramics (Yentsch 1991a).

Ceramic analysis may proceed on the sherd level where fragments are sorted, counted, and categorized to produce a Mean Ceramic Date (MCD) for a site or a feature as suggested by Stanley South (1977). The drawbacks to sherd-level analysis are obvious. The actual numbers and forms of ceramic vessels are not known and therefore little can be said about the meaning and importance of the ceramic vessels recovered from the site. Site comparisons based on sherd-level analysis are also suspect, since 25 sherds recovered from one site may represent perhaps two vessels whereas 25 sherds from another site may represent ten vessels. For these reasons, sherd-level analysis was not considered a valid option in this study. A type of analysis based on the minimum number of vessels represented on each site was chosen. How the minimum number of vessels from a site is determined is explained explicitly by Noël Hume (1982) and by Beaudry, et al. (1983) and will not be detailed here.
Suffice it to say that "Minimum vessel analysis has the advantage that with its use, an archaeologist can observe variations in the cultural organization of activities at a series of sites both at a functional level, ... and a symbolic level" (Yentsch 1990:25). One of the major reasons the five Martin's Hundred sites and the Hampton site can be compared is the fact that minimum vessel counts have been made for the ceramics recovered from the excavations.

The following table summarizes the various vessel forms (bowls, tankards, pans, etc.) by ware type:

Table IV-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>647</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Coarseware (Totals)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dishes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mugs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tygs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cauldrons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storage jars</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pipkins</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jugs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porringers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bowls</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chamber pots</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skillets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pitchers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butter pot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strainer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Coarsewares</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Totals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish costrels</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butter pots</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberian oil jars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of England chargers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of England platters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudor green fuming pots</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Devon plain storage jars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Devon plain pipkin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Devon gravel pipkin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Devon gravel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cauldrion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean slipware dish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Italian slipware bowl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black-glazed redware mug</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Devon tyg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Devon Platter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tin-Enamled EW (Totals)</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bowls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drug pots</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plates</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porringers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dishes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chargers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jug</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brown Stoneware (Totals)</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chamber pots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartmann bottles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storage jars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jugs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuming pot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tankard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ceramic vessels from these sites can be grouped by type and function in order to determine what kinds of ceramics were being purchased by the residents of each site and what jobs they needed the vessels to perform. By looking at ceramic types in relation to the function of the vessel, we may be able to say something about the importance of high status tablewares at each site.

Figure IV-3 compares the percentages of local coarsewares, European coarsewares, tin-enameled earthenwares, brown stoneware and Westerwald vessels recovered from each site. Immediately apparent is the

---

4 Site E is excluded from this part of the analysis because its ceramic assemblages consisted of only three vessels.
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surprisingly high ratio of imported to local coarsewares at both JC647 and the Hampton sites in contrast to that of the supposed high status Martin's Hundred sites A and B. One would expect that local coarsewares were being produced primarily because they were cheaper than those imported from Europe and that they would therefore appeal to those people with less disposable income. Local coarsewares should have been equally available at the Martin's Hundred sites since they may even have been manufactured there (Noël Hume 1982). Availability may explain, however, the high ratio of imported coarsewares at Hampton. The Hampton site was located in Virginia's most populous entrepot; its occupants would have had easier access to European ceramics than those at Martin's Hundred. Why, then, is the ratio of European coarsewares higher at JC647 than at the other Martin's Hundred sites? Several explanations may be suggested, none of which seem to be adequate: (1) the residents of JC647 were so poor, they could not even afford to buy locally made ceramics and had to rely upon those they brought with them from England. (2) They did not find the locally made wares aesthetically pleasing. (3) the site was occupied for such a short period of time that the deposition of newly acquired ceramics was minimal.
Other difficulties are encountered when attempting to explain the unexpected percentages represented in the chart. The ratio of tin-enameled earthenware, a supposedly high-status ceramic type, to other ceramics is highest at 44JC647 and the Hampton site. The abundance of tin-enameled earthenware is not surprising at Hampton, known by its other artifacts and architecture to have been the home of someone fairly well-to-do, but the high percentage at JC647 seems unlikely. Again, this deviation is hard to explain except that the delft at JC647 may have been part of the baggage from England. That the pieces wound up as trash speaks to the unwelcome destruction of perhaps very valued possessions.

Looking at the chart once again, we are faced with yet another anomaly: why, on one of the richest small sites ever excavated in Tidewater, Site B, were there no examples of brown stoneware (Frechen)? Practically every other contemporary site in the area boasts ample supplies of Bartmann bottles and brown stoneware storage pots, jugs, tankards, and so forth.

The message conveyed by the chart and this analysis of ware types by site is that division into supposed high and
low status ceramic types does not seem to conform to conclusions drawn on other grounds. A better and more meaningful way of looking at ceramic assemblages may be through examining the function of the vessels recovered in conjunction with the functional aspects of the various ware types as demonstrated in the recent work of Anne Yentsch (1990, 1991a, 1991b) and the Yentsch-based analysis of standards of living in the early Chesapeake by Dennis Pogue (1993). Pogue compared 22 seventeenth and early eighteenth sites in Maryland and Virginia, including the Hampton one, for which there existed quantifiable ceramic data. He was using archaeological material recovered from the sites to prove that the existing probate records often underestimated the wealth of individuals during the seventeenth century, which caused historians to assume that life in early Virginia was ruder than it actually was. Pogue used some of Yentsch's functional categories for ceramics to help make his point; he showed that fine wares and "new beverage" vessels were well represented in the archaeological record.

Both scholars grouped vessels into Yentsch's functional categories based on the course food takes through the household: introduction, preparation, consumption, and disposal. Using the Potomac Topological System (Beaudry et
al., 1983), vessel types may be classified as involved in (1) food preparation and storage, (2) liquid storage (bottles), (3) serving and dining⁵, or, (4) drinking (traditional beverage vessels).

In the table below, the vessels from the five Martin's Hundred sites and Hampton have been classified according to these categories and have been further subdivided into ware types and vessel forms represented in each.

Vessel Function by Ware Type (Table IV-2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>647</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Preparation and Storage</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local CW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cauldrons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storage jars</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pipkins</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bowls</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butterpots</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skillets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jugs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁵ Serving and dining vessels have been grouped in this analysis because "dining" as a functional type appears to have been rare in the seventeenth century.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>647</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>colander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Prep. and Storage - European CW</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butterpots</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberian oil jars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Devon storage jars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Devon pipkins</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Devon cauldrons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Italian bowls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Prep. and Storage - brown sw</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storage jars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butterpots</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bottles - brown sw Bartmann only</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dining/Serving - local coarseware</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dishes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porringers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dining/Serving - European coarseware</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of England chargers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of England platters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean slipware dishes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Devon platter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dining/Serving - tin enamelled ew</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bowls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plates</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porringers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dishes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chargers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jug</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drinking - local coarseware</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mugs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tygs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jugs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pitchers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drinking - European coarseware</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish costrel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black-glazed redware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Devon tyg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking - delft mug only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking - brown stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jugs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tankard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking - Westerwald</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jugs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tankards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-FOOD-RELATED VESSELS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chamber pots - local coarseware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chamber pots - Euro coarseware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chamber pots - brown stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chamber pots - Westerwald</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuming pots - European coarseware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuming pots - brown stoneware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drug pots - tin-enamelled ew</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anne Yentsch has noted that "the symbolism of pottery and porcelain vessels is a consequence of the social rank of the people who use the vessels" (Yentsch 1991:193). Little porcelain shows up on Tidewater sites before the latter part of the seventeenth century, but we can look at social status in other ceramic types and their functions. In several articles Yentsch has equated social status with the ceramic functional categories of dining and serving (Yentsch 1990, 1991a, 1991b). These types of vessels usually begin appearing on Chesapeake sites in the mid to late seventeenth century, but analysis has shown that such specialized utensils were evident slightly earlier at Martin's Hundred, principally at sites A and B. As Figure IV-4 illustrates, sites A, B, and Hampton had significant percentages of dining and serving ceramic vessels, site 647 fewer, site D even fewer, and site E, none at all. Even more revealing are the graphs showing tin-enameled dining and serving vessels and Westerwald drinking and serving containers (Figures IV-5 and 6). Formalized dining, using expensive dishes and mugs was another means of expressing power (Yentsch 1991b).
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Important social distinctions can be seen in the vessel types represented by various wares. The presence of six and eight delft plates at sites A and B respectively, reflects the attitude of their owners. Yentsch has suggested that the vividly colored white based wares in serving vessels, especially plates, were indications of high status developed from the courtly tradition of the medieval period (Yentsch 1990). No delft plates were recovered from the other three Martin's Hundred sites. Only two bowls and a small dish were found at site 647.

The very high number, 32, of tin-enamed earthenware plates recovered from the Hampton site is probably due to several factors. As mentioned before, the site is a very high status site and such ceramics would be expected; the site was located at a shipping entrepot where European ceramics would have been readily available; the site was occupied a bit longer than the other five in our study. Its occupation probably lasted into the 1660s, when dining was becoming a more formalized activity.

A look at the non-food ceramics was also revealing. Sites A, B, D, and Hampton contained fragments of chamber pots and at least two of those at site A were Westerwald.
Sites E and 8 had none. Also included in the non-food ceramic vessel category are drug and ointment pots, generally indicating attention to appearance and health as well as hygiene. These items were found only at sites A and B at Martin's Hundred, and, in great quantities, at Hampton (Figure IV-7).

Faunal Remains

Unfortunately, faunal data from the earlier Martin's Hundred sites are incomplete since no formal site reports were written for sites A, B, D, and E. However, enough raw data, consisting of some identification and counts, have been located for sites A and B that some general trends can be discussed that may provide clues regarding differential status.

Henry Miller suggests that "exploitation of deer also distinguishes the wealthiest homes from others... a likely explanation is that... wealthy planters in early Maryland and Virginia had the means to employ professional hunters" (Miller 1988:186). Although faunal remains are hardly mentioned in Noël Hume's book, Stanley Olsen identified
numerous deer bones from refuse pits at sites A and B, but none at sites D and E. Joanne Bowen and Steve Atkins, who performed the faunal analysis at site JC647 (in Edwards 1994), found pig, cow, frog, terrapin, and even bald eagle bones in refuse pits at the site, but not a single deer bone. Deer bones, however, were found in relative abundance at the Hampton site (Brown in Edwards, et al. 1989). The inhabitants of JC647 were apparently not culturally or technologically equipped to hunt for large game, or could not afford to hire a gun. Large domesticated animal remains were extant at all of the sites, but in proportions that may say something about the economic status of the occupants.

Although both pig and cow are almost universally represented on all historical sites in the Chesapeake, beef seems to have been the meat of preference throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Bowen, per. comm.). Henry Miller (1984) has suggested that cows' milk, rather than cows' meat, may have been the traditional staple source of protein for English peasants, both in England and in the American colonies. Since it is also argued that deer hunting was not in the cultural repertoire of lower class Englishmen, and cows were primarily used for milk products, then it follows that faunal analysis would show that pigs
were a more important source of meat than cows on lower status sites and deer remains would be absent. The following chart illustrates these conclusions for the sites under study: (Table IV-3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Most Important Meat</th>
<th>Deer Present?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Beef</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beef</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC647</td>
<td>Pork</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>Beef</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of kill-off patterns for all the sites may further illustrate the point by showing that the cow remains found on the lower echelon sites were from older individuals, who were killed for meat after their usefulness as milk producers had decline. Unfortunately, such analysis has only been accomplished for the Hampton and JC647 sites. Results from these two sites do indicate that younger animals were being slaughtered at Hampton than at JC647 (Brown in Edwards, et al. 1989; Bowen and Atkins in Edwards 1993).
Architecture

During the first half of the seventeenth century, most buildings in the Chesapeake were constructed around wooden posts buried in the ground. Cary Carson, Norman Barka, William Kelso, Garry Stone, Dell Upton (1981), and Fraser Neiman (1978, 1980, 1990) among others, have shown that earthfast construction was universal and had little or nothing to do with the relative wealth of the builder. House size did not seem to have been a way in which one displayed wealth, although house embellishments including glazed windows, interior plaster, and tile roofs, may have been used as such a vehicle.

The table below compares the dimensions of the structural remains uncovered at the various sites under examination, including the associated outbuildings, if any:

Table IV-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Hampton</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>647</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>16x35</td>
<td>18.5x40</td>
<td>19x37</td>
<td>15x25</td>
<td>12x14</td>
<td>16x24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.B. 1</td>
<td>18x20</td>
<td>18x16.5</td>
<td>10x28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.B. 2</td>
<td>20x40</td>
<td>20x20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A quick examination of the table reveals two factors that may speak to the notion of status: (1) the principal structures at sites A, B, and Hampton are larger than those at sites D, E, and JC647; (2) sites A, B, and Hampton all have supporting structures in association with the principal dwelling, while sites D, E, and JC647 do not.

Additionally, window glass and window leads were recovered from sites A and B (Noël Hume 1982) and at Hampton (Edwards, et al. 1989). As rude as these wooden structures may have been, they probably had casement windows. No window glass or leads were left in the archaeological record at sites D, E, or JC647. Oiled paper, cloth, or shutters probably covered the window openings at these houses, making a typical Virginia winter day seem even gloomier.

The Muster of 1624/25
As mentioned earlier, immediately after the dissolution of the Virginia Company, the Crown ordered a census, or muster, taken of the colony. This muster was organized by plantation and further subdivided by household (see Appendix A for the Martin’s Hundred and Hampton musters). Information provided in the census included not only the names of all adults, but more often than not, their ages, when they immigrated to Virginia, and on what ship they arrived. In addition, the provisions and armaments of each household were accounted, listing such commodities as houses, stores, cows, goats, swine, corn, meal, fish, guns, swords, powder, lead, and armor. Although infrequently used by historical archaeologists as a source for the study of seventeenth-century material culture, probably because of inconsistencies and confusing nomenclature, the muster can be used, as Norman Barka pointed out ...” to analyze closely settlement traits and artifact content from excavated sites in order to establish early English behavioral patterns” (1993:335).

The sites at Martin’s Hundred and Hampton, which are the subjects of analysis in this paper, probably were established within a decade of the muster and several may
have been in existence by the early 1620s. It seems appropriate, then, to take a closer look at the musters for Martin’s Hundred and the east side of the Hampton River, where HT55 was located, to see how they compare with each other and the rest of the colony in terms of provisions and armaments.

The following chart6 (Figure IV-8) shows the average number of houses, commodities, and armaments for each person listed in the muster for each locality. A glance at the chart quickly shows that the 27 settlers at Martin’s Hundred had more guns, swords, powder, lead, and body armor per person than those at Hampton and more than the colony-wide average. They had more than the average number of cows and fish as well, but fewer houses, pigs, and corn per person than the rest of the colony. Hampton, a supposedly prosperous area, only tops the colony average significantly in terms of housing and it only slightly slips ahead in corn and lead provisions.

---

6 The chart is in a logarithmic scale in order to better illustrate the widely divergent numbers represented. For example, Martin’s Hundred averages 146 fish per person, but only 0.26 house per person. A linear scale chart would hardly display the 0.26, whereas a logarithmic scale allows this display of large and small numbers on the same chart.
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Logarithmic scale - Figure IV-8
At first glance, the Martin's Hundred inhabitants appear to be fairly well off, compared to the average. Their apparent abundance of fire-power may stem from the devastation wreaked on the plantation by the locals only three years earlier and the fact that they continued to be attacked by Native Americans for some time after 1622 (McCartney, pers. com.). A closer look at the distribution of Martin's Hundred's wealth within the plantation is revealing, however. Henry Hardwood's muster, while accounting for only 26% of the people, includes 43% of the houses, all of the cows, a third of the corn and fish, two-thirds of the guns, swords, powder, and armor, and over 80% of the lead. Clearly, the wealth of the plantation rested primarily with one person.

This very cursory use of muster data does tend to support the notion purported by the analysis of the archaeological data: most of the commodities at Martin's Hundred were concentrated at two sites, both of which may have been Harwood's. No doubt the overwhelming military advantage of the Harwood household was perceived by all parties as protection against a very real enemy rather than
as a coercive force used to keep tenants and servants “in line”. Could this protective atmosphere also be perceived as being paternalistic, much as the master protects his slaves, or as the British colonial empire was to see itself in later years, as protector of the unwashed masses?

These analyses have suggested that not only did the occupants of sites A and B at Martin's Hundred dispose of and therefore own a larger number of ceramic vessels and artifacts in general, but also that their vessels were representative of higher social standing than those recovered from the other sample sites at Martin's Hundred.
Archaeology is an inherently destructive process. In choosing to excavate any site, the archaeologist is obligated to analyze the material recovered and to report on the findings. Most responsible archaeologists go through this process, and share the information they gathered with their colleagues and the school, corporation or foundation that paid for the costly endeavor. The information gathered by an archaeologist about a specific site can be of interest to both the archaeological community and the public. The value of this information is greatly enhanced, however, when compared with information recovered from contemporary or like-function sites. In order for archaeology to address broad historical questions, such comparison is necessary. It is necessary as well to have some basis for grouping sites into comparable sets.

As Dan Mouer notes in his 1987 paper, "Everything in its Place . . .: Locational Models and Notions of the Elite in Virginia, 1660-1865", variation in material culture is assumed to be conditioned by interactions of geographic place, social place, and temporal place. Sites A, B, D, E,
647, and Hampton share geographic place -- lower Tidewater, Virginia, and a temporal place -- the second quarter of the seventeenth century, but they obviously do not share a similar social place, if we assume, once again, that material culture varies with social status, and that variations in social status mean social inequality.

The close examination of this 1625-1650 group of sites affords the opportunity to address an important period that social historians characterize inconsistently. Lois Green Carr (1978, 1984), Russell Menard and Lorena Walsh (1983), Jon Kukla (1985), and others seem to accentuate the positive aspects of the period, stressing the development of community, economic opportunity, and the rise of stabilizing institutions, while others, notably Edmund Morgan (1975) and Timothy Breen (1980, 1985), emphasize high mortality, impermanence, poor management, and the extreme tensions resulting from the exploitation of indentured servants by the elite. The latter view has laid the groundwork for archaeologists seeking to study inequality -- dominance and resistance -- in the early period of Anglo-American history.

(1982, 1988), to name just a few, have drawn upon the class tension generated in the seventeenth century to illuminate the symbolic nature of material culture in the eighteenth. Both obvious and subtle variations in the archaeological record have been used to explain how one group has strengthened and perpetuated its dominance over another.

Was inequality in the form of status differentiation manifest in the variability in the archaeological record at the Martin's Hundred and Hampton sites in the second quarter of the seventeenth century? Using these six fully-excavated sites from the period, several variables were compared that may suggest that the occupants of sites A and B were perpetuating the overt dominance exerted by the Virginia Company until 1624. The physical positions of sites A and B, architectural details left in the archaeological record, diet, ceramic assemblages, personal items, and the historical record were examined for variability that might reflect inequality.

At Martin's Hundred, the locations of sites A and B suggest a dominant position. At 20 and 19 meters above sea level, both are located on almost the highest elevations on the geologic feature known as the Grove Plain. Sites D and
647, especially, and site E, to some degree, are all located on lower elevations. Today, forests prevent seeing any one of the sites from the other, but in the early to mid seventeenth century it is likely that cultivation and clearing by Native Americans and English invaders had left much of the area open, which would have allowed the people at A and B to literally look down upon the rest of the community.

Architecturally, there are few differences in the construction methods used in the principal dwellings at the sites discussed. There are, however, differences in house sizes that are unusual in the Chesapeake region, with the larger houses being at the higher status sites. Other architectural differences at the higher status sites have been noted, including glazed windows and supporting structures. Glazed windows imply comfort and convenience, and perhaps even an air of cheerfulness not shared with the lower echelon sites. The outbuildings suggest that the people living at A, B, and Hampton may have had more physical room in which to live and work, that again, provided an additional degree of comfort and convenience as well as a subtle but perhaps effective display of wealth and position in the community.
Animal remains left behind in refuse pits may also give us a clue about differential status. It is doubtful that the piteous cries of hunger voiced in Frethorne's letters home to his parents were heard at sites A and B at Martin's Hundred and certainly not at the well-provisioned Hampton site. Food is basic to all animals, humankind included, and the struggle between those who have and those who have not transcends time and space.

An analysis of ceramic vessels recovered from the six sites was covered in the last chapter. It revealed a distinct disparity in lifestyles within the communities. Vessels that demonstrated divergent functional uses and ware types between the elite sites, A, B, and Hampton, and the lower echelon homesteads were examined.

To quote Anne Yentsch once more, "because there were few clearly defined, mutually exclusive social spaces, the emblems of rank were individually specific (i.e. clothing and personal utensils identified an individual's rank)" (Yentsch 1991:200). Such items of personal adornment as gold and silver threads, gold clothing points, armor, and spurs were found only at sites A and B.
Site 44JC647 at Martin's Hundred is probably representative of many, if not most of the households established in the Chesapeake during the second quarter of the seventeenth century. The tiny, drab, single-room house may have been home to a family, or, as often was the case in the early settlement of Virginia, an all-male household. Whoever they were, they probably came to the colony with hopes of improving whatever condition they found themselves in England. In the summer months, they may have planted a small kitchen garden within the 200-square foot fenced area on the south side of the house and grown tobacco for profit on the land surrounding the house lot. They evidently traded some of their tobacco for meat, pottery and a few other commodities. The kitchen refuse excavated from two pits suggests that the beef and pork they most likely preferred to eat had to be supplemented with fish and such seemingly unappetizing local fauna as terrapin and eagle.

The eighteen accidentally broken ceramic vessels they once used to prepare and serve their food were likely representative of the types of preparation, drinking and dining utensils they used daily. Through these vessels and the other meager remains of their sojourn at Martin's
Hundred, their material lives are contrasted with those of their nearby, well-to-do neighbors and another upper class Tidewater settlement at Hampton. Material possessions are a reflection of social status and social status is often a reflection of quality of life. The struggle between the haves to keep their possessions and status and the have-nots to obtain both, has continued throughout history and was probably present at Martin's Hundred in the seventeenth century. Many archaeologists today, especially Mark Leone and followers of his dialectic materialist approach, seek to identify that struggle, seen as dominance and resistance to being dominated, in the archaeological record. Others, like James Deetz and his associates seek to interpret what was essentially a culture quite alien from our own by examining how the archaeological record can be used as a point of departure for further understanding.

The archaeology of 44JC647 and its comparison with other sites at Martin's Hundred and Hampton clearly identifies the dichotomy of material culture within an early colonial community. It has not, however, identified the struggle between the rich and the poor. Such a struggle certainly must have existed, as it always has on some level. If the manifestations of resistance can be found in the
archaeological record in the seventeenth century, they will be found on sites such as 44JC647. The inherent fragility of these types of sites, however, is such that only a careful examination of that record will reveal this type of information about the early Chesapeake.

The archaeology of the early seventeenth-century Chesapeake is relatively new. Twenty years ago, neither Norman Barka nor Ivor Noël Hume had completed their respective excavations at Flowerdew Hundred or Wolstenholm Town. The construction techniques involved in "impermanent" architecture, today taken for granted, were still being fundamentally examined. The richness and medieval nature of artifacts such as body armor, crossbow bolts, and clothing appointments, as well as the palisaded fortified settlements, and very cosmopolitan ceramics, were exciting to everyone involved. Sites such as 44JC647 were not frequently recognized, and when they were, their material paucity deemed them far too uninteresting to warrant spending thousands of dollars to excavate. The excavation of rich sites, such as Flowerdew, Wolstenholm, and Jordan's Point has done much to bring a segment of the seventeenth-century Tidewater to life and further analysis will continue to widen its interpretation. The seemingly uninteresting
sites such as 44JC647 are equally important and infinitely more fragile. They must be recognized and researched with a great deal of care.

This thesis set out to examine status markers in the early seventeenth-century Chesapeake and to attempt to understand whether this variability found in artifacts, architecture, diet, and a part of the historical record could successfully be approached from a Marxist perspective. In spite of the obvious dichotomies characterizing the sites, the "quick time" quality of the archaeological record does not work well in inferring social interaction between the upper and lower echelon in Tidewater. A further and a much more detailed examination of the historical record may provide such insights. It may provide the necessary ingredient of Marxism; the dialectic of social intercourse that illustrates resistance to domination.

Even though the Marxist perspective has not been shown to be illustrated in the seventeenth century Tidewater artifact assemblages, the archaeological record is not devoid of meaning. On the contrary, social and economic meaning can be derived from all of the materials studied. The ratio of domestic and imported pipes has been looked at
from the perspective of variability in status. Other sites, those previously excavated, and those yet to be dug, should be examined to see whether the poorer sites are represented by larger ratios of domestic to imported pipes. The ceramic analysis has questioned the notion that variety, not quantity, was a significant status marker, and has supported the analysis of ceramics on the vessel rather than the sherd level. The faunal remains have suggested a heavier reliance on pork and less use of beef and deer for protein intake on poorer sites. Examination of the architectural remains has supported the longstanding Old World tradition that house size and wealth were connected, but more importantly, it has shown that the existence of ancillary buildings may be a better status indicator than the size or construction technique of the main structure.

All of these characteristics help broaden the understanding of a people who were very unlike Americans today, who had ideas and concepts we can only glimpse through the archaeological record, and who were often overlooked in the historical one.
Appendix 1

Muster of 1625: Hampton and Martin’s Hundred

A Muster of the Inhabitente of Elizabeth Cittie
Beyond the Hampton River
Beinge the Companyes Land

Capt Francis West His Muster
Capt Francis West Counselor aged 36 in the Mary Ann Margett
1610
Mrs Francis West Widdowe in the Supply 1620
Nathaniell West borne in Virginia

Servants
Joane Fairchild aged 20 in the George 1618
Benjamin Owin aged 18 in the Swan 1623
William Parnell aged 18 in the Southampton 1622
Walter Couper aged 22 in the Neptune 1618
Reinould Gidwin aged 30 in the Abigall 1620
John Pedro a Neger aged 30 in the Swan 1623

PROVISION: Corne, 2 barreles; Fish, 300 ct; goates, 14; Kiddes, 18;
Houses, 2; Pallizado, 1; boate, 1; ARMES: Armors, 4; peeces, 10; pistoles, 3;
Swords, 6; powder 4lb; lead, 10lb.

Capt John Martin His Muster
Capt John Martin
Sackford Wetherell aged 21
John Smith aged 31 In the Swan 1624
John Howard aged 24
John Anthonie aged 23

PROVISION: Meale, 2 hogsheads 1/2. ARMES: Armor, 1; Targett, 1;
peeces, 5; Machcockes, 11; powder, 20 lb; Lead, 500 lb; Roules of Mach, 4.
George Medcalfe His Muster

George Medcalfe aged 46
Sara Medcalfe aged 30 in the Hopewell 1624
Joanne A Child
   PROVISION: Corne, 3 barrels; Fish, 200ct; house. ARMES: peeces, 2;
   powder, 1 lb; lead, 10 lb.

Edward Johnson His Muster

Edward Johnson aged 26 in the Abigail 1621
in the Bona Nova 1621
A Child borne in Virginia
   PROVISION: Corne, 4 barreles. ARMES: peece, 1; powder, 41b; lead, 30
   lb; house, 1; Ordnance Mounted, 2.

John Lauckfild His Muster

John Lauckfild aged 24 in the Bona Nova 1621
Alice Lauckfild aged 24 in the Abbigall 1621
Sammuell Kennell aged 30 in the Abigail 1621
   PROVISION: Corne, 7 barreles; Fish, 200 ct. ARMES: peeces, 4; Swords,
   2; powder, 2 lb; lead, 20 lb; house, 1.

William Fowler His Muster

William Fowler aged 30 in the Abigall 1621
Margrett Fowler aged 30 in the Abigall 1621
   PROVISION: Corne, 3 barreles; Fish, 50; house, 1. ARMES: peeces, 2;
   powder, 1 lb; lead, 6 lb.

Walter Ely His Muster

Walter Ely
Elizabeth Ely aged 30 in the Warwicke 1622
Ann Ely borne in Virginia
   PROVISION: Corne, 4 barrels; Fish, 900 ct. ARMES: peeces, 1; lead, 30
   lb; house, 1.
William Tiler His Muster

William Tiler in the *Francis Bonaventure* 1620
Elizabeth Tiler in the *Francis Bonaventure* 1620

Servants
Robart More aged 50 in the *Providence* 1622
William Browne aged 26 in the *Providence* 1622
Robart Todd aged 20 in the *Hopewell* 1622
Anthonie Burt aged 18 in the *Hopewell* 1622
Samiel Bennett aged 40 in the *Providence* 1622
Joane Bennett in the *providence* 1622

PROVISION: Corne, 17 barreles; Meale, 1 hogshead; Fish, 300. ARMES: peeces, 9; Coates, 3; swords, 4; powder, 31b; lead, 50 lb. CATTELL: Milch Cowes, 4; Bull, 1; Piges, 3; house, 1; Sowes, 2.

Thomas Flynt His Muster

Thomas Fliynt in the *Diana* 1618
Thomas Merres aged 21 in the *Francis Bonaventure* 1620
Henrie Wheeler aged 20 in the *Tryall* 1620
John Brocke aged 19 in the *Bona Nova* 1619
James Brookes aged 19 in the *Jonathan* 1619
Robart Savage aged 18 in the *Elizabeth* 1621

PROVISIONS: Corne, 8 barreles. ARMES: peeces, 8; Armors, 2; powder, 10 lb; lead, 20 lb; house, 1; Store, 1.

John Ward His Muster

John Ward in the *Elizabeth* 1621
Adam Rimwell aged 24 in the *Bona Nova* 1619
Christopher Wynwill aged 26 in the *Bona Nova* 1619
Oliver Jenkin aged 40
Joane Jenkin & a littell Child
Henrie Potter aged 50
Ann Potter in the *London Marchant*
Robart Goodman aged 24 in the *Bona Nova* 1619

PROVISION: Corne, 20 barreles; Fish, 500 ct. ARMES: peeces, 8; Armors, 2; powder, 8 lb; lead, 20 lb; houses, 2; stores, 2.
Gregorie Dorie His Muster

Gregorie Dorie aged 36 in the Bona Nova 1620
his wiffw & littell Child borne in Virginia
    PROVISION: Corne, 5 barreles. ARMES: peeces, 2; powder, 1 lb; lead, 10 lb; Armor, 1; house, 1; pallizado, 1.

John More His Muster

John More aged 36 in the Bona Nova 1620
Elizabeth More in the Abigall 1622
    PROVISION: Corne, 3 barreles; Fish, 400 ct. ARMES: peeces, 3; powder, 2 lb; lead, 16 lb; house, 1; pallizado, 1; store, 1.

Sargent William Barry His Muster

William Barry in the Bona Nova 1619

Servants
Richard Frisbie aged 34 in the Jonathan 1619
William Rookins aged 26 in the Bona Nova 1619
Joseph Hatfield aged 24 in the Bona Nova 1619
Cutbert Seirson aged 22 in the Bona Nova 1619
John Gibbes aged 24 in the Abigall 1619
Francis Hill aged 22 in the Bona Nova 1619
John Vaghan aged 23 in the Bona Nova 1619
Edward Marshall aged 26 in the Abigall 1621
William Joyce aged 26 on the Abigall 1621
William Evands aged 23 in the Bona Nova 1619
Ralph Osborne aged 22 in the Bona Nova 1619
Morris Stanley aged 26 in the Hopewell 1624
Niccolias Weasell aged 28 in the Abigall 1621
Stephen Dickson aged 25 in the Bona Nova 1619
Thomas Calder aged 24 in the Bona Nova 1619
    PROVISION: Corne, 80 barreles. ARMES: peeces, 10; Armors, 3; powder, 10 lb; lead, 20 lb; houses, 2; Stores, 6.
William Hampton His Muster

William Hampton aged 34 in the Bona Nova 1621
Joane Hampton
John Arndell aged 22 in the Abigail 1621

PROVISION: Corne, 5 barreles; Fish, 200 ct. ARMES: pceces, 8; powder, 1 lb; lead, 20 lb; house, 1.

Anthonie Bonall His Muster

Anthonie Bonall age 42 in the Abigail 1621
Elias Legardo age 38 in the Abigail 1621
Robart Wright age 45 in the Swan 1608
Joane Wright and two Children borne in Virgina
William Binsley age 18 in the Jacob 1624
Robart Godwin age 19 in the Swan 1624

PROVISION: Corne, 5 barreles. ARMES: pceces, 6; swords, 4; powder, 2 lb; lead, 6 lb; house, 1; pallizade, 1; Stores, 3.

Robart Thrasher His Muster

Robart Thrasher age 22 in the Bona Nova 1620
Roland Williamses age 20 in the Jonathan 1623

Servant
John Sacker age 20 in the Marget and John 1623

PROVISION: Corne, 8 barreles. ARMES: pceces, 4; Armor, 1; sword, 1; powder, 2 lb; lead, 10 lb; house, 1.

John Haney age 27 in the Marget and John 1621
Elizabet Hanie in the Abigail 1622
Nicholas Rowe in the Elizabeth 1621
Mary Rowe in the London Marchant 1620

Servants
Thomas Moreland aged 19 in the Abigail 1621
Ralph Hoode aged 19 in the Abigail 1621

A List of Dead Beyond Hampton River

of Mr Bonales Servant, 1
Mr Dowse his men, 2
Mr Peter Arndell
The Muster of the Inhabitants
of Martins Hundred Taken the
4th of February 1624.

Mr William Harwood came in the Francis Bonaventure

Servants:
Hugh Hughs came in the Guifte.
Ann his wife
Thomas Doughtie aged 26
John Halsey aged 22 yeres came in the Abigall
Samuell Weaver 20 in the Bony bess
Elizabeth Bygrave 12 came in the Warwick.

Corne, 10 barrells; Fish, 12 hundred; Powder, 60 lb; Pecces fixt, 10; Machcocks, 25 and 10 lb of Match.; Pecce of Ordnance, 1 wth all things thereto belonging; Shott, 300 lb; Armours, 8; Coats of Male, 10; Coats of Steele, 3 and 20 swords; Neat Cattell, 10 belonging to the Hundred; Houses, 3; Boat, 1.

Ellis Emerson
Ann his wife
Thomas his sonn aged 11 came in the George 1623.

Servants:
Thomas Goulding aged 26 yeres came in the George 1623.
Martin Slatier aged 20 cam fro Canada in the Swan 1624

Corne, 6 barrells; Fish, 3h hundred; Powder, 12 lb; Shott, 30 lb; Pecces fixt, 1; Matchcock, 1; Armour, 1 and 4 headps; Coats of Male, 2; Coate of Steele 1; Swords, 2; Swine, 2; House, 1.

Robert Addams
Augustine Leak came in the Bona Nova
Winifred Leak his wife came in the George 1623.

Servants:
Richard Smith aged 24 yeres came in the George 1623

Corne, 3 barrells; Fish, 11 hundred; Powder, 6 lb; Shott, 5 lb; Pecces fixt, 6; Armour, 1; Coat of plate, 1; Swords, 2; Piggs, 2; Houses, 2; Boat, 1.

John Jackson

---
1 March 1 was considered New Year's Day until the early eighteenth century, so February 24, 1624, by our calendar, was actually in 1625.
Ann his wife came in the Warwick
A Child aged 20 weeks

Servants:
Thomas Ward aged 47 yeres
John Stephens 35 yeres came in the Warwick

Corne, 4 barrells; Fish, 800; Powder, 2 lb; Shott, 6 lb; Peeces
fixt, 4; Armours, 3; Coate of Male, 1; Swords, 3; Houses, 1.

Samuel March came in the William & Thomas
Collice his wife in the Ann 1623
Samuell Culley came in the London Marchant

Corne, 5 barrells; Fish, 5 hundred; Powder 1 lb; Shott, 20 lb; Peeces
fixt, 3; Armour, 1; Swords, 2.

Robert Scotchmore and his Company now planted heare are
reckonn before in the Maine.

[from the Maine muster]:

Robert Scotchmore came in the George 1623
Thomas Kniston came in the George 1623

Servants:
Roger Kidd aged 24 yeares in the George 1623

Corne, 15 bushells; Pease, 1 hogshead; Peeces, 3; Powder, 10 lb;
Armours, 3.

Dead at Martins Hundred this yeare

Alice Emerson, a girle
Robert a boy of Mr Emarsons
a girle of John Jacksons
a Child of Samuell March.
**MARTIN'S 100**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Houses</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Swine</th>
<th>Goats</th>
<th>Corn</th>
<th>Pease</th>
<th>Fish</th>
<th>Guns</th>
<th>Swords</th>
<th>Powder</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Armour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harwood</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addams</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotchmore</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:**

|         | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |

**HAMPTON**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metcalf</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauckfield</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiler</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flynt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrasher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:**

|         | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |

**Per Person:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Colony</th>
<th>M100</th>
<th>Hampton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>houses</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cattle</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swine</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corn</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fish</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guns</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swords</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powder</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>armour</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Imported Pipe Stem Analysis at Martin’s Hundred

In order to group the 13 known seventeenth-century sites discovered at Martin's Hundred since 1971 into meaningful temporal categories corresponding with broadly based economic trends, James Deetz's work at Flowerdew Hundred, a contemporary "particular" plantation further up the James River was examined.

While attempting to organize 18 historic sites at Flowerdew, Deetz chose to examine imported clay smoking pipe stems recovered from site surveys of the area (Deetz 1987). Realizing that the Binford dating method would provide only a single, questionable date for each site rather than a period of occupation with a beginning and end, Deetz used Harrington histograms instead to sort his data. He discovered that the graphs made patterns that suggested three temporal groupings to the sites (Figure 1). Deetz's Group 1 sites produced histograms peaking in the 1620-1650 period. Group 2 sites produced flatter profiles, indicating a longer term of occupation, and fell into the latter part of the century. Group 3 sites peaked in the early to mid-18th century.
His conjunctive approach, used the material record as a "point of departure" Deetz believed that "archaeologists should seek explanation for their data in terms of the known history of a region and time represented by the material. Such explanations can then be used to frame further questions to be asked of the archaeological data, and the answers to these questions again formulated with the historical record in mind" (Deetz 1993:12). Taking his own advice, he looked to the historical record to explain the patterns in the histograms at Flowerdew. He found that the end dates of the sites in Group 1 seemed to coincide with a severe drop in tobacco prices that probably led to farmers abandoning the sites. The second group, with its longer profiles, seemed to reflect a period when arriving immigrants and native-born Virginians tended to stay in the Chesapeake longer than their predecessors, a phenomenon that was observed by Alan Kulikoff in his 1986 work Tobacco and Slaves. The third corresponds to the rise of slavery-based economy and the coalescing of smaller farms into larger plantations (Deetz 1988).

Colonial Williamsburg Staff Archaeologist David Muraca first had the idea of testing Deetz’s Flowerdew results at Martin’s Hundred. In this paper, Deetz’s method has been tested on sites examined at Martin's Hundred by Ivor Noël Hume in the 1970s, site 44JC647, and the Hampton site. Martin's Hundred was chosen because of the similarities
between it and Flowerdew. Both began as enclosed settlements in the late 1610s and expanded into individual homesteads during the remainder of the century. Both were started as "particular" plantations, small colonies within the colony, and as such, may have reacted similarly to broad economic changes. Both plantations were consolidated into large, single landholdings in the early eighteenth century, and both have been extensively surveyed archaeologically. There are differences as well. Flowerdew is located on a large low plain of very fertile soil, on a point jutting into the river. Martin's Hundred land is higher and crossed with steep ravines.

Harrington histograms of imported clay smoking pipe bore diameters at Martin's Hundred also produced three groups, two of which fit Deetz's Flowerdew groups quite closely (Figure 2). The Martin's Hundred Group 2 sites match Deetz's Group 1 sites almost exactly. The Martin's Hundred Group 1 sites were not represented at Flowerdew. They peaked about 20 years earlier than Deetz's Group 1, for reasons probably concerning the temporary abandonment of Martin's Hundred in 1622, following the Anglo-Powatan War.

The striking similarity between the Flowerdew Hundred Group 1 and Martin's Hundred Group 2 may mean that both plantations were affected similarly by prevailing economic conditions. At Martin's Hundred, sites A, B, D, E, F, and 8
all fell into the Group 2, 1625-1650 period\(^1\). Fortunately, all of the sites except site F had been extensively excavated and could be compared. The Hampton site histograms peaked along with the Martin's Hundred Group 2 sites, but, as shown in the chart, exhibit a much more gradual curve indicating a longer occupation span than the Martin's Hundred sites. The temporal basis for comparing the five sites at Martin's Hundred and the Hampton site is thus established through the application of Deetz's method at Flowerdew.

---

\(^1\) Group 3 sites at Martin's Hundred and Group 2 and 3 sites at Flowerdew fall outside the temporal range of this study and are thus not discussed at length.
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