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I. Introduction

Jordan's Journey

Jordan's Point is a small prominence reaching out into the bottom of a broad bay formed in the confluence of the James and Appomattox Rivers. The south side of the James in this area is scalloped with the remnants of old meander scars and embayments formed over the past few thousand years. The headlands that frame these bays are locally known as "points", and these points, or peninsulas, were loci of some of the more interesting and important chapters of Tidewater Virginia's history. As these points go, Jordan's is a rather small one. But its role in history has been significant nonetheless, and its place in the history of Virginia archaeology is certain to loom large for many years to come.

This year, 1992, is the five hundredth anniversary of the meeting of Old and New World peoples. Archaeologists, anthropologists, historians and others have taken the occasion to re-think the consequences of what one scholar has called "The Columbian Exchange". Most archaeologists refer to the event, and the period, as "Contact". It is easy to mistakenly believe that the colonization of the New World by Europeans was simply the beginning of a glorious frontier expansion which led inexorably to the flowering of American culture. Conversely, others too facility view the contact between hemispheres as the launching of an era of cruel exploitation, slavery, and warfare. Each of these views contains some truth, and each is terribly short-sighted. The immense changes that began with the voyages of Columbus were rapidly felt around the world, and they continue to this day. No lives remain untouched by the exchange of cultures and their products, diseases and cures, atrocities and charities. The world was transformed nearly overnight, and the metamorphosis continues even as we re-evaluate the conjoined histories of diverse societies since 1492.

The nexus of exchange in Virginia is generally placed beginning in 1607, with the founding of the colony at Jamestown, or, by some, with the somewhat earlier Roanoke voyages and the Jesuit mission. It is possible - perhaps likely - that the footfalls of Columbus and his men on the islands of the Caribbean resounded in Virginia much earlier. There is some evidence that the Native American cultures met by Captains Smith and Newport in their early forays up the James were profoundly changed from those which had lived along these shores for many previous centuries. It is certain that, following 1607, life would never again be the same, either for those whose ancestors of many generations were buried here, or for those who crossed the Atlantic, voluntarily or otherwise, to venture in an untried game.
When Englishmen first saw Jordan's Point it probably was graced by the houses and fields of people they would call Weyanoke. A dozen or so years later a number of families, and several single men, mostly servants, established a "plantation" - a village, actually - on the point, and they called it "Jordan's Journey". They raised houses over the ground cleared by Indians for their own houses. They planted crops, many of which were plants borrowed from their Indian neighbors, and they cultivated fields cleared earlier by Indians for their own gardens. They erected barriers between themselves and the Native American peoples who surrounded, and far outnumbered, them: barriers of armor, a fortress palisade, walls of culture and custom. And yet they appear to have depended on their neighbors for many things. These foreigners, after all, were strangers, a small minority of displaced immigrants in a world filled with those whose ancestors had learned to live in this country over twelve millennia. The barriers did not shield either people from diseases to which their bodies had no immunity. The fences were low and the cultural buffers were permeable. The exchange transpired. Contact was inevitable, but it was also complex; its manifestations and nuances are difficult, today, to comprehend.

Archaeological site 44Pg302 comprises the remains of the household complex founded by Samuel Jordan, his wife Cicely, her daughters, and their adult male servants. For present purposes, we have estimated the dates of occupation of the site as encompassing the fifteen-year period between ca. 1620 and ca. 1635. In the 1620's, the new settlement of Jordan's Journey was one of the largest English enclaves in what was then referred to as "the upper parts" of James River, and was included within the corporation of Charles City. In 1619, Jordan was elected burgess to the first representative assembly in the English New World. In his 1624 history Captain John Smith described the Jordan's Journey community as having been fortified. We have uncovered the entire fort and the 11 buildings it enclosed.

Prior to the establishment of Jordan's Journey, the location had been the site of a substantial Indian settlement. The area was included within the territory of the Weyanoke Indians, and many of the remains identified to date are those of a Protohistoric and/or Early Historic Weyanoke settlement. Captain John Smith's map of 1624 indicates a settlement on the Point, and various early patents describe the area here as lying within the territory of Weyanoke or Great Weyanoke. 1

Samuel Jordan died of unknown causes in 1623. William Farrar was Jordan's successor - as burgess, community leader, and husband to his widow, Cicely. The settlement at the time of the uprising probably contained much of what is found in the 1625 muster -

---

1. The territory of Great Weyanoke was principally situated on the north bank of the James, including Weyanoke Point and probably the entire area between upper Eppes Island and Westover. It has been suggested that Jordan's Point may have lain within the Appomattox territory, but our review of early patents and land descriptions leads us to disagree with this notion.
a kind of census of people, livestock, houses, boats, and arms prepared for the transfer of Virginia from the Company to the Crown. There were numerous "peeces", mostly matchlock muskets, a good supply of lead and powder, 10 complete suits of armor, 26 "coats of male", some which may have included other light armor such as brigandine or jack vests. The community consisted of 22 houses for 55 people, including free and servants, and a large stock of grain, cattle and poultry. William Farrar and Ciceley Jordan were listed as heads of the principle household complex in the community, and, within that complex, they had 5 houses. These five houses are undoubtedly the 5 longhouses described in this report. In addition, we have revealed evidence for a variety of service buildings and other structures and features.

Surface studies of the site indicated that the majority of materials dating to the early 17th century were concentrated in a 1 1/2 acre area. This area was plowed and disked in preparation for a surface collection which was undertaken after setting the field out in a 10' grid. The surface collection indicated that aboriginal materials covered the entire area, but were concentrated primarily along Rt. 156; that is, on the ridge of the terrace over a sheltered bay of James River just south and east of MacCord's earlier excavation. Likewise, early 17th-century materials are found throughout the field, but appeared to be most densely concentrated in a large area somewhat east of the terrace ridge.

Following the surface collection, approximately 70% of the site was cleared by machine and subsequently mapped. In this area, more than 1100 cultural features have been identified. These comprise remains associated with the early Colonial buildings, the fort enclosure, fencelines, etc., and at least 9 prehistoric or protohistoric structures. In addition 9 other Native American buildings were unearthed adjacent to the site by others prior to VCU's work here.

Our excavations have revealed evidence suggesting that the colonists may have received food from their Indian neighbors, and that at least one African may have been present on the site. Among materials apparently made on the site there were some hand-modelled tobacco pipes - including one waster fragment. There were also some beautifully decorated Indian trade pipes recovered in the colonial trash pits. A surprising find has been a moderate number of bricks. Hearths identified so far all appear to have been wood and daub structures, although some of the highly burned brocks probably served as hearth linings or floors. There are substantial quantities of burned mud chinking or daub in feature fills, indicating the use of this material at on chimneys and house walls. One unusual feature appears to be a lime kiln constructed prior to the early houses. This comprises a circular pit, the walls of which were plastered with clay and fired. A large quantity of shell mortar has been found in the feature fill, and most of the pit, which has been excavated in bisection, is apparently filled with burned fresh water mussel shells. The presence of brick and lime mortar suggests that the settlers had planned to do some masonry construction, but, as of this writing, no evidence of brick-lined cellars or brick hearths has been recovered.
Other finds include hundreds of brigandine plates and numerous other armor pieces, the basket hilts and pommels of swords and sabers, considerable quantities of shot and shot sprue, gun barrels and locks, a couple of rare early coins and the largest collection of jettons known from any colonial context. There are unique brass and iron and pewter objects of various kinds, and a large variety of hand tools, including saws, chisels, and axes. There is a large sample of beads, glass and brass buttons, clothing accessories such as hooks and eyes, aiglets, cloth and/or cord shot with silver and gold, etc. Examples of a wide variety of "exotic" stone samples have been recovered from feature fills. These are of western Piedmont schists and gneisses, and probably represent ore prospecting samples collected by the early settlers through trade with Indians. In addition, an important early 17th-century cemetery has been identified, as well as a number of Native American interments, and one or more possible Indian ritual features.

Jordan's Journey represents one of the very few settlements of the Virginia Company Period (1607-1624) yet identified and excavated. The site is comparable in date and importance to the enclosed settlement at Flowerdew Hundred and to the Wolstenholme Towne excavation at Martin's Hundred. The presence of extensive and well-preserved features and structures from the earliest period of English settlement in North America lends the site a significance which is national or international in scope. The excavation of this large settlement, along with some of the smaller compounds with which it is associated, should add considerable insight into community planning and organization on the early colonial frontier. Equally well represented are vast remains of the Indian settlement. Features and artifacts associated with this settlement have the potential to shed considerable light on the relationship between those James River social groups which formed the core of Powhatan's Algonkian chiefdom and both Siouan and Iroquoian speaking groups to the south, as well with the colonial newcomers.

There are only a few archaeological sites in Virginia where details of contact between natives and newcomers can be studied in such detail. Even so, the evidence of archaeology is always ambiguous and incomplete, always open to alternate interpretations. As we try to make sense out of the stains in the ground and the material remnants of early life at Jordan's Point, we are as much creating, as discovering, our history. The shreds and patches of ancient lives and events have been summoned forth, like ghosts from a grave, to be among us in the present. We study them in search for their meanings: the meanings of history and the meaning of Contact for those of us who live daily with its legacy, five hundred years after Columbus.

B. Project Organization and Acknowledgements
This volume is a preliminary report on archaeological excavations undertaken during 1990 and 1991 by Virginia Commonwealth University's Archaeological Research Center (VCU-ARC) at site # 44Pg302, known as "Jordan's Journey", in Prince George County, Virginia. The purpose of the study has been to rescue unique and valuable archaeological information and materials threatened with destruction by residential development of the former Hopewell Airport property on Jordan's Point. Major funding for this project has been provided by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR) through their Threatened Sites program. Additional funding and other assistance was provided through an emergency grant to VCU-ARC by the National Geographic Society, by a generous gift from a donor who prefers to remain anonymous, by VCU-ARC, and by numerous volunteers who have assisted with the excavation.

L. Daniel Mouer and Douglas C. McLearen served as Principal Investigators for this project, and as senior authors and editors of this report. Christopher P. Egghart was Field Director, ably assisted by Crew Chief R. Taft Kiser. Egghart also wrote the section on field methods in this volume. Kiser also provided the extensive artifact inventory presented here, the discussion of coins and jettons recovered from the site, and, along with VCU-ARC Laboratory manager, Beverly Binns, the ceramic minimum vessel analysis. Beverly Binns also authored the discussion on jewelry and personal items presented here. Dane T. Magoon conducted the research into tobacco pipes from Jordan's Journey that has been incorporated in various sections of this report. This work was completed as a student independent research project under the direction of Dan Mouer and Taft Kiser. Artifact photography and final renderings of all artwork were prepared by Anne Fletcher, Lisa Taranto, and Chris Farnwald. Most of the field photography in this report was done by Chris Egghart, with some additional photos by Dan Mouer, Doug McLearen, and Dave Hazzard.

The authors are grateful for the very generous support of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, and particularly to the Threatened Sites coordinator, David K. Hazzard; Survey and Register section head, Dr. E. Randolph Turner, III; and State Archaeologist, Dr. M. Catherine Slusser. Additional assistance was generously provided by other VDHR personnel as well: special thanks to Melba Myers, Conservator; Lizbeth Acuff, Curator; and Keith T. Egloff, Assistant Curator. We want to thank the site's owners, James Cuddihy and Plato Eliades of Prince George Investments, Inc., developers of "Jordan on the James", for their patience and numerous indulgences. We are particularly grateful for the opportunity to study the site, and for their generous donation of the collections from all of the Jordan's Point sites to the Commonwealth of Virginia. We would like to mention our thanks to Bonnie Cuddihy for her enthusiastic support for our work.

The crewpersons who excavated Jordan's Journey deserve special mention for a job very well done. We would like especially to thank Linwood Barthurst, Amber Bennett,
Sylvia Flynn, David Givens, Betsy Harker, Paul Luton, Dane Magoon, Randy Moncure, Kathy Pool, Jennifer Rea, Bruce Rodgers, Kathy Siebert, and Andy Wichorek. The hard work, great skill and good humor of this crew is unparalleled in our experience. Former VCU-ARC staffer Amber Bennett - currently a graduate student in the American Studies Program at the University of Pennsylvania - has prepared an analysis of one of the brass jettons from Jordan's Journey (Bennett n.d.). Her paper has proven helpful in our discussion of this important class of artifacts from the site.

There were also many volunteers and students who worked on the project. VCU's Field School students for 1990 and 1991 got spoiled by learning the ropes on this exceptional site. Doug Sanford brought his students to the site to put in a good day's work, and we would like to thank them all for their help. We are very grateful for all the help we received. Special thanks go to Bill Ruppert, a volunteer who deserves an attendance pin (make that a medal) for working with us at least one day out of nearly every week, rain or shine, hot or cold. Tony Powell also gave up his vacations for the work at "JP", as we've come to call Jordan's Point. Thanks, Tony. Thanks, too, to members of the Greater Richmond Chapter of the Archaeological Society of Virginia (ASV), particularly Harry Jaeger and Dan Proctor. Student volunteers with the ASV's 1991 annual field school earned their stripes, and our thanks, in the intense heat of summer on Jordan's Point. In 1991 a large and enthusiastic crew of sixth and seventh graders learned the less glamorous aspects of archaeology by pushing shovels and water screening at JP. For both 1990 and 1991, the Jordan's Journey excavation was open to the public for Virginia Archaeology Week. Exhibits, site tours and demonstrations were co-sponsored at the site by VCU and the VDHR.

We owe a considerable debt to Terry Bond, a living history interpreter from Jamestown Settlement who brought his period tools, weapons, clothing, accoutrements and expertise to the site to assist us in bring Jordan's Journey to life for hundreds of visitors. We also appreciate the efforts and advice of Cary Carson, Director of Research for the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, who offered suggestions for the interpretation of Structure 4 presented here. Very helpful technical assistance and advice was rendered by a number of other colleagues. Their help has proven indispensable. These include Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume of Williamsburg; Richard Doty, Curator of Western Numismatics for the National Museum of Natural History; Jay Gaynor, Collections Department, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation; Charles Hodges of the James River Institute of Archaeology, and Beverly Straub, also of the James River Institute for Archaeology. Lydia Smith of Birmingham, Alabama has generously shared her important genealogical research on the Jordan family in England.

C. The Scope of This Report
This report presents a basic description of the methods and findings of the archaeological study of 44Pg302 during 1990 and 1991. It should be kept in mind that this work has been accomplished under the strictures of "salvage" archaeology. For that reason, budget and time limitations severely limit the scope of this report. The vast majority of funds received from various sources have gone into recovering the data and materials from the field. In addition, excavations are still underway at this site, as well as at related sites on Jordan's Point. For these reasons, this is not a "final" report on the site. There is only a minimal amount of interpretation in this volume and laboratory analyses have not progressed much beyond the stage of identifying artifacts. The scholarly reader will miss some sections that are typical in site reports; for example, there is no review of the literature, in-depth discussion of research questions, or narrative background section presented here. The purpose of this report is to provide a permanent record of what was done, and what was found at the site during two years of study. The collections and the data from this site represent a very important suite of materials and information that beg for greater analysis and more thoughtful interpretations than are possible at this point. On the other hand, we consider it important to provide sponsors and colleagues with a detailed summary of what has been accomplished to date.

Much remains to be done. There are other vitally important sites of the Jordan's Journey village that are threatened with destruction in the very near future. The vast collection of materials and information recovered from site 44Pg302 remains to be thoroughly studied, conserved, and interpreted. There are virtually dozens of studies waiting to be done on coins, jewelry, clothing items, arms and armor, architecture, and other classes of material life. The collection from Jordan's Journey includes well over 60,000 items, many of them rare or unique. This site needs to be analyzed in comparison with the smaller early 17th-century sites at Jordan's Point, so that broader community patterns - of both Native American and Colonial settlements - can be properly discerned. There is a substantial literature - much of it grey, but some that is actually in black-and-white - concerning the archaeology of the early 17th century in Virginia. There is an even broader comparative literature from contemporary sites elsewhere in eastern North America, as well as the Caribbean and Post-Medieval Europe. These sources for fruitful comparison have been explored, but there is a great deal to be done. Especially, our knowledge of Jordan's Journey archaeology needs to be interpreted in the light of the lives of the people who lived there. Martha McCartney's historical study, and other sources of history and culture history ready to hand (and some not so handy) need to be incorporated into deeper and more human readings of life for early Virginians.

This is a beginning, but it is only a beginning.

D. The Archaeology of Jordan's Point
The archaeological study of Jordan's Point neither began nor ended with the work reported here. Archaeologists working under the auspices of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources have been identifying, and excavating sites since it was first learned that extraordinary archaeological remains were threatened by development. Jordan's Point has been known as a source of prehistoric Indian relics since at least the 1930s. Collections from the site were incorporated into Dr. Clifford Evans' (1955) landmark study of Virginia prehistory. Howard A. MacCord, Sr. (1967) conducted a salvage excavation in advance of road construction along Route 156, just northwest of the site, in the 1970s. His excavation - which was confined to the area to be disturbed by construction - recovered evidence for aboriginal trash or storage pits and burials. Dr. E. Randolph Turner III (1976, n.d.) surveyed the site for his doctoral research and found it to be one of the most impressive prehistoric sites in eastern Virginia. An historical marker noting the location of the plantation of Revolutionary patriot Richard Bland has stood alongside the point for many years.

In the early 1980s, while conducting research for excavations at Bermuda Hundred, one of the present authors (Mouer) noted in the historical record that a number of prominent members of the 1613 community at the Hundred had taken the opportunity offered by the Virginia Company after 1618 for private land ownership. They established a community of households and farm fields adjacent to each other at Jordan's Point. Various collectors of antiquities had reported finding a number of late 16th century German jettons or counters, suggesting that important early 17th-century remains could be extant on Jordan's Point. While various surveys of prehistoric remains had been done, the historic sites of Jordan's Point were unknown. The author and several of his students paid several preliminary visits to the site - then the property of the Hopewell Airport. Finds of fragments of early ceramic vessels, terra cotta tiles and tobacco pipes suggested that the potential for 17th century sites on the point was good. Mr. Ralph Porter, a VCU student and long-time member of the Archaeological Society of Virginia, conducted a systematic surface study at Jordan's Point. In so doing, Porter created an excellent map of surface finds that suggested the rich variety of archaeological remains on the point. Included in his collection of artifacts were early 17th century ceramics, jettons, and fragments of brigandine plates from armored vests. No sooner had Porter completed his survey than rumors began to fly that the Hopewell Airport was being sold for a residential development.

Mr. Nicholas Lucketti, then of the Virginia Division of Historic Landmarks, entered into negotiations with the new owner and began to locate and excavate important sites. Over the past few years, excavations, all sponsored by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (formerly the Virginia Division of Historic Landmarks), have been conducted by Lucketti, Barabara Heath, Jay Harrison, and Charles Hodges. General

---

2. Howard MacCord recorded "The Hopewell Airport Site" in the state archives, and assigned it the registry number 44Pg1, or the first archaeological site to be registered in Prince George County, Virginia.
coordination of the work has been under the supervision of David Hazzard of VDHR. Among the projects completed to date is a documentary history of Jordan's Point authored by Martha McCartney (1988). Virginia Commonwealth University's proposal to excavate 44Pg302 was granted by VDHR and work was begun on the site in the summer of 1990. Excavations have continued ever since, with short seasonal breaks. In addition, VCU-ARC is presently completing the excavation of human remains at the site, and, during the summer of 1992, VCU's Field Archaeology summer school will complete excavations at the site. Pending final budget decisions, the field school students and the full-time crews of VCU-ARC will also survey, map and test additional related sites on the point.

It is the hope of the VDHR to prepare a series of special publications on the work at Jordan's Point, beginning with McCartney's comprehensive history. This series will be produced over the next few years and will conclude with a synthetic, interpretive volume that summarizes all the work at the Point. It is our intention to expand upon this present report considerably before it is prepared for publication. Even so, the enormous quantities of artifacts from, and information about, the Protohistoric Indian settlement and the early 17th village will undoubtedly spawn technical and scholarly papers, as well as exhibits, magazine articles, and lectures, for many years to come.

**E. Contexts for Research**

*Need something here about study of Contact Indian sites.*

Between 1606 and 1624 Virginia was a chartered corporation - a private enterprise - under the dominion of the Virginia Company of London. Historians and archaeologists refer to this period as "The Company Period". Accidental destruction of many of the Virginia Company's records has meant that the history of early Virginia is very poorly known compared, for example, to the early years of the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonies, or to English colonies in the Caribbean. Virginia was the first of England's colonial ventures, and, as such, its history occupies an important place in a greater understanding of the varieties of colonial ventures launched from Europe's shores. From 1625 onward, the records are better, as the Virginia Company Charter was revoked by Charles I, and the colony was became an enterprise of the Crown. Classic compilations, like those of Phillip Alexander Bruce, indicate the wealth of materials available for historical study Nonetheless, the material conditions of life in early Virginia are poorly represented in documents, and for that reason, the archaeology of the 17th-century has been an important quest of Virginia archaeology for the past century, ever since the founding of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, and their various archaeological research projects at Jamestown.

Even with such auspicious, and early, beginnings, the history and archaeology of 17th-century Virginia, and its sister Chesapeake Colony, Maryland, are relatively new
studies. In the past 20 or 25 years there has appeared a variety of important publications dealing with the social and economic history of the period. Students like like Lois Carr and Lorena Walsh, Jim Horn, and Edmund Morgan demonstrate that the materials for understanding this century have by no means been exhausted. There has been a corresponding plethora of excavations of archaeological sites (although too few of these have been published in detail). Among these are Kelso's work at Carter's Grove and Kingsmill; The Martin's Hundred excavations of Noël Hume; on-going studies at Flowerdew Hundred under Barka, Deetz and others; a variety of important excavations by Marley Brown and his associates at the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation; a number of landmark studies by the James River Institute for Archaeology; and several important projects undertaken by Virginia Commonwealth University. The material evidence has produced a special interest in topics such as architecture, plantation siting and organization, and even mortuary remains. Nonetheless, it is safe to say that each new site excavated provides important new insights, and uncovers far more questions than answers. This is particularly true of the earlier periods during the tenure of the Virginia Company, and the tense period that followed upon the heels of the 1622 uprising of the Powhatan groups against the colony.

Despite the large amount of archaeological research effort devoted to the 17th century, there are few projects which have resulted in the large-scale, extensive uncovering of complete settlements or plantations, particularly from the early part of the century. Sites that have been extensively excavated, which are comparable in size and date to Jordan's Journey, are limited primarily to a complex of sites at Flowerdew Hundred and Wolstenholme Town and related sites at Martin's Hundred. With the exception of a report on one important structure at Flowerdew (Barka 1976), technical reports have not been completed for either of these projects, although both sites have been widely interpreted and publicized through the international press, through popular magazine articles, and with museum exhibits. In the case of Martin's Hundred, a thorough description of the project has been written up in a publication aimed at a broad public, and this volume has recently been revised and re-issued. The new archaeology museum at Colonial Williamsburg, which is devoted entirely to the Martin's Hundred excavations, and on-site interpretation of Wolstenholme Town combine to form the largest archaeological interpretation program in Virginia's history.

F. The Site: 44Pg302

1. General Site Description

The site which is the subject of our investigations, and of this report, is a ca. 1-1/2 acre quadrangular field defined on the north and the east by the former locations of airplane taxi ways. Although all of Jordan's Point is comprised of a relatively level Coastal Plain
terrace, the site occupies the highest ground on the point. While there is extensive
evidence of earlier prehistoric occupation on this part of Jordan's Point, the
archaeological components of principal interest are the remains of a Protohistoric Indian
settlement and an early fortified colonial plantation. In both cases, the remains that form
44Pg302 are simply portions of larger settlements. Indian houses and other features,
which are apparently roughly contemporaneous with the remains at this site, are spread
nearly ubiquitously around the perimeter of the point. As will be discussed in greater
detail below, the houses and other remains uncovered at 44Pg302 were probably part of
an internally dispersed village, the houses and gardens of which most likely covered
most of the Point.

The historic component comprises a complete fortified compound containing at least 11
buildings in addition to other structures and features. This fortified compound probably
served as the "bawn", or fortified manor house complex, for a much larger community
which may have been laid out along a common axis on the Point. In January of 1624/5
there were 22 houses distributed among 15 lots or household compounds making up
the community then known as "Jordan's Journey". Site 44Pg302 was the largest of these,
and it was the household complex and related structures of the community leaders:
first, Samuel Jordan and, after his death in 1623, William Farrar.

The site was first defined by noting the approximate dimensions of a moderate
scattering of Protohistoric and early 17th-century artifacts on the map prepared from
surface survey of Jordan's Point by Ralph Porter. The area was tested through a series of
small test squares by Nicholas Lucketti and William Kelso, placed adjacent to the
former taxiway that defines the eastern edge of the site, and these tests revealed the
potential for substantial early colonial remains. During construction of an entrance road
to the new residential development on Jordan's Point, a cluster of at least 9 Indian
houses and several human burials (both Colonial and Native American) were
uncovered. This entrance road now defines the northern edge of the site reported here.
MacCord's excavations had been placed just near the northwestern corner of the present
site. Here he had uncovered a series of Native American trash pits and burials. The
western limits of the site are defined principally by the edge of the landform. The
southern limits of the site were estimated based on the apparent fall-off in the density of
surface artifacts. This edge was more precisely defined once the site clearing was
undertaken.

2. Soils Conditions and Microtopographic Features

Initial testing indicated that the site area had been plowed throughout. In most places,
plowzone depth averaged ca. 0.80 feet. Plow soil consisted of a medium brown highly
organic loam. Subsoil generally consisted of a reddish brown clay loam or silty clay. In
the southern part of the site, the plow line was relatively distinct. In the northern parts
of the site however, the plow line was very difficult to discern. Overburden thickness
was also considerably greater in that area - with a maximum depth of 1.65 feet registered along the northern limits of the tract - due to fills associated with the old airport taxiways.

Variations in subsoil characteristics were observed in different areas. Considerably more clayey subsoil was encountered in the west central area, centered around point 180N 210E. A wide band of sandier soil is present along the western fringe of the site. In this latter area, fire cracked rocks are present just below the subsoil interface. The sandier soils are likely a result of the presence of minor amounts of aeolian material along the western, river-facing landform edge. These deposits appear to have buried some Archaic material to a depth just below the plow line. Also of note was extremely dense, hard subsoil present in the north east and eastern parts of the site. This phenomenon was initially attributed to the deposition of fill associated with runway construction at the old Hopewell Airport. In the far northeastern corner of the site, considerable difficulty was encountered in removing, by hand several inches of hardened fill material that overlay the subsoil in that area. However, extremely dense and hard soil was also encountered in grave shaft fill in the same area. It is likely that the deposition of fill associated with the runway construction further compacted already dense subsoil. Finally, pockets of gravel and small cobbles were noted within the subsoil in various parts of the site. Isolated larger cobbles were present in the subsoil throughout the site area.

Following the removal of the plowed soil and fills, minor topographic variations that had been masked by differing overburden thickness became more evident. The highest ground was present in the southeast/south-central parts of the site. From this very minor knoll the land drops gently to north before rising up again near the edge of the tract. The eastern limits of the site are defined by an area of low, poorly drained ground. This area comprises the head of a wide, linear swale that extends north to present James River bank. This natural feature probably contained a small spring or intermittent stream, which has since been buried by agricultural activities and airport runway construction. The land contour also gently drops away south of the site. The terrain is relatively level along the western edge of the site and it would appear as if the landform has been truncated by the receding James River bank and the Route 156 construction.
II. 44Pg302, Archaeological Investigations 1990-1991

A. Methods

1. Controlled Surface Collection

Field work was begun in May of 1990. The first phase of the investigations consisted of a controlled surface collection. The site area was plowed and disked. The English unit of measure, expressed in engineer's scale was chosen for the project. An L-shaped, 50 foot interval hub and tack baseline was established along the southern and eastern limits of the plowed area. Grid points were designated by distance north and east from an arbitrary point to the southwest of the site. This grid encompassed a roughly square tract measuring 290 feet east to west and 270 feet north to south. A ten foot interval grid was then marked off. This area accommodated 761 ten foot surface collection units.

The surface collection was carried out in the following manner. Ten crew persons lined up, one to a unit. All persons, in unison, made three passes over their respective units, covering one-third of the square with each pass. Collecting conditions were very good, with excellent surface visibility. The collected artifacts were secured in labeled bags. The surface collection was completed in a single day.

2. Excavations

After having been effectively sampled, the plow soil was removed. This was done in two stages. A paddle pan grader was used to remove the bulk of the plow soil, after which a telescoping arm grading machine was brought in to expose the subsoil. The paddle pan grader was very effective in clearing plow soil along the southern one-half of the site. This area was situated on a wide, low knoll. Plowzone depth was uniform and the plowzone-subsoil boundary was easy to distinguish. Here the grader removed all but the last ca. 0.25 feet of the plow soil. However, some difficulty was encountered along the northeast quadrant of the site. This area had evidently accumulated colluvial sediments from the low knoll. Plow zone depth was considerably greater, ranging from 1.00 to 1.65 feet. Soils in this area were also more poorly drained than on the higher ground. As a result, the paddle pan sank and cut into the subsoil. Further work in this
area would have seriously compromised the integrity of the subsurface deposits. Use of the paddle pan grader was therefore discontinued, leaving approximately one foot of plow soil on that portion of the site.

Final plowzone removal was begun at the southeast corner of the site. On the higher ground, the plowzone-subsoil transition was very distinct. Once the subsoil was exposed, no more than an additional 0.10 foot was graded to remove the mottled Ap-B transition layer. In the lower lying areas to the north, this transition zone was thicker and the subsoil darker in color. Here it was necessary to plane the subsoil with an additional pass of the grader blade in order to properly expose the subsoil.

The cleared area was shovel cleaned and carefully trowled over. The ten foot grid was then reestablished. The exposed features were mapped on a one inch equals two and one-half feet (1: 30) scale using a five foot drawing screen. An overall composite map at a one inch equals 10 feet (1: 120 ) was generated and updated as new areas were opened.

Features were generally excavated in bisections drawn along the longest axis. The exposed walls were then profiled. The exceptions were small prehistoric post molds which were usually fully excavated before being profiled. Excavated soil from all features was passed through a one quarter inch mesh wire screen. Larger features such as cellars and pits were excavated stratigraphically when individual deposition episodes were discernible. Each individual provenience (i.e. Feature X post hole, Feature X  post mold, ) was given an excavation unit (EU) number. These were assigned in a single numerical sequence for the whole site throughout the entire excavation.

Features were numbered as they were tested. The same numbering sequence was applied to both prehistoric and historic features. Some large, obvious cultural features were numbered into the sequence as they were mapped. Historic and prehistoric structures were designated in a single numerical sequence. Minor outbuildings and obvious palisade or fence line features were all given structure numbers. A total of 28 structure designations were assigned.

Soil samples were taken from all major features. A maximum of ten liters of soil was removed and bagged for each EU. Although an attempt was made to standardize on the ten liter sample, some EUs yielded considerably less than this standard size. Soil samples were taken to obtain micro-faunal and floral remains from historic and prehistoric features as well as to recover material for radiocarbon dating of prehistoric deposits. During the 1991 field season, running water was made available to the project and water screening of several major features was undertaken. Fill soil was placed in a conventional one quarter inch mesh screen and a dispersed spray used to force the soil through. This method allowed for the recovery of a large amount of small faunal material as well as fragile historic artifacts that would otherwise have been lost during
conventional screening. Features subjected to water screening were F-435, F-431 and portions of F-430.

All features were photographed with a 35 mm camera in black and white and in color slide film. Features such as historic posts were photographed in bisection. Major features were photographed prior to excavation, in bisection and following their completion. Various stages of excavation of these features were also recorded.

Summary of Field Seasons

The 1990 field season initially focused on the southeast quadrant of the site. This area contained a wealth of Colonial and Native American features and a number of structure patterns were identified. These were: Structure 1, a large post built Colonial house; Structure 2, a large, well constructed Native American house; Structure 3 another Native American house; Structure 4, a large Colonial house with wall slots and a large cellar. Structure 21, an apparent outbuilding with a cellar was also uncovered in the same area. Additional work just to the west uncovered a cluster of burials beyond what was recognized as a palisade fence line. Structure 5, a post built structure, and Features 411 and 409, a kiln and a large borrow pit containing the brigandine vest were also uncovered. A small patch was cleared of plow soil to the west of the cemetery area. Here a large possible ceremonial fire pit and a Native American burial were identified. A north-south trending transact was also stripped along the western edge of the tract. This uncovered four Native American structures (Structures 9,11,12 and 13) as well as several large, amorphous daub-filled pits of uncertain cultural association.

During the course of the season, a large number of structural post features belonging to Structure 1, 4, 5 and 21 were bisectioned. Structures 2 and 3, the Native American houses were excavated. In addition, two, major features were investigated. Feature 110, the Structure 21 cellar, was bisectioned and the cellar in Structure 4 (F-320) tested. The kiln (F-411) and the large borrow pit were excavated in bisection. Also excavated were a number of prehistoric and historic pit features and a section of the palisade line.

The 1991 season concentrated on fully exposing and mapping the enclosed Colonial settlement. Plow soil was removed on a broad transact north from the area investigated during the previous year. At total of five small structures were identified in this part of the site. In addition to successfully defining the enclosed compound, eleven historic and two prehistoric burials were uncovered. Several very large historic features were also encountered. These were; F-435, a possible well and F-430, a large complex of intersecting pits of unknown function. These features were excavated during the course of the season. Structure 4 was fully excavated as were the two cellar features begun during 1990 season. Also completed were several historic refuse pit features. In addition, Structure 17, a small Colonial building with a cellar identified in the northern end of the compound was fully excavated.
A portion of the northwest quadrant of the site has yet to be cleared. This area measures approximately 110 by 130 feet and represents slightly less than one-fifth of the original tract. This area is slightly higher and more level that the northeast quadrant. The remaining plow soil is approximately 0.35 feet thick.

3. Laboratory Methods

All materials collected during the course of these investigations have been cleaned of surface dirt. Many of the fragile remains, particularly some food bone refuse and some human bone from burial excavations, have been stabilized with a water soluble acrylic consolidant. A very few selected items have undergone some further conservation under the direction of Melba Myers, Conservator for the Virginia Department of Historic Resources. There is a large assemblage of metal objects, including lead, brass and pewter objects of various kinds; and iron or steel items, such as tools and pieces of arms and armor, which are presently awaiting stabilization. All objects have been permitted to dry thoroughly, except for selected items that have been retained in moist conditions, or removed in matrix, and which are awaiting further study and treatment. A few exceptional items have been scrutinized using microscopic or radiographic techniques. For the most part, the collection has been stored in heavy plastic bags which, in turn, are stored in museum cartons with large quantities of packing materials to prevent breakage. Selected items, particularly iron objects, are stored in acid free cartons. As of this writing, the collections from the site are stored at the VCU-ARC laboratories. Upon completion of the research on this site, the collections will be transferred to the curation facilities at the VDHR.

All other artifacts have been catalogued and labelled - directly on the artifact where feasible - the site and catalogue (excavation unit) number. Subsequent to preliminary cataloguing materials were sorted by class and selected classes of material have been "pulled" to class study collections (e.g., all ceramics are stored together). Each artifact has been individually identified and described, and this inventory, or finds list, appears here as Appendix *. Ceramic items have been cross-mended and a minimum vessel list, with descriptions and comparisons, has been prepared (Appendix *). Tobacco pipe stems, bowls and marks have been studied, and Binford-Harrington dates have been calculated for all features. Binford dates are provided in the feature descriptions, to follow, for all features containing at least 30 stems with measurable bore diameters. Although the site's dates of occupation are generally outside the range of the most accurate results for this dating method, these data have proven useful, when taken with other evidence, in interpreting the sequence of feature filling and construction on the
site. The "other evidence" includes the generally more useful dating of bowl forms and marks.  

Large quantities of feature fill were returned to the lab for floatation separation in order to recover small artifacts, seeds and faunal remains. Floatation was carried out using a drum float tank with graded geological sieves to catch the light fraction. Both light and heavy factions were recovered and separated. There are substantial numbers of small floral and faunal remains yet to be identified by specialists. Many hundreds of other items, such as beads, pins, buttons, etc., but inventories from the floatation study are not available at this time. Additional samples have been, and will be, recovered from selected sealed contexts to be saved for future analyses including palynology and phytolith studies. The numbers of sealed, datable contexts and generally good preservation conditions in many of the features should permit the recovery of useful environmental and ethnobiological data from the early historic occupation. Some of the Protohistoric Period features may also contain useful samples.

B. Findings of the Controlled Surface Collection

1. Protohistoric and Prehistoric Components

2. The Colonial Component

The surface collection indicated that, besides the prehistoric materials, there was only a single historic component of any substance on the site. As often is the case with sites if this early period, there were relatively few materials recovered. A complete inventory of the controlled surface collection is presented in Appendix 1*. Figures *-* present the distributions of selected classes of artifacts recovered in the controlled surface collection from the Colonial component. A more detailed study in the future of these surface distributions may prove helpful in interpreting the structure of the site, the nature of individual buildings and areas within the settlement, and perhaps even distinctions among the uses of rooms within buildings. However, the relatively low density of surface materials suggests that such studies may have limited utility compared with similar studies for the prehistoric components at the site, or for later, more dense, historic components on other sites.

---

3. The pipe analysis was conducted by Dane Magoon as a student research project under the direction of authors Mouer and Kiser.

4. As can be expected, there was a very light scatter throughout the field of artifacts from later periods. These appear to comprise nothing more than peripheral field scatter, and will not be discussed here.
For the present the primary purpose of the controlled surface collection has been to generate distribution maps which would allow us to make informed decisions about which parts of the site to mechanically strip for mapping and excavation. The surface collection revealed clearly the presence of an early 17th-century occupation covering approximately the eastern third of the site. A light scatter of materials was found throughout the field, but the vast majority of artifacts were recovered from this large concentration. Figure *, which indicates the distributions of building materials - primarily brick, daub, and window glass fragments - shows an additional concentration in the center of the northern third of the site. This concentration occurs in a part of the site which has not yet been cleared of topsoil, and it suggests the possible presence of another building on the site. **I NEED FURTHER ANALYSIS OF MATERIALS FROM THE CSC. IS THIS 18TH C?**

Given the clear clustering of historic materials in the eastern third of the site, this was selected as the area to be opened first for further investigations. While clearing and mapping indicated that, indeed, the Colonial houses and other buildings were clustered within a palisade in this area, further clearing to the west revealed the presence of numerous Colonial burials. Had we confined the stripping of topsoil to the area indicated by the plowzone surface study, we would have missed the very important cemetery at Jordan's Journey.

C. Findings of the Excavation

1. Structures, Features, and Feature Complexes

a. Introduction

Figure * is a composite plan of the site illustrating all features that were discovered during the course of excavation, as well as groupings of features identified as structures. In this section we will discuss the major structures and selected other features on the site. Where features could be associated with a structure, such as a house, fence or palisade, they are discussed together following an overall description of that structure. The structures are presented in numerical order, by component, except that Structures 1, 21, 24, 15, and 16 are all discussed together as a group. Following the discussion of identified structures, we discuss other major features that have been excavated, or partly excavated. Each feature description includes the feature number, its grid provenience, a Binford Mean Date, a notation as to whether it is part of the

---

5. Only excavated features or, in rare cases, features requiring special discussion in the text, are described. There are summary descriptions for many fewer features than were mapped.
6. Binford dates are presented only for features which contained 30 or more pipe stems.
historic or prehistoric occupation of the site, a brief description, and a statement concerning its excavation treatment. Where depths are given, this refers to the depth below the stripped surface. In some cases, depth below the original surface has been estimated, and is explicitly so described. The reader is referred to the artifact inventory (Appendix 2) for a listing of finds in each feature. In addition, Appendix 3 provides brief descriptions of some additional features which have been numbered and, in many cases, excavated but which have not been addressed in this present chapter.

It is the ideal, of course, to account for every feature on a site, but this is an ideal that is only rarely achieved. At Jordan’s Journey we uncovered more than 1100 archaeological features. The vast majority of these were post holes or postmolds from one of the two main site components. Many of these post features clearly reveal patterns of regular spacing, size and alignment which permitted us to discern various structures. There is, however, a sizable residuum of post features which cannot be, or at least have not yet been, associated with specific structures. Probable prehistoric postmolds are quite dense in certain parts of the site, and many of these appear to form segments of arcs similar to those of house walls. However, we have described as structures only those feature groupings about which we are most confident. There are, likewise, a large number of historic post features, particularly clustered near the eastern wall - and particularly the southeastern corner - of the palisade enclosure. Some of these posts appear to form alignments suggesting fences or other structures. Again, we have not represented groupings of features as structures unless we feel convinced of our interpretations. There are obviously some portions of the site, such as inside the southeastern quadrant of the palisade, which lend themselves to alternate interpretations. Table * presents a summary description of each of the structures identified in the excavations. Each of these structures can be located by reference to the interpreted composite site plan presented as Figure *.

**Table *: List of Structures**

1. Colonial longhouse near the palisade east wall.
4. Colonial longhouse with wall trenches and large cellar.
5. Colonial longhouse near the west wall of the palisade.
6. Not used.
7. Not used.
8. Not used.

---

7. Because we had no idea at the outset that we would be able to spend two full seasons of excavation on this site - in fact, we believed that we would have no more than 3 or 4 months - we did not complete feature register forms for all of these. Only about one-half of the features uncovered have been numbered, and somewhat fewer than this number have been excavated.
9. Small Native American structure in the extreme SW corner of site.
10. Colonial longhouse in the middle of the fort.
11. Native American building in the western portion of the site.
12. Native American building at the western edge of the site.
13. Native American building at the northwestern corner of the western block.
15. Colonial building south of Structure 1, which shares a common wall with the palisade.
17. Small Colonial building containing a small cellar.
18. Small colonial building west of Structure 17.
19. Very small colonial structure near the northwestern corner of the fort.
20. Colonial longhouse partly constructed outside of, and sharing a wall with, the fort.
22. Large Native American structure near the southern edge of the western block.
23. Partial pattern of a Native American building just west of the Colonial cemetery.
25. Palisaded fort enclosing the Colonial settlement.
26. Nineteenth-century fenceline running roughly east-west across the southern third of the site.
27. Possible fenced yard south of Structure 21.
28. Native American building that is partly overlapped by Structures 21 and 27.

Accompanying the descriptions of structures and features are a selection of plan drawings of individual features, or of groups of features, as appropriate. In addition, representative sections of post holes and molds have been presented. In interpreting structures, such as houses and fencelines, careful attention has been paid to the field records, sections, and plans in order to match posts with similar size and depth characteristics. The overall site composite plan (Figure *) shows all mapped features. Many of these have not been excavated, and some that have been excavated have proven to be rodent or root disturbances, earlier test pits, etc. The detailed plans of structures and features depict only those features thought to belong with - or possibly belong with - the structure or feature depicted. Descriptions and interpretations of historic structures offered here are necessarily tentative. Archaeological evidence for only one structure has been reviewed by a qualified architectural historian with experience in interpreting 17th-century structures. 8

b. The Protohistoric Component

8. That example is Structure 4, and we owe a debt to Cary Carson for his helpful comments in this case. Internal room and facade configurations for other historic structures have been offered by the authors, but we do not claim much expertise beyond the logical dictates of archaeology.
A total of 8 complete Native American structures representing houses, and perhaps in some cases other more specialized buildings, were found during 1990 and 1991. These are numbered on the site as Structures 2, 3, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 22. In addition to these is another partial structure, #23, the western portion of which appears to have been largely destroyed by plowing. This structure would originally have been a large building similar to complete Structures 2, 3 and 22. In addition to the above structures is "proposed" Structure 28, a more tentatively defined building or fencing which is less clear delineated, and in some other respects, is distinct from the other more well defined structures. Another structure of a totally different type is Structure 29, a circular area of large posts which may be similar to ones depicted in the 16th century John White paintings (Hulton 1984).

Very few pit features of Native American origin were identified. In addition, the majority that were investigated proved to be Native American burials, full excavations of which were not undertaken until the 1992 season. This latter season is beyond the scope of this document and is frequently referred to but not reported herein. In three cases, there are pits whose size, shape, and to some extent, contents, suggest burials in which all traces of human bone have weathered away and no clear body stains are apparent. In addition, a few "pits", including one that had been suspected as a burial, proved to be tree fall holes. It should be noted, however, that some of the as untested and unnumbered soil stains of questionable origin could prove to be other Native American features.

In no cases was a pit feature found that could convincingly be interpreted as a storage pit. In addition, no obvious "hearths" were found inside of post mold patterns representing house structures, and it is believed that all such hearths were originally so shallow that they were destroyed by plowing. Features 23 and 257, were two hearth-like pits lying outside of any clearly defined structural patterns; however, both were shallow and could have served as outside facilities for cooking/food processing. Feature 23 was rather generalized and its functional interpretation was through process of elimination; it is doubtful that specialized refuse features were ever dug, and it did not have expected characteristics of a storage feature. Feature 257 was a small pit filled with mussel shell. This feature certainly may have been a small roasting pit. This shell-rich pit is undated and lies in a peripheral portion of the site. However, the presence of Gaston and, in some cases, Roanoke sherds, in other pit fills indicates that most if not all investigated pits, including burials, belong to the late Protohistoric village component of the site.

The discussion below begins with descriptions of structures on the site. Following the description of each structure is a list of associated features which includes a grid reference for each one, the dimensions, and the status with respect to excavation. Artifacts recovered are listed in the master inventory appended to this report.
Following the structure presentation are descriptive summaries of additional Native American features.

**STRUCTURES**

The house structures are mainly oval and appear to have been constructed of green saplings set into the ground, with those opposite each other bent over to form tensioned domed or arbor roofs. Sapling cross pieces would have been lashed to the vertical members, and surfaces would most likely have been covered with marsh grass mattings or bark.

Although the shapes are largely oval, some have more rounded or squared off ends or corners than others. One structure in the far western part of the site is round, and a few others are roughly oval, though not as elongated as the rest. The one fully round structure is small (15' diameter) and has a possibly associated central post. For reasons discussed below, this structure may have had daubed surfaces. This structure, and possibly other relatively small ones in this vicinity, may have either been houses or some types of specialized buildings such as storage facilities. On the other hand, there is the possibility that these smaller structures, all of which lie in the far western portion of the site, are earlier than the rest. Their location in relative proximity to MacCord's (1967) Hopewell Airport Site excavations should be kept in mind, since analysis of his ceramic assemblage (see below, under ceramics presentation) has indicated an earlier occupation than that of the main village component of 44Pg302. These westernmost structures (Structures 9 and 11-13) are the smallest on the site and range from 15' in diameter to about 17.5' by 12.5'.

Three of the largest structures are oriented east-west. They are oval and measure 25' or more in greatest dimension. These structures, numbers 2, 3 and 22, range from 25' to 26.5' east-west and from 16' to 18.25' north-south. A fragmentary structure, number 23, appears to have been nearly lost to plowing. However, its estimated dimensions are comparable to those of the other three large structures.

Although analogies with ethnohistorical studies indicate that most of these structures probably once had hearths and smoke holes in the roofs (Roundtree 1989: 61), no good candidates for hearths were found in any of the structures. Most structures do have internal posts, however, and the frequencies of these are strong enough to indicate that at least some of them are integral parts of the structures. The lack of internal hearths is probably due to deep plowing and destruction of what were once either very shallowly dug or surface-laid hearths.

The majority of the structures are comparable to those found on other areas of Jordan's Point by VDHR and their contractors. In addition, they also compare well with those at nearby Flowerdew Hundred, and at the recently excavated village, 44Jc308, on the
Governor's Land at Two Rivers, in the former territory of the Paspaheghs (Hodges and Hodges 1991). All of the Jordan's Point structures are smaller than those at the Great Neck Site in Virginia Beach (Hodges n. d. a; Hodges and Hodges 1991).

Table * lists the house structures as well as buildings that may be either house structures or special purpose buildings. Dimensions, orientation and post spacing are presented, with measurements in engineer's scale (feet and tenths). Orientation refers to the placement of the long axis of each building. Proposed Structure 28 and the circular ring of large posts, number 29, are not included. Dimensions of fragmentary Structure 23 are estimated, as is the long axis of Structure 12, the western end of which was not uncovered in the excavations.

Table *: Native American Houses and Probable House Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Dimensions (feet)</th>
<th>Typical mold interval (feet)</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.5 x 18.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>E - W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.5 x 16</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>E - W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15 x 15</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.75 x 15</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>NE - SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.5 (?) x 12.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>E - W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.25 x 13.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>E - W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.75 x 15</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>NW - SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>25 x 17.5</td>
<td>1.5-1.75</td>
<td>E - W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.5 (?) x 17.5 (?)</td>
<td>1.25-1.5 (?)</td>
<td>NW - SE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive summaries and feature data on each structure are presented below. Figures *-* illustrate the plan views of the structures and, where appropriate, possibly associated features.

Structure 2

Structure 2 is located in the southeastern part of the excavated area, just south of Structure 1, a Colonial house. Structure 2 partially surrounds and, in places, is intruded by an additional later Colonial structure, Number 21. Figure * illustrates Structure 2. For the sake of visual clarity, the later Colonial features have been omitted, with the exceptions of those which intrude on the wall pattern (indicated in hatched lines). However, the reader should keep in mind the large area of the interior that has been
taken out by Structure 21's cellar (Feature 110), and should refer to the overall site plan as well.

Twenty-eight of the post molds were excavated. The eastern ca. one fourth of the structure was uncovered at a later time than that of the post mold excavations, and these additional molds which complete the structural pattern have not been excavated or numbered.

Structure 2 is one of the three largest Native American buildings found on the site so far, and was most likely a dwelling. The structure is oval and measures 25.5' east-west and 18.25' north-south, with a long axis orientation running east-west. The structure is composed of 49 wall posts, most of which are spaced about 1.25' apart. In a few cases, there are additional molds clustered together, either in the wall line or immediately inside or outside of it. These may be integral parts of the wall, possibly as a result of repair and/or reinforcement of some type. Some along the south wall may actually be parts of another overlapping structure that either pre-dates or post-dates the present structure (see below, under Structure 28). There is a very significant gap along the south wall and not far from where the curve of the east wall begins. That this is a doorway is almost certain. Even though intrusive Colonial post hole, Feature 85, has probably obliterated a wall post in this area, the gap is still about three feet, twice the otherwise typical spacing of the posts.

Molds vary from 0.3'-0.53', with most being relatively large. The smaller ones are probably those that, for some reason, were set less deep than others. The plow truncation then sheared the molds farther down on the posts where they had begun to taper, with increasingly smaller diameters toward the tips. Depths vary from 0.15' to as much as 0.85'. The average depth of the 28 excavated examples is 0.42' (just over 5 inches). Deeper ones were located on the north wall and in roughly the center of the west wall. Bottoms generally tapered to a blunt point.

Internal features include 17 post molds, only one of which was dug (Feature 90). An additional mold, Feature 204, is rather rectangular and looks more like a Colonial post rather than one associated with the Native American structure. However, it is unexcavated and the plan shape may be fortuitous.

Features 111, 112 and 106, also located within the structure, were not excavated. They appear to be natural disturbances.

Because of the historic period Colonial structure and its associated cellar, much of the inside of the structure has been removed. However, there is clearly some kind of internal patterning, even though it is too disturbed and incomplete to reconstruct. For example, a pattern begins just past the doorway where a north-south line runs from Feature 90 to Feature 119, at which point it may intersect a series of molds running east-
west. In roughly the western half of the structure there are two approximately parallel, east-west-trending lines of molds spaced about equidistant from the walls. How far east this possible pattern extends is uncertain as the southern line is not continuous. If these molds are not for roof supports or alternatively, just random background noise and not associated at all, they could be interpreted as supporting some type of internal platform. If this is the case - and the evidence is certainly not the best - the structure may have been a communal storage building or a charnel house rather than a dwelling. Another alternative is that some of the interior molds, particularly those in the southern part of the structure, are actually associated with proposed Structure 28, a tentatively defined building to be discussed later in this section.

Few artifacts were found in the excavated post molds. These consisted of only a couple of quartzite flakes, a sherd of Gaston Simple Stamped, and a chunk of burned clay, probably daub. Numerous other Native American artifacts were found in the back fills of later Colonial features within the structure and in the general vicinity.

North wall post 189 clearly intruded Feature 135, a rectangular pit. The structural post had penetrated the entire feature and extended into the subsoil below. Contents of the pit feature included a few flakes and fire-cracked rocks, a plain/smoothed sand tempered sherd and, curiously, a flake of English flint. Although the inclusion of this last item may indicate a definite post-contact date for the latest Native American occupation of the site, one should not make too much of a single small flake that could have been moved into the fill by undetected root, rodent or insect channels. The shape of the pit suggests the possibility of a burial in which all traces of the body have decomposed. Data pertaining to Feature 135 as well as the excavated twenty-eight posts are listed below.

Post Molds associated with Structure 2

F-86  203N 381E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.27' wide and 0.35' deep. The mold was surrounded by a possible hole, a light mottled clay halo of .42' in diameter, which was not excavated. The feature is a possibly associated with Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-88  201N 392E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.36' wide and 0.6' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-89  203N 392E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.35' wide and 0.19' deep. The feature is possibly associated with Structure 2. The western bisection was removed.
F-90 205N 396E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.3' wide and 0.21' deep. The feature is inside Structure 2 and may be associated. The mold was fully excavated.

F-101 207N 379E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.27' wide and 0.26' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-103 208N 376E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.5' in diameter and 0.35' deep. The feature is possibly associated with Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-104 210N 376E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.33' in diameter and 0.57' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-105 211N 376E
Prehistoric. Post 0.30' in diameter and at least 0.65' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-117 213N 377E
Prehistoric. Post 0.35' in diameter and at least 0.5' deep. The feature is probably a part of Structure 2 overgrown by roots. The upper levels of the mold were removed but the bottom was not reached.

F-118 215N 377E
Prehistoric. Post 0.35' in diameter and 0.23 deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-128 218N 379E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.35' in diameter and 0.4' deep. The feature is part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-136 218N 397E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.42' in diameter and 0.45' deep. The feature is probably part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-138 219N 393E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.43' in diameter and 0.84' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-139 219N 392E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.35' in diameter and 0.85 deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2 and intrudes pit F-135. The mold was fully excavated.

F-141 220N 389E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.44' in diameter and at least 0.75' deep. The feature is probably a part of Structure 2 overgrown by roots. The upper levels of the mold were removed but the bottom was not reached.

F-143 220N 388E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.5' in diameter and 0.53' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-145 220N 385E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.34' in diameter and 0.25' deep with a root tail. The feature appears to be an overgrown post of Structure 2. The stain was fully excavated.

F-146 220N 383E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.53' in diameter and 0.45' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-147 219N 381E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.35' in diameter and 0.15' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-148 217N 378E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.3' in diameter and 0.3' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-197 206N 377E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.3' in diameter and 0.35' deep. The feature is possibly associated with Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-206 208N 377E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.4' in diameter and 0.45' deep. The feature is possibly a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-207 205N 379E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.27' in diameter and 0.3' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-210 204N 380E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.32' in diameter and 0.3' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.
F-212  203N 384E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.33' in diameter and 0.49' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-214  202N 386E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.33' in diameter and 0.36' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-215  202N 387E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.33' in diameter and 0.29' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

F-271  203N 382E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.28' in diameter and 0.25' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 2. The mold was fully excavated.

Other Features Possibly Associated with Structure 2

F-135  220N 392E
Prehistoric pit measuring 4.3' north-south and 2.0' east-west with a variable depth from 0.38' at the south end to 0.65' at the north end. Fill was dark brown loam with charcoal flecking and numerous pieces of burned clay. The fill was overlain by F-139, a post of prehistoric Structure 2. The western bisections of both features were removed to obtain a profile.

Structure 3

Structure 3 is located adjacent southwest of Structure 4 and is partially intruded on by the later building (Figure *). Structure 3 is an oval pattern which appears to be a dwelling. The structure measures 26.5' east-west by 16' north-south and is oriented with its long axis running east-west. It is composed of 42 post molds, most of which are spaced about 1.25' feet apart.

The southwest end post of Structure 4 has cut off one or two molds from the wall pattern, and two unexcavated squared molds may be historic intrusions; otherwise the structure is fairly well intact. A shallow flat bottomed basin lying near the inside west wall was first assumed to be prehistoric, but upon excavation, contained a nail. Feature 400, one of the Colonial palisade posts, also lies inside the structure. No prehistoric pits or burials lie in particularly close proximity to the structure and only a few stray post molds were found nearby.
All of the wall posts were excavated. Those posts which were not excavated were mapped but not numbered. Molds varied from 0.28' in diameter or greatest dimension (a few were roughly oval) and from 1.5-4.7' in depth. Plow truncation was fairly severe and the average diameter was 0.3' and the average depth, only 0.28' (just under 3.5 inches). Profiles (Figure *) are typically pointed to blunt pointed.

An entrance is difficult to distinguish. A doorway may have been located along the eastern side where a small rounded pit or large post is located. This pit/post, lying shortly south of post mold 379, was not excavated but is most likely an intrusive post. If this 2.5' gap is actually the entrance, it is in contrast to that of other similar structures on the site. The entrance was more likely located along the southeastern part of the wall, between Features 373 and 380 or between 380 and 376. Two squared molds that have not been excavated (Features 381 and 574) are thought to be intrusive historic driven rails or stakes of some sort.

It is possible that post molds 375 and 380 are part of an overlapping earlier or later structure. This interpretation was one that was favored for a time during the field work. While this theory is a reasonable explanation, the interpretation of the pattern of posts extending north from Features 375 to 397 and beyond as an internal feature which is an actual part of the house is equally plausible. Although it is possible that this arc is part of either another house that has been mainly plowed out or an open sided structure of some sort, it may instead be some type of internal partition. Another Structure number (8) was originally given to this northwest-trending arc.

Feature 397, which appears to be in or on the northern end of the arc, contained a brass straight pin. However, the mold looks just like a prehistoric post in plan and profile, and it certainly appears to be a part of the arc. Thus, unless the pin is actually associated with a very late post-contact structure, it is an intrusive element in the mold. Certainly, something as small and light as the pin could have entered the mold through undetected insect or plant disturbance.

Originally, another Structure number (6) was also given to several of the doubled molds along the northwest and west sides of the structure in the belief that some type of windbreak might have been represented. However, this theory is not convincing and a more likely explanation is repair and/or reinforcement.

Another pattern could possibly be represented by three or all of the four unnumbered post molds in the center of the structure and/or they may be associated with post molds 343 and 344. These may possibly represent some type of platform or rack(s).

Post Molds Associated with Structure 3
F-332  177N 316E
Prehistoric.  Post mold 0.3' in diameter and 0.41 deep.  The feature is a part of Structure 3.  The mold was fully excavated.

F-333  177N 317E
Prehistoric.  Post mold 0.3' in diameter and 0.45' deep.  The feature is a part of Structure 3.  The mold was fully excavated.

F-334  176N 322E
Prehistoric.  Post mold 0.35' in diameter and 0.42' deep.  The feature is a part of Structure 3.  The mold was fully excavated.

F-336  177N 314E
Prehistoric.  Post mold 0.4' in diameter and 0.47' deep.  The feature is a part of Structure 3.  The mold was fully excavated.

F-338  177N 319E
Prehistoric.  Post mold 0.2' in diameter and 0.4' deep.  The feature is a part of Structure 3.  The mold was fully excavated.

F-339  176N 323E
Prehistoric.  The feature is a part of Structure 3.  The mold was fully excavated.

F-346  177N 312E
Prehistoric.  Post mold 0.33' in diameter and 0.28' deep.  The feature is a part of Structure 3.  The mold was fully excavated.

F-347  176N 312E
Prehistoric.  Post mold 0.45' in diameter and 0.2' deep.  The feature is a part of Structure 3.  The mold was fully excavated.

F-348  177N 310E
Prehistoric.  Post mold 0.3' in diameter and 0.3' deep.  The feature is a part of Structure 3.  The mold was fully excavated.

F-349  176N 310E
Prehistoric.  Post mold 0.31' in diameter and 0.23' deep.  The feature is a part of Structure 3.  The mold was fully excavated.

F-350  175N 309E
Prehistoric.  Post mold 0.35' in diameter and 0.41' deep.  The feature is a part of Structure 3.  The mold was fully excavated.
F-351 173N 309E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.25' in diameter and 0.34' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-352 172N 308E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.28' in diameter and 0.42' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-354 169N 307E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.26' in diameter and 0.24' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-356 167N 307E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.32' in diameter and 0.3' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-357 166N 308E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.28' in diameter and 0.28' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-358 164N 308E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.29' in diameter and 0.25' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-359 163N 310E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.27' in diameter and 0.28' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-360 162N 311E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.3' in diameter and 0.26' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-361 162N 312E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.31' in diameter and 0.26' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-362 161N 314E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.29' in diameter and 0.27' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-363 161N 316E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.26' in diameter and 0.24' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-364 161N 318E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.3' in diameter and 0.24' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-365 161N 319E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.27' in diameter and 0.23' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-367 170N 308E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.25' in diameter and 0.28' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-372 160N 321E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.27' in diameter and 0.28' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-373 160N 322E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.23' in diameter and 0.18' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-374 160N 324E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.25' in diameter and 0.17' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-375 160N 325E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.3' in diameter and 0.28' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-376 163N 328E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.3' in diameter and 0.28' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-377 164N 329E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.32' in diameter and 0.47' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-378 166N 330E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.29' in diameter and 0.32' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.
F-379  169N 330E  
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.17' in diameter and 0.15' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-383  174N 328E  
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.37' in diameter and 0.25' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-384  175N 326E  
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.31' in diameter and 0.28' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-385  176N 325E  
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.34' in diameter and 0.29' deep. The feature is a part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-353  171N 307E  
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.4' in diameter and 0.32' deep. This feature was originally listed as part of Structure 6 but is now considered part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-355  168N 307E  
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.42' in diameter and 0.27' deep. This feature was originally listed as part of Structure 6 but is now considered part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-390  162N 325E  
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.22' in diameter and 0.11' deep. This feature was originally listed as part of Structure 8 but is now considered part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-391  163N 325E  
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.21' in diameter and 0.17' deep. This feature was originally listed as part of Structure 8 but is now considered part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-393  160N 320E block  
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.24' in diameter and 0.21' deep. Exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on the map. This feature was originally listed as part of Structure 6 but is now considered part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-394  166N 324E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.32' in diameter and 0.33' deep. This feature was originally listed as part of Structure 8 but is now considered part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-396 167N 324E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.2' in diameter and 0.14' deep. This feature was originally listed as part of Structure 8 but is now considered part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-397 168N 322E
Historic. Post mold 0.34' in diameter and 0.38' deep. This feature was originally listed as part of Structure 8 but is now considered part of Structure 3. However, an historic artifact was recovered from the mold. The mold was fully excavated.

F-412 160N 320E block
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.21' in diameter and 0.18' deep. Exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on the map. This feature was originally listed as part of Structure 8 but is now considered part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

F-413 164N 325E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.3' in diameter and 0.3' deep. This feature was originally listed as part of Structure 8 but is now considered part of Structure 3. The mold was fully excavated.

**Structure 9**

Structure 9 lies in the southwesternmost corner of the stripped part of the tract and is one of two rounded rather than oval Native American structures on the site. One possibly associated feature, F-420, was fully excavated. However, neither the structural wall posts nor any other nearby features have yet been excavated or numbered.

The structure is round and measures 15 feet in diameter. The walls consist of 46 post molds, some of which are parallel paired on the interior. Spacing is mainly at 1.25' intervals. Molds range from about 0.2' to 0.3' in diameter, and most are about 0.25' across.

Doorways are difficult to distinguish, as there are three possible candidates: a 3' gap and a 2.5' gap on the north edge, and another gap on the west/northwest edge. Although this latter gap is real, it is impossible to accurately measure due to an unnumbered rounded 1.5' diameter stain of undetermined origin. This disturbance, possibly a prehistoric pit, either intrudes the wall line or is intruded by the wall line, but
the mold cannot be distinguished in the feature fill. However, the gap from the pit to
the post mold to the north of it is 1.75', suggesting that some gap does exist, even
though its original dimensions are gone. Because none of the wall posts have been
excavated, however, it is not certain what degree of plow truncation has taken place;
hence, all posts may be very shallow, and perhaps the shallowest ones are plowed
away. If this is the case, then doorways are a matter of conjecture.

Feature 420, an apparent large post hole and mold, lies near the center of the structure
and was excavated. The feature is spaced equidistantly, 6.25' from the the west and
north edges of the structure walls. The profile showed what appeared to be a post hole
and mold that had been intruded by a tap root. Contents of the post hole consisted of
only a few tiny burned clay (daub?) chunks and no artifacts. The mold, on the other
hand, produced a charred acorn or small hickory nut fragment as well as 20 chunks of
unfired daub. Many of these chunks have one flattened and well smoothed side, one
turns a right angle, and one has what are clearly impressions of sticks or cane (wattles?).
The feature may be a center post for the structure or it may not be associated. If this
feature is truly associated with the structure, then there was surely some daubing along
the walls of the structure, and some of it made its way into the mold upon destruction
of the building, either through intentional dismantling or weathering.

Two unnumbered stains lie north and south of Feature 420, and a straight line can be
drawn through all three; however, none of these three features look alike. In fact, the
southernmost is clearly a small stump mold. The northernmost, a small oval pit with a
rock jammed into its north end, has a much more recent appearance; in addition, the
last grader pass temporarily removed the rock, revealing a small part of the feature in
section. The stain was extremely shallow and appeared nothing like that of the central
feature in the middle of the structure.

Feature 420 is surrounded by a triangular pattern of four small post molds.
Approximately 3' to the east and still inside of the structure is another pattern of 6
molds which may be a rack or a bench.

Three unnumbered pits lie along the wall lines. Two of these pits are clearly earlier
than the structure, as they are intruded by its post molds. The westernmost of these pits
is 3.75' in diameter and had been intruded by several posts. Another pit to the southeast
is intruded by one mold, while, as already mentioned, a pit along the west wall may or
may not be intruded. Several other small pits and/or large posts lie nearby. Again,
however, these features have not been numbered or investigated beyond initial
mapping.

This structure is smaller than others on the site, and is the only one that is truly round.
On the other hand, however, none of the structures in the far western part of the site are
as large or as elongated as those in the central and eastern part. This structure, which
could have been daubed, either represents a dwelling or some special use building such as a granary or a more generalized storage crib.

Features Possibly Associated with Structure 9:

F-420 145N 149E
Prehistoric. Post hole 0.9' in diameter and 1.05' deep with a post mold of 0.6' diameter. Although apparently disturbed by a tap root, this feature is a possible center post for Structure 9. The feature was bisected and then fully excavated, with mold and hole kept separate.

Structure 11

Structure 11 is located near the southwestern corner of the site and only 15' northeast of Structure 9. The structure is nearly rounded as it measures 16.75' east-west and 15 feet north-south, with the long axis running on a slight southwest to northeast trend. The structure is composed of 33 posts molds, though a few appear to be repairs on originals. This structure has not been investigated in any way other than initial mapping; none of its features have been numbered or tested.

When viewing Figure *, it is obvious that post diameters are consistently smaller in roughly the eastern half of the structure. This difference is a product of grading only, and does not reflect differential post mold thickness from one side of the structure to another. When the westernmost strip of plowzone was removed in 1990, only half of this structure was uncovered. Later, toward the close of the 1991 season, an adjoining strip was removed and the eastern half of the structure was revealed. During this 1991 plow zone removal, it was decided that the grader should further truncate the very top of the subsoil to remove the rather deep and messy interface that had been encountered the year before. At that time, failure to scrape deep enough had required too great an expenditure of valuable field time and expense to clean and reclean to simply define features. Consequently, since the posts are probably very shallow to begin with, the deeper grading during 1991 caught the posts on their taper downward, producing smaller plan view diameters that have no bearing whatsoever on the original size of the saplings used to construct this building. Therefore, post mold diameters are best compared to nearby structures in this western area by using the west wall diameters only. Here posts range from 0.25-0.45' in diameter, with most measuring about 0.3-0.35' across. Spacing is mainly at 1.5' intervals, greater than that on structures described above.

There is more than one possibility for a doorway, as there several gaps in the wall. While the easternmost of these may be due to deep truncation, the remainder, if not all, are more likely true patterns. The favored entrance theory is a ca. 2.75' gap along the
southeast edge of the structure's wall line. Another, measuring about the same length, lies along the southwest edge, while a third, making a 3' span, lies along the northwest edge. Yet another possible gap is located further east along the north edge, but the intrusion of a 19th century fence post obscures this one. Possibly, as could conceivably be the case with some other structures, there are multiple entrances.

A possible internal partition composed of a line of 7 molds lies in the eastern part of the structure. An alternative interpretation is that this is part of an overlapping structure that is either open sided or partially plowed away. On the other hand, the molds in the line inside of the structure are fairly closely spaced, while a 5' gap is made between the north end of the internal line and the point at which it would continue into the curved pattern that extends to the northeast of the structure. Even if one of Structure 11's wall posts would have been put in the same place as that of an overlapping structure, a 3' gap would exist. If the possible extension of this line to the northeast of the structure is not part of an overlapping arc, then it could be a fencing of some sort.

Another oval pattern composed of both small and large molds which may or may not be associated with one another is located directly southwest of the building. This oval pattern is more or less contiguous with Structure 11 and measures 5.5' east-west by 7.5' north-south. It is not certain whether this is an addition to Structure 11, a separate small structure of some sort, or the mainly plowed out remains of more than one structural entity.

There are 6 post molds and post mold-like stains in the western part of the structure. Some or all may be parts of some post-built internal feature, some may be posts which may not be associated with the structure, while others could be natural disturbances. Two fairly large, rounded, apparent post holes, one of which shows a hole-and-mold plan, are located in the northeastern part of the structure. These may or may not be associated with the building. Three medium sized stains, one of which could be a large post, lie just outside to the northeast. Another large post or small pit lies just south of the structure. None of these disturbances have been investigated.

There are several historic intrusions not illustrated on this map (see overall site plan). These include a line of 19th century fence posts, one of which intrudes the north wall line. Two features which appear to be historic post holes, including a fairly large (ca. 1.5') post-and-mold feature, are located in the southwest part of the inside of the house; however, these intrusions have not taken out any large area of the original floor plan.

Structure 12
Structure 12 is an east-west oriented building located in the northwestern part of the stripped area and 67 feet due north of Structure 9. The structure has only been mapped, with none of its component features numbered or excavated.

Structure 12 was not fully uncovered, as its westernmost portion ran under the wall of the grader cut; however, most of the structure was revealed in the cut, and by following its shape, one can estimate its east-west dimensions as 17.5'. North south-dimensions are 12.5'.

The revealed portion of the structure is composed of 29 post molds, most of which are spaced about 1.5' apart. Eight posts along the northern edge are paired in that four of the main wall posts have counterparts lying parallel 0.5' away, possibly as weather reinforcement. Post mold diameters are mainly from 2-2.5'.

There are three molds, or possibly two molds and a mold-like natural disturbance, which jut out 1-1.25' from the front. It is tempting to suggest that this is an entrance. However, a fourth mold which is much larger (0.5') than the rest lies in the middle of what would otherwise be a ca. 3.5' gap, leaving only a bit less than 1.25' on either side of it. Since the large post lies along the center end of the structure and is in good alignment and spacing with the other posts, it is probably a part of the wall line, and an entrance in this area is not very likely. Possibly, a more convincing entrance is located in the area which has not yet been uncovered.

Internal features include five posts which, if actually associated, may form one or more racks or platforms. A large post or small pit is located in the southwestern part of the interior, and two large posts and one small one are located to the south. The northernmost of these is almost, if not completely, in line with the south wall.

This structure is small, but is fairly oval and otherwise similar to some of the larger structures on the site. It may be a special purpose building or a dwelling.

**Structure 13**

Structure 13, an oval structure, lies in the northwesternmost corner of the stripped area, and only ca. 21' north of Structure 12, described above. This structure has also not been investigated beyond the mapping stage, and none of its posts or other possibly associated features have been numbered or tested.

Structure 13 is oriented with its long axis running east-west, and measures 16.25' east-west by 13.75' north-south. The structure is composed of 32 post molds spaced mainly at 1.5' intervals. Post mold diameters range from about 0.25'-0.3'. A single probable large post (ca. 0.75' diameter) lies in the east central part of the structure's interior. Two
additional features lie nearby just south of the structure. One of these is oddly shaped and is most likely a root or rodent disturbance. The other may be a post hole and mold, but would require testing for confirmation.

The structure is either a special purpose building or a dwelling.

**Structure 14**

Structure 14 is located 8.75' northwest of Structure 2. The former structure is an oval pattern of 44 post molds. The structure measures 18.75' north-south and ca. 15 feet east-west. Unlike Structure 2, however, the long axis of Structure 14 is oriented on a northwest-southeast bearing. The corners are almost squared. Most molds are about 0.25' in diameter and spaced mainly at 1.25' intervals. A 1.75' gap along the southeastern part of the wall could be a doorway.

This structure has not been excavated and most of the molds have not been numbered. There are two probable historic period Colonial intrusions along the walls and more in the general vicinity, but only one of these later features covers a wall post. Two ca. 0.5-0.7' diameter stains are located near the west wall, but their date is uncertain.

A possibly associated pit which may be a decomposed burial is Feature 155, located only 1.75' from the southeast corner of the building and 5.4 feet from the northwestern edge of Structure 2. The only artifacts in the feature were a flake and three projectile points. Two of the points were small quartz triangular types, one of which was serrated. The other was a broken quartz fragment which could not be identified. The plan shape of the pit (see below), the nature and scarcity of the artifact content, and the profile, strongly suggest an infant burial that had decomposed entirely.

This structure is the largest of the less elongated and generally smaller of the Native American structures on the site. It is probably a dwelling.

**Features Possibly Associated with Structure 14**

F-155 225N 378E
Prehistoric pit consisting of an elongated oval measuring 3.85' east-west by 1.75' north-south and 0.52' deep. Sides were almost straight and the bottom was flattened. The fill was composed of two layers. The uppermost was a 0.15-0.2' thick layer of rather leached brown loam with some minor charcoal flecking, while the bottom layer which comprised the remainder of the fill was lighter brown loam. The feature is probably a Native American infant burial with no bones surviving. The feature was fully excavated.
Structure 22

Structure 22, interpreted as a dwelling, is located in the south central part of the site, 18' east of Structure 11 and 85' west of Structure 3. This structure is one of three large and rather elongated Native American houses on the site (Structures 2, 3 and 22). Structure 22 has not been investigated beyond the mapping stage, and as is the case with most of the structures of this type on the site, none of the structural elements or possibly associated other features have been tested or numbered.

The structure is oriented with its long axis running east-west and measures 25' east-west by 17.5' north-south. It is composed of 37 post molds spaced at 1.5-1.75' intervals. Mold diameters vary from 0.2-0.3' and are mainly about 0.25'; however, machine truncation in this area (opened late in the 1991 season; see Structure 11 discussion) probably accounts for fairly small diameters. Possible internal features of some kind are represented by an arc of four small molds in the eastern interior of the structure and an elongated triangle made by three similar molds in the northwestern interior. A couple of somewhat larger post mold-like stains are also located within the interior, but their placements give no clues as to function, and it is doubtful that these are actually associated with the structure; more likely they are associated in some way with an enigmatic line of other large posts that extend outside of and beyond the structure (see overall site map).

Structure 23

This structure is located 70' east of Structure 12 and 46' north/northeast of Structure 22. Structure 23 refers to a partial house pattern, the majority of which is believed to have been plowed away. Even though only the east/southeastern section is intact, the shape and estimated dimensions match well those of other Native American house patterns on the site. This structure has not been investigated beyond mapping, and none of the post molds have been numbered or tested.

Structure 23’s dimensions can be estimated by looking at the partial configuration and following the curves to connect partially intact wall sections with single remnant posts. Using this method, dimensions were estimated at 27.5' north-south by 17.5' east-west, dimensions similar to those of other large structures on the site. The orientation of the structure’s long axis would have been northwest-southeast. Molds vary from about 0.2-0.25' in diameter, and it is likely that all of these molds are very highly truncated and shallow.
There are a few possible stray posts in the area, including four large ones measuring roughly 0.5-0.65' in diameter. One of these larger posts is either on or adjacent to the northeast wall line, while another may be on the hypothesized northwest wall line.

A possible small pit measuring about 1.25' by 1.75' lies inside the structure and adjacent to the northeast wall. The nature of this possible pit is undetermined. Feature 509, lying in the interior of the structure, appeared to be a disturbance. Description is as follows:

F-509 220N 243E
Amorphous pit 4.7' north-south and 2.39' east-west with a depth of 1.2'. The southeast half was excavated. The soft nature of the fill and the shape of the plan and profile suggested a tree disturbance which probably post-dates the structure. The disturbance was left in bisection.

**Structure 28**

Unlike other structures on the site, "proposed" Structure 28 is not at all clear, even though a large number of presumably component post molds are present. Consequently, this structure is difficult to visualize when compared to the clearly defined plans of the remaining Native American buildings.

Proposed Structure 28 is located adjacent south of Structure 2 and may even overlap the latter. Unless Structure 28 is some kind of fenced area or addition hanging off of Structure 2 at an odd angle, Structure 28 is a separate entity that either pre-dates or post-dates Structure 2.

Structure 28 is composed of at least 17 post molds that do not touch or overlap Structure 2, and it is likely that some of those molds that are closely spaced along the latter structure's south wall are also a part of Structure 2. The orientation of Structure 28 is northwest-southeast, with a possible length of about 20' north-south and a width of 15' east-west. Some internal posts are present, and there is, in general, a perplexing array of stray post molds in the vicinity. Molds are spaced oddly, in that those along the northwestern and northeastern edges are spaced about 3.75' apart, while those on the western and southern edges are as much as 5' apart. A 6.75' gap on the eastern side where spacing is otherwise similar to that of other structures on the site, may be an entrance. A large post lies near the center of the interior. For the most part the interior is difficult to discuss, since Feature 233, a very large historic shallow basin, has taken away much of the presumed floor space.

Post molds that may make up the structure are (clockwise from south edge) 236, 52, 60, 59, 64, 65, 68, an unnumbered one between 68 and 83, 118, and possibly 187. At this point the wall line of Structure 2 is intersected, and it is possible the internal post molds
of Structure 2 such as 89, 100, 203 and 205 are actually parts of Structure 28. Other possibly associated molds are, from north to south, 268, 71 61, 62, 58, 47, 46, 43, 42, 41, 238 and an unnumbered one between the latter two molds. Although most of these molds were numbered, time and other priorities prevented their excavation.

**Structure 29 and The Feature 417/418 Complex**

In the western part of the site, where native American structures 9, 11, 12, 13 and 22 are located, and less than 10' north of Structure 22, are two pits, Features 417 and 418, and a number of large post molds surrounding them. Some of these molds form a configuration, Structure 29, to be described and discussed in detail below. Feature 417 is complex and is also discussed below. Feature 18 was begun in 1990, but upon removal of only a very shallow area of fill, it quickly became clear that this feature represented a flexed Native American burial. Accordingly, the initial excavation was back filled and carefully covered until such time as burials would be excavated. The pit was recently reopened during the excavation of both the Native American and Colonial burials on the site. This stage of work is not yet complete and will be presented in a later report on the 1992 efforts.

Feature 417 was a large rectangular pit with relatively straight sides and a flat bottom. The pit was intruded on its northeastern edge by a 19th century fence post hole, and final excavation revealed a relatively small tap root disturbance in the bottom of the western half. The feature looks much like a burial pit, and it is this writer's opinion that it may have once held human remains, but that all traces have since decomposed.

The 1990 excavation of this pit consisted of removal of the western half in two apparent natural layers. However, when the profile was revealed, it became clear that four layers were present (Figure *). The upper three layers were all dark and ashy, with some varying charcoal content by layer. These three layers were taken out as a single unit (EU1024) in the initial bisection, but were separated during the final excavation efforts. The bottom layer was a mixture of brown loam and reddish yellow clay loam subsoil redeposited as fill. This bottom layer of mixed clayey and organic-rich soil appears to have been a rapid filling episode. The upper layers, however, suggest one of two interpretations: either a second pit was dug directly atop the first and then either used as a cooking pit or back filled with hearth cleanings; or, as an alternative, the pit was partially back filled with mixed subsoil and topsoil, and then a fire was made in the pit, after which it was completely back filled with associated burn debris and organic rich surface soil. The first interpretation seems more likely, as the bottom layer extends fully up the sides, and the darker layer does not run the full dimensions of the top of the pit. What is most likely to have taken place, then, is that a more recent pit was dug into the top of a burial.
A large Gaston Simple Stamped vessel section was found in a very shallow basin shaped area in the bottom of the western half of the pit. Although the section was cracked into pieces, all pieces were lying together in situ. Underneath the vessel section was a very faint paper thin smear of what may have once been bone. Accordingly, this pit was investigated during the recent (1992) burial excavations, in the belief that a portion of a skeleton, or at least a shadow of one, could be found in the eastern half. Unfortunately, however, the only bone found was an as yet unidentified and heavily decomposed fragment found loose as back fill in an upper stratum. Hence, the interpretation of the pit as a burial is still tentative.

Analysis of ceramics from the western half of the pit indicate that this feature is part of the major late village component of the site, as the majority of the ceramics (48.6%) were Gaston, while the rest were a mixture of various types. Individual Gaston sherds were usually larger than others, and, as mentioned above, a cluster of twenty five of the Gaston sherds were lying together in one large broken vessel section on the bottom. While plain, fabric impressed and cord marked wares were all present as minor types, 27.7% of the total recovered ceramics were fabric impressed, and of these, a small majority were of the very hard and durable, very fine sand tempered to untempered paste type.

This pit and Feature 18, a flexed burial lying immediately to the east, will be discussed fully in a later report pertaining to burials and other work in the 1992 season.

A total of 10 or more large post molds surround Features 417 and 418 in an irregularly circular to squared pattern measuring about 27.5' east-west by 21.25 north-south. While this picture is confused by a number of large posts that are thinly scattered through the western area of the site, and some patterns may be obscured the presence of some as yet unexcavated features of probable historic and undetermined origin, there is clearly a pattern within this larger area, and this pattern is one of regular shape and post spacing.

Completely surrounding Features 417 and 418 are large posts forming a circular area measuring 17.5' in diameter, with an even post mold spacing of 7.5'. This configuration is composed of five post molds, Features 421, 424, 425 and two others that are not excavated or numbered. Another mold that would have completed the circle is missing, and in its place is a small pit feature which may have obliterated the missing post.

Three of the posts that appear to form the circular enclosure around Features 417 and 418 were numbered, bisected, and then fully excavated, and another more peripheral post was also excavated. The three posts that form regular spacing within the circle, Features 421, 424 and 425, ranged from 0.5-0.6' in diameter, with depths of 0.65', 0.4' and 0.4' respectively. Profiles were blunt pointed/rounded or slightly flattened on the bottoms. Feature 425 contained a Gaston sherd, while the remainder contained either
nondiagnostic lithics or, in one example, nothing at all. It is interesting that Feature 423, slightly outside of the circle, was shallower with a less regular bottom.

John White's late 16th century renderings of the North Carolina Algonkian town of Secoton (Hulton 1984; Harriot 1972 [1590]) show two configurations of large upright posts: one, a circular area used for dancing at times of intercommunity feasting; the other, a smaller though similar structure located nearby. The dance circle lay within an otherwise barren area used for socializing and feasting, while the smaller structure is said to have been in a "rownd plott" where the inhabitants assembled themselves to "make their folemne prayers" (Harriot 1972 [1590]: 68). A fire is shown burning in the area enclosed by the smaller structure's posts. This structure is said to have been in proximity to a funerary building, and a large building shown in the foreground in White's original Secoton depiction is labelled as such. This building is large, but otherwise looks no different than a dwelling house.

Both large post structures in the White painting are built with thick posts set upright in the ground, with no fencing between them. The dance circle posts are shown as just above head height, while those of the smaller "prayer" area are much shorter. Near the tops of all posts of both structures are carved faces looking into the areas enclosed by them. The dance circle is clearly round and (if the relative perspective can at all be trusted at all) suggests a shape, size and post spacing like that of the 44Pg302 post configuration. In addition, the original White painting shows another post that sets slightly outside of the circle. The smaller structure looks squared or rectangular, with one outlying post whose carved face looks inward.

There are several ways to interpret the 44Pg302 post ring: 1) the posts intentionally enclose the burials; 2) the posts intentionally enclose something akin to the "prayer" structure", suggesting the possibility that the darker and probably intrusive stratum in Feature 418 is a back filled fire pit, and that the burials may or may not be associated; or 3) the burials are slightly earlier or slightly later, and the posts represent a dance circle like the one depicted by White.

Also shown in the White paintings are rows of either large set posts or small tree trunks sheared off, and these appear to separate the garden plots from the dance circle area described in Harriot as "a feurrall [separate] broad plotte whear they meete with their neighbors, to celebrate their cheefe floemne feafltes". Obviously, however, one must remember that White anglicized the layouts and probably even many of the internal details of the villages to conform better with European standards of order, and the de Bry copies are even more anglicized. Accordingly, it is reasonable to believe that such a row of posts would not necessarily have been placed in such a straight line or even with such consistent spacing. The relevance of the depictions of these latter posts is their association with the dance circle and greater feasting area, and how this pattern of
internal village space could be used as a starting point for interpretation of much of the "background noise" in this area of the present site.

For example, there is a large area from ca. 200N to 240N and the end of the excavation block, and from 170E to 230E, where there is very little of anything in the way of features and no later large Colonial features to hide earlier detail. Bordering this area to the northwest is a dwelling or specialized structure (#12); to the east, the remnant of a large oval structure (#23); and to the south, the Feature 417/418 area and possibly associated post circle. About 20' northeast of the post circle is an unexcavated pit that is partially surrounded by some as yet unexcavated posts. These borders are also roughly consistent with locations of other large posts of unknown function and less consistent pattern than that of the small circle around the 417/418 area. Perhaps what is still present in the ground, modifying for plow destruction of some features as well was background noise from later features and disturbances, is showing at least part of a settlement layout of spatial distinctions between domestic, agricultural, ceremonial and other community activity areas.

Excavated Post molds Associated and Possibly Associated with Structure 29

F-421 194N 220E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.5' in diameter and 0.65' deep. The feature may be part of a dance ring or similar structure depicted in the John White paintings. The feature was fully excavated.

F-423 188N 215E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.6' in diameter and 0.35' deep. The feature may or may not be part of a dance ring or similar structure depicted in the John White paintings. There is a possibility that it is a historic intrusion. The feature was fully excavated.

F-424 186N 217E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.6' in diameter and 0.4' deep. The feature may be part of a dance ring or similar structure depicted in the John White paintings. The feature was fully excavated.

F-425 188N 233E
Prehistoric. Post mold 0.6' in diameter and 0.4' deep. The feature may be part of a dance ring or similar structure depicted in the John White paintings. The feature was fully excavated.

Other Features Possibly associated with Structure 29
F-417  190N 200E
Prehistoric. Oval to rectangular possible fire pit intruding a probable Native American burial. The entire feature measures 6.5' by 4.35' and 1.25' deep. One half of the pit was excavated in the 1990 season and is included in the artifact inventories. The recently excavated remainder is still under analysis and will be reported later, along with the results of burial investigations and other 1992 excavations.

F-418  150N 200E block
Flexed Native American burial. The pit was opened in 1990 and closed again. The recently excavated remainder, including the human skeleton, is still under analysis and will be reported later, along with other results of the 1992 excavations.

MISCELLANEOUS PIT FEATURES AND BURIALS

The following includes descriptions of other Native American pit features that do not appear to be associated with structural post mold patterns. Three of these have since proved to be Native American burials, the excavation of which was not undertaken until the 1992 season. These are not included in the artifact inventories and will be reported more fully in a later report.

F-23  194N 354E
Prehistoric. Shallow basin shaped pit 4.3' in plan by 0.6' deep. This rounded shallow basin pit measuring was located 20' west of proposed Structure 28, 25' southwest of Structure 2, 31' south of Structure 14, and 30' northeast of Structure 3. In addition, two opposing partial arcs of post molds are situated from 5-10' east of the pit. However, these arcs may represent what little is left of some highly truncated and nearly plowed out house structures.

The pit contained small amounts of Gaston, Roanoke and shell tempered plain/smoothed sherds as well a number of fire-cracked rocks, a few flakes, an Archaic point, and some unidentified bone fragments. The pit was basin-shaped and not flat bottomed or otherwise suggestive of a burial. A cooking/food processing feature that has been back-filled with general refuse is suggested.

F-257  158N 366E
Prehistoric. Circular pit with steeply sloping sides and flat bottom, 1.1' in diameter and 0.25' deep.

The pit had nearly vertical sides and a flat bottom. The fill was a mixture of dark loam and riverine mussel shells, with some charcoal flecking. The feature was excavated in
bisection only. Only one artifact was found - a small sherd of crushed quartz tempered, cord marked pottery (unclassified). The feature may be part of the main late village component of the site or it could represent earlier occupation. The pit was located in the far southeastern corner of the site, and 41' from (southeast of) the nearest Native American structure (#3)

F-436 320N 322E
Prehistoric. Burial, 4.0' north-south by 5.7' east-west with a depth of 1.7'.

This pit was originally thought to be a large cooking and/or refuse pit due to large amounts of shell and charcoal in the top of the pit. The pit was bisected during the summer of 1991, but the excavation was stopped when human bones were found. The feature was re-opened and the burial excavation completed during the 1992 season. the analysis of the pit will be presented in the forthcoming report of human burials.

Ceramics in the eastern bisection included Gaston, Roanoke, Townsend and other fabric impressed types. Gaston sherds were very slightly more abundant than others and were typically the largest sherds.

F-465 280N 310E
Prehistoric. This is a burial measuring 6’ north-south and 5’ east-west. It had been intruded on its southern end by one of the palisade posts of the Jordan's Journey fortification. This feature was initially recognized as a burial by its shape, and so was not excavated until the 1992 season. During these 1992 burial excavations, a large vessel section of Gaston Simple Stamped pottery similar to the specimen found in Feature 418 was found lying next to the skeleton on the bottom of Feature 465. Full analysis is still in progress and will be presented in a forthcoming report.

F-524 176N 232E
Prehistoric. This pit is about 3' by 5' in plan view and was not investigated during the 19901 and 1991 seasons. Because it lies in proximity to Features 417 and 418, it is being reinvestigated as part of the 1992 burial excavations and will be reported later.

F-526 243N 305E
Prehistoric. This is a shallow, oval burial pit measuring 6.6' by 4.9' in plan view. The burial was found toward the close of the 1991 season and its status as a grave was suspected at that time. Accordingly, it was not excavated until the 1992 season, at which time an extended burial was found. Analysis has not yet been undertaken and will be reported in full in a later report of the 1992 work.

**c. The 17th-Century Component**

**THE PALISADE (STRUCTURE 25)**
The early 17th-century occupation is enclosed within a palisade fortification in the shape of an elongated pentagon measuring approximately 260' at its greatest length north-south, and 110' east-west. The palisade walls were apparently constructed of posts, pails and rails, with posts spaced at approximately 12.5' intervals. This spacing does not hold for the northwestern wall of the fort and its apical northern bastion, nor for a probable box bastion in the southeastern corner of the fort. The northern wall was built with posts on 9' centers, suggesting that this wall may have stood higher than the others. Likewise, the southeastern box bastion has closely-spaced (average 5' interval) posts, indicating extra height or strength at this position. There is no evidence of a paling ditch; presumably, light pales were nailed above-ground to the rails.

Only 6 posts of the palisade have been excavated. The molds of these varied in size between about .6' and .7' diameters, set to depths (below plowzone) between .9' and 1.35', or between approximately 2' and 2 1/2 feet deep below the original surface. These 7" or 8" posts probably supported walls of 7' - 8' in height. The walls of the box bastion at the southeastern corner of the palisade were probably 10' or more high, as was the northern wall and its apical bastion. Noël Hume (1991: 216-224) has reviewed the historical evidence concerning the construction of palisades in early 17th-century Virginia, and has concluded that the walls at the Martin's Hundred fort were about 7-1/2' high. Those walls were supported on 9' centers. While the height of the wall is dependent on the interval spacing of the posts, there are other variables to be considered, such as the number of rails between posts, and the nature of any corner or cross bracing that might have been used. The posts in the palisade were as heavy as - or slightly heavier than - the corner bracing posts on the large houses. While housewalls had studs, sheathing, and bracing to provide strength and stability, the lath-and-plaster walls were also heavier than those of the palisade, and rose at least 10' - and perhaps 20' or more - to the plates.

The northern tip, or apex of the Jordan's Journey fort apparently served as a bastion. A series of auxiliary posts inside the bastion may have supported a firing step or observation platform. This apex stands at the highest point on the landform: the land falls off through swales to the northeast and west, and gently falls to the immediate north. From this point, with even a slight elevation above ground level, a gunner or observor could cover a field of vision for a considerable distance both up and down the James River, and up the Appomattox. If the primary concern of the fort's builders had been to protect the settlement from European invasion up the James, it would have served that purpose better if located towards the eastern end of the point. If the primary, or additional concern was protection from Indian invasion from either the upstream or downstream directions, as was certainly the case, the chosen location was probably the best possible. The southeastern corner box bastion, and the overall geometry of the fort, would have offered additional coverage of, and protection from, an attack from the inland forest.
The southeastern corner of the fort is somewhat confusing, and the interpretation offered here (see Figure *) is one of several possibilities. In this interpretation, Structure 20 stands outside the fort, with its western wall incorporated into the fort. A bastion or gatehouse appears to have stood immediately south of Structure 20, and this corner of the fort has been clipped, permitting fire coverage of a gate which must be entered through a "funnel". Once inside the fort, a potential enemy was faced with the fenceline of Structure 27, and possible fire from windows in Structure 20. The gate, in other words is in a cul-de-sac, or maze, and would have been easily defended. One function of Structure 20, then, may have been to serve as a gatehouse, guardhouse, and trading post. This will be taken up again, below.

Another interesting feature can be found just beyond the northwestern apex. Here, placed on 9' intervals, are two posts extending beyond the fort's curtain wall. This may represent a short flanker wall, or perhaps a continuing palisade along a covered way connecting the fort with other features to the northwest. Early excavations in the new entrance road to Jordan's Point did not reveal a line of historic posts. Another possible post hole can be found 9' beyond the northern wall, and 12.5' northeast of this postulated flanker. If other posts have been obliterated by human interments placed here after the fort was no longer in use, these posts outside the northwest corner may have framed a small box bastion. As the burials are thought to be contemporaneous with the fort, this does not seem a likely alternative. Until further work can be done north of the road, we may have to settle on the "flanker" interpretation.

Two other posts can be found on the inside of the northwestern apex. These suggest a possible gate and a bastion in this location as well, although one that is far simpler than at the opposing corner of the fort. Several other gates can be postulated from the irregular spacing of post intervals. generally, these "gates" tend to open adjacent to corners of buildings, or near apexes on the fort. Possible gate locations are marked on Figure *.

The fort at Jordan's Journey is remarkably similar to a bawne, or plantation village fort, enclosing the manor house at ***, an early 17th-century English settlement in Ulster. The bawne - or fortified manor house - includes a building constructed along the outer wall of the palisade, just as Structure 20 is situated at Jordan's Journey. There is also a "clipped" corner and gate arrangement similar to the Jordan's Journey fort. Noël Hume has noted the similarities between some erly fortified settlements in Virginia and contemporary settlements in Ulster, and has further pointed out that both colonies - Virginia and Ulster - were settled by similar, and sometimes the same, people at the same time under conditions they considered comparable. These similarities will be taken up again, in the "Discussion" chapter at the end of this report.
The closest example of a "bawne" fortification to Jordan's Journey is very close indeed. Downriver, a few miles the other side of Tar Bay, lay Fowerdew Hundred. There John Yeardly constructed a 235' long palisade that was very similar to that at Jordan's Journey. In its basic construction method and defense principals, the Jordan's Journey fort also shares many features with the fort at Wolstenholme Town in Martin's Hundred. A fort of similar size and shape, but constructed with ditch-set pales, has recently been uncovered by Nicholas Lucketti at Harbor View, in Suffolk County, Virginia. This fort was probably built about 1645, as was a similar fort at site 44Sk194, adjacent to Harbor View. This latter fort was partly uncovered and mapped by one of the present authors (McLearen), but has not been excavated. There was also evidence of a flanker or covered way extending from one apex of this fort to another, unexplored, portion of the site.

There is a slight bend in the eastern palisade wall directly outside of a posited door in Structure 1. here, too, are two small puncheon post molds between the house and the palisade wall. This constellation of features is interpreted as a small firing step or observation platform accessible to the "head of the hundred" living in Structure 1. It is worth noting here that Feature 294, a palisade post abutting one of these small puncheon posts, contained a pipe bowl fragment in its post hole. This suggests that the palisade may have been constructed after the house. On the other hand, it may mean simply that one of the palisade's builders broke his pipe! Five other posts excavated on the palisade contained no artifacts, prehistoric artifacts only, or, in two cases, a couple small fragments of burned daub. These latter may have been from the Indian occupation. In short, there is no other evidence in hand that the palisade was a late feature on the site.

**Features associated with Structure 25**

F-294 237N 401E  
Historic. Post hole 1.0' in diameter and 0.9' deep with a mold of 0.6'. The feature is a part of the 17th century palisade line, Structure 25. It was left in bisection.

F-324 231N 310E  
Historic. Post hole 1.25' in diameter and 1.2' deep with mold of 0.6'. The feature is a part of the 17th century palisade line, Structure 25. The western bisection was removed.

F-389 206N 309E  
Historic. Post hole 1.3' in diameter and 1.0' deep with a mold of 0.68'. The feature is a part of the 17th century palisade line, Structure 25. The western bisection was removed.

9. The Flowerdew Hundred fortification may have evolved through several developmental stages, according to Hodges (1992). Its final form was a somewhat stronger, more formal fortification than the post-rails-and-pales form.
F-398  181N 308E
Historic. Post hole 1.25' in diameter and 1.35' deep with a post mold of 0.56'. The feature is a part of the 17th century palisade line, Structure 25. The western bisection was removed.

F-399  194N 309E
Historic. Post hole 1.6' in diameter and 1.3' deep with a mold of 0.7'. The feature is a part of the 17th century palisade line, Structure 25. The western bisection was removed.

F-400  169N 309E
Historic. Post hole ca. 1.0' in diameter. The feature is a part of the 17th century palisade line, Structure 25. The western bisection was removed.

HOUSES AND OTHER BUILDINGS

A total of at least 11 buildings belonging to the early 17th-century component were revealed in the excavations. All buildings on the site are represented by post holes and postmolds rather than features representing masonry foundations or ground-laid sills. There are five buildings on the site which are interpreted to be early 17th-century houses. These are Structures 1, 4, 5, 10 and 20. Two smaller buildings are probably houses as well; namely Structures 17 and 18.

The five principal houses are described here as "longhouses", an ancient European house form dating back to the Neolithic period. Longhouses typically are only one room deep, and are generally three times (or more) as long as they are wide. Longhouse forms may be a predominant house type found within English forts. The archaeological evidence does not permit us to know with much certainty whether these houses were constructed in single storeys, low-rooms with lofts, or if they rose to a full two storeys. Two storey houses are nearly universal in depictions of contemporary dwellings in fortified English plantations in Northern Ireland, and were probably the norm here as well (Figures **).

Large quantities of daub were found in nearly every feature, as well as in plowzone contexts, even at considerable distances from the inferred locations of hearths. These timber houses were almost certainly constructed with walls and hearth hoods or chimneys of lath or wattles daubed with clay (and in at least one example, with a mixture of clay and lime). In those instances in which impressions of the armature structure of the walls remains in the clay daub, these impressions suggest primarily split lath frameworks. Some impressions, however, are clearly of sticks, suggesting wickerwork wattles.
Structures 4, 10, 15, and two short walls in a shed attached to Structure 1 all had evidence of slot trenches associated with some exterior walls. The small shed in Structure 1 may also have an interior partition identified with a slot trench. Similar slots have been found associated with early 17th-century houses in Virginia, and these features have often been referred to as "sill slots", presumably designed to accommodate interrupted sills. At this site, these slots were clearly pierced by the postmolds, but not the post holes, associated with wall studs, in those walls that had studs. Thus they were probably not slots to accommodate sills, but rather they were designed to accommodate the wall itself. By burying the wall slightly beneath the ground, the builders provided a method of keeping wind, water, dust, and vermin out of houses that had no sills. The absence of slot trenches is less informative. In many cases, they may be absent simply because they have been removed by deeper local plowing. In other cases, this seems unlikely. For instance, the slots preserved on two walls in one small room of the shed on Structure 1 - and the absence of similar slots anywhere else in Structure 1 - probably reflect original construction characteristics rather than post-depositional circumstances. Likewise, the well-preserved slots on Structure 4 can be contrasted with the total absence of similar features on Structure 5, 6 feet to the west. These differences, we presume, reflect original differences in the construction of these buildings.

Nails were ubiquitous on the site; large quantities were found in nearly every feature, as were large numbers of wood-working tools. Certainly the houses were roofed with wood, and we have little doubt that they were also clad with wood on their exterior surfaces. Some may have had panelled interiors. Many graphic and written interpretations of early Virginia houses have relied on the romantic image of thatched-roof buildings with exposed "half-timber" wall construction. No doubt some such buildings were constructed in Virginia. Jordan's Journey, however, was built under the direction of "ancient planters" who had had ample opportunities to learn the effects of Virginia's climate on exposed clay walls and roof thatching. While their basic construction differs very little from the thatched roof, half-timber reconstructions some favor, the houses at Jordan's Journey were more likely clad entirely in sawn or riven boards. The image is less romantic, perhaps, but considerably more practical. So long as the supply of nails held out, wooden cladding would have been the more reasonable choice.

**The Manor House Complex: Structures 1, 15, 16, 20, 21, 24, and 27.**

Structure 1 is the largest building on the site. It appears to be closely associated with several other structures, including Structure 15, which may be a stable, and the adjoining Structure 16, which may be either a tobacco barn, or a cow barn. Both of these buildings are enclosed within a corral (Structure 24) that is linked to Structure 1. Structure 21 is a small square outbuilding containing a root cellar; this building is also associated with Structure 1; it was connected to the southern end of that house by a short fence. Structure 20 is a longhouse that may have served as a servant quarter and
gatehouse or trading post. Its back, or west, wall was incorporated into the palisade fortification.

A fenced yard and work area north of Structure 21, has been defined here as Structure 27. This enclosure is connected to the southwest corner of Structures 21 and 20. Thus all of these buildings (Structures 1, 15, 16, 20 and 21) and the livestock enclosure (Structure 24) and yard (Structure 27) are associated through wall alignments and/or connecting fences, including the corral, and form a separate enclosed compound within the larger palisade compound. This separation from the remainder of the structures, along with the control over livestock, grain, tobacco or other resources permitted by this arrangement, suggests that Structure 1 was the principal dwelling at this site. If so, it would be the dwelling of Samuel and Ciseley Jordan and, after 1623, of Ciseley and William Farrar. Therefore, this would be not only the principal house on this site, but the "manor house", so to speak, for all of the Jordan's Journey village.

**Structure 1**

Structure 1 is a 3-bay longhouse, oriented north-south, measuring 55' x 16' 10. In addition, the house sported a 5' shed on the northern gable end. The bays are evenly spaced at 18' intervals. The southern and northern gables walls are defined by three large posts, each set in holes measuring about 2' on a side, on average. The framing posts were originally set between 1.5' and 2' below the ground surface. The postmolds for framing posts average about 8" in diameter. The northernmost of two internal partition walls 11 also includes a central post, while the southern internal wall does not. The central post in this northern internal wall may have supported a ridge beam, or it may have acted simply as the corner framing post for the hearth which was located in the northeastern corner of the central room.

Yet another possibility is that this post represents a block pier supporting a "summer" beam that provided an extra bearing for floor joists in the northern room. The central and southern bays are characterized by the presence of wall stud post holes and molds placed at ca. 3' intervals, which indicates that these rooms did not have joists for a suspended floor. By contrast, the northern bay has no studs in the ground. This room may have had a floor hung on joists.

A total of 15 post holes and molds associated with the walls of this structure were excavated at least in bisection. Of these, with three exceptions, post holes either contained no artifacts or prehistoric artifacts only. The three exceptions, between them,  

10. All building measurements are measured between centers of framing postmolds and rounded to the nearest foot. Actual building dimensions (between outside walls) would have been slightly larger.

11. The presence of a hearth against the northern partition wall confirms its presence. The southern partition wall is inferred. It is possible, of course, that the southern 2/3 of the house comprised a single large hall.
contained 1 flint flake, 3 chunks of burned daub, and 7 nail fragments. The presence of historic artifacts suggests that this structure may not be the youngest building on the site. On the other hand, the post holes contained only a few construction-related materials, while many of the molds contained numerous items such as pipes, beads, jettons, etc. It remains a possibility, therefore, that this is among the earliest structures on the site.

Structure 1 contains a number of posts and other features within its walls. None of these have been excavated as of this writing, although some will be completed by VCU field school students during the summer of 1992. Three clusters of internal features are of special interest. The southernmost room contains a complex of features that are difficult to interpret. One of these, Feature 196, is a shallow square hole thought to be a backfilled testpit from earlier testing of this site by Lucketti. The maze of posts directly south of this feature includes one 18th or 19th century fence-post (see Structure 26, below). The remaining posts most likely framed a stair tower. One of these posts appears to have been replaced or repaired at least once (probably twice). There are, of course other alternatives. If this room had been used for storage, for instance, the posts may have framed a rack for barrels or bales.

Another cluster of internal features is located in the northeast corner of the middle room. Upon towel-cleaning this room, a large diffuse area of burned subsoil, daub fragments, charcoal and ash was revealed, along with a series of small post holes. These features probably represent a corner hearth and hood (or chimney).

At the northern end of the house there is evidence for the framing of a 5 - 6' wide shed internally partitioned by a central north-south wall. This internal wall may have contained a door, as suggested by an interruption in the wall slot. This internal wall may have been added after construction of the shed, as indicated by a small framing post immediately adjacent to, and cutting the post hole of, the gable post of the house. The wall slots on the inner room of the shed suggest the possibility that this room was built to be more relatively weather tight. Perhaps the shed was a food storage area, and this smaller room within the shed held grain, flour, or other perishables potentially vulnerable to vermin or moisture.

The locations of doors may be represented by small jamb framing posts in the western wall of the house and shed (see Figure *). No door locations could be postulated for the eastern wall, with one possible exception. The distance between wall studs on the house is quite regular, and almost always 3'. In the eastern wall of the southernmost room, the distance between Features 287 and 289 is 6', but the intervening stud, feature 288, is only slightly over 2' from Feature 287. This leaves an interval of approximately 4' between Features 288 and 289: ample room for a door. Furthermore, there are two small driven posts outside the house, one each directly east of Features 288 and 289. These may have supported a door hood. As this hood would have ended just inches from the
eastern palisade wall, it would seem that the house may predate the palisade; that is, the door was constructed without anticipating the construction of the fort. An alternative interpretation is that these two small posts supported a step, permitting a person in the house to step out, and up, to be in an observation or firing position at the palisade. As these posts occur inside a slight bend in the palisade wall, this is the preferred interpretation.

Features associated with Structure 1

F-162 227N 396E
Historic. Post hole 2.1' in diameter and 2.0' deep with a mold of 0.6' in diameter. The feature is a southeastern corner post of Structure 1. The western bisection was removed.

F-164 228N 388E
Historic. Post hole is 2.22' across and 0.9' deep with a mold 0.55' in diameter and 1.75' deep. The feature is a southern gable post for Structure 1. The western bisection was removed.

F-168 232N 381E
Historic. Post hole is 0.75' in diameter and 0.23' deep. The feature is a stud in the western wall of Structure 1. The western bisection was removed.

F-177 235N 381E
Historic. Post hole is 0.85' in diameter and 0.25' deep with mold of 0.4'. The feature is a stud in the western wall of Structure 1. It was left in bisection.

F-178 238N 381E
Historic. Post hole is 0.82' in diameter and 0.21' deep with a mold of 0.24'. The feature is a stud in the western wall of Structure 1. It was left in bisection.

F-180 241N 382E
Historic. Post hole is 0.91' in diameter and 0.22' deep with a mold of 0.6'. The feature is a stud in western wall of Structure 1. The western bisection was removed.

F-193 244N 382E
Historic. Post hole is 0.98' in diameter and 0.45' deep with a mold of 0.45'. The feature is a stud in western wall of Structure 1. The western bisection was removed.

F-199 248N 383E
Historic. Post hole 2.0' in diameter and 1.6' deep with a mold of 0.65'. The feature is a large framing or bay post in the western wall of Structure 1. The western bisection was removed.
F-286  246N 398E
Historic. Post hole 2.0 in diameter with mold of ca. 0.8'. The feature is a framing or bay post in the eastern wall of Structure 1. The western bisection was removed.

F-287  234N 397E
Historic. Post hole 0.90' in diameter and 0.45' deep with a post mold of 0.41'. The feature is a stud in eastern wall of Structure 1. It was excavated in bisection.

F-288  237N 397E
Historic. Post hole 0.8' in diameter and 0.4' deep with post mold of 0.4'. The feature is a stud in eastern wall of Structure 1. The western bisection was removed.

F-289  240N 398E
Historic. Post hole 0.85' in diameter and 0.27' deep. No apparent post mold. The feature is a stud in eastern wall of Structure 1. The western bisection was removed.

F-295  243N 398E
Historic. Post hole circa 1.2', square. The feature is a post for the interior cheek of corner fireplace in Structure 1. It was not excavated.

F-439  261N 393E
Historic. Post hole circa 1.2', square. The feature is a post for the interior cheek of corner fireplace in Structure 1. It was not excavated.

Structure 15

Structure 15 stands approximately 35 feet north of Structure 1. Its eastern wall was incorporated into the palisade fortification. The building stood approximately 22' long by 14' deep. No excavataions have yet taken place on any of the features related to this structure, although study of the building is scheduled for the summer of 1992. As of this writing, only two features associated with Structure 15 have been recorded on feature records and assigned numbers. These are described briefly, below. Figure * shows these, plus other features which are interpreted here as Structure 15. Not indicated in this plan is a probable gable post in the middle of the north wall. The presence of this post is suggested by a widening or bulge in the wall slot trench at this point.

The gable end walls of the building are probably each represented by a line of three framing posts. No mid-wall posts have been discovered on either the eastern or western
walls, except for a possible light puncheon post in the west wall. The 22' span required for plates or a ridge beam seems excessive, and so the architecture of this building may be unusual. There are remnant wall slots on the southern, eastern and northern walls. A single stud or jamp post can be seen in the southern wall, near the southeast corner of the building. This post suggests a gable-end door at this location. The existence of a wall slot on the eastern wall suggests the likelihood that this building was constructed prior to the palisade fort, which is tied to the eastern corners of this structure. The fact that the palisade changes direction at the northeastern corner of this building also strengthens this inference by suggesting that the palisade was constructed by sighting a line to the standing building.

Structure 15, and the small building north of it, Structure 16, were enclosed within an arc of fence interpreted here as a livestock enclosure, or corral. This corral extends the overall enclosure of the manor house complex, and indicates that access to these buildings was somewhat restricted. The function of this service building cannot be inferred with confidence. It may have served as a stable, a livestock barn, a tobacco barn, or similar agricultural building.

Features associated with Structure 15

F-437 340N 405E
Historic. Post hole 2' square. The feature is the northwestern corner post of Structure 15. Not excavated

F-438 339N 407E
Historic. Ditch stain circa 0.6' by 6.0' long. The feature is a wall trench at the northern end of Structure 15. It was not excavated.

Structure 16

Just a few feet north of Structure 15 is Structure 16, another apparent agricultural outbuilding. As with Structure 15, none of these features has been excavated, and any remarks here are necessarily speculative. Furthermore, none of these features has yet been assigned numbers or had feature record forms completed, so there are no individual feature descriptions available. The orientation of the building suggests that it may have been constructed after the palisade fort.

The building measures approximately 15' square. The southern wall contains three equally-spaced framing posts. The southeastern corner post stood approximately 1.5' from the palisade, which may have served as the back wall of the building. The northern wall is constructed similar to the south wall, with a stud or light framing post located in the northeast corner. This post, along with a similar post outside the north wall, may represent the location of a door. This is very likely as there appear to be gates
in the corral (Structure 24) and the palisade (Structure 25, immediately adjacent to this location. The east wall has no studs or posts intervening between its corner posts. The west wall of the building, on the other hand, has three stud posts. These studs were placed in an interval sequence from north to south, as follows: 2.5', 2.5', 5', 2.5'. This interval suggests that the 5' gap represents a door. No explanation for the studs in this wall, and the absence of similar studs in the opposing wall, can be given. While we are inclined to interpret this structure as an agricultural building, its dimensions and structure are very similar to Structures 17 and 18, which may have been houses. Structure 16 is orientated to the palisade wall, but not to any other feature on the site. This suggests that the building may have been a relatively late addition to the site. Excavations in 1992 will attempt to clarify the function and dating sequence of this building.

Structure 20

Structure 20 is a longhouse constructed outside the fort, and with the palisade tied to its northwest and southwest corners. The house measures 41' x 17', and was apparently divided into two rooms. The principal structural components of this house are three wall units: the southern, northern, and central walls, each comprised of three equally-spaced, equal-sized posts. This house, unlike Structure 1, included a ridge beam or roof truss support in its cross wall. The long exterior walls of the southern room of the house have no obvious studs, slots, or other features preserved below the surface. In contrast, the northern room has at least two jamb-framing posts, and a possible single stud midway between the door and the northeast corner of the house. Likewise, a door can be posited in the west wall of the north room. This door is directly opposite a gate in the fence between Structures 1 and 21.

Two posts can be found inside the northern room adjacent to - but not on line with - the center wall. They are placed to either side of the central support post. These, plus a single repaired post found three or four feet inside the room, may represent framing for a central hearth and hood or chimney. One of these could have supported a door jamb between the rooms as well.

Post holes that have been excavated for Structure 20 do not contain historic materials or, in two cases, they contain fragments of burned daub which may be prehistoric. Another exception should be mentioned. That is Feature 522, a framing post which was repaired once, and the hole of which was subsequently disturbed by a tree root. This hole contained a single 7 mm. lead shot.

As noted above, Structure 20 may have served as a gate house, or other types of functions in which those living within the fort - specifically, Samuel Jordan and William Farrar - and those living outside the fort - servants, other members of the community, and Indians - came together for common purposes. The position of the
house outside the palisade wall, and adjacent to the main gate, also suggests a security function. Access to the interior of the fort was probably controlled somewhat strictly. Here supplies may have been dispersed, public meetings held, etc. The building may have served as a community house, church and court. It may have also served as a trading post. Later, in the 18th century, frontier forts often incorporated a trading post at the gate. Native Americans and colonists could meet in a controlled environment. It was, after all, the easy familiarity between Natives and colonists that was blamed for the tremendous losses of the 1622 attack.

**Features associated with Structure 20**

**F-85  203N 396E**  
Historic. Square post hole 1.7' wide and 0.9' deep, with mold of 0.55'. The feature is a part of Structure 20. It was left in bisection.

**F-290  202N 404E**  
Historic. Post hole 1.89' in diameter and 0.65 deep with mold of 0.68'. The feature is inside Structure 20, possibly a door frame or fireplace support. The western bisection was removed.

**F-291  203N 401E**  
Historic. Post hole 1.5' in diameter and 0.4' deep with a mold of 1.0'. The feature is inside Structure 20, possibly a door frame or fireplace support. The western bisection was removed.

**F-292  224N 399E**  
Historic. Post hole 2.0' in diameter and 1.0' deep with mold of 0.7'. The feature is the northwestern corner post of Structure 20. The northern bisection was removed.

**F-297  214N 398E**  
Historic. Post hole 1.1' in diameter and 0.26' deep. The feature may be a door post in the western wall of Structure 20. The western bisection was removed.

**F-298  209N 398E**  
Historic. Post hole 1.25' in diameter and 0.24' deep with a post mold of 0.8'. The feature is inside Structure 20 and may be associated. The western bisection was removed.

**F-300  218N 399E**  
Historic. Post hole 1.1' in diameter and 0.12' deep. No post mold visible. The feature may be a door post in the western wall of Structure 20. The western bisection was removed.
F-511  179N 411E
Historic. Post hole 1.8’ roughly square with a depth of 1.1’ and a mold circa .55’ in diameter. The feature is the southeastern corner post of Structure 20. The southern bisection was removed.

F-512  181N 402E
Historic. Post hole 1.5’ north-south and 2’ east-west with a depth of .55’ and a mold circa .65’ in diameter. The feature is the southern gable post of Structure 20. The western bisection was removed.

F-521  220N 417E
Historic. Post hole 1.98’ north-south and 1.74’ east-west with a depth of .9’ and a mold circa .6’ in diameter. The feature is the northeastern corner post of Structure 20. The southern bisection was removed.

F-522  201N 414E
Historic. Post hole 2.25’ north-south and 1.6’ east-west with a depth of circa .8’. The feature is a framing or bay post of Structure 20. It appears to have been repaired as well as heavily disturbed by a tree. The southern bisection was removed.

Structure 21

Structure 21 is a small outbuilding which stands 12 feet south of Structure 1 (Figures *,*). The west walls of Structures 1 and 21 are aligned, and there are two light posts in the interval between these buildings suggesting they were connected by a fence. The spacing of these posts also indicates the possible location of a gate into the yard between the buildings. This gate, it should be noted, stands directly in line with, and 20 feet away from, a postulated door into the northern room of Structure 20.

Structure 21 is a square building, measuring 13’ x 13’, that was probably internally divided into two room of unequal size. The northern room is 7’ deep and contains a small cellar or buttery (Feature 110, described more fully in the feature list, below). The southern room is is 6’ deep. The existence of a partition wall in the building is inferred from the presence to two nearly identical, and paired, studs or small framing posts, one each in the eastern and western walls (Features 112 and 107). In addition, the cellar is confined completely within the northern room of the building, suggesting the presence of a wall. The northern and southern walls of Structure 21 are each constructed of three equally-spaced posts. The center or gable post on the southern wall (Feature 95) appears to have been nearly twice as large as the corner posts. The northern wall gable post has not yet been excavated.

This architecture - large gable posts and lighter corner posts - suggests the possibility that the building may have been an A-frame structure without plates, although all posts
are vertical. Conversely, a standard wall configuration may have been used, but with the principal framing emphasis on the gable posts suggesting a high-pitch roof. The rather light and shallow mid-wall posts on the western and eastern walls suggest very little load-bearing capacity. Again, either these served simply as wall studs, for supporting lath or wattles, and/or they supported a non-bearing partition.

Two and 1/2 feet south of the southern wall of Structure 21 there is a run of light posts which may represent a lean-to shed on this building. An alternate interpretation is that these posts are a fenceline running from the southwest corner of Structure 21 to the palisade, although no post could be found which would tie the fence to the palisade. If this represents a shed, it was either very shallow, or the posts represent roof supports on an open shed; that is, one without a southern wall. Another intriguing possibility is that this added structure represents a large cooking hearth or bake oven hood. The best evidence that this might be the case is the large quantity of burned daub and brick fragments found in postmolds associated with Structure 21, and, especially, in the cellar. Also found in the cellar, and very important for this possible interpretation, were numerous barrel bands - perhaps for flour storage - and the iron blade of a bread peel.

As with Structure 1, the excavated post holes of Structure 21 contain no artifacts, or prehistoric artifacts or, in a very few cases, a handful of construction-related historic materials. No occupation debris, such as bottle glass, ceramics or pipe fragments, were found. Given the density of occupation debris in post molds and in abandonment-period features, such as the fill in Feature 110, it seems likely that Structure 21 and its shed were built early in the occupation sequence, probably about the same time as Structure 1.

**Features Associated With Structure 21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-92</td>
<td>203N 377E</td>
<td>Historic. Post hole of 1.9' wide and 1.1' deep with mold of 0.35'. The feature is the southwestern corner post of Structure 21. The western bisection was removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-95</td>
<td>203N 383E</td>
<td>Historic. Post hole of 1.95' wide and 0.7' deep with mold of 0.8'. The feature is the southern wall gable post of Structure 21. The western bisection was removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-96</td>
<td>202N 390E</td>
<td>Historic. Post hole of 1.55' wide and 1.0' deep with mold of 0.4'. The feature is the southeastern corner post of Structure 21. The western bisection was removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-106</td>
<td>207N 391 E</td>
<td>Historic. Post hole, ca. .6' in diameter. This may be a door jamp post on the east wall of Structure 21. Not excavated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F-107  208N 378E
Historic.  Post hole 1.2' wide and 0.3' deep.  The feature is a stud or partition-wall or bay post in the western wall of Structure 21.  The western bisection was removed.

F-110  211N 384E
Historic.  Cellar or buttery of ca. 6.0' by 4.0' and 2.4' deep.  The cellar appears to have been lined with wooden cribbing framed by four small corner posts.  A Binford mean date of 1635.61 was calculated using measurements from 70 pipestems.  The feature is inside the northern room of Structure 21.  The feature was fully excavated.  The feature was first excavated in bisection, by stratum, and then the second half of the fill was also removed stratigraphically.  Eleven distinct fill levels were discerned, including erosion deposits at the edges and bottom of the feature (Strata 8 and 11), which indicate that the cellar stood open for some period of time after Structure 21 had been dismantled (or had collapsed).  The remainder of eleven strata appear to have accumulated over a very short period, and may represent a single filling episode.  Alternately, Stratum 6 may represent an initial filling episode, followed by wash and subsequent trash disposal in the slumped and compacted feature (Strata 1-5).  Figure * depicts a profile of the bisected cellar.

It has become the archaeological custom in the Chesapeake to refer to small underground storage cellars as "root cellars". This term became common in the 19th century, or perhaps slightly earlier, but it does not appear to have been the normal usage in Colonial times.  A more common term, especially in the early 17th century, is simply "cellar", "buttery", or "trap".  Small cellars have been excavated on a great many sites of the 17th century, and, as might be expected, they vary considerably in size, structure, and location within buildings - or even outside of buildings.  This small cellar appears to have been lined and covered with a trap-door or boards.

The original function of the cellar probably cannot be inferred from the fill artifacts which apparently accumulated here as refuse at, or after, the abandonment of the site. Nonetheless, it can be assumed that refuse placed here was gathered from nearby, and thus the contents of this feature may be useful for determining something about the uses and nature of Structures 1, 20, and 21. Of course, some of the artifacts may have been in the cellar at abandonment. Of particular interest here were some barrel bands. Of course we cannot be certain whether barrels in this cellar would have been used for the storage of grains or flour, beer or wine, salt meat or fish, etc.

The deposits in this cellar included numerous knives or knife fragments, a large quantity of redware cooking or food storage/preparation containers, stoneware bottle fragments, tools such as saws and axes, a whetstone and a grinding wheel, some personal items including a few beads, buttons, sewing pins, tobacco pipes, etc. There was a large number of food bone and shell remains in the cellar. Some of the artifacts
found here point to the nature of the household which lived nearby, probably in Structure 1, although these deposits may include trash from Structure 20, as well. There are a number of indications of a high-status household, including Ming porcelain wine cups and a polychrome delft tile (Figure *). At least two elaborate Westerwald jugs are represented here (although the presence of these is probably not a status indicator): one of these is a frieze jug with architectural columns and molded portrait cameos of the electors of the palatinate; the other is a biconic shaped jug.

There was very little in the way of artifacts representing arms and armor in this feature, compared with other refuse-filled features on the site, and there were, perhaps, relatively few personal items and clothing accoutrements. There were several fragments of what may have been a single piece of plate armor, but very little in the way of brigandine or jack armor, the types which were by far the most common on the site. The arms category is represented only by a few pieces of shot and, perhaps, some flint. The relatively small amount of arms, armor and personal items suggests again that the cellar was filled after site abandonment, and the fill represents sheet refuse and items that were in the nearby buildings. Conversely, those features which were used as refuse pits during occupation seem to have considerably higher quantities of these types of artifacts. It might also be noted that plate armor was more expensive than brigandines or jacks, and this might suggest a relatively high-status household.

F-112 208N 391E
Historic. Post hole of 1' wide. The feature is a stud or partition-wall or bay post in the eastern wall of Structure 21. The feature has not been excavated.

F-125 215N 378E
Historic. Posthole 1.6' wide and 1.2' deep, with a mold of 0.4' diameter. The feature is the northwestern corner post of Structure 21. The western bisection was removed.

F-130 214N 391E
Unknown. Post hole 1.90' in diameter and 0.80 deep with .4' diameter mold. The feature was excavated in bisection. This post is the northeastern corner framing post for Structure 21.

F-224 199N 389E
Historic. Post hole 1.0' in diameter and 0.7' deep with mold of 0.4'. The feature is possibly part of a fence or lean-to on the southern side of Structure 21. The western bisection was removed.

F-225 200N 385E
Historic. Post hole 0.65' in diameter and 0.15 deep. The feature is possibly part of a fence or lean-to on the southern side of Structure 21. The western bisection was removed.
F-227 199N 377E
Historic. Post hole 1.1' in diameter, 0.35' deep. The feature is possibly part of a fence or lean-to on the southern side of Structure 21. The western bisection was removed.

F-250 Southwest corner bottom of F-110
Historic. Post mold ca. 0.3' in diameter. Located in the floor of the cellar F-110 inside Structure 21, this feature is the southwestern corner post for the wooden liner. It was not excavated.

F-251 Southeast corner bottom of F-110
Historic. Post mold ca. 0.3' in diameter. Located in the floor of the cellar F-110 inside Structure 21, this feature is the southeastern corner post for the wooden liner. It was not excavated.

F-252 Inside F-110
Historic. Round stain ca. 1.0' in diameter in floor of the cellar in Structure 21. It was not excavated.

F-253 Inside F-110
Historic. Round stain ca. 1.0' in diameter in floor of the cellar in Structure 21. It was not excavated.

F-459 Northeast corner bottom of F-110
Historic. Post mold ca. 0.4' square. Located in the floor of the cellar F-110 inside Structure 21, this feature is the northeastern corner post for the wooden liner. It was not excavated.

F-460 Northwest corner bottom of F-110
Historic. Post mold ca. 0.4' in diameter. Located in the floor of cellar F-110 inside Structure 21, this feature is the southwestern corner post for the wooden liner. It was not excavated.

**Structure 24**

Structure 24 is a long arc of posts north of Structure 1 interpreted to be a corral. This enclosure is attached to the northern end of Structure 1. Its northern terminus is tied into the palisade just north of Structure 16. The intervals between posts varies between 10 and 13 feet; such variation is probably unusual in a relatively light and informal structure such as this. Presumably, the corral was used to confine horses and, perhaps, some cattle - especially a milk cow. The corral fence is pierced in two places by gates, which are indicated by close post intervals on Figure *. None of the features associated
with this structure have been assigned numbers, and none have been excavated. A sample of posts related to this structure are scheduled for excavation in 1992.

**Structure 27**

Structure 27 is a rather conjectural reconstruction which was originally seen as a possibility for accounting for a number of residual post features south of Structure 21 and west of Structure 20. These posts have not been excavated, so their comparability is not known. It should be noted that this portion of the site has not been studied with the same level of intensity as the rest of the palisaded settlement. The base maps include features that were uncovered after machine-clearing and an initial trowel-cleaning only. Further work in this area may result in a different interpretation.

The structure appears to represent a fenced enclosed work yard associated with the Manor House complex. The enclosure was apparently tied to the southwestern corner of Structure 20, and there appears to have been a gate located in this corner. The fence extended west for 25 feet on an alignment with the south wall of Structure 20, and parallel to the south wall of Structure 21. It then turned 90 degrees south, parallel to the wall of Structure 21, and ran 15 feet to a corner. The fence turned 90 degrees east, and was tied into the southwest corner of Structure 21, again with a gate adjacent to the building.

Within the yard there are a number of small post holes, which cannot be interpreted, and a large ash pit or similar feature (Feature 232), described below.

**Features associated with Structure 27**

Post hole /postmold complexes that appear to be associated with this enclosure include Features 41, 42, 45, 76, 77, 237, 238, and 247. None of these have been excavated, so no further descriptions are presented here. Plan views may be seen in Figure *. Features 237 and 238 appear to represent a repaired gate post at the southeastern corner of the enclosure, with Feature 238 being the later post.

**F-232 191N 388E**

Historic. Shallow pit measuring 6.0' north-south and 7.8' east-west. This fill of this shallow, rectangular pit was a mixture of very dense, compact, loam and ash. The southern bisection was removed. This feature is very difficult to interpret. It is similar in size and the nature of its fill to a feature interpreted as a hearth within the manor house at Clifts Plantation (Neiman 1980*, see his Figure *, Feature *). It is possible that this represents the base or ash pit of a free-standing exterior bread oven. Other possibilities might include: a smithy forge, although no artifactual evidence, such as slag or cinder confirms this; an on-ground pottery or pipe kiln, although only a single coil break of locally-made pottery found nearby in Feature 110 suggests the possibility...
of local pottery making; a hearth for rendering lard or blanching hogs and fish for smoking/salting, etc. Obviously, there is insufficient evidence to make any firm determinations about this feature. Suffice it to say that the feature underscores the function of Structure 27 as an enclosed work yard related to the manor house.

OTHER BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES

Structure 4

Structure 4 is a longhouse located near the southern end of the fort. Its construction was perhaps the most complex of any of the Jordan Point buildings. Well-preserved wall slots, robber holes for post salvaging, and other features also combined to make this the most archaeologically complex structure on the site. Because of that, the features related to this structure were all excavated. Special care was taken to reveal, and record the relationships between the wall slots, studs, framing posts, and auxiliary posts (Figure *). This is the only structure on the site that provided evidence for having been dismantled; robber holes intruded many of the main structural post holes. Some of these "robber holes" were subsequently pierced by post molds, indicating that structural posts and studs had been repaired or replaced. Others appear to be the terminal features in their post hole sequences, thus suggesting salvaging of large timbers after the house had been abandoned. In addition, a 19th century fence post (part of Structure 26) intruded the northeastern corner post. Before these intrusions were noted, there was some understandable confusion in designating holes and molds, and so the artifact content of holes and molds, and the implications of this for dating, must be assessed with careful reference to the records of individual features and excavation units within features.

Our understanding of the room divisions, and placement of the hearth, doors, and stairs in this structure is derived from a graphic interpretation prepared by Cary Carson, Director of Research for the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation (Figure *). Carson’s reading was based on his study of the archaeological plan presented here as Figure *.

This building measures 51' x 16' and it was apparently divided into three rooms of unequal size. The northern room, which was 13' deep, contained a large cellar or buttery (Feature 320). The southernmost room was also 13' deep, and may have been heated by a fireplace that defined the internal partitioning of this room. The large central room, apparently a hall, was also heated. A lobby entrance stood between the hearth and a door on the west wall of the house. Either the hall or the southern room (a parlor?) could be entered from the lobby. There were apparently two additional door openings on the west wall: one of these entered the hall directly, and the other entered the northern room. An internal door has been inferred between the hall and northern room, and Carson has suggested a stair to the second storey or loft was constructed between the hearth and eastern wall of the house. Carson has also suggested that a stair
into the cellar may have been placed against that feature's west wall, although no archaeological evidence for this feature was found.

Prior to excavating the wall slots, a series of small, closely-spaced, circular stains were noted in some places, particularly in the western wall near the northern corner (see Figure *). Upon cleaning the surfaces of the slots, these stains disappeared, indicating they were quite shallow. These probably were stains of vertical elements of the wattles from which the wall was constructed. The wall slots on this structure were sectioned lengthwise, so that full wall profiles could be drawn. The purpose of these sections was to reveal the sequences involved in wall construction. However, post robbing tended to obscure or obliterate the original relationships between the wall slots and structural post holes. Nonetheless, these sections preserve a faithful record of the relative sizes, placements, and depths of studs and framing posts in this structure.

Except for a few bisections in which the robber hole and original construction hole could not be distinguished, the artifact inventories for structural post holes, stud post holes, and wall trenches do not contain historic artifacts. As with the other excavated structures discussed so far, there are minor exceptions like a few nails or similar construction-related items. This indicates that Structure 4, like Structures 1, 21, 24, 20 and 15, was built early in the historic occupation. This inference is further underscored by the fact that all of these buildings share a similar compass orientation. The building stood long enough to require repair or replacement of several of the wall studs, and reinforcement of one of the corner posts.

The architectural interpretation offered here indicates that Structure 4 served primarily as a house. The internal organization is a basic hall-parlor plan with an additional room perhaps used mostly for storage. There were second-storey or loft rooms which probably served as additional storage place and, perhaps, provided one or more chamber rooms. Further information about the house is derived from the contents of its cellar. That discussion follows, below.

**Features associated with Structure 4**

F-320 215N 340E
Historic. Cellar or buttery circa 8.7' square and 2.8' deep. Binford mean date of 1624.81 from 320 pipestems. Located inside Structure 4, this cellar could apparently be accessed from a door to the west. Serving as a food storage area, it was probably partitioned off from the remainder of the building and may have also had an interior access door. The feature was fully excavated, stratigraphically, and in quadrants. Approximately 10,000 artifacts were recovered from the fill layers in this cellar.

The fill sequence of the cellar was straightforward (see Figure *). The builders had lined the floor, and probably the walls, with a thick, impermeable layer of clay, probably for
damp-proofing. The clay floor has not been excavated except for a small test square that was cut through to demonstrate that no earlier primary deposits lay below. This floor can be seen in the photograph of the completed archaeological excavation (Plate *). No artifacts were recovered from this small cut in the floor.

Eight distinct fill deposits were identified, in addition to initial wall erosion slump deposits and an intrusive post hole from a 19th century fence at the top of the cellar fill. The cellar had apparently stood open for a short time after the dismantling of Structure 4, allowing some erosion of the lip and wall coating (?) of the cellar and accumulation of these erosional deposits at the edges of the cellar floor. Over these slump deposits, there was a thick "primary" deposit of refuse placed in the cellar. This refuse, Strata VI and VII, included a large number of metal objects. The fill included large amounts of charcoal, but most of the artifacts within the fill do not appear to have been burned. Plate * illustrates a mass of brigandine armor and a hoe pedestalled over the earlier slump deposits. These materials appear to have been dumped from a barrow or basket into the eastern edge of the cellar.

Midden-rich soil was thrown over this deposit, forming Stratum V. The hole remained open for enough time for the fill to settle. At some later time, a large mass of wood was thrown into the hole. This wood had either been burned on the surface prior to being deposited, or it was burned in situ. Stratum IV contained 8 stains of what appeared to have been charred boards or timbers lying in a mass of charcoal and artifacts, some of which appear to have been burned. These boards may have been a section of house wall or roof cladding, flooring, or a section of the palisade wall (Plate *). Strata I-III were actually a rather uniform ashy fill covering this burn layer.

Except for the materials associated with fill in a 19th century fence post, and possibly in a thin wash lense over this feature, all materials date to the early 17th-century occupation, or earlier. It seems apparent that, although this site was completely abandoned as a place for buildings at ca. 1635, others remained living nearby. They dismantled some of the remaining structures and filled features, probably in order to prepare this field for agricultural use. Structure 4 is the only building excavated so far which shows evidence for dismantling. The burn layer and later fill levels in the cellar are probably from this field-cleaning episode.

As with the cellar in Structure 21 (Feature 110), the artifacts deposited here at, or after, abandonment of the site were probably generated very nearby. The refuse fills (Strata IV, VI, and VII) probably include materials from within Structure 4. The other fills are apparently from topsoil shovelled up around the cellar, and the materials incorporated in these layers probably represent midden associated primarily with Structure 4. As noted above, there are probably more than 10,000 artifacts that were recovered from this feature, not counting floatation materials yet to be tabulated. They include the entire gamut of artifact types typically found at the site. Clearly, the large numbers of
domestic and food refuse items argue strongly for a function of Structure 4 as a house. Thus, the artifact data confirms the architectural interpretation.

Without further analysis, we cannot easily distinguish the status or nature of the occupants of this house from those of Structure 1, as indicated by fill artifacts in the cellar of its outbuilding, Structure 21. There are many items here which may have belonged to a substantial householder, although historical evidence suggests that occupants other than the Jordan/Farrar household were generally servants. Some of these servants eventually gained their freedom, of course, and McCartney has been able to trace a number of them in documents. For the most part, we may assume that freed servants claimed their own lands as soon as they could do so. One considerable difference between these cellar fills is the relative quantities of arms and armor items. These were rare in Structure 21, but quite abundant here. Other relatively numerous items include beads and jettons. There were fragments of clothing shot with silver and gold foil as well. The extensive wall trenches of Structure 4 suggest that this house may have been the most elaborately or finely built house on the property. In trying to determine which house may have been used by the Jordan/Farrar family, each has something to recommend it: Structure 1, with its series of enclosures and auxiliary buildings, is positioned in a way to assert greater control over the fort, the livestock, and perhaps the tobacco and food products. Structure 4, however, with its strong and weatherproof walls and its artifactual evidence for fine material goods, must be considered a good second candidate.

F-322  222N 334E
Historic. Post hole 3.5' north-south and 3.0' east-west, with a depth of 2.0' deep. The feature is the northwestern corner post of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-323  221N 340E
Historic. Ditch stain circa 0.8' wide, 13' long and 0.16' deep, with a generally flat bottom. The feature is the wall trench section between F-322 and F-345 in the northern gable end of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-325  172N 329E
Historic. Post hole 3.0' in diameter and 2.1' deep with a mold of 0.8' and 1.9' deep. The feature is the southwestern corner post of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-331  180N 346E
Historic. The feature is a ditch or wall trench for the eastern wall of Structure 4, later renumbered as F-445, see F-445. The feature was fully excavated.

F-345  222N 349E
Historic. Post hole 2.4' in diameter and 2.0' deep with a mold of 0.5'. The feature is the northeastern corner post of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.
F-369 183N 347E
Historic. Post hole 1.6' in diameter and 0.6' deep with a post mold of 0.7'. The feature is a stud in the eastern wall of Structure 4 dug into the bottom of the wall ditch and was not visible until the ditch was removed. The feature was fully excavated.

F-370 197N 347E
Historic. Post hole 2.55' in diameter and 1.75' deep with a post mold of 0.7'. The feature is a framing or bay post in the eastern wall of Structure 4. Lying 0.1' to south of the post mold is a second mold 0.33' in diameter and 0.3' deep and which may have been a wall stud. Two other small possible molds were also visible in the hole fill. The feature was fully excavated.

F-371 172N 337E
Historic. Post hole 1.5' in diameter and 1.0' deep with a post mold of 0.6'. The feature is the southern gable post of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-386 222N 342E
Historic. Post mold 1.1' in diameter and 1.4' deep with a mold of 0.45'. The feature is the northern gable post for Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-387 184N 330E
Historic. Post hole circa 2.4' square with a depth of 2.2'. The feature is a framing or bay post in the western wall of Structure 4, also possibly part of door. The feature was fully excavated.

F-402 199N 331E
Historic. Post hole ca. 3.0' in diameter. The feature is a framing or bay post in the western wall of Structure 4. The western bisection was removed.

F-428 215N 340E
Historic. A post hole in the slump lense of Structure 4 root cellar F-320 which may not be related to F-320. The feature was fully excavated.

F-441 171N 345E
Historic. Post hole circa 2.4' square with a depth of 2.2'. The feature is the southeast corner post of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-442 172N 334E
Historic. Ditch stain circa 0.85' wide by 14' long. The feature is the wall trench section between F-325 and F-441 in the southern gable end of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.
F-443  171N 340E
Historic.  Post hole 0.75' north-south and 1.3' east-west with a mold of 0.5'.  The feature is a stud in southern gable end of Structure 4, visible on surface of F-442 trench and probably a replacement.  The feature was fully excavated.

F-444  218N 340E
Historic.  Eight linear stains running north-south inside the F-320 cellar of Structure 4.  Lying on the sloping fill of stratum 4, the stains disappeared into a heavy charcoal layer.  The features appeared to be boards.  See the description of Feature 320, above for further details. The features were fully excavated.

F-445  177N 346E
Historic.  Ditch stain circa 1' wide by 10' long and 0.4' deep.  The feature is the wall trench section between F-441 and F-369 in the eastern wall of Structure 4.  The feature was fully excavated.

F-446  180N 346E
Historic.  Post hole .9' north-south and .75' east-west with a depth of 0.2' below trench F-445 and a mold .5' in diameter.  The feature is a stud in the eastern wall trench of Structure 4.  The feature was fully excavated.

F-447  190N 347E
Historic.  Ditch stain circa 0.8' wide by 10' long and 0.2' deep.  The feature is the wall trench section between F-369 and F-370 in the eastern wall of Structure 4.  The feature was fully excavated.

F-448  “190N 347E”
Historic.  Post hole 0.65' in diameter and 0.1' deep.  The feature is a stud in F-447, the eastern wall trench of Structure 4.  Exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on maps.  The feature was fully excavated.

F-449  194N 338E
Historic.  Post hole 0.7' and roughly square.  The feature lies on the eastern edge of Structure 4 eastern wall trench F-447, and is possibly a replacement stud or scaffolding post.  It was not excavated.

F-450  175N 329E
Historic.  Ditch stain circa 0.8' wide by 10' long and 0.3' deep.  The feature is the wall trench section between F-325 and F-387 in the western wall of Structure 4.  The feature was fully excavated.

F-451  177N 329E
Historic. Post hole 1’ square with a depth of 0.7’ and a mold .4’ in diameter. The feature is a stud in the western wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-452 195N 331E
Historic. Ditch stain circa 0.8’ wide by 8’ long and 0.2’ deep. The feature is the wall trench section between F-387 and F-402 in the western wall of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-453 196N 332E
Historic. Post hole 1.3’ north-south and 1.0’ east-west with a depth of 0.9’ and a mold circa .5’ in diameter. The feature is cut into trench F-452 and is a probable replacement post in the western wall of Structure 4. The hole was heavily rodent-disturbed. The feature was fully excavated.

F-454 192N 331E
Historic. Post hole .9’ north-south and 1.1’ east-west with a depth of 0.8’ and a mold .4’ in diameter. The feature is cut into trench F-452 and is a probable stud in the western wall of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-455 189N 331E
Historic. Post hole .8’ square with a depth of 0.9’ and a mold .45’ in diameter. The feature is a stud and possible door post in the western wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-456 203N 332E
Historic. Ditch stain circa 1’ wide by 5’ long and 0.3’ deep. The feature is the wall trench section between F-402 and F-457 in the western wall of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-457 210N 333E
Historic. Post hole 1.95’ north-south and 2.05’ east-west with a depth of 1’. The feature is a replacement post located in the western wall of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-458 210N 349E
Historic. Post hole 1.65’ square with a depth of 0.65’ and a mold circa 0.45’ in diameter. The feature is a bay or framing post cut into the eastern wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-461 202N 332E
Historic. Post hole 1.2’ north-south and 1’ east-west with a depth of 0.55’ and a mold circa 0.65’ in diameter. The feature is a stud in the western wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-462 215N 339E
Historic. Ditch stain circa 1.0’ wide by 9.0’ long and 0.3’ deep. The feature is the wall trench section between F-345 and F-458 in the eastern wall of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-463 213N 339E
Historic. Post hole 0.7’ square with a depth of 0.2’ and a mold circa 0.4’ in diameter. The feature is a stud in the eastern wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-464 217N 339E
Historic. Post hole 0.75’ square with a depth of 0.22’ and a mold circa 0.4’ in diameter. The feature is a stud in the eastern wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-466 171N 341E
Historic. Post hole 0.9’ in diameter and a mold of 0.4’. The feature is a stud in the southern gable wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-467 172N 345E
Historic. Post hole with indistinct boundary and discernable mold of 0.47’. The feature is apparently a repair to southeastern corner post F-441 of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-469 180N 330E
Historic. Post hole roughly 0.9’ square with a depth of 0.4’ and a mold circa 0.5’ in diameter. Visible on the trench surface, the feature is a stud cut into the western wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-470 222N 334E
Historic. Hole 1.9’ north-south and 2.1’ east-west with a depth of circa 1’. The feature is a repair to northwestern corner post F-322 of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-472 221N 336E
Historic. Hole 1.5’ northeast-southwest and 1.0’ northwest-southeast. The feature is a repair to northwest corner post F-322 of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-474 171N 330E
Historic. Hole approximately 2’ in diameter with mold of circa 1’. The feature is a repair to the southwestern corner post F-325 of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-475 212N 333E
Historic. Ditch stain circa 0.9’ wide by 8’ long and 0.2’ deep. The feature is the wall trench section between F-322 and F-457 in the western wall of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-476 218N 333E
Historic. Post hole 1.1’ north-south and 1.25’ east-west with a mold of 0.55’ and a depth of .45’. The feature is a stud and possible door support in the western wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-477 214N 333E
Historic. Post hole 1.2’ north-south and 1’ east-west with a mold of 0.48’ and a depth of .7’. The feature is a stud and possible door support in the western wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-479 200N 348E
Historic. Post hole roughly 1’ square with a mold of 0.55’ and a depth of .25’. The feature is a stud in the eastern wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-480 205N 348E
Historic. Post hole .85’ north-south and .9’ east-west with a mold of 0.5’ and a depth of .3’. The feature is a stud cut into the eastern wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-481 205N 332E
Historic. Post hole .95’ in diameter with a mold of 0.5’ and a depth of .5’. The feature is a stud in the western wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-482 190N 331E
Historic. Linear soil anomaly 2’ north-south and 1.1’ east-west with a depth of 0.3’. F-482 is cut into western wall trench F-452 and in turn is cut by stud F-455. F-482 is probably a repair to the western wall of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-483 203E 348N
Historic. Post hole 0.37’ in diameter and 0.14’ deep. The feature cuts into F-484, the eastern wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-484 202N 348E
Historic. Ditch stain circa 0.6' wide by 5.0' long and 0.2' deep. The feature is the wall trench section between F-370 and F-458 in the eastern wall of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-485 201N 348E
Historic. Post hole 0.28' in diameter and 0.07' deep. The feature is a stud in the eastern wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

F-489 205N 348E
Historic. Post hole 1.8' north-south and circa 1' east-west with two molds of 0.5' in diameter, one with a depth of .7' and the other with a depth of .3'. The features are studs cut into the eastern wall trench of Structure 4. The feature was fully excavated.

Structure 5

Structure 5 is a Colonial longhouse located along the western palisade wall west of Structures 4 and 10. The house measures approximately 37' x 16'. In addition, there was a small shed, oven, or exterior hearth attached to the northeastern corner of the house. This addition measures 7' x 8'. The construction features of the building were quite similar to those of the other longhouses discussed so far. The house was constructed in two bays; the main structural posts measured between 7" and 8" in diameter, and were set 2' - 2.5' deep. Studs were placed along the walls on approximately 3' centers; however, stud spacing and occurrence is more variable with this house than with those discussed so far. Some studs seem to be "missing" altogether. We can only guess whether this is because they were seated shallowly, and lost to the plow, or were never present. Those stud molds which are present tend to be quite shallow. Again, it is not possible to determine whether this is due to their having been set shallowly in the first place, or due to more intensive erosion or deeper plowing in this part of the site.

The house may have been divided into two equal-size rooms, with a partition wall running between the bay posts located at the center of the long walls. There are two probable door openings on the east wall. One of these is situated approximately 6' north of the southeast corner, and the other is approximately 6' south of the northeast corner. The facade appears to reflect mirror symmetry. Perhaps the building was a double house designed to house servants or tenants. This inference may be strengthened by noting that there was probably a hearth at each gable end of the house. One of these is suggested by a large post (Feature 407) inside the south room wall, circa 1' from the gable post. There are several small puncheon post molds (some of which may be prehistoric) adjacent to these larger posts. A small framing posts stands outside the southwestern corner of the house as well. This constellation of otherwise unexplained features may represent the supports of a hearth in this corner of the house. The opposing, northeastern, corner of the house also has a number of features that are difficult to interpret. A framing or stud post is found midway between the northeast
corner post and the gable post, and it is flanked by smaller puncheon posts. Outside the house in this corner are several posts, including puncheons and one or two small framing posts. These may frame a small shed, but the walls of the shed do not align with the house walls, nor is it obvious how the framing would have tied to the house. These appear, instead to represent framing for a "catted" chimney or external hearth hood. If this is correct, then there were hearths in each of the two rooms. The location of stairs cannot be inferred, due to the lack of appropriate features inside the building. perhaps the loft was accessed by way of ladders.

Aside from the possible hearth-related features described above, there is only one other internal feature in the house. This is a moderately large post hole situated in the middle of the northern room. This post has not been excavated, nor has a mold been discerned. The function of this post is unknown, although it may have been added to provide support to a sagging ridge beam or roof truss. It is also possible that this post served as framing for a non-bearing partition wall which ran between this post and a stud on the western wall. In this case, Feature 330 would not have served as a stud on the eastern wall, as described, below, but more likely as a door post. This would alter the interpretation of the house to that of a hall-parlor form. These two interpretations are depicted in Figures * and *.

A total of fourteen framing posts or wall stud posts have been excavated on Structure 5. The contents of the post holes indicates that this house was probably constructed early in the settlement sequence. Only one post hole, Feature 388, contained any historic debris, and this consisted only of two small pieces of lead shot and a single flint flake. These artifacts could have been left by an historic Indian occupation as well. The structure does stratigraphically cut Feature 411. This feature was a lime kiln used to make lime to mix with clay daub during the initial construction phase at the site. It probably also cuts Feature 409, a large pit that probably functioned as a combination saw pit, for preparing house cladding and pales, and as a daub pit.

**Features associated with Structure 5**

F-317  215N 326E  
Historic. Post hole of circa 2.0' in diameter with a mold of circa 0.6'. The feature is the southeastern corner post of Structure 5. It was left in bisection.

F-318  215N 312E  
Historic. Post hole 1.9' in diameter and 1.2' deep with a mold of 0.6'. The feature is the southwestern corner post of Structure 5. It was left in bisection.

F-326  221N 327E  
Historic. Post hole 0.7' in diameter and 0.2' deep. The feature is a stud in the eastern wall of Structure 5. The western bisection was removed.
F-327  227N 328E
Historic.  Post hole 1.5' in diameter and 0.4' deep with a mold of 0.5'.  The feature is a stud in the eastern wall of Structure 5.  The western bisection was removed.

F-330  243N 338E
Historic.  Post hole 0.8' in diameter and 0.2' deep.  The feature is a stud in eastern wall of Structure 5.  The western bisection was removed.

F-335  227N 311E
Historic.  Post hole is 1.1' in diameter and 0.2' deep.  The feature is a stud in the western wall of Structure 5.  The southern bisection was removed.

F-340  230N 311E
Historic.  Post hole 0.7' in diameter and 0.4' deep.  The feature is a stud in the western wall of Structure 5.  The western bisection was removed.

F-388  233N 327E
Historic.  Post hole 1.85' in diameter and 1.35' deep with a mold of 0.5'.  The feature is a framing or bay post in the eastern wall of Structure 5.  The western bisection was removed.

F-405  200N 300E block
Historic.  Post hole 1.2' in diameter and 0.15' deep with a post mold of 0.4'.  Exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on the map.  The feature is listed as a stud in Structure 5.  The southern bisection was removed.

F-406  200N 300E block
Historic.  Post hole 1.5' in diameter and 0.18' deep with a post mold of 0.35' and 0.25' deep.  Exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on the map.  The feature is listed as a stud in Structure 5.  The southern bisection was removed.

F-407  216N 319E
Historic.  Post hole 1.3' in diameter and 0.35' deep with a mold of 0.95' and 1.0' deep.  The feature stands 1.0' directly north of the southern gable post and may be part of a hearth in Structure 5.  The northern bisection was removed.

F-414  254N 326E
Historic.  Post hole 0.75' in diameter and 0.38' deep.  The feature is probably associated with a hearth, oven, or shed on the northern end of Structure 5; it cuts into the earlier lime kiln F-411.  The feature was fully excavated.

F-415  251N 327E
Historic. Post hole 1.99' in diameter and 1.9' deep with a post mold of 0.45'. The feature is the northeastern corner post of Structure 5 and cuts into the lime kiln F-411. The northern bisection was removed.

F-416 250N 300E block
Historic. Post hole ca. 1.3' in diameter. The feature cuts into lime kiln F-411 and may be a framing post for a hearth, oven, or shed attached to Structure 5. Exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on the map. The southern bisection was removed.

**Structure 10**

**Features associated with Structure 10**

Structure 10 is a Colonial longhouse measuring approximately 55' x 16', with a 3' x 9' shed or chimney extending from the northwest corner. The southernmost room appears to be a 10' deep addition that was added to an original building 45' in length. This addition has a small shed or chimney extending from its southeastern corner. Only two features associated with this structure have yet been excavated. These are the northeastern and northwestern corner posts of the original 45' long structure. There was a considerable difference of depth between these two elements of what, supposedly, would have been a tie-beam pair. One was set 1.75' (below the base of the plowzone), and the other was only 1.3' deep. It is possible, of course, that the plow zone was deeper towards the eastern edge of this structure. That this may have been so is further confirmed by moderately well-preserved wall slots on the west wall, and their absence on the east wall. The two excavated posts, and several other major structural post molds which can be measured from the initial field map, are considerably larger, on average, than the structural posts for the other longhouses. Post diameters seem to average about 1' in diameter. What's more, there are a great many internal features in Structure 10. These include heavy posts, lighter posts, puncheon molds, and two large areas of ash and burned soil.

While it is possible to speculate more about the nature of this house, what is actually needed is more intensive field study. For that reason, VCU's summer field school will devote considerable effort to further study of this important building during the summer of 1992.

F-516 290N 347E
Historic. Post hole 2.76' north-south and 3.08' east-west with a depth of 1.75' and a mold circa .8' in diameter. The feature is the northwestern corner post of the original core building within Structure 10. The northern bisection was removed.
F-517  290N 364E
Historic.  Post hole 2.7’ square with a depth of 1.3’ and a mold 1.1’ in diameter.  The feature is the northeastern corner post of the original core building within Structure 10. The northern bisection was removed.

Structure 17

Structure 17 is a small single-bay (probably single-room) building located in the northern end of the fort (Figures *and*, Plate *). The building measures approximately 16' x 12'. The north and south walls are each comprised of two corner posts and a central gable post or wall stud. There are no other posts clearly associated with this building, and the only other feature related to the structure is a small cellar (F-499) in the northeastern corner of the floor. The corner posts varied between .5' - .7' diameter, and were set approximately 2'- 2.5' below the original surface. The central posts in each wall were relatively light posts set much more shallowly (about 1.25' below the original surface). All features associated with this building have been excavated.

This building is located at the opposite end of the fortified enclosure from the longhouses, most or all of which appear to have served primarily as residential buildings. Structure 17, on the other hand, is in a part of the site that appears to have been reserved for livestock, trash disposal, and work areas. The presence of a small cellar, reminiscent of the so-called "root cellars" typically associated with later slave dwellings, suggests that this building may have been a house. The contents of the root cellar are helpful, but not unambiguous, for shedding light on the building's function. Materials recovered here included domestic items like fireplace tongs, a flatiron, a broken brass kitchen skimmer, a knife, and food bone refuse. Portions of only three ceramic vessels were found, and these are a Ming porcelain wine cup, a redware pot, and a Bartmann bottle. A few glass case bottle fragments were also recovered. Personal items were numerous, including several beads, an ear bauble, aiglets, and a large number of pipe bowl and stem fragments, a spur, etc. There are also numerous items from the arms and armor category, including a lots of shot of various sizes, and a shot mold; possible gun parts, a bandolier cap, and a fragment of plate armor. Architectural elements included 281 nails, and 44 chunks of burned clay or daub, probably hearth packing. Many of these chunks were rather large. The occurrence of burned daub in this feature, and in some of the post molds to Structure 17, suggests the likelihood that there was a hearth on the building, although its location has not been determined. Three marked bale seals were also recovered, suggesting possible storage of cloth or similar items. 12

12. There were a total of 39 sherds of Native American ceramics, or which 21, or 60%, were of the Protohistoric Gaston or Roanoke types. Five of the sherds were from the rim of a single Gaston vessel. This may indicate that at least some of the Gaston type ceramics in this feature could be primary refuse, rather than incidentally redeposited items. The possibility of Colonila use of Native American ceramics will be taken up again, under the discussion of artifacts.
The artifacts found in this cellar are almost certainly materials that had been lying about within or around the building at the time of its abandonment. There was no evidence of erosion or slump in the walls of F-499; this indicates that the cellar was probably filled quickly, rather than being used as an open trash pit. The large numbers and diversity of items found here indicate that the building was probably a house. The function of the house may be clarified somewhat by looking at evidence for its date, relative to other buildings on the site. First, the majority of the post holes for this building contained no artifacts. Those that did have artifacts in their backfill had only prehistoric materials such as flakes or fire-cracked rock. This suggests that the building was constructed relatively early in the occupation sequence; perhaps earlier even than the longhouses, each of which had some - albeit few - historic materials in their post holes, wall trenches or other construction-related features. The Binford pipe stem date for the filling of F-499 is 1639. We must use Binford dates with caution at this early period, however. More reliable is the evidence of pipe bowls, and these are uniformly among the earliest bowls on the site (see the discussion of pipe bowls and makers' marks in a following chapter).

It seems likely that Structure 17 was the original Colonial house on the site. There is evidence that it was occupied by both males and at least one female. This may have been a temporary building used during the construction of the longhouses, or it may have been a tenant quarter which actually predates the construction of the fort and the other buildings on the site. As the fort had probably been constructed in 1622, according to John Smith's history, this house may predate 1622. Furthermore, the 1625 muster indicates the presence of five houses in the Jordan/Farrar compound, and we assume that these were the five longhouses. This building may have been dismantled by that time, or it may have been re-used as a storage building. The dating of pipe bowls in the cellar fill suggest the possibility, at least, that this building was abandoned prior to 1625.

**Features associated with Structure 17**

F- 499 373N 362E
Historic. Cellar measuring 3.4' north-south and 5.25 east-west with a depth of 1.1'. Binford mean date of 1638.75 from 56 pipestems. The feature is located inside the northwest corner of Structure 17. The feature was fully excavated.

This is the smallest of the three cellars located on the site. Its fill consisted of two distinct, but similar, layers, plus a leach zone of staining between the fill and the subsoil floor of the pit. The fill layers were each grey, charcoal-rich, ashy loams or midden-rich topsoil, although the lower layer contained a higher quantity, and larger pieces of, charcoal. The sides were quite vertical and exhibited no signs of erosion. Presumably, the cellar had originally been covered by planks or a trap door. For a discussion of the artifactual contents of this feature, see the description of Structure 17, above.
F-500  375N 354E
Historic.  Post hole 2.1’ north-south and 1.2’ east-west with a depth of .75’ and a mold circa .7’ in diameter. The feature is the northwestern corner post of Structure 17. The feature was fully excavated.

F-501  360N 353E
Historic.  Post hole 1.7’ north-south and 1.5’ east-west with a depth of 0.35’ and a mold circa 0.6’ in diameter. This feature is the southwestern corner post of Structure 17 and appears to be a replacement. The feature was fully excavated.

F-502  361N 366E
Historic.  Post hole 1.6’ north-south and 1.45’ east-west with a depth of 0.8’ and a mold .5’ in diameter. The feature is the southeastern corner post of Structure 17. The feature was fully excavated.

F-503  376N 366E
Historic.  Post hole 1.7’ north-south and 1.5’ east-west with a depth of .75’ and a mold circa .5’ in diameter. The feature is the northeastern corner post of Structure 17. The feature was fully excavated.

F-506  361N 360E
Historic.  Post hole 0.91’ north-south and 1.23’ east-west with a depth of .24’ and a mold circa .55’ in diameter. The feature is the center post in the southern wall of Structure 17. The feature was fully excavated.

F-507  375N 360E
Historic.  Post hole 1.2’ north-south and 1.2’ east-west with a depth of .27’ and a mold circa 0.4’ in diameter. The feature is the center post in the northern wall of Structure 17. The feature was fully excavated.

Structure 18

Structure 18 is another small one-room building located in the northern part of the site. The building was 16’ x 14’ in size (Figure *). Like Structure 15, this building is comprised of six posts: three each on the northern and southern walls. Only three posts - one gable post and three corner posts - have been excavated. A fourth (F-434) has been measured and numbered, but not excavated. The posts on this building appear to be similar in size to those of Structure 17, or slightly larger. The corner posts are not set as deeply as in the neighboring building, however. The two which have been excavated had depths of only .65’ and .8’ below the cleared surface. The one excavated gable post (F-513), on the other hand, was set considerably deeper than either gable post on Structure 15.
While this house is similar in size and location to Structure 17, it differs in some important ways. Because there is no cellar, we cannot associate artifacts - other than the few items in post molds and, perhaps, in the controlled surface collection - directly with the building. It is much more difficult to infer the function of this building. No feature evidence of a hearth was noted, but then that was also the case for Structure 17. It is possible, however, to suggest that these buildings were not constructed at the same time. While Structure 17 may have been the earliest building on the site, Structure 18 was probably built somewhat later: either at the same time as the longhouses, or, perhaps, it was added afterward. Each of the three excavated post holes contained historic items in their fills. These may have been derived from midden which accumulated while Structure 17 was in use, and before Structure 18 was built.

**Features associated with Structure 18**

F-434  347N 343E  
Historic. Post hole circa 2.5' square with mold of 0.8'. The feature is the southern gable and ridge post of structure 18. It was not excavated.

F-513  362N 342E  
Historic. Post hole 2.17' north-south and 2.2' east-west with a depth of .65' and a mold circa .6' in diameter. The feature is the northern gable or ridge post of Structure 18. The northern bisection was removed.

F-514  347N 351E  
Historic. Post hole 1.2' north-south and 1.23' east-west with a depth of .8' and a mold circa .6' in diameter. The feature is the southeastern corner post of Structure 18. The northern bisection was removed.

F-515  362N 336E  
Historic. Post hole 1.5' north-south and 1.4' east-west with a depth of .6' and a mold circa .6' in diameter. The feature is the northwestern corner post of Structure 18. The southern bisection was removed.

**Structure 19**

Adjacent to the west wall of the palisade, there appears to be a rectangular configuration comprising a possible building or enclosure measuring 6' x 10'. This has been designated Structure 19 (Figure *). The structure is comprised of two bays; one is approximately 3' deep, and one 7' deep. Structure 19 is oriented east-west, unlike all of the other buildings on the site, which are oriented north-south. Two small puncheon (?) posts stand 4' from the northern wall and form a line parallel to the northern wall of the structure. The easternmost of these aligns with the eastern wall of Structure 19.
There are a number of other posts in the vicinity which we cannot interpret. The nature and function of Structure 19 is open to speculation. Perhaps it served as a small pen, a corn-crib, or feeding bin. None of the features has yet been excavated or numbered, so it is not possible to be more certain about this structure.

OTHER FEATURES

Besides houses and their cellars, enclosures, the palisaded fort itself, and other structures, we have identified and excavated a large number of historic features on the site. The following is a description of the major historic features. A list of miscellaneous features, including those which turned out to be disturbances, tree root casts, etc., is provided here as Appendix *.

The Well

F-435  350N 328E
Historic.  Well measuring circa 16' in diameter at its lip, and at least 14' deep.  Binford mean date of 1635.22 from 247 pipestems.  The feature appears to have been abandoned before completion due to unstable sand strata encountered about 9' below modern grade.  The feature was clearly being used for trash disposal during the occupation of the site.  At 11' below grade, excavation was suspended for safety reasons.

Feature 435 is interpreted to be the excavation of a well or deep cistern on the site. It is uncertain whether the well was completed, or was abandoned after a deep excavation collapsed or, more likely, failed to encounter a water table.13 Plates *, *, and * show the well before, during, and after cessation of excavation. Figure * illustrates the stratigraphic section of fills in the feature. When first encountered, the well appeared at the surface as a large, ca. 16' diameter, circular stain. The first four or five feet of fills (Strata I-VII) contained dense refuse deposits. Tens of thousands of artifacts were recovered from this feature alone, including unique food refuse items like charred beans and corn remains. The deposits in this feature were wet-screened to enhance recovery of small and delicate items.

At first it was believed that a lined well had been salvaged, and that the upper deposits were simply secondary fill materials used to refill the well after site abandonment. After further excavation, this does not appear to be the case. No robbed well shaft was ever encountered. Rather than a robber's pit, it appears we have excavated a builder's pit for a well that was never coompleted. Below about 5' to 6' in depth, the matrix deposits become loose sand. We were forced to abandon excavation below approximately 11' in depth, although a slit-spoon core sampler was sunk at the bottom of our excavation,

13. The present land-owner has stated that recent test borings in this field did not encounter water until reaching a depth of 60' or more.
and this indicated that the fill deposit continues to at least 14' deep, and possibly much deeper.

**The Lime Kiln**

F-411  254N 323E  
Historic.  Circular lime kiln 6.8' in diameter and 2.6' deep with cone shaped walls burned in situ. Filled with burned freshwater mussel shells, this feature predates Structure 5. The northern bisection was removed.

The colonists produced some lime, apparently to mix with clay for daubing or plastering houses. A very few chunks of lime were recovered from some features and one feature only, F-431, contained a number of large chunks of daub mixed with lime. This same feature included a number of burned quartzite rocks covered with a film of lime, or with whitewash. While some chunks of limestone were recovered from one of the cellar fills, the lime that was used in the houses at Jordan's Journey was produced at the site. Feature 411 is a circular pit that was apparently used as a kiln for indurating lime from mussel shells. The feature is in the shape of an inverted truncated cone and the adjacent matrix exhibits extreme reddening and hardening from heat. The shape and size are similar to those of two lime kilns excavated at Jamestown (Cotter 1958: **, Figures **).

The reason that so little lime was recovered from the site is partially (though enigmatically) explained by the fact that the last load of lime fired in the kiln was never removed. The kiln remains packed with burned, crushed mussel shells. It is difficult to understand why such trouble was taken to gather the shells, construct and fire the kiln, and then to abandon the use of lime. It is possible that preliminary construction of the settlement was interrupted - perhaps by the March 1622 Indian uprising or similar emergency - and attention was turned to other, more pressing tasks.

What is clear is that the kiln is among the earliest features on the site. It is cut by several posts associated with Structure 5, which indicates that the kiln had been backfilled before that longhouse was built. The artifacts in the excavated bisection were all of Native American origin. These included several sherds of Roanoke Simple Stamped and a plain, smoothed shell-tempered ware thought to be of protohistoric date. All of these sherds were found mixed in with the lime, and all exhibit signs of having been incidentally re-fired to a higher temperature than was typical for Indian pottery. This observation provides yet another mystery. While dirt or sods may have been piled on top of the fired kiln, it is uncertain how Indian pottery and a few lithics came to be mixed with the thick lens of shell packing which is otherwise devoid of soil.

We have had to consider an alternative interpretation of this feature. It remains a possibility - but only a narrow one - that the pit was excavated by Native Americans to
indurate shell for use as pottery temper. This idea seems unlikely for several reasons. While all but one of the sherds in the fill are of shell-tempered types, the occurrence of shell-tempered pottery is rather rare on this site. No similar feature has been reported on any Late Woodland or Protohistoric Period site in Virginia or surrounding states. While shell-filled pits are not uncommon - and there are some at Jordan's Journey - these aboriginal features are typically very small, shallow features. Pits of similar size and shape have been found on prehistoric sites in Virginia where they appear to have served as either silo (storage) pits or roasting pits, but none have been dated to the terminal Late Woodland, and none of these have exhibited evidence for use as lime indurating ovens. The similarity of this feature to other early Virginia lime kilns, and the presence of some shell lime - if only some - used in daub and other ways by the colonists indicates that this was a colonial kiln, despite the complete lack of European-made artifacts in the fill.

Miscellaneous Pit Features

F-1  163N 363E
Historic. Basin-shaped pit 2.2' long and 0.65' deep. An unidentified ferrous object was found protruding from the unexcavated section. The feature was left in bisection.

This small, irregular-shaped pit was originally thought to be a prehistoric feature. Artifacts recovered included a sherd of unidentified Native American pottery, and some bone and shell fragments. The presence of an iron artifact, as yet unidentified, suggests that this feature is associated with the colonial occupation. It is not out of the question, however, that this is a post-Contact Indian feature. There are a number of other small Indian pits in this area. A floatation sample was taken, but has not yet been analyzed. Perhaps when this has been finished, the nature of this pit will be more reliably known.

F-196  242N 395E
Historic. Square shallow flat bottomed feature, 2.5' in diameter and 0.22' deep. Although artifacts were recovered and this feature is inside Structure 1, it is very possible this feature is an earlier test pit excavated by Nicholas Lucketti. It is similar in size and shape to others of Lucketti's tests, many of which are clustered in this part of the site. The western bisection was removed.

F-321  183N 315E
Historic. Flat-bottomed oval pit, 3.3' north-south and 4.1' east-west, with a depth of 0.8'. The feature was fully excavated. The pit was filled with dark loam soil heavily flecked with ash and charcoal. This appears to be one of several small ash pita on the site used primarily for dumping hearth sweepings and other household trash. This feature is located approximately 15 feet outside what might be a "back" door adjacent to the hearth in Structure 4.
F-342  173N 312E
Historic. Shallow flat bottomed oval pit measuring 2.55' north-south, 2.3' east-west and 0.22' deep. The feature was fully excavated. This very small, very shallow feature lies near the southwestern corner of the fort. Its function is unknown.

F-404  237N 338E
Historic. Pit 4.05' long, pear shaped, with sloping sides and maximum depth of 1.6'. Binford mean date of 1620.67 from 45 pipestems. Originally this feature was probably dug for daub and then later used as an ash and trash dump. The feature was fully excavated. This is another ash pit which lies approximately 13 feet beyond a door to Structure 5, and probably serviced the occupants of that house. This, and similar "ash pits" may have been originally excavated for daub to repair or renew coatings on hearth hoods or chimneys. After excavation, they appear to have remained open for some time and collected household trash and hearth cleanings.

Among the large quantities of household items in this feature, including several parts to one or more brass kettles, kitchen and serving ceramics, etc., there were numerous "arms and armor" artifacts, including two sword basket hilts, a shell guard, a sword blade and a musket barrel.

F-409  255N 331E
Historic. Roughly rectangular pit 5.7' east-west and about 15.5' long north-south with a keeled bottom and depth of 4.2'. Binford mean date of 1639.06 from 262 pipestems. This feature was probably dug for daub during the construction of the longhouses. The long rectangular shape and considerable depth is unusual for a borrow pit and it is likely that F-409 also functioned as a sawpit. The feature was quickly backfilled and after the fill settled the resulting depression was used as a trashpit. Stratum III, the original fill, was left partially unexcavated in the southern bisection.

It should be noted that among the various saw blades and blade fragments recovered from the site, there was a large blade of a two-man saw, quite possibly used in this pit (although this saw was recovered from another feature). No evidence of decomposed sawdust or wood chips were found in the bottom of the pit, although this is not surprising. The keeled profile may have resulted from subsequent daub mining after the feature was no longer needed for sawing, or, this shape may have been useful for providing a sump drain under a board "floor", to keep the pit useable during or following a rain shower.

At the surface, F-409 appears to have been intruded slightly by a corner post to Structure 5. The fills in these features was so similar that this stratigraphic relationship could not be easily discerned, but it is our conclusion that the large pit had been backfilled before Structure 5 was built. The subsequent settling and use of the resulting
depression as a trash dump was probably concurrent with the occupation of Structure 5. Artifacts in the original fill (Stratum III) are primarily prehistoric, thus confirming the dating of the feature as one of the earliest on the site, along with the lime kiln. This early dating does not include the dense trash deposits in Stratum I and, especially, Stratum II, which accumulated during the occupation.

The feature was bisected across the short (east-west) axis, approximately 8' south of the northern end of the pit. The fills of the northern bisection were removed first, in three strata: Stratum 1 was a shallow wash lens in a slump depression at the top of the pit. Stratum II is a ca. 1' thick primary refuse accumulation, and Stratum III is intentional backfill material. This lower stratum, which comprises the vast majority of the feature fill, was a mixture of clayey materials derived from subsoil and organic loam, derived from topsoil. This is one of the few large bulk deposits on the site which contains a more-or-less representative sample of the materials lying on the ground at the time the English colonists arrived at the site. The southern bisection was not completely excavated, Strata I and II were completely removed, but only 1/3 or so of Stratum III was taken out in this bisection.

Stratum II was extremely dense with food refuse and occupational trash deposits. Near the northern end of the feature, an intact quadrant of a brigandine vest was uncovered. This unique artifact was cleaned and stabilized in situ, and then encased in a "mushroom" of papiér maché, plaster of paris, and plastic resins. The brigandine was isolated on a pedestal, and then undercut. A plywood platform was inserted under the artifact, which was then lifted and returned to the laboratory, so that completion of the excavation and stabilization could be accomplished under more controlled conditions. According to Ivor Noël Hume, this may be the only intact brigandine archaeologically excavated anywhere. While hundreds of brigandine plates were recovered from various features at Jordan's Journey, including several masses of plates representing intact fragments of original armor, this find proved to be unique in its completeness.

In excavating the southern bisection, we decided to "pedestal" the vast quantities of artifacts - particularly the food refuse bone - in order to be able to treat this fragile material with consolidants, and to record as much of the faunal material as possible before lifting (and frequently breaking) these intact, but poorly preserved specimens. Plate * shows the excavated stratum with many of the larger bone specimens, and some other artifacts, in situ.

Besides the food refuse and the brigandine quadrant, there were many important finds in this feature. At the top of Stratum II, and probably among the last items discarded in the pit, was a 5' long wrought iron roasting spit, nearly identical to one illustrated in Figure *. Large quantities of ceramics recovered include numerous fragments of Virginia-made redwares, Seville storage jars, and Iberian costrels. An iron kettle fragment is another kitchen item recovered from the pit. Large quantities of personal
items, particularly clothing accoutrements, were recovered from this pit, as well as from other primary refuse deposits on the site.

Of particular interest is the fact that Stratum III represents the assemblage of materials left on the ground by prehistoric and protohistoric groups. Throughout the excavations, there have been a large number of sherds of protohistoric aboriginal ceramics recovered from Colonila features. While it is likely that most of these are incidental backfill items, this likelihood diminishes when considering primary refuse deposits. It may be possible that colonists were using, and discarding, Indian pots at Jordan's Point. By comparing the ratio of protohistoric ceramics (Gaston and Roanoke wares, primarily) to other prehistoric ceramics between Stratum III, the initial backfill deposit, and Strata I and II, containing primary refuse, it is possible to test this hypothesis.

Table *, below, shows the sherd count and percentage distributions of 113 identifiable sherds between the upper (refuse) and lower (initial backfill) levels of Feature 409. The following pie charts graphically display the ratios in these different deposits. Sixty-eight percent of the Native American sherds in the upper levels are of protohistoric types, while only 58% of those in the lower levels are protohistoric. This latter figure is quite close to that for the site as a whole; Gaston, Roanoke and plain smoothed shell-tempered ceramics account for just over 60% of all identifiable sherds. While the difference between Feature 409 deposits is not huge, it is large enough to suggest the possibility that the refuse deposit differs in a non-random way from the lower deposit; that is, that some of the protohistoric ceramics were discarded by colonists after ca. 1620.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sherd Count</th>
<th>Protohistoric</th>
<th>Prehistoric</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 &amp; S2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Protohistoric</th>
<th>Prehistoric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 &amp; S2</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table *: Protohistoric/Prehistoric Ceramics in F-409

14. Minimum vessel counts have not been completed on Native American ceramics.
F-430  300N 320E
Historic. Pit measuring approximately 22' north-south by 16' east-west and about 3" deep. Binford mean date of 1639.06 from 403 pipestems. Located in the lowest point of the site, this feature originally appeared to be a large stain surrounded by posts. Upon excavation it was found to be a large borrow pit or quarry area consisting of interconnected pits representing at least 12 different digging episodes. The feature was fully excavated.

Feature 430 was the largest single feature uncovered on the site. It originally appeared to be a roughly oval-shaped pit. Short appendages on the outline of the pit appeared to be post holes. Our initial interpretation, before any excavation began, was that this feature could represent a semi-subterranean "first stage" house - a Grubenhaus (pit house) - erected for shelter during the initial construction period on the site. The first bisection of the feature was made on an east-west line, removing just under 1/3 of the feature from the north. After excavating below the rich organic fill layers at the top of the feature, the bottom of the feature revealed a very irregular, undulating surface, indicative of various digging episode. This impression was strengthened by observation of the first section profile. Our interpretation of the feature then changed. It now appears to be the major source of daub for the houses. Both large and small pits are juxtaposed adjacent to each other, and sometimes intersecting each other. Their upper edges were eroded due to exposure, indicating that they were left open as refuse pits. This caused the upper levels of each individual feature to blend into a series of blended midden layers. Below these, individual pits could be discerned, and each of these was designated by a letter (i.e., F-430 A, 430B...430J), and excavated separately (Figures * and *). In addition, three separately numbered features (F-518, F-519 and F-520) were originally thought to be posts surrounding the "pit house", but these proved to be additional discreet digging and filling episodes. The feature was excavated in 17 separate excavation units, so that further analysis might make it possible to discern
minor differences in the patterns of materials in individual refuse dumps, and perhaps
to tease apart some dating differences within the feature. Analysis at this level has not
yet been accomplished, however.

We can hypothesize that the larger digging episodes were undertaken during the initial
construction phase at the site, and that several of the smaller intersecting and peripheral
episodes represent mining for daub to repair chimneys and hearths. Further confusing
any hope of reconstructing many of the individual digging and filling episodes were
lenses of backfill thrown over organic deposits, and the reworking of all deposits by
redigging and erosion. Clearly the pits that make up this feature served as one of the
primary trash pits for the compound, along with the partially back-filled failed well.
This feature complex was clearly the richest source of artifacts on the site, possible
except for the well. The inventory of materials is huge and diverse. Besides a variety of
guns, armor, tools and ceramics, this feature complex contained a diverse assortment of
personal items, food remains and other materials.

F-431  325N 360E
Historic. Pit complex measuring 14' north-south by 9.5' east-west at the surface, with a
depth of 2.7' on the southern end and 5.1' on the northern end. Binford mean date of
1635 from 373 pipestems. The feature was fully excavated. This feature appears to have
been dug in at least two episodes (Figure *). The deepest section to north may have
functioned as a privy. This pit apparently cut an earlier daub pit (Stratum II). Another
apparently discreet deposit (EU 2008) intruded this daub pit, and may represent a
purposeful burial of a single an armor gorget backplate. The entire feature was heavily
disturbed by groundhog burrows, especially in the upper foot or two. No stratigraphic
separation could be discerned between the large oval feature, as it appeared at the
surface, and the deep cylindical "privy" portion at the northern end of the complex.
Figure * depicts a probable reconstruction of the sequence. Unfortunately, the severe
disturbances made it necessary to include all materials from the upper foot of fills, and
those of the deep "privy" into a single stratigraphic unit (Stratum I).

The identification of a possible privy in an early 17th-century Virginia context is
unusual, perhaps unique. This tentative interpretation is based on a number of
considerations. First, the cylindrical shape and depth of the feature suggest this possible
function. Most daub pits on the site are considerably shallower, and are rather
amorphous in shape. There were numerous other pits available for discarding primary
refuse, including all the pits making up Feature 430, and the large well (Feature 435), as
well as smaller ash pits scattered around the site. In addition, this it is located at some
distance from the main house structures, and in a part of the site which seems to have
been used primarily for communal trash disposal, animal husbandry, etc. As all the
occupants of the compound were enclosed within a fort, and presumably were
prepared for the possibility of a siege, it seems reasonable to assume that a privy would
have been available for use.
As early as the period of Sir Thomas Gates' governorship, which began officially in 1609, the leaders of Virginia's colonial enterprise at Jamestown had expressed concern for the disposal of unclean wastes. The *Laws Divine, Morall and Martiall, etc.* provide a punishment of whipping for any at Jamestown who would rinse pots and pans near the well or pump, throw wash water into the streets or lanes, or relieve him/herself less than 1/4 mile from the Palisade (Strachey 1612). By 1624, John Smith had noted that Indians "skulking" in the woods would pick off colonists venturing from the fort to relieve themselves. It seems reasonable that the ancient planters who established Jordan's Journey, and who had lived through the hard-won lessons since the days of Gates and Dale, might have decided to compromise by constructing a privy within the fort.

The principal fill in this feature was a mixture of lenses of clay, loam, organic materials, ash, charcoal and refuse. There was no clearly discernable primary privy fill. The contained a quantity of large, heavily fired daub chunks, bricks and other refuse suggesting that some of this fill was added to the feature at the time the site was abandoned and houses were dismantled. Many of the artifacts and fill lenses appear to be from primary refuse, however. A floatation sample was taken from the bottom of the possible privy shaft, but the biological specimens have not yet been analyzed.

**F-433  305N 371E**  
Historic. Basin shaped pit 4.2' north-south by 3.4' east-west with a depth of 1.05'. The feature is probably a small daub borrow pit reused as an ash and refuse dump. The feature was fully excavated.

This feature is another in the series of small pits which were probably used to mine daub for repairing chimneys and hearth linings, and which was subsequently used to dump hearth cleanings and household refuse. Like the other such pits on the site, this one is close to one of the longhouses; it lies just 10' beyond a probable door near the northeast corner of Structure 10. This house may also have had a chimney at its northern end. There were many fewer artifacts in this pit than in some of the other ash pits discussed above, although the ash- and charcoal-filled deposits were quite similar. Most, or all of the pits thought to have served as ash pits also contained some weaponry or armor, along with household and personal items. While household and personal trash was limited in this feature, wqe did recover a small cannon ball, probably from a gun known at the time as a "falcon".

**F-518  306N 314E**  
Historic. Pit 2.5' north-south and 2.4' east-west with a depth of 0.82'. Initially thought to be a post, the feature is actually a discrete mining episode in borrow pit F-430. The artifacts (EU 2133) were incorporated into F-430 and this pit was later called F-430E. The feature was fully excavated.
F-519 "308N 319E"
Historic. Pit 0.75' in diameter and 0.25' deep. Initially thought to be a post, the feature is actually a discrete mining episode in borrow pit F-430. The feature was fully excavated.

F-520 "308N 315E"
Historic. Dimensions 1.8' in diameter and 0.35' deep. Initially thought to be a post, the feature is actually a discrete mining episode in borrow pit F-430. The feature was fully excavated.

The Large Post

The Cemetery

2. Artifacts

Approximately 54,000 artifacts have been recovered from feature excavations at the Jordan/Farrar compound at Jordan's Point, not counting the numerous items yet to be analyzed from floatation of feature fills. In addition, the controlled surface collection resulted in the retrieval of 8-10,000 items, primarily prehistoric debitage and fire-cracked rock. This is a huge collection from any site; it includes what is possibly the largest collection from any single early-17th century English colonial site yet excavated. As noted in the Introduction, it is not the purpose of this report to present a comprehensive analysis of artifacts from the site. Time has permitted little analysis beyond that required for basic identification and inventory purposes. What follows are summary discussions of some of the more important classes of artifacts from the site. The analysis of ceramics is somewhat more complete than for other artifact classes. Some groups, eg., arms and armor, carpentry and agricultural tools, culinary tools and utensils, etc., are extremely well represented in the collection, but have not been dealt with in any detail here. These discussions are meant only to amplify the inventory somewhat, and to provide a sense of what remains to be done. It is our collective feeling that the artifacts from this site should provide volumes of specific analyses and in-depth interpretations. These must await another forum, however.

a. Prehistoric and Protohistoric Components

CERAMICS

The vast majority of the classified Native American ceramics recovered from controlled surface collections and all excavations of 44Pg302 date from the Late Woodland through Protohistoric/Contact periods. Of these, the majority appear to date from the more
recent centuries of the Late Woodland and later. A slim minority date to the Middle Woodland period, and a smaller number of rather crude, thick sherds are probably Middle Woodland. While no definite Early Woodland ceramics were found, one sand-tempered, thick, friable sherd could be either Early Woodland or early Middle Woodland, and at least a few Early Woodland sherds could certainly be hidden among some of the numerous heavily weathered fragments that were too small and eroded to be classified.

The following presentation deals with sherds recovered from the 1990 and 1991 seasons of excavation. It does not include the smaller sample from the controlled surface collection which was described earlier in this report. Also, additional ceramics have been recovered from the excavation of both Native American and Colonial burials, results of which will be presented in a later report. Although some reference will be made to the ceramics recovered from these latter excavations, the work is still in progress, and the recovered ceramics have not been included in the quantifications used below. However, it is worth noting that the majority of the ceramics found in the burials are of the Gaston type, including a large vessel section found in the bottom of one of the burial pits. The frequencies of ceramics referred to below and presented in Tables * and * are derived from the master inventory by provenience, included as an appendix to this report.

**Table *: List of Native American Ceramics, 44Pg302**
(does not include initial controlled surface collections)

- Gaston 794 (26.9%)
- Roanoke 113 (3.8%)
- Shell tempered plain/smoothed 149 (5%)
- Shell tempered plain, thick, friable (Mockley?) 3 (<1%)
- Townsend 143 (4.8%)
- Very fine sand tempered/untempered, "Townsend-like" 182 (6.2%)
- Very fine sand tempered/untempered plain 13 (<1%)
- Very coarse sand-tempered fabric-impressed (Middle Woodland?) 1 (<1%)
- Sand tempered fabric-impressed 233 (7.9%)
- Sand tempered plain/smoothed 15 (<1%)
- Sand tempered, incised (probably over plain/smoothed) 2 (<1%)
- Sand tempered plain, very thick, friable (Early or Middle Woodland?) 1 (<1%)
- Crushed quartz tempered plain/smoothed 4 (<1%)
- Crushed quartz tempered fabric impressed 1 (<1%)
- Crushed quartz tempered cord marked 1 (<1%)
- Crushed quartz tempered, unidentifiable surface treatment 1 (<1%)
- Crushed quartz and sand tempered plain/smoothed 2 (<1%)
- Crushed quartz and sand tempered, smoothed over simple stamped surfaces 33 (1.1%)
Crushed quartz, shell and sand tempered, smoothed over fabric or net marked surface 1 (<1%)
Shell and fine sand tempered, possibly net marked (eroded) 1 (<1%)
"Grit tempered" fabric impressed 1 (<1%)
Prince George net marked 1 (<1%)
Gravel tempered plain (Prince George?) 2 (<1%)
Mockley cord marked 5 (<1%)
Mockley net marked 21 (<1%)
Sand tempered net marked, "Pope's Creek-like" 19 (<1%)
Unidentifiable fragments 1,209 (40.98%)
Total ceramics 2,951

**Table *: 44Pg302, Native American Ceramics in Order of Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable fragments</td>
<td>1,209 (40.98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaston</td>
<td>794 (26.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand tempered fabric-impressed</td>
<td>233 (7.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very fine sand tempered/untempered, &quot;Townsend-like&quot;</td>
<td>182 (6.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell tempered plain/smoothed</td>
<td>149 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend</td>
<td>143 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke</td>
<td>113 (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushed quartz and sand tempered, smoothed over simple stamped surfaces</td>
<td>33 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other miscellaneous Middle Woodland, Late Woodland-Protohistoric/Contact period and temporally unclassified ceramics</td>
<td>95 (less than 1% for each category; 3.2% total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ceramics</td>
<td>2,951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard established type names were used where appropriate. Those ceramics that did not fit into established well-dated types were designated by surface treatment and temper; however, the sorting usually considered more general paste characteristics as well. The major ceramic types are described and discussed below.

**Gaston Ware**

The most common Native American ceramic type on the site is Gaston Simple Stamped (Coe 1964: 105-107) and variants, all of which are subsumed under the nomen "Gaston" for the purposes of the present study.

The Gaston type is also comparable to Cashie Simple Stamped (Phelps 1980), and probably Binford's (1964) Branchville Simple Stamped. Although most of the Gaston pottery from 44Pg302 is largely consistent with Coe's descriptions, there is far more
variation in this assemblage than in the one described by Coe for the Gaston Site and used by him to create the type definition.

While the paste varies among the 44Pg302 sherds, the most common texture is smooth and clayey. There is a fair range of variation, however, and some sherds have a fine sandy to coarse silty paste. In spite of whether sherds are clayey or fine sandy, however, all are rather firm, and none are very friable or soft. In addition, some examples contain glittering specks of mica which look as if they are natural constituents of the clay. This micaceous content, a characteristic noted by Coe in his original descriptions, is present in many of the sherds, but certainly does not hold true for all. In general, however, all sherds are rather hard, differences in surface color and general firing characteristics among sherds do not appear to necessarily correlate with paste qualities, and different clays appear to account for most of the paste variations.

Temper ranges from large pieces of crushed quartz, often mixed with small numbers of fine rounded pebbles, to much more finely crushed quartz grit, and less often, medium to coarse sand or a combination of sand and crushed quartz. A minority of the fine sandy to coarse silty paste sherds contain either fine sand temper, or less often, practically no discernable temper at all.

The intentional addition of any sand as temper is in contrast to Coe's original description of the paste which stated that prepared crushed quartz was always used and that "rounded river sand was not used" (Coe 1964: 105). Had there not been such a range of variation and so many intergrading examples recovered from 44Pg302, it may have been possible to reliably separate out the fine sandy paste sherds from the smoother, clayey sherds with coarse temper particles and thus create two possibly useful subtypes. However, the range of gradations is such that the "pigeon-holing" of the numerous intermediate examples would have been a very impressionistic sorting process of dubious value. In addition, some of the hard, clayey paste sherds contain much sand, while some of the fine sandy paste sherds have large rock temper particles, again underscoring the assumption that clay sources played a major part in paste differences.

The colors tend to suggest that some pots were fired in an upright position, while most were inverted. The range of variation in surface color is from pale gray/neutral or pale brown to black, and there is often a large degree of shading on a single large sherd or on several sherds from the same vessel. The majority of the sherds are oxidized pale brown or pale reddish brown or show oxidation-reduction with light brown/tan colors smudged with pale to dark gray. On the most complete vessel sections found, the reduction is close to or on the rim area, another characteristic noted by Coe in his original descriptions. A minority of the sherds are medium to dark brown, with or without the dark cloudy areas.
On some examples, the colors are reduced on the inside and oxidized on the exterior, while the opposite is true of others. On most sherds, however, either interiors and exteriors match or the interiors are darker. Cores are variable, but generally reflect the surface color. Cores on sherds where the interior is distinct from the exterior will generally match that of the interior surface for some or all of the thickness of the core.

Surface treatment consists of malleation of most or all of the exterior surface with either an untwisted cord or a narrow leather thong wrapped around a paddle. In some cases, however, a carved grooved paddle may have been used. The stamping varies from very fine to relatively coarse. Either random overlapping or stamping in opposing obtuse angles to the rim is common, and in the few instances where large vessel sections were found, both overlapping and nonoverlapping stamping in angles both horizontal and diagonal to the rim were found on the same pot. In addition, some sherds indicate that parts of the vessels were sometimes smoothed over, but typically to such a minor extent that the stamping was not completely masked. Interiors were typically smoothed, probably either by hand or with a stone or bone tool.

The most common rim treatments are similar to those noted by Coe. The vast majority are folded or thickened, with the lips flattened and either stamped with the same paddle used to treat the surface or parallel-nicked with the paddle edges. This latter treatment often resulted in a shallowly notched appearance. One extreme example of rim folding shows a thin section folded over to such an extent that an almost collared effect like that of an added rim strip was achieved. On rare examples with unfolded rims, the rims are usually slightly inverted and then flattened to a minor extent, with the stamping typically extending continuously from the body on to the lip.

Although the majority of the rims are undecorated, some show incised lines, rows of evenly spaced "stab and drag" effects, fine punctates, a combination of these decorations, and in one case, what may be small cord-wrapped dowel impressions running on even spacing and diagonal to the rim.

Gaston Ware was dated to A. D. 1741 +/- 200 at the Gaston Site (Coe 1964: 100-101, 118); however, the 200 year error factor on that date is significant, as more recent work by Davis (1987) indicates that Gaston or similar late simple stamped pottery did not appear after ca. A. D. 1700, and in fact, was probably most popular during the latter part of the 16th century. While check stamped and plain ceramics appear to dominate after that time in eastern North Carolina, check stamping is not particularly common in eastern Virginia, and as will be discussed later, simple stamped pottery appears to have persisted as a major surface treatment in the early 17th century in the James drainage.

While a sample of Gaston sherds was recovered from plow zone at 44Pg302, the majority of the sherds were found in historic features such as post holes, post molds and refuse deposits in root cellars, pits and in the well. While most of these sherds were
no doubt incidental back fill inclusions of older materials lying about the site surface, it
is possible that at least some may have been used by the colonists upon first arriving,
and that they may have been obtained in either of two ways: 1) for the purpose of
having a cheap supply of easily disposable utilitarian vessels; or 2) they were obtained
in an incidental fashion, having been filled with foodstuffs (i.e., corn) traded or given to
them by the neighboring Indians. On the other hand, it is noteworthy that the largest
vessel sections were only found in Native American features. For example, the largest
section was found lying on the bottom of Feature 417, believed to have once contained a
burial that had since decomposed. A comparable though slightly smaller vessel section
was found in Feature 465, a definite Native American burial.

A much smaller number of hard and mainly clayey sherds which are in all other
respects like the typical Gaston examples, show more complete exterior smoothing over
some sort of surface treatment which is probably either cord-marking or simple-
stamping, most likely the latter. These are classified in tables and inventories as
"crushed quartz and sand tempered, smoothed over simple stamped surfaces"

A few sherds that are simply plain also have typical hard Gaston paste and may be
plain/smoothed equivalents. These types of sherds are rare, however, and all are
separately classified in the inventories according to sand, crushed quartz or combined
sand and crushed quartz temper. It is possible, of course, that these plain groupings
may include some examples of earlier pottery types.

**Roanoke Ware**

Roanoke Simple Stamped represents a minority ware on the site. Roanoke was defined
by Blaker (1952: 257; Harrington 1948; Evans 1955) and is now known to date from the
14th century through at least the late 16th century. In addition, it is more than likely a
part of early 17th century Native American assemblages in the James drainage.
Roanoke was found by Harrington (1948: 251) *in situ* in the bottom of the ditch of the
original Fort Raleigh, along with one quartz and coarse sand tempered simple stamped
vessel that is comparable to Gaston/Cashie Simple Stamped (Harrington 1962: 41-46).

The Roanoke vessels at 44Pg302 are *not* simply Gaston with shell temper, though there
are certainly many similarities. These include simple stamped surface treatment,
comparable interior smoothing, and parallel grooves or stamping on the top of flattened
lips on both types. Although the numbers of Roanoke rim sherds are low, there is
evidence that the thickening and folding with notching or stamping on the lips may not
be as common on Roanoke sherds from the site as it is on Gaston. One unusual sherd
exhibits a groove running lengthwise along the top of the lip. In addition, the more
severe folding of the lip is not present in the sample. Roanoke rim forms on the site vary
from straight to slightly insloping or slightly outsloping, and some exhibit a gently
constricted neck. Other differences between the Roanoke and Gaston sherds are a much
higher incidence of reduced colors on Roanoke sherds (many are almost black), as well as lack of decoration, and a lesser amount of fine stamping; most stamping is coarse, with the untwisted cords/thongs or carved paddle impressions being relatively wide and spaced fairly far apart.

Temper consists of finely crushed to more coarsely broken shell. While intact shell is still present in a few sherds, it has leached out in most. In general, this pottery is fired relatively hard. As might be expected, of course, some of the smaller sherds with abundant leached temper are soft by comparison.

Dates on Roanoke Ware from the Great Neck Site complex in Virginia Beach are: A. D. 1330 +/- 80 (Hodges n. d.a); A. D. 1510 +/- 50 (Hodges n.d.a); and A. D. 1515 +/- 70 (Painter 1981). As pointed out by Hodges (n. d.b: 194-195), the first two dates were associated with features containing 46% and 89% Roanoke sherds respectively. The remaining sherds in these features were Townsend. These proportions suggest the rise of simple stamping well prior to contact and the increase in its popularity through time. The suggestion made by Paul Gardner (1990: 49-50) that large percentages of Roanoke Ware may indicate post-contact sites could be true for sites in some of the districts of the Powhatan chiefdom, but it may be wise to exercise caution when dealing with the bay shoreline areas of southeastern Virginia where the shell-tempered tradition had been in effect for an extremely long period of time and where the earliest date on Roanoke Ware has been obtained. On the other hand, Roanoke is the majority type on at least one historically documented village (Tree Hill Farm or Powhatan, see below), even though the site location is near the Fall Line.

**Townsend Ware**

Typical Townsend Ware is another minority type on the site. As will be discussed below, however, similar fabric-impressed pottery lacking shell temper is more abundant. In fact, shell-tempered, sand tempered, and very fine sand tempered/untempered fabric-impressed ceramics together comprise 18.9% of the entire assemblage. As will be discussed in more detail below, it is not certain what time bracket within this period may be represented by the Townsend assemblage from this site.

Townsend Ware, defined by Blaker (1973) and elaborated on by others (Lopez 1971; Griffith and Artusy 1975; Griffith 1977, 1980) is hard-fired, shell-tempered and surface-impressed on exteriors with a relatively fine weave wicker fabric. On some sherds in the present sample, the fabric impressions have been smoothed over, but are still visible, though barely. Interiors are all well smoothed and some appear to have been floated.
In contrast to Roanoke sherds, the shell has leached from all Townsend examples in the present assemblage. In addition, the shell is generally very finely crushed and is present in rather small quantities, particularly when compared to the Roanoke sherds. Paste is hard and durable, with texture varying from clayey to silty or, less often, very fine sandy.

Colors vary from tan to light reddish brown with gray clouding. A large number of the sherds have a fairly red hue, and no completely gray to black reduced examples were found. Cores are well oxidized.

Rims are straight or, less often, very slightly outsloping. Lips are rounded or flattened and slightly thickened. Two rims are shallowly notched. Few decorated examples were found, and those that show any type of decoration are too fragmentary to be compared to the motifs in Griffith's (1977, 1980) typology. Decorations consist of either broad to narrow line incising or small punctates that appear to have been made with a hollow reed, leaving a ringed effect with negative space in the middle of each punctation. One incised sherd shows a band of parallel rows of lines intersecting another band running at an obtuse angle to the other. Punctates are in multiple rows. Again, however, it must be emphasized that the sherds are too fragmentary to establish full patterns.

Unfortunately, there is no evidence to either support or refute an argument for fully contemporaneous use of the Townsend Ware on the site with the Gaston and Roanoke Wares; Townsend may have been a minority ware during the most recent occupation of the site or it may represent far earlier and less intensive use of the area. In general, the Townsend sherds on the site are not reliable diagnostic artifacts of the protohistoric and early post-contact periods as the Townsend ware group covers the full range of the Late Woodland period and beyond; i.e., from ca. A.D. 900 to contact. Virginia dates are: A.D. 945 +/- 65 from a storage pit at the Pasbehay Tenement Site on the Governor's Land near Jamestown (Outlaw 1990: 85); A.D. 1260 +/- 50 and A.D. 1245 +/- 125 from the basal grave fill of an ossuary located nearby on the Governor's Land (Outlaw 1990: 85); and A.D. 1590 +/- 120 from a pit feature on the DeShazo Site on the Rappahannock River near Port Royal (MacCord 1965).

The earliest dated context at the Governor's Land contained a Rappahannock fabric-impressed (undecorated) vessel and a number of other Townsend Ware sherds, while the ossuary contained only a single sherd which may be an example of the type variety Rappahannock Incised. The late date from DeShazo was from "Feature 3", a pit containing both European artifacts and sherds that are mainly Townsend, with both fabric-impressed and smoothed over fabric-impressed surfaces (Hodges n.d.b: 15).

MacCord (1965: 104) illustrated a few sherds from this pit and from another pit which did not contain European artifacts. This latter pit may or may not be fully contemporaneous with the known late pit, Feature 3. One of the illustrated sherds has
the same reed punctate decorations as some of the 44Pg302 examples. The photo caption does not point out which specimens came from which pit, and it is not certain if this type of decoration is necessarily diagnostic of protohistoric or post-contact occupation wherever found.

"Townsend-like", very fine sand-tempered or untempered

This category accounts for 182 sherds. As is the case with the Townsend sherds, however, the time depth of this pottery has not been firmly established, even though it is suspected to be a relatively late type.

These "Townsend-like" sherds represent ceramics that are in all respects similar to the Townsend sherds from the site except that the former contain very fine sand temper or, in most cases, little or no discernable tempering agents. All sherds in this category were looked at very carefully in an attempt to be certain that no sherds with very finely crushed shell in small quantities were present. The two main criteria for sorting were that either no temper could be seen or the sherds showed some fine to very fine particles that may or may not have been intentional tempering agents.

Colors of the Townsend-like sherds are like those of the true Townsend sherds. In addition, all of the former have very hard, durable paste, with texture varying from silty to very fine sandy. Fabric-impressions are the same as on Townsend, and the interiors are well smoothed and often floated.

Rims vary from straight to slightly outsloping or slightly insloping, and one is bevelled on the interior of the rim. A few lips have been nicked or notched with paddle edges and one is folded over the exterior for a short distance - a characteristic of most of the Gaston rims. Decorations consist of incised lines (mostly broad) over the fabric impressions. Some of these incised examples may be comparable to Griffith's Townsend/Rappahannock Incised motif types "R11, R13, and R19".

While the more elaborate of Griffith's motifs are believed to pre-date A. D. 1350 in Delaware, the evidence from the present site is too fragmentary to establish either the full complexity of the motifs or their frequencies on the site. In addition, whether or not the Delaware sequence is applicable in Virginia has not been established, and the relationship of the very fine sand-tempered/untempered fabric-impressed ware and classic Townsend ware is also unclear.

Tentatively, the very fine sand-tempered/untempered ware is proposed as a local variation on Townsend. In this respect, however, it may or may not have the full time depth of true Townsend. In addition, it may be restricted to the Inner Coastal Plain. Similar ware has been found in Henrico County along the upper Chickahominy River and on Four Mile Creek, a tributary of the James near Curles Neck. At the Four Mile
Creek Site (Mouer 1986), extremely similar ware was found in association with Gaston Ware and very small triangular projectile points of white quartz. Although the site was shallow, it was largely single component and showed post molds suggesting some type of structure. These associations very strongly suggest an upper Late Woodland to contact period date for this pottery type.

Sand-tempered fabric-impressed

This category accounts for 233 sherds. The time depth of this group has not been established and it is possible that many if not most of the sherds are from purely Late Woodland vessels.

These sherds are similar to the "Townsend-like" very fine sand-tempered/untempered grouping, but deviate from them in type and quantity of temper. The paste varies from silty to sandy, but most sherds are nonetheless very hard and not at all friable. This group of sherds was distinguished from the category discussed above by inclusions that appear to represent intentional sand temper. In addition, most sherds contain medium-sized grains and are somewhat gritty to the touch. Some contain a number of coarse sand grains, and in rare instances, a few stray water worn pebbles. Some of these sherds have a sugary or glittering appearance which may be either micaceous sand additions or a result of the use of coarse micaceous clay. There are some examples that intergrade with the very fine sand-tempered/untempered category, and consequently, some of the sherd sorting may have been somewhat arbitrary. In general, however, the consistent procedure was to look for and separate out those sherds containing definite sand temper, particularly when medium sand grains were clearly visible.

Colors are the same as on Townsend and "Townsend-like" sherds, except that a larger number of the sherds of the present category have very dark reduced areas, particularly around the rims. Surface treatments are similar between the types, though interiors of the present category often display less thorough smoothing and some temper particles on the surface.

Rims are direct and slightly insloping to slightly outsloping. Many rims are folded over and thickened like those of Gaston sherds. Lip notching, incising or other decorative treatments are absent.

It is tempting to view at least the majority of these sherds as purely Late Woodland and pre-contact in age. On the other hand, they may simply represent a range in variation among more or less contemporaneous and fairly late, non-shell-tempered fabric-impressed vessels. Another alternative is that the sherd sample consists of vessel fragments representing a fairly long time range within the Late Woodland and early contact periods. Perhaps some are simply variations on late vessels, while others - particularly those with coarser temper - are older Late Woodland ceramics. Certainly,
more work needs to be done to reliably place all of the fabric-impressed ceramics in their proper chronological sequence on the site. As will be discussed later, however, there is evidence to suggest that most of the fabric impressed sherds are associated with pre-contact village occupation.

One sherd is typed as "very coarse sand-tempered fabric-impressed", as it contains larger temper particles and is somewhat weathered and friable. Possibly, this sherd is from a late Middle Woodland or early late Woodland vessel. Two other single examples of temporally ambiguous sherds are mainly quartz tempered: one with finely crushed quartz grit and perhaps a bit of sand; and another with larger crushed quartz fragments.

**Shell-tempered Plain/Smoothed**

A total of 149 shell tempered plain sherds were recovered. A minority of the plain sherds are very similar to those of Roanoke vessels except that the former have been completely smoothed on both surfaces and no original surface treatment, if any ever existed, can be seen under the smoothing. Three separately classified sherds of notably thicker, softer and more weathered plain shell-tempered pottery may be examples of the Middle Woodland type Mockley Plain. All remaining shell tempered plain sherds are believed to represent a late pottery type, possibly a plain variant of Roanoke Ware. The more Mockley-like examples have been labelled as such in the inventories and are not included in the above count.

Due to the small sample and fragmentary condition of most sherds, Evans' (1955) type "Sussex Plain" was not used. Sussex Plain is not well dated, but appears to be a Late Woodland to Contact period type.

In a review of information pertaining to the distribution and dating of protohistoric - post-contact period ceramics, Hodges (n.d. b:13-19) has pointed out that the production of plain surfaces on both sand/grit and shell-tempered wares became more popular during the protohistoric period. Examples pertaining to shell-tempered wares include the rise of plain surfaces in the Yeocomico Series (Potter 1982) on the Northern Neck of Virginia, the above-referenced DeShazo date of A.D.1590 on both Townsend and smoothed-over fabric-impressed sherds, and more recently, site 4Kw73, where a date of A.D. 1540 +/- 60 was obtained for shell-tempered plain ceramics (Jones, McCartney, and McFadden 1990: 77, as referenced in Hodges n.d.b: 15).

The sherds from 44Pg302 vary from relatively soft to very hard and durable. The softer sherds are those having abundant leach holes from coarse shell fragments, while the harder sherds generally contain less shell and more finely broken fragments. In some examples, the shell is still largely intact. Although it is possible that this assemblage represents a mixture of late Middle Woodland (Mockley), Late Woodland and
Protohistoric wares, with the more weathered sherds being the oldest and the very hard and sometimes unleached sherds being the youngest, the post-depositional factors that may have affected weathering cannot be completely accounted for, and hence, this assumption cannot be proven.

With the exception of a few very thick and extremely soft and weathered sherds typed as "possibly" Mockley, all plain/smoothed sherds with shell tempering and no signs of surface treatment under the smoothing were put into a common category. In addition, the majority of all plain shell-tempered sherds are hard, well made and similar in appearance. This factor, together with the very small amount of Mockley on the present site, and the fact that plain sherds always appear in relatively small numbers in Mockley assemblages, indicates that the present assemblage probably contains sherds that are mainly, if not exclusively, related to the most recent Native American occupation of the site.

Sherd surfaces vary from oxidized light tan to nearly black. Many are light grayish tan with darker smudging. A few sherds are nearly black on all surfaces, while others are mainly reduced on the interiors or on both cores and interiors.

The rim sherd sample is very small. Recovered rims vary from straight to insloping or slightly outsloping. All are flattened, and two are very slightly folded over the exterior. The only decorations are on fragments of one or possibly two small, thin vessels. On these examples, short crudely incised lines, ca. 2/3-3/4-inch long, run at obtuse angles to the rim. One basal sherd with a fairly large amount of preserved shell temper appears to have been broken from a rounded to almost flattened base vessel, with a maximum basal thickness of about 3/8-inch.

One unusual group of sherds appears to belong to a single vessel. All fragments were recovered from the fill of the historic lime kiln, Feature 411. The sherds are oxidized brick red and contain both intact and leached shell temper, as well as areas where particles that appear to be intentional sand/grit temper are present. On some surfaces, it appears that some simple stamping may have been smoothed over, but the re-fired conditions and lime precipitate coatings on many of the sherds prevent a good assessment of what a good portion of the vessel may have looked like.

Mockley Ware

Thirty sherds were typed as Mockley, with another 3 typed as possibly Mockley (plain/smoothed). Of the thirty sherds, 26 are net-marked or net roughened, while the remaining 5 are cord-marked. Mockley sherds represent late Middle occupation on the site. Although Mockley dates cluster mainly from ca. A.D. 200-850, two surprisingly early dates of A.D. 20 and A.D. 40 were obtained from the City of Hampton (Edwards et al 1989).
The low numbers of sherds indicate either an ephemeral camp site or a peripheral portion of a larger settlement located somewhere else in the vicinity but outside of the 44Pg302 lot. The former interpretation seems more likely.

**Pope's Creek-like, sand-tempered net marked ware.**

This group consists of 19 relatively thick and somewhat friable sherds tempered with moderate to sizable quantities of medium to coarse sand. Exterior surfaces are net-impressed, while interior surfaces are plain. The typical interior scoring found on Pope's Creek Ware is missing from this sample; however, not all Pope's Creek vessels have interior scoring.

This ware is also somewhat similar to the type Varina Net-marked, a Middle Woodland ware defined for the Inner Coastal Plain James and Chickahominy drainages in Henrico County (Mouer, Gleach and McLearen 1986; McLearen 1987). Varina is generally less friable than Pope's Creek; it has not been found with interior scoring; and all vessels are tempered mainly with relatively coarse particles, including some crushed rock. The type has been dated to the third century A.D. at two different sites on the Chickahominy and James drainages. Except for the addition of relatively coarse temper, however, the 44Pg302 sherds appear more similar to Pope's Creek, even though they have some characteristics of both wares. In addition, Stephenson's (1963) original descriptions of the Pope's Creek type indicate rather coarse sand temper as opposed to the finer sand temper found on central Virginia examples of otherwise typically interior-scored and net-marked Pope's Creek Ware.

Based on the accepted date range of Pope's Creek Ware, these sherds probably represent occupation of the site at some point(s) between ca. 500 B.C. and A.D. 200. The nature of this early Middle Woodland occupation is probably similar to that of the Mockley component.

**Prince George Ware**

Only one sherd of Prince George (Evans 1955) Ware was found. This relatively small sherd is net-marked and contains the typical rounded gravel temper that is characteristic of the ware. Prince George ware has been dated from 690 B.C. +/- 140 in James City County (net-marked variety) (Hodges, personal communications 1990) to A.D. 335 +/- 85 in Henrico County (cord-marked variety) (Gleach 1986). This writer feels that the most likely date range for Prince George Ware as a whole is from ca. 550 B.C. - A.D. 250 (McLearen 1991b: 60-61). Two eroded sherds typed simply as "gravel-tempered plain" in the artifact inventories may also be fragments of Prince George vessels.
Mixed shell and lithic tempered sherds

Two sherds were found with mixed temper. One contains shell and fine sand temper. The surface is extremely weathered, but appears to have been net marked. This sherd probably represents a Mockley sherd with some sand added to the shell temper, or alternatively, a Mockley vessel made from a poorly cleaned sandy clay. Another sherd contains leached shell, crushed quartz and sand temper. The original surface treatment has been smoothed over, but appears to have been either fabric or net marked. A late Middle Woodland age is suggested.

Discussion

It has become apparent in the last few years that shell-tempered Roanoke Simple Stamped and sand or crushed rock-tempered Gaston variants are the principal pottery types to be expected on Protohistoric and probably, early post-contact period sites of the Powhatan Chiefdom on the James drainage. As will be discussed below, however, recent investigations have demonstrated what may be significant differences in proportions of ceramics by site, and it is not yet clear whether are not all of these differences are temporal.

Given that Roanoke and Gaston Ware are contemporaneous, it is assumed that both types were used together during at least the most recent of the Native American occupations of 44Pg302. Roanoke is certainly a minority ware, however, and the implications of this are not fully understood at present.

At site 44Jc308, on the Governor's Land at Two Rivers, in former Paspahegh territory near Jamestown, Roanoke is the majority ware, and Gaston was only minimally represented (Hodges and Hodges 1991). At the Tree Hill Farm Site, which is assumed to be the village of Powhatan in what is now Henrico County, both types occur together, and there is a fair amount of Gaston ware; however, Roanoke is also the majority ware at that site, and shell tempering outnumbers all other temper categories. This is significant, since Tree Hill Farm lies near the Fall Line and away from good sources of shell. Without further investigations of a larger number of villages of the Powhatan Chiefdom, however, it is not possible to state whether or not these differing proportions relate to short term temporal preferences (suggesting that the most recent sites contain the greatest proportions of Roanoke Ware) or other factors which may vary among the different ethnic districts of the greater chiefdom. Such factors could include differences in each group's ceramic traditions, differences in the rate and type of change in ceramic preferences among each ethnic group, and the degree and type of outside interactions that occurred in each district.

It is clear that Townsend ware was one of the principal pottery types among some of those districts outside of the James drainage. As mentioned above, Townsend was the
majority ware at the De Shazo Site on the Rappahannock River (MacCord 1965) and was found associated with European artifacts. The time depth of Townsend is significant, however, and Townsend occurs on the James as early as ca. A.D. 900-950 (Outlaw 1990: 85). By contact times, some groups in the James drainage certainly may have still retained the use of Townsend or even the fabric-impressed non-shell tempered variants alongside the simple stamped pottery. While this scenario is not out of the question at the present site, it is viewed as unlikely during the terminal occupation of the village.

Late prehistoric times probably saw variable popularity of Townsend pottery among the various groups who would later comprise the core of the Powhatan chiefdom. By the late 16th century, and possibly the early part of the first quarter of the 17th century, Townsend may have been in use in some areas, while declining or no longer in use at all in others. At Tree Hill Farm/Powhatan, where shell-tempered sherds were in the majority and simple stamping was the dominant surface treatment, not one sherd of Townsend was found, and few fabric-impressed sherds of any kind were present.

MacCord's (1967) excavations of the Hopewell Airport Site at Jordan's Point strongly suggest a pure Late Woodland village occupation on the point, with Townsend and sand tempered fabric impressed ceramics as the majority types, and minimal representation of simple stamping. The excavations were located along the widening of Route 156 and adjacent west of the present excavations. Here there was some sediment deposition which had resulted in what may have been an unplowed topsoil lying beneath recent plow zone. The sand tempered fabric impressed sherds, typed as "Stony Creek" in the 1967 report, are probably comparable to the sand tempered and very fine sand tempered/untempered pottery described above for 44Pg302. In addition, the "Chickahominy" fabric impressed shell tempered sherds described in the report are obviously Townsend.

Analysis of MacCord's tables showing ceramics from non-feature contexts indicates that slightly over 33% were sand-tempered and fabric impressed, with less than 10% simple stamped. A flexed burial pit contained about equal numbers of Townsend and sand tempered fabric impressed sherds, while an overlapping refuse pit contained 44 sand tempered fabric impressed sherds, 4 crushed rock tempered fabric impressed sherds and 91 Townsend sherds. In addition, no simple stamped ceramics were reported in any of the features. These data, combined with the lower landform placement of MacCord's excavations, very strongly suggests that the location of his excavations was part of an earlier Late Woodland village occupation with fabric impressed pottery types as the major wares. The few simple stamped sherds found were either not associated with this early settlement or were at that time only minority types. Hence, a pre-16th century date is likely. Using the same reasoning when looking at the 44Pg302 assemblage, at least some if not most of the Townsend and other fabric impressed sherds may be exclusively associated with an extension of this earlier village, while
others may represent a later time when fabric impression is declining and simple stamping is the majority type.

Hopefully, radiocarbon samples can be run to firmly date the main 44Pg302 occupation and help to support the above interpretation. It is noteworthy that the ceramic assemblage from 44Pg300, situated to the southeast of the present site and assumed to be a related part of this dispersed settlement, contained similar house patterns to those at 44Pg302 and a ceramic assemblage that is overwhelmingly dominated by simple stamped lithic and sand tempered (Gaston) ceramics (VDHR finds list for 44Pg300 1991).

**LITHICS**

The lithic artifacts recovered from the site are a mixture of weapons, tools and production waste from Early Archaic times through the late village occupation of the site, and it is likely that the majority are from mixed Middle through Late Archaic episodes of use. With the exception of projectile points, which includes all 1990-1991 work, the quantifications used below are from the master inventory of the 1990 and 1991 excavations, exclusive of the controlled surface collections.

**Projectile Points**

Table * lists projectile points found on the site. These were found in feature fills and in surface collections, mainly the latter. Not included are points picked up from the piled back dirt by others and given to VCU personnel; however, no radically different temporal indicators are contained within that collection, and the information gained from them does not differ significantly from the sample presented in this table. A collection from various parts of Jordan's Point was lent to VCU by Carl Coffin, a local avocational archaeologist. Types in the Coffin collection indicate all time periods from Early Archaic through Late Woodland and/or Contact, with a heavy representation of Savannah River and variants, and numerous Middle Archaic points as well. MacCord’s (1967) assemblage from the adjacent excavations of the Hopewell Airport Site, discussed above, showed mainly Middle and Late Archaic forms, with Savannah River dominating and the Middle Archaic Guilford type as the second most abundant point type.

***

**Table *: Projectile Points**

Clarksville small triangular: 2 quartz
Yadkin triangular: 1 quartzite
Serrated triangular: 1 quartz
Other triangular: 2 quartz, 1 quartzite
Rossville: 1 quartz
Piscataway: 5 quartz
Calvert: 1 quartz
Savannah River: 1 quartzite
Savannah River variant: 4 quartzite, 1 rhyolite
Narrow blade Savannah River variants: 3 quartzite
Small Savannah River: 1 quartz
Small stemmed (probably Late Archaic/Early Woodland): 2 quartzite
Lackawaxen: 1 argillite
Guilford: 6 quartzite, 1 Carolina slate
Morrow Mountain II: 5 quartzite, 1 quartz
Morrow Mountain I: 1 chert
Stanly: 1 quartzite
Kirk Stemmed: 1 quartzite
Serrated midsection and shoulder, probably Kirk Stemmed: 1
Palmer: 1 quartzite

***

Types from 1990-91 excavations of 44Pg302 range from the Early Archaic (Palmer Corner-notched, ca. 7,800-7,000 B.C.) to the Protohistoric/Contact periods (Clarksville and small serrated triangular). The most common types date to the Late Archaic period. These include Savannah River and variants, Lackawaxen, and probably the small undifferentiated stemmed examples. The latter examples have weakly contracting stems and thick cross-sections (Plate *). Otherwise they are similar to the small late variant of the Savannah River type. Four basic variants of Savannah River are present: the small late variant; large, wide-bladed examples with short contracting stems and rounded to pointed bases; wide-bladed examples with long contracting stems and concave bases (the modal type); and narrow bladed variations on the latter subtype. The contracting stem/rounded base subtype is the most common one on the site. This form has been referred to by McCary (1976) as "Savannah River Variant". While such variants are common along the eastern seaboard and inland, in Virginia they are often misclassified by avocationals and some professionals as large variants of the Morrow Mountain point. Plates * and * illustrate the range of variation. Note what would have been a very large variant in Plate *. This specimen was probably a knife rather than a spear point.

The second most common temporal category is Middle Archaic, with the earliest being Kirk Stemmed, a transitional Early - Middle Archaic form. Other Middle Archiac points are Stanly, Morrow Mountain (mainly Morrow Mountain II) and Guilford. These last two types occur in about equal numbers and represent occupation of the site ca. 5,000-4,000 B.C., with the Morrow Mountain I type being the earliest and the Guilford type the latest (Coe 1964). A single Stanly point represents early Middle Archaic use of the
site about 5,800-5,500 B.C., based on dates in Virginia (Rodgers 1968) and Tennessee (Chapman 1985).

A quartz Calvert point may represent Early Woodland use of the site, based on temporal associations derived from data on the Northern Neck (Potter 1982; Waselkov 1982). The several Piscataway and Rossville points are made on quartz only and represent Early Woodland and/or early Middle Woodland use of the site. Piscataway points are common on sites of the Elk Island tradition of the James Piedmont (Mouer 1990) and are found in Early Woodland contexts in the Shenandoah Valley as well (McLearen 1991a). Rossville is associated with net marked lithic tempered pottery in Pennsylvania and has been dated to the 6th century B.C. (Kinsey 1972).

These Piscataway and Rossville point types intergrade and should be thought of as a continuum. As Stephenson (1963) uses "Rossville", these points are only slightly larger (and more often wider) variants of Piscataway, and hence, typing of the two points can be somewhat arbitrary when specimens do not fall into one extreme end of the range of variation. Piscataway points on the site are generally in the wider and, in general, larger end of the size range. Because these specimens intergrade with Rossville, and since no definite Early Woodland pottery was found, all or most of the Piscataway specimens may be associated with the early Middle Woodland Pope's Creek-like pottery on the site.

With the exception of a single Yadkin point which may be either late Middle Woodland or early Late Woodland, the triangular points on the site probably represent recent Late Woodland and protohistoric/early post-contact period use of the excavated area. The Clarksville and other triangular types are undoubtedly associated with the major village component of the site. Those points not typed as Clarksville include two quartz specimens found together in the bottom of Feature 155, a suspected Native American child burial that had completely decomposed and weathered, leaving no bones or definite body staining. One of these points is serrated, while the other is not. Both points are made on white quartz. Because one point is serrated, and both are slightly larger than most Clarksville points, they were separately classified in the inventories. A fragment of a smaller serrated point (not included in the inventory) has recently been found in the upper chest area of a Colonial burial within the main cemetery area just west of the palisaded Jordan compound. These latter two instances are the only proveniences where such points were found in contexts that may be primary.

Other Tools

Bifaces

Twenty-seven bifaces were recovered from the 1990-91 excavations. However, the count is probably not representative of the biface density, since abundant fragments of
bifaces (mainly quartzite) can be seen any time one looks over any of the plow zone spoil piles.

Of the recovered and quantified bifaces, 19 are quartzite, 5 are quartz, 1 is rhyolite, 1 is jasper and the other is of an unidentified material. All bifaces appear to represent tools/points in various stages of manufacture from chipped cobbles to nearly finished tools, with most in intermediate to very late stages of manufacture. The nature of the bifaces indicates that the vast majority belong to Archaic components. Many of the quartzite bifaces are rather large and may be preforms for Savannah River points. Others are long and thick and probably are either Guilford or Morrow Mountain II preforms. The jasper example appears to be a basal section for a large possible lanceolate point. This example is interesting in that it is in a late stage of manufacture and is very heavily patinated. The cross section is relatively flat and the base is thinned. Although this piece may be a late stage preform for a fluted point, it is too fragmentary for a firm identification.

**Bifacial Knife**

One thin, flat, leaf-shaped biface was found in two pieces, after it had been pressed into the ground by the grade-all during plow zone removal. This specimen is made of patinated light green Carolina Slate Belt material and is similar in some respects to the larger of the Morrow Mountain I points illustrated by Coe (1964: 38, bottom row of his Plate 33) for the Doershuk Site. However, the presumed basal tip of the specimen in question is gone. In this writer's opinion, the larger and more crudely percussion-flaked Morrow Mountain I points described and illustrated by Coe are probably knives, and the same is most likely true of the 44Pg302 specimen.

**Grooved axe**

Plate * illustrates the single prehistoric grooved axe found on the site. This specimen is made from greenstone and has been manufactured through pecking and grinding. The hafting groove covers one face and both edges but does not continue onto the other face. The bitt end appears somewhat smoothed from use as an axe or adze, while the poll end shows possible use as a hammer. Although these axes are characteristic of the Late Archaic and Early Woodland periods (McLearen 1991c), they appear to persist, at least as minor tool forms, into later periods as well.

**Drill**

A distal fragment of a bifacial drill was found; the base was missing. This artifact probably belongs to an Archaic component.

**Scrapers**
Two quartzite scrapers were found. Both are on large quartzite flakes, with edges bevelled and worn. They are not characteristic of the formalized end and side scrapers of the Paleo-Indian and Early Archaic periods.

**Cobble Tools**

These items are water worn cobbles used as either grinding stones or hammerstones. The majority (30) are hammerstones. Of these, 29 are on quartzite cobbles and one is on conglomerate. Only two grinding stones were found; one is on sandstone and the other is quartzite. The majority of these tools are probably associated with Archaic components of the site.

In addition to these items are two quartzite cobbles from which a few flakes had been removed. These were probably cobbles "tested" for flaking quality.

**Debitage**

The debitage category, as used here, refers to flakes, cores, and chunks. Each category is discussed below.

**Flakes**

Flakes were not analyzed by size or presence/absence of cortex. The sample of flakes looked at for quantification and comparison of lithic types is the sample from all 1990-91 excavations, except that of the initial controlled surface collection.

Local high grade quartzite which could have been obtained from stream bed or terrace deposit sources is the overwhelmingly dominant lithic material (2,280 flakes) accounting for 88.9% of the total assemblage. Although quartz is the next most abundant material, the numbers are surprisingly low (7.1% or 182 flakes). The third most abundant lithic type is referred to as "Carolina Slate Belt material" (48 flakes or 1.9%). This material is surely not local, and is probably derived from southside Virginia near the Carolina border, or less likely, from closer Virginia Piedmont sources. It is extremely unlikely that this material would have been found in cobbles in the James or its tributaries. The fourth most abundant material is chert, accounting for 1.4% of the assemblage (35 flakes). Materials which each make up less than 1% of the total assemblage are: jasper (13 flakes), rhyolite (6 flakes), greenstone (1 flake) and petrified bone (1 flake). While jasper and chert could have been found in some local stream cobbles, the rhyolite and greenstone are not local. Greenstone, a form of metamorphosed basalt, is generally derived from the Catoctin formation of the Blue Ridge, though there are closer sources in the Piedmont. The rhyolite is similar to that of
the Blue Ridge of Maryland and Pennsylvania, but could conceivably be from the same source area as that of the Carolina Slate Belt material.

Cores

The only cores found were twelve quartzite examples and one of quartz. Obviously, initial quarrying and primary reduction took place elsewhere.

Chunks

A number of angular chunks were also found. These include 51 of quartz, 22 of quartzite, and one each of greenstone, jasper, chert and petrified wood. The larger number of quartz chunks may be due to low grades of this material which tend to shatter apart in amorphous fragments as opposed to the tougher and more consistently high grade quartzite used on the site.

Summary

In general, the dominance of quartzite debitage and quartzite bifaces is consistent with the dominant pre-village components of the site - the Middle and Late Archaic components. Unfortunately, however, it is impossible to separate out these components in the absence of feature contexts.

b. The 17th-Century Component

CERAMICS

A minimum vessel count was conducted on the ceramic materials recovered from 44Pg302 "Jordan's Journey" and is presented below. Ceramics were sorted with respect to ware, form, and function. Rim, body and base sherds were examined for mends, crossmends, and similarity. Individual vessels were distinguished by differences in type, decoration, glaze, paste, and form. Due to the sparseness and individual nature of ceramics on early 17th century sites, in many instances one body sherd was representative of one whole vessel. Sherds that could not be attributed to any one vessel and may have gone to more than one, are listed as examples of the counted vessels.

A minimum total of 101 individual ceramic vessels were identified in the collection from 44Pg302 (see Table *, Summary of Vessels). Five of these vessels are clearly not contemporaneous with the circa 1620-1635 occupation of Jordan's Journey. Two of these later vessels are probably from the eighteenth century, while the remaining 3 are from the nineteenth century. All 5 almost certainly originated from site 44Pg303 located approximately 40 yards to the north. Two of these vessels were found in later intrusions into seventeenth-century features. In the first instance a circa 1865 ink bottle fragment was found in an erosion channel cut into daub pit F-409. In the second case a
post-1810 transfer printed saucer fragment came from a fence post cut into a corner post of Structure 4. The latter fragment allows a terminus post quem of 1810 to be placed on the intrusive fenceline cutting across the seventeenth-century Jordan’s Journey complex.

Excluding these 5 later pieces, a minimum total of 96 early seventeenth-century vessels were recovered from the pits and holes of Jordan’s Journey. This number is comparable to the 106 vessels found at The Maine, a roughly contemporaneous site (Outlaw 1990: Appendix I). A breakdown by function (see Table *, Ceramic Vessels Classified By Function) shows food preparation and storage to have been the single largest use. Almost 23% of the vessels were used in food consumption and over 11% can be related to medicine. Due to a number of factors, over a quarter of the vessels could not be assigned to a functional category.

In general, these 96 pieces from Jordan’s Journey form a typical collection for a pre-1640 Tidewater Virginia site. As expected, we found lead glazed redwares, Westerwald jugs, Bartmann bottles, Midlands purple, Iberian storage jars, Iberian costrels, and various tin enamel forms. As is typical on a Tidewater site pre-dating the Navigation Acts, the ceramics come from England, the Netherlands, Germany, Italy, Spain, France, China, and Virginia.

Despite the overall predictability of the assemblage, it also contains a number of the more rare types, including porcelain, Tudor green, North Italian marbled polychrome, Merida red type, Werra sgraffito slipware, and West of England ware. Additionally, there were several surprises. Three of the German stoneware forms were totally unknown to the authors. A dry-bodied grey stoneware was found which Ivor Noël Hume identified as a product of Normandy (personal communication). A buff-bodied pedestal base vessel with a manganese purple interior lead glaze is still unidentified. Most puzzling of all is a slightly carinated shallow earthenware pot with lug handles and burnishing on the interior and exterior. This slab-built or coiled vessel does not resemble any European or Native American form known to the authors and seems most likely a product of an African or Afro-Caribbean tradition.

Including this unknown burnished vessel, earthenwares account for 65, or 67.7% of the total assemblage. Of these earthenwares, 19, or 19.79% of the total assemblage are tin enamelled earthenwares (delft or majolica), over half of which are drug jars and ointment pots. The bulk of the earthenwares are red-bodied wares associated with food preparation and storage. Two very notable exceptions are the North Italian marbled polychrome bowl and the slip-decorated Werra ware charger. The North Italian bowl presumably was used on the table. The function of the Werra charger is less clear. It shows no knife marks and probably was simply a display piece.

Twenty one of the vessels, or 21.87%, were stoneware. Two of these were crucible fragments which were probably brought to Virginia as tools in the quest for gold and
silver. A third vessel, mentioned above, is a dry-bodied grey jar, identified as a product of Normandy. These stonewares have been found at Fort Pentagoet in Maine by Faulkner (1987:211) as well as by Outlaw (1990:51) at The Maine in James City County. Beyond a brief mention in both publications, very little information has been found on this group of ceramics.

Almost nineteen percent of all the ceramics found were Rhenish stonewares. Four of these pieces were Westerwald jugs, which will be discussed below. One vessel, represented by a single sherd, has a rich brown interior and an exterior covered with a glossy lead glaze. This jug was probably a high quality drinking pot with a wide mouth and rounded belly: a type common in the late 16th century. A second piece, also possibly late 16th century, is a plain gray stoneware jug with traces of a reeded or finely rilled neck. Two of the Rhenish vessels are typical grey stoneware with salt glaze over iron oxide. The form, however, is that of a wide mouthed jar. One of the two may be a massive 16th century three handled jug (Von Bock, 1986:267), however the second is clearly a jar. While it's predictable that Rhenish stoneware potters made jars, the authors have knowledge of only one other example, a vessel of questionable context surface collected from the plowzone at Flowerdew Hundred site 44Pg79.

The most common Rhenish stoneware found in early Tidewater is the bartmann or bellarmine jug. Eight individual bartmann bottles were recovered, although only one identifiable medallion fragment was found, that of Julich-Kleve-Berg. Two near complete masks are also in the collection, a "goggle mouth" and a "grinning ladder mouth". A ninth "bartmann-type" bottle was found of the very small form which does not have sprig molded decoration. The exact function of this small size is not known; Ruempol and van Dongen (1990:170) suggest a container for oil and vinegar, with a volume of about 10 ounces they may have also been used as costrels.

The collection contains a large amount of porcelain, 10 vessels or 10.41% of the total. While nothing beyond their presence can be stated conclusively, these 10 pieces contain some of the most tantalizing hints available about status and social display at the Jordan/Farrar settlement.

One of these pieces is a storage jar which is represented by a single sherd from the shoulder to the rim. Storage jars are rarely found during this time period in Virginia, with flatwares, cups, and bowls being the most common forms. The function of this piece at Jordan's Journey is of course, unknown. It's cost and material clearly separates it from the earthenware and stoneware jars. Almost certainly the vessel was purchased for storage of special contents. A conjecture would be that this porcelain storage jar, as a rare and unusual piece with connotations of high status, held the personal tobacco supply of the head of the plantation.
The remaining nine porcelain vessels broken during the occupation are all drinking vessels. Five of these are small wine cups holding approximately one or two ounces and decorated with a simple underglaze band described as a "flame frieze", as described by van der Pijl-Ketel. Van der Pijl-Ketel calls the body a "very fine semi-eggshell" and states "The discovery of such fine ware having been made for export before 1612 was rather surprising."

The four other porcelain vessels are slightly larger and classified as bowls, probably originally designed for tea, although tea drinking is not documented as a commonplace at this early period. The volumes of these bowls would vary from an estimated 4 ounces to approximately 7 ounces. Two of these bowls are coarsely potted and decorated with flowering vines. The third bowl is also rather crudely potted and decorated with a flower in the center. The fourth bowl is extremely fine porcelain and was probably the most highly decorated of the porcelain vessels.

Taken as a whole, the porcelain drinking vessels naturally divide into two groups. First are the tea bowls, which are of varying shapes, sizes, and quality, but which in Virginia probably functioned quite well as high status wine cups. The second division is the tiny wine cups, which were probably bought together and existed as a set of at least five. Van der Pijl-Ketel suggests these are the frequently mentioned "pimpelkens", small cups for "brandewijn" (brandy or other spirits). The fact that so many were recovered at Jordan's Journey may indicate they were an earlier purchase than the porcelain drinking bowls. The function of the tiny wine cups, probably similar to a modern shot glass, may have also contributed to the high breakage.

To visualize these porcelain vessels as they were used, a second group of ceramics must also be considered. These are the 4 sprig molded blue-and-grey stoneware jugs from the German Westerwald. Although less delicate and much more common, Westerwald products were arguably some of the finest ceramics being produced in Western Europe at the time. These heavy European stonewares provide a functional compliment to the Jordan's porcelain, carrying the liquids from cask to cup.

Two of the Westerwald pieces were medium-sized jugs or pitchers, holding approximately half a gallon, with a sprig-molded frieze on a flattened panel around the girth. One of these friezes contains portrait medallions of the Elector's of the Palatinate (Ivor Noël Hume, personal communication). The second frieze contains the Elector's coats of arms. The Boymans-van Beuningen Museum in Rotterdam contains parallels for both of these jugs, both attributed to Raeren, the portrait version dated "1598" and the arms dated "1596". A Westerwald base with extremely heavy wear patterns was recovered which very likely belongs to the portrait jug.

A third medium-sized Westerwald pitcher or jug was excavated. Unfortunately although numerous pieces were recovered a complete vessel profile cannot be
established. The form appears to be a gently expanding neck leading to a rounded belly, a form more similar to nineteenth century pitchers than 17th century Westerwald. The decoration of the piece is equally unusual. Typical jugs of the period are divided by a mid-girth band and are heavily sprig molded above and below, with some stamped decoration. This jug has no midgirth band and very little sprig molding; its primary decoration consists of stamped designs that are typically secondary. In many ways this vessel is ahead of its time, a nineteenth-century form as well as simplified decoration and deep blue cobalt more characteristic of the late 17th century.

The pair of Westerwald frieze jugs, while slightly out of date, functioned not only to carry wine from the cask to the table, but also as a reminder of the Old World and of Old World quality. The sizes chosen were not the largest nor the smallest, but a medium size, suitable for a family entertaining a visiting planter in the wilds of Virginia. At the same time, perhaps, this pair of familiar (and possibly heirloom) pitchers was counterbalanced by the third medium sized jug which was a total departure from tradition, a new style for a New World.

The fourth Westerwald vessel is an extremely well-executed small jug which would have held approximately 20 ounces. Hurst calls this type "biconic" and the form is roughly that of two rounded cones joined at the midgirth band. In general, the lower halves are fluted while the upper sections are divided into panels with sprig molding and stamped decoration. While this vessel may have served as a small pitcher, it seems more likely to have been an individual high-status drinking pot. The "Pocahontas Jug" at Jamestown Settlement, said to have been a gift from King James I to Pocahontas, is similar in both size and decoration, although lacking cobalt.

Given the uncertainties of archaeology, it is both dangerous and difficult to draw conclusions from these 14 pieces of pottery. These vessels were discarded at the site in the early 17th century, and that is the only solid fact. We do not know the total number of vessels actually at the site, who purchased them, when they were purchased, or where they were purchased. The list of unknowns is endless.

One central theme, however, probably lies behind all fourteen vessels. Considered as a whole sitting on a cupboard, the porcelain storage jar, nine cups, and four Westerwald jugs form a social display visibly proving the worth and wealth of the plantation. Consciously or subconsciously, the vessels were chosen to reflect the taste of the owner or owners, who probably wished it known they understood and appreciated quality but also possessed a sense of restraint.

Pairing the Westerwald and the porcelain, it is possible to dream up an image of Cicely Jordan's table, late one evening in 1623. Perhaps a successful planter from upriver has stopped for the night. In the middle of the table is the porcelain storage jar, its lid off, fingers pinching out pipebowls of tobacco. Two or three of the tiny porcelain cups sit
on the table, a bartman bottle of brandy passing over them. Beside the tobacco jar stands a Westerwald pitcher, half full of wine. Around the table people play cards and sip wine from the porcelain cups. Samuel Jordan, feeling ill and in the final months of his life, avoids the wine and brandy and slowly drinks beer from his stone pot. In the golden candlelight the white porcelain gleams, people laugh, cards slap on the table, pipes are lit and the bottle comes around again. At a quick glance in the flickering light it looks like home, like a successful yeoman's table in England. The company is good, tobacco and alcohol are abundant, and there's no reason to think about the nearly endless dangers and uncertainties beyond the tiny English island surrounded by tobacco and corn.

***

Table *: Ceramic Vessels Classified By Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessels</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Food consumption</td>
<td>22.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Food preparation and storage</td>
<td>39.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Medicinal</td>
<td>11.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>26.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>=99.93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Minimum vessels 1, 2, 96, 97, and 99 are not contemporaneous with site and are excluded from functional breakdown.)

Table *: Summary of Vessels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessels</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Porcelain bowls</td>
<td>Late Ming c. 1613-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Porcelain wine cups</td>
<td>Late Ming c. 1613-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Porcelain storage jar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Normandy stoneware jar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Midlands purple jar</td>
<td>c. 1620-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tudor Green bowl</td>
<td>Early 17th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tudor Green hollowform</td>
<td>Early 17th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Earthenware Pedestal base, salt or lamp</td>
<td>c. 1600-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 North Italian Marbled Polychrome bowl</td>
<td>c. 1600-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Slip decorated redwares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Westerwald chamberpot</td>
<td>17th-18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Westerwald biconic jug</td>
<td>c. 1600-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Westerwald Frieze jugs</td>
<td>c. 1596-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Westerwald jug</td>
<td>c. 1600-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Bartmann jugs</td>
<td>17th century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 German jugs
2 German storage jars
1 German hollowform, possible drinking pot
3 Iberian olive jars
2 Iberian costrels c. 1600-50
1 Tin enamel hollowform, possibly mug
1 Tin enamel hollowform, possibly Majolica
2 Tin enamel hollowforms
10 Tin enamel ointment pots c. 1612-70
2 Tin enamel hollowforms, bottle or jar
1 Tin enamel bowl or plate
1 Tin enamel saucer
1 Tin enamel drug jar
1 Redware candlestick
5 West of England jars c. 1609-30
1 Jamestown thumbed rim storage jar c. 1625-50
2 Redware pipkins
12 Redware hollowforms
3 Redware storage jars, possibly Virginia
1 Redware hollowform, Virginia
1 Redware small pot
1 Redware pan
1 Redware bowl or pan
1 Redware hollowform, probably Merida type
1 Earthenware hollowform with handle
1 African or Afro-Caribbean earthenware pot
1 Werra ware charger c. 1600-25
2 Stoneware crucibles
1 White salt glaze hollowform c. 1720-1780
1 Creamware platform c. 1760-1820
1 Salt glazed stoneware ink bottle c. 1865
1 Salt glazed stoneware crock 19th century
1 Whiteware saucer post-1810

Minimum Vessel List
Vessels have been identified by comparisons with other extant Virginia collections, and with published examples from archaeological and museum collections. In the vessel list that follows, the vessel is identified by number, type and form. The provenience (e.g., feature number) and excavation unit catalogue number ("EU") is given for each sherd contributing to the vessel. Following this is a description and references to comparable items in other collections, where appropriate.
Vessel No. 1
White saltglaze hollowform
c. 1720-80
This vessel was found in: General Surface Collection, EU 1.

Vessel No. 2
Creamware flatform
c. 1760-1820
This vessel was found in: General Surface Collection, EU 1, EU 1190.

Vessel No. 3
Porcelain bowl
Late Ming
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1017, EU 1103.
Blue underglaze floral decoration. While this vessel is clearly a unique vessel, no clear parallel has been located. The high bowl inventory number 9801 illustrated by van der Pijl-Ketel is probably a close match. This bowl probably served as a high status cup.

Vessel No. 4
Porcelain bowl
Late Ming
This vessel was found in: General Surface Collection, EU 1.
Blue underglaze floral decoration on interior. The vessel is relatively poorly potted. This bowl probably served as a high status cup.

Vessel No. 5
Porcelain wine cup
Late Ming, c. 1613-44
This vessel was found in: F-320, EU 889.
Blue underglaze frieze of flames. Dimensions are approximately 0.125' high by 0.155' diameter. These vessels are described by van der Pijl-Ketel as “very fine semi-eggshell”. This small cup probably served as a high status vessel.
Similar sherds (no decoration) are from: General Surface Collection EU 1; F-110, EU 766; F-419, EU 1028; F-320, EU 1109; F-110, EU 1122; F-499, EU 2058.
Comparative: Cups of this type were recovered from the 1613 wreck of the VOC merchantman Witte Leeuw. They were also recovered from The Maine at Governor's Land and are illustrated in the 1617 painting Bouquet of Flowers in Glass by Christoffel van den Berghe. Matches Vessel No. 6, Vessel No. 7, Vessel No. 8, and Vessel No. 9.

Vessel No. 6
Porcelain wine cup
Late Ming, c. 1613-44
This vessel was found in: F-110, EU 766.
Matches Vessel No. 5, Vessel No. 7, Vessel No. 8, and Vessel No. 9.

Vessel No. 7
Porcelain wine cup
Late Ming, c. 1613-44
This vessel was found in: F-431, EU 2066, EU 2096; F-499, EU 2078.
Matches Vessel No. 5, Vessel No. 6, Vessel No. 8, and Vessel No. 9.

Vessel No. 8
Porcelain wine cup
Late Ming, c. 1613-44
This vessel was found in: F-431, EU 2069.
Matches Vessel No. 5, Vessel No. 6, Vessel No. 7, and Vessel No. 9.

Vessel No. 9
Porcelain wine cup
Late Ming, c. 1613-44
This vessel was found in: General Surface Collection, EU 1.
Matches Vessel No. 5, Vessel No. 6, Vessel No. 7, and Vessel No. 8.

Vessel No. 10
Porcelain bowl
Late Ming, c. 1613-44
This vessel was found in: General Surface Collection, EU 1(3); F-431, EU 2066, EU 2069 (2), EU 2076, EU 2096.
Blue underglaze flowering vines. Dimensions are approximately 0.165' high by 0.362' diameter. This vessel is described by van der Pijl-Ketel as “Chinese in shape and therefore not especially made for the export to Europe”. This bowl probably functioned as a high status cup.
Comparative: Bowls of this type were found on the 1613 wreck of the VOC merchantman Witte Leeuw, as well as at 44 PG 65, the Flowerdew Hundred fort of c. 1618-35.
See: van der Pijl-Ketel, pages 156-157, inv. no. NG 1977-147W.

Vessel No. 11
Porcelain wine cup
Late Ming
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2117.
Blue underglaze floral decoration. Estimated diameter 0.175' and height of 0.13'. Although it was poorly made and probably not intended for export, in Virginia this cup probably functioned as a high status vessel.
Comparative: Bowls of similar decoration and form were found on the 1613 wreck of the VOC merchantman Witte Leeuw. The Witte Leeuw examples have a finer body and are slightly smaller.
See: van der Pijl-Ketel, pages 161-163, inv. no. NG 1977-137W.

Vessel No. 12
Porcelain storage jar
South China
This vessel was found in: F-431, EU 2076.
Light grey porcelain, thick glossy glaze, interior and exterior, wheel marks on the shoulder. The artifact identification was supplied by Ivor Noël Hume, personal communication.

Vessel No. 13
Tudor Green bowl
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1017, and EU 1105 (2).
Buff body, green lead glazed interior with some glaze running down exterior. Sometimes called "Surrey Whiteware" but Ivor Noël Hume (personal communication) states the ware also has non-Surrey origins and "Tudor Green" is more precise.
Similar sherds are from: F-320, EU 889 (3); F-409, EU 1017, EU 1105 (4), EU 1103; F-320, EU 1106, EU 1109 (8), EU 2026 (5), EU 2040 (3).

Vessel No. 14
Tudor Green hollowform base
This vessel was found in: F-435, EU 2047 (2).
Buff body, glaze missing, rilling visible on interior.
Similar sherds are from: General Provenience, EU 1; F-435, EU 1116, EU 2047 (3), EU 2064, EU 2071 (4), EU 2095 (2), EU 2102 (6), EU 2104, F-431 EU 2066 (2).
There are four unattributable Tudor Green sherds that may belong to either Vessel No. 13 or Vessel No. 14. These sherds are as follows: F-320, EU 1109; F-435, EU 1165(2), EU 2039.

Vessel No. 15
Unidentified earthenware pedestal base salt or oil lamp
This vessel was found in: F-404 EU 1033.
Buff bodied earthenware with reddish amber brown interior lead glaze. Some traces of glaze on exterior. Noël Hume (personal communication) suggests the vessel may be a salt and has some similarity to French products. The vessel might also be an oil lamp, a function suggested by a similar sherd with a spout.
Similar sherds are from: F-435, EU 1165; F-431, EU 2076 (2) (rim sherd with spout).

Vessel No. 16
North Italian Marbled Polychrome bowl
c. 1600-50
This vessel was found in: F-403, EU 1001.
Fine orange red body covered with white slip and marbling of green, brown, orange red, and white. Unlike the bichrome examples found later in the century, this polychrome with green seems to be most common in Virginia in the 1610-30 range. Comparative: Fragments of similar vessels were found at 44 PG 64, the Flowerdew Hundred stone foundation house site of c. 1625-40.
See: Hurst, pages 33-37, and Colour Plate III.

Vessel No. 17
Slip decorated redware
This vessel was found in: General Surface Collection, EU 1.
Red orange body with coarse sand. Interior lead glaze with a swirling white trailed slip over dark brown iron oxide.

Vessel No. 18
Slip decorated redware hollowform
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1017.
Orange red sandy body with an exterior lead glaze and traces of a white slip.

Vessel No. 19
Slip decorated redware platform
This vessel was found in: General Provenience, EU 1190.
Dull orange sandy body with an exterior lead glaze and traces of white slip.

There is a redware handle fragment with a drop of white slip similar to Vessel No. 18 and Vessel No. 19. This sherd was found in F-430, EU 2117.

Vessel No. 20
Westerwald chamberpot
c. 1610-40
This vessel was found in: General Surface Collection, EU 1; F-320, EU 889, EU 2026 (2); F-430; EU 2117 (2).
This is an extremely unusual vessel incorporating many traditional secondary decorative techniques into the main design. These elements include beaded cordons, stamped flowers, stamped "sheaf", stamped rosettes, cobalt filled lines, and
basketweave or “cut glass” panels. Both the form and decorative treatment are unusual and no comparative examples are known. This vessel probably served as a high status pitcher.

Similar sherds are from: General Surface Collection, EU 1 (5); F-320, EU 889; F-435, EU 1165; F-431, EU 2076 (9), EU 2069 (2), EU 2088 (4), EU 2096(15); and F-404, EU 1002.

Vessel No.  22  
Westerwald biconic jug  
c. 1610-40  
This vessel was found in: F-110, EU 766.  
Decorated with cobalt filled cordons and grooves at base of neck and at midgirth, the shoulder has a basketweave or “cut glass” panel separated by a groove from a cobalt covered panel with stamped flowers. This vessel stood approximately 0.55’ tall and probably served as a high status individual drinking pot.  
See: Hurst, pages 221-225. Also, von Bock, inv. no 486.

Vessel No.  23  
Westerwald frieze jug  
c. 1598  
This vessel was found in: F-435, EU 2039 (3), EU 2071, EU 2095 (7).  
Midgirth frieze of portrait medallions separated by goat headed caryatid columns, raised herringbone cordons and stamped hearts, fluting on shoulder. This vessel probably served as a high status pitcher.  
Similar sherd from: F-430 EU 2117, base  
Comparative: Similar sherds are from 44 PG 307 at Jordan's Point.  
See: de Bodt, page 47, numbers 49-50.

Vessel No.  24  
Westerwald frieze jug  
c. 1596  
This vessel was found in: F-110, EU 1102.  
Midgirth frieze of armorial shields separated by goat headed caryatid columns, raised herringbone cordon.  
Similar sherds are from: General Provenience, EU 1 (3); F-409, EU 1053; F-435, EU 1165; F-431, EU 2069, EU 2096 (5).  
See: de Bodt, page 43 and 44, numbers 41-42.

Vessel No.  21-24 type  
Four additional Westerwald sherds were recovered, one small sherd with a raised cordon from F-435, EU 2095; and a jug rim with raised cordons from F-430, EU 2117 (2); F-431, EU 2066, EU 2076.

Vessel No.  25
Bartmann jug
17th century
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2117.
Light brown mottled glaze.

Vessel No. 26
Bartmann jug
17th century
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2117 (2).
Light brown mottled glaze.

Vessel No. 27
Bartmann jug
17th century
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2117 (3).
Light brown mottled glaze.

Vessel No. 28
Bartmann jug
17th century
This vessel was found in: F-431, EU 2096.
Light brown mottled glaze.

Vessel No. 29
Bartmann jug
17th century
This vessel was found in: F-431, EU 2069.
Light brown mottled glaze.

Vessel No. 30
Bartmann jug
17th century
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2129.
Light brown mottled glaze.

Vessel No. 31
Bartmann jug
17th century
This vessel was found in: F-110, EU 1124.
Light brown mottled glaze.

Vessel No. 32
Bartmann jug
17th century
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2129.
Dark brown mottled glaze.

Vessel No. 33
German jug
17th century
This vessel was found in: F-430 EU 2100, EU 2117 (2), EU 2129.
This vessel is the small version of the Bartmann form, approximately .4' tall, with a
typical light brown mottled glaze. Unlike the larger jugs, this form has no molding.

Vessel No. 34
German storage jar
This vessel was found in: F-431 EU 2066; F-430 EU 2117.
Raised cordon at mouth, light brown mottled glaze. A extremely unusual form for a
Virginia site. Comparative examples or even illustrations of this storage jar form are
not known. It is possible this vessel is a very large 16th century three handled jug.
See: Von Bock, page 267, numbers 353 ns 354 for possible form.

Vessel No. 35
German storage jar
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2117, EU 2129.
Light brown mottled glaze. Large Rhenish stoneware storage jars are an extremely
unusual form for a Virginia site. Only one comparative example, from poor context
(surface collection at 44Pg79), is known to the authors.

Vessel No. 36
German jug
This vessel was found in: F-431, EU 2096.
A Rhenish salt glazed stoneware with no iron oxide decoration. Identification from the
small fragment is difficult but this vessel appears to be a large round bodied jug with a
fine rilled neck
See: Von Bock, page 279, number 372, for possible form.

Vessel No. 37
German stoneware, possible drinking pot
F-431 EU 2066
Lead glazed, rich ferrous oxide interior and exterior. This unknown vessel of extremely
high quality was probably an individual drinking pot.

Also recovered are an additional 178 Bartmann and other German stoneware sherds,
including one splashed with cobalt, 11 medallion fragments, two of which are identified
as Julich-Kleve-Berg (see Hahnel, #1368), 2 handle sherds and 3 base fragments. Sherds
are from: General Surface Collection, EU 1 (21), EU 1113; F-110, EU 1152; F-320, EU’s 889 (2), 1028 (2), 1043 (2) 1106,1109 (3), 1192 (2), and 2026; F-404, EU’s 1002 (3) and 1033 (3); F-409, EU’s 1017 (6), 1053, 1101, 1103 (5), 1104 (2), 1105 (5); F-435, EU’s 1165 (3), 2071, 2095 (2); F-430, EU’s 2001 (2), 2042, 2100, 2115, 2117 (16), 2129 (38); F-430A, EU 2144; F-467, EU 2007 (2); F-476, EU 2012; F-499, EU 2058, 2078; F-431, EU’s 2066 (5), 2069 (4), 2076 (11), 2088 (3), 2096 (17).

Vessel No. 38
Iberian storage jar, probably Seville
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2129.
Fine orange red body with white slip on exterior.

Vessel No. 39
Iberian storage jar, probably Seville
This vessel was found in: F-435, EU 2091.
Fine orange red body with white slip on exterior
Unidentified maker’s mark, "D"? inside of a circle.

Vessel No. 40
Iberian storage jar, probably Seville
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2129.
Fine orange red body with white slip on interior and exterior
Similar sherds are from: F-430A, EU 2144 (2).

Vessel No. 41
Iberian costrel, probably Seville
C. 1600-50
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2129 (4).
Soft buff body with traces of thin tin glazing.
Similar sherds are from: F-320, EU 889 (29) including 1 from EU 889 and 1 from F-320, EU 1109 with traces of a blue star, also F-320, EU 1028 (4); F-404, EU’s 1002,1033; F-409, EU’s 1017 (7), 1103 (2), 1105 (6); F-110, EU 1102 (5); F-430, EU’s 1107 (2), 2115 (2), 2117 (3), 2129 (12); F-430A, EU 2144; F-320, EU’s 1028 (4), 1109 (7), 1192 (5), 2026 (5), 2040 (2); F-435, EU’s 1165 (4), 2071 (3), 2095 (5); F-431, EU’s 2066 (5), 2096 (5); F-457, EU 2011 (3); and General Provenience EU 1113.
Comparative: These costrels are a very common early vessel. Similar costrels have been found at: Jordan’s Point site 44 PG 300, dating from about 1620-60; Martin’s Hundred Site A dating 1620-45; and Flowerdew Hundred sites 44 PG 79 and 44 PG 82, which date to 1620-40.
See: Hurst pages 63-64 and Figure 28.75. Also Noël Hume 1979, page 52 and Figure 3-12.

Vessel No. 42
c. 1600-1650
Iberian Costrel
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1105.
Unusual pink/brown fabric covered with a white slip
Similar sherds are from: F-325, EU 895; F-404, EU 1002; F-409, EU’s 1017 (24), 1103 (67), 1105 (55); F-320, EU’s 1028, 1041, 1043, 2089; F-430, EU 2129 (2); and F-428, EU 1046.

Vessel No. 38, 39, and 40
Also recovered are 55 Iberian storage jar sherds. Sherds are from: General Provenience EU 1; F-320, EU’s 889, 1028 (2), 1043, 1109 (4), 1192, 2026, 2040 (3); F-409, EU’s 1053, 1103 (2), 1104 (4); F-430, EU’s 2001 (5), 2117 (13), 2129 (17), 2100 (2); F-430A, EU 2144; F-470, EU 2008; F-435, EU’s 2039, 2047 (2), 2071 (2); F-431, EU’s 2069, 2076, 2096.

Vessel No. 43
Tin enamel hollowform, possibly mug
This vessel was found in: General Provenience, EU 1; F-409, EU 1016, and 1105.
Buff body, manganese stipple exterior, interior with some accidental blue stippling on tin enamel, low flat cordon. This vessel is probably a bulbous mug or caudle cup.
Similar sherds are from: F-409, EU’s 1103 (2), 1104 and 1017(2).
See: Noël Hume 1977, page 68 and Figure VI:7, also Plate 23.

Vessel No. 44
Tin enamel hollowform, possibly Majolica
This vessel was found in: F-431 EU 2066 and 2096
Buff body, very thin plain white glaze.

Vessel No. 45
Tin enamel hollowform
This vessel was found in: F-110 EU 1152; F- 431, EU’s 2066(2), 2069, 2076(5), 2088, 2096(10); and F-320 EU 2089.
Buff body, green/blue opaque glaze

Vessel No. 46
Tin enamel hollowform
This vessel was found in: F-320, EU’s 1041, 1109, 1192(10), 2026 (4), and 2089.
Buff body, pale blue opaque glaze

Vessel No. 47
Tin enamel ointment pot
C. 1612-45
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU’s 1017(13) and 1105(2), crossmending to F-320 EU's 889 and 2040. There is one sherd that does not mend from EU 1017.
Buff body, plain white glaze with a pinkish tinge due to thinness of glaze.
See: Noël Hume 1977, pages 61-62 and Figure IV:1-5.

Vessel No. 48
Tin enamel ointment pot
First half of the 17th c.
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU's 2129 (18), 2117; F-435, EU 2064(4). There is one crossmend between F-430, EU 2129 and F-435, EU 2064.
Buff body, white translucent glaze.

Vessel No. 49
Tin enamel ointment pot
First half of the 17th c.
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2129.
Buff body, white opaque glaze. Small, base approximately 0.12' in diameter.

Vessel No. 50
Tin enamel ointment pot
First half of the 17th c.
This vessel was found in: F-110, EU 766.
Buff body, white translucent glaze with pinkish cast. Base approximately 0.18' in diameter.

Vessel No. 51
Tin enamel hollowform, bottle or jar
This vessel was found in: General Surface Collection EU 1
Buff body with pinkish tinge, plain white tin enamel, large and heavily potted vessel.

Vessel No. 52
Tin enamel hollowform, bottle or jar
This vessel was found in: F-435, EU 2039.
Buff body with pinkish tinge, plain white glaze, large and heavily potted vessel.

Vessel No. 47-52 types
Also recovered are 48 sherds with buff body and white glaze similar to vessels #47-52. These sherds are as follows: General Provenience, EU 1 (3); F-199, EU 842; F-320, EU's 889, 1043 (2); F-337, EU 909; F-409, EU's 1017 (3), 1103 (2); F-458, EU 1173; F-431, EU's 2066 (6), 2076 (7), 2088 (2), 2096 (5); F-430, EU's 2117 (6), 2129 (3); F-435, EU 2095 (5).

Vessel No. 53
Tin enamel ointment pot
c. 1612-70
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1017.
Buff body, blue stripes
Vessel No.  54
Tin enamel ointment pot  
c. 1612-70  
This vessel was found in: F-292, EU 862.  
Buff body, blue stripes.  
See: Noël Hume 1977, pages 64-66

Vessel No.  55
Tin enamel ointment pot  
c. 1612-70  
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2115.  
Buff body, blue stripes.  
See: Noël Hume 1977, pages 64-66

Vessel No.  56
Tin enamel ointment pot  
c. 1612-70  
This vessel was found in: F-110, EU 1192.  
Buff body, blue stripes.  
See: Noël Hume 1977, pages 64-66

Vessel No.  57
Tin enamel ointment pot  
c. 1612-70  
This vessel was found in: F-431, EU's 2069 (3) and 2096 (3).  
Buff body, blue stripes, cobalt stippling on interior and exterior, (possibly accidental).  
See: Noël Hume 1977, pages 64-66

Vessel No.  58
Tin enamel ointment pot  
c. 1612-70  
This vessel was found in: F-431, EU 2076.  
Buff body, blue stripes  
See: Noël Hume 1977, pages 64-66

Vessel No.  59
Tin enamel drug jar, large  
c. 1612-70  
This vessel was found in: F-435, EU's 2076 (2), 2071; F-431 EU's 2069 (2), 2088, 2093.  
Buff body, opaque white glaze, the decoration is in blue and yellow with tan chevrons.  
See: Noël Hume 1977, pages 64-66, also Figure V.
Vessel No. 53 through Vessel No. 59:
Also recovered are numerous unattributable tin enamel sherds. These sherds are as follows: General Surface Collection, EU 1 (5); 200N 350E General Surface, EU 763; F-110, EU’s 766 (6), 1100, 1102 (5), 1152; F-286, EU 855; F-320, EU’s 889 (9), 1028 (5), 1043 (4), 1109 (9), 1150, 1192, 2026, and 2040; F-409, EU’s 1017 (2), 1053, 1103 (6), 1104 (3), 1105; F-345, EU 916; F-441, EU 1130 (2); F-430, EU’s 2001 (4), 2115, 2117 (3), 2129; F-435, EU’s 1165 (6), 2071, 2105, 2107; F-431, EU’s 2066 (3), 2095 (9), 2096 (2), 2096 (26); F-321, EU 2111. There are also four different base fragments and one rim sherd that are unattributable: F-430A, EU 2144; F-430, EU’s 2100 and 2117 (2), 2001 (2); F-320, EU 889 and 1192; and F-431, EU 2076.

Vessel No. 60
Tin enamel bowl or plate
This vessel was found in: Surface Collection 200N 350E block, EU 763.
Buff body, blue on white central decoration.

Vessel No. 61
Tin enamel saucer
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1105.
Buff body, white opaque glaze with blue decoration.

Vessel No. 62
Redware candlestick base
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU’s 2129 (6) and 2117.
Well potted hard fired pinkish orange body with hematite inclusions, glossy clear lead glaze. Beverly Straube (personal communication) believes this vessel is probably Dutch.

Vessel No. 63
West of England balustroidal jar
c. 1609-30
This vessel was found in: F-435, EU’s 1116 (2), 1165 (2), 2071 (13), 2095 (9), 2102 (7), and 2091 (7).
Fine earthenware body varying from orange exterior to grey interior. Mottled interior lead glaze varying from olive green to black. Faulkner calls this type "North Devon gravel free".
Similar sherds are from: General Surface Collection, EU 1 (2).
Comparative: These vessels are rare and early. They have been found at the Martin's Hundred Company Compound, on the 1609 wreck of the Sea Venture, at The Maine on Governor's Land, at Pentagoet in context of 1629-35, and at Flowerdew Hundred's 44 PG 64 stone foundation house dating from 1625-40.
See: Noël Hume 1979, pages 195-198 and Figure 10-7. Also Faulkner, pages 203-205, Figure 7.17:a, and page 302. Also Outlaw, pages 105-106, and Figure A3.1:3-5.

Vessel No. 64
West of England balustroidal jar
This vessel was found in: F-431, EU’s 2069, 2066, 2076, 2088; F-430A, EU 2144; F-435, EU 2095.
Fine earthenware body varying from orange exterior to grey interior. Interior with heavy rilling and devitrifying honey brown lead glaze.
See: Vessel No. 63 above.

Vessel No. 65
West of England balustroidal jar
This vessel was found in: F-435, EU 2095 (3).
Fine earthenware body varying from orange exterior to grey interior. Interior with heavy rilling, and devitrifying honey brown lead glaze.
See: Vessel No. 63 above.

Vessel No. 66
West of England balustroidal jar
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2117 (3).
Fine earthenware body varying from orange exterior to grey interior. Interior with slight rilling, and devitrifying honey brown lead glaze.
See: Vessel No. 63 above.

Vessel No. 67
West of England balustroidal jar
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2129.
Fine earthenware body varying from orange exterior to grey interior. Interior with slight rilling, and devitrifying honey brown lead glaze.

Vessel No. 68
Jamestown storage jar
c. 1625-50
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1017; F-430, EU’s 2117 (22) and 2129 (4); F-431, EU 2096.
Brick red body with interior lead glaze, finger marked fillet around the rim.
Similar sherd from: General Surface Collection, EU 1.
See: Hudson, page 41-43, also Illustration 2.

Vessel No. 69
Redware pipkin
This vessel was found in: F-435, EU's 2047 (2), 2039.
Fine, hard fired earthenware body varying from orange exterior to grey interior, olive green lead glaze interior with pulled strap handle and folded, pinched feet.
Similar sherds include: F-409, EU 1105; F-435, EU's 1165 (9), 2033, 2039 (2), 2071 (4), 2095 (7), 2102 (5); and F-431, EU 2066.

Vessel No. 70
Redware pipkin
This vessel was found in: F-435, EU's 2071 (2), 2095 (2), and 2104.
Fine, hard fired earthenware body varying from orange exterior to grey interior, thin olive green lead glaze interior with folded, pinched feet.
Similar sherds include: F-435, EU 1165 (7), 2033 (3), 2039 (3), 2047 (13), 2071 (8), 2095 (20); F-409, EU 1017; F-404, EU 1033; F-320, EU 2040; F-431, EU's 2066, 2076, 2096; and General Provenience EU 1190.

Vessel No. 71
Redware holloware
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2100.
This is probably a storage jar. Thin well potted body, varying from orange exterior to grey interior, olive green lead glaze interior.
Similar sherds include: F-430, EU's 2100 and 2117.

Vessel No. 72
Redware holloware
This vessel was found in: F-286, EU 855; F-345, EU 916; F-431, EU's 2069 (2) and 2096 (2).
Hard fired, grey body, dark olive green interior glaze, turned decoration on exterior.

Vessel No. 73
Redware holloware
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1103; F-435, EU's 1165, 2071 (2), 2091, 2095 (7), 2102, 2107; F-431, EU 2096.
Orange body, brown lead glazed interior.

Vessel No. 74
Redware holloware
This vessel was found in: F-431, EU's 2076 and 2096.
Fine, hard fired earthenware body varying from orange exterior to grey interior, thin olive green lead glaze interior.
Vessel No. 75
Redware holloware
This vessel was found in: General Provenience, EU 1; F-110, EU’s 766 (2), 1124; F-404, EU 1002; F-409, EU’s 1103 (3), 1105 (2); F-430, EU 2117 and 2129.
Thin hard fired dark red body, with dark brown interior lead glaze, turned decoration on exterior.

Vessel No. 76
Virginia redware storage jar
This vessel was found in: F-320, EU 889; F-435, EU 1165.
Badly fired sandy body varying from orange to grey, with white clay and hematite inclusions. Thin interior greenish lead glaze.

Vessel No. 77
Redware storage jar, possibly Virginia
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1016 and 1105 (2).
Hard fired body varying from red to black with small white inclusions, badly devitrified lead glaze on interior.

Vessel No. 78
Redware hollowform
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1017.
Pale grey to orange body, light olive lead glaze interior.

Vessel No. 79
Redware small cylindrical pot
This vessel was found in: F-320, EU’s 2026, 2040 (3); F-430, EU 2129.
Bright orange sandy body with hematite inclusions, interior and exterior olive lead glaze.

Vessel No. 80
Redware hollowform
This vessel was found in: F-435, EU 2071 (5).
Thin well potted pink/orange body with mottled caramel brown lead glaze on the interior.

Vessel No. 81
Redware pan
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1103; F-435, EU’s 2039 (2), 2095; F-499, EU 2058; F-431, EU 2076 and 2069.
Hard fired dark reddish brown body with grey interior, clear lead glaze on the interior and splashed partially down the horizontal loop handles and exterior. Slight rilling on
the interior. Ivor Noël Hume (personal communication) feels this vessel is probably Dutch.

Vessel No.  82
Redware bowl or pan
This vessel was found in: F-431, EU 2069.
Well fired reddish orange body with mottled caramel brown lead glaze on the interior and everted rim.

Vessel No.  83
Redware hollowform
This vessel was found in: General Surface Collection, EU 1; F-409, EU 1017; F-404, EU 1033.
Orange red sandy body with grey core, yellowish olive green lead glaze speckled with black. Base of foot also glazed. Probably a small jar.

Vessel No.  84
Redware hollowform
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1053 (2).
Very thin, orange sandy body with thin honey brown glaze on the interior and exterior.

Vessel No.  85
Redware hollowform
This vessel was found in: F-470, EU 2008; and F-431, 2066.
Fine orange sandy body, with very thin honey brown lead glaze on the interior only. Slight everted rim.

Vessel No.  86
Virginia redware hollowform
This vessel was found in: F-320, EU’s 889, 1109 (2), 2040 (2); F-404, EU 1002 (3); F-430, EU 2117, 2129 (3).
Sandy bright orange body with hematite inclusions, interior and exterior clear lead glaze with some black flecking.

Vessel No.  87
Virginia Redware storage jar
This vessel was found in: General provenience, EU 1; F-110, EU’s 766, 1102; F-409, EU’s 1017 (7), 1053 (2), 1101, 1103, 1105 (3); F-435, EU 2047; F-431, EU 2066.
Reddish orange sandy body with white clay and hematite inclusions. No interior glaze, thin traces of lead glaze on exterior.

Vessel No.  88
Redware hollowform
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1017 (2), 1053, 1103; F-320, EU 2040 (2).
Fine sandy orange body with honey brown lead glaze on the exterior with traces of lead glaze on the interior.

Vessel No. 89
Slip decorated redware
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1103; F-431, EU 2066.
Fine sandy orange body with exterior honey brown lead glaze and traces of white slip.

Vessel No. 90
Redware hollowform, probably Merida Type
This vessel was found in: F-320, EU 889.
Hard fired dark red body, exterior appears burnished.
See: Hurst, pages 69-73.

Vessel No. 91
Redware hollowform
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1105 (2).
Well fired pale orange body with no exterior or interior glaze.

Vessel No. 92
Earthenware hollowform with handle
This vessel was found in: F-435, EU 2071.
Very unusual unglazed coarse sand tempered earthenware, varying orange to grey body, well potted, small hole at the top of the rim where the handle joins. Possibly a pipkin?

Vessel No. 93
Unidentified earthenware pot
This vessel was found in: F-430, EU 2117; F-515, EU 2123 (2); F-435, EU's 1165, 2039 (9), 2047 (6), 2071 (10), 2091 (9), 2095 (7), 2102 (15), 2103 (4), 2105 (4); and 2 sherds from F-503, EU 2074. that cross mend to several of the above EU's from F-435.
Slightly carinated shallow pot form with small opposing "mammiform" lug handles, slabbed, unevenly fired sand- and pebble-tempered body, stick or stone burnished on the interior and exterior. Possibly African or Caribbean.

Vessel No. 94
Werraware charger
This vessel was found in: F-320, EU 2026.
Red earthenware, brown lead glaze, slip decoration in white, green, and black, sgraffito.
Representation: probably a soldier holding a flag.
See: de Bodt, page 65.
Vessel No. 95
Stoneware crucible
This vessel was found in: F-431, EU 2096
Sandy pale orange body, hand formed rim sherd.

Vessel No. 96
Stoneware ink bottle
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1104.

Vessel No. 97
Stoneware storage jar, 19th century
This vessel was found in: General Provenience, EU 1.
Large cylindrical, wheel thrown grey bodied stoneware jar, salt glazed exterior.

Vessel No. 98
Stoneware hollowform
This vessel was found in: F-435, EU 1165.
Coarse sand grey body with no glaze. Possibly a crucible.

Vessel No. 99
Whiteware saucer, post-1810.
F-345 EU 1169
Brown floral transfer print.

Vessel No. 100
Normandy stoneware, wide mouthed bottle or jar
This vessel was found in: F-409, EU 1017, 1103; F-435, EU 1165, EU 2071 (2), and EU 2095.
Plain unglazed dry bodied grey stoneware, plain rounded rim with ridged cordon 0.04' below. Ivor Noël Hume (personal communication) identifies this as a product of Normandy. This vessel may also be similar to Faulkner's unidentified vessel "SW-1". "SW-1" has an everted rim, while Vessel No. 100 has straight profile, similar to examples recorded by Decarie-Audet. Faulkner cites Decarie-Audet as attributing them to the Loire Valley and Beauvais region.
See: Faulkner, page 211 and Figure 7-22, and page 304. Also Decarie-Audet, Figures 18a and 26.

Vessel No. 101
Midlands Purple storage jar  
c. 1620-40  
This vessel was found in: F-404, EU 1033; and General Provenience, EU 1.  
Reddish purple hardfired body, rim, does not show the thick black glaze often found low on the interior of these vessels.  
Comparative: The date range given is based on their occurrence at Flowerdew Hundred Plantation, where these jars are found on tenant sites 44 PG 79 and 44 PG 82. They are also found at The Maine at Governor's Land.  
See: Outlaw, page 107, and Figure A3.1:7, 11.

There are 30 small unglazed earthenware body sherds that were unattributable to any one vessel or vessel type, having either no glaze or the glaze missing. Sherds include: F-110, EU 766; F-409, EU's 1017, 1103, 1104, 1105; F-435, EU's 1165 (3), 2047, 2071, 2091, 2095 (8); F-320, EU's 2026 (2), 2040 (3); F-431, EU's 2066 (3), 2076, 2096; F-430A, EU 2144.

OTHER CERAMICS:

Redware, probably Virginia  
This piece was found in: F-110, EU 766.  
Reddish grey coarse sandy body, appears to be handle. May just be piece of modeled clay accidently fired.

Tin enamel tile fragment  
c. 1600-50  
This piece was found in: F-110, EU 766.  
Buff body with dromedary motif executed in white, blue, yellow, and green. Dutch or English. Fragments of similar tiles have been found a few hundred yards away at 44 PG 307.  
See: Noël Hume 1977, pages 54-56, also Plate 9, Color Plate facing page 20, and Figure 1. Also shows some similarities to de Jonge, illustration 9a-c, 12d, and 32a-d.

TOBACCO PIPES

Imported European Pipes

Several thousand pieces of imported European tobacco pipes were recovered from the excavations at Jordan's Journey. Many of these were very small fragments with little analytical or interpretive value. There were, however, hundreds of bowls, or fragments of bowls, with shapes suitable for assisting with the archaeological dating of the site and its major features. In addition, there were nearly 2,000 stem fragments sufficiently complete to permit calculation of a pipe stem date, following Binford's adaptation of the method of Harrington. In addition to using pipes forms for dating, there are makers'

marks on many of the bowls, and on some stems. These marks can help date the site, and can be useful for determining the trade ties between early Virginia and various northern European ports. Such information can only be gleaned from marks, of course, when there is a reasonable identification of the pipe's maker, and his dates and place of operation.

**Pipe Dating**

Using Binford's regression, we have calculated a "Binford Mead Date" (BMD) of 1634 for the site as a whole.\(^{15}\) This date was based on measurements of 1816 stems. Many have argued the questionable validity of using Binford dates for sites of this period, especially Noël Hume (see, for instance, Noël Hume 1991: 120-122). There is insufficient consistency in pipe stem bore diameters to provide a very accurate date, even with a rather large sample such as that from Jordan's Journey. One thing that can be said for the pipestem dates, however, is that they are consistently too late during the early seventeenth century. By the end of the century, the dates "settle down" and become far more accurate. This suggests that the sources for pipes were more variable early in the century than later, and this observation is in keeping with our general impressions of material culture from Virginia before the Navigation Acts.

In addition to calculating a Binford date for the site overall, we have calculated dates on all features having thirty or more measureable stems. These dates are reported in the individual feature descriptions. We had hoped that there might be some consistency in the error of the dates which would permit comparison, and relative dating, between features. This does not seem to be the case. The wide variations found between features that, on other evidence, appear to be nearly contemporaneous, suggests, instead, that different groupings of pipes found there ways into different features. This observation in itself has some interpretive value; we might suppose, for example, that pipes were personally, rather than communally, acquired objects. Consistently late Binford dates may yet be correctable by adding a constant to the calculations, but widely variable dates, even if all are relatively late dates, suggests instead variation among pipe makers. Some combination of stem hole diameter measurements and bowl form analysis may yet provide a very reliable dating tool for the early 17th century.

**Pipe Marks of Jordan's Journey**

This is not a complete list and description of all the maker's marks of Jordan's Journey, but rather a collection of those individual marks about which something is known. Whether it be the name of a possible manufacturer or simply the occurrence of the mark at another site, this section lists what specifics are known at the present time, quickly details the examples found at Jordan's Journey, and points out from which features and

---

\(^{15}\) The regression parameters were: \(Y=1931.85, X=38.26\).
EU's they came, by order of feature number. This section provides information on 56 of the 78 marked ball clay pipes from 44 PG 302.

"TG"

Six pipes recovered from the Jordan's Journey site are marked "TG". Two pipes with similar heel marks have been found at Martin's Hundred, and A. Noël Hume describes the decorations around the initials as "incised tripartite fronds above and below" (1979, p.30). Also according to Noël Hume, Oswald attributes the style of the mark to "London and Bristol" (1979, p.29). This mark is well distributed throughout the site, and occurs in the following features:

F-110
EU 766
1 heel fragment, ball clay

EU 1102
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, 7/64, c.1620-1640

F-404
EU 1002
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, c. 1630-1660

F-409
EU 1103
1 pipe bowl fragment, ball clay, 8/64, c. 1630-1660

F-430
EU 2129
1 pipe bowl fragment, ball clay, 7/64

F-435
EU 2071
1 bowl fragment, ball clay, 8/64

Gauntlet or Hand Mark
Gauntlet heel marks appear at Martin’s Hundred as well, and A. Noël Hume illustrates several matches for the variations found at Jordan’s Journey (1979: Figure 2, #4; Figure 7, #7; and Figure 8, #’s 6-8). Although these imprints can be either right- or left-handed, they have been treated here as one type, since only one (the two piece mend from F-409) shows any indication of having the thumb on the left hand side. Oswald points to a Somerset origin for this mark, and has an example dated from 1620-1640 (1975: p. 63); however, this mark has other designs around the gauntlet, while those at Jordan’s Journey do not. Another example is given a possible Winchester origin, as well as a date range between 1590 and 1620 (Oswald, 1970: p. 242, #b4). This particular mark can be found in many of the features and EU’s at Jordan’s Journey, which has 17 examples:

F-110
EU 1102
1 pipe heel fragment, ball clay

F-404
EU 1002
1 pipe stem fragment, ball clay

F-409
EU 1016
1 pipe bowl fragment, ball clay
EU 1105
1 pipe stem, ball clay, 8/64, mends with example from EU 1016

F-430
EU 2001
1 pipe, ball clay, 7/64, stem broken and end reworked to usable form, c. 1610-1630
EU 2117
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, 6/64, c. 1610-1630
1 pipe heel, ball clay
3 pipe heels, ball clay, 7/64

EU 2129
2 pipe bowl fragments, ball clay, 7/64, c. 1610-1630
1 pipe bowl fragment, ball clay, 7/64, stem reworked for use, c. 1610-1630
1 pipe bowl fragment, ball clay, 7/64, three piece mend,
2 pipe bowl fragments, ball clay, 7/64
1 pipe heel, ball clay

"TH"

In Outlaw's work on Governor's Land (1990: p.158 & 169, Figure 266), there is an exact match for this heel mark, of which 10 examples can be found at Jordan's Journey. It is described as "a circular heel impressed with maker's mark "TH" sprigged at top and bottom and encircled by pearl beading". This mark can be found in the following features and EU's:

F-409
EU 1105
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, 8/64, c. 1620-1640

F-430
EU 2129
2 pipe bowl fragments, ball clay

F-431
EU 2076
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, 8/64, c. 1620-1640
2 pipe bowl fragments, ball clay
EU 2088
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, 8/64, c. 1620-1640
EU 2096
2 pipe bowls, ball clay, 8/64, c. 1620-1640
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, c. 1620-1640

"SV" stem mark

There are three of this particular mark at Jordan's Journey, and, according to Oswald, the shop responsible for the mark produced pipes for up to a century, starting around London and later at Lincolnshire (1975: p.88). A Jordan's Journey example with a whole bowl is a perfect likeness to Oswald's Figure 16, #13 (1975: p. 89), which he dates between 1620 and 1640, and other later examples have been found by Ivor Noël Hume at Clay Bank, Virginia (Oswald, 1975: p.89). The mark itself appears on the top of the
stem near the bowl, being an incised monogram, and initially appears in circulation around 1620 (Atkinson and Oswald, 1969: p.18).

F-110

EU 766
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, c. 1620-1640

F-409

EU 1103
1 pipe stem, ball clay, 8/64

F-430

EU 2117
1 pipe stem, ball clay, 8/64

"WB"

There is only one example of this mark at Jordan's Journey, and the "most probable maker" was a William Bachelor, who made pipes between 1619 and 1635; another candidate, but less likely, was a William Brooker of Ratcliffe, who misses the mark by a few too many years (Atkinson and Oswald, 1969: p.15). This mark was found in:

F-499

EU 2058
1 pipe bowl fragment, ball clay, 8/64

"SC"

This mark belongs to one of three individuals: "Simon Cole or Samuel Cowse who signed 1619 Charter or Samuel Crosse of Stepney married 1644", and the range given by Oswald runs from 1620 to 1640 (1970: p.242-243, #c4). Jordan's Journey has one example of this mark:

F-431

EU 2096
1 pipe bowl fragment, ball clay, 8/64

Tudor Roses
Tudor roses are rather common designs - there are many variations to this classification - but in Faulkner's work on his excavations at Pentagoet, one example appears which is identical to one from Jordan's Journey, in EU 2071 (1987: p.175, #h); the Pentagoet mark was found in a pre-Pentagoet I context, and could possibly be from the remains of Penobscot, a Plymouth Colony post; the date range is from 1629 to 1635. The pipe is also believed to be of Dutch manufacture (Faulkner, 1987: p.175). While Faulkner reports that a similar Tudor Rose was found at Martin's Hundred (A. Noel Hume, 1979: p.9, fig. 1, #8), the example from the latter site is not at all similar to those from Pentagoet or Jordan's Journey.

The only other Tudor Rose that stands out in the Jordan's Journey catalog is from EU 2026; this example features a crowned Tudor Rose, along with the initials "IC" or "IO". Tudor Roses can be found in these features and EU's:

**F-320**

EU 1043
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, c. 1620-1640

EU 2026
1 pipe bowl fragment, ball clay, 7/64 (crowned, with initials)
1 pipe heel, ball clay

**F-345**

EU 916
1 pipe stem, 8/64

**F-435**

EU 2047
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, 8/64, c. 1610-1630

EU 2071
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, 7/64, c. 1600-1630

EU 2095
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, 8/64, c. 1630-1660 (possibly a Tudor Rose: illegible)

*Miscellaneous*

Other marks from Jordan's Journey have been identified at nearby sites from the same time period. Two examples of one design are similar to a mark from Governor's Land,
which is listed as "three parallel lines orthogonally crossing with two parallel lines" in this work; Outlaw describes the mark in similar terms, as "three parallel lines crossing a pair of parallel lines" (1990: p.158-159, #261). These can be found in:

F-430

EU 2129
1 pipe bowl fragment, ball clay, 6/64

F-435

EU 2071
1 pipe bowl fragment, ball clay, 6/64

Other marks from Governor's Land also appear at 44 PG 302, including one with an "ovoid heel base...impressed with eight-pointed asterisk" (Outlaw, 1990: p.160-161, #267). Examples at Jordan's Journey can be found in:

F-431

EU 2076
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, 7/64, c. 1620-1640

EU 2096
1 pipe bowl fragment, ball clay, 8/64

A different mark, with a design somewhat similar to the one mentioned above, appears both at Jordan's Journey and in Atkinson and Oswald's work London Clay Tobacco Pipes (1969: p.13, fig. 3, #2); in this report, it is simply described as a spoked wheel, or occasionally as an eight-spoked wheel, and Jordan's Journey has three examples. This mark is found on "small, early pipes", and is given a range of "1600-1630" (Atkinson and Oswald, 1969: p.13). At 44 PG 302, it can be found in the following feature and related EU's:

F-435

EU 2047
1 pipe bowl fragment, ball clay, 7/64

EU 2102
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, 7/64, c. 1620-1630
1 pipe bowl fragment, ball clay, 7/64
Martin's Hundred also provides other marks that match those of Jordan's Journey. A "spoked wheel" found at Martin's Hundred, with an assigned date of 1600 to 1630 (A. Noël Hume, 1979: p. 31-32, fig. 9, #2), closely resembles the "flower/wheel" found in the following EU's:

F-431

EU 2076
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, 8/64, c. 1620-1640

EU 2096
1 pipe bowl, ball clay, c. 1620-1640
1 pipe bowl fragment, 8/64

Another mark from Martin's Hundred that has a match at Jordan's Journey is the "impressed circle divided into four segments" (A. Noël Hume, 1979: p. 30-31, fig. 8, #10); the example at 44 PG 302 is labeled as a "quartered circle", and is found in the following EU:

F- 431

EU 2096
1 pipe bowl fragment, ball clay, 8/64

Locally-made Tobacco Pipes and Indian Trade Pipes

GLASS VESSELS

CULINARY UTENSILS AND TOOLS

ARCHITECTURAL REMAINS

PERSONAL EFFECTS, JEWELRY, AND ACCOUTREMENTS

Along with the recovery of the architectural, faunal and ceramic assemblages from a site, the recovery of personal effects, although often sparse on 17th-century sites, can be the most intriguing and informative. They provide us a window that we may look through, past the roof over their head and the pots they were eating out of, to the individual. In the absence of flesh and bones perhaps we can at least put clothes on these inhabitants of early Virginia.

Faulkner (1987:249), among others, points out the risks of inferring privilege from artifacts; however, historic documents of the 17th century do provide us with sufficient
documentation of high status apparel to at least speculate about some of the personal effects recovered from Jordan's Journey. Like the Martin's Hundred Site A of c.1625-1645 in James City County, Jordan's Journey produced fragments of clothing with gold and silver threads. A cord of woven fiber with threads wrapped in silver and gold was excavated from Feature 320, a cellar in Structure 4. Feature 430, a large borrow pit inside the west wall of the compound which was later used as a trash dump, produced a woven fiber band with finished edges and threads wrapped with silver foil in a slanting striped twill pattern. One silver sequin was also recovered from each of Features 320 and 430. Ivor Noël Hume (1991:60) cites a 1621 law passed to "Suppress drunkeness gameing & excess in cloaths [and] not to permit any but ye Council & heads of hundreds to wear gold in their cloaths". The need for such a law suggests that there were many people garbed in this fashion prior to the law. Noël Hume (1991:63) is also quick to point out the tenuousness of life during this time and how one's clothing might survive for use by more than one owner. However, given the approximate time period for the settlement at Jordan's Journey (1620-1635), it is possible that these artifacts may have belonged to clothing worn by Samuel Jordan or William Farrar, the settlement's "heads of the hundred".

Another item of particular interest that suggests the presence of a high status female is a silver hair pin. Measuring 0.44' long, the pin is rectangular in section with a pierced cut out finial and engraved hatched decoration on the front and back of the upper end (Figure *). Hair pins of this type were worn as a trinket in conjunction with a style of hair cap that was in vogue from about 1610 to 1625. "They are made of gold, silver or bronze and pinned up underneath the cap through the hair. The side coming clear from the forehead is often decorated and has a hole for the attachment of a pendant" (Baart 1977:219). Perhaps one of the faceted cut glass or rock crystal beads found in Feature 431, or the swirled black glass dangle from Structure 17's cellar (Feature 499), once adorned this hair pin (ill. 75 Baart 1977:218).

The pin was found in Feature 430, a large borrow/trash pit complex. Again, it is tempting to suppose that Cicely Jordan, wife of Samuel Jordan - and later William Farrar - may have used such a pin to secure a lace cap to her head. In the 1623 list of the Living and the Dead and 1625 Muster, Cicely is the only adult female listed in the complex. Preliminary analysis of the historic burials located just outside the palisade indicate that more than one adult female was buried there. Whether they actually resided at the fort is unknown.

Other jewelry found on the site includes a possible earring bauble, a black glass sphere with white prunts found in Structure 17's cellar (Feature 499). A plain brass band finger ring with traces of gilding, 14 mm. inside diameter, was found in Feature 409. A gold ring fragment was excavated from Feature 431. It is embossed with flat raised disks in the center and small protruding beads on the side, and it is engraved on the interior with "Mo...?". The ring has a touchmark "R" or possibly a monogram "AR" in a spade
Two similar rings were found in an early 17th-century context on excavations at Flowerdew Hundred in Prince George County. One of these is a brass ring, the other is a fragment of a gold ring, ornamented with a chased herringbone pattern (Gibbs 1987:55).

Other artifactual remains of personal effects include a small brass book clasp from Feature 409, a bone box comb from Feature 435, as well as other artifacts commonly found on early 17th century sites: clothing fasteners, sewing equipment, and beads. There were 89 buttons found at 44Pg302, 84 of which were spherical black glass ranging in size from 9 mm to 13 mm. In addition there were 1 iron button, 3 plain brass buttons, 1 decorated brass button, and 1 possible silver button. All of the buttons have iron shanks, except the brass which were cast in one piece. There were 18 bent wire hooks and eyes. Fourteen were brass and 4 were of iron. By far one of the most common small artifacts found were the 306 brass aiglets, the metal points at the end of a ribbon or lace used to tie clothing. The majority of these were rolled brass, some dimpled and one with spiraled decoration. Thirty-four were of thin solid brass that had been crimped onto the fabric.

Evidence of tailoring and manufacture of clothing is supported by the 342 straight pins and lead bale seals that were scattered among the occupation refuse at 44Pg302. These lead seals were probably attached to bolts of cloth to certify their quality, quantity and place of origin (Faulkner 1987:255). Presently, the only positively identified seals are two from Augsburg. Two others may bear the arms of Munich, and a fifth seal may be marked with the crowned harp of Ireland. It is likely that some of the cloth was being used as trade goods, but most of it was probably intended for use by the colonists at Jordans's Journey. The pins were brass common pins with soldered, wire-wound heads (Faulkner 1987:255) of varying sizes. The majority were excavated from Feature 431 along with a large brass thimble. There were 9 iron or steel needles and needle fragments, and 1 brass needle. The remains of one or two pairs of iron or steel scissors were excavated from the large borrow pit features.

One hundred and ten beads were excavated from feature contexts at 44Pg302. Two others were recovered in the controlled surface collection. The majority of the beads were glass and fit into Kenneth and Martha Kidd's bead classification system; most were oblong or round, millifiori type, or solid color, robin's egg blue, oyster white, bright mint green, bright navy, black, and aqua blue. Feature 320 contained 3 lead beads, 1 with swirled decoration, 1 stamped with three dots in diamonds, and 1 plain round bead. Also from the same feature was a bead made out of a white organic material, possibly bone, and one made of an unknown disintegrating material. Half of a round wooden bead and two faceted cut glass or rock crystal beads were also recovered.
The artifacts mentioned in this section were excavated primarily from primary deposits in features which served as trash dumps during the occupation of the site. Some of these items, particularly a few of the beads, were apparently incorporated into secondary deposits of midden used to backfill cellars and other holes at the end of the occupation. Table * lists the personal objects and clothing accoutrements recovered from the site, by feature. Details about the proveniences can be found in the feature descriptions throughout this report, and in the inventory of finds presented as Appendix 2*.

Table *: List of Jewelry and Personal Items, by Feature and Excavation Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Excavation Unit</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-92</td>
<td>EU 768</td>
<td>Post hole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Straight pin fragment, brass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-110</td>
<td>EU 766</td>
<td>South bisection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Bead, glass, turquoise, 5 mm, Kidd Type IIa31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Bead, glass, turquoise, 8 mm, Kidd Type IIa31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Buttons, black glass with iron shank, 11-12 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Straight pins, brass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Aiglets, rolled brass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU 1102</td>
<td>North bisection, stratum II</td>
<td>1 Button, black glass with iron shank, 10 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Straight pins, brass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Aiglet fragment, rolled brass, dimpled decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Aiglet fragment, rolled brass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Clothing hook, twisted brass wire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU 1124</td>
<td>North bisection, stratum III</td>
<td>2 Straight pins, brass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU 1133</td>
<td>North bisection, stratum VI</td>
<td>1 Bead, glass, aqua blue, round, 7 mm, Kidd Type IIa36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Straight pin brass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-162</td>
<td>EU 781</td>
<td>Post mold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Bead, glass gooseberry, 8 mm, Kidd Type IIb18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-199</td>
<td>EU 842</td>
<td>Post mold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Bead, glass, dark palm green, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F-320  EU 889: Southwest quadrant
4 Beads, glass, oyster white, oblong, c. 4 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
1 Bead, glass, oyster white, chopped teardrop, 5 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
5 Buttons, black glass with iron shanks, 9-12 mm
1 Button, brass, cast 1-piece with shank, 9 mm
2 Aiglets, rolled brass
1 Straight pin, brass
1 Bead, lead, oblong, 4 mm

EU 1028: Southeast quadrant stratum IV
1 Bead, glass, oyster white, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
1 Sequin, silver, 4 mm

EU 1041: Southeast quadrant stratum V
1 Bead, glass, surf green, 5 mm, Kidd Type IIa25
1 Bead, glass, oyster white, 4 mm, Kidd Type IIa11

EU 1043: Southeast quadrant stratum VI
4 Buttons, black glass with iron shank, 11-13 mm
1 Bead, white organic material, possibly bone, 4 mm
1 Bead, glass, oyster white, oblong, 3 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
1 Bead, glass, oyster white, round, 3 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
1 Bead, lead, oblong with swirled ridges, 6 mm
2 Aiglet fragments, brass
1 Straight pin, brass

EU 1106: 1991 initial clean-up
6 Buttons, black glass with iron shank, 11 mm
1 Bead, glass, round, oyster white, 4 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
2 Beads glass, round, bright mint green, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa23
1 Bead, lead, oblong, stamped with 3 dots in diamonds
1 Straight pin, brass, 0.09'
1 Scissors finger loop

EU 1109: North bisection, Strata I, II, and III
2 Buttons, black glass with iron shanks, 12-13 mm
1 Bead, glass, round, light grey, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa9
1 Straight pin, brass
1 Aiglet, rolled brass
3 Aiglet fragments, rolled brass

EU 1192: North bisection, under the burn layer, stratum V
1 Bead, glass, white, oblong, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa15
1 Bead, oyster white, round, 4 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
2 Aiglet fragments, rolled brass

EU 2026: North bisection Stratum VI
2 Buttons, black glass with iron shanks, 9 mm, 11 mm
1 Bead, unknown disintegrating material, grainy yellow green loose conglomerate, ca. 9 mm
1 Bead, lead, round 5 mm
1 Bead, glass, round, oyster white, 6 mm Kidd Type IIa11
1 Bead, glass, round, oyster white, 3 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
1 Cord, woven fiber, some threads wrapped in gold and silver foil
3 Aiglets, rolled brass

EU 2040: North bisection, stratum VII
1 Probable earring dangle, black glass, dotted with white prunts, 6 mm
1 Button, black glass with iron shank, 11 mm
1 Bead, glass, oyster white, 4 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
1 Bead, glass, oyster white, 7 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
1 Bead, glass, robin's egg blue, 7 mm, Kidd Type IIa40
1 Bead, glass, robin's egg blue, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa40
9 Aiglet fragments, rolled brass
3 Straight pin fragments, brass

EU 2089: North bisection stratum VIII
1 Bead, glass, millifiori type with green, white and redwood, 7 mm, Kidd Type IVk6
1 Bead, glass, bright mint green, 8 mm, Kidd Type IIa23

F-345 EU 916: Post hole and robber hole, mixed
1 Bead, glass, brite Navy, 3 mm, Kidd Type IIa56
1 Button, brass, 1 pc cast with shank, 9 mm

F-397 EU 983: All feature fill
1 Straight pin, brass

F-404 EU 1002: West bisection
2 Aiglets, rolled brass
2 Aiglets, rolled brass with dimpling
EU 1033: East bisection
1 Bead, glass, brite mint green, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa23
1 Bead, glass, oyster white, broken, 4 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
2 Aiglets, rolled brass

F-409 EU 1017: North bisection S-II
11 Buttons, black glass with iron shank, 10-12 mm
1 Bead, glass, brite mint green, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa23
1 Ring, jewelry, brass, plain band with traces of gilding, 14 mm inside dia.
6 Aiglets, brass
1 Clothing hook, shaped brass wire

EU 1053: Southeast quadrant S-II
1 Bead, glass, oyster white, 4 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
1 Button, black glass with iron shank, 10 mm
5 Aiglet fragments, rolled brass
3 Straight pins, brass

EU 1101: 1991 Initial clean-up
1 Button, black glass with iron shank, 12 mm

EU 1103: Southeast bisection, stratum II
3 Buttons, black glass with iron shanks, 11 mm
1 Bead, glass, round, Millifori type with green, white and redwood, 7 mm, Kidd Type IV k6
1 Bead, glass, oblong, 5 mm, black, Kidd Type IIa8
1 Bead glass, round, fragment, black, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa6
2 Beads, glass, round, broken, oyster white, 4 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
1 Glass fragment, clear, flat, possible mirror
2 Aiglets, rolled brass
5 Straight pins, brass
2 Straight pin fragments, brass

EU 1105: Southwest quadrant, stratum II
7 Buttons, black glass with iron shanks, 10-12 mm
2 Beads, glass, round, oyster white, 5 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
1 Bead, glass, round, oyster white, 7 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
1 Bead, glass, round, brite mint green, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa23
1 Glass fragment, clear, flat, probably mirror
4 Aiglets, rolled brass
7 Aiglet fragments, rolled brass
3 Straight pin fragments, brass
1 Wire, brass, "S" shaped, probably clothing fastener
1 Book clasp fragment, brass, stamped decoration, 0.08' long
1 Wire mass, brass, thin single strand, possibly woven into fabric

F-430 EU 2001: North section stratum I
1 Bead, glass, oblong, bright mint green, 7 mm, Kidd Type Ia9

EU 2042: North section, stratum II
1 Button, black glass with iron shank, 12 mm

EU 2100: North section, stratum 3
3 Buttons, black glass with iron shanks, 10-12 mm
2 Straight pins, brass
1 Needle, iron

EU 2115: South section stratum I
1 Aiglet, rolled brass

EU 2117: South section stratum II
4 Buttons, black glass with iron shanks, 9-11 mm
1 Bead, glass, round, robin’s egg blue, 11 mm, Kidd type IIa 40
3 Beads, glass, round, dark palm green, 6 mm, Kidd type IIa28
1 Bead, glass, oblong, white, 6 mm, Kidd type IIa13
1 Bead, glass, oblong, white, 3 mm, Kidd type Ia 5
1 Bead fragment, glass, round, oyster white, 5 mm, Kidd IIa 11
1 Bead, glass, molded ridges, aqua, 6 mm
1 Bead, glass, round, brick red over apple green, 5 mm, Kidd type IVa5
1 Silver hair pin, 0.44' long, rectangular in section, cut-out and pierced finial, with rectangular slot 0.05' long, engraved decoration on upper end. Style of c. 1610-1625.
12 Aiglets, rolled brass
4 Aiglet fragments
19 Straight pins, brass
1 Box comb fragment, bone

EU 2129: Deposit A, stratum II
2 Buttons, black glass with iron shank, 12 mm
1 Button, black glass with iron shank, 9 mm
1 Button, ferrous with wire shank
1 Bead, glass, flattened sphere, white, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa13
1 Bead, glass, round, white, 4 mm, Kidd Type IIa13
1 Bead, glass, round, black, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa6
1 Bead, glass, round, robin's egg blue, 4 mm, Kidd Type IIa40
1 Bead, glass, round, Millifiori type with green, white, and redwood, Kidd Type IVk6
1 Bead, wooden, half round, 6 mm
1 Clothing band, woven fiber with finished edges, threads wrapped in silver foil worked into a slanting striped pattern, 0.035' wide
1 Sequin, silver, teardrop shaped, 5 mm x 4 mm
11 Aiglets, rolled brass
24 Aiglet fragments
6 Pins, brass, ca. 0.8'
2 Pins, brass, ca. 0.12'
1 Clothing hook, ferrous
1 Buckle, ferrous, square, sheet metal attachment point on center bar
1 Buckle, ferrous, figure 8
1 Scissor half, ferrous, missing tip of blade
1 Sword belt hanger eye, ferrous

EU 2144: Deposit A, stratum III
1 Button, black glass with ferrous shank, 12mm
1 Bead, glass, robin's egg blue, Kidd Type IIa40
1 Bottle neck, glass of pewter screw threads

F-431 EU 1108: Initial clean-up
1 Bead, glass, seed, black, 3 mm

EU 2066: South bisection, stratum I, heavily rodent disturbed
1 Button, black glass with iron shank, 11mm
1 Bead, glass, light grey, 7mm, Kidd Type IIa23
1 Bead, glass, robin's egg blue, 4mm, Kidd Type IIa23
1 Bead, glass, brite mint green, 6mm, Kidd Type IIa23
1 Bead, glass, brite mint green, 6mm, faceted
1 Button, cast brass one piece with integral shank
1 Clothing hook, brass wire
1 Needle, brass, .27'
3 Aiglets, rolled brass
2 Aiglets, crimped brass, thin, needle-like
7 Aiglet fragments, rolled brass
8 Straight pins, brass

EU 2076: South bisection, stratum I
1 Bead, glass, round, millifiori type with green, white, and redwood. Kidd Type IVk6
2 Beads, glass, oyster white, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
1 Bead, glass, white, 8 mm, Kidd Type IIa15
1 Bead, glass, light aqua blue, oblong, 6 mm
1 Bead, glass, light green "Gooseberry", 7 mm, Kidd Type IIb18
2 Beads, cut glass or rock crystal, faceted
1 Hemispherical fragment, silver, possibly from a hollow button
1 Button, brass, hollow, with incised spiral decoration
1 Clothing eye, brass wire
1 Brass thimble, roughly triangular in section, illegible makers mark
57 Straight pins, brass
24 Aiglets, rolled brass
1 Aiglet, rolled brass, dimpled decoration
1 Buckle, iron, "figure 8", circa 0.1' square
1 Buckle half, Y shaped attachment point, iron ring on end, 0.1' long

EU 2088: Discrete deposit containing gorget backplate
1 Bead, glass millifiori type with green, white and redwood, 7 mm, Kidd Type IV k6
1 Bead, glass, opaque white, impressed with three ridges, two roped, 7 mm
3 Aiglets, rolled brass
5 Straight pins, brass

EU 2096: North bisection, stratum I, heavily rodent disturbed
1 Bead, glass, round, robin's egg blue, 10 mm, Kidd Type IIa40
1 Bead, glass, round, robin's egg blue, 7 mm, Kidd Type IIa40
1 Bead, glass, round, robin's egg blue, 4 mm, Kidd Type IIa40
2 Bead, glass, round, bright mint green, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa23
1 Bead, glass, round, millifiori type with green, white, and redwood, 7 mm, Kidd Type IV k6
1 Bead, glass, round, ivory color
2 Bead, glass, round, oyster white, 8 mm Kidd Type IIa11
3 Bead, glass, round, oyster white, 6 mm Kidd Type IIa11
1 Bead, glass, round, oyster white, 5 mm Kidd Type IIa11
2 Bead, glass, round, oyster white, 3 mm Kidd Type IIa11
1 Bead fragment, glass, oblong, oyster white, 5 mm, Kidd Type IIa15
1 Bead, glass, oyster white, 5 mm, a double, Kidd Type IIa11, unseparated
1 Glass fragment, clear, possibly mirror glass
1 Ring fragment, gold, flat raised disks down center, edges with small protruding beads. Touchmark “R” or possibly monogram “AR” in spade shield. Engraved “Mo...”
3 Hooks, clothing, brass
5 Eyes, clothing, brass
1 Clothing fastener fragment, brass
12 Aiglets, rolled brass
29 Aiglet fragments, rolled brass
2 Aiglet fragments, rolled brass, dimpled decoration
1 Aiglet fragment, rolled brass, spiral twist ridging
7 Aiglets, crimped brass, thin, needle-like
1 Buckle, brass, D shaped, cast with decoration and acanthus-like finial, ferrous tongue
2 Wire clumps, brass, twisted, possibly woven into fabric
71 Straight pins, brass
3 Wire fragments, ferrous, possibly needle fragments
1 Needle, ferrous, 0.15' long
1 Clothing eye, ferrous, fragment
1 Buckle, figure 8, ferrous, 0.08' wide

F-435 EU 1165: South bisection, stratum I
1 Button, black glass with iron shank, 11 mm
2 Aiglets, rolled brass
1 Straight pin, brass

EU 2033: South bisection, stratum II
1 Aiglet, rolled brass
1 Straight pin, brass

EU 2039: South bisection, stratum III
1 Bead, glass, 4 mm, aqua blue, Kidd Type IIa39
5 Aiglets, rolled brass
1 Aiglet fragment rolled brass
3 Straight pins, brass
1 Sword belt attachment, ring for buckler hook, wrought iron

EU 2047: South bisection, stratum IV
4 Buttons, black glass with iron shanks, 10-12 mm
1 Bead, glass, aqua blue, double rounds, 8 mm
1 Bead, glass, bright mint green, round, 7 mm, Kidd Type IIa23
1 Bead, glass, round oyster white, 4 mm, Kidd Type IIa11

EU 2071: Clean-up
1 Bead, glass, brite mint green, 5 mm, Kidd Type IIa23
3 Beads, glass, brite mint green, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa23
3 Glass fragments, clear and flat, probably mirror
1 Silver fragment, 0.04' x 0.025', solder on one end
1 Silver shield, octagonal, crudely engraved outlined field with an "I", 0.05' x 0.04'
8 Straight pin fragments
1 Aiglet, rolled brass
7 Aiglet fragments, rolled brass
3 Aiglets, rolled brass, dimpled decoration
20 Straight pins, brass
3 Needle fragments, iron

EU 2091: South bisection, stratum VI
2 Buttons, black glass with iron shanks, 12 mm
1 Straight pin, brass
2 Aiglets, rolled brass
10 Aiglet fragments, rolled brass

EU 2095: North bisection, stratum I
2 Buttons, black glass with iron shanks, 10-11 mm
1 Bead, glass, oyster white, 4 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
1 Ring, brass wire, traces of gilding, 23 mm, broken apart at joint
1 Ring, brass wire, 13 mm, broken open
8 Aiglets, rolled brass
2 Aiglets, rolled brass, dimpled decoration
9 Aiglet fragments, rolled brass
1 Aiglet, crimped brass, thin, needle-like
51 Straight pins, brass
3 Needles, iron
1 Needle fragment, iron
1 Clothing hook, steel
1 Box comb fragment, bone

EU 2102: North bisection stratum III
8 Buttons, black glass with iron shanks, 11-12 mm
4 Straight pins, brass, concreted together, found in situ as if lost in original packing
30 Straight pins, brass
6 Aiglets, rolled brass
1 Aiglet, rolled brass, dimpled decoration
2 Aiglet fragments
1 Scissors half

EU 2103: North bisection stratum IV
1 Button, glass, black with iron shanks, 11 mm
1 Straight pin, brass

EU 2104: North bisection stratum V
1 Straight pin, brass
1 Aiglet, rolled brass

EU 2105: North bisection stratum VI
6 Buttons, black glass with iron shanks, 10-12 mm
5 Bottle glass fragments, case
1 Aiglet fragment, rolled brass, dimpled decoration
2 Aiglet fragments, rolled brass
3 Straight pins, brass
1 Aiglet, crimped brass, thin and needle-like
4 Brass tacks
1 Unidentified Ferrous Object, wrought iron bent into flattened loop, probably a candle snuffer finger loop
1 Clothing hook, iron wire

EU 2107: South bisection, stratum VIII
1 Unidentified ferrous object, probably a broken buckle, 0.07 x 0.05'
F-441  EU 1136:  South bisection, probably mixed with robber hole fill.
1 Straight pin, brass

F-467  EU 2007:  Post hole
19 Aiglets, crimped brass, thin, needle like, all 19 held in situ in matrix
1 Aiglet, brass, crimped end, needle-like
2 Aiglet fragments, brass, crimped ends

F-470  EU 2008:  All feature fill
2 Aiglet fragments, rolled brass

F-499  EU 2058:  North bisection strata I and II
1 bead, glass, round, red with four swirling blue stripes outlined with white, 6 mm
1 Aiglet, crimped brass, needlelike
1 Aiglet, rolled brass
6 Aiglet fragments, rolled brass
5 Straight pins, brass

EU 2078:  South bisection, stratum I
2 Beads, oyster white, 5 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
1 Aiglet, rolled brass
2 Aiglet fragments, rolled brass
1 Spur fragment, iron, with a rowel

EU 2085:  South bisection, stratum II
1 Probable earring dangle, thin swirled tear drop of black glass
1 Bead, glass, oyster white, 5 mm, Kidd Type IIa11
3 Straight pins, brass
2 Aiglets, rolled brass
1 Aiglet fragment, rolled brass

General Provenience:  The following were excavated from a single feature context
(probably either F-430 or F-431) and were used for "Archaeology Week" exhibit, but the
provenience tag was lost.
11 Buttons, black glass with ferrous shank, 10-12 mm
8 Beads, glass, brite mint green, 7 mm, Kidd Type IIa23
1 Bead, glass, robin’s egg blue, 6 mm, Kidd Type IIa40
3 Beads, glass, light green, molded in ridges
1 Bead fragment, glass, millifiori type with brite navy, white, and redwood, 8 mm, Kidd Type IVk3

EU 1113:  General Surface Collection
1 Bead, round, amethyst color and possibly amethyst stone, 4 mm
1 Button, brass, one piece with cast shank missing, 10 mm

EU 1151: Surface Collection
1 Button, brass, cast one piece with shank, 9 mm

EU 72: Controlled Surface Collection
1 glass bead (unidentified)

EU 577 Controlled Surface Collection
1 glass bead (unidentified)

JETTONS AND COINS

Despite the popular image of archaeologists digging up fistfuls of doubloons, coins are rarely found on early English sites in Virginia. Out of 53,879 artifacts recovered from Jordan's Journey, only two coins were found. They are a French douzain from borrow pit and possible privy F-431, and an "Irish" halfpenny from the upper level of root cellar F-320 inside Structure 4. Verbal descriptions of both coins were given to Dr. Richard Doty, Curator of Western Numismatics at the Smithsonian Institution, and he graciously supplied identifications over the phone.

The douzain is 22 mm in diameter. On the obverse is a cross with splayed ends and coronets in the angles. On the reverse are the arms of France, three fleur-de-lis on a crowned spade shield. The field is separated by a diagonal bar, which Dr. Doty states is not usual and may be a minting error. Flanking the shield is an "H", the mintmark for La Rochelle. Some lettering is visible on both the obverse and reverse. The material is "vellon" or "billon", a copper and silver alloy which is silver colored but primarily copper. When excavated, this douzain appeared to be a brass jetton and was not identified until cataloging.

This coin could date into the 1590's; however, Dr. Doty notes that douzains were quite common during the reign of Louis XIII (1610-1643) and that it does not have the counterstamp of circa 1640. How the coin came to Jordan's Journey is of course unknown, but it is worth noting that in 1613 Virginia Governor Samuel Argall destroyed the 51-man French outpost of Saint-Sauveur (Faulkner 1987:14) and was later given orders to make a second attack. Faulkner (1987:14) also mentions that a fort built by Claude de La Tour was captured by the English in 1628. As an Atlantic port, La Rochelle supplied much of the coinage of New France.

The Irish halfpenny is 15 mm in diameter. On the obverse is the crowned harp of Ireland and the date "1601". On the reverse is the coat of arms of England flanked by the royal cipher "ER". Some lettering is visible on both the obverse and reverse. The material is copper thickly coated with tin. Dr. Doty identifies the coin as English, made
for use in Ireland. It has been noted elsewhere that many of the same individuals, or groups of individuals, settled plantations in Ulster and in Virginia in the early 17th century. Could it be that some "Irish" coins also made it to Virginia as part of what Ivor Noël Hume has called the common Ulster-Virginia "plantation kit"?

On pre-1650 English sites in Virginia it is very common to find at least one of the brass Nuremberg mathematical counters called jettons. These coin-like artifacts are thin disks, approximately 22 mm. in diameter and typically of the design Mitchiner (1988:474) calls the "rose and orb series." The obverse is three crowns alternating with fleur de lis around a central rose. The reverse shows the cross and orb or "Reich's apple" surrounded by a tressure. Lettering on the obverse of these tokens normally contains the maker's name and the place of manufacture, Nuremberg. The reverse typically contains one of a variety of mottos abbreviated to about 18 letters. One example from Jordan's Journey examined by Bennett (1992:28) bore the legend "GOT+ALEIN+DIE+EHR+UND+", which she translated as "Honor and God Alone" or perhaps "God Alone is the Honorable One".

According to Mitchiner (1988:17), jettons originated in the Middle Ages as a method of calculating figures, and in England were called "reckoning counters". Probably the best analogy is the comparison with the beads of an abacus. Jettons were placed and moved on counting boards, tables or "reckoning cloths", which were marked with lines for "1", "10", "100", "1000", and so forth. Mitchiner (1988:17) states that in an age when roman numerals were used, jettons and counting boards allowed easy calculation of figures. As Arabic numerals became common at the beginning of the seventeenth century, Mitchiner (1988:20) writes that in England the use jettons as reckoning counters "declined from the reign of Charles I and had virtually died out in this field by the end of the seventeenth century." In the authors' experience, archaeological evidence from Virginia parallels these dates, with jettons only rarely being found after mid-century. Despite the demise of counting boards, jettons continued to be made as gaming pieces, and are probably the origin of the modern poker chip.

One hundred and seventy eight jettons were recovered from the excavations at Jordan's Journey, which appears to be the largest collection from any Tidewater site. In the excavations at Martin's Hundred, 4 were found (Noël Hume 1983:317) and only 1 at the Hampton University site (Edwards et al,1989:245). Approximately 10 were excavated from the Flowerdew Hundred tenant site 44PG82, and more were recovered from the Fortified Area, 44PG65.

At Jordan's Journey the largest concentration came from a cellar, F-320, inside Structure 4, where 42% of the collection was found. A daub/trash pit and possible privy, F-431, contained 27%, while another daub/trash pit F-430 held another 15%. To group the percentages slightly differently, 57% of the jettons came from the primary trash deposits in daub pits F-404, F-409, F-430, F-431 and the failed well, F-435. Jettons at Jordan's
Journey were clearly considered worthless, and it is interesting to note that the two features which held 69% of the jettons also each had a coin of little or no value.

Jettons, as disks of thin stamped brass, are particularly subject to mineralization. Marks cannot be read on 46% of the jettons, although they are of the rose and orb series. Of the identifiable jettons, 48% are marked "WULF LAVFER", while 6% are "WOVLFLAVFER." It seems very likely the 82 unidentifiable jettons are a mixture of Wulf and Woulf Laufer.

Over a span of almost a century the city of Nuremberg contained three different men named Wolf Laufer who produced rose and orb jettons. Fortunately, according to Mitchiner (1988:474), this father, son, and grandson varied their marks to provide a signature. Wulf I (active c. 1583-1601) signed as "WVLF", Wolf II (active c.1612-1651) as "WOLF" and "WOULF, and Wolf III (active c. 1650-1670) as "WOLFF".

Whether all of these jettons came to Jordan's Journey at the same time is not known. Barnard (1916) cited in Bennett (1992:22), states that jettons were commonly bought in sets of 100, but that a set could also be 50 or 200. They were packed in purses, cylinders, or boxes, and referred to as a "nest". The unusually large number found at Jordan's suggests a nest of 200, purchased after 1612. If this nest was obtained in England they did not belong to Samuel Jordan, who came to Virginia in 1610; however, they might have belonged to William Farrar, who arrived in 1618 and married Cecily after Samuel's death in 1623.\textsuperscript{16}

What was the function of these jettons in Virginia? For at least thirty years (Harrington,1962:21) it has been suggested that jettons were used in trade with the Native Americans. As Harrington (1962:21) notes; "They would have been ideal as trade goods, being both attractive and cheap." Numerous examples have been found punched with holes, presumably for wearing as a necklace. Unfortunately, as with other items clearly documented as trade goods, there is very little supporting archaeological evidence. If the Jordan's Journey jettons were intended as trade goods, we must ask why they ended up in Colonial trash deposits at the site. While copper was very highly valued by Native Americans at Contact, there is some evidence that its value dropped quickly. Early trade included copper trinkets, but soon whole brass kettles were being traded. Perhaps by 1618 - if that is when these jettons arrived - the Indian trade had already been transformed to one based mainly on cloth, tools, and firearms, rather than trinkets of glass and copper.

\textsuperscript{16} There may have been more than one nest of jettons at Jordan's Journey. Long before any excavations had begun, this site had become known to local relic hunters, as well as to archaeologists, as "the jetton site", due to the large (but unknown) number collected from the surface. In addition, during VCU's study of the site, a few jettons were collected from surface or plowzone contexts, and these are not included in the total of 178 jettons discussed here.
It is almost certain that jettons were traded with the Native Americans. However, it is a mistake to consign all jettons to the Native American trade, ignoring their centuries-old function. Merchants in Europe were not the only people who needed to do mathematical calculations, and a planter immigrating to Virginia could have easily packed a nest and a reckoning cloth. The people who settled the plantations along the James had tens of thousands of pounds of tobacco to be counted, and there were certainly people in the colony who knew how to use a counting board.

Jettons, like all artifacts, raise more questions than they answer. Were they trade goods or goods for conducting trade? What types of sites contain jettons? Are they found in indentured servants quarters? Are they found only with tenants or on high status sites? Do they say something about education levels? Do they speak of English dreams and ambitions carried to Virginia? Are the 178 jettons evidence that Jordan's Journey functioned - or was intended to function - as a mercantile center? Or do these jettons simply prove that Cecily Jordan or William Farrar enjoyed a good game of cards?

Carpentry and Agricultural Tools

Arms and Armor

Paleoecological and Paleoethnobiological Remains
IV. Discussion

1. The 17th Century Component

Discuss settlement layout, make comparisons with other sites and with European settlements, eg., Ireland

2. The Prehistoric and Protohistoric Components

Discuss settlement internal pattern and compare to historic accounts of other site as well as recent excavations, e.g., Governor's Land.
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Appendix 3: Other Miscellaneous Features

F-31 174N 396E
Historic. Square post hole of circa 1.0' with mold of 0.65' and a possible repair mold of 0.4'. It was left in bisection.

F-40 183N 394E
Historic. Post hole 1.6' wide, 0.8' deep, with a mold of 0.6'. It was left in bisection.

F-94 205N 364E
Historic. Post hole of 1.75' wide and 0.36' deep with mold of 0.44'. The western bisection was removed.

F-120 212N 396E
Historic. Post hole 1.3' in diameter and 0.5' deep with 0.75' diameter mold. The feature lies between Structure 20 and Structure 21. The western bisection was removed.

F-126 219N 378E
Historic. Post hole 0.75' in diameter and 0.7' deep. The feature is possibly part of fence or shed between Structure 1 and Structure 21. The western bisection was removed.

F-130 214N 391E
Unknown. Post hole 1.9' in diameter and 0.80 deep with a "mold" of 0.4' in diameter. The "mold" appears to actually be taproot. The western bisection was removed.

F-221 222N 378E
Historic. Post hole 0.7' in diameter and 0.55 deep. The feature is possibly part of fence or shed between Structure 1 and Structure 21. The feature was fully excavated.

F-222 200N 350E block
Unknown. Post mold 0.34' in diameter and 0.38' deep. Exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on the map. The feature was fully excavated.

F-240 184N 380E
Historic. Post hole 0.75' in diameter and 0.65' deep. The feature is possibly associated with Structure 21 or Structure 20. The western bisection was removed.

F-248 188N 364E
Unknown. Post mold ca. 0.3' in diameter. The feature could belong to either the 17th century palisade or the 18th or 19th century fenceline. It was left in bisection.

F-285 may be at 225N 285E
Historic. Post hole 2.2' in diameter and 2.0' deep with mold of 0.75'. The post replaced and the second hole is slightly deeper than the first. Exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on the map. This feature may be located at 225N 285E. The western bisection was removed.

F-293 200N 400E block
Unknown. "Appeared to be rectangular at surface but was found to be shallow and amorphous. Declared a disturbance." Exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on the map. This feature was probably a Luccketti test pit.

F-294 237N 401E
Historic. Post hole 1.0' in diameter and 0.9' deep with a mold of 0.6'. The feature could belong to either the 17th century palisade or the 18th or 19th century fenceline. It was left in bisection.

F-296 200N 400E block
Unknown. Post mold 0.5' in diameter and 0.35' deep. Exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on the map. The western bisection was removed.

F-301 242N 404E
Historic. The feature appears to be a post or pier hole, 1.2' in diameter and 0.2' deep. No separate mold was discerned. A single wrought nail was recovered, and the feature was left in bisection.

F-303 150N 350E block
Historic. Post hole 2.0' in diameter and 0.5' deep with a mold of 0.58'. Exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on the map. It was left in bisection.

F-316 215N 327E
Historic. Post hole 0.9' in diameter and 0.75' deep with a mold of 0.4'. Some of the post is still surviving. The feature is part of the 18th or 19th century fenceline accidently cutting into southeastern corner post F-317 of Structure 5. The feature was fully excavated.

F-319 300N 200E block
Unknown. The paperwork is not on file, exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on the map.

F-328 209N 311E
Historic. Soil stain circa 0.75' square. The paperwork is not on file.

F-329 Unknown
Historic. The paperwork is not on file. The feature catalog lists "post hole with intact post". This feature is probably part of the 18th or 19th century fence.

F-337 150N 350E block
Historic. Listed as "post mold and hole isolated from any known structure". Exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on the map. The eastern bisection was removed.

F-341 200N 300E
Historic. Post hole 1.95' in diameter and 1.65' deep with a mold of 0.5'. Exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on the map. It was left in bisection.

F-368 221N 351E
Historic. Post hole 1.25' in diameter and 0.95' deep with a wooden post 0.3' in diameter. The feature is a part of the 18th or 19th century fenceline and cuts into the northeastern corner post of Structure 4. The western bisection was removed.

F-382 160N 323E
Historic. Square post mold 0.36' in diameter and 0.28' deep. No hole was seen around the feature, it appears to be a puncheon of unknown function and association. The feature was fully excavated.

F-403 250N 350E block
Historic. The paperwork is not on file. Exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on the map. This feature may be an undefined stain in the southern end of Structure 10. It was not excavated.

F-432
Unknown. "Large probable post hole near Kelso's old excavations." The paperwork is not on file.

F-440 218N 340E
Historic. Post hole circa 1.12' square with a surviving wooden post. This feature cuts into cellar F-320 and is part of the 18th or 19th century fenceline. The feature was fully excavated.

F-478 170N 346E
Tree root mold.

F-488 207N 348E
Rodent disturbance.

F-498
This feature number has been reassigned to F-474.

F-504 372N 367E
Tree root mold.

F-508 "203N 213E"
Unknown. "Post hole and mold, undetermined prehistoric." Dimensions are 0.7' north-south and 0.55 east-west with a depth of 0.9'. Exact provenience was not recorded and the feature was not labeled on the map. The southern bisection was removed.

F-509 218N 243E
Unknown. Amorphous pit 4.7' north-south and 2.39' east-west with a depth of 1.2'. The feature is believed to be a tree fall. It was left in bisection.
F-510  322N 333E
Unknown. Oblong stain 9’ north-south and 7’ east-west. The feature is believed to be a tree fall. It was left in bisection.