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During the nineteenth century Florida's burgeoning frontier was at its most dynamic, struggling to establish and maintain its own place in the modern world. Throughout this period, countless numbers of settlements and small towns were established and developed then dismantled and forgotten, leaving nothing more behind than an historical impact on the natural landscape. The community of Clay Landing was one such place. Located on the east bank of the Suwannee River in what is now Levy County in north-central Florida, Clay Landing had been a significant agricultural settlement and a major port of interest in the commercial trade traffic of the Suwannee during the mid-nineteenth century. By the 1870's, for reasons unstated in the historical record, Clay Landing began to decline in significance; disappearing from record entirely after 1890. The land that had once been Clay Landing was incorporated into Manatee Springs State Park in 1949. Although historic maps and other documents suggest that a number of homesteads were located on the property throughout the nineteenth century; no historic structures exist within present-day park boundaries, and no archaeological investigation has been done to identify and record any historical and cultural remains that may be present therein. This paper is an analysis of the "lost" community of Clay Landing, the individuals who lived there, and the social and economic networks they developed as an attempt to establish and maintain a place in the modern world. Through the integrated analysis of historic map and archival research, oral histories, and data collected from a preliminary landscape survey, this thesis uses a global perspective to understand how the community of Clay Landing developed and existed as part of an energetic region, nation, and world. In so doing, this thesis will provide a stepping-stone toward further archaeological research and investigation of this historic settlement, and prove that Clay Landing is an historically and culturally significant community, both to the study of the global nature of modern life, and to the history and heritage of Florida.
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CLAY LANDING:
A NINETEENTH CENTURY RURAL COMMUNITY ON THE FLORIDA FRONTIER
INTRODUCTION

This thesis is an investigation of the historical and cultural development of Clay Landing, a nineteenth-century frontier settlement located on the east bank of the Suwannee River in Levy County, Florida. Clay Landing first appeared on historic maps of north-central Florida during the 1840’s. It remained a viable rural community of small, single family farmsteads and plantations, represented on regional maps until the 1890’s. However, by the turn of the twentieth century, the community of Clay Landing disappeared from historic record.

The paucity of historical sources, and absence of archaeological evidence concerning Clay Landing, has made it difficult to understand the development of this historic community. Using a multi-scaled historical archaeological approach that integrates the analysis of available secondary historical sources, primary documentary evidence, oral histories, and a preliminary archaeological landscape survey, this thesis seeks to elucidate the social and economic forces that shaped the development of the community of Clay Landing within the landscape of the north-central Florida frontier. This thesis argues that this small community, though seemingly isolated on the edge of Florida’s burgeoning frontier, was very much connected to the wider modern world, and as such, has much to contribute to the study of the global nature of modern life.
The theoretical tone of this thesis is based on the research program set forth by Charles Orser, Jr. (1996: 204), in his book, *A Historical Archaeology of the Modern World*, in which he proposes that “historical archaeologists – regardless of where they conduct their investigations – couch their research questions mutualistically in broadly conceived terms that fully incorporate the netlike complexities of modern life.” Orser contends that historical archaeology is the study of the modern world, and this “modern world” is defined as the time period in which the global processes of Eurocentrism, global colonialism, capitalism, and modernity converged (ibid: 86). These processes, referred to by Orser as “the four haunts,” are inexorably linked and pervasive throughout time and space, reaching every part of the modern world and “changing the way people interacted with one another in complex, multi-faceted ways” (ibid: 27). To study and adequately understand these interactions, the presence of the “haunts” must be made explicit in one’s research (ibid: 204).

In addition to recognizing the influence of the four haunts, Orser asserts that historical archaeologists must also maintain a “mutualist perspective.” According to the mutualist view, human life is fundamentally based on individuals and the numerous social relationships they create and maintain, and these relationships are inevitably linked with various larger and farther-reaching networks of relationships (Orser 1996: 21; 32). The concept of landscape is central to this perspective, because the landscape is the “spatial arena” in which all relationships – those established between individuals, and those created between individuals and the physical environment – are enacted (Orser 1996: 138). Though inevitably bounded in some way, whether regionally,
topographically, or ethnographically, the structure of the landscape is essentially based upon human relationships, and is thus fluid and flexible.

The mutualist landscape is composed of both physical, and sociohistorical structures. The physical structure of the landscape consists of the natural environment, including: topography, hydrology, and climate; while the sociohistorical structure is constructed by the individuals living within the physical structure, and contains the social, political, and economic institutions created by those individuals acting within, and constrained by, the physical structure (Orser 1996: 138-139; 185). As such, the landscape’s structure is pivotal in determining “human potentialities” within the landscape (Marquardt 1992: 105, qtd. in Orser 1996: 185). By thinking mutualistically and analyzing the physical and sociohistorical structure of the landscape in conjunction with global processes, one is better able to understand the relationships and networks established by individuals, and what they reveal about social and cultural life in the past.

It is not the intention of this paper to attempt to prove or disprove the validity of Orser’s theories, or the universality of the four haunts in all historical archaeological sites. Orser’s research program is used here as a framework for this study because in the case of Clay Landing, it is valid. Clay Landing existed in the relatively recent past; as such it was inarguably, part of the modern world. It was located in rural Florida, which, as history recounts, has had more than adequate experience with the processes of colonialism, Eurocentrism, capitalism, and modernity. Clay Landing was merely one of countless numbers of settlements or small towns throughout this period to be established and developed, then dismantled and forgotten; in many cases, leaving nothing more behind them then a barely perceptible impact on the natural landscape. Since so very
little remains of Clay Landing – both physically and historically – it is necessary to study it in the broadest conceivable terms. In adopting a global perspective that is mutualistic and takes into account the influences of Orser’s four haunts and both the physical and sociohistorical (or cultural) landscapes, it is possible to better understand the “lost” community of Clay Landing, the individuals who lived there, and the social and economic networks they developed as an attempt to establish and maintain a place in the modern world.

Chapter I will address the early development of the Florida frontier and the ways in which global processes (i.e., colonialism, Eurocentrism, capitalism, and modernity) influenced and shaped that development. By presenting a broad historical background of Florida’s frontier, this chapter will provide the historical context and analytical framework necessary for understanding the nineteenth century community of Clay Landing.

Chapter I focuses particularly on the development of four important historical factors that resulted from global influences, namely: the establishment of pastoral and agricultural enterprises by the early Spanish and British colonial powers; the effective removal of competition from the indigenous population by European colonists and American settlers; the implementation and exploitation of slave-based labor systems which expedited the cultivation of land and the production of agricultural commodities for trade; and the development of modern infrastructure and networks of commerce which facilitated widespread settlement of the frontier. All of these factors were essential to the settlement of north-central Florida, and to the development of the community of Clay Landing in particular. They directly affected which types of individuals would
choose to immigrate to the region, where they would ultimately decide to settle, and how they would live and thrive.

Chapter II will examine the growth and eventual decline of Clay Landing within the landscape of the newly developed north-central Florida frontier. By presenting the settlement of Clay Landing as a typical example of a nineteenth century frontier community, it will discuss the ways in which the examination of this particular community may be used to understand how and why settlement occurred in north-central Florida in general.

Through the interpretation of primary archival research, Chapter II focuses on specific individuals who lived at Clay Landing during the mid-nineteenth century. Using a mutualistic perspective, it examines the demographic and socio-economic dynamics of Clay Landing’s community in order to ascertain the types of social and economic relationships that individuals may have established within the community and within the region. Probable networks of interaction within the local and regional community are elucidated through analysis of historic documents, maps, and oral histories, while farther-reaching economic networks on a national and international scale are explicated using secondary historical sources. Drawing on the historical developments discussed in Chapter I, Chapter II argues that the community of Clay Landing came into existence as a result of the modern development of north-central Florida’s landscape, and grew to significance based upon its ability to accommodate and facilitate networks of trade throughout that landscape and on to the wider world.

The absence of archaeology in regard to the study of Clay Landing makes it difficult to adequately understand the community’s role in the modern global community
of the nineteenth century. Much of the area where the settlement once stood was incorporated into Manatee Springs State Park in Chiefland, Florida in 1949. To date, there has been no comprehensive archaeological survey of the park, and the cultural resources located therein, including those associated with Clay Landing, have yet to be identified or recorded. No historic structures exist within the present-day park boundaries, and the land where these structures were located, along with the agricultural fields, historic markers, and roads that may have once led to them, has since been reclaimed by nature. All that remains of Clay Landing is a landscape of dense pine and mixed forest on the banks of the Suwannee River, punctuated by subtle yet defining characteristics of past agricultural and historical disturbance – the cultural landscape.

Building upon the specific socio-history provided in Chapter II, Chapter III examines Clay Landing’s cultural landscape. Using data gathered during a landscape survey of areas within Manatee Springs State Park, conducted during the fall of 2007; Chapter III investigates four potential archaeological sites associated with Clay Landing, and examines how continuity and change in the existing condition of the natural landscape could reflect past settlement and agricultural practices, and networks of social and economic relationships in the historic community of Clay Landing.

Owing to James Deetz’ (1990:2) interpretation of the cultural landscape as “that part of the terrain which is modified according to a set of cultural plans;” Orser (1996: 138) rejected the specific appellation of “cultural landscape” as too culturist. In his discussion of the concept of landscape, Orser favored the separate, yet interconnected terms, “physical structure” and “sociohistorical structure,” which have been discussed above. I have not adopted this particular mutualist terminology in my analysis of Clay
Landing, but have decided instead to interpret the cultural landscape as the embodiment of both the physical and the sociohistorical structures. In defining the cultural landscape for the purposes of this study, I have chosen to use the National Park Service’s (Birnbaum 1995:2) definition of the historic vernacular landscape, which is:

A landscape that evolved through use by the people whose activities or occupancy shaped that landscape. Through social or cultural attitudes of the individual, family or a community, the landscape reflects the physical, biological, and cultural character of those everyday lives.

This thesis adopts a mutualist perspective that takes into account the pervasive nature of global processes throughout the modern world, and seeks to understand how and why the historic community of Clay Landing developed, and what the relationships established by individuals living within that community may reveal about social and cultural life in the past. The analysis of the development of north-central Florida’s frontier, combined with Clay Landing’s specific social history and cultural landscape, will show that this small frontier community was indeed, part of a larger global community, and as such may contribute unprecedented information to the study of nineteenth century Florida, and the global nature of modern life.
CHAPTER I  

FLORIDA AND THE MODERN WORLD: AN HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In attempting to answer questions about the past, historical archaeologists are taking into consideration more and more the ever-present influences and/or consequences of colonialism and imperialism, Eurocentrism, capitalism, and modernity. The questions historical archaeologists ask about the past change and develop in conjunction with the ways in which they perceive the world around them. In this world of the present, one is reminded daily of aspects of prejudice, inequality, class struggle, and violence - the ever-present "haunts" of capitalism, Eurocentrism, and colonialism, lurking just below the surface (Orser 1996: 57). With the constant innovations in information technology, electronic communication, and the worldwide media, human beings are forced to accept their place in the global community. Therefore, it seems fitting that recognizing the global nature of the present, the discipline of historical archaeology would seek to understand aspects of the past in a more global context. In keeping with this heuristic trend, historical archaeology is defined for the purposes of this paper as "a multi- and interdisciplinary field that shares a special relationship with the formal disciplines of anthropology and history and seeks to understand the global nature of modern life" (Orser 1996: 27)

Charles Orser, Jr. (1996: 86) has defined the "modern world" as the time period in which the global processes of Eurocentrism, global colonialism, capitalism, and
modernity converged. After the beginning of European expansion during the fifteenth century, these interconnected processes became ubiquitous, "affecting all sites throughout the modern world" (ibid: 87). This chapter will address the ways in which these global processes influenced and shaped the early development of the Florida frontier. It will present a broad historical background of the Florida frontier in order to provide the historical context necessary for understanding the nineteenth century community of Clay Landing. The historic context of an archaeological site is "the analytical framework within which the property's importance can be understood," and is a necessary component of any archaeological study (Hardesty & Little 2000: 13).

When examining artifactual evidence, archaeologists understand that no artifact can directly reflect past human behavior. It is the responsibility of the archaeologist to identify the factors and processes responsible for creating an artifact's context in order to give meaning to the archaeological record. The same concept holds true for the archaeological site and its historic context. No site can exist in a vacuum. As such, no archaeological site may be adequately understood in the absence of historic context. As Anne Yentsch (1990: 24) astutely observed in developing the historic context for her study of Lot 83 in Annapolis, Maryland, "one cannot understand the parts of an entity without some sense of the whole which they comprise nor can one comprehend the whole until one has seen the parts from which it is made."

As aforementioned in the Introduction, this thesis investigates the social and economic forces that shaped the development of the frontier community of Clay Landing within the landscape of the north-central Florida frontier, and argues that the community, by virtue of its development and the various relationships established within it, was very
much connected to the wider modern world. Investigation of this community therefore, can contribute much to the study of nineteenth century Florida and the global nature of modern life in general. As a part of the modern world, the community of Clay Landing was unquestionably, affected by global processes and influences. This chapter will present a concise historical background of the Florida frontier and focus particularly on the development of important historical factors that resulted from global influences, including: the establishment of pastoral and agricultural enterprises by the early Spanish and British colonial powers; the effective removal of competition from the indigenous population by European colonists and American settlers; the implementation and exploitation of slave-based labor systems which expedited the cultivation of land and the production of agricultural commodities for trade; and the development of modern infrastructure and networks of commerce which facilitated widespread settlement of the frontier.

These circumstances and events were essential to the settlement of north-central Florida, and to the development of the community of Clay Landing in particular; ultimately determining the types of individuals that would choose to immigrate to the area, where they would settle, and how they would make a living. Since so little remains of Clay Landing, both physically and historically, a broadly conceived contextual framework, like that presented in this chapter, is essential to understanding the development of the community itself, the individuals who lived there, the social and economic networks in which they acted, and how they existed as a part of a larger global community.
COLONIAL POWERS IN FLORIDA

The geographical area that today comprises the state of Florida was first “discovered,” and claimed for Spain by Juan Ponce de Leon in 1513. It is the oldest of the North American frontiers, and the first to be colonized by European powers. By the time of the historic landings at Jamestown in 1607 and Plymouth in 1620, Florida had long since been infiltrated by Spanish and French explorers, and was already home to the decades old settlement of St. Augustine and numerous Franciscan missions (Gannon 1993:3). Although Florida entered European history as a province of possible economic and political importance in the early sixteenth century, its own history stretched much further back. At the time of European contact, Florida natives and their ancestors had been living in the area for thousands of years. Florida archaeologist, Jerald T. Milanich (1996: 14) has estimated that there were approximately 350,000 Native Americans living in Florida at the time of the first Spanish arrival in 1513.

European expansion overseas began in the early fifteenth century. Eric Wolf (1997:109), in his Europe and the People Without History, has asserted that this expansion was a response to, and an attempt to rectify the “crisis of feudalism,” or the impoverishment of the European countryside by military tribute-takers, by “locating, seizing, and distributing resources available beyond the European frontiers.” The fifteenth century witnessed the beginning of a mercantile economy in which European nations, including: Portugal, Spain, the Netherlands, France, and England, expanded overseas in search of wealth. Wolf (1997: 129) argued that after this initial expansion, “all struggles for dominance within Europe would take on a global character, as the European states sought to control the oceans and oust their competitors from points of
vantage gained in Asia, America, or Africa.” Everywhere they went, the Europeans “made the world their battleground” (ibid: 130). The case of Florida was no different; and in this instance, Spain, France, and England were the key players.

Spain considered *La Florida* (the territory of which extended from the Florida peninsula northward to encompass the entire southeastern quarter of North America and the eastern coastline as far north as Newfoundland) as one of its colonies beginning in the 1520’s. However, very little was actually accomplished there by the Spaniards before 1565. During the 1520’s, three separate expeditions led by Juan Ponce de Leon, Lucas Vazquez de Ayllon, and Panfilo de Narvaez, were sent to Florida for the purposes of locating valuable natural resources and establishing settlement via military conquest; all were unsuccessful. In 1539, Hernando de Soto set off on his famous, though equally unsuccessful, expedition from Tampa Bay. De Soto’s journey lasted four years and traversed nearly four thousand miles, yet still failed to establish any settlement. Historian Michael Gannon (1996: 32) concluded of De Soto’s attempts in *La Florida*:

None of the chartered goals established by the king had been met: behind them stood no settlement or hospital, no mine or farm, no presidio or mission, no flag, no cross. The most significant practical result of what may be called that extended armed raid was the damage inflicted on the southeastern native populations. Dozens of chiefdoms, overstressed and humiliated by de Soto, went into decline or collapsed.

In 1564, King Phillip II of Spain sent an expedition of over one thousand men to *La Florida*, led by the new *adelantado*, Pedro Menendez de Aviles. Menendez’ orders were to oust new French settlers who had established a settlement on the east coast, affirm Spanish possession of the colony, establish two permanent cities therein, and make every attempt at converting the native population to Catholicism (Lyon 1996: 43).
In late August of 1565, Menendez and his men arrived at the St. John’s River, and after a “short but sharp battle,” they captured the new French fort, Fort Caroline, renaming it San Mateo, and established around it the city of St. Augustine (ibid: 44). That city would prove to be the first permanent Spanish settlement in *La Florida*, as well as the first permanent city in the present-day United States.

Menendez spent his next few years as *adelantado* traveling the coast, ousting any remaining French he encountered, posting men wherever he could to facilitate new Spanish settlements, and encouraging the expansion of the Jesuit missionary network throughout the peninsula. He immediately began to populate the colony with “soldier-farmers” and *labrodores* or small farmers that he had imported from Castille at his own expense (Lyon 1996: 51-52). Using the mission systems as inroads to the interior of the peninsula, the Spanish built garrisons throughout the countryside with the hopes of facilitating the growth of agricultural and pastoral settlements. Though Menendez desperately wanted to take his agricultural pursuits inland and to more fertile land in the west, conflict with the native population made it impossible, and confined the settlers to the poor coastal lands (Lyon 1996: 57).

Westward expansion would not occur in *La Florida* until after 1574. In that year, the Spanish Crown enacted a new set of laws that put an end to the High Conquest period discussed above, and led to the establishment of the Franciscan mission system (Turner Bushnell 1996: 62). This development of new mission provinces occurred in two waves. The first took place along the east coast and the St. John’s River, from 1587 into the 1620’s. The second lasted from 1633 to 1670, and occurred in the west along the Gulf Coast and western rivers. The development of the western mission provinces was a direct
result of colonists’ desire to exploit the agricultural and commercial advantages of Florida’s western watershed. Remembering Menendez’ earlier failures in his western endeavors, the colonists understood that settlement would be impossible without first creating a treaty of peace with the western natives. As a result, they formed the mission provinces in an attempt to pacify the Apalachee, Calusa, Pohoy, and Tocobaga peoples of western Florida (ibid: 70-71).

The establishment of mission provinces and the pacification of their native populations saved the Spanish colony from collapse. Since its inception La Florida was constantly struggling with lack of supplies and food shortages. The new, fertile provinces of the west, while serving as the colony’s “emergency breadbasket,” also allowed access to western rivers and ports, resulting in the development of new markets and coastal trade. Particularly important was the successful cattle industry that developed in the savannahs of La Chua, in present-day Alachua County. From La Chua, cattle were transported to St. Augustine via the St. John’s River and dried meat, tallow, and hides were shipped down the Suwannee River to the Gulf and later to Havana (Gannon 1993: 10; Turner Bushnell 1996: 73).

Despite her efforts at pacification and expansion, Spain failed to hold La Florida. During the 1670’s English traders from the newly founded Carolina colony began to move into Florida. Arriving first in the province of Apalachicola, they quickly replaced the Spanish in trade with the local native population and gained their allegiance. During the last decades of the seventeenth century the majority of native peoples in the provinces withdrew from the missions and allied themselves with the English (Turner Bushnell 1996: 74). The Spanish provinces were further weakened in 1702 and 1704
when the governor of South Carolina, James Moore, with a force of Creeks (formerly the Apalachicola), destroyed 9 of the 12 Apalachee missions and kidnapped nearly 1,000 Apalachee natives, leading to the abandonment of the province's garrison (Hann 1996:93).

In the peace treaty that followed the French and Indian War in 1763, the Spanish ceded La Florida to the British (Coker 1996:130). From the territory gained in their acquisition of La Florida, Britain created two colonies: East Florida, which contained the entirety of the peninsula westward to the Apalachicola River, with its capital remaining at St. Augustine; and West Florida, which contained the Panhandle west of the Apalachicola, and its new capital at Pensacola. Though the British ruled the Florida colonies for only twenty years, they were responsible for establishing the patterns of settlement, agriculture, and trade that would come to define Florida through the territorial period and into its statehood. British strategy was very much in line with Menendez's dream during the sixteenth century. Its main goal was to increase the European population throughout the whole of each colony as quickly as possible, and establish widespread agriculture. To accomplish this task the crown offered free land to anyone agreeing to import his or her own laborers. The English crown also established the trend that would become a constant throughout Florida history - offering free land for past military service.

The idea of immigration to Florida became very popular in both the American colonies and England, as well. Aristocrats, entrepreneurs, and merchants were all eager for land. Unfortunately for the British, "the difficulty of getting to the Floridas and the disappointments following arrival inhibited immigration" (Fabel 1996:136). Infertile
coastal soils, high living costs, and rampant disease made life on the coast difficult, and absentee planters throughout the interior of the colonies had great difficulty in compelling their indentured servants to stay (ibid).

Although the British Floridas’ white population never reached great numbers – in the 1770’s it was estimated that West Florida contained 3,700 whites, 1,200 blacks, and over 27,000 Native Americans, and East Florida contained a white population of less than 300 individuals and 900 black slaves – the colonies were nonetheless successful (Fabel 1996: 136). Nevertheless, Florida historian Michael Gannon (1993: 19) has asserted that the British did more in twenty years to develop Florida’s land and resources than the Spaniards did in two hundred years.

When it became clear that indentured servants could not be depended upon, British colonists from South Carolina introduced the slave-based plantation system to Florida. As a result, the lucrative enterprises of cotton and indigo plantations took root in East Florida where wealthy aristocrats owned virtually all of the land. East Florida became a major exporter in the global market of indigo, as well as rice, cotton, and citrus products. In West Florida, the development of the textile and timber industries, and trade with Britain and the Spanish colony of Louisiana, flourished (Fabel 1996: 142).

Due to their secure economy, large aristocratic population, and strong military presence to counterbalance the Indian population, the Florida colonies remained largely loyalist during the Revolutionary War. As a result, the colonies’ populations swelled during the war years. As loyalist refugees poured into and around St. Augustine, East Florida’s population of 6,000 people grew to over 17,000 (Gannon 1993: 24). Though East Florida saw little of the war, West Florida was not as fortunate. When Spain allied
herself with the French on the side of the American rebels in 1779, a Spanish force from Louisiana was sent to West Florida. After a long campaign and heavy losses in battle at Baton Rouge, Mobile, and Pensacola, Britain effectively lost West Florida to Spain in 1781 (Coker and Parker 1996: 150). Although both Florida colonies had been economically successful, the British crown was never fully dependent on Floridian exports. Therefore, at the conclusion of the war in order to achieve peace with Spain, Britain signed the Treaty of Paris in 1783, giving both Florida colonies back to Spain (Fabel 1996: 48).

Florida’s “Second Spanish Period” was relatively short-lived, lasting from 1783 to 1821, and Spain’s possession of the province has been described as “tenuous at best” (Gannon 1993:24). During this second occupation, Spain - perhaps in an attempt to emulate the success of the British - had decided to abandon her old pacification strategy in favor of new policies concentrated on immigration and trade. In 1790, the Spanish crown began offering homestead grants to foreigners, and American citizens accepted with zeal. As Florida’s Anglo-American population began to grow, the colonies became less Spanish and more open to the idea of incorporation into the newly formed United States, thus facilitating Spain’s ultimate loss of control of the colonies (Coker and Parker 1996: 160; Gannon 1993: 26).

EARLY AMERICAN FLORIDA

During the War of 1812 when Spain allied herself with Britain, the United States government sanctioned an invasion of East Florida. Its primary concerns were “to expand the jurisdiction of the U.S. Non-Importation Act, to assert U.S. hegemony in the
region, and to pre-empt any self-serving British activity in Florida” (Coker and Parker 1996: 162). In 1814 General Andrew Jackson invaded Pensacola, routing the British forces and their Creek allies, capturing the town and gaining control of the colony west of the Perdido River (Patrick and Morris 1967: 28). Jackson returned to Florida during the First Seminole War in 1818 and seized the Spanish forts near Tallahassee and again in Pensacola (Gannon 1993: 27). Little by little, by both official and unofficial means, the United States and its citizens encroached further into Florida. Negotiations between Spain and the U.S. finally began in 1819 and on February 22, 1821, Florida became an American territory (ibid: 162-164).

Florida’s civil government was established on March 30, 1823. Under United States’ control, East and West Florida were combined into one territory consisting of 13,073,631 acres separated into two counties: St. Johns in the peninsular region, and Escambia in the western panhandle (Stoneman-Douglas 1967: 133). One of the greatest problems to be addressed by the new territorial government was the issue of land ownership. According to the Adams-Onis Treaty of 1821, any land that had been titled to private ownership before January 24, 1818 had to be confirmed by the United States government. This amendment was not conducive to settlement of the area because previous land records were often written in Spanish, misplaced or non-existent, or falsified (Tibeau 1971: 123). In order to begin an orderly settlement of the vast Florida interior the land needed to be systematically surveyed. In 1824 the General Survey Act was passed, and surveyor-general Colonel Robert Butler began the endeavor, establishing base and meridian lines at the newly founded territorial capital of Tallahassee (ibid: 124). The county of Escambia was further divided into counties Jackson, Walton, and
Washington; St. Johns County was subdivided into Duval, Alachua, and Nassau counties, with Mosquito and Monroe counties in the southern peninsula; and the land falling between the Apalachicola and Suwannee Rivers was established as Middle Florida, containing the counties Leon, Gadsen, and later Hamilton, Jefferson, and Madison (see Figure 1.5). Land was divided into sections of 640 acres (one square mile), with thirty-six sections allotted to each township with ranges east and west of the established line in Tallahassee (Stoneman-Douglas 1967:134).

Public land sales began in Tallahassee in 1825, at St. Augustine in 1826, and later at Newnansville in 1843. Land was available incredibly cheap at $1.25 an acre, and by the time Florida was admitted as a state in 1845, the amount of land sold at each office had been estimated at: 796,891.81 acres in Tallahassee; 70,155 acres in St. Augustine; and 5,448.78 acres in Newnansville (Tibeau 1971: 124). However, not all public land was immediately offered for sale and the surveying process was very slow. For example, the tract of land east of the Suwannee River encompassing Clay Landing was not surveyed until 1849. In order to facilitate settlement, the federal government passed a bill in 1826 granting settlers "the right of preemption" to the purchase of any public land on which they had established a homestead previous to the surveying of that land for public sale (ibid: 125).

Immigration into Florida during the territorial period was due mainly to two factors: the surge in agricultural enthusiasm, and the government sponsored incentives offered on public land sales after the Second Seminole War. "Wave after wave of agricultural enthusiasms" swept the entire United States during the beginning of the nineteenth century (Nolan 1984: 23). Scores of observational travel books touting
Florida’s attributes and aimed at facilitating immigration were published at the time. In his 1823, *Observations Upon the Floridas*, Charles Vignoles painted Florida as a veritable utopia, suited to virtually all economic enterprises and any social class. Whether attempting to appeal to the small farmer, or simply to assuage the concerns of the slave-holding elite, Vignoles (1823: 98) romanticized the prospects of small-scale fruit and olive cultivation, stating:

> A generation of industrious whites will grow up whose simple manners and virtuous habits will resemble the vine cutters and olive dressers of France and Spain but free as the air, their unshackled independence will render them doubly happier than those almost still feudal peasants; and as a body they will prevent the possibility of those commotions which have lately threatened more than one slaveholding state.

After the importation of the Chinese mulberry tree (trees in which silkworms thrive) in the 1820’s, silkworm breeding and silk cultivation became an extremely popular fad. One historian commented that, in terms of immigration, “mulberries did for Florida what gold would later do for California” (Nolan 1984: 25). Vignoles saw this phenomenon as an answer to the plight of the “poor whites” of the South. He argued that the care and breeding of silk worms was “so easy” that “it would afford an employment to the children of the poor white settler who otherwise might be idle, useless, and contractive of indolent and bad habits” (Vignoles 1823: 104). As to the “respectable independent planter,” Vignoles (1823: 107-108) painted a portrait of such happiness and limitless opportunity that could not fail to sway would-be immigrants:

> Sugar, tea, fruit, preserves, animal and vegetable food [which] will be the produce of his own fields or farm yard: the rivers supply the most delicious shell and scale fish: the wild fowl are excellent and numerous: his vineyard, olive and orange groves will offer their unstinted products; his orchard and his garden supply all to tempt and gratify the appetite ... he will be
wholly independent of the world, while he will send out his cargoes of superfluous productions
to supply the wants of his less fortunate fellow citizens in more northern climes.

Unfortunately, the exotic enterprises advertised by writers like Vignoles – olives, wine, coffee, silk, etc. – failed to take hold as staple crops. But by 1828, the citrus industry had been firmly established in East Florida, with St. Augustine exporting annual crops of two million oranges (Nolan 1984: 22). In West Florida, Pensacola had become an important outlet for the lumber and naval stores industries (Patrick and Morris 1967: 32). The remaining areas of the territory exported small amounts of sugar, rice, tobacco, and corn, but were ultimately dominated by the production of cotton; and in particular, the exclusive and more expensive “Sea Island” cotton variety that thrived in Middle Florida and its environs (Stoneman-Douglas 1967: 23).

Rising cotton profits and the “cheap, rich, red soil of the Tallahassee hills well suited to cotton growing” soon attracted droves of planters from the old plantations lands of Virginia, Georgia, and the Carolinas (Stoneman-Douglas 1967: 140). This migration resulted in exponential population growth throughout the territory, and in Middle Florida and the Alachua County area in particular. In 1825 a territorial census recorded a population of 5,780 people in West Florida, 2,370 in Middle Florida, and 5,077 in East Florida. By 1830, population had risen to 9,478 in West Florida, 15,779 in Middle Florida, and 8,956 in East Florida (Tibeau 1971: 134).

As Florida’s white population grew, so did the tension between the new settlers and the native Indian population. Whereas the previous Spanish and British governments attempted to enact policies that would permit colonists and natives to amicably coexist and engage in trade, the new territorial government and its American constituents preferred a policy of segregation and ultimate removal of the indigenous population. The
Moultrie Creek Treaty of December 23, 1823 confined the majority of the Seminole population on a 4 million acre reservation in central Florida north of Charlotte Harbor and south of Ocala. Those who would not sign the treaty were forced to move to lands in the western Apalachicola plains. Even though territorial Governor Duval himself said, “the lands are wretchedly poor and cannot support [the Indian population],” white settlers soon grew dissatisfied with the Seminole’s presence and ultimately wanted the reservation land for themselves (Stoneman-Douglas 1967: 155).

On April 8, 1834, the federal government ratified the Treaty of Payne’s Landing, which stipulated the complete removal of the Seminoles to reservation lands in Mississippi within three years. However, owing to an apparent miscommunication between the legislators and the Seminole representatives, there was a disagreement as to the exact removal date. Disgruntled Seminoles retaliated against the injustice in the form of sporadic acts of violence against settlers throughout East Florida (Tibeau 1971: 157). In response, an angry President Jackson issued a proclamation on February 16, 1835 to begin the Second Seminole War, assuring the Seminoles: “I tell you that you must go and you will go” (Stoneman-Douglas 1967: 144).

THE SECOND SEMINOLE WAR

The Second Seminole War lasted from 1835 to 1842, and was centered mainly in the counties of Alachua and Hillsborough. This area was not prepared for war and had no organized militia or army, and no supplies (Hawk 1986: 61). The territory relied on the federal government to send aid. Though 30,000 Florida men would eventually serve
at least one stint as militiamen during the war, it was necessary for the government to send in over 10,000 United States Army Regulars (ibid: 69).

Florida’s settlers depended on federal aid and relief at this time as well. This greatly annoyed the American citizens of the Northern states. The territory had always been plagued by money problems, due mainly to the difficulty in levying taxes throughout the chaotic countryside, and the federal government was often unable to collect the debts owed by the territory. In 1833 there was less than $4,500 recorded in the territorial treasury (Stoneman-Douglas 1967: 151). In 1837, the war-weakened territorial banks failed, resulting in depression (ibid: 146). Fearing attack from roaming bands of Seminoles, some planters abandoned their plantation lands and fled to the cities. As a result, cities boomed, but cotton prices collapsed and land values plummeted (Nolan 1984: 51). Florida’s teetering economy after the “Panic of 1837” was only righted by the “injection of massive government funds,” and the influx of immigration under the Armed Occupation Act of 1842 (ibid: 50).

The Second Seminole War may have temporarily stalled Florida’s economic growth, but it was extremely advantageous to the development of her infrastructure. When Florida became an American territory in 1823 the only thoroughfare through the Indian controlled forests of Florida’s interior was the old “King’s Way,” a pathway that extended from St. Marks to St. Augustine (Stoneman-Douglas 1967: 133). This route, also referred to as “King’s Road” or “Royal Road;” was laid by the Spanish at the end of the seventeenth century to connect the chain of missions, or “El Camino Real,” that extended across Florida’s peninsula (Conway Duever, et al. 1997: 4-22). It was rarely utilized during the British colonial period and had since fallen into disrepair. In 1824, the
United States Congress appropriated $20,000 toward refurbishment of this road and the addition of 240 new miles, to create a public road that ran from St. Augustine to Pensacola.

This new road, which later became known as the Bellamy Road (after the planter who donated his slaves to lay it), was vital to Florida’s development in the nineteenth century. It offered direct access for settlement into the interior, and provided a practical route for the long-distance transportation of agricultural commodities grown in Alachua County and the Middle Florida plantations (ibid: 5-17). F.W. Buchholz in his *History of Alachua County, Florida*, commented that, “The opening of the Bellamy Road made the production of long staple cotton attractive and the settlers from the sea islands of Georgia and Carolina began to raise it as a money crop” (qtd. in Conway Duever et al. 1997: 5-17).

In addition to the Bellamy Road, there were of course, a number of less extensive roads or trails, as well as causeways and bridges constituted either by “federal largess” or the local constituency (Patrick and Morris 1967: 33). However these structures were often rudimentary and unreliable. Their upkeep was the responsibility of the citizens who lived near these thoroughfares. Settlers were required to provide a specific number of man-hours of labor, or the equivalent in cash, annually to ensure the working condition of local roads (Stoneman-Douglas 1967: 141). Unfortunately, the funding and manpower made available was seldom enough.

For the military to stand against the Seminoles both offensively and defensively, it was essential for them to have an adequate understanding of the terrain, with accessible and reliable transportation networks throughout. At the beginning of the war, General
Zachary Taylor established the “square system,” which divided much of Florida’s peninsula into twenty-mile square districts. A military fort with necessary depots and stores were established in each square, with a vast network of roads laid to connect them (Denham and Honeycutt, eds. 2004: 106).

The occupation of Florida’s interior under the square-system enabled areas that had previously been inaccessible wilderness to be opened up to settlement. By 1839, fifty-three new forts and their respective camps had been established, 848 miles of new or improved road had been laid, and over 3,643 feet of bridges and causeways had been built (Collins 2000: 3). The presence of military forts and personnel offered settlers a modicum of protection from roaming bands of Seminoles and the newly laid roads enabled adequate transportation and communication throughout the region. The entire military complex that was put in place as a result of the war acted as a catalyst for economic growth throughout East Florida, contributing to the further development of a number of burgeoning industries, including: ranching, steamboating, lumber, and naval stores. These enterprises provided new sources of funds and opportunities to civilians in the surrounding landscape, by offering employment for wagon teams, boat captains and crews, laborers, merchants, and many others (Tibeau 1971:137-138). By the end of the Seminole War, Alachua County became a major exporter of cattle and to a lesser extent mules and horses, timber in pine, and “live-oak for boat-building,” indigo, and of course, cotton (Buchholz qtd. in Conway Duever et al. 1997: 5-17).

A federal census in 1830 recorded populations of 15,779 in Middle Florida, and 8,956 in East Florida. By 1840 the numbers had increased to approximately 34,000 in Middle Florida, and 15,000 in East Florida (Tibeau 1971: 134). In 1841, Colonel
William Jenkins Worth was named as the new army commander of military actions in the Florida territory. Worth believed that encouraging planters who had fled the countryside to return to their lands, and offering incentives to new immigrants to establish and maintain new settlements in unoccupied areas, would drive the remaining Seminoles out of the territory’s interior with out further military action. On July 2, 1841 the St. Augustine News reported that Worth had requested of the federal government that:

    Rations be allowed to all such of the inhabitants as shall return to their abandoned households and also that both the pay and rations of soldiers of the Army may be allowed to all such persons as shall now step forward to make new settlements – at least for one year (qtd. in Denham and Honeycutt, eds. 2004: 151).

A mere three months later, the same newspaper announced the establishment of seven new settlements, all in previously unoccupied territory (St. Augustine News, October 8, 1841 in Denham and Honeycutt, eds. 2004: 152).

    Worth’s effort was a precursor to the Armed Occupation Act that was introduced by Senator Thomas Hart Benton of Missouri and enacted on August 4, 1842. This act made 200,000 acres south of Gainesville available to settlers in 160-acre tracts, excluding coastal areas and lands within a two-mile radius of military forts. To receive a land grant under the act, petitioners had to clear at least five acres of land, build a house and reside there for a minimum of five years, be over the age of eighteen, and able to bear arms. The implementation of Worth’s plan in conjunction with the Armed Occupation Act created a surge of new immigration into the Florida countryside that quelled Seminole hostilities, at least for the time being, and in August of 1842, Worth declared that the conflict was over (Denham and Honeycutt, eds. 2004: 152).
In the first nine months following the enactment of Armed Occupation Act, 370 claims were filed at the land office in St. Augustine, and 947 claims were filed at the newly established Newnansville land office (Tibeau 1971: 149). Forty-three permits were issued in 1842, and over 1,274 would be issued the following year (Yearty 2000: 16).

One Newnansville inhabitant, Corrinna Brown, wrote to her brother in April of 1843 that, “hundreds daily flock into the country to look up lands – to speculate on – and to take up those tracts offered by the government – under the armed occupation law” (Denham and Honeycutt, eds. 2005: 175). In a manner reminiscent of the efforts of Spain’s adelantado Pedro Menendez de Aviles and his soldier-farmers of the sixteenth century, the systematic settlement of the Florida territory – an endeavor that had been attempted countless times since the territory’s debut onto the modern world stage – seemed to have finally come to fruition. By 1845, Florida’s population had reached 57,951, and enough for the required two representatives in Congress. In March of that year, Florida was finally admitted as a state of the Union (Stoneman-Douglas 1967: 159).

**SUMMARY**

This chapter presented a broad historical framework that illustrated how the global processes of colonialism, Eurocentrism, capitalism, and modernity affected and shaped settlement and development in north-central Florida. In doing so, it has provided the historical context necessary for understanding the historical landscape of nineteenth century Florida, and the development of the community of Clay Landing. Since the arrival of the first colonial powers on Florida’s shores at the start of the sixteenth century, Florida settlers had remained in a constant state of flux economically, politically, and
socially, but always with similar goals, namely: the subjugation (or in rare instances, pacification) of the native population; the expansion of the frontier via systematic white settlement; the exploitation of available natural resources and the development of agricultural commodities for trade in the world market; and the establishment of modern infrastructure to support and facilitate expansion and economic growth.

By the end of Florida’s territorial period, these goals had ultimately been realized. The Seminole War was over. Government sponsored incentives combined with the personal ambitions of would-be settlers, had succeeded in ousting the residual native population, and opening up virtually all of Florida’s remaining wilderness. Florida farmers had embraced the slave-based plantation system of the Old South and as a result, became leading agricultural producers. Modern infrastructure established as a result of the Seminole War had enabled the development of regional and global trade networks, and Florida’s cotton, cattle, lumber, and turpentine industries were flourishing. These developments were the driving force that facilitated the emergence of the settlement of Clay Landing during the mid-nineteenth century.
CHAPTER II

THE “LOST” COMMUNITY OF CLAY LANDING

During the mid-nineteenth century Florida’s burgeoning frontier was at its most dynamic, struggling to establish and maintain its own place in the modern world. Throughout this period, countless numbers of settlements and small towns were established and developed, then dismantled and forgotten. Often, these communities left nothing more behind than a barely perceptible impact on the natural landscape; or, in the most fortunate incidences, a few historical documents buried in a county archive. The community of Clay Landing in Levy County was one such place. Very little is known about the settlements and small towns like Clay Landing that were once so vital to the economic and social development of Florida’s frontier.

Sometimes referred to as “natural towns,” because they evolved specifically to accommodate emerging patterns of local trade and production; these settlements grew to significance depending upon their ability to produce commodities based upon locally available resources, and to maintain their position within regional trade networks (Anonymous 1986: 17). Once natural resources in the area were expended, or trade routes shifted, the settlements dwindled and their inhabitants eventually immigrated to other more productive locales. Communities such as these, though they existed in the very recent past, have for the most part, been forgotten. Without extensive historical
research of primary documentation and archaeological investigation to locate and interpret these historic settlements, they will be effectively lost to history.

Secondary historical sources concerning the settlement and development of the rural frontier in north-central Florida are extremely rare. Studies that have been conducted on the subject of the Florida frontier are generally concerned with: plantation life in Middle Florida during the early territorial period (Baptist 2002); or, the wave of frontier settlement that occurred during the immigration boom at the end of the nineteenth century. Sources pertaining specifically to the Alachua/Levy county region of Florida during the mid-nineteenth century are difficult to find. Thus far, the explanation for this dearth of information remains uncertain. During my research, I was able to locate only two secondary sources concentrating on Levy County – a county history, entitled *Romantic and Historic Levy County*, by Ruth Verrill, and an irregular periodical published by the Levy County Archives Committee, called *Search for Yesterday: A History of Levy County, Florida*.

Verrill’s *Romantic and Historic Levy County*, published in 1976, is to date the only comprehensive secondary historical resource available regarding Levy County. Although Clay Landing was mentioned a number of times in the book, it was always referred to in a very general manner. For example, in a discussion of military campaigns during the First Seminole War (1817-1818), Verrill (1976: 10) stated:

> General Jackson, with his men, marched to the east of the Suwannee River where Arbuthnot and Ambrister [British traders executed for their dealings with local natives and refugee slaves,] had a thriving trading post at Clay Landing, with an Indian village nearby.

Later, when discussing domestic issues of settlers arriving to the area at the start of the Second Seminole War, Verrill casually mentioned that, “Indian made pottery was
obtainable at the trading posts, Fanning, Clay Landing, Wacasassee, etc.” (ibid: 29). She described the Suwannee River during the antebellum period as the main thoroughfare for inland plantations in the shipment of cotton, lumber, turpentine and produce, and named Clay Landing as one of its major landings (ibid: 122). In regard to activity in Levy County during the Civil War, Verrill claimed that Clay Landing, in addition to having played a significant role in blockade running, also contained: a Confederate camp and battery, four warehouses used to store contraband cotton, and a steam powered cotton gin and press (ibid: 82). These facilities were apparently raided and destroyed by Union forces in April of 1864 (ibid: 83). As of April 1, 1865, Verrill claimed that “military records” indicated a sizable Confederate force of 500 cavalry men located at “Clay Landing and vicinity” (ibid: 88). These troops were likely stationed at Ft. Fanning located approximately seven miles to the north of Clay Landing.

Although Clay Landing gained mention in nearly every major event surrounding Levy County’s history, its own story is never elucidated in Verrill’s book; and even its status as an entity (trading post, settlement, military barracks) remains somewhat unclear. Verrill presented these tidbits of information regarding Clay Landing as fact, though she cited no specific sources. Since Verrill was a long-time Levy County resident and local genealogist, it is impossible to know whether her information was the result of historical research, local legend, or a combination of both. The latter is most likely, as Verrill made no pretense of scientific objectivity in the presentation of her work. This is clearly evidenced by the title of the book, itself.

The most plausible explanation for Verrill’s lack of elaboration on the information concerning Clay Landing may be that the history and status of the
community were common knowledge at the time in which her book was first published. Although Clay Landing ceased to exist on maps of the state and region around the turn of the century, individuals still lived there as late as the 1930’s. This is evidenced by a 1935, Levy County highway map commissioned by the State Road Department, which illustrates that the only access to Clay Landing was via a “third class road” that devolved into a rough, dirt trail four miles east of the town. Therefore, it is safe to assume that Clay Landing was no longer a viable town at this time. Fourteen years later, the land containing the town was appropriated by the state into Manatee Springs State Park, and presumably, any remaining inhabitants would have abandoned the area. The simple progression of time and the passage of one generation to the next, has allowed for information regarding this historic town, which may have been commonplace to Ruth Verrill a mere four decades ago, to be forgotten. This type of information loss may be partly responsible for the paucity of information available regarding mid- to late-nineteenth century rural frontier communities in Florida history.

Clay Landing is also mentioned in the Levy County Archive Committee’s, *Search for Yesterday* publications. However, as is the case in Verrill’s book, the settlement itself is never discussed. The majority of references to Clay Landing occur in the transcriptions of historic county board commission minutes. These references, though interesting, are often fragmentary and sometimes cryptic. The only statement regarding Clay Landing that was in any way descriptive came from an unknown author in one of the *Yesterday* “chapters,” published in December of 1986. It simply stated:

Clay Landing is a leading contender to being one of the oldest settlements in Levy County ... during this time period [the 1850’s], the prominence of Clay Landing should be noted. An Indian
village was there from the 1700’s, someone probably started a trading post, followed by various stores; steamboats loaded and unloaded there (Anonymous 1986: 9-10).

Although the secondary sources presented above are admittedly quite tenuous, they do help to provide a general sense of Clay Landing. Both indicated that Clay Landing was a significant center for local and regional trade and commerce with white settlers entering the area during the Seminole Wars, with possible ties to earlier trade with the native population. Its position on the Suwannee River appears to have contributed to the settlement’s growth during the development of the steamboat industry at the end of the 1830’s; and this success apparently continued throughout the 1850’s and 1860’s. However, it appears that Clay Landing began to wane in significance after this time, since no further references were made to it, in either source, after the culmination of the Civil War.

The specific reason for the sudden decline and eventual disappearance of Clay Landing is not included in the historical record. However, it is possible to speculate, based upon the “natural town” hypothesis. Historical sources indicate that Clay Landing’s growth coincided with the settlement boom following the Second Seminole War, and the development of the steamboat industry. Steamboat service first began in central Florida in 1827, and flourished rapidly along both the Apalachicola and Suwannee rivers. In 1838, one source recorded at least 30 individual boats operating on the Apalachicola (Castelnau qtd. in Tebeau 1971: 141). The Seminole War provided a tremendous boost to the steamboat industry. In addition to its own vessels, the U.S. government also contracted private boats to transport stores, equipment, and troops; in 1838 alone, the military chartered 40 private boats for this purpose (Tebeau 1971: 142).
Due to its geographic location on the Suwannee River (the major thoroughfare during the antebellum period), Clay Landing’s significance stemmed from its ability to facilitate local and regional trade networks dependent upon the river and to transport commodities from the interior to the port at Cedar Key. In March of 1861, when the Florida Railroad Company completed its cross-peninsular railway connecting the port at Fernandina on the east coast, with Cedar Key in the west, an alternative mode of transport was made available that was both convenient and more reliable than steamboat service (Tebeau 1971: 192). Over time, the shift in trade routes in favor of the railroad rendered Clay Landing’s position on the Suwannee obsolete. As a result, the settlement no longer drew those individuals who desired to participate in trade, and its community ceased to grow. Individuals living at Clay Landing with the financial means to do so, likely moved on to developing towns that were more accessible to the trade patterns established by the new railroad. The explorer N.H. Bishop (1878: Chapter 15), in his famous *Voyage of the Paper Canoe*, stated upon reaching the Suwannee River, “The building of railroads in the south has diverted trade from one locality to another, and many towns, once prosperous, have gone to decay.”

Another particularly significant example of the rise and fall process of a “natural town,” may be observed in the case of Newnansville, a frontier town located to the north east of Clay Landing in Alachua County. As previously mentioned in Chapter I, a land office was established at Newnansville in the early 1840’s, and it was the locale in which the majority of land patents for the Alachua and Levy county area were granted. During the Second Seminole War, the town of Newnansville became a hub of activity as well as a “central place for security” within the region of north-central Florida (Conway Duever,
et al. 1997: 5-9). Due to its strategic location near the Bellamy Road extension of the old east-west pathway that linked St. Augustine to the Alachua region, Newnansville had evolved from an Indian village and small plantation community during the mid-1820’s, into a significant town. As such, it became a “staging area for activities ranging from military deployments to land titling and colonization efforts” (Spencer 1995, qtd. in Conway Duever, et al. 1997: 5-9). Newnansville’s strategic location also made the town “one of the most secure military squares in [the territory of] East Florida” (Conway Duever, et al. 1997: 5-9).

Analysis of historic maps, military records, and newspapers, has shown that Newnansville was home to the military fort, Fort Gilleland, as well as a number of other “citizen forts,” or blockhouses. In addition, there were also a number of accessible forts in the area surrounding Newnansville that aided to its secure position, including: Fort 13, Fort White, Fort Call, Fort Gillespie, Fort Harlee, and Ft. Clarke (ibid; Denham and Honeycutt 2004: 104). When it was surveyed in 1832, the town had an approximate population of 500 individuals, and was the largest settlement in the area. Throughout the war, the population rose to nearly 1,500 with displaced refugees and those looking to acquire land, and by 1840 it had swelled to over 2,000 inhabitants (Denham and Honeycutt 2004: 104).

Although Newnansville was probably the largest inland town in Florida during its time, and very important in its relevance to the Seminole War and the settlement of north-central Florida’s frontier, very little is actually known about it - apart from the information related above. In 1853, the Florida Southern Railroad publicized its intended route, and its intention to by-pass Newnansville. As a result, the Alachua County seat
was moved to Gainesville and the town of Newnansville began to decline rapidly. Many of the town’s settlers immigrated to new settlements that were growing quickly in areas near Gainesville or Ft. King, near Ocala. In the words of one Alachua County historian, “the Bellamy Road made Newnansville; the railroad took it away” (Buchholz 1929 qtd. in Conway Duever, et al. 1997: 5-11). Although the area still served as a small trading center for the local cotton plantations, and the land office still remained, the town of Newnansville was defunct by the 1860’s (Conway Duever, et al, 1997: 5-10).

Although Clay Landing may have never reached the size and status of Newnansville, similarities between the two settlements are evident. Over time, by virtue of their respective geographic locations – Newnansville’s location on the Bellamy Road, and Clay Landing’s placement along the Suwannee River – both grew to be significant settlements and commercial centers, active in local and regional trade networks. Presumably, both also suffered the same decline as trade routes shifted over time. The sources provided by Verrill and the Levy Archive Committee, have provided a general sense of why the settlement of Clay Landing may have developed. However, they give little sense of the community itself, and how it developed. It is necessary to dig deeper into the historical record to understand the community of Clay Landing, and the relationships that individuals living there may have established within the community, and with the world around them.

Using the combination of available historical maps and primary documents, the remainder of this chapter will reconstruct the community of Clay Landing as it existed during the middle of the nineteenth century. Analysis of historical maps of the region and locality will define the layout of the settlement, and illustrate its significance within
the landscape of the frontier; while the examination of land tract, census, and probate records will identify the individuals who lived in the settlement, and help to illuminate the social and economic dynamics that defined the community.

SETTLEMENT AT CLAY LANDING

Clay Landing does not appear on regional maps until the start of the Second Seminole War. I was able to locate two military maps dating to the Seminole War period that illustrate the geographic region including Clay Landing. Unfortunately, these maps are copies of the original, and their cartographer and date are not available. Judging by the style and content of the maps, however, it is likely that they were drawn sometime between 1838 and 1840. Although the maps depict the same general area, they do contain striking differences. In one of the maps, which illustrates the ninth military district, containing Fort Fanning (located approximately seven miles north of Clay Landing), there are four major wagon roads depicted branching from the fort, leading to: Ft. Jennings, Wacasassa, Newnansville, and Ft. White. There are two unnamed locations illustrated on the east bank of the Suwannee, both north and south of the fort. The northern location, probably Suwannee Old Town, is connected to the Ft. White and Newnansville roads via a wagon road. The area to the south, presumably Clay Landing, appears to be linked to the Ft. Jennings road by a horse trail. Conversely, the second map, containing military districts nine, and districts three and four to the southeast (shown in Figure 2.1), shows only three wagon roads extending from Ft. Fanning; and the road leading to Clay Landing from the Ft. Jennings road is represented as a major wagon
Clay Landing (depicted here as "Clay's Landing") is accessible by two separate wagon roads. The northeast road connects to the Ft. Fanning - Ft. Jennings road. The road leading to the southwest, here named "Lt. Long's Road," appears to have no visible terminus. However, other historical maps indicate this road as leading to Post No. 4, the military fort designated for the 4th District. Map from Gulf Archaeology Research Institute.
road, not a trail. There is also another wagon road, identified as "Lt. Long's Road," leading from Clay Landing to the southwest, into the fourth military district. Although it is not named on this map, it is likely that the terminus of this road is a military fort that would ultimately come to be identified as Post Number 4.

Clay Landing is identified on the Figure 2.1 map as "Clay's Landing;" this particular discrepancy was observed in at least one other historical map located during research. As no mention of any individual by the name of Clay was ever located in regard to the history of the area, it is my belief that this variation is merely, an accidental corruption. In my opinion, Clay Landing’s name is a literal interpretation of the landing itself, in that it refers to the clay content of the subsoil present in that particular area along the floodplain of the Suwannee River (Florida Department of Environmental Protection 2004: A 3-1, A 3-2).

Analysis of the two military maps, indicate that Clay Landing was an operational landing used during the Second Seminole War. It was accessible by wagon road to at least three of the military forts in the area, and its natural position on the Suwannee River would have been extremely advantageous during the "brief heyday" that the steamboat industry experienced before the railroads entered the area in the 1860’s (Tebeau 1971: 141).

It is likely that Clay Landing became a major port of call during the Seminole War period. Its increasing significance is further indicated by the appearance of Clay Landing on territorial maps at the beginning of the 1840’s (see Figure 2.2). From 1840 throughout the 1850’s and 1860’s, Clay Landing is regularly depicted in both regional and state maps; and is the only settlement in Levy County during this period that is
This 1840 territorial map of East Florida is one of the earliest to depict Clay Landing. Map by Capt. John MacKay and Lieut. J.E. Blake by order of the U.S. Senate. From Gulf Archaeology Research Institute.
represented with any consistency. However, maps of the settlement at Clay Landing are not available before 1849. Although the land containing the settlement was tentatively sectioned for sale in 1829, it was not surveyed and permanently re-sectioned by A.H. Jones until November of 1849. The settlement at Clay Landing was included in Jones’ 1849 plat map of Levy County, Township 11 South, Range 13 East.

I was able to locate four separate variations of Jones’ 1849 plat map that included topographical detail. Three of these were housed at the Florida State Archives in Tallahassee; the other was a copy of the original plat from the Levy County Archives, at the Levy County Courthouse in Bronson. I was unable to view the original plat map, because some unscrupulous individual had recently stolen the document from the courthouse archives, slicing it from the original County Plat Book with a razor. Fortunately, I was given a copy of the map from the personal collection of Manatee Springs State Park Ranger, Andrew Moody, who had made the copy some years ago while doing historical research of his own (see Figure 2.3).

According to the plat map, the settlement of Clay Landing is laid out within a cleared area of pine barren, located east of the Suwannee River, through Sections 13, 24, 25, and 36, and the easternmost halves of Sections 26 and 35. Surrounding the settlement on the north, west, and south, are dense hammocks bounded by swamp and the Suwannee River. The landing itself is located at a bend of the river in the southwest quarter of Section 13, which is devoid of swamp. There are eight structures and seven agricultural fields represented in the settlement. All are situated along a central road that runs north-south, through the length of the settlement and branches in three separate directions as it
enters Section 13. One of these offshoots leads directly to the landing, while the other two continue toward the east.

The three versions of the T11S, R13E plat map housed in the State Archives are comparable to the Levy County plat map in regard to layout and topography, but display minor variances in the placement or absence of structures. These discrepancies may be due to human error during the manual recopying process. However, there is notable differentiation in the depiction of the road or trail that runs through the settlement. In the plat shown in Figure 2.3, this route is depicted as a dashed line, which would seem to denote a simple trail or pathway. The route is similarly depicted in one of the State Archive plats; however, another plat marks the same route with a solid line, while the last shows a double solid line (indicating a wagon road) that degenerates into a single solid and dashed line as the route enters Section 36.

This discrepancy may or may not be significant, but it does present some confusion in understanding the type and amount of traffic and commerce that the community experienced. Analysis of Levy County plat maps T12S, R13E; T13S, R13E; and T14S, R13E, positioned directly south of Clay Landing, have shown the presence of a wagon road named “Road from Post No. 4 to Clay Landing,” demarcated by a double solid line, running north-south through the county (Levy County, Florida Book of 1838 Maps by Township and Range: 7-9; Levy County Archives). This Post No. 4 Road appears to be comparable to the Lt. Long Road depicted in the military map shown in Figure 2.1. The presence of such a road would indicate a significant amount of traffic between the two locales. As such, it is likely that the Clay Landing road initially started
Figure 2.3

1849 Plat Map of Clay Landing

Plat map of Levy County Township 11 South, Range 13 East; surveyed by A.H. Jones in November 1849. The name “Clay Landing,” written across lots 3 and 4 of Section 13, presumably marks the location of the actual landing, itself. Other localities identified by name are: “Bryant’s Field,” located in the southwest quarter of Section 25, and “Manatee Springs,” in the southeast quarter of Section 26. From the personal collection of Andrew Moody (original map from Levy County, Florida Book of 1838 Maps by Township and Range: 6; Levy County Archives, no longer extant).
as a rudimentary trail that over time evolved into a fully functional wagon road linking the landing to the military fort, Post No. 4. It is also probable that a similar road linked Clay Landing to Ft. Fanning to the north, and that one of the eastward routes shown in Section 13 of the plat was indeed that road.

THE CLAY LANDING COMMUNITY

William H. Adams, in his study of the community of Silcott, Washington, stated that the borders of a community are “delineated on the basis of interaction spheres,” or “the frequency and depth of interpersonal relationships between neighbors” (Adams 1977: 26). While Adams’ definition is valid, it does present a problem in establishing the boundaries of the community of Clay Landing. Without benefit of material evidence from archaeological investigation, or information from living inhabitants, it is difficult to determine with any degree of accuracy, the depth and breadth of the networks of interaction among individuals in a particular region. It is possible that the actual community of Clay Landing may have extended far beyond the settlement depicted in the T 11S, R 13E plat, or alternatively, have been limited to a particular portion of it. However, from the information that is available at this time, specifically: historical maps, land tract records, and census data; it appears that the community of Clay Landing was made up of those individuals living along the east bank of the Suwannee River in the area depicted in the in Levy County plat Township 11S, Range 13E, shown in Figure 2.3.

In determining boundaries for the community of Clay Landing, my intention is only to set parameters that will simplify the analysis of information for this study and facilitate a more productive interpretation of the available data. I am in no way implying
that the community was cut-off from the larger Levy County community, or the world.

Clay Landing was a community that existed in the modern world; as such, the social
relationships established and maintained within that community would unavoidably be
linked in some way to larger and more widespread relationships and communities.

In order to adequately understand any community, it is necessary to identify (to
whatever degree possible) the individuals who constitute it. Human life is fundamentally
based on individuals and the relationships they create and maintain (Carrithers 1992: 11).
In identifying individuals and attempting to understand the networks of relationships they
may have established, one can uncover much about social and cultural life in the past.

By accessing the historical State of Florida Tract Books, which are obligingly
categorized according to county townships and ranges, I was able to identify Clay
Landing’s landowners, and the probable owners of the homesteads depicted on the T11S,
R13E map. The individuals who bought, or were deeded land within Clay Landing are as
follows: Bernard M. Byrne, George H. Tresper, Benjamin Brownlow, David A.
Brownlow, John Waterson [sic], Isaac P. Hardee, Edmond Shackleford, Joseph B.
Hardee, Aaron Smith, Henry M. Holland, Sylvester Bryant, Sr., Sylvester Bryant, Jr., and
land owned by Edmond Shackleford had been previously deeded to Isaac P. Hardee
under “M.B.L. Warrant No. 15179,” presumably for military service in the Seminole War

According to the Tract Book records, it appears that: the two structures and
agricultural fields located in Lot #3 and Lot #4 of Section 13, and the homestead in the
N ½ of the NE ¼ of Section 24, were the property of George H. Tresper; the structure in
the NE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 13 was owned by Benjamin Brownlow; the homestead in the center of Section 24 was owned by Edmond Shackleford; and Sylvester Bryant, Sr. and his son owned the three structures in Section 25, as well as the cultivated areas in Sections 25, 26, and 35 (*State of Florida Tract Books*, Vol. 12: 275-282). All of the land purchases made by these individuals took place between the years of 1851 and 1860. There were very few land transactions that occurred within the locality after 1860, and none that occurred before 1851.

Jones’ 1849 map indicates that Clay Landing’s community was already established before its inhabitants actually purchased their land. This information suggests that the inhabitants of Clay Landing were not members of the planter elite. Material wealth and access to lines of credit allowed members of the planter class to purchase the best land as the government auctioned it, and before they physically relocated to the particular area. Middle and lower class farmers were often forced to immigrate first, with families, furniture, slaves, and livestock, in tow, and select their tracts enroute (Baptist 2002: 37). After settling on a suitable piece of property, they would establish a farmstead, attempt to raise cash, and hope to take advantage of preemption rights. This appears to have been the case at Clay Landing.

The 1850 Federal Census indicated that Clay Landing was, predominantly, established by immigrants from Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina (1850 Federal Census for Levy County, Levy County Archives). They were members of the Methodist Church and, with exception to George Tresper, a merchant, and Benjamin Brownlow, a Methodist preacher; “farmer” was the predominant occupation among the men in the settlement (1850 Federal Census for Levy County, Levy County Archives).
The pattern of immigration from Georgia and the Carolinas that is reflected in Clay Landing's early population had been a constant throughout the Florida frontier since the early nineteenth century. One study of immigration patterns of non-planter whites in Middle Florida during the territorial period (Baptist 2002: 40), indicated that of the total households recorded for Jackson and Leon counties in the 1830 census: 28.2% were originally from Georgia; 27% from North Carolina, and 13.2% from South Carolina. According to the 1850 census returns for the whole of Levy County: an overwhelming 42% of the sixty-nine families recorded (320 individuals), were headed by individuals originally from Georgia; 13% were from South Carolina; and only 4% were from North Carolina (1850 Federal Census for Levy County, Levy County Archives). In his book, Creating An Old South: Middle Florida's Plantation Frontier before the Civil War, Edward Baptist (2002: 43) explained this phenomenon:

The desire for economic and political independence, and the lack of these necessities in the old counties of the coastal plains [of Georgia and the Carolinas], propelled common white men out of the coastal swamps and the pine flats. They hoped, in new states and territories, to establish themselves as independent landowners, and to demand that planters treat them as equals and as men.

Unlike its neighbors to the west in Middle Florida’s plantation belt, Levy was not a major slaveholding county. According to the Slave Schedule that accompanied the 1850 Federal Census for Levy County; the entire county contained 152 slaves. Only two individuals in the county possessed twenty or more slaves, and the majority of slaveholders possessed less than five. Of the individuals who owned land at Clay Landing, only three possessed slaves in 1850: Sylvester Bryant, Sr. owned ten; Isaac P.
In 1850, these individuals were still establishing themselves in a burgeoning settlement. As homesteads were established, the fields cleared and cultivated, and initial cash crops fetched returns, landholders would most likely have invested their profits in acquiring more slaves in order to increase productivity. By the time of his death in 1857, Sylvester Bryant, Sr. had acquired eleven more slaves and a small fortune in cattle, with an estate valued at $13,305. The following is a transcription of the appraisal of his estate:

Filed December 30, 1857 by Thomas N. Clyatt, Judge of Probate, Recorded in Book A No. 1 pages 112 & 113:

We the undersigned being duly sworn according to law to appraise the Estate of S. Bryant, Sr, do hereby value the property – viz –

Big Mary-William & Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Phina</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianna</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenora</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

also

Little Mary & Family – viz –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Mary</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chany</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

also

Ferriby & child $1,100
Jake 1,000

also

Tools & farming utensils $10
Cart 5
Waggon [sic] 50
Bay mare & Colt 100
One old mule 25
One 2 year old Bay mare 75
One Black Filly 60
Two mules 5 year old each 250
500 head cattle $4 ea. 2000

$4,925
$4,825
$10
5
50
100
25
75
60
250
2000
The 1860 Federal Census and Agricultural Schedule for Levy County provide further insight into the developing economic dynamics of the community. This census was the first in Levy County to identify the individual’s specific location according to post office, rather than by arbitrarily designated districts. In the 1850 census, Clay Landing landholders were recorded as belonging to both the “First” and “Second” districts of Levy County. Presumably, indicating that the settlement was divided between the two districts. As such, there was no way to identify based upon location, the other individuals who may have lived at Clay Landing, but did not own land. Fortunately, the Clay Landing post office, having been established in 1852, was one of the locations included in the 1860 census (Verrill 1976: 70). Assuming that the individuals whose locations are listed as “Clay Landing,” or “Clay Landing PO,” actually lived at Clay Landing, it is possible to ascertain the size and makeup of the community. As of 1860, there were fifty-three individuals living at Clay Landing within nine separate households (1860 Federal Census for Levy County, Levy County Archives).

In 1860, the occupation for every head of household at Clay Landing, with the exception of George Tresper, was recorded as “farmer.” Of the nine households listed, only five owned the land on which they lived. For the majority of these individuals, the value of their real estate and personal estate were also listed. George Tresper owned 2,640 dollars in real estate, with a personal estate valued at 10,000 dollars. Elizabeth Bryant owned 800 dollars worth of real estate, and her son Sylvester Bryant, the administrator of her late husband’s estate, was valued at 13,850 dollars. Isaac P. Hardee
was recorded as owning 1,000 dollars in real estate. In addition to their large estates, the census also recorded servants, not slaves, living in the Bryant and Tresper households. George Tresper had a clerk (presumably to run his store) living at his home, as well as a servant woman and her child. Sylvester Bryant had a young man, probably a laborer, and a steward living in his household (1860 Federal Census for Levy County, Levy County Archives).

The census and agricultural schedule clearly indicate that the Tresper and Bryant families represent the wealthy minority of the Clay Landing community. The Hardee and Holland families owned their land and did possess moderate farmsteads with considerable amounts of livestock, but not to the degree of the Bryants. The remaining four families owned no land at all. Having not been included in the 1850 census, these individuals were presumably, newcomers to the settlement. They posed a stark contrast to Clay Landing’s original settlers, in that they were predominantly Baptists and had immigrated from Alabama, rather than Georgia or South Carolina (1860 Federal Census for Levy County, Levy County Archives).

Households such as these, either rented their land from speculators, or “squatted” on vacant lands owned by the government and absentee speculators. Historically referred to as “poor whites,” or “crackers,” these individuals were often portrayed as shiftless and lazy by members of the upper class. However, one Middle Florida planter Achille Murat, commented of their character, “A week after [the squatter’s arrival at a potential farm site], I have been astonished to see a good hut there, a field of cattle, and some poultry, the wife spinning cotton, [and] the husband destroying the trees by making a circular incision in them, called a girdle” (Murat qtd. in Baptist 2002: 46). This “girdling” of
trees allowed farmers who did not have access to the manpower of slaves, to clear small areas of the forest over a period of time, in order to cultivate small crops or graze livestock (Baptist 2002: 46).

Most of these landless individuals living at Clay Landing, though poor, did own some property; and as such, were included in the 1860 agricultural schedule. The following table, which includes the value of agricultural property of Clay Landing’s households, displays the economic diversity of the community.

**TABLE 2.1**

1860 AGRICULTURAL SCHEDULE OF CLAY LANDING HOUSEHOLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acres of Improved Land</th>
<th>Acres of Unimproved Land</th>
<th>$ Value of Farm</th>
<th>$ Value of Farm Implements and Machinery</th>
<th>$ Value of Livestock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Bryant</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac P. Hardee</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry M. Holland</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Hodge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Howard</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.W. Jones</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William W. Stevens</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Green 2002: 1860 Agricultural Census, Levy County, Florida, USGenWeb Archives)

Sylvester Bryant’s household is absent from this table because he was not included in the agricultural schedule, due to his death in early March of 1860. His estate, with his late father’s estate, valued at $18,290, was then divided between his mother Elizabeth Bryant, and Isaac Hardee, the widower of his late sister (Levy County, Florida Probate, Book C: 19-38, Levy County Archives). It is clear from the information presented in Table 2.1 that livestock was an important commodity in Clay Landing’s community. Every household (with the exception of A.W. Jones, who according to the
information presented in the 1860 schedule, appears to have possessed no property of any kind) owned at least some livestock (Green 2002).

Livestock, and cattle in particular, was extremely important in north-central Florida, and had been since the first Spanish Colonial Period. The development of the cattle industry in Alachua County by the Franciscan mission system was discussed in Chapter I. Cattle and hogs had roamed freely in the area since the species were introduced by De Soto in 1539, and continued to do so until the 1949 Fence Law was passed that prohibited open-range grazing (Conway Duever, et al. 1997: 2-4). Settlers systematically burned the dense underbrush that grew throughout the pine barren to induce the growth of grass that would feed the livestock, and then allowed them to run loose throughout the forest. The animals were herded up and penned once a year to be fattened and branded for sale (Baptist 2002: 50). Cattle was either sold locally, or driven over land or down river to ports for shipment. Clay Landing’s positioning within the regional landscape of the frontier was such that it enabled settlers to easily transport their cattle to any of the military forts in the area, or down the Suwannee to the port at Cedar Key. From Cedar Key, the livestock could then be shipped to Cuba and New Orleans.

Cattle and beef products had been shipped via the Suwannee River for regional and international export since the seventeenth century (Turner Bushnell 1996: 73). In November of 1865, the Estate of Sylvester Bryant, Elizabeth Bryant, and Isaac P. Hardee, all had cattle marks and brands registered with the county (see Figure 2.4).

The soil of Clay Landing, like that of the surrounding region of northern Florida, was well suited for growing cotton. Although cotton was a major commodity in that area during the antebellum period, with 69,000 bales produced in 1860, this apparently, was
The illustration and description of cattle marks and brands registered for the Estate of Sylvester Bryant, Elizabeth Bryant, and Isaac P. Hardee. *Marks and Brands, Levy County, Book A: 15; Levy County Archives.*
not the case at Clay Landing (Conway Duever, et al. 1997: 5-19). Edward Baptist (2002) provides a possible explanation of why cattle, as opposed to cotton, was the predominant commodity produced at Clay Landing. Records have indicated that the population of Clay Landing consisted of upper-middle to lower class farmers owning few slaves. Large-scale cotton production would not have been possible for such individuals. According to Baptist (2002: 50-51):

The attempt to produce a cotton crop was a gamble for a household that possessed limited labor resources. Each day spent in the cotton patch was one less day spent on producing food crops. Even creating cotton fields cost and risked more than clearing land for corn, the source of bread ... Planters preferred to have their slaves clear large fields of trees, stumps, and roots so that they could use plows ... To produce significant quantities for the market, countrymen [farmers owning less than ten slaves] had to use plows. Plowing freed up valuable family labor for the task of hoeing corn but required large initial investments of labor in grubbing up roots to prepare the soil for cultivation.

For the most part, the farmers of Clay Landing simply did not possess the numbers of slaves necessary for large-scale cotton cultivation. Apart from the Bryant family who owned twenty-one slaves, the only other significant slaveholder at Clay Landing appears to have been Edmond Shackleford. According to the Inventory and Appraisement of his property filed on March 1, 1857, he owned twenty-six slaves. His estate presents a striking contrast to the other Clay Landing households, in that Shackleford’s most valuable assets were not in cattle (he owned only nine head of cattle), but in slaves and cotton. The exact monetary value of the cotton (between two and three thousand dollars), is illegible, but the amount is recorded as: “4 ½ Baggs say 1800 lbs. Sea Island Cotton; 1 Bale say 500 lb. upland cotton” (Wills and Letters of Administration 1847-1859, Levy County, Book A: 88-89, Levy County Archives). Shackleford’s estate
was valued at over twenty-one thousand dollars; unfortunately, the exact amount is illegible due to the degradation of the historic document (ibid).

While Clay Landing may not have relied solely upon the production of cotton, it is likely that the households may have depended upon small cotton crops to supplement their incomes. Other secondary crops like sugar cane and sorghum, grown to produce cane juice and syrup, may have also served this purpose. A list of the personal property of Isaac P. Hardee recorded after his death in 1880 included among his possessions two barrels of syrup amounting to $13.20, eighty- and fifty-gallon kettles, and “one Sugar Mill” valued at 25 dollars (Levy County, Florida Probate, Book C: 11). The bulk of agricultural production, however, was probably devoted to the cultivation of corn, and other subsistence crops.

Native peoples had started maize cultivation in the area as early as A.D. 750, and it remained an important agricultural product in the Alachua/Levy county area throughout Florida history (Milanich 1996; Conway Duever, et al. 1997: 5-16). Corn was an important staple of the frontier household. The Inventory and Appraisement of property of Sylvester Bryant, Jr. indicated “40 Bushels Corn at $1.25” as the first, and most expensive item (totaling 50 dollars) that was “set apart for the use and support of the widow and child” (Levy County, Florida Probate, Book C: 31, Levy County Archives). The other subsistence items set aside to sustain Bryant’s widow and child for one year, were: “3 Head of beef Cattle at $12 – 36.00; 300 lbs. Bacon at .15 per lb. – 45.00; 100 lbs. Coffee at .18 ¾ per lb. – 18.75; 200 lbs. Sugar at .10 per lb. – 20.00; 2 Bbls. [sic] Flour at $10 – 20.00; 2 sacks Salt at $3 – 6.00” (Levy County, Florida Probate, Book C: 31-32, Levy County Archives). Among the personal items recorded in the estate of Isaac
P. Hardee were listed “one corn sheller,” one “grindstone,” and “Grindstone rollers” (ibid: 11).

NETWORKS OF INTERACTION

Census records have indicated that George Tresper, who owned the tracts of land including the actual landing at Clay Landing, was a merchant. Information regarding the Tresper household is not included in the 1860 agricultural schedule, presumably because his business was mainly in trade and not agriculture. Historical records and documents available at this time, give little indication as to the type and size of George Tresper’s trade business. The fact that his store was centrally located at the landing itself, and connected by wagon road to the area’s two military forts, suggests that he was involved to some degree in regional trade. Local commercial trade within the settlement would have certainly been a factor as well. According to Gerald Carson (1965: 37), quoted by Adams (1977: 88) in his discussion of local commercial trade networks:

Trading areas were established by the distance a farm family could travel by horse back, oxcart, or wagon. A circle with a five-mile radius would represent a fair estimate of the amount of geography in which a country dealer could take a serious commercial interest.

Although historic Levy County Commission board minutes indicated a “Highsmith’s Store,” located in Levyville (a town located a few miles to the southeast), it may have been difficult for Clay Landing’s settlers to have reached. On November 8, 1852, the board amended that a new road be cut from Clay Landing to Levyville, directed to Highsmith’s Store; but the order was rescinded on December 13 of that same year (Cooper 1977: 4). It is likely that Tresper’s was the only store accessible to the people of Clay Landing. Some sense of the type of trade conducted at Tresper’s store may be
gleaned from the personal correspondence of one of Tresper’s contemporaries – George Brown, an immigrant from New Hampshire, operated a store in Newnansville that thrived for more than a decade. On July 18, 1846, George wrote the following to his brother:

I am still in business at this village, and have slowly, but I hope surely, prospered. My trade is large, though of a small kind. My customers are a curious sort of people, very different from the close-calculating folk of New England. My [receipts] are mostly in raccoon hides, and “sea Island” cotton. Of the last I ship this year about 200 Bales. I purchase it in seed from the plantations, and grow it on my own... (Denham and Honeycutt, eds. 2004: 208)

In addition to patronizing Tresper’s store, it is very likely that the community of Clay Landing participated to some degree, in local networks of bartering, called “neighboring” (Adams 1977: 85). Neighboring was defined by Adams (1977: 85) as: “a social contract between two individuals or two families in which tasks too large for individuals were tackled collectively.” Although Adams definition described neighboring as a barter system for labor, bartering of commodities and agricultural products between families was also common. These types of trade relationships were reciprocal in nature, and served to create both economic and social networks throughout the community (Adams 1977: 86).

Evidence of neighboring in Levy County can be seen at the turn of the twentieth century in a newspaper article published August 30, 1979, in the Chiefland Citizen. In that article Gene Hardee, one of Isaac P. Hardee’s descendants, then 87 years old, recounted some memories from his early childhood. Although, Hardee was remembering the 1890’s at Hardeetown, a small community just outside of Clay Landing, it is possible that conditions were similar at Clay Landing thirty years earlier. Hardee related the importance of neighboring, and the bartering of both labor and goods. He stressed the
necessity of neighborly teamwork during the difficult processes of girdling trees and clearing fields for cultivation. He also remembered that trading agricultural items like ham, bacon, cane syrup, and sweet potatoes, for store-bought necessities, was often more common at the local general store than using legal tender (*Chiefland Citizen* August 30, 1979: D9). Bartering of goods would have been extremely common on the north-central Florida frontier when cash money was scarce. Although the resources available at this time offer little information as to whether or not this was the case at Clay Landing, contemporary historical accounts from Newnansville indicate that cash shortages were universal throughout the frontier.

Corrinna Brown Aldrich (sister of George Brown discussed above) and her husband immigrated to Newnansville in 1839, and lived there until 1846. Throughout that time she wrote often to her brother Mannvillette. In virtually all of her letters, she commented to some degree as to the scarcity of currency, and the difficulty of collecting money owed by the government. In a letter to Mannvillette on January 3, 1841 toward the end of the Seminole War, she discussed how the region was suffering from lack of currency exchange, saying “When we have money and wish to send it away, we cannot do it for want of exchange. The soldiers being paid off in specie—makes specie plenty and yet we may say money is scarce” (Denham and Honeycutt 2004: 143). In another letter written two years later on April 30, 1843, Corrinna told her brother that her husband had yet to collect payment for his services in the Seminole War, which had ended the year before:

Edward has not yet collected from any source but hopes to in fact as soon as muster rolls are sent from our dilatory officers in Washington ... He intends to lay his claims before Congress—about three thousand is due him (Denham and Honeycutt, eds. 2004: 175).
In addition to the wartime economy and the sluggishness of government agency, the frontier landscape also played a part in inhibiting the exchange of funds. Corrinna’s husband Edward attempted to raise cash by branching out in his economic pursuits and contracting out the labor of his slaves to the military fort, Ft. Fanning, to the southwest of Newnansville and just a few miles north of Clay Landing. However, Corrinna commented, months later, that he was still unable to collect the debt owed him due to the “difficult and dangerous” road from Newnansville to Ft. Fanning (Denham and Honeycutt, eds. 2004: 143).

Unpredictable frontier economics, and the difficulties of obtaining cash experienced by individuals like Corrinna Brown Aldrich, may have served to facilitate and strengthen the development of local bartering networks and neighboring systems throughout the north-central Florida frontier and within the community of Clay Landing.

Reciprocal economic relationships may facilitate the development of deeper social relationships, however, networks of interaction within a community are not always economically based. Evidence of the social relationships established within the community of Clay Landing is also discernible in the historical record. Some of these relationships may have been based purely on geography. For instance, in the probate inventories and appraisals for the estates of Sylvester Bryant, Junior and Senior, Esther Ann Hardee, and Edmond Shackleford, many of the estate appraisers were other inhabitants of Clay Landing who lived nearby the deceased. The appraisers of the estate of Sylvester Bryant, Jr. were: George H. Tresper, John Waterston, and John T. Jackson (Levy County, Florida Probate, Book C: 31, Levy County Archives). The assigned distributors for the estate of Sylvester Bryant, Sr. were: W.A.F. Jones, George H.
Tresper, and John W. Quincy (Levy County, Florida Probate, Book C: 34, Levy County Archives). For the estate of Edmond Shackleford, the appraisers were Isaac P. Hardee and S. Bryant (Wills and Letters of Administration 1847-1859, Levy County, Book A: 89, Levy County Archives).

Many of the men at Clay Landing also served together in some capacity, as county officials. Levy County, of which Clay Landing was a part, was established shortly after Florida became a state. Unfortunately, the earliest Levy County Commission board minutes, from 1845 to 1850, were destroyed during the Civil War (Gunnell 1977: 3). However, Clay Landing and its inhabitants are mentioned often in the minutes that are available for the 1850’s and early 1860’s. Sylvester Bryant, Isaac P. Hardee, and Robert Waterston, are among the County Board Commissioners listed for January of 1858 (Cooper 1977:6). In a board meeting in October of 1858 that established the road districts for the county, Isaac P. Hardee and Sylvester Bryant were appointed as commissioners for District Number Two (ibid).

Local oral histories and genealogical information from Levy County residents have helped to elucidate the particularly close social relationship between the Hardee and Bryant families. The following is an excerpt of a letter written by Susan Lottie Hardee Williams, granddaughter of Isaac P. Hardee, to her granddaughter, Mary Eugenia Smith Rowe, on March 3, 1965. It was included in an unpublished, personal family history entitled, Levy County's Kissing Kin—Hardee's & Such, compiled by Rowe (2004). This letter not only explains the connection between the Hardee and Bryant families, but also provides personal insight that fills in some of the gaps left by the historical record. I have
chosen to transcribe the excerpt, rather than summarize it, because I believe that the personal language is important:

My grandfather Isaac P. Hardee, a red headed Irishman, was born in South Carolina and came to Florida in 1839 as a volunteer in the Seminole War.

Grandfather later obtained a land grant which extended from the Suwannee River for a long distance.

He first settled near Clay Landing on the river.

His main occupation was farming and stock raising. He owned numerous slaves.

The story goes that grandfather stole his first wife Esther Anne Bryant, as she was ready in her wedding dress to marry another man in Lake City, spiriting her out through a window. His slaves provided the crowning touch of the elopement by stealing the wedding cake.

He took his bride to Tallahassee. Later they returned to his home near Clay Landing on the Suwannee River in Levy County.

Grandfather and grandmother lived here until “swamp” fever, now known as malaria, took the lives of grandmother, their little girl, and some of their slaves.

Then grandfather decided to move inland to escape the malady. He moved about seven miles east from the river and built Hardee plantation home about the year 1860, near the town of Chiefland now...

Soon after building this house Grandfather married Susan Bryant, widow of his first wife’s brother (Williams 1965:4-5, in Rowe 2004).

Williams’ letter has shown that the Bryants and Hardees were more than just neighbors; they were intimately connected. As such, they were likely to pool their labor and resources as necessity called for it, and possibly even their lands, which were adjacent to each other.

Williams stated that Isaac P. Hardee with his new wife and family, moved inland to escape a fever epidemic sometime after 1860. This information suggests that the
decline of Clay Landing may not have been purely economical. Elizabeth Bryant, widow of Sylvester Bryant, Sr., left alone at Clay Landing, may have also moved on. The destruction of blockade contraband storehouses and other facilities at Clay Landing by Federal troops at the height of the Civil War, just a few years later, likely had detrimental affect on George Tresper’s business. On March 29, 1867, Tresper’s Clay Landing’s post office was discontinued, suggesting that the Tresper family had left the community as well (Verrill 1976: 70). When N.H. Bishop (1878: Chapter 15) reached Clay Landing in 1875 during his voyage of the paper canoe, he described it simply as, “where Mrs. Tresper formerly lived in a very comfortable house.” The absence of the Bryants, Hardees, and Trespers, three of the major landholding families, would have greatly weakened the community. These factors combined with the possible affects of the introduction of the new railroad discussed above, are a plausible explanation for Clay Landing’s ultimate failure as a viable community.

SUMMARY

This chapter presented a comprehensive analysis of the settlement and community of Clay Landing. Using available secondary sources, primary historical documents and maps, as well as local oral histories, I have attempted to reconstruct the settlement as it might have existed during the 1840’s through the 1860’s. In doing so, I have shown that Clay Landing was a rural frontier community that came into existence as a result of the modern development of north-central Florida’s landscape, and grew to significance based upon it’s ability to accommodate and facilitate networks of trade throughout that landscape and on to the wider world.
The community of Clay Landing had been virtually lost to history because it had failed to establish itself as a viable community in the modern world. However, the interpretation of historical data has illustrated that during the mid-nineteenth century, Clay Landing was a dynamic and economically diverse community of real individuals, actively participating in various social and economic relationships, and trying to carve out a small, yet productive, piece of the frontier landscape for themselves.
CHAPTER III
CLAY LANDING: A CULTURAL LANDSCAPE

So far, this thesis has developed a comprehensive social history of the nineteenth century settlement of Clay Landing. It has addressed the early expansion of the Florida frontier and the ways in which global processes (i.e. colonialism, Eurocentrism, capitalism, and modernity) influenced and shaped its landscape, making the settlement and development of the community of Clay Landing possible. This study looked mutualistically at Clay Landing’s community during the mid-nineteenth century, and elucidated, through the analysis of historic documents, maps, and oral histories, the networks of social and economic relationships individuals might have established within the local and regional community. Farther-reaching economic networks on a national and international scale were speculated upon, though not explicitly verified. Although historical research was unable to uncover any direct historical evidence that specifically demonstrated Clay Landing’s involvement in the global economy, secondary historical sources have shown that the port at Clay Landing, as early as the seventeenth century, played a role in the trade traffic of the Suwannee River and thus, participated in networks of international trade via the port at Cedar Key. It is illogical to assume that Clay Landing’s residents would have ignored this position, or chosen not to exploit its economic advantages.
Adams (1976; 1977) clarified this particular shortfall of the historic and ethnographic evidence in his examination of the small farming community of Silcott, Washington. In his study, Adams (1976; 1977) argued that various networks of trade and interaction linked the community of Silcott to the national and global economy. He discussed six major trade networks in which the community participated: local, local-commercial, area-commercial, regional, national, and international. Of these networks, Adams (1976: 99) remarked: “The regional, national, and international networks are best studied through the archaeology, whereas the local networks and area commercial networks are best examined through ethnography.”

Thus far, I have not discussed archaeology, or its capability to contribute to my argument that Clay Landing was part of the modern global community. The absence of archaeology in this study is not a matter of neglect, but rather, lack of data. When this study began, there had never been any archaeological investigation of any historical site associated with the settlement of Clay Landing. As a result, there is no archaeological record pertaining to Clay Landing, and no data sets that can be used to study the community’s regional, national, and international networks.

Much of the area that made up the settlement of Clay Landing was appropriated by the State of Florida in 1949 and included in Manatee Springs State Park (MSSP). The Florida Master Site File (FMSF) listed seven prehistoric archaeological sites located within MSSP’s boundaries (Lv32, Lv33, Lv37, Lv85, Lv86, Lv112, and Lv139). Most of these sites were identified and recorded during the 1950’s by University of Florida archaeologists, J.M. Goggin, or Ripley Bullen; only one (Lv32 located at the headspring) was excavated. Occupation of the sites ranged from Archaic to Seminole contexts, with
the highest density of occupation occurring during the Weeden Island Period (MSSP 2004: 24; FMSF 8Lv33; FMSF 8Lv37). Although, FMSF records indicated evidence of historic (19th and 20th century) occupation at sites Lv33 and Lv37, no historic material was collected or recorded in the site file, and it is unknown whether these sites were associated with the settlement of Clay Landing. In regard to the park’s other cultural resources, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection’s (FDEP) current Unit Management Plan for MSSP (2004: 23) included the following statement:

Because it contains a first magnitude spring and because it borders the Suwannee River, an important transportation corridor and productive river, Manatee Springs State Park is likely to contain additional important historical and archaeological sites. However, no comprehensive cultural resource survey has been performed in the park, so the true extent of cultural resources there remains unknown.

In an effort to jump-start cultural resource activities within the park, and at the same time, contribute valuable information to this study, I conducted a preliminary cultural landscape survey of areas within MSSP associated with the community of Clay Landing. Analysis of Clay Landing’s cultural landscape has the potential to shed new light on this lost historic community, as well as provide a vital component to future archaeological investigation. This chapter outlines the cultural landscape survey of Clay Landing, presents the data that was observed, and discusses how this new information relates to the current study.

In his *Historical Archaeology of the Modern World*, Orser (1996: 138) argued that the “concept of a cultural landscape is not mutualistic…because it gives supreme preeminence to culture.” This is not the case here. Chapter II has established that the community of Clay Landing was created by actual individuals and the relationships they
chose to create and maintain. This cultural landscape analysis of Clay Landing will not treat “culture” as “a mysterious thing that hovered over” settlers, as Orser (1996:138) feared; but rather, as the observable manifestation of these past networks of interaction.

In defining the cultural landscape for the purposes of this study, I have chosen to use the National Park Service’s (Birnbaum 1995:2) definition of the historic vernacular landscape, which is:

A landscape that evolved through use by the people whose activities or occupancy shaped that landscape. Through social or cultural attitudes of the individual, family or a community, the landscape reflects the physical, biological, and cultural character of those everyday lives.

THE PROJECT

The cultural landscape survey of Clay Landing was conducted under the auspices of Gulf Archaeology Research Institute (GARI). GARI Director, Gary Ellis, served as supervising archaeologist in the field, with myself as primary field investigator, and MSSP Park Ranger Andrew Moody as field guide and volunteer investigator. The purpose of the cultural landscape survey was:

1. to locate, identify, and record possible archaeological sites associated with the mid-nineteenth century community of Clay Landing located within MSSP boundaries.
2. to document the existing condition of the landscape, its continuity and change, and examine how the cultural landscape reflects past networks of social and economic relationships at Clay Landing.
3. to prove Clay Landing’s cultural and historical significance, and provide a stepping-stone toward further archaeological investigation and historic preservation of its associated sites.

The survey was only able to include those sites associated with Clay Landing located within park boundaries. Therefore, the Brownlow and Tresper properties depicted in Section 13-11S-13E and the northern half of Section 24-11S-13E, located on private property outside the park, were not addressed in the survey. The project area was limited to Sections 25 and 26, and the southern half of Section 24, of Levy County T 11S, R 13E, represented in USGS Quad Maps: Fanning Springs, and Manatee Springs. Due to time and cost constraints, survey work was further limited to specific areas within the project area where probability of occupation was supported by evidence gathered during research and analysis of historical and ethnographic resources (i.e., the properties of Edmond Shackleford, Sylvester Bryant, and Isaac P. Hardee).

METHODOLOGY

The project concentrated on four probable homestead sites, identified as: Shackleford Homestead, Bryant Homestead, Bryant #2 Homestead, and Hardee Homestead (see Figure 3.1). Sites selected for the survey were located using a compass and measuring wheel in combination with historic map analysis, historic surveyor notes, and the wilderness/tracking expertise of the field surveyor and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection field guide, MSSP Park Ranger Moody. Survey work in the field was limited to five days, and was conducted between October 15 and November 16, 2007. Survey of the sites was non-invasive. Field techniques were based on observation
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only, and consisted of locating and recording remains of past human activity via manual note taking and mapping, photography, and GPS. Such “remains” included: artifacts visible on the ground surface; historical boundaries, field and road signatures; and defining landscape characteristics, like abnormal variations in topography and vegetation.

In accordance with permitted activity, no cultural or biological materials were collected or removed from state property. All observed data was carefully recorded, photographed, and positioned using GPS, so that it could be inventoried, analyzed, and accurately mapped at a later date. All findings were included in necessary FMSF forms and a final comprehensive report (currently in progress) to be submitted to the state with recommendations for future investigation, treatment, and preservation.

ECOLOGICAL CONTEXT

The region of north-central Florida consists of porous limestone (or karst) geology, and is largely made up of upland ridges, highlands, and hammocks, and to a lesser extent, interior flatwoods and coastal lowlands (Main and Allen 2007). The region contains numerous natural communities of temperate southern hardwood species, as well as pine dominated forest, and scrub habitats. In terms of hydrology, the area is characterized by a number of rivers, flowing from northern swamplands southward to the Gulf of Mexico, as well as various spring systems.

MSSP is located within the Gulf Coastal Lowlands, a region distinguished by its “remarkable karst topography” of Pleistocene epoch limestone formations, and the resulting system of rivers, underground streams, sinks, and springs (FDEP 2004: 10; Main and Allen 2007). The Suwannee River forms the park’s western boundary. This
river is the second largest in Florida, flowing 245 miles from Georgia’s Okefenokee Swamp to the Gulf of Mexico, with a drainage basin of over 1,000 square miles (Main and Allen 2007). Manatee Spring, the park’s namesake, is a first magnitude spring, and contributes an average of 180 cubic feet per second to the river’s flow (FDEP 2004: 13). In addition to the river and spring, MSSP also contains a number of smaller “surface-water bodies” caused by sinkholes, and the swamp lake, Shacklefoot Pond (ibid).

Florida’s Gulf Coastal Lowlands are remarkably flat, and the variations in levels of elevation within MSSP are minor. The FDEP recorded elevation ranges from less than 5 feet National Geodetic Vertical Datum (NGVD) in the Suwannee floodplain swamps, to 25 feet NGVD at the parks highest knoll (2004: 10). The park contains eleven distinct soil types, ranging from sandy, well drained, upland soils, to poorly drained swamp soils (ibid: 11). The most prevalent soil type in the park is the Otela-Tavares complex. This soil type is present at all of the four sites included in the survey. The Otela-Tavares complex, common in the karst uplands, consists of very deep, moderately well drained, sandy soils, with 1% to 5% slopes (ibid: 12, Addendum 3-3).

The FDEP recorded sixteen distinct natural communities present in MSSP (2004: 16). Of these communities, the most widespread is the upland pine forest, which covers 756.90 of the park’s 2,443 acres (ibid: 17). Two of the sites surveyed, the Bryant Homestead and the Bryant #2 Homestead, lie within this community. The upland pine community is characterized by widely spaced pine with a relative lack of understory shrubs, and a dense ground cover of grasses and various herbaceous plants (Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) and the Florida Department of Natural Resources (DNR) 1990: 17). Longleaf pine and wiregrasses are dominant in pristine areas; whereas
loblolly, shortleaf, and slash pines combined with field grass and herb ground cover are indicative of disturbed areas. Temperate hardwood species, including various species of oak, are also present (ibid).

The Hardee Homestead site is situated within upland pine forest that is succeeding to upland mixed forest. This community is often associated with upland pine, and contains many of the same species found in the upland pine community. As a result, the two are virtually indistinguishable, especially during early succession. At MSSP, upland pine serves as a “broad transition zone” between the elevated sandhill communities and the upland mixed communities near the lowlands of the swamp (FDEP 2004: 18). The principal difference between the two communities is evident in the tree canopy. The upland mixed forest is characterized by “well-developed” hardwoods and a densely closed canopy (FNAI and Florida DNR 1990: 16).

The Shackleford Homestead is located within bottomland forest that is bounded at the northwest by basin swamp, and at the southeast by upland pine. According to the FNAI (1990: 33), “Bottomland Forest is characterized as a low-lying, closed-canopy forest of tall, straight trees with either a dense shrubby understory and little ground cover, or an open understory and ground cover of ferns, herbs, and grasses.” This bottomland forest occurred due to the nearby depression, or basin, of Shacklefoot Pond, located to the northeast of the site.

Bottomland communities are common in these low-lying areas where the water table is relatively high, but there is little occurrence of complete inundation. Such conditions allow for typical upland plant species to thrive (FNAI 1990: 33). Characteristic species of bottomland forest are therefore, similar to the upland pine and
mixed communities, and contain a number of oak and pine varieties, as well as magnolia, cedar, and maple (ibid). The FNAI (1990: 33) states that, “Bottomland Forest is a very stable community that requires a hundred years or more to mature.” MSSP’s bottomland community displays a lack of mature growth. According to the FDEP (2004: 19), this is a result of logging activities that occurred during the first half of the 20th century.

Historic logging and turpentine production, in combination with the historic agricultural activities of field crop cultivation and livestock grazing throughout Florida’s history, have had drastic influences on the characteristics of MSSP’s natural landscape. These historical impacts have resulted in the encroachment of upland mixed forest into the once pristine, upland pine forest (FDEP 2004: 18). Historically, upland pine had been the dominant natural community in MSSP, with longleaf pine as the prevailing species. Logging removed virtually all of the park’s virgin longleaf pine. While secondary growth of longleaf pine is present, the upland pine community has been invaded by loblolly pines and other hardwood species (ibid: 19).

Historical agriculture also had severe impacts on the forest floor. The FDEP (2004: 19) stated that throughout MSSP’s upland pine community, “the native groundcover plant diversity is very low, with certain indicator species such as wiregrass…completely absent.” The FNAI (1990: 18) explained the phenomenon as follows:

Upland Pine Forests have been substantially degraded throughout their range. The sandy clay soils were prime agricultural lands for plantations as well as for American Indians. Thus, the longleaf pines were logged, the soil was turned, and the wiregrass disappeared. Only isolated tracts of the original longleaf pine-wiregrass association remain, the bulk being replaced by loblolly-shortleaf pine associations.
In an attempt to restore the park’s natural communities and maintain its ecological diversity, the management at MSSP established a natural fire regime (FDEP 2004: 31). Although the implementation of seasonal prescribed burns has helped to forestall trends of succession, and re-establish native groundcover species in some areas, historical impacts of human occupation are still observable throughout the park.

SITE ANALYSES

It is clear that the existing landscape of MSSP is very different from the one experienced by the mid-nineteenth century settlers of Clay Landing. However, it is also apparent that modifications to the historic landscape, caused by the implementation of the choices and actions made by those settlers were, in part, responsible for creating the current landscape. Observations of the existing landscape of MSSP juxtaposed with analysis of A.H. Jones’ 1849 plat map (Figure 2.3) of Clay Landing, and accompanying survey notes, make it possible to elucidate aspects of landscape continuity and change. Examination of these changes illuminates the cultural landscape of Clay Landing, and helps one to better understand the attitudes, activities, and relationships of the individuals who shaped that landscape.

Bryant Homestead

As aforementioned in Chapter II, Sylvester Bryant, Sr. and his son, owned the land containing the three structures depicted in Section 25, and the cultivated areas in Sections 25, 26, and 35, of Jones’ 1849 map (State of Florida Tract Books, Vol. 12: 275-282). Two of the three homestead sites were located during this survey. The first, located in the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of Section 25, identified here as
The Bryant Homestead, occupied the first parcel of land to be purchased in Levy County Township 11S, Range 13E. Sylvester Bryant Sr. originally purchased it on November 17, 1851, just seven months after it was offered for sale by the state. Original tract book records of the property’s deed holder depict “Jr.” written in block letters atop the original “Sr.,” indicating that at some point however, the land was conveyed to Sylvester Bryant, Jr. (*State of Florida Tract Books, Vol. 12: 275-282*).

The Bryant Homestead structure depicted in Jones’ map was the largest of the three Bryant dwellings. This difference in size could indicate that the structure was physically larger in comparison with the others, suggesting that it was the home of Sylvester Bryant, Sr., and the primary family dwelling. It should be noted however, that all the structures represented on the map are identical in composition, and it is possible that the size variation by the artist was non-deliberate.

The homestead was located adjacent to the main Clay Landing road, on the road’s west side. Unlike most of the other dwellings depicted on the Clay Landing map, the Bryant Homestead was situated a significant distance away from its associated agricultural fields. Two of the agricultural fields owned by the Bryant’s were located to the structure’s southwest, below Manatee Spring, and to the northwest, along a cypress swamp. The latter was labeled, “Bryant’s Field,” on the map. In his survey notes, Jones (1849: South Boundary Section No. 26) described the area surrounding the Bryant Homestead and Bryant’s Field as, “Pine and Oak land – [that] Equals 1st rate pine in quality.”

As it exists within the current landscape, the Bryant Homestead site (see Figure 3.2) is located on the south side of State Road 320, just east of MSSP’s Youth Camp area.
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FIGURE 3.3 Saw palmetto stand marking the likely location of the Bryant dwelling. Photo taken 100' to east, facing southwest.

FIGURE 3.4 Linear topographical depression running north-south, indicating possible road signature of historical Lt. Long’s Road. Photo taken facing south.
In contrast to the first rate pine forest noted by Jones, the site’s present natural community, though classified as upland pine forest, has succeeded to secondary pine and oak growth. The site’s understory is markedly open compared to the surrounding forest, and consists mainly of smaller, tree-like, varieties of oak scrub. The groundcover contains sporadic growth of various types of grasses.

While all of these topographical characteristics are indicative of historic agricultural disturbance, they are nonspecific in regard to the exact nature of the disturbance. The homestead site’s defining feature is an extremely dense saw palmetto stand of approximately 100 feet in circumference, located on an area of slightly elevated ground (see Figure 3.3). The appearance of this stand is intriguing, as palmetto species are not characteristic of upland pine communities. The presence of such atypical growth suggests a significant historic disturbance to the specific area. The size of the palmetto stand, and its positioning on the site’s highest ground, further suggests that the disturbance was caused by the presence of a dwelling.

Florida’s climate, coupled with Clay Landing’s low terrain and close proximity to the Suwannee River, would have caused occasional flooding throughout the settlement. The possibility of inundation would have made it imperative for settlers to position their homes atop the highest possible ground. The elevated palmetto area would have been a logical location for the placement of the Bryant Homestead.

Inspection of the site’s ground surface revealed the presence of slight depressions in topography of approximately ten feet in width, located 100 feet to the east, and to the northwest of the palmetto stand. These depressions appear to be historic road signatures and run north-south, and northeast-southwest, respectively. The depressions intersect
320 feet to the north of the palmetto growth. Jones’ 1849 map depicts the Bryant homestead adjacent to the west side of the main road, historically referred to as Lt. Long’s Road, or the Post No. 4 Road. It is possible that the north-south road signature located to the east of the palmetto stand is evidence of that road (see Figure 3.4). The northeast-southwest depression may be the remnant of a local access road. Based upon the road’s southwestern bearing, it is plausible that the access road served to link the Bryant’s agricultural fields near the spring, to the homestead and main road. Although he did not depict it on his map, Jones’ survey notes for the western boundary of Section 25 indicate the presence of a “road to spring” (1849: West Boundary Section No. 25). A series of other slight depressions were observed north of the homestead, adjacent to the northwest of this road. These depressions could be evidence of some sort of roundabout, or wagon turnaround, and may be indicative of the location of a possible outbuilding.

Unfortunately, no archaeological surface materials were observed during the survey of the Bryant Homestead. MSSP is an extremely diverse and dynamic natural environment; and factors like drastic weather changes, various plant growth cycles, animal activity, and deep sandy soils, all contribute to the low probability of surface artifact discovery. The ground surface of the Bryant Homestead site is barely visible due to a dense layer of organic debris (i.e., fallen leaves and pine needles) that covers the forest floor. Further, more intensive, sub-surface survey work in which the groundcover is stripped, is necessary in order to assess the site’s data potential. Additional examination of the palmetto stand is also required, as surface investigation of the area was not possible due to the extreme density of growth and the presence of shed rattlesnake skins, indicating the likelihood of a rattlesnake nest. Another Bryant
homestead, the smallest of the three depicted on the 1849 plat, located just north of the site, was not included in the survey due to rattlesnake infestation. This survey was conducted during extremely warm temperatures. Further survey work should be conducted in the cooler winter months, when rattlesnakes are dormant, in order to alleviate the danger of serious injury.

*Bryant Homestead #2*

A second Bryant Homestead, owned by Sylvester Bryant, Jr., and depicted at the northernmost center of Section 25 on the 1849 plat, was included in the survey. Bryant purchased the land tract on December 26, 1855 (*State of Florida Tract Books, Vol. 12: 275-282*). According to the plat, the homestead consisted of a dwelling situated at the northwestern corner of an agricultural field. Of the four variations of the 1849 plat located during research, two placed the Bryant structure on the main Clay Landing Road’s west side, while the remaining two placed it on the east. However, Jones’ survey notes indicated a likely eastern placement. When surveying the section’s boundary from east to west, Jones encountered the house before reaching the road (1849: South Boundary Section No. 24). His notes further described the house as situated “5 chains,” or 330 feet, south of Section 24’s southern boundary line, and within “2nd rate pine and oak land” (ibid). Based upon Jones’ measurements, the area located just south of the intersection of MSSP’s Clay Trail and Shacklefoot Trail, in Section 25-11S-13E was designated as the Bryant Homestead #2 site.

This site is also characterized by upland pine forest, but in this case, the succession toward upland mixed forest is much further advanced. The community consists of pine and oak forest with very dense understory and ground cover. The site is
bisected by Shacklefoot Trail. Both the topography and forest structure are markedly
different on either side of the trail. The western side of Shacklefoot Trail is slightly
elevated and remarkably level. It displays a relatively dense canopy of pine and oak, and
a dense understory of oak and various shrubs. The groundcover is extremely dense and
contains a large variety of grasses, including wiregrass, and herbaceous plants.

The east side of Shacklefoot Trail, adjacent to the trail, continues at the same
elevation, and contains the same plant species and structure as the west. However, the
topography begins to slope approximately 110 feet east of the trail toward the east,
forming a slight depression. This depressed area runs parallel to the trail for nearly 450
feet. This area is characterized by a relatively open canopy with an extremely dense
groundcover of grasses, vines, and herbaceous plants, and an understory dominated by
large clusters of sabal palm. Sabal palm is more characteristic of upland mixed forest,
and is not typically found in upland pine communities.

Advanced succession and the diversity of plant species throughout the site are
clearly indicative of past agricultural disturbance. However, no specific characteristics of
the Bryant homestead were discernable. Analysis of the topography revealed an elevated
and level area on Shacklefoot Trail’s west side that extended slightly past the trail’s
eastern side. This area, which coincided with Jones’ placement of the Bryant dwelling
330 feet south of Section 24’s southern boundary, is a probable location for the
homestead. The extreme density of the site’s groundcover precluded any discovery of
surface artifacts. Further examination of the site’s ground surface, perhaps after a
prescribed burn of the area has removed the understory and groundcover obstruction, is
necessary to determine the site’s significance.
Shackleford Homestead

Edmond Shackleford owned the land that contained the homestead illustrated in the center of Section 24 of the 1849 plat. He acquired it from Isaac P. Hardee, who had received the land in a grant for military service during the Second Seminole War. The homestead was depicted to the west of the main road, and contained an agricultural field with a dwelling situated to the south.

The Shackleford Homestead site, as it exists presently, is located within the bottomland forest community that borders the southwestern basin of Shacklefoot Pond. The similarity in the name of the pond to the nineteenth century owner of the property is obvious. “Shacklefoot” is most likely, an historical corruption of the surname Shackleford. Interestingly, the pond and its surrounding basin were not illustrated on the historic plat. It is conceivable that the depression could have been caused by a sinkhole that had not yet occurred when the map was drawn. However, the FDEP (2004: 13) has classified the pond as a “swamp lake,” a water body that was not the result of a sinkhole. It is more likely that the pond’s absence on the map was a result of neglect on the part of the surveyor. Historical surveyors were paid based upon the amount of acreage surveyed. As a result, they often engaged in somewhat slap-dash surveying practices – like surveying only the border lines of sections, and relying on word of mouth, or previous survey results, to fill in the vast acres in between. It is imperative, due to such circumstances, to treat historical map evidence with some degree of skepticism.

The species present at the Shackleford Homestead site are similar to those found at the Bryant Homestead #2 site. The forest consists mainly of various oak species and to a lesser extent pine, with a relatively dense canopy. The canopy is not fully closed, as is
characteristic of bottomland forest, because the trees present are not fully mature. The
understory is open, and the ground cover, when present, consists of clusters of grass and
herbs. The site (see Figure 3.5) is bounded on the east and west by elevated ridges. The
southwestern quadrant of the site is level, and at the same elevation as the western ridge.
A low-lying, seasonal cypress pond (see Figure 3.6) abuts the ridge to the west. This
level area, by virtue of its elevation, is protected from possible flooding or inundation that
may be caused by the seasonal pond, or the nearby Shacklefoot Pond. As such, it is the
most rational location for the Shackleford dwelling. Although the level area is virtually
clear of grass and underbrush, the thickness of organic debris (i.e., decomposing fallen
trees and leaf litter) that covers the ground surface inhibits the probability of surface
artifact discovery.

The remainder of the site’s topography gradually slopes from these elevated areas
toward a depressed area in the northeastern portion of the site. This depressed area
contains the site’s defining feature, which is characterized by a rectangular shaped,
growth of dog-fennel (see Figure 3.7), approximately 120 feet wide by 250 feet long.
Although dog-fennel is a species typically found in bottomland communities, the near
geometric pattern of this growth seems to suggest historic disturbance, and the possible
presence of an historical agricultural field. Slight topographical depressions observable
running parallel to the field’s south and west sides, seem to support this, and may be
indicative of an historical access road.

A caveat should be interjected here. Throughout the twentieth century, various
areas of MSSP had been logged for commercial purposes. Aerial photographs taken of
the park in 1961 have shown the area surrounding the Shackleford Homestead site as
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**FIGURE 3.5**

Shackelford Homestead Site
Located within Bottomland Forest with immature Oak and Pine structure

Geometric pattern of dog-fennel growth at bottom of gradual slope indicating possible agricultural field

Elevated ridge

Low-lying seasonal Cypress pond at bottom of slope

Depressions indicating possible access road

Probable homestead location on elevated level area

**FIGURE 3.6** The seasonal cypress pond that bounds the site to the west. Photo taken from the site’s elevated western ridge, facing west.

**FIGURE 3.7** Rectangular shaped growth of dog-fennel may be indicative of an historical agricultural field. Photo taken from southeast corner of field, facing west.
having been clear-cut. Therefore, it is possible that the defining landscape characteristics observed in the dog-fennel field and possible road signatures, occurred not as a result of historical agricultural disturbance, but rather, as an effect of these later topographical disturbances to the site. Though not necessarily negating the historic map and document evidence that a nineteenth century homestead existed at the Shackleford Homestead site, such impacts make the landscape characteristics that are indicative of the Shackleford Homestead more difficult to identify and interpret.

In the specific case of the Shackleford Homestead site, landscape analysis alone is insufficient to determine historical occupation and elucidate the nature of human activity. No archaeological materials were observed during ground surface investigation, and modern logging impacts to the site’s topography have likely tainted any observable characteristic of historic agricultural disturbance. Sub-surface testing, in the form of core sampling or shovel testing, is necessary to confirm mid-nineteenth century occupation of the site and its possible association with the community of Clay Landing.

Hardee Homestead

Florida tract records indicated that Isaac P. Hardee owned the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 24, and the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of Section 25-11S-13E (State of Florida Tract Books, Vol. 12: 280-281). Pedestrian reconnaissance of this area revealed the presence of two historic fat lighter-pine markers at the northeast and northwest corners of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 24-11S-13E. These markers are believed to be the original northern boundary markers of Isaac P. Hardee’s property. The markers are tapered into the ground, approximately 1.5 feet in height, and are four sided (see Figure 3.8). Each side is
FIGURE 3.8 Original fat lighter pine boundary marker (pictured left of an early-20th century concrete marker) marking the northeast corner of Isaac P. Hardee's property.

FIGURE 3.9 Cut stumps marking the western boundary of Isaac P. Hardee’s property.

FIGURE 3.10 The Hardee Homestead site displays an open canopy and insubstantial understory inconsistent with the surrounding natural community. Photo taken approximately 100' to the northwest of the site, facing southeast.
engraved (i.e., 1/4, 4/8, 3/4, 3/4) marking its placement in relation to its position within the 40-acre quarters of Section 24, as well as its position in relation to the Township and Range plat. The 4/8 engraved on the markers’ southern façade indicates the boundary of the fourth lot west, and eighth lot south, of the northern boundary of the 11S-13E plat. Two cuts stumps (see Figure 3.9) were also located, and are believed to mark the western boundary of Hardee’s property.

Hardee purchased the land on November 30, 1860, but documentary evidence and family histories discussed in Chapter II, indicated that he had been living there as early as the late 1840’s. Although the homestead of Isaac P. Hardee was not depicted on Jones’ 1849 plat, his land tract was illustrated as an open clearing, cut from the surrounding hammock. One of the State Archives’ variations of the 1849 plat contained the name “Isaac P. Hardee,” written over this area.

Hardee descendants believe the Clay Landing homestead was abandoned due to poor environmental conditions, and its close proximity to the Suwannee floodplain and swamp. This hypothesis is supported by Jones’ (1849: West Boundary Section No. 25) survey notes of the area, which describe the lands to the west of the homestead as cypress swamp and “2nd rate hammock and oak land.” The areas north and east of the homestead consisted of pine and oak (Jones 1849: South Boundary Section No. 24).

The Hardee Homestead site is located in the far northwest corner of Section 25-11S-13E, approximately 226 feet southeast of MSSP’s Scenic Trail. The site lies within an area of upland pine forest that has succeeded to upland mixed forest. The natural community consists of a well-developed forest, dominated by varieties of oak, including turkey, laurel, bluejack, and live, interspersed with slash pine and some sabal palm. The
tree canopy is largely closed, and both the understory and groundcover are extremely
dense. The plant life present in these areas is diverse, but predominantly characterized by
oak, and various herbs and field grasses. An atypically open canopy, and insubstantial
understory when compared to the surrounding forest, makes the site immediately
observable from the park trail (see Figure 3.10). These landscape anomalies are an
obvious indication of historical disturbance.

Analysis of the site’s topography revealed a slightly elevated, level area extending
approximately 100 feet northeast, by 120 feet southeast (see Figure 3.11). The level area
is comprised of three different zones of vegetation. The southeastern section of the area
contains few mature trees, but a dense growth of tall field grass. The center of the area is
characterized by live oak scrub interspersed with well-developed oak and pine. The
northwestern portion of the site is remarkable clear of mature tree growth, but contains a
moderate groundcover of various grasses and small plants concentrated around the area’s
perimeter. There is a linear depression in the site’s topography approximately 78.5 feet
east of the level area’s northwestern corner. This depression, which runs northwest-
southeast, may be indicative of an historical local access road.

Ground surface investigation of the level area revealed a number of
archaeological materials, including: two partially burned, wooden rails or beams with
iron nails present (see Figure 3.12); a partially burned brick fragment; a stoneware sherdi
(see Figure 3.13); and two fragments of blue-green bottle glass. Such architectural and
household items, in correlation with the observable landscape characteristics, suggest the
past existence of a dwelling on the site. Fire damage and weathering have made it
impossible to determine whether the wooden beams present are indicative of a cabin, out
FIGURE 3.11
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FIGURE 3.12 One of the historic wooden beams located in the clearing within the site's level area, containing both square cut, and drawn iron nails.

FIGURE 3.13 One of two basal stoneware sherds located at the Hardee Homestead site.
building, or a fence. Although fences were not used in the area to delineate property, they were built around field crops and family gardens to keep out livestock. The diagnostic features of the nails found within the wood indicate a significant range of use during which improvements could have been made to the structure/fence. The beams contain two square headed, tapered shaft, cut nails, and five flat, round headed, drawn nails. The square cut iron nails have an approximate date range between 1810 and 1891, while the iron drawn nails have a terminus post quern of 1879 (Wells 1998: 332). The fire damage to the wood does not appear to be historic, but rather the results of a prescribed, seasonal burn of the surrounding forest. The blackened brick, however, does appear to have been burnt through use. It is possible that the burnt brick is evidence of a cabin’s fireplace. In her book, Verrill (1976: 138) described “the first Hardee plantation home,” as a two-story, log and clay structure, with “large fireplaces.”

Two clusters of surface artifacts were also discovered just outside the level area, located on a gentle slope 14 feet west of the clearing’s northwest corner, and 19 feet west of its southwest corner. The contents of these groupings, identified respectively as Clusters 1 and 2, are listed below in Table 3.1. Cluster 1 (see Figure 3.14) is comprised of household items of stove and kettle parts, and a fragment of stoneware, as well as architectural brick fragments. Cluster 2 (see Figure 3.15) is made up entirely of activity related items, with the exception of one household item, a glass liquor bottle.

All of the artifacts present in Cluster 2 are remarkably well preserved and intact, and all (apart from the glass bottle) are consistent with mid-nineteenth century frontier agriculture and lifeways. The wagon wheel is of obvious importance to any rural environment. The crosscut saw (see Figure 3.15) was also a very important tool.
TABLE 3.1
HARDEE HOMESTEAD ARTIFACT INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLUSTER 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettle spout</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Cast iron; L- 6.5&quot;, W- 4&quot;, D- 1&quot;; forked mouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stove fragment</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Cast iron stove door fragment; L- 6.5&quot;, W- 5&quot;; 0.25&quot; raised detailing and hinge on reverse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stove fragment</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Cast iron stove door fragment; L- 6.5&quot;, W- 4.5&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stove fragment</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Cast iron stove door fragment; L- 5.5&quot;, W- 4.5&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron; possible stove pipe flashing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Perforated strip of unknown metal, L- 11.5&quot;, W- 2.5&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Unknown metal fragment, L- 3.5&quot;, W- 3.25&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick fragment</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Orange/red; mold made; visible trowel striations; L- 2.5&quot;, W- 2.25&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick fragment</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Orange/red; partially burned; L- 2.75&quot;, W- 2.25&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick fragment</td>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Yellow/orange; mold made; visible trowel striations; partially burned; L- 4.5&quot;, W- 4&quot;, Th- 2.5&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware sherd</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Basal fragment; buff/grey body; salt-glazed; dark brown interior wash; L- 9&quot;, H- 3&quot;; Th- 0.25&quot;</td>
<td>1705 - 1930 (Miller 2000: 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLUSTER 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagon wheel rim</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron; D- 53&quot;, W- 1.5&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagon wheel hub</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron; D- 5.25&quot;, W- 1.5&quot;; partial nail attached at center, 0.25&quot; hole on opposing side</td>
<td>Early 19th to mid-20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plow/Cultivator share</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron; large shovel shaped blade L- 8.5&quot;, W- 8&quot;; 1&quot; square hole at top, center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plow/Cultivator share</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron; small shovel shaped blade L- 7&quot;, W- 3.5&quot;; 1&quot; square hole at top, center; broken tip</td>
<td>Early 19th to mid-20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw blade</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Cross-cut saw blade L- 64&quot;, W- 5.25&quot;; alternating teeth W- 0.75&quot; and 0.25&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Clear; intact, H- 9&quot;, W- 3.75&quot;; mold-made; flat body; &quot;FULL PINT&quot; embossed below neck; &quot;G WINE 2&quot; embossed on base</td>
<td>Post-1906 (Federal Food and Drug Act of 1906)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spike</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron; L- 13&quot;; D- 1&quot;; round shaft; 2 sided, tapered point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L= length, H=height, W=width, Th=thickness, D=diameter
Concentrated cluster of household and architectural materials located 14' west of the northwest corner of the site's level area.

Selected artifacts from Cluster 1, clockwise from top left: cast iron stove door fragment with raised detailing and hinge on reverse; cast iron stove door fragment with raised detailing; cast iron kettle spout; basal sherd of buff/grey bodied stoneware with dark brown interior wash and salt glaze; partially burned, yellow/orange brick fragment, mold made with visible trowel striations; perforated strip of unidentified metal.
Concentrated cluster of activity related and household materials located 19’ west of the southwest corner of the site’s level area.

Selected artifacts from Cluster 2, clockwise from top left: crosscut saw blade; “FULL PINT” embossed glass liquor bottle; iron spike; iron wagon wheel hub rim; small iron shovel plow share; large iron shovel plow share.
According to Alex Bealer (1976: 36) in his book, *The Tools That Built America*, the crosscut saw, “though not essential...enabled the pioneer jack-of-all-trades to cut the logs for his cabin more easily than by ax alone, and it made the jobs of trimming the ends of logs for neat corners, and shaping dovetails, much quicker and easier.” The two shovel-shaped, plow blades, or “shares” (see Figure 3.15), that were located, are characteristic of a double-shovel plow, or cultivator, as they were often used in both capacities.

Introduced during the early nineteenth century, the double-shovel plow soon became the “most widely used horse-drawn cultivator,” and was extremely popular in the cultivation of corn (Hardeman 1981: 88). The presence of shovel cultivator shares is significant because it provides an insight into the types of crops that were being cultivated at Clay Landing, and supports the assertion made in Chapter II, that corn was likely an important crop within the community of Clay Landing.

Most of the identifiable artifacts within the Hardee Homestead assemblage are comparable to items listed in the inventory of property recorded after Isaac P. Hardee’s death. A number of items, including: “one buggy...one cross cut saw...one cooking stove...one wagon,” and various plows and sets of “plow gear,” are incredibly similar to many of the materials found at the Hardee site. Others, however, suggest a broad period of occupation of the site, ranging from the early nineteenth to the early twentieth century. Although this timeframe is consistent with the historical context of Clay Landing, the presence of late-nineteenth and twentieth century artifacts (i.e., post-1906 Pure Food and Drug Act glass bottle; post-1879 flat headed, round shaft nails; and unidentified metal) at the site is puzzling. Historical records and Hardee family history, provided by Isaac’s descendants, indicated that he left the Clay Landing homestead sometime after 1861, and
established the small sub-division of Chiefland, called Hardeetown, nearby. Further research into Hardee family history has revealed that Isaac B. Hardee (son of Isaac P. Hardee) briefly re-established a Clay Landing post office from October 14, 1874 to March 10, 1875 (Verrill 1976: 70). It is possible that during that time, he returned to the family’s original homestead at Clay Landing. On April 27, 1903, Albert P. Hardee, Isaac P. Hardee’s grandson, purchased the eastern lots adjacent to the original Hardee land in Sections 23 and 26-11S-13E (*State of Florida Tract Books*, Vol. 12: 280-281). Whether or not he lived on the property is unknown, but it is possible that he too spent time at the former homestead. Hardee descendants also maintain that the land continued to be used, as late as the early 1900’s, for family recreation and hunting.

The dense concentration of surface artifacts in two specific areas of the site suggests that that the materials were deliberately placed. It is possible that the groupings of artifacts were refuse piles arranged by the later occupants, or visitors to the site, who had attempted to clear the yard of accumulated debris. Such an activity would account for the artifacts’ deposition, and the mixing of mid-nineteenth and early twentieth century cultural materials. Further archaeological investigation and subsurface testing of the Hardee Homestead will likely yield a greater representation of nineteenth century deposits, uncompromised by later occupations.

**SUMMARY**

Through analysis of the continuity and change in the natural landscape of Manatee Springs State Park, this study succeeded in identifying four potential archaeological sites associated with the historic community of Clay Landing. While
dense organic debris and leaf litter has obstructed the ground surface throughout the project area and precluded discovery of cultural materials at most of the sites, historical disturbances were discernable through various defining landscape characteristics. The Hardee Homestead site however, yielded a significant amount of nineteenth century surface artifacts that could be associated with the mid-nineteenth century community of Clay Landing. These materials are indicative of rural nineteenth century frontier lifeways, and provide an interesting insight into the daily lives of the individuals who lived at the site.

While very little regarding the social and economic relationships established by these individuals could be explicated through this cursory survey, it is my hope that this study will serve as a stepping-stone toward further archaeological research of these sites. This study presages a formal archaeological investigation of Clay Landing, and sets the stage for more formalized work that should focus on the problems and issues that archaeology could address, in this case: the reflection of past social and economic relationships and regional, national, and international networks of interaction that are observable through material culture.
CHAPTER IV
CONCLUDING REMARKS

Using a mutualistic, global perspective, this thesis has investigated the historical and cultural development of the community of Clay Landing. It has addressed the ways in which global processes influenced and shaped the landscape of the north-central Florida frontier, making the settlement of Clay Landing possible. Through the integrated analysis of secondary historical sources, primary documentary evidence, oral histories, and a preliminary archaeological landscape survey, this study looked mutualistically at Clay Landing’s community as it existed during the mid-nineteenth century, and elucidated some of the social and economic relationships that individuals within that community created and maintained. In doing so, it has shown that Clay Landing was a dynamic community of real individuals that was – by virtue of its very existence and subsistence – connected to the wider modern world.

In his early argument for historical archaeology’s adoption of a global perspective, James Deetz (1977: 5) said that:

When the first European sailing ships set out for distant parts of the world, a chain of events was set into motion. Two worlds that had been separate from each other for millennia suddenly were brought into close contact, with spectacular and often catastrophic results.

This “chain of events” set in motion by European expansion in the fifteenth century made the settlement and development of Clay Landing in the nineteenth century possible. The European nations of Spain and Britain were directly responsible for
establishing the foundations of infrastructure, agriculture, industry, and trade networks that nineteenth century Americans would later build upon. Nearly every facet of Clay Landing’s existence – its position on the main commercial thoroughfare of the Suwannee River, its participation in corn cultivation and supplemental cash crops, and its exploitation of slave labor, can be linked to early Spanish and British endeavors. Those that cannot, for example: the systematic removal of the native population, and the incentives offered on the purchase of land which enabled the initial growth of the settlement, were still the result of outside agency on the part of the United States.

Conveying the global nature of the modern world in which Clay Landing existed was not the only objective of this study. This argument was intended as a touchstone for the analysis of the Clay Landing community itself, to gain a better understanding of the individuals living within that community, and the social and economic relationships they developed as an attempt to establish and maintain a place in the modern world. While various local networks and relationships were revealed through historical research, the deficiency of the historic record in its failure to represent a significant portion of Clay Landing’s population – the non-landed individuals, slaves, and women and children – made it difficult to fully understand the nature of these networks.

In order to adequately understand the complexities of Clay Landing’s community and the ways in which that community developed ties to larger networks throughout the region, nation, and world, a formal archaeological investigation of the sites located and identified during the cultural landscape survey of Clay Landing, must be conducted. As aforementioned, Adams (1977) has argued that networks of interaction on regional, national, and international scales, are best examined through archaeology. Analysis of
Clay Landing’s material culture, which can only be accessed through subsurface testing and excavation, will reveal much about the depth and breadth of these networks, as well as contribute new information to those relationships established within the community itself.

In regard to recommendations for future research of Clay Landing, I would argue that there is much work to be done. Clay Landing was one of possibly hundreds of nineteenth century frontier communities that once existed in north-central Florida. To my knowledge, none of these settlements, that were once so vital to Florida’s development, have been studied archaeologically. Most, like Clay Landing, have been lost to history. Further archaeological study of the cultural landscape of Clay Landing has the potential to provide unprecedented information to the study of settlement and socioeconomics in nineteenth century north-central Florida, as well as offering new insight into the lifeways of rural frontier communities in the modern world.

Further investigation at Clay Landing also has the potential to give voice to the portion of the community that the historical record has rendered silent, namely: enslaved African-Americans, non-landed whites, women, and children. Although most of the individuals at Clay Landing owned few slaves, or none at all, the enslaved population at Clay Landing was still sizeable. The exact number of enslaved individuals present at Clay Landing is unknown. However, probate records for Sylvester Bryant, Sr. and Edmond Shackleford, recorded in 1857, indicated forty-seven slaves owned between these two individuals (Probate Records 1847-1920, Probate B; Wills and Letters of Administration 1847-1859, Levy County, Book A: 88, Levy County Archives). The 1860 census, conducted three years later, recorded the white population of Clay Landing
as a mere fifty-three individuals. It is possible that the enslaved community of Clay Landing was equal in size to that of the white community. Survey work should be conducted to locate sites associated with the enslaved people of Clay Landing. Archaeological investigation of these areas could provide insight into the lifeways and identities of enslaved African-Americans on the Florida frontier, and help to elucidate the nature of the relationships these individuals established and maintained within the slave community, and with whites. The nature of Clay Landing as a community of small farmsteads where landholders owned relatively few slaves has the potential to shed new light on the differences that may have existed between large-plantation slavery and slavery on small farms.

The archaeological component of this study focused particularly, on locating the sites associated with Clay Landing that were supported by historic map and documentary analysis. As such, it was limited to the examination of those individuals who held a significant amount of personal property and owned the land on which they lived. Further archaeological survey of other areas in MSSP, may succeed in locating the homestead sites of those households that did not own land. In addition, historical research has shown that a small community of these non-landed individuals continued to live at Clay Landing well into the twentieth century. Analysis of these sites, and the material culture they yield could be beneficial in studies regarding issues of identity, possible class distinction, and socioeconomic class relationships on the Florida frontier throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Of the fifty-three white individuals living at Clay Landing in 1860, 43% were children and 28% (exactly half of the adult population) were women. Males may have
assumed the dominant roles in the community, but they by no means constituted the majority of the population. In many of the households that owned little or no slaves, women and children would have worked the land side by side with men. Further investigation of homestead sites and analysis of the material culture associated with Clay Landing can provide new information to studies of gender and identity, and the roles of women and children on the frontier. Analysis of the Bryant Homestead in particular, a household that was headed, after 1857, by its matriarch Elizabeth Bryant, may provide an important component to understanding women’s roles on the nineteenth century frontier.

The possibilities of future research agendas concerning the cultural landscape of Clay Landing and its historical community are virtually limitless. It is my hope that this study will provide the necessary first step toward further archaeological investigation that will prove that Clay Landing is an historically and culturally significant community that has much to offer, both to the study of the global nature of modern life, and to the history and heritage of Florida.
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