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Part I

Introduction

This report describes the work undertaken by a group of researchers exploring the nature of domestic life in the colonial Chesapeake as revealed through the archaeological record. The project, “A Comparative Archaeological Study of Colonial Chesapeake Culture,” represents a collaborative effort on the part of a number of institutions in Maryland and Virginia to examine the materiality of domestic life as it changed over the course of nearly two centuries. With support from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Maryland Historical Trust, and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, project participants had as their primary goal the consideration of three broad issues concerning early Chesapeake society, including:

- The organization of plantation labor and the rise of slavery;
- Intercultural contact and relations;
- Living standards and the consumer revolution.

We were especially interested in documenting and interpreting temporal and geographical variability in the context of these topical issues. We approached these topics by assembling collections catalogs from 18 archaeological sites from Maryland and Virginia that had been professionally excavated, many with public funds of one sort or another. This report describes the work, our results, and future directions for the project. Materials found in this report and more can be found on the web page developed for this project at [www.chesapeakearchaeology.org](http://www.chesapeakearchaeology.org).

The Chesapeake region, consisting primarily of Tidewater Maryland and Virginia, was the first area of intensive English settlement in North America. After several ill-fated attempts in what is now North Carolina, English colonists established a permanent settlement at Jamestown, Virginia in 1607. In part because of the early date of its settlement, the colonial Chesapeake has been the focus of sustained scholarly and popular interest for much of the 20th century. Archaeological research began at Jamestown, St. Mary’s City, and Williamsburg in the first half of the 20th century, with programs continuing at all three sites today (Kelso and Straube 2000; Miller 1983; Brown and Samford 1994; Hudgins 1993). In the 1970s, archaeologists expanded their research to include sites outside the colonial capitals, with much of this work undertaken in response to the region’s land development pressures. As a result, an extraordinary amount of material has been unearthed in the ensuing decades, but a lack of institutional coordination had generally kept the full research potential of this material from being realized. The present project provided resources for that coordination and constitutes one of the first collaborative projects of its kind in the region.

Colonial Chesapeake society formed through the ongoing encounters and interactions of a diverse number of groups of varying ethnic and cultural backgrounds. At contact, Native American tribes were competing with one another for autonomy and even dominance, and the arrival of the English complicated and altered these inter-tribal political relationships. As the English struggled to establish colonial hold, they came with their own varying social backgrounds and soon brought men and women of African ancestry to the Chesapeake. In this setting, Old World understandings of social and cultural difference were de-stabilized and transformed, giving rise to a variety of new cultural forms. By taking a broad comparative approach, we have attempted to describe a landscape that represents the diversity of contacts and the implications these contacts have had for shaping new understandings about social and cultural difference.
We chose the plantation as our primary unit of study because the overwhelming majority of immigrants to the Chesapeake lived on tobacco plantations. English and African colonists, regardless of their economic or legal status, usually found themselves members of plantation households throughout the colonial period. Often, Indian neighbors visited these places to trade, work, or socialize with the residents. We also examine two households occupied by local Indians and located on lands reserved for their use. These findings will enhance future interpretations of plantation sites as well as those found in the relatively urban enclaves of Jamestown, St. Mary’s City, Williamsburg, and Annapolis, where long-term programs have been investigating these settlements (Horning 1995; Kelso 1995, 1996; Kelso and Straube 2000; Kelso, Luccketti, and Straube 1997, 1998, 1999; Miller 1983, 1988; Brown and Samford 1994).

This project is the first step in initiating and then sustaining detailed comparative work in this region of the Atlantic world, accomplishing this in large part by producing and making comparable data sets more easily available. We recognize that this project is by no means the first attempt at comparative study of the Chesapeake. One of our co-authors, Dennis Pogue (1993), has previously examined English standards of living in Maryland and Virginia, and he has also compared tobacco pipe assemblages recovered from sites in southern Maryland (Pogue 1991). Al Luckenbach and his colleagues (Luckenbach, Cox, and Kille 2002) at the Lost Towns Project have similarly compared tobacco pipe assemblages from sites in Anne Arundel County. Henry Miller (1988b) has examined the diet of the English colonists in comparative perspective using faunal assemblages. Cary Carson and his colleagues (Carson et al 1981) produced a comprehensive and comparative study of 17th-century earthfast Chesapeake architecture, linking its impermanence to the relentless demands of the tobacco economy. Anne Yentsch (1991) has compared Chesapeake ceramic assemblages, while Susan L. Henry (1979) and Matthew Emerson (1988) have studied red clay pipe assemblages. There are also the collections of articles concerning the archaeology of 17th- and 18th-century Virginia published by the Archaeological Society of Virginia (Reinhart 1996; Reinhart and Pogue 1993), where themes such as fortifications, house patterns, consumer goods and the standard of living, and the life styles of various ethnic groups are discussed. Lastly, the Digital Archaeological Archive of Comparative Slavery (http://www.daacs.org/), or DAACS, is a powerful and useful web-based research tool that pools the artifact and context information from archaeological sites in the Chesapeake once occupied by slaves; while many of the sites found in DAACS were occupied after the colonial period had come to an end, those that were occupied during the 17th and 18th centuries are revealing slave lifeways in the region.

Our project builds on this earlier work, becoming the first multi-institutional collaborative project that attempts to compare more than one or two material types or classes from a number of sites. In so doing, we build on the earlier findings and gain a deeper understanding of the behavioral patterns and relationships of all inhabitants of the Colonial Chesapeake.

Historical Background

The 1607 arrival of the English occurred at a pivotal point in the political development of Native American society in the Chesapeake as the Powhatan chiefdom emerged as an important force. With contact, two very different worlds collided, and conflict, negotiation, and cooperation all came to characterize encounters between the invading colonists and the Indians. Early interactions tended to be more violent than in later years, even as the English were dependent on Indian corn and other supplies for survival. By mid-century, however, the colonists had gained the upper hand, albeit at tremendous cost to both societies (Fausz 1988; Gleach 1997; Rountree 1993). In Maryland, Lord Baltimore avoided some of this cost by adopting a policy of
accommodation. Maryland’s Indians accepted Baltimore’s demand of tributary status and used it – and the colonists’ need for allies and corn – to preserve their way of life well into the late 17th century (Merrell 1979; Jennings 1982).

As the English and their Indian neighbors worked out new understandings of one another, the colonists focused their attention on exploiting the region’s resources. During the first half of the 17th century, the settlers participated in the lucrative fur trade as they took stock of the Chesapeake environment. The colonists also began supplying a seemingly insatiable European appetite for tobacco and, by Maryland’s founding in 1634, annual exports of tobacco amounted to nearly three million pounds. The sot-weed emerged as the foundation of the Chesapeake economy, and the plantation system that developed to support its production would persist well into the 19th century. Even today, the legacy of nearly four centuries of tobacco cultivation remains etched in the region’s landscape (Main 1982; Kulikoff 1986).

For most if not all of the 17th century, English population growth along the tobacco coast was sustained through immigration. Men and women from different parts of England and from different stations in life came to the Chesapeake in search of greater economic opportunity. The overwhelming majority of immigrants were bound laborers, put to work either in the fields growing tobacco or in plantation households as domestic servants. Men outnumbered women and morbidity and mortality were high: if a newly arrived male survived his initial period of “seasoning,” he had a life expectancy of 40 to 45 years. Women (especially pregnant women) and children were similarly at risk. These factors – the predominance of servitude, unbalanced sex ratios, and short life expectancy – imposed limitations on the formation of traditional households in the Chesapeake. Only in the very late 17th and early 18th centuries did a predominantly native born European population begin to emerge in the region (Earle 1979; Horn 1979, 1994; Tate and Ammerman 1979; Carr et al 1991; Rutman and Rutman 1984).

By the late 17th and early 18th centuries, the native population was declining and English immigration was slowing. Beginning in the late 1670s, the price of tobacco fell so steeply that the region’s economy was thrown into a severe and prolonged depression. Tobacco production continued to demand land and labor, however, and during this period, planters made the crucial transition from white servitude to black slavery. Inhabitants of African ancestry, a small minority through most of the 17th century, dramatically increased in number and, by the mid-18th century, exceeded the English population in many localities. The reasons for this conversion to slavery and its economic and social consequences remain a subject of lively debate among colonial historians (Jordan 1968; Sobel 1987; Vaughan 1989; Davis 1997; Breen and Innes 1980; Berlin 1998).

To accommodate the varied backgrounds of the newly arrived inhabitants, the continued presence of Indians, and the harsh realities of frontier life in Maryland and Virginia, old rules were continuously modified and new ones developed. These rules attempted to establish boundaries and define appropriate behavior between planters and laborers, between men and women, and between adults and children. English efforts at replicating their culture were complicated, however, by ongoing interaction with local Indians and with the growing number of people of African origin, interactions requiring a whole new set of rules. Continued encounters between such disparate cultural groups ultimately transformed Old World understandings of social and cultural difference and, in turn, gave rise to a variety of new cultural forms. All of these social negotiations undoubtedly occurred in any number of places, but for many people, the plantation and its household became the most important setting for such encounters (Hudgins 1984; Mouer 1993).
Until recently, the images produced by most historical and archaeological scholarship have tended to represent 17th-century Chesapeake landscapes as populated predominantly if not exclusively by English men and women. These representations suggest little interaction among English settlers, Indians, and Africans (cf. Horn 1994; Carr et al 1991). When researchers have investigated 17th-century Native American culture, more often than not they have located Indians in spaces mostly unoccupied by the English (cf. Fausz 1988; McCartney 1985; Merrell 1979; Potter 1993; Rountree and Davidson 1997). While it is true that both groups used territory and geography to define their place in the emerging colonial world, Indians and Europeans often encountered one another in plantation contexts (Mouer 1993).

Africans were present in the region almost from the beginning of English settlement, but because they were so few in number, little is known about the circumstances in which they lived. Contemporary accounts suggest that Englishmen found Africans strange and unsettling and, though the latter may have constituted a minority throughout most of the 17th century, both the Virginia and Maryland assemblies passed laws defining their place in colonial society (Jordan 1968; Walsh 1997). To understand the rise of race-based slavery in the Chesapeake by the early 18th century, the experiences and encounters of Africans and Europeans in the 17th century must be explored. Indeed, there is a great need for a study of colonial Chesapeake society that returns English, Indians, and Africans to a shared landscape.

The Archaeological Study of Domestic Life

The archaeological study of colonial households has a relatively long history in the Chesapeake, beginning at St. Mary’s City in the late 1970s. Archaeologists examining spatial distributions of architecture and artifacts at several sites in Maryland’s first capital found that, for much of the 17th century, planters, their families, and their (usually European) laborers worked and lived together in shared spaces on plantations. A similar use of space was documented at the Clifts plantation site in Westmoreland County, Virginia. By the end of the 17th century, however, as the switch from servitude to slavery was underway, the growing population of strange new laborers was increasingly housed in separate quarters, often at some remove from the planter’s dwelling. As planters spatially segregated themselves from their laborers, they were in effect reifying the growing social distance they perceived between themselves and their bondsmen. At the same time, rooms within planters’ dwellings were becoming more formalized and specialized in use, relegating slaves to spaces where they were rendered invisible—at least to English eyes. The slaves in turn were able to manipulate space in ways that significantly enhanced their mobility within the plantation landscape, carving out spaces they could control (Keeler 1978; King and Miller 1987; King 1988, 1990; Neiman 1986, 1993; Pogue 1997; Upton 1985).

More recently, archaeologist Matthew Emerson (1988, 1999) has attempted to locate Africans in the archaeological record by identifying specific artifacts believed to have been made by these men and women. Emerson suggests Africans were responsible for the production of many if not all of the local tobacco pipes often found at 17th-century archaeological sites. Similarly, Anne Yentsch (1994) has concluded that glass beads recovered from the Calvert site in Annapolis indicate that slaves working there in the 18th century were able to retain traditional African patterns of adornment. On the other hand, Emerson and Yentsch, as well as other archaeologists, acknowledge that linking ethnicity to artifacts is a complicated and tricky business (Mouer et al 1999; Perry and Paynter 1999).

Fraser Neiman argues that, at least for local pipes, perhaps a more important question is not who made these objects, but rather who used them. Neiman suggests that local pipes were
smoked predominantly by servants, and the analysis of their spatial distribution may suggest how labor was organized on early plantations (Neiman and King 1999). Other studies, however, complicate this interpretation. For example, locally-produced pipes are found at nearly every 17th-century site excavated in the Patuxent River drainage, comprising one to four percent of each site’s total pipe assemblage. At one site, Patuxent Point, however, local pipes account for nearly 14 percent of the pipe total and are concentrated in an area that may not have been a locus of servant activity. Bound laborers are known to have resided at all of the Patuxent River sites, so the smaller proportions of local pipes at each site do not necessarily reflect the absence of servants. The strikingly higher percentage of local pipes at Patuxent Point demands explanation, suggesting that the residents of that site had differential access to these objects, and likely a form of social interaction different than what was common elsewhere (King and Chaney 2004).

The distribution of colono-ware bowls at the same Patuxent River sites presents additional problems for consideration. Fragments of these hand-built, unglazed ceramics are usually found in association with food preparation contexts, such as milk houses or in fireplace refuse. Occasionally, colono-ware fragments are also found in association with servant’s quarters. Planters’ wives and their servants were the people who used these vessels in their household work, and their distributions do not coincide with those of local tobacco pipes. These subtleties indicate that variation linked to class and gender, and probably other categories, is recoverable from the archaeological record (Henry 1980; Noel Hume 1962; Veech 1997).

All of these archaeological findings come from a very limited number of sites which, most researchers acknowledge, are skewed toward the wealthy. Such limitations are due in large part to the labor and time intensive nature of archaeological data recovery. A single site often requires months if not years of professional study. As a result, one or two sites have come to ‘stand for’ an entire region. With the investigation of more and more sites, however, archaeologists are recognizing that considerable variability characterized Chesapeake plantation settlements and the archaeological assemblages these settlements left behind. Most of the sites upon which the findings from St. Mary’s City are based, for example, represent village rather than plantation households (Miller 1988), and it is likely that social interactions and relationships in village or town settings differed from those found on plantation sites. There is also growing evidence that intra-regional variability linked to the production of sweet-scented or oronoco tobacco can be found between plantation sites in Maryland and Virginia (cf. Walsh 1999).

After nearly three decades of archaeological research, collections representing archaeological sites from all time periods and localities throughout the region are now available for comparative study. These include materials recovered from sites occupied by servants and tenants as well as by middling and elite households, and sites occupied by English, Africans, and Indians. Curated by a range of organizations and institutions in Maryland and Virginia, many of these collections are publicly accessible, but most organizations lack the resources or mission to undertake large scale, integrated, comparative study. For this project, NEH support provided an overarching framework and support staff by which we examined these collections to test current interpretations of material life in the Chesapeake and develop new ones. Through comparative study, we consider how the men and women who made up this emerging new society – English, African, and Indian – used material culture to define and shape their relationships with one another.

Methods

A primary purpose of this project was to begin a detailed comparison of the material conditions of life in the colonial period, especially the use of domestic space, as revealed by the
archaeological record. We began by choosing domestic sites associated with plantations that together represented the span of the colonial period, from about 1620 until about 1750, and that provided geographical coverage, from the James River in Virginia to the Severn River in Maryland. In addition, we selected sites that had been fairly extensively tested, including not just features but plowed midden deposits as well. Eighteen sites were identified that met these criteria and that were publicly available for study; the locations of these sites are shown in Figure 1 and their temporal relationships are depicted in Figure 2.

![Figure 1. Location of archaeological sites used in the study.](image)

We then began assembling the artifact catalogs for these 18 sites. Many of these catalogs existed in electronic form, while a few were available only on paper. Further, while the

---

1 Paper catalogs only were available for Jordan's Journey (44PG302), Camden (44CE3), and Cliffs Plantation (44WM33). Further, the Camden collection, while largely intact, has nonetheless had some of its materials (i.e., lithics) de-accessioned and some material loaned or donated to other institutions (including the Virginia Historical Society and the Pamunkey Indian Museum).
assemblages from these sites met certain criteria, the excavation programs used at each of the 18 sites varied, sometimes dramatically. In some cases, projects had to be completed within several months, while others represent longer-term programs. Further, once excavated, the assemblages included here were processed and catalogued at a variety of highly respected institutions, each with its own rules and procedures for organizing archaeological data. For the most part, we have accepted these original catalogs and performed no additional checking of the artifacts themselves.

![Temporal distribution of archaeological sites used in this study.](image)

Figure 2. Temporal distribution of archaeological sites used in this study.

Such an approach is not without problems. For example, we found that the level of detail captured in the electronic and paper catalogs varied among institutions. Terminology also varies. Some catalogs contained obvious—and therefore correctable—errors. Errors less evident, such as typographical ones (keying “0” when “9” was intended, for example), may not have been caught in the process of assembling these databases. The structure of the electronic databases, when they were available, also differed from institution to institution. We made some effort to standardize structure in order to enhance comparability, but the final versions of the individual site databases are not fully equivalent. To have made them so—by forcing them into a uniform template—would have risked the loss of potentially valuable information from certain collections. These databases have been made publicly available as part of the project, and our colleagues are strongly encouraged to peruse downloaded individual databases before subjecting them to additional analyses.

One of the important objectives of the project was to address the substantive issues posed at the beginning of this report through a spatial lens. We were interested not only in the types and quantities of artifacts from each site, but where at the site the materials were used and eventually discarded. We wanted to know which artifacts were closely associated, which were not, and how
these materials related to architecture and other yard features at these sites. From these associations, we hoped to infer various types of activities taking place on these plantation homelots, where they were occurring, who was involved, and any changes through time and across geographical space that might indicate changes in the economic or social interactions of plantation residents and their visitors. In search of this information, we selected, for the most part, sites for which a large and reliable sample of the plow zone had been collected. By “large and reliable,” we mean plow zone units ranging in size from no less than 2.5-by-2.5-feet to 5-by-5-feet (or 1-by-1-meter to 2-by-2-meters) with the soil screened through ¼-inch mesh. Ideally, plow zone units were relatively closely spaced, with no more than 25 or 30 feet separating the center points of nearby units. These conditions were met for most of the sites used in this study; we elected to use some assemblages for which the plow zone sample was less than ideal in order to achieve geographical and/or chronological coverage.

Artifact distribution maps are useful for presenting visual representations of selected types of materials recovered from these archaeological sites, including their quantities and spatial locations. For this project, most of the distribution maps we produced represent materials recovered from plow zone contexts. In a few cases, spatial distributions of materials recovered from feature contexts were also generated to augment the plow zone evidence. The maps we produced were generated using the SURFER mapping program available from Golden Software, Inc.; however, the methods we used to construct each map are not unique to SURFER. First, it is important to remember that these distribution maps represent density projections based on a set of sampled evidence. The reliability of each map is only as good as the underlying data on which it is based. The SURFER distribution maps we generated represent information contained in specific data points (or excavation units, see below)—the greater the spacing between data points (or excavation units), the less reliable the projected density representation. In addition, studies have shown that systematically-collected data rather than data collected from ‘critical points’ (i.e., areas of high or low concentration) or from randomly sampled points yield more reliable results.

In our maps, data points represent the center point of excavation units. For example, a 5-by-5-foot excavation unit with grid coordinates of N100-N105/E200-205 would have its data point represented as N102.5/E202.5 (center point of the unit). All materials recovered from that particular 5-by-5-foot unit would be assigned to that data point. Not all projects used 5-by-5-foot units, however; some projects used 2.5-by-2.5-foot or 1-by-1-meter units. In a very few cases, excavation units used at the same site varied in size, so we standardized units by using multipliers. For example, at the Sandys site (44JC802), excavators used both 2.5-by-2.5-foot and 5-by-5-foot units. To standardize counts, then, we multiplied quantities of material recovered from 2.5-by-2.5-foot units by 4 (alternatively, we could have divided materials from 5-by-5-foot units by 4). While not a perfect measure, this method allowed data point values to be standardized and therefore more reliably comparable. Finally, at one site, Carter’s Grove 8 (44JC647), many of the materials recovered from the plow zone had been piece-plotted. These materials were handled in our project by creating a grid for the site and aggregating materials by squares superimposed on the site plan.

---

2 The plow zone from one site, King’s Reach (18CV83), was screened through 3/8-inch mesh. Excavators at King’s Reach chose to use the screen size used in archaeological investigations at Historic St. Mary’s City. All other sites had their plow zone soils screened through ¼-inch mesh. At Posey, a cubic foot sample of the plow zone from each unit was screened through window mesh to enhance recovery of small artifacts, such as shell and glass beads.
Next, interval levels were calculated for each map. In other words, what levels of artifact concentration should the maps show? First, the total number of the particular artifact type or class being mapped was calculated. For example, for a map of the distribution of tin-glazed earthenware, we calculated the total number of fragments in the map’s database, along with the mean and standard deviation. These are common statistics and can be easily reproduced by researchers evaluating our data or generating new maps. We believe that these statistics are better than simply “eyeballing” interval levels. Indeed, we have found that using an eyeball method can be difficult to reproduce for the same researcher, let alone others. Interval levels were then calculated by distance from the mean using $\frac{1}{2}$ standard deviation.

For categories of artifacts with small total numbers, we generated maps that showed the location of each object or object fragment. While the small total number may preclude further statistical analysis, the spatial distributions of these materials are still relevant to the questions we posed in this project and are valuable for comparing distributions between sites.

Dozens of maps were generated for each archaeological site. These maps generally included total domestic artifacts, total architectural artifacts, total ceramics, ceramics by type, ceramics by form, total tobacco pipes, white pipes by stem bore diameter, terra cotta pipes, bottle glass, table glass, shell, bone, nails, brick, window glass, and many more artifact types and classes. Of course, if a particular type or class of artifact was not recovered from a site, no map of that type was prepared. Further, while we produced dozens of maps, many more could be generated if a researcher desired using the data sets available on the project’s web page (www.chesapeakearchaeology.org).

Midden Analysis

At most domestic sites in the colonial Chesapeake, refuse was often deposited in yard areas adjacent to doors and windows, and activities conducted in the nearby spaces can often be inferred from materials recovered from the associated middens (cf. King and Miller 1987). This pattern of refuse disposal is clearly evident at the 18 sites used in this study, and we developed a standard method for identifying and then analyzing middens at these sites. This analysis took into account that most sites in the Chesapeake have been subjected to post-occupational agricultural plowing at one time or another, undeniably damaging the archaeological integrity of midden deposits. Nonetheless, the horizontal relationships of materials found in midden deposits are only minimally disturbed, suggesting that information on the use of space within these plantation household sites is recoverable from plow-disturbed midden deposits.

After artifact distribution maps were prepared for each site, we visually compared maps from the same site to identify midden areas. Overlapping concentrations of ceramics, tobacco pipes, glass, and animal bone indicated a potential refuse midden or area where refuse was consistently deposited. Once midden areas were visually identified, plow zone excavation units from within those areas were pulled and aggregated. In some cases, especially at sites occupied for long periods of time, midden areas were difficult to identify. In those cases, sections of yards (i.e., north yard, south yard) have been isolated and analyzed. Although the types and groups of artifacts selected for comparison varied from site to site, in general, the following categories of artifacts were first compared:

Total Domestic Artifacts: This category generally includes white clay tobacco pipes, red clay tobacco pipes, ceramics, case and wine bottle glass, and animal bone, and can provide evidence about the location of consistent refuse disposal at the site. In some cases, Total Domestic Artifacts was calculated with and without animal bone, especially if a site’s plow zone
sample was less reliable and most of the evidence for that site came from better preserved feature deposits (such as at Jordan’s Point). Since bone preserves better in feature contexts than in the plow zone, this adjustment allowed us to provide a check when comparing sites with and without plow zone evidence.

Ceramics: Both temporal and functional information are available from ceramics. Ceramics have been organized by type and, when possible, by vessel form. Vessel form distributions represent sherd counts of a particular vessel shape and not individual vessels. For example, two colander sherds would be counted as two colander sherds, even if those sherds represent one vessel. Again, this is not a perfect measure, but reconstructing vessels from plow zone artifacts is difficult, given the damage done to sherds in the plowing process. It may also be difficult if not impossible to determine if two colander sherds are or are not from the same vessel. If a midden yields mostly colander, milk pan, and butter pot sherds, however, this information can be used to argue that a particular deposit derived from the activities of dairying and food processing. Individual vessel data was not available from all sites.

Pipe Stem Bore Diameters: Stem bore diameters of white clay tobacco pipes provide useful chronological information, especially with regard to changing patterns of refuse disposal at a site. The method is not perfect, as it tends to be less reliable for pipe assemblages pre-dating 1660 or those less than 100 stems in number. Nonetheless, the method is important for establishing basic chronological relationships in many cases.

For comparative purposes, raw counts of various material types were converted to percentages; a chi-square test was used to measure strengths of variation and association.

In some cases, such as at Jordan’s Point, the analysis of plowed midden deposits was not attempted because the available data are not sufficiently robust to produce reliable interpretations. In that case, and in a few other instances, materials recovered from spatially distinct feature contexts were compared in an effort to explore intrasite spatial structure.

Only a portion of the maps and charts generated for this project are reproduced in this report. All of the maps and charts are, however, available by site on our project web page (www.chesapeakearchaeology.org).

An Archaeological Narrative

The questions posed in the original grant proposal and at the beginning of this report are broad in scope, but the information for addressing these questions comes from archaeological sites representing plantation households occupied by individual men and women – not social categories. Within these households, individuals made choices or decisions shaped by class, ethnicity, gender, legal status, and religious confession in the context of a colonial situation. The individuals who occupied these sites, many of whom remain unidentified and unnamed, are critically important for documenting the actions, practices, behaviors, and relationships within these households, and, from these individual actions, we may begin to abstract the larger social and historical processes relevant to our questions. In this section, we present an archaeological narrative that provides a brief introduction and biography of each site and how those findings serve to build the context for interpreting the other sites in this study. This narrative is presented chronologically, and should serve to illustrate the diverse nature of the plantation settlements found over the course of nearly two centuries in Maryland and Virginia.
The Earliest Settlements, 1620-1660

The earliest site included in this study was the settlement located at Jordan’s Point, approximately 35 miles north of Jamestown on the south side of the James River at its confluence with the Appomattox River. The property was previously occupied by Weyanoke Indians, one of the groups that formed the Powhatan chiefdom, but the site’s excavators believe that these Indians had abandoned the site by the time Samuel Jordan, his family, and their servants arrived about 1620. Jordan and his family were definitely at Jordan’s Point when Opechancanough led his devastating attack against the English settlers in March 1622. The Jordans survived – the fortified settlement at Jordan’s Point either was not attacked or proved sufficiently protective – but Jordan (who had come to Virginia in 1610) was dead of other causes by 1623. His wife, Cicely, remained at Jordan’s Point, eventually marrying her neighbor, William Farrar, who had relocated to Jordan’s Point after his own property had been attacked in 1622 (Mouer et al 1992; McCartney 1988).³

The muster of inhabitants living at Jordan’s Point in early 1625 suggests that the Jordan-Farrar household was one of several scattered throughout the area, a pattern of settlement also reflected in the number and distribution of early 17th-century sites found in the vicinity. The site complex excavated by Virginia Commonwealth University and the one used in this project, 44PG302, was probably the Jordan-Farrar household. A fortified compound was uncovered at 44PG302, enclosing at least five buildings that appear to have served as dwellings (Figure 3). Five “houses” were listed for the Jordan-Farrar household in the 1625 muster, and these houses would have sheltered William Farrar, Cicely Jordan, Jordan’s two daughters, a third female child, and ten male servants ranging in age from 16 to 35. Some of these buildings were relatively large by early 17th-century standards, with as many as three rooms in up to 880 square feet per structure, but their construction was what architectural historians would describe as impermanent, with principal posts and other framing supports placed directly in the ground at the mercy of wood-devouring insects and wood-damaging cycles of freezing and thawing. Other buildings include domestic or agricultural service structures. The compound was fortified early in the site’s occupation if not at the beginning,⁴ with access in and out in two places: on the east side through what the excavators have described as a gate house and on the west side by a doorway in the palisade’s west wall.

The fortification found enclosing the Jordan-Farrar household complex is not unusual for this time. Wooden fortifications have been found at a number of other contemporary sites, including Jamestown, Wolstenholme Town at Martin’s Hundred, and Flowerdew Hundred. A number of researchers, including the Jordan’s Point excavators, have pointed out the similarities between these Virginia fortifications and similar enclosures erected in Ulster, a 17th-century English settlement in Ireland (Hodges 1992; Mouer et al 1992:50; Noël Hume 1982). Mouer et al (1992:51-52) note how historically documented households living nearby but outside the enclosed Jordan-Farrar compound (and for which archaeological evidence exists) replicates the Irish pattern, and Jordan and later William Farrar might have viewed themselves as “minor barons,” providing a safe, fortified haven in times of attack or other uncertainty.

When the 1625 muster was taken, the Jordan-Farrar household appears to have been well-provisioned with 200 bushels of corn, 200 pounds of fish, 16 cows, and 20 chickens. The household was also well-armed with powder, shot, “fixt pieces,” and “coats of male.” The

³ Ten people at Farrar’s dwelling on the Appomattox were reported to have been slain in the 1622 attack.
⁴ Only six post hole features associated with the compound’s palisade were excavated and only one contained any European artifacts (a pipe bowl fragment).
Jordan-Farrar household was better supplied than most neighboring households, although this is not especially surprising given Cicely Jordan’s and William Farrar’s social and economic standing in the colony. William Farrar was respected in early Virginia for his leadership qualities, having been appointed in March 1626 to the Governor’s Council. He also served as a commissioner “for the Upper Parts kept above Persie’s Hundred,” where he made decisions to

Figure 3. Plan view of structures and other features at Jordan’s Point.
hold local court sessions at Jordan’s Point. As a wealthy and free widow, Cicely Jordan enjoyed her own power, attracting at least two suitors (Farrar and a local Anglican minister) who could offer her additional economic and social resources. Indeed, the minister sued Jordan to force her to honor what he thought was her promise to marry him. Jordan instead married Farrar, and only after Farrar and she had been sharing the same settlement for a year or two. That Jordan and Farrar were able to push the boundaries of early 17th-century English senses of propriety suggests the standing the couple enjoyed in frontier Virginia, as well as the reality of establishing English customs in early Virginia (McCartney 1988).

The artifact assemblage recovered from Jordan’s Point is exceptional. Unfortunately, however, only a rapidly collected sample of the site’s surface was made before the plow zone was mechanically stripped, so it is difficult to make statements about the structure and use of space at the settlement. Indeed, the nature of these surface materials provides a striking contrast with the materials recovered from feature contexts. Table 1, which presents a summary list of the artifacts from the field’s surface, reveals that the overwhelming majority of materials appear to be associated with the earlier Weyanoke Indian occupation, including stone tools and flakes and ceramics (fire-cracked rock was also recovered in large quantity). Because the site had probably been abandoned by the time Jordan arrived, the majority of the Native American-manufactured materials are not believed to be directly related to the English occupation. Surface materials associated with the English occupation include early 17th-century ceramics, white and red clay tobacco pipes, and colonial bottle glass. These materials, however, do not match the diversity and richness of material recovered from the feature contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>artifact type</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>artifact type</th>
<th>count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>2,679</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Ceramics</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Bone</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>English Flint</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Ceramics</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Brick Fragments</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pipe Fragments</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Pipe Fragments</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wrought Nail</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Materials recovered from surface collection units at Jordan’s Point.

The artifacts recovered from the feature deposits at Jordan’s Point suggest that, although residents lived in relatively large but flimsy and short-lived wooden structures, they graced their tables with Late Ming Chinese porcelain bowls and wine cups and German Westerwald spring-molded stoneware jugs (Mouer et al 1992:117). They consumed tobacco from beautifully crafted Indian tobacco pipes while fortifying their compound from attacks by these same Indians. Thousands of armor fragments, including plate armor, brigandine fragments, and chain mail, as well as gun fragments, gunflints, lead shot, sword parts, and related artifacts suggest the fear that must have existed after Opechancanough’s 1622 attack, although, in the end, most of these

---

5 A total of 786 10-by-10-feet units were surface collected by a ten-person crew over the course of a single day.
materials ended up being discarded. Indeed, some of this armament and weaponry may have been as much about making a statement to other colonists as it was about providing real protection from Indian attack. The artifacts also suggest that in the midst of all this colonial posturing, the everyday domestic activities necessary to the plantation’s success were ongoing, from livestock tending to food processing and preparation.

Exactly which structure(s) the Jordans and later Farrar and the ten male servants occupied is unclear. Structure 4, however, is an especially interesting building (cf. Figure 3). This earthfast building, which served as a dwelling, measured 51-by-16-feet and was constructed early in the site’s occupation. The site’s excavators inferred a passage in the fortified enclosure directly across from Structure 4. Just outside the palisade’s entry was the settlement’s cemetery, consisting of a hodgepodge of burial arrangements scattered along the palisade’s exterior west and north walls. Presumably, this is a portion of the yard the occupants at Jordan’s Point would have wanted some level of regular access to. Individuals entering the enclosure by the cemetery and through this doorway would see two entrances into Structure 4. The first, directly across from the break in the palisade, led into the unheated north room of Structure 4. This room with its cellar was interpreted by Mouer et al (1992) as a buttery. To the right of this service entrance was what appears to be the building’s formal entrance, leading into a small lobby for the reception of visitors before proceeding into rooms on either side of the lobby entrance.

Although Mouer et al (1992) do not consider Structure 4 to be the “manor house” at Jordan’s Point (they give that designation to Structure 1), the materials found in the fill of the northern room’s cellar forced us to reconsider just what function Structure 4 served. The cellar in Structure 4, identified as Feature 320, extended approximately 2.8 feet below subsoil and was completely excavated. Mouer et al (1992) suggest that the cellar stood open for some time after the dismantling of Structure 4, and that eventually what remained of Structure 4 was thrown into the cellar and burned. Strata V-VIII were deposited prior to the burning episode, and Strata I-IV during and after. For this analysis, we are including materials recovered from the pre-burning levels because we believe that these materials were used in or around Structure 4 and represent the material evidence of activities taking place there when the building was occupied (Table 2).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Site Total</th>
<th>Feature 320</th>
<th>Feature 435</th>
<th>FEATURE 409</th>
<th>Feature 430</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Pipe</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Pipe</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Bottle</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTS</td>
<td>N=21,457</td>
<td>N=935</td>
<td>N=2,518</td>
<td>N=2,296</td>
<td>N=2,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armor</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun artifacts</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jettons</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Materials from selected features, Jordan’s Point. Top as percentages; bottom as counts.

---

6 Only a portion of Feature 320 was excavated stratigraphically. Materials from the southwest quadrant—which was excavated as a single level—are not included in this analysis.
We acknowledge problems with using cellar fill to make statements about a building’s function, particularly the fact that the cellar was likely filled after the building had been abandoned and was no longer in use. With this in mind, we nonetheless observed significant differences between the distributions of artifacts recovered from the cellar fill (Feature 320) in Structure 4 and from the fill of other feature deposits (cf. Table 2). Artifacts recovered from the cellar in Structure 4 yielded percentages of white and red clay tobacco pipes and ceramic fragments significantly larger than for the site as a whole. Indeed, the Structure 4 cellar contained more than a third of all the red clay pipe fragments recovered from the site. The cellar also yielded a larger percentage of ceramics than other features, including pieces from a Late Ming porcelain wine cup. And, far greater quantities (in counts) of armor, gun parts, and other weaponry, and of copper alloy jettons were recovered from this cellar than from anywhere else on the site. A silver sequin and a cord of woven fiber wrapped in gold and silver foil were also recovered from the cellar’s fill. Conversely, animal bone was recovered from the cellar in a significantly smaller proportion than that observed for the other features or for the site as a whole.

Mouer et al (1992:54) interpret nearby Structure 20 as a “servant quarter and gate house or trading post” because its west wall appears to have been incorporated into the palisade fortification. Under this scenario, “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.” For Structure 20 it is difficult to prove or to challenge this interpretation because there are no artifact-rich features directly associated with Structure 20 and midden deposits were mechanically removed. However, the archaeological evidence does suggest that Structure 4 also served a public purpose, where participants engaged in a greater amount of tobacco smoking with less food consumption surrounded by weapons and armor. Perhaps Structure 4 operated as the space for the court sessions held from time to time at Jordan’s Point. It may have very well been the place where members of outlying households and friendly Indians were received during their visits to the Jordan-Farrar compound. It may also have served as the residence of Samuel Jordan or William Farrar because there is evidence of a stair behind the lobby entry that would have led to a second story or loft. Without the evidence, it is impossible to rule out (or rule in) Structure 20 as a more public structure, but the archaeological evidence from Structure 4 suggests that this latter building served an important public purpose at Jordan’s Point.

The fortified settlement at Jordan’s Point appears to have been abandoned no earlier than 1630 and possibly as late as 1635, with materials from at least one structure salvaged for reuse, probably elsewhere in the sparsely populated English neighborhood. As Jordan’s Point was abandoned, occupation was underway at Sandys, Buck, and Carter’s Grove 8 (CG 8), small plantation households located farther down the river within six or seven miles of Jamestown. Not one of these three sites was fortified; by the early 1630s, the English at these sites were apparently feeling a bit more secure, perhaps because the settlers were closer to Jamestown or because they had somewhere else to go in case of attack. These three sites were also located east of the Middle Plantation palisade, a structure first conceived in 1626 and finally erected in 1634 in an effort to clear the land south of Jamestown of Indians. The palisade traversed the peninsula from the James to the York rivers and was designed to keep uninvited Indians out of what was now considered by the English to be English territory. While many historians have minimized the significance of the palisade, Philip Levy (2004:265-287) has argued that the wall’s physical

7 Of course it’s possible that only the cellar was abandoned and filled while the rest of the building remained in use.
8 For reasons related to sample size, only features with artifact counts of 250 items or more were compared with Feature 320.
enactment of a policy of racial (or Indian) exclusion was more than a psychological comfort to the Virginia English, and resulted in a very real and dramatic displacement of the region’s native population. Sandys, Buck, and CG-8 may have been occupied shortly before the palisade’s eventual construction in 1634, with the process of native displacement represented by English settlement already well underway.

Sandys, Buck, and CG-8 appear to represent households drawn from different economic levels in early Virginia society. Sandys, just north of Martin’s Hundred and situated on the James River, was probably occupied by John Wareham, a merchant who also served as a burgess in the Virginia assembly in 1632 and 1633. Wareham was dead by 1638; the site may have been occupied for several years after his death by John Browning (Mallios 2000). The Buck site, located just outside Jamestown approximately a half mile from Back River, was occupied either by descendants of the Reverend Richard Buck (known for officiating at the marriage of John Rolfe and Pocahontas) or by servants of the Buck heirs; the excavators believe the latter although the evidence is not clear (Mallios 1999). In contrast, there is no documentary evidence identifying the residents of CG-8, which was located nearly a mile inland on the Martin’s Hundred tract. The site’s excavators believe CG-8 was occupied by a poor tenant household. For this reason, CG-8 is considered one of the more important sites in this project, given that so little is known archaeologically about the lower economic levels of early Virginia society (Edwards 2004).

Archaeologically, not only were these slightly later sites not fortified, far fewer buildings were uncovered at each than were found at Jordan’s Journey. At Sandys, John Wareham erected two and possibly three buildings, and only one appears to have been heated and used as a dwelling (Figure 4). This building, known as Structure 2, measured 38-by-18-feet and was probably divided into two rooms with the larger room heated. The other two buildings may have been used as storage or agricultural buildings. At CG-8, the unidentified resident(s) occupied a smaller earthfast dwelling measuring 24.6-by-16.4-feet with a lean-to addition of 6.9-by-10.4 feet (Figure 5). While merchant John Wareham had approximately 684 square feet of enclosed domestic space, the tenants at CG-8 had only about 475 square feet (including the lean-to addition). This contrasts with the enclosed domestic space apparently available at Jordan’s Point, where Cicely Jordan, William Farrar, Jordan’s children, and ten male servants occupied five houses enclosing 3,828 square feet of domestic space. This measurement does not include attached lean-to additions, sheds, second stories, or other nearby service structures in the Jordan’s compound; divided by the 12 adults living in the Jordan-Farrar household in 1625, about 320
square feet of enclosed living space appears to have been allotted for each adult. Unfortunately, we do not know the sizes of the households at Sandys or CG 8, including whether the householders had families or servants living with them. Based on surveys of early Chesapeake households undertaken by historians, it is likely that at least one other adult did live in these households (Main 1982). Assuming two adults in each household, 342 square feet of living space was allotted per individual at Sandys and 238 square feet at CG 8. More adults are likely, though, suggesting that, after little more than a generation, Virginia planters were building and occupying a diversity of architectural forms.

Although the occupants of CG 8 may have lived in a smaller structure, the recovery of some brick, albeit in small numbers, suggests that the dwelling had few amenities, at best some brick incorporated into the hearth or chimney. A palisade fence also enclosed a small yard adjacent to the dwelling’s south side. Interestingly, the dwelling at Sandys, though bigger than the one at CG 8, also had only a few fragments of window glass and a relatively large number of brick fragments. No intact brick hearths were found, and the brick may have come from Utopia, a later site not far from Sandys.9

Figure 5. Plan view of structures and other features at CG 8.

Although a large area of ground was exposed at the Buck site, revealing a number of post holes and molds, if a dwelling was situated there, its precise configuration is difficult to identify (Figure 6; Mallios 1999). Four one-cell structures described as “sheds” were inferred from some of the post mold patterns, but these structures – if in fact that’s what they were – only measured 5-by-5-feet in plan. Nonetheless, artifact distributions and three wells provide strong evidence that a dwelling was located in this area. Areas with few artifacts and features indicate that the dwelling may be located in the eastern portion of the excavation, but this is conjectural. The building may have also left no subplow zone trace. Interestingly, not a single fragment of window glass or lead came was recovered from the Buck site, indicating that any building in this vicinity probably did not have glazed windows.

When the site assemblages from Sandys, Buck, and CG 8 are compared, the low economic standing of the household at CG 8 is revealed in the raw counts of materials comprising the category Total Domestic Artifacts (Table 3). Just over 2,600 artifacts comprise the Total Domestic Artifacts from CG 8. In terms of counts, the Sandys assemblage has almost four times the number of Total Domestic Artifacts, not surprising for a man who was both a merchant and a burgess. The Total Domestic Artifact count for Buck is mid-way between Sandys and CG 8. The percentage of ceramics from each site varies, but not as dramatically as the tobacco pipe and case bottle categories. Sandys yielded the largest percentage of tobacco pipe fragments—36 percent—with Buck and CG 8 yielding 16.1 and 18 percent, respectively. Relatively few red clay tobacco pipes were recovered from Sandys, while red clay pipes account for about half the tobacco pipe fragments recovered at CG 8 and the overwhelming majority of pipes recovered from Buck. Case

---

9 Later materials associated with the nearby Utopia site were found at Sandys. However, the early component at Sandys is not disputed.
bottle glass was recovered from all three sites, accounting for just over one-quarter of the total domestic assemblage from Sandys, and nearly half the total domestic artifacts from CG 8 and Buck.

The residents at all three sites appear to be armed; weaponry was recovered from each but in varying amounts. Sandys, however, yielded an impressive 582 items, while only 145 and 22 items were recovered from Buck and CG 8, respectively. The majority of these artifacts from all three sites consisted of lead shot. At Sandys, a sword, sword belt artifacts, a dagger, a cannon ball, and eleven gun fragments were also recovered. A snaphaunce fragment was recovered from Buck. Although 19 pieces of shot and two gunflints were recovered from CG 8, no gun artifacts were found, suggesting that any gun in the household was taken care of and did not enter the archaeological record. A sword fragment was, however, recovered. At Sandys, brigandine fragments, chain mail, and other armor artifacts were recovered in large quantity. Not a single fragment of armor was recovered from CG 8, while two pieces were recovered from Buck.

Figure 6. Plan view of features at the Buck site.
behind a large but apparently unheated structure (D) (cf. Figure 4). A possible fifth midden area
may derive from the northern room in this building and may indicate that this was a locus for socializing characterized by

Of the few ceramics recovered from Midden B, tin-glazed earthenware formed almost 50 percent of the assemblage. Vessel
forms represented among all the ceramic fragments from Midden B include costrels, flasks, jugs, and olive jars – vessels used for the storage of liquids. Midden B may derive from the northern room in this building and may indicate that this was a locus for socializing characterized by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jordan’s Point</th>
<th>SANDYS</th>
<th>CG 8</th>
<th>Buck</th>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Pipe</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Pipe</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Bottle</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTS</td>
<td>N=6,695</td>
<td>N=10,505</td>
<td>N=2,621</td>
<td>N=4,879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Armor           | 2,209          | 342    | 0     | 2    | 0     |
| Weapon artifacts| 756            | 582    | 22    | 145  | 61    |
| Porcelain       | 23             | 6      | 0     | 1    | 14    |

Table 3. Materials recovered from Jordan’s Point, Sandys, CG 8, Buck, and Old Chapel Field. Top set of artifacts presented as percentages; bottom set as counts. Animal bone totals are not included because of differential recovery methods between Jordan’s Point and the other four site assemblages.

Distributions of artifacts at these three sites are valuable for suggesting how the respective residents were now, post-1622, organizing their homelots on the English frontier. We’ve already noted that none of these sites was fortified like Jordan’s Point. And, while weapon artifacts were recovered at Sandys, CG 8, and Buck, only Sandys approaches the counts from Jordan’s Point. Similarly, only Sandys and Jordan’s Point have significant quantities of armor artifacts. Wareham may have kept himself armored given his proximity to Martin’s Hundred, which suffered terrible losses in 1622. Still, Jordan’s Point has more than six times the amount of armor as Sandys. With regard to domestic artifacts, the later sites have fewer tobacco pipes and more ceramics and case bottle glass.

At the Sandys site, four refuse middens were identified, and their analysis reveals differential uses of space at this homelot. Middens include a large area of domestic refuse on the western edge of the site (A), two middens on either side of Structure 2 (B and C), and an area behind a large but apparently unheated structure (D) (cf. Figure 4). A possible fifth midden area (E) was identified at the north edge of the site, but given the low artifact counts recovered from this area and the limited testing, we have not used its assemblage in this analysis. All of the refuse middens at Sandys contained types of domestic materials expected at all of the sites, including ceramics, tobacco pipes, bottle glass, and animal bone. Significant variation, however, in midden composition at Sandys reveals how the homelot was differentially used by its occupants.

The compositions of Middens B and C suggest the kinds of activities taking place in Structure 2, the building the excavators identified as the dwelling (Table 4). Midden B is characterized by large proportions of case bottle glass (nearly 70 percent of the Total Domestic Artifacts) and white clay tobacco pipes. Table glass, which was found in small proportions at the site, was concentrated in Midden B. Comparatively few ceramics and animal bone were recovered from the midden. And, although red clay tobacco pipes were found at the site in small numbers, they do not appear to have been smoked in Structure 2. Of the few ceramics recovered from Midden B, tin-glazed earthenware formed almost 50 percent of the assemblage. Vessel forms represented among all the ceramic fragments from Midden B include costrels, flasks, jugs, and olive jars – vessels used for the storage of liquids. Midden B may derive from the northern room in this building and may indicate that this was a locus for socializing characterized by
drinking and smoking but not the consumption of food. Midden C, on the south side of the dwelling, had a similarly high proportion of case bottle glass (more than 58 percent), virtually no animal bone, and no red pipes. Midden C did have a significantly larger percentage of ceramics than Midden B, mostly tin-glazed earthenware. Vessel forms include bottles, costrels, jars, and Spanish olive jars. Midden C also had the highest percentage of table glass of any midden. Small artifact finds from Middens B and C include twelve fragments of mirror glass, clothing items (including beads, buttons, aglets, and eyes), upholstery tacks, two knives, a spoon, and two lead die. In addition, two brigandine fragments were recovered from Midden B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Midden a</th>
<th>midden b</th>
<th>midden c</th>
<th>midden d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Pipe</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Pipe</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case bottle</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table glass</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTS</td>
<td>N=245</td>
<td>N=448</td>
<td>N=794</td>
<td>N=529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin-glazed earthenware</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Midden composition, Sandys site. All figures are given as percentages; the tin-glazed earthenware percentage is calculated from total ceramic fragments.

Midden A, located about 25 or 30 feet from the dwelling on the site’s western edge, had larger proportions of ceramics and of white tobacco pipes than either Middens B or C, more bone, and a significantly lower percentage of case bottle glass. The ceramic type assemblage recovered from Midden A, however, consisted of only 16 percent tin-glazed earthenwares, with nearly half the assemblage comprised of locally-produced Jamestown coarseware. Vessel forms represented by the sherds include jars, jugs, Spanish olive jars, butter pots, and pans. Midden A looks much more like refuse from food processing and preparation activities, probably work performed by female servants (or Wareham’s wife if he was in fact married). There were no structures uncovered in this vicinity but that may be a function of testing methodology or, if a structure stood here, it could have left no trace.

Midden D is located in an area where three artifact-rich features on the site were found, and it is possible that the materials recovered from Midden D were plowed out of the tops of these deposits. These features consisted of a daub pit, storage pit, and a well that was never completed. This feature complex and Midden D are located behind Structure 1, an unusual and apparently unheated building that the site’s excavators interpreted as a barn or storehouse. The yard immediately surrounding Structure 1 is clean of domestic artifacts of all types, suggesting that if domestic activities took place here, the material was not discarded right outside the building. Midden D yielded white tobacco pipe fragments, but the largest proportion of red pipes was found concentrated in this midden. Much more animal bone was recovered from Midden D than from Middens A, B, or C. No case bottle glass and no table glass fragments were recovered from this midden. The ceramic type assemblage consists predominantly of tin-glazed earthenware, although coarsewares are also present. Vessel forms represented by sherds include colanders, cooking pots, butter pots, dishes, and galley pots. Midden D appears to represent activities related to food processing and possibly its consumption. Whoever had access to and was consuming tobacco from red pipes worked in this area.
The plow zone distribution of the gun and sword artifacts, the cannon ball, and chain mail fragments suggest that weapon artifacts and armor were present (and lost) in most areas of the site (Figure 7). However, a concentration of weapon and armor artifacts is evident along the south wall of Structure 1—the building the site’s excavators believe functioned as a store or warehouse. This may have been the case, although it is unusual that there are no artifacts associated with the building. Perhaps this structure also had an as-yet-unknown defensive purpose. A paling fence ran closely along Structure 1’s southeastern corner less than three feet from the wall; the plow zone concentration of weapon and armor artifacts occurs where the paling ends and where a door may have existed. The excavators had suggested this paling may have served a security purpose related to the protection of goods in the building.

Although many questions remain unanswered about the Sandys site, it does seem clear that, well into the 1630s, at least some Virginia English still maintained fears about their surroundings. These fears did not prevent them from going about their daily work of attempting to replicate and impose English architectural and domestic forms on the landscape, and the evidence from Middens B and C suggest that Wareham (and perhaps later Browning) engaged in social activities that involved the consumption of wine from porcelain cups and table glass, and tobacco from English pipes. But Wareham was sufficiently armed and armored, perhaps not just for the seemingly unpredictable Indian attack but for the symbolic statement such a defensive posture would have made to his English neighbors—like the residents at CG 8, who lived in the same neighborhood with apparently less protection and who may have sought out places like Sandys when the alarm was raised.

Indeed, although the occupants of CG-8 remain unidentified, archaeologists have little doubt that the residents there represented the lower levels of early Virginia society. Located approximately one mile inland from the Sandys site, CG-8 was a much more sparsely furnished occupation. In a comparison of the ceramic vessels recovered from CG-8 with those recovered from three other Martin’s Hundred sites, Edwards (2004) found that CG-8 yielded the smallest number of vessels, with a count of 18. However, these 18 vessels represent ten different forms, while sites with five to ten times the number of vessels had just over twice the number of forms. In other words, the occupants at CG-8 had a large enough variety of ceramic forms to perform necessary household tasks, just fewer vessels with which to do them.
At CG-8, domestic artifacts were found concentrated outside the enclosed yard, east and west of the dwelling (cf. Figure 5). However, the piece plotting of artifacts from plow zone contexts at CG-8 revealed that, unbeknownst to the excavators at the time, the highest concentration of materials was over the structure. Typically, plow zone artifact densities are often highest outside structures, in surrounding yard areas. A very high concentration of case bottle glass, possibly representing one or two bottles, was observed within the dwelling. Because of the multiple methods of data recovery at CG-8 as well as the site’s overall low density of artifacts, identifying midden areas is problematic. What is evident is that the occupants at CG-8 were consuming tobacco from white and red clay pipes and discarding broken pipe pieces in the same area of the homelot. The concentration of case bottle fragments within the dwelling corresponds with a similarly high concentration of brick, suggesting that this spot may be the location of the hearth.

Not long after Jordan’s Point had been abandoned and Sandys, Buck, and CG-8 had been occupied (that is, by the mid-1630s), Richard Kemp, Secretary of the Virginia colony, arrived at Rich Neck, a 4,000-acre tract in Middle Plantation near what would become Williamsburg in the 18th century (McFaden et al 1999; Muraca, Levy, and McFaden 2003). Kemp and his wife, Elizabeth, did something very different than any of their English predecessors in the hinterlands around Jamestown: by 1640, they had built two structures entirely of brick, a rare sight in Virginia in the first half of the 17th century (Figure 8). The site’s excavators believe that Kemp may have been trying to reproduce the house he had lived in at nearby Jamestown. Kemp’s plantation at Rich Neck lay immediately west or outside of the Middle Plantation palisade, in an area contemporaries described as “without the forest” (Levy 2004:277). The Kemps also acquired and used enslaved people from Africa to work their plantation. Rich Neck is one of the first sites, at least in our study, occupied for longer than 20 or 25 years: by the time Rich Neck was abandoned at the turn of the 18th century, the site had been occupied for more than six decades.

The dwelling house built by Kemp was almost the same size in plan as the earthfast structure John Wareham had put up for himself a few years earlier at Sandys. Measuring 35-by-20-feet, the Rich Neck dwelling only provided an additional six square feet of enclosed space on its first floor. But Kemp’s house was of brick, a construction technology that offered greater structural longevity if not permanence, and greater comfort. Across an enclosed courtyard from their dwelling, the Kemps erected a brick outbuilding that functioned as a kitchen and as a residence for servants, slaves, or both. After Kemp died, Elizabeth’s second and third husbands, who moved in with her at Rich Neck, appear to have made only minor changes to the compound.10 Not until Thomas Ludwell (who, like Kemp, was also a Secretary of the Colony) acquired the plantation in 1665 were major renovations and expansions made.

One of the attributes that makes Rich Neck different from the other sites discussed so far—its significantly longer period of occupation—is also the attribute that makes the identification and analysis of early (versus late) midden deposits more difficult to do (Figure 9). Because all of the midden deposits at the site have been subjected to post-occupational plowing, it can be difficult if not impossible to sort out temporal relationships within middens, especially those used continuously throughout the site’s occupation. Sometimes, plow zone distributions of artifacts may correlate with early period architecture and fence lines. Negative evidence is also

---

10 One of Elizabeth’s husbands was Thomas Lunsford, whose daughter, Katherine, subsequently established settlements in the Rappahannock River drainage among existing Indian towns. One of these towns, what is today called Camden, is included in this study.
important. If gun and gun-related artifacts are not found in association with a building, for example, it’s likely that guns were rarely if ever associated with activities taking place there.

Figure 8. Plan view of structures and other selected features at Rich Neck.
An initial review of the types of artifacts recovered from the plowed midden deposits at Rich Neck, their quantities, and their associations reveals few dramatic differences. Ceramics, white and red tobacco pipes, case and wine bottle glass, and animal bone were recovered from all areas of the Rich Neck yard. Only the enclosed yard between the dwelling and the kitchen outbuilding was kept virtually free of any refuse whatsoever (a trend that continues throughout the 17th century). Differences between artifact-rich middens are far more subtle, revealed in slight variations in proportions of artifact types or in the presence of artifacts often described as “small finds” (Table 5). Four middens appear to have been used during the early period, including two associated with the principal dwelling (west and east middens) and two associated with the detached kitchen (kitchen midden and Midden A). These middens, however, continued in use through the end of the 17th century, so the patterns represent the site’s entire range of occupation. With that in mind, the kitchen middens contained proportionately more bone and bottle glass than the dwelling middens while more ceramics and pipe fragments were recovered from deposits associated with the dwelling. There seemed to be little variation in the proportions of red clay pipes among the middens.

Greater proportions of tin-glazed earthenware fragments were recovered from the dwelling middens than from the kitchen midden, but all middens had ceramic assemblages with at least 43 percent tin-glazed pottery. While vessel reconstructions are not yet completed for Rich Neck, ceramic types do not suggest any dramatic functional differences between the dwelling middens and the kitchen middens. In each, tin-glazed earthenwares formed the largest category of ceramic type found, followed by English brown (a post-1690 ceramic) and Rhenish blue and gray stoneware. Although colonowares were recovered from Rich Neck, they occurred in small numbers; still, not a single colonoware sherd was recovered from either kitchen midden, while three to four percent of the ceramic assemblages associated with the planter’s dwelling consisted of colonoware. Generally, utilitarian ceramic ware types, including Buckley, black-glazed redware, and North Devon Gravel-tempered earthenware form surprisingly small percentages of the total ceramic assemblages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West Dwelling</th>
<th>East Dwelling</th>
<th>Kitchen</th>
<th>Midden A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pipe</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Midden composition, selected middens, Rich Neck. All figures are given as percentages; the tin-glazed earthenware percentage is calculated from total ceramic fragments.

The differences among small finds recovered from the dwelling and the kitchen structure are also subtle. Copper alloy furniture tacks, mirror glass, locks, and clothing artifacts were recovered from the soils associated with both dwellings. Far greater numbers of tin-glazed fireplace tile fragments were found in association with the main dwelling (Figure 10). While gunflints and flint debitage were found in association with both structures, four or five times as many fragments were recovered from the dwelling (Figure 11). Lead shot and lead musket balls were three times more prevalent at the dwelling (Figure 12). Again, the problem is that it is difficult to say what period these materials date to, but what is certain is that, during the early period, guns and gun-related artifacts were not used or stored in the kitchen, more tobacco consumption was taking place in the dwelling, and the enclosed yard was kept clean of refuse.

Although the buildings at Rich Neck were not fortified in the same way as the compound at Jordan’s Journey, their more formidable brick construction and their location just outside the Middle Plantation palisade coupled with the apparently armed state of the individuals occupying the dwelling suggest a continuing if evolved state of fear on the part
of the Virginia English. Only one small brigandine fragment was recovered from the site, suggesting that, by Kemp’s occupation, the Virginia English had little use for chain or plate armor. At the same time that Kemp and his wife were managing their fear, they were also replicating an English setting as much as possible, with brick buildings facing on a clean, enclosed forecourt. The excavators have suggested that this space may have been the location of a formal garden—a rare but not completely unknown feature in early Virginia. Indeed, the residents preceding Kemp at a nearby site are documented as having had a formal garden. Although the site of that occupation has been found, it remains relatively untested. Garden historians remain skeptical, however, of a formal garden at Rich Neck.

As English settlement was slowly expanding in Tidewater Virginia, Lord Baltimore was getting underway with his settlement of Maryland on Virginia’s northern border. Baltimore had dispatched his younger brother, Leonard, to Maryland in the fall of 1633 along with two ships of settlers and supplies. In March 1634, the settlers landed and established a small settlement at a place they named St. Mary’s City, which became the colony’s capital. The settlers also worked to establish good relations with the local Indians. Baltimore did not want to repeat what he saw as Virginia’s expensive mistakes with regard to Indian diplomacy. Since Baltimore’s first priority was to make money, and since Maryland represented a great deal of personal investment on his part, he wisely sought to avoid mistakes that might spur costly wars. For their part, the Indians were just as glad to put Baltimore’s settlers between them and their aggressive and hostile northern neighbors, the Susquehannocks.

Lord Baltimore was a Roman Catholic, although both he and his father, the first Lord Baltimore, were politically astute and managed to earn and keep the favor of the king. Baltimore was concerned, however, that his religion might put off the Protestant settlers he very much needed for financial success. So, he carefully crafted a policy that addressed the problem by not establishing a church in Maryland. Catholics were welcome, but so were members of the Church of England and, in fact, the majority of the settlers who arrived in 1634 with Governor Leonard Calvert were Protestant. This policy was subsequently codified in law by the Maryland Assembly when, in 1649, it passed An Act Concerning Religion. No one believing in the divinity of Christ would be harassed for their particular practice of religion.

Among the early settlers to Maryland were several Jesuits, including Father Andrew White, who were also investing in the colony and who hoped to establish missions among the

Figure 12. Distribution of lead shot at Rich Neck.
Maryland Indians to effect their conversion. By 1636, these Jesuits had acquired a large tract of land known as St. Inigoes Manor just south of St. Mary’s City, and they moved there to establish the headquarters of their mission effort in Maryland. The Jesuits to this day retain ownership of a large portion of St. Inigoes Manor. A fort had also been established at St. Inigoes by 1637, although it is not clear if the mission and the fort were one and the same. The fort was reportedly large enough to accommodate the local population for up to a year, if necessary. A domestic site dating from the mid-1630s until c. 1660 was tested in 2000, yielding several thousand artifacts, some unidentified features, and at least three graves but no evidence of a fortification (nor clear evidence of a dwelling) (Sperling and Galke 2001). This site, called Old Chapel Field, represents what excavators believe are the archaeological traces of the mission headquarters. Old Chapel Field is the earliest English occupation yet identified outside St. Mary’s City and as such presents an opportunity to examine the material conditions of plantation life in Maryland at an early date.

Only 20 test units, each measuring 5-by-5-feet, were excavated at the Old Chapel Field site, revealing a number of artifact-filled features but no evidence of a dwelling or of fence lines (Figure 13). A considerable amount of brick was recovered from the site, suggesting that bricks had been incorporated into the as-yet-unidentified structure. Several pieces of window glass (but no window leads) indicate that the building probably had glazed windows. One feature has been interpreted as a shell-burning pit for the purpose of rendering lime. A cemetery containing at least three graves, one with evidence of a wooden marker, is also part of the site.

Ceramics dominate the assemblage, accounting for nearly 60 percent of the Total Domestic Artifacts (cf. Table 3). Red clay pipes form nearly 26 percent of the assemblage with white pipes about 13 percent. Case bottle glass represents only 1.4 percent of the Total Domestic Artifacts.

Both Native American- and European-made items were recovered from Old Chapel Field, and excavators believe that these materials are contemporary with one another. European ceramics include tin-glazed earthenware, early North Devon Fine ware, Martincamp ware, North Italian slipware, Kraak (Chinese) porcelain, and Rhenish brown stoneware as well as various lead-glazed coarse earthenwares. Native Americans probably produced the majority of handmade red clay pipes recovered from Old Chapel Field, although several fragments of a locally-made tobacco pipe may have been produced by the unidentified individual known as “Bookbinder” working in Lower Norfolk, Virginia (Cox, Luckenbach, and Kille 2005). Other artifacts from Old Chapel Field include glass beads, a probable bead of copper alloy, a jetton, a coin weight, a sword belt hook, a spur fragment, horse furniture, lead shot, scissors, fish hooks, a mouth harp,
knife blades, buttons, a hook-and-eye, and a tenterhook. Interestingly, no religious artifacts were recovered from the site.

The Old Chapel Field site “looks” much like what we would expect for an early Chesapeake assemblage, with its finer ceramics, Chinese porcelain, horse furniture, and Indian and European trade goods. Missing are fragments of armor, although lead shot, flint, and, as noted in the preceding paragraph, a sword belt hook were recovered. Few fragments of English armor have been found on Maryland sites, and those that have been recovered come from St. Mary’s City, including a tasset recovered from a c.1640s context. Archaeologists with Historic St. Mary’s City believe this particular piece of armor was used in conflicts with other Englishmen and not with Native Americans.

Shortly after the Jesuits had settled St. Inigoes Manor, they moved to establish another mission at the mouth of the Patuxent River in an area called Mattapany, about twelve miles by land from St. Inigoes. The Jesuits had received this land in the late 1630s directly from local Indians living in the area and not from Lord Baltimore, causing a serious rift between the Jesuits and the Maryland proprietor. This controversy, an Indian raid by the Susquehannocks in 1642 of the lower Patuxent, and Ingle’s Rebellion in 1645 temporarily halted the expansion of English settlement in Maryland. Despite intensive survey, the site of the early Jesuit mission at Mattapany has not yet been identified (Chaney 2001). English settlement picked up again in the late 1640s and, in 1651, William Stevens and his wife, Magdalen, acquired a 100-acre tract of land along the north side of the Patuxent in what is today Calvert County. Descendants of William Stevens now living on the Eastern Shore believe that the couple came from Virginia, having accepted Lord Baltimore’s invitation to the Virginia Puritans to come to in Maryland. Many of these immigrants from Virginia settled in Anne Arundel County around Providence, but a few established plantations in what would later become Calvert County. The Stevens along with their children remained at the Patuxent River plantation until 1665, when the family moved to Dorchester County on Maryland’s Eastern Shore (King and Ubelaker 1996). The site, erroneously called Compton by its 20th-century excavators, remained occupied by as-yet-unidentified tenants through 1685 (Louis Berger Associates, Inc. 1988).

Excavators uncovered traces of at least two and possibly three earthfast buildings at the Stevens plantation (Figure 14). The larger structure measured 18-by-20-feet with a later shed addition. A wooden chimney on the building’s east gable end provided heat. A second structure located about 20 feet north of the larger structure measured 16-by-16-feet and also had a wooden chimney located on its east gable end. This building had a lean-to addition on its west gable end. These apparently single-cell structures were much smaller and therefore less specialized in their use of space than the buildings previously seen at Jordan’s Point, Sandys, and Rich Neck. The Compton dwellings are more like the building uncovered at CG-8, although, as discussed below, the Compton artifacts are not those of a poor tenant household, even when a tenant later moves in

---

11 Mattapany is an Algonquin word that means the meeting of two paths or a path and a body of water.
12 Ingle’s Rebellion, which took place in 1645, was one expression in the colonies of the conflict between the English king and Parliament. The Calverts sided with the king during the conflict, and Richard Ingle used the opportunity to sail into Maryland and attack Catholic settlers and others loyal to Lord Baltimore.
13 Compton is the parcel of land just south of the Stevens’ plantation, patented in 1651 for Ishmael LeCompte. Because the name has come to be associated with the archaeological site and collection used in this project, we elected to retain the name to minimize confusion.
14 The site’s excavators identified what they interpreted as five earthfast buildings at the site. The site plan was reanalyzed and reinterpreted during the course of the present project with assistance from architectural historians at the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.
after the Stevenses move out. The Compton buildings were not fortified and, indeed, there is minimal evidence for yard enclosures of any type. But the occupants at Compton were not

completely without fears, given that they were among the first to move back into the area after the Indian raids of the early 1640s. Gun artifacts and lead shot were recovered during the site’s excavations.

Perhaps the most striking fact about the Compton artifact assemblage is the high number of Dutch pipe and ceramic fragments found in the collection. Indeed, no other nearby site, including Patuxent Point and Mattapany, has a ceramic assemblage that looks like the one recovered from Compton. Both Patuxent Point (c. 1658) and Mattapany (c. 1666) were occupied a bit later than Compton, suggesting that the Dutch ceramics likely came to the site in the decade
of the 1650s. Lax enforcement of a series of English navigation acts appears to account for the greater numbers of Dutch materials recovered on Maryland sites occupied before the 1660s, but even so, the amount of Dutch materials at Compton is unusually high. Informally, we have suggested a correlation between Dutch artifacts and early Puritan settlements in Anne Arundel County (Providence), especially when compared with contemporary sites at St. Mary’s City or even at Old Chapel Field (where virtually no Dutch ceramics were recovered). If William Stevens was a Puritan, as his descendants have suggested, that could possibly explain the high proportions of Dutch materials at Compton. Yet, the quantities of Dutch materials at Compton also far exceed anything seen at Providence. The high percentage of Dutch material at Compton remains a mystery for further study.

Analysis of the distributions of artifacts at Compton revealed three areas of refuse disposal (cf. Figure 14). Middens were identified in the yard behind the smaller dwelling, in the yard between the two dwellings, and in the yard east of the larger dwelling. In addition, two midden concentrations were found in the area also occupied by the larger dwelling and its attached shed. Since midden deposits are rarely found in locations over buildings (although CG-8 near Williamsburg appears to be an exception), it may be that the smaller building served as the initial residence on the site, with the larger building constructed and occupied later. Unfortunately, almost no post holes and molds associated with these structures were excavated, so sequences of building construction are difficult to construct. Midden C, which was identified within the larger structure, yielded a pipe stem date earlier than the other middens, and the distribution of the bore diameters suggests that the midden was abandoned earlier than the other middens, perhaps when the larger building was erected over the midden. However, readers are cautioned that the counts from these middens are not especially high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>midden a</th>
<th>midden b</th>
<th>midden c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle glass</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pipe</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Pipe</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTS</td>
<td>N=156</td>
<td>N=175</td>
<td>N=123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tin-glazed earthenware
North Devon Gravel Free
North Devon Gravel Tempered
Unidentified Lead-Glazed Earthenware

10/64 12.0 5.9 0.0
9/64 8.0 17.7 19.1
8/64 12.0 5.9 28.6
7/64 68.0 70.6 52.4
6/64 0.0 0.0 0.0

Table 6. Composition, selected middens, Compton; tin-glazed earthenware percentage calculated from total ceramics; pipe stem bore percentages calculated from total measurable white clay pipe bores.
dwelling, yielded the smallest percentage of ceramics, about twice as much bottle glass, larger percentages of white clay pipe, and the least amount of terra cotta pipe—not unlike the two middens associated with John Wareham’s dwelling at the Sandys site.\(^1\) However, unlike the Sandys dwelling middens, Midden A at Compton had a large proportion of animal bone. With regard to the distributions of ceramic types, Midden A had a relatively low percentage of tin-glazed earthenware and a very high percentage of North Devon Gravel-free ceramics (mostly from jars). The materials in Midden A suggest that food, tobacco, and drink were consumed in the smaller building. The building may be smaller than its neighbor to the south but it does not necessarily appear to be a secondary structure.

In contrast, Midden B, located just east of the second, larger building, contained proportionately more than twice as many ceramics as Midden A, with the highest proportion of unidentified coarse earthenwares among the four middens. These unidentified ceramics are more likely to represent fragments from utilitarian food processing and preparation vessels. Midden B also has a high proportion of red pipe fragments. Midden B suggests that food processing, food consumption, and tobacco smoking activities, including from red pipes, were likely taking place in the adjacent structure.

Midden C is similar in composition to Midden B and may have received refuse from the overlying structure prior to the addition of the shed.

The “Golden Age,” 1660-1690

Compton had been occupied for little more then seven years when Captain John Odber acquired the adjacent tract known today as Patuxent Point (Figure 15). Patuxent Point, which was occupied by 1658, represents the first settlement in our study in this second phase of English occupation (1660-1690). Both Compton and Patuxent Point were occupied throughout the period, one described by Carr, Walsh, and Menard (1991) as a “Golden Age” of English occupation in the Chesapeake. This ‘Golden Age’ was characterized by upward economic and social mobility, especially for those settlers who were European, male, and who beat the demographic odds. Women’s fortunes ran with their husbands, even though many widows brought resources to the union that often benefited their second spouse. The age was perhaps not so golden for the still low but increasing numbers of imported Africans, and the events of these decades are now being mined for the insights they might offer about the transition from a “society with slaves” to a “slave society” (Berlin 1998).

Captain Odber lived at Patuxent Point for only a few years before relocating to Maryland’s Eastern Shore, perhaps at the same time the Stevenses were leaving nearby Compton. Odber probably built the 20-by-40-foot earthfast dwelling at Patuxent Point. The dwelling was relatively spacious, divided into two rooms (at least one of which was heated), with wooden floors and glazed windows. A second structure, probably a quarter, was located in the dwelling’s west yard. The only evidence for this second structure (other than the nearby middens) was a small, flat-bottomed storage pit which had been filled with fireplace ashes. Patuxent Point also had an associated cemetery with the remains of 19 individuals buried in 18 graves.

Four refuse middens were identified at Patuxent Point, including two associated with the dwelling and two associated with the probable quarter. The distributions of pipe stem bore diameters in the middens suggest that the middens are contemporary, and the distributions of total

\(^1\) A far larger proportion of bottle glass was observed in the middens associated with Wareham’s dwelling, and the Wareham occupation was a little earlier, but the trends are similar.
domestic artifacts and ceramic types suggest that the middens generally have the same material composition (Table 7). The two middens associated with the principal dwelling (A and B) have more white and red pipe fragments, while those with the quarter (C and D) have more bottle glass. But, the differences are not striking, and the analysis suggests that similar activities—food preparation, food consumption, and socializing—took place in both the dwelling and the inferred quarter. The principal difference is not in the middens themselves but in the two buildings—one more spacious and almost certainly more comfortable than the other. Servants probably lived and resided in the quarter, while the planter and his family lived in the larger dwelling.

Table 7. Midden composition, Patuxent Point. Bone was quantified by volume and is not included in these figures; tin-glazed earthenwares are percentage of total ceramics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>midden a</th>
<th>midden b</th>
<th>midden c</th>
<th>midden d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pipe</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red pipe</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle glass</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTS</td>
<td>N=433</td>
<td>N=377</td>
<td>N=291</td>
<td>N=193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin-glazed earthenware</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This interpretation is borne out by patterns evident in the associated cemetery, a seeming hodgepodge of burials that may reflect the occupation of the site by two different households. A group of four adult individuals may represent the remains of servants. One of these individuals,
found in Grave 18, was tentatively identified as African (King and Ubelaker 1996:52), and the 16 to 17 year old male in Grave 18 had been interred holding a white clay tobacco pipe in his hands (Figure 16). It is not uncommon to find individuals of African ancestry interred with tobacco pipes—a number of cases are known from Virginia, Barbados, and Africa (King 2006). Perhaps the individuals buried in this cluster occupied the probable quarter at Patuxent Point if they were indeed servants. In death, they were set apart from what is likely the planter’s family cemetery (as suggested by the burials of a number of children). The tobacco pipe recovered in association with Grave 18, however, represents a different treatment in death than that accorded the individuals in Graves 16, 17, and 19.

A subsequent examination of the skeleton found in Grave 18, however, has called into question the ancestry of the 16-to-17-year-old male in this grave. Douglas Owsley (personal communication) has identified this skeleton as “European,” pointing out that a European burial at Jamestown had also been found with an associated pipe. Archaeologists at Jamestown, however, do not consider this association an example of a ritual interment; their interpretation suggests that the individual at Jamestown was dead some time before burial and was buried fully clothed, along with the things in the individual’s pockets, including a pipe and spoon. A review of the records for Grave 18 by a third physical anthropologist, Thomas Crist, does suggest that the individual buried in this grave has traits that would be considered typical of individuals of European ancestry, although Crist points out that our understanding of what ancestry “looks like” in the 17th century is an open topic.

Given the question of Grave 18’s biological ancestry and the burial’s association with the ritual interment of a white clay tobacco pipe, the circumstances of Burial 18’s life and death are especially interesting. The ritual pipe interment is well known for the early modern Atlantic, but only for individuals of African ancestry. This is not to say that the individual in Grave 18 must therefore be African, but rather that whatever the ancestry of Burial 18 – which at least two physical anthropologists believe is European – this individual was treated in the death ritual in a manner known to be associated with (some) people of African descent. Whatever Burial 18’s biological ancestry, the archaeological evidence raises important questions about identity and difference in the early modern world.

Soon after the dwelling at Patuxent Point had been built, Mattapany, which included the land earlier disputed between Lord Baltimore and the Jesuits, was occupied by Charles Calvert, Lord Baltimore’s eldest son. Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore and proprietor of the Maryland colony for its first four decades, never came to Maryland. His son, Charles, arrived as governor in 1661 and took up residence at St. John’s in the capital at St. Mary’s City. Charles soon found himself at odds with his meddlesome uncle, Philip Calvert, who was already living in Maryland. The two kinsmen did not get along, perhaps in part because Charles was heir to the proprietorship. So, in 1666, Charles left St. Mary’s City for Mattapany, where his second wife, Jane, lived at her plantation located at the mouth of the Patuxent River. Jane’s first husband,
Henry Sewall, who had also been the Secretary of the colony and a good friend of Charles’, had received the Mattapany tract from Lord Baltimore. At Mattapany, Charles set about building a “fair house of brick and timber,” the likes of which had not yet been seen in 17th-century Maryland (Chaney 2001; King and Chaney 1999; Pogue 1987).

Built sometime between 1666 and 1672, Calvert’s house measured 25 by 50 feet on a two-and-a-half brick wide foundation, supporting two and likely three stories (Figure 17). The dwelling’s full basement with its partially tiled floor was raised several feet above ground level. The roof was pantile, the walls plastered, and at least some fireplaces had decorative tin-glazed tiles. The dwelling’s south yard was enclosed by a log palisade, a structure much heavier and far more substantial than a standard paling fence. At the palisade’s corner was an unidentified structure that may represent the archaeological traces of some kind of bastion. About a hundred yards away, near the plantation’s landing and under Charles Calvert’s control, stood the colony’s weapons magazine, which was built and in use by 1678. Calvert, who had inherited his father’s title as Lord Baltimore and proprietor in 1676, was, through the layout of his plantation, sending an important message to Maryland’s denizens about his power and authority.

![Figure 17. Plan view of structures, palisade, and middens at Mattapany.](image)

Visitors to Lord Baltimore’s Mattapany plantation experienced a landscape very different from other plantation landscapes in the colony. Visitors arriving by water first encountered the weapons magazine positioned on a bluff about 15 feet above the landing. Calvert’s large, two- or three-story brick dwelling on its raised basement – itself an unusual sight – rose in the background, partially enclosed by the log palisade. Some of the visitors to Mattapany included members of the Governor’s Council and the Provincial Court which sometimes met at Baltimore’s plantation. These men and other elite visitors would have been granted access through the enclosed palisaded forecourt, ascending exterior stairs to the mansion’s first floor.
There, these important visitors would have observed Calvert’s portrait of his mother, Anne Arundel, hanging on the wall, and would have gathered in the parlor to go about the business of governing the colony.

Although Lord Baltimore left for England in 1684 never to return, the plantation remained in his family’s possession, and archaeological evidence indicates that the house was occupied until about c. 1740. The nearby magazine site appears to have been abandoned no later than 1700, reflecting not only the physical departure of Baltimore, but his loss of political control in the colony in 1689. At that time, a group of rebels unhappy with Lord Baltimore and calling themselves the Protestant Associators seized the State House at St. Mary’s City and then marched to Mattapany, there seizing Baltimore’s house and the magazine and establishing their headquarters. The Protestant Associators eventually relinquished control as a new government was established in Maryland and Calvert’s family regained possession of the Mattapany plantation.

Although Mattapany house was occupied for nearly 80 years, at times with large households approaching 30 members, the excavated plow zone units yielded what appear to be relatively (and surprisingly) low densities of artifacts. In part, this may simply reflect the fact that the majority of units were located only on the west and south sides of the dwelling. Shovel test data, however, do not suggest heavier concentrations of materials on the north and east sides (Chaney 2001), so the low overall densities may be representative of 17th-century yard use at the plantation. The area within the log palisade had an especially low density of materials, suggesting that this fortified courtyard was kept relatively free of refuse. Compare the low densities recovered at Mattapany with the numbers of materials recovered from middens at Rich Neck (cf. Table 5), a site which, like Mattapany, was occupied for several generations. Even nearby sites, like Patuxent Point and Compton, which were occupied for 35 years or less, yielded more artifacts in the plow zone than did Mattapany. These findings raise important questions about refuse disposal at these sites with the distinct possibility that Lord Baltimore’s household deliberately disposed of its trash beyond the boundaries of the homelot.

All of the middens contain more or less the same materials, although, because artifact densities are low, midden counts may not be statistically representative (Table 8). Midden D, located outside the palisaded enclosure near the possible bastion, contained refuse likely deriving from a food consumption and socializing context: Midden D had the highest proportion of tin-glazed earthenware as well as significant quantities of tobacco pipe fragments and bottle glass. As noted above, the foreyard was kept relatively clean of refuse, although the high percentage of white salt-glazed stoneware here suggests that the area was not kept as scrupulously clean in the 18th century.

Middens A and E, on the other hand, located west of the dwelling, contained the largest proportions of ceramics, the smallest proportions of tobacco pipes, and large percentages of utilitarian coarse earthenwares like North Devon gravel-tempered wares and Buckley earthenwares. Midden A appears to have been used through the 18th century, given the relatively large proportion of white salt-glazed stonewares. Midden E probably derived from activities taking place in a secondary building in this approximate location. Midden C is also associated with the building.

When compared with the wooden, earthfast buildings at nearby Compton and Patuxent Point, the two-to-three-story brick and timber house at Mattapany was designed to impress. Indeed, Charles Calvert’s house was probably the most impressive dwelling in Maryland when it was built, and remained so for many years following. But although it was of substantial brick
construction, Mattapany was not as well built as later brick structures in the region would be. Its brick façade did contribute to its survival as a habitable building for 80 years. Much of the brick recovered from Mattapany, however, is poorly formed, misshapen, or cracked, suggesting it was produced rapidly. The brick also appears to have been laid fairly quickly, with the mason occasionally getting off his bond. The potentially sloppy effect this would have created was partially alleviated by the use of scored mortar joints to create a more uniform appearance.

Charles Calvert clearly invested far more resources in the construction and appointment of his dwelling than did his neighbors, but even he had to contend with the labor shortages characteristic of the Chesapeake economy, settling for a brick mason whose skills, while acceptable, were not the highest (King and Chaney 2003).

In a study of the personal and household furnishings recovered from Mattapany, Compton, and Patuxent Point, the contrast evident in the architectural record is not as stark. The residents of Compton and Patuxent Point did acquire personal and household furnishings that provided some comfort and opportunities for display. And, somewhat surprisingly, the Mattapany domestic artifact assemblage is not too dissimilar from the other two sites. Indeed, the only salient difference is in the numbers of certain goods rather than in the types of goods. While Calvert invested heavily in architecture and its public display, he and his family did not seek to furnish themselves or their house with dramatically different goods. Visitors to Mattapany may have had all sorts of boundaries to negotiate before admission to Calvert’s house, but once there, they would have seen furnishings similar to those found in their own houses, just more of them (King and Chaney 2003).

While Governor Charles Calvert was going about the building of his plantation at Mattapany, an unidentified tenant of Thomas Pope’s was engaged in developing a plantation at the Clifts, located on the south shore of the Potomac River in Westmoreland County, Virginia. The Clifts appears to have been occupied by c.1670, and was apparently occupied by tenants until its abandonment c.1730. Documentary records indicate that the Popes owned the property containing the Clifts until 1716, when they sold it to Thomas Lee. Unfortunately, the records are silent on who lived at the site, and both the Popes and Lee are known to have lived elsewhere.

The principal dwelling and all of the outbuildings at the Clifts were of earthfast construction (Figure 18). The principal dwelling was relatively large, consisting of a “three-unit,
center-chimney, cross-passage” plan that was subsequently reconfigured about 1700 into a hall and parlor plan. The dwelling was also fortified early in its occupation by a palisade fence with bastions on opposite corners, possibly erected during the Indian scare preceding Bacon’s Rebellion in 1676. Archaeological evidence for 13 other buildings, including work houses, quarters, smokehouses, and a dairy, was also recovered. A nearby cemetery contained the remains of 16 individuals, many of African ancestry. The entire homelot was physically divided using a combination of post and rail and paling fences.

Fraser Neiman has developed a chronology for the site that includes four periods: c.1670-1685, c. 1685-1705, c.1705-1715, and c.1715-1730. Phases I and II consisted of the dwelling (which was fortified at least part of this time), a workhouse/quarter and two smokehouses (Neiman 1980). Phases III and IV consisted of the recently reconfigured dwelling (without the fortification), a new workhouse/quarter, and five outbuildings (Neiman 1980). Although changes in the structure of the homelot occurred over the site’s 50-year occupation, building locations and artifact distributions reveal that domestic activities, including the discard of refuse and the housing of at least some servants, consistently took place on the western side of the homelot. In contrast with Mattapan, the Clifts Plantation yard was rich in artifacts. Given that the residents of the Clifts were almost certainly tenants, and that Governor Calvert was also the Maryland proprietor, the cleanliness of the yard at Mattapan must have been intentional. Yet, the tenants at the Clifts were no economic slouches, and if their social aspirations followed, it is unclear why they did not work to keep their yards free of refuse.
Figure 19. Location of midden deposits at the Clifts.

Distribution maps reveal four areas of concentrated refuse disposal which were selected for further comparison (Figure 19). Midden A, located in the west yard, is associated with two structures believed to have served as smokehouses. Middens B and C were also located in the west yard, with Midden B associated with an outbuilding and Midden C with the principal dwelling and nearby quarter. Midden D is located on the principal dwelling’s east end in an area containing a garden or other enclosed parcel. Middens A and D appear to have formed earlier in the site’s occupation, while B and C formed later.

As expected, middens contained all types of material, but in varying quantities (Table 9). Midden A, for example, had the smallest proportions of bottle glass, table glass, and white clay pipe, and the largest proportions of red clay pipes and animal bone fragments. Based on distributions of pipe stem bore diameters, Midden A began forming early and continued in use throughout the site’s occupation. Midden A had the largest proportions of so-called Morgan Jones ceramic, a locally-produced earthenware made in Westmoreland County (Chappell and Kelso 1974), and the lowest proportion of tin-glazed earthenware. Vessel forms predominantly represented by the ceramic fragments recovered from Midden A include pans, jugs, and storage jars.

Midden D, which also appears to be early, yielded a higher percentage of bottle and table glass, more white pipes, no red pipes, and less bone. The majority of vessel forms (86 percent) derive from cups and tankards. Midden B appears to have derived primarily from a food and beverage consumption context, probably from activities taking place in the east room of the main dwelling. This more formal room looked out upon enclosed gardens and the plantation’s cemetery.
MIDDEN A  MIDDEN B  MIDDEN C  MIDDEN D
Ceramics  24.0  17.0  20.0  22.0
White Pipe  26.0  46.0  57.0  35.0
Red Pipe  1.0  0.0  0.0  0.0
Bottle Glass  9.0  16.0  18.0  27.0
Table Glass  0.0  5.0  4.0  7.0
Faunal material  39.0  15.0  2.0  9.0
N=1,937  N=5,428  N=5,911  N=2,834

Table 9. Midden composition, Clifts; numbers given as percentages.

Midden C had the largest proportions of bottle glass and table glass, and the smallest proportion of animal bone fragments. Tin-glazed earthenware, slip-decorated earthenware, Rhenish blue and gray stoneware, Nottingham ware, and white and dipped white salt-glazed stoneware formed more than 75 percent of the ceramic type assemblage. Identifiable vessel forms were few, but included a jug and bottle. Midden C appears to represent refuse derived from social activities including drink and tobacco (but not food) consumption. Midden B differs from C in that more animal bone was recovered from this midden, but overall their contents are similar.

The Clifts was occupied for a sixty year period. Neiman believes that the abandoned buildings at the Clifts were ultimately demolished to make way for a road from a nearby landing to Stratford Hall, an impressive masonry structure built in 1738.

Outside the Golden Age: Indian Settlement, 1660-1690

As Compton was being occupied by William Stevens and his family in 1651, Sandys, Buck, and CG-8 in the lower James either had just been abandoned or were close to being abandoned. Old Chapel Field would be abandoned by the end of the decade (that is, by 1660). Fears of Indians and of Indian attack had not disappeared but had been transformed; as late as 1675, the Maryland proprietor was shaken when a delegation of Susquehannock Indians appeared on his doorstep at Mattapany looking for a place to settle, and the Clifts was being fortified at about the same time. Still, by the 1650s, Virginians and Marylanders alike had, for the most part, the upper hand in dealings with local Indians, although that could change on a daily and local basis. The primary problem now was how to provide Indians with the minimal resources they needed to survive, in some respects a far less expensive proposition than wholesale extirpation. Both the Virginia and Maryland governments attempted to establish preserves or tracts of land where the local tribes could expect some sort of protection from the relentless encroachment of English settlement. Two sites used in this study are places that more or less remained areas of Indian settlement through much of the 17th century, although by the 18th century, the Indians had been forced from or departed these places as well. Camden was located on the south side of the Rappahannock River in Caroline County, Virginia, and Posey was located near Mattawoman Creek on the north side of the Potomac in Maryland.

The Camden site represents a heavy concentration of materials recovered from a small area located within a much larger settlement, probably an Indian town. During the 17th century, Nanzattico and Portobago Indians were living in the area, although their relationship to the

2 The Susquehannocks were now under siege by the Seneca. Calvert told them they could have land near the headwaters of the Potomac.
Camden settlement is not precisely known. By mid-century, Colonel Edward Hill of Charles City County may have established a settlement in the area for trading with the local Indians. There were a number of Indian towns in the region that would have been attractive to men like Hill for trade. By 1670, Katherine Lunsford, daughter of Sir Thomas Lunsford, the man who had married Richard Kemp’s widow and lived at Rich Neck near Williamsburg, had inherited property in the area. Katherine received permission to settle the property as long as “she did not disturb the Indians who were then living upon the tract” (McCartney 2004:239). Augustine Herrman’s map of Maryland and Virginia shows spots along the Rappahannock River labeled as “Portobacco” and “Puamslen” (south side) and “Nansattico,” “Chinquatuck,” and “Mangimocxen” (north side), but the structures he depicts are in the style of English houses (Figure 20). Eventually much of the land on both sides of the river was acquired by Ralph Wormeley of Rosegill when he married Katherine Lunsford. In 1686, Wormeley brought the Frenchman, Durand du Dauphine, to visit Wormeley’s Nanzattico and Portobago plantations, where the two men “were greeted warmly by Indians garbed in a mixture of European clothing and native dress.” Durand du Dauphine commented that the natives were willing to trade earthen vessels and pots in exchange for corn. Their village was within view on the opposite (south) side of the river, where the two men went the next day. But relations, while seemingly good during the Frenchman’s visit, were always tense; in 1666, Governor Berkeley had wanted to see the natives in the area destroyed. In the early 18th century, when some Indians in the area were accused of killing an English family, all members of the tribe were captured, marched to Williamsburg, and either sold into servitude or deported to Antigua (McCartney 2004). Although Camden was abandoned well before that event, it suggests the political environment in which the people at Camden tried to make their way.

North of Camden, in Maryland, the Posey site is located on land that had been granted by the Maryland proprietor to Thomas Cornwallis, but it’s unclear whether Cornwallis ever settled the tract. The Maryland Provincial Council was aware that Indians remained situated on these lands in the second half of the 17th century, and they attempted to control English settlement in the area until land allocations to the local Indians had been settled. Herrman’s Map of Maryland and Virginia shows what appear to be Indian longhouses in the vicinity of the Posey site (cf. Figure 20). By the 1680s, the Maryland government was becoming less interested in helping the local Indians in the area, although Cornwallis’ land still appears at that time to have been “in the possession of Indians.” Finally, in 1695, the Maryland government pondered how it might convince Indians living in that area to

Figure 20. Augustine Herrman’s Map of Maryland and Virginia showing settlement along the upper Rappahannock and Potomac rivers.

3 Although the map was published in 1673, the fieldwork for creating the map was undertaken in 1670.
allow some English settlement. It is about this time – before the end of the 17th century – that the Posey site appears to have been abandoned.

The excavations conducted at Camden and at Posey yielded archaeological assemblages dramatically different from those seen at any of the contemporary English settlements included in this study and yet strikingly similar to one another (Figures 21 and 22; Table 10). Both sites yielded assemblages dominated by Algonquian pottery, particularly hand-built Potomac Creek wares in conical forms. Also recovered were Indian-made red clay tobacco pipes, lithic artifacts, and shell beads. Evidence of shell bead manufacture was recovered from the Posey site. European materials, including ceramics, glass, white pipe, flint, and metal, are also present in the assemblages from both sites, but in small amounts. The materials recovered from Camden and Posey reveal that the Indian men and women occupying these sites were not adopting European goods and practices with abandon, instead producing ceramics and tobacco pipes in recognizable Algonquian forms. European ceramics represent a very small percentage of both site assemblages, with tin-glazed earthenware a majority ware type.

Also recovered from both sites were fragments representing at least one Rhenish brown stoneware Bellarmine jug. The human likeness of the mask on these bottles may have held special significance for the Indians who acquired them (Porter 2006 and this report). Although representations of the human form are relatively rare in Algonquian Indian material culture, those that are known appear to have religious or spiritual significance. The percentages and sheer numbers of red and white tobacco pipes from both sites are low when compared with contemporary English sites, suggesting that local Indians did not develop the insatiable appetite for tobacco that most Englishmen (and not a few English women) did. Ben Porter (2006) suggests that the Indians living at the two sites were using tobacco for ritual or sacred purposes, and not for recreational purposes or everyday consumption. Animal bone assemblages recovered from both sites reveal almost entirely indigenous wild species; at Posey, only five bones were

---

4 Recovery methods undoubtedly affect our conclusions about the shell beads recovered from Camden and Posey. At Camden, plow disturbed soils were screened through 1/4-inch mesh while at Posey, a column sample from each plow zone unit was water-screened through window-mesh. While shell beads were recovered from Posey using 1/4-inch mesh, far more shell beads were found through fine screening.
found that came from a European domesticated species, and that was a pig. At Camden, a single horse tooth was recovered; all other faunal material came from wild species.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Camden Count</th>
<th>camden PERCENT</th>
<th>posey Count</th>
<th>posey PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian Pottery</td>
<td>7,270</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>5,224</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Ceramics</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Pipes</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pipes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Objects</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7,824</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6,181</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Distributions of selected artifact categories, Camden and Posey; after Porter (2006).

At Camden, a projectile point was recovered that had been fashioned from glass. At Posey, at least one apparent bifurcated projectile point had been formed from a sheet of brass. Triangular forms of sheet brass, some with a central hole, have also been identified as projectile points, although how effective these items would have been as points is open to discussion. Further, a piece of European flint at the Posey site had been modified into a typical Native American cutting tool. The Indians at Camden and Posey, however, did not completely reject European technologies. Lead shot, gun flints, and gun fragments were presumably used as weapons or for hunting. Both sites yielded whole nails with clinched ends, suggesting the nails had indeed been used to fasten boards with the sharp ends folded over. The nature of these boards or how they were used, including whether or not for an architectural purpose, however, is unclear.

A previous comparison of the Camden and Posey sites (Galke 2004) concluded that the large numbers of Indian pottery fragments recovered from both sites suggested that at least some groups of Virginia and Maryland Indians were maintaining a distinctly Indian identity in the face of European encroachment. Porter’s (2006 and this report) more detailed analysis confirms these observations, and suggests some of the ways beyond the making of traditional ceramic pots or pipes that Indians were maintaining their lifeways. However, as Porter cautions, while Indians may have continued to produce “Indian” artifacts and to use European artifacts in “Indian” ways, the spatial location of the Camden and Posey sites were indeed “new” and represent geographical outcomes of contact.

More to the point, the overwhelming numbers of “Indian” artifacts at both sites may mask an important difference, especially when the assemblages are compared with materials recovered from Indian sites occupied in the late 16th and early 17th centuries. For example, the protohistoric component at Jordan’s Point yielded slightly more than 3,000 ceramic fragments (Mouer et al 1992:95); excavator’s at Jordan’s Point believe that the majority of these ceramics were associated with a Weyanoke Indian settlement that pre-dated the arrival of Samuel Jordan and his family. These ceramics consist of Gaston, Roanoke, and Townsend wares, and the
excavators are careful to point out that they could have been deposited over a long period. Further, Jordan’s Point appears to have been occupied by more households than the single one represented at Posey, or the likely one household represented in the area excavated at Camden. Excavators uncovered traces of eight “complete Native American structures, [that] appear to be Protohistoric in age” (i.e., post-1500 AD) (Gallivan 2004:28).

While it is difficult to compare the assemblages from Camden and Posey with that recovered from Jordan’s Point in a side-by-side fashion, it does appear that far more ceramic fragments are being recovered from the two later sites, and these fragments are being generated by what appears to be a smaller population of site occupants, at least in the case of Posey. We know that, by the third quarter of the 17th century, “deer hides had become the primary item produced by Native Americans in the southern interior Chesapeake for trade with Euro-Americans,” requiring an increase in the harvesting of deer and the alteration of economic organization strategies by native participants (Lapham 2004:173). But, deer were not the only items the native inhabitants were producing for the Chesapeake English market. Dauphine reported that Indians in the vicinity of Camden traded pots in exchange for corn, and ample documentary and archaeological evidence exists that indicates Indian-made ceramic pots (and pipes) were being exchanged (Davidson 2004; Rountree and Davidson 1997). The high numbers of Indian pottery found at both Camden and Posey is probably not indicative of a native effort to “resist” assimilation and to make a material statement of identity, as Galke (2004:105, 107) suggests, but an outcome of changing economic relationships between Europeans, Indians, and goods traded. Clearly, more work is needed to explore these ideas, but Lapham’s (2004) work suggests that more deer meant more trade with Europeans, and there’s no reason to believe that that model would not apply to other Indian-produced goods.

Northern English Settlements, 1650-1690

While the occupants of the Clifts Plantation were busy fortifying their dwelling and living through the events of Bacon’s Rebellion, Thomas Jeffe, Jr. was struggling to establish a tobacco plantation on the South River in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. Jeffe and his wife, Mary, lived at the Chalkley site for less than a decade, from 1677 until 1685, when Jeffe sold the land to investors. Archaeologists uncovered a small earthfast dwelling measuring 16.5-by-20-feet, heated by an end chimney of frame and some brick (Figure 23; Luckenbach, Read, and Ware 1995). The dwelling had at least one glazed window. The ceramic assemblage, consisting of a total of 528 fragments representing at least 32 vessels, includes mostly utilitarian earthenwares. North Devon Sgraffito vessels are the largest represented tableware, although very small amounts of tin-glazed earthenware, Staffordshire slipware, Rhenish stoneware, and Manganese Mottled earthenware are present. Only 44 white clay pipe stem fragments with measurable bores were recovered from the site, and more than half of these were 6/64ths-inch or smaller.5

Although no evidence was recovered for an internal partition of the dwelling, we analyzed plow zone assemblages located at what would have been the northern and southern gable ends of the structure (Table 11). Artifact counts are low, so any patterns must be interpreted cautiously. However, few differences in assemblage composition were observed for the two middens. Midden A (at the north end of the dwelling) had a less diverse number of ceramic types than Midden B. Thomas and Mary Jeffe appear to have been consuming tobacco and processing food and drink with the very barest of material goods. Although the paucity of

5 Although the number of plow zone pipe stems with measurable bores is low and therefore statistically not as reliable as a larger sample, the high number of 6/64ths-inch bores is surprising, given the early date of the site.
artifacts can be attributed in part to the short-term occupation of the site, the densities do reflect a relatively poor household.

Further north but still in Anne Arundel County, Burle’s Town Land was occupied perhaps as early as 1649 through the 1680s. The site is located at Providence, a 17th-century settlement on the north side of the Severn River in Anne Arundel County settled primarily by Puritans invited by Lord Baltimore to Maryland in 1649 (Luckenbach 1995). The site is first mentioned in the records in 1662, when it was patented by Robert and Mary Burle. When Robert died in 1676, the property went to his daughter, Rebecca. Burle’s wife, Mary, may have stayed at the site through the 1680s. Burle was an important member of the community at Providence, keeping land records and accounts for the government. He was also concerned with the workings of the Puritan Church and sought counsel from religious fathers in New England about the teachings of Puritan William Durand, who also lived at Providence.

The long dwelling structure at Burle’s Town Land, as Al Luckenbach has observed, is reminiscent of the buildings erected decades earlier at Jordan’s Point (cf. Figure 3). The building measured 20-by-60-feet and appears to have been divided into two sections (Figure 24). These two sections were further divided into rooms by two internal fireplaces. Artifacts indicate that the building had glazed windows, decorative yellow fire bricks, and Dutch tin- and lead-glazed tiles. Pantiles, a type of roofing tile, were found in association with the north end of the building, suggesting that this end (and perhaps both ends) had a more durable, fireproof roof. A second building, probably a service structure, is located southeast of the principal dwelling, although its exact age and form are unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>midden a count</th>
<th>midden a percent</th>
<th>midden b count</th>
<th>midden b percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pipe</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Midden composition, Chalkley.
Excavations at Burle’s Town Land yielded a rich assemblage of more than 60,000 artifacts, including approximately 22,000 ceramic fragments, more than 15,000 red and white tobacco pipe fragments, and quantities of bottle glass, animal bone, nails, and many small finds. Yard middens associated with the dwelling were rich in artifacts, and two middens were identified for analysis, including one on the west side of the dwelling and the second on the east. Further, the east yard midden was divided into a north, central, and south sections.

Middens in both yards contained similar types of domestic materials. The west yard midden contained proportionately less bottle glass and animal bone and more red clay pipes than the components of the east yard midden (Table 12). On the east side, the northern portion of the midden had a significantly larger proportion of bottle glass and table glass, but a relatively low proportion of tobacco pipes and animal bone. The southern end of the east midden had a larger proportion of pipes and animal bone. This midden also had the smallest percentage of ceramic fragments (37 percent) and bottle glass (three percent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West yard midden</th>
<th>east yard/ north end</th>
<th>east yard/ central end</th>
<th>east yard/ south end</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Glass</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pipe</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Pipe</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>4,502</td>
<td>3,735</td>
<td>2,958</td>
<td>6,631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Midden composition, Burle’s Town Land.

The patterns of refuse distribution and their association with the unusual architectural arrangement at Burle’s complicate interpretation. Al Luckenbach has suggested that what we are seeing at Burle’s Town Land may be a townhouse, not unlike the townhouses built about the same time in Jamestown. The placement of the chimneys in the two ends of the building raises the question of where the dwelling’s principal entrances were. All of the middens appear more closely associated with the northern end of the building. There are differences between the west and east yard middens, and differences within the east yard midden, but these differences are subtle.

Chaney’s Hills, located in Anne Arundel County on a tributary of the South River, was occupied by Richard Chaney and his wife, Charity, from 1658 until just before his death in 1686. Chaney’s will indicates that he had three daughters, three sons, and a female servant in his household (Ballweber 1999). Archaeologists uncovered a 28-by-17-foot building with an unusual
A second structure identified on the basis of concentrations of artifacts is believed to have been located approximately 90 feet south of the dwelling. The majority of the ceramics indicate a 17th-date contemporary with Chaney’s occupation. The recovery of English brown stoneware, however, suggests that some occupation took place at the site through the early 1690s.

Three midden areas (A, B, and C) were identified in association with what is likely the principal dwelling, while Midden D is associated with the hypothesized dwelling 90 feet away (Table 13). Midden D has the smallest proportion of ceramics and the largest proportion of tobacco pipes (all white; no red clay pipes were recovered from this site). More ceramics and less pipe were found in the middens associated with the principal dwelling. Otherwise, all of the middens contain a mix of materials representing all domestic activities.

The location of a second concentration of materials almost a hundred feet away is somewhat unusual, at least in terms of distance. At most of the sites examined here, ancillary structures tend to be closer to the principal dwelling. Only in larger compounds, such as at Rich Neck, is the homelot space occupied greater in size, and in those cases, the spaces in-between are being used. The lack of artifacts in the area between the two buildings suggests that the space is not being used, at least not for the discard of trash from domestic activities. The midden analysis suggests that similar domestic activities were taking place in the area of the dwelling and the likely second structure, and that the second structure was not serving a specialized function. Distributions of pipe stem bore diameters suggest the second building area may have been the first structure occupied, and the first abandoned, on the property. Perhaps Chaney and his family occupied this structure as they built the more substantial dwelling. Distributions of Rhenish stonewares, tin-glazed earthenwares, and table glass (Figure 26) at the larger dwelling indicate the likely place where Chaney lived. Perhaps the second structure became the place where the female servant lived. All of this is, of course, speculative without additional evidence, but the artifact patterns do suggest separation of something, even if it is unclear at this point what that ‘something’ is.

Figure 25. Plan view of structures and middens at Chaney’s Hills.

Architectural historians have suggested that the dwelling may have been larger and not fully uncovered during the course of excavation.
Table 13. Midden composition, Chaney’s Hills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>midden A</th>
<th>midden b</th>
<th>midden c</th>
<th>midden d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pipe</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=1235</td>
<td>N=398</td>
<td>N=254</td>
<td>N=268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/64ths</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/64ths</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/64ths</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/64ths</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/64ths</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin-glazed earthenware</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a Society with Slaves to a Slave Society

By the end of the 17th century, in both Maryland and Virginia, it was clear that the use of enslaved African men and women was not only an acceptable form of labor, but one that was here to stay. While indentured English and other European servants continued to come to the Chesapeake region, their numbers had so dramatically declined that many planters turned to slave labor. The opportunities Carr, Menard, and Walsh (1999) describe for the ‘Golden Age’ (at least for the English) were no longer on the table, and slaves bound for life had, in the eyes of many Englishmen, no need for such opportunities at any rate.
The King’s Reach site, located on the north side of the Patuxent in Calvert County, was first occupied c. 1690 by Richard Smith, Jr. on a tract of land Smith had inherited from his father in 1689 (Pogue 1988, 1990, 1997). The Smith family was and had been well-to-do; the father had come to Maryland as Lord Baltimore’s attorney, and Richard, Jr. had been a supporter of Lord Baltimore when the Protestant rebels seized political control of the colony in 1689. The younger Smith also served as Surveyor General and, in the process, acquired a number of large tracts throughout the colony. Smith was also a slaveholder. At his death, he owned 44 enslaved men, women, and children. He was not the first planter in our sample to have done so; the Kemps had slaves at Rich Neck, and slaves were attached to Rich Neck until its abandonment in the early 18th century. Slaves labored at the Clifts and at Mattapany, and someone of likely African ancestry was buried in the cemetery at Patuxent Point. What sets Smith apart is the date when he first built and occupied his plantation (c.1690), which he had recently inherited from his father. This was in the middle of the tobacco depression, and right after Lord Baltimore had lost control of his colony.

![Figure 27. Plan view of structures, fence lines, and middens at King’s Reach.](image)

The house Smith built was of earthfast construction, measuring 20-by-30-feet in size with a chimney apparently made of frame (Figure 27). A 10-foot shed addition ran along the back of the dwelling, while a separate quarter measuring 10-by-20-feet stood in the dwelling’s foreyard. Some researchers have been surprised by the relative impermanence and small size of Smith’s dwelling, especially given his standing with Lord Baltimore. At the time King’s Reach was built, however, Baltimore’s government was under siege and Smith was periodically imprisoned for his loyalty to the proprietor. Smith abandoned King’s Reach in 1711, when he moved into a newly built partially or wholly brick structure on the same tract. Perhaps King’s Reach was considered a temporary, expedient shelter, until Smith could re-establish himself in a post-Baltimore world.

Smith almost certainly had enslaved laborers during the time he and his family lived at King’s Reach; a quarter located approximately 500 feet away from the King’s Reach site appears to have been built using palisade construction, a construction technique that would have been
familiar to recently imported Africans. The shed addition at the back of the King’s Reach
dwelling was also of palisade-type construction and could have been built by the same laborers
who put up the quarter. Smith’s probate inventory, created in 1715, lists slaves with both African
and English names. Some of these individuals are clearly housed at distant quarters, and some
appear to have a greater role in plantation affairs than others. King’s Reach was likely part of the
home plantation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dwelling</th>
<th>quarter</th>
<th>ravine</th>
<th>dairy</th>
<th>shed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Glass</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pipe</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=2,573</td>
<td>N=2,177</td>
<td>N=717</td>
<td>N=1,116</td>
<td>N=623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Midden composition, King’s Reach.

Five midden areas were identified at King’s Reach, including three associated with the
dwelling (dwelling, dairy, and shed) and one associated with the adjacent quarter (Table 14). The
fifth midden, located in a ravine behind the dwelling, appears to have received trash throughout
the site’s occupation, and was the last midden in use prior to the site’s abandonment.

The ravine midden contains the highest proportions of table and bottle glass and tobacco
pipes with the lowest proportion of animal bone fragments. Ceramic vessel fragments recovered
from the ravine midden represent forms used in the consumption of food and drink, including
plates, saucers, and drinking pots. Ceramic bottle and butter pot fragments were also recovered
from the ravine in relatively high numbers.

On the south side of the dwelling, the dwelling and quarter middens exhibited some
interesting differences. Both middens contained large numbers of artifacts. More tobacco pipes
were recovered from the dwelling midden, while more animal bone fragments were recovered
from the quarter midden. A significantly greater percentage of tin-glazed earthenwares (primarily
from plates) and English brown stoneware were recovered from the quarter midden. Far more
butter pot and jug fragments were recovered from the dwelling midden.

There is some evidence that Smith was a merchant who needed space to store goods on
his plantation. At his death, his probate inventory lists an upper and a lower store, and these two
buildings were well stocked with all sorts of English goods, from fabric to ceramics. The two
stores are located at the newer plantation house Smith had built in 1711, but it is likely that he had
storage requirements before then. Perhaps the quarter functioned as a store, especially close by to
allow Smith to keep an eye on it and its contents. It is plausible that a servant or slave lived in the
quarter, given the possibility of a small hearth (indeed, servants or slaves could have also
quartered in the principal dwelling).

Also nearby, approximately 600 feet from Smith’s dwelling and 100 feet from the field
quarter, archaeologists discovered a large, contemporary agricultural building that may have been
a tobacco house (King 1999). Measuring 25-by-50-feet, this building would have held tobacco
cut in fields from farther away, requiring additional labor to transport it for curing.

Our earlier comparison of Compton, Patuxent Point, and Mattapany revealed that the
households at all three enjoyed more or less the same types of domestic furnishings. What set
Mattapany apart – after all, this was the plantation dwelling of the third Lord Baltimore – was the greater numbers of domestic furnishings. What also set Mattapany apart was Baltimore’s investment in his architecture, and his dwelling stood out in an otherwise undifferentiated landscape. Although Smith was Baltimore’s supporter and civil servant (as surveyor general), by the time he built and occupied King’s Reach, the economic, social, and political landscape of Maryland was considerably changed. Smith chose to build a structure that impressed most of us involved with this project as beneath his economic and social standing.

While Smith may have been conserving his resources when it came to architecture, he appears to have invested in the acquisition of slave labor, the construction of agricultural buildings, and in his merchant activities. Smith’s plantation became a place where planters came to acquire goods; it also became a landscape with newly imported Africans (and a number of them) building and occupying structures that probably looked different than Smith’s, and the associated artifacts indicate that Smith provided these households with the barest minimum of goods. After twenty years at King’s Reach, as the Chesapeake was emerging from the tobacco depression, Smith was able to abandon King’s Reach for a newly constructed brick dwelling prominently placed on a point of land on his plantation. Even so, Smith’s new brick house lasted only forty years; Smith himself died after occupying the house for less than five years.

While Smith continued his efforts to make his plantation productive in the context of the tobacco economy, on the Eastern Shore, Richard Bennett III and his wife, Elizabeth, began the construction of a more impressive dwelling in Queen Anne’s County. To this point, Eastern Shore planters had been, like their counterparts elsewhere in Maryland, focused on the production of tobacco. Beginning in the early 18th century, however, planters on the Eastern Shore had begun the shift from tobacco to grain (Clemens 1980). Bennett’s Point, the last site in our study, was occupied by Bennett and his wife between 1700 and 1749. Bennett’s Point was a major port (not unlike what Smith was trying to do in Calvert County), and Richard Bennett, a lawyer, planter, and merchant, became one of the wealthiest men in the colony. Excavations were conducted at Bennett’s Point by avocational volunteers between 1966 and 1974, and those investigations are reported in Wesler (1984). And, like Smith, Bennett was also a slaveholder. Grain, however, did not require the same intensive labor requirements as tobacco, while still generating a viable return.

The dwelling house at Bennett’s Point measured 22-by-80-feet, with a massive, centrally-placed H-shaped hearth heating two rooms (Figure 28). The building had at least three rooms on the ground floor. The foundation, laid in Flemish bond, measured a brick-and-a-half wide and likely supported a second floor. The house was destroyed by fire in the 1760s. Excavation units focused primarily on the dwelling’s footprint, limiting what can be said about the organization of the entire homelot, including the yard space immediately surrounding the dwelling. Nonetheless, the artifacts recovered from this site and their distribution do have relevance for the project at hand.

More than 4,600 ceramic fragments were recovered from the 48 units over the dwelling. Earthenware types include materials previously seen at the other sites, including North Devon Gravel Tempered, gravel-free, and Sgraffito wares, tin-glazed ceramics, Iberian wares, black-glazed redwares, and Rhenish and White salt-glazed stonewares. In addition were 330 Chinese porcelain fragments from bowls and teacups. Chinese porcelain is not altogether absent at the sites considered here, but never in the high quantities reported for Bennett’s Point.
The central room, located east of the chimney stack, exhibited concentrations of tobacco pipes, wine bottles, tin-glazed earthenwares, and white salt-glazed stonewares. The fireplace on this side of the chimney also appears to have been decorated with delft tiles. The room to the chimney’s west, which may have been a kind of “back room” with its entrance through the central room, had concentrations of pipes, wine bottles, case bottles, and porcelain, but few tin-glazed earthenwares or white salt-glazed stonewares. These materials suggest the kind of formal, consumptive activities taking place at the site, and the spatial segregation of these activities into two rooms, each with slightly different material culture assemblages. The central room may have functioned as a dining room, while the “back room” served for the social consumption of tea.

Not only was Bennett more able to invest in the accoutrements associated with formal dining and tea drinking, he was also able to house these activities in separate architectural spaces. These activities are more than just an expression of the greater leisure time available to a planter like Bennett; they are also relevant to a discussion of Bennett’s role in shaping his social circle and group identity through shared experience, using material goods out of the purchasing realm of most people in the 18th century. While few slaveholders acquired the kinds of resources necessary to emulate Bennett and his household, Bennett, through his public standing, helped shape notions of his elite class. In Calvert County, Smith was never able to invest in consumer goods on the scale Richard Bennett did, even after moving to his new brick house.
Part II

Measuring the Advent of Gentility in the Colonial Chesapeake

Dennis J. Pogue

Compiling a data base that is widely accessible to scholars is viewed as an important tangible benefit of the effort to explore the material conditions of domestic life in the Chesapeake Bay region—Virginia and Maryland—during the period spanning the 17th and early 18th centuries. The questions at hand are hardly new, beginning with a desire to document how the different groups making up that society—Englishmen, Africans, and Native Americans—used material culture to shape their daily lives, as well as to order their everyday relationships with each other. My own long-term interest has been to trace the process by which English cultural norms were adapted to New World conditions, to provide insight into why that adaptation occurred, and to assess the role of material culture in effecting that change. These questions have been in the air at least since the 1970s, but archaeologists will require a rich corpus of comparative and regionally representative evidence to have any hope of success in answering them.

This project provides an opportunity to begin those comparisons, although the usual caveats apply and need to be acknowledged at this point. As we began this endeavor, we were looking for assemblages from well-excavated sites, and where the excavators had taken care to extract a representative sample of artifacts from plowed contexts. The latter criterion was deemed crucial in enabling us to analyze spatial patterns of artifact distributions at each site, and then to make inter-site comparisons. Because the number of sites with available collections that fit those characteristics is limited, we were not at liberty to further refine the sample set by organizing it according to other important factors, such as geographic distribution, level of wealth, length of occupation, richness of supporting documentation, and the like. We also still need to resolve some issues in terms of the catalogue data—more on that later.

The first really serious interest in matters of the material condition of domestic life on the part of archaeologists was spurred by the work of the Chesapeake school of social historians in the 1970s. After reading what Edmund Morgan (1975), Lois Carr and Lorena Walsh (1988, 1994), and Cary and Barbara Carson (1976), and their colleagues had to say about the volatile mix of social, cultural, and political currents that shaped life in 17th-century Virginia and Maryland, archaeologists naturally wanted to join the fun. To a greater or lesser degree, most of these scholars adopted a frontier settlement model as an organizing device for their interpretations of Chesapeake social history. According to this formulation, Chesapeake society followed a series of developmental steps, evolving from a period of cultural impoverishment characteristic of the years beginning just after initial settlement, followed by rapid adaptation in the face of New World conditions, and concluding with a fully realized new social and economic structure.

James Deetz’s (1977) conception of the development of the “Georgian mindset,” presented in his influential book In Small Things Forgotten, and the “consumer revolution” model espoused most eloquently by Cary Carson beginning in the late 1980s, elaborated on the frontier model in ways that were particularly evocative for archaeologists. Both models postulated that the trajectory of changes that had been identified by documentary historians had their corollary in patterns of development in material culture that could be used to paint a more detailed picture of life in the early Chesapeake.
Carson (1994) and others adapted the findings of English scholars who proposed that a profound change in social norms had occurred in England beginning in the 16th century, resulting in the breakdown of traditional means of marking status, and the selection of a whole new class of objects to serve as standards of social intercourse. This movement, dubbed the “consumer revolution,” spread overseas along with the thousands of emigrants to the New World, Carson and others argued, and found particularly fertile ground in which to grow in the turbulent social and economic conditions of the 17th-century Chesapeake.

The first archaeological data in play in support of this thesis consisted of the identification of novel characteristics of Chesapeake building forms and methods, and patterns in their modification over time (Carson et al. 1981; Neiman 1986, 1990, 1993; Stone 1982). Briefly, in response to specific regional conditions, and in particular the adoption of a region-wide economic strategy of a monoculture based on the cultivation and export of tobacco, Chesapeake housing took on a variety of characteristics selected for their low construction costs. Houses of this type represented a remarkable step backward for most English settlers. Experimentation in terms of house size and layout continued over the ensuing decades, however, and by the last years of the century significant changes had occurred. These were both functional and stylistic in nature, and they have been interpreted as reflecting both the ascendance of a native-born gentry elite, and their desire to more clearly delineate their owner’s status, both real and desired.

Even more important support for the interpretation of a region-wide consumer revolution has been provided by analyzing data derived from probate inventories. The probate data suggest that, across the board, the standards of living for English immigrants to the Chesapeake were considerably lower than what these same immigrants had experienced back home, and those settlers who enjoyed even significant advantages in wealth did not demonstrate their economic standing by owning distinctive and costly types of objects. Rather, they simply owned more of the same types of things that were found in the households of those of more modest means. Based on an analysis of probate inventories from southern Maryland, Lois Carr and Lorena Walsh (1988, 1994) conclude that it was not until about 1715 that the Tidewater elite began to acquire a greater array of material goods that facilitated a style of living that more clearly set them off from ordinary folk. Evidence for this development was found in an increase in items to which Walsh and Carr gave the term “amenities,” such things as fine ceramics, table knives and forks, books and clocks, and the like.

Given the popularity of ceramics as a topic of study among archaeologists, it is not surprising that their next attempts to provide insights into these matters was based on identifying patterns in the types and use of ceramic vessels found on Chesapeake sites. Following the lead of Anne Yentsch (1991), a number of years ago I was able to compile relatively detailed data relating to ceramic vessels found at 17 sites spanning the period circa 1620 to 1730. The results also seem to indicate a period of functional adjustment and a long trajectory of stylistic elaboration. Essentially, when the assemblages are tabulated according to broad functional types, a clear trend appears, with food preparation vessels declining as the dominant type, and with beverage vessels becoming more prevalent after circa 1680. According to Yentsch, and in combination with faunal evidence for dietary patterns provided by Henry Miller (1984, 1988b) and others, these changes in the proportions of vessel types reflect the increasing presentation of individualized servings of food and drink at dining, which in turn indicates a major shift in foodways that began several decades earlier than was suggested by the probate data alone.

The introduction of specialized wares in support of the newly fashionable activity of tea drinking is especially noteworthy in this regard, as the influx of those wares made up a significant percentage of the increasing portion of beverage vessels after 1690, and it serves to exemplify the
notion of cultural elaboration. Adopting the tea ceremony as a prime means of social mediation among the elite was a novel departure from traditional practices, and thus reflects the type of new, socially-driven change that is at the heart of the consumer revolution model.

A related concept is that of segmentation—the insertion of additional activities and related implements within traditional social spheres. Identifying such novelties is helpful in understanding the larger cultural processes at work, and evidence for them should be discernible in the archaeological record. For example, the introduction of a new table utensil, such as the fork, to traditional habits of dining qualifies as such, and, like the adoption of tea wares, suggests a deeper cultural meaning.

As a means of expanding on these insights, back in the early 1990s, I compiled a sample of household-level, archaeologically recovered artifact assemblages in order to measure the presence or absence of selected categories of objects (Pogue 1993). In doing so, I consciously attempted to replicate as best I could the “amenities” selected by Carr and Walsh (1988) for their study of changing living standards. My categories included such things as fine and coarse earthenwares, knives, spoons, candles, and a variety of other household items. I was searching for evidence of elaboration and segmentation over time that would support the consumer revolution model as well as test the contention that it was not until the 18th century that the elite began to acquire different, more socially distinctive items. Finally, I hoped to provide a perspective on the issue of the timing and trajectory of changes in living standards that was independent of inventory data.

Unfortunately, limitations in the sample—especially the lack of detailed information available to allow me to make finer distinctions between certain artifact types—hindered me in this attempt. Other than the appearance during the last quarter of the 17th century of such novel items as table forks, few definitive patterns were discernible. However, one important outcome seems to be beyond doubt. According to my admittedly small sample, the interpretations of scholars using probate data as a measure of living standards appear to be biased by the habitual under-representation of certain types of objects in their documents. Contrary to the findings that a wide array of household items do not appear in inventories, those same items were found with regularity in the archaeological assemblages that were examined. For example, according to inventories, only 13 percent of Maryland’s poorest households and roughly 76 percent of the wealthiest owned any ceramics made of earthenware or stoneware. Furthermore, only 5 percent of the wealthiest households owned “fine ceramics,” a category which includes tin-glazed earthenware. In contrast, a full 100 percent of the sites selected for my original study, as well as the 18 sites included in the present project, yielded both coarse and fine ceramics. And the list goes on. When it came to table spoons and knives, and such seemingly necessary objects as hoes, the inventories habitually missed them, as they appear at all but the very poorest archaeological sites.

As a means of addressing these issues anew, I developed an expanded range of types of artifacts, a new amenities list, if you will. These consist of 40 types of artifacts arranged in seven general classes—relating to food, furnishings, entertainment, sewing, clothing, horse furniture, weaponry, and architecture. Unfortunately, due to cataloging issues that are yet to be resolved, I was only able to use 11 of the 18 sites for this analysis, but I am encouraged that the preliminary results will indicate the value of this overall approach.

Once again, on the basis of sheer numbers alone, no strong temporal trends are apparent. But when the assemblages are examined according to artifact class, several interesting patterns suggest themselves, and will bear further investigation. Note in particular the high peaks for two
sites, Jordan’s Point, an early 17th-century site on the James River in Virginia, and for King’s Reach, in Calvert County, Maryland, occupied during the last years of the 17th century. Also note the marked difference between Jordan’s Point and the site that is temporally closest to it, CG8, home to an anonymous and apparently impoverished household that settled a few miles downstream from Jordan’s on the north bank of the James.

The Jordan’s site is the earliest of the sites in our sample, having been occupied from circa 1620 to 1635, and was an enclosed settlement with at least five dwellings and associated storage buildings. The early date of its occupation and the nucleated layout that is similar to that found at other early sites, such as Jamestown, Martin’s Hundred, and Flowerdew Hundred, suggest that the associated artifact assemblage would exhibit characteristics that were quite different from those found at later sites, such as King’s Reach. And in fact, this is the case. Food related items such as pots and pot hooks, skillets and spits, etc., are the single most numerous category, but probably the most distinctive result is the high number of weaponry and military related objects, such as armor, swords and dagger parts, and gun parts, the highest of any of the sites studied here, and the total absence of entertainment related objects.

In contrast, the very sparse architectural evidence found at CG 8, interpreted as a single dwelling with an adjoining enclosed yard, together with the paucity of recovered artifacts, indicates that the site probably was occupied by a single household of quite limited means. When the data for the seven categories are compared with that from Jordan’s, the difference is dramatic. The excavators of the site, led by Andy Edwards, have concluded that CG 8 is representative of that rarest and most easily overlooked of domestic complexes, the homelot of a household operating at the lowest level of Chesapeake society. When compared to others in our sample, the associated artifact assemblage certainly supports that interpretation. Yet even so, the recovery of the remnants of 18 ceramic vessels—including stoneware and tin-glazed earthenware—once again is contrary to the expectations based on inventories.

King’s Reach is a tobacco plantation homelot occupied from circa 1690 to 1710, and probably was the home of Richard Smith, Jr., a wealthy colonist who served for a time as the Surveyor General of Maryland. Although Smith was well-to-do, he lived in an earthfast structure like those of most of his neighbors, apparently investing his wealth in a variety of household goods rather than in architectural embellishments.

The artifact assemblage recovered from King’s Reach is remarkably rich, especially given the fact that the great majority of the subsurface features were not fully excavated. Julie King has referred to the site as “the small finds capital of Maryland,” given both the large numbers as well as the variety of household items found there. Once again, this chart only indicates the presence of selected items, not their frequency, and thus provides only a hint of the numbers involved. For now, simply note the significance of food related items, along with strong representation in the sewing and horse related categories, and the not-unexpected relative lack of weaponry.

Just to demonstrate the variety of items in question—and to get a few pictures of artifacts into a paper supposedly dedicated to them—here you see spoons and what I believe to be a table knife, personal items like a jaw harp, buckles, cufflinks, beads, pins and a thimble, and a copper finger ring. The horse-related items include stirrups, spurs, bridle bits, harness buckles, and brass harness bosses. Also present are a variety of iron tools, architectural hardware, and more.

The contrast between the overall patterns of the King’s Reach and Jordan’s assemblages is marked, and I believe clearly speaks to the changing social conditions occurring over the
course of the century. Once again, the Jordans’s assemblage is dominated by food, sewing, and weaponry related items. At King’s Reach, the food and sewing categories are comparable, most likely demonstrating the universal significance of those activities that seemingly changed little over time, but weaponry has declined, undoubtedly reflecting the more settled nature of the region. In addition, entertainment, clothing, and horse-related objects represent an increased proportion of the King’s Reach assemblage, and they all are categories that have been identified as becoming more important over time and reflecting a maturing society.

Mattapany was the home of Charles Calvert, the Governor of Maryland and the heir of Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore and Lord Proprietor of the colony. As such, Calvert was one of the wealthiest as well as the most powerful man in the colony. Calvert built one of the largest homes in Maryland, a structure that was even more noteworthy given the fact that it was constructed of brick. Less than 200 yards from the dwelling, a series of trash filled pits yielded an artifact assemblage that seems likely to be associated with Mattapany, and I have included those items in this study. But even after adding the artifacts recovered from the pits, the overall Mattapany assemblage is surprising for its relative paucity of amenities. In their analysis of the Mattapany artifact assemblage, Julie King and Ed Chaney (2003) concluded that Calvert clearly invested heavily in the construction and presentation of his dwelling, to the apparent sacrifice of his household goods.

Finally, I would like to briefly discuss some patterns of intrasite variability that appear to present further interpretive opportunities. The Clifts site, located near the Potomac River on the Northern Neck of Virginia, was occupied for a remarkably long span of years, from circa 1670 to 1730, and thus presents the opportunity to study changing patterns of behavior at one site, and where comparability of data should be less of a concern. Four distinct phases of deposition have been identified, and a comparison of the frequencies of the selected categories of artifacts according to phase presents some interesting results. Most noteworthy may be the fact that there appears to be little change over time for several of the categories—sewing, architecture, even food and entertainment—but the greater incidence of horse related materials and clothing items in the final phase is suggestive and, along with the declining significance of weaponry, go along with patterns from the other sites.

So, where do we go from here? First of all, we need better data, and more of it. To a degree this will undoubtedly occur as more sites are added to the study set, but previous experience indicates that more detailed information will need to be gleaned from all of the assemblages as well. As an example, consider the question of the segmentation of dining utensils that I alluded to earlier. With the introduction of table forks during the last decades of the 17th century, the function of table knives clearly was affected. How can we explore this change, and more to the point, how can we measure and interpret it? At the most basic level, we would like to be able to identify knives according to their function, but at present there is no objective means to do so. The likeliest approach to this problem is to attempt to capture meaningful dimensions of data from the knives themselves. Here is what we are faced with – rusty fragments of knife blades that don’t seem very forthcoming. Since the knives that we recover are seldom complete, I have started by measuring the height and width of the blade fragments, in hopes that relative size still will be a helpful characteristic and that those measurements will cohere in a rational pattern. This scatterplot represents the measurements obtained from 20 knives from the King’s Reach and Rich Neck sites. If size alone were the dominant functional characteristic, then I would expect to see a stronger pattern of differentiation, possibly a bimodal distribution reflecting the difference between table and utility knives. Clearly it is not that simple, however, although these charts showing the range of variation among the two dimensions—knife height on the left and width on
the right—suggest that size still may be helpful, as the range between largest and smallest is significant.

Hopefully, with the creation of a more robust sample of data pertaining not only to knives, but to the entire range of domestic furnishings from throughout the region, we will take an important step forward in our goal of more fully explicating the interplay of cultural dynamics that were at work in the development of early Chesapeake society.
Notions of Comfort in the Early Colonial Chesapeake

Philip Levy, John Coombs, and David Muraca

In previous papers, we have sought to use archaeological data to rethink some of the reigning assumptions about life in the colonial Chesapeake and move toward a new vision of an early colonial Virginia “frontier.” Our work has focused principally on a few sites in the Virginia tidewater and along the upper reaches of the Rappahannock spanning the years between 1640 and 1760. For example, we used the artifactual and architectural data from a circa 1690 Rappahannock plantation to argue that the existing models of the “frontier” informed by Frederick Jackson Turner and Emmanuel Wallerstien do not account for the combinations of housing and assemblages we are seeing at these sites (Levy, Coombs, and Muraca 2004).

In this chapter we examine a corollary theme, that the Virginia colonial hinterlands were rough, reduced versions of the heartland. This de facto Core-Periphery model suggests that, as one moved away from the heartland, isolation, impoverishment, and cultural and material simplicity took hold. Researchers who cite this model describe the frontier as a land of ‘make-do’, where colonists cobbled together limited resources and lived simple lives regardless of their social station or wealth. Relying mostly on probate data, these scholars have argued that rich and poor alike shared what Aubrey Land and others have called a “rude simplicity,” where material class distinctions were leveled and differences between rich from poor, if they existed, were marked by the quantity of simple possessions people owned, and not the quality of what they owned. This vision of material Virginia has been most recently restated by John Crowley (2001) in The Invention of Comfort: Sensibilities and Design in Early Modern Britain and Early America, where he explores how modern concepts of comfort took shape in the 17th- and 18th-century British Atlantic world.

We examine eleven of the sites compiled in this project to consider how some of the key indicators of comfort (as described by Crowley) played out in Virginia and Maryland. Comparing these eleven sites suggests that, like England and New England, Chesapeake settlers had real architectural and material choices for how their homes should look and function. Rather than lagging behind other parts of the Atlantic World—as Crowley and others have suggested—Chesapeake planters incorporated many of the elements of comfort, including forms of domestic heating, security, illumination, protection from fire, pest-control, privacy, aesthetics, and hygienic living. We argue that this ability to partake of these metropolitan trends places Chesapeake planters of many socio-economic groups solidly in the then-current Atlantic World mainstream. Planters were able to, and did, employ a range of material embellishment based on their particular desires.

The vast majority of these embellishments do not show up in probate inventories or other historical records; we see them, as our colleague Dennis Pogue observed in the previous chapter, only through archaeological excavation. Comparative site study reveals the regional spread and social depth of these domestic trends. We have divided our eleven sites into four categories defined by the social ranking of their interpreted owners. At the bottom of this truncated hierarchy are sites occupied by tenants, servants, and slaves. Just above them are poor to middling planters followed by county-level elites, and at the top are colonial-level elites. Members of each of these groups appear in varying degrees in the project’s collected sites. We discuss the eleven sites hierarchically and suggest how the sites’ features and assemblages reveal 17th-century settlers participating in the elements of comfort.
The homes of the 17th-century’s meanest sort are notoriously tricky to identify archaeologically, and consequently are often overlooked. Thus, this largest of demographic groups is poorly represented in the overall data set. In this project we have only a few of these homes available for study, and many are located near elite dwellings. The only geographically isolated example of a tenant/indentured servant’s house is a frame post-in-the-ground structure located along Virginia’s James River at what is today called Carter’s Grove. The principal structure’s ground floor contained 403 square feet of space, divided into two rooms. Tacked onto one gable end was a lean-to shed addition providing an additional 72 square feet of space. The building’s regular appearance suggests it was carpenter built. The structure’s roof was wooden, its floor earthen, its walls unplastered riven clapboard, and its living space directly accessed from the outside. Although brick fragments were recovered, no mortared bricks were. Large quantities of burned daub indicate the dwelling sported a wattle and daub fireplace, the sole source of heat and interior lighting. Unglazed windows offered sunlight during the day, but also allowed rain, heat, and cold inside the house. Candle-related paraphernalia and mirror glass were absent, meaning the fireplace served as the only source of artificial illumination. Security came in the form of a gun and a sword, but no locks on the doors. There may have been some concerns about internal security as two furniture locks were recovered from this site.

Ten miles upriver, Rich Neck plantation’s owners used three post-in-the-ground structures to house their slaves. The ground floor square footage for these buildings was 256, 360, and 720 respectively. No evidence of hearths, fireplaces, daub, or wooden floors was present in these buildings. The two smaller structures contained only a single room on the ground floor. The largest structure probably contained three ground floor rooms. All three buildings featured direct outside entrance into the dwellings and windows allowed in air and light. Missing artifacts include mirror glass, locks and keys, and candle-related accoutrements. Window glass and lead cames found around the two smaller structures may have originally been associated with the plantation’s kitchen located nearby.

Artifact evidence from these sites suggests that there was no attempt on the part of the builder to use architecture to limit the impact of a fire, increase privacy, or improve hygiene for indentured servants, tenants, and slaves. These issues would have been of little concern to property owners—niceties not to be wasted on servants and tenants.

The size and types of structures in this group are often thought of as typical 17th-century Chesapeake dwellings. Their small dimensions, lack of specialized space, deficiency of amenities, and direct outdoor entrances match many scholars’ mental image of the typical Chesapeake house. But even some of these houses contained unexpected amenities. For example, the tenant/indentured servant house at Carter’s Grove possessed a chimney. The presence of fireplaces in the entire sample of English occupied houses calls into question the prevailing notion that hearths laid directly on the ground were common in Virginia and Maryland after the 1620s.

The data also challenges the notion that Chesapeake freemen typically lived in single roomed houses. The tenant/indentured servant house, while slightly smaller than the ordinary planter houses in the study, contained two ground floor rooms. The variability in the size of slave housing may have more to do with number of occupants forced to live in them than any significant social meaning.

One step above tenants, indentured servants, and slaves were ordinary planters. This group greatly outnumbered its more genteel counterparts in the 17th-century Chesapeake.
Typically they worked their fields with their families or a small bound labor force growing tobacco and corn, raising livestock, and establishing orchards and kitchen gardens.

The two ordinary planter houses in the study are similar in many ways to servant housing. Larger in size (600 and 500 square feet compared to 461 square feet for the servant dwelling), these post-in-the-ground structures employ wooden roofs, and exterior wattle and daub chimneys on the gable end. Both allowed visitors to enter directly into living space from outside. Differences include the development of specialized space and flooring materials. Both structures in this group had two main ground rooms with one featuring a small closet and the other a large unlined cellar. Both had wooden floors on the ground floor—one in just one room, the other in both rooms. Both structures featured glazed windows allowing light in without the weather. One dwelling underwent a major renovation that involved the demolition of the wattle and daub chimney in favor of a stone and brick fireplace.

This group did not employ very many architectural niceties in the houses. There is no evidence that mirrors or candles were used to create artificial lighting. When darkness arrived these planters either used the fireplaces for light or went to sleep. The houses were roofed with wooden shingles and no evidence of plastering exists. Decorative items such as delft tiles are missing, but one house used metal rings to display textiles. Door locks and keys and guns increased security at these sites.

Increased size and number of rooms, wooden floors, specialized spaces, glazed windows, and security efforts separated the ordinary planters from servants. These attributes reflect the initial stirrings of a quest for comfort on part of the men. None of these features would have appeared in probate inventories and thus are lost to historians searching for distinctions between the Chesapeake’s two lower castes.

The next group of dwellings belongs to county-level elites consisting of planters holding county offices, such as sheriff or justice of the peace, to more established planters who may have had honorific titles, led militias, or served in representative assemblies. Many of these men controlled large amounts of land and became quite wealthy. Our sample includes the homes of such members of the lower gentry as a lawyer, a merchant, a ship’s captain, and a provincial surveyor.

For the first time in this study, this group could choose between wood frame and brick houses. Three chose earthfast with brick elements and one chose to build a crossplan brick house. Interestingly, the planter who chose brick built his house before his rise in power and prestige. The houses are larger (684, 800, 900, 1152 square feet) and in addition to the traditional hall and parlor included sheds, closets, and towers. One structure (King’s Reach) contained six cellars, while another contained an 800-square-foot finished brick cellar. The principal structures at each site contained between three and four ground floor rooms, featured brick chimneys, and two had wooden floors. Also for the first time, specialized space was used to limit visitor access from the outside in one of the houses. The others provided direct access from the outside to at least some rooms.

All of the houses in this group made use of window glass and mirror glass. Three had at least some portion of the structure plastered and employed curtain rings. The brick house employed specialty brick and ceramic roofing tiles. None of the houses boasted decorative delft tiles and only one used yellow fireplace bricks. Door locks as well as guns provided security at these houses.
All of the homeowners in this group used artificial lighting to fend off the night. For the first time ceramic roofing tiles are employed to lessen the likelihood of a catastrophic fire. Large sections of the house were plastered in order to increase cleanliness. While most houses in this group did not employ many decorative architectural elements, the cross plan house contained specialty bricks, floor tiles, roofing tiles, and even a brick cartouche. The finished cellar’s Flemish bond brickwork was struck to give it a finished appearance. A large portion of the cellar was used to house wine and as a place for gentlemen to withdraw and drink. Also for the first time, architecture is used to create privacy. At two of the houses, privacy was enhanced either through the use of back rooms, or a small entranceway that controlled visitor access to the house.

Colonial elites, as their name infers, administered the two colonies. These were the men at the top of the colonial social pyramid. This study included a few sites occupied by members of this group including a Secretary of the Colony, a colonial Governor and proprietor, a wealthy lawyer, and a merchant among others.

The choice of building material for this group differs significantly from that of the provincial elites. In this group, three out of the four householders selected brick over wood in the construction of their dwellings. These houses are the largest in the two colonies, with the first floors featuring 1250 to 1760 square feet of space. The number of first floor rooms ranged from three to six rooms. All featured glazed windows and brick fireplaces decorated with delft tiles. At least two of the structures attempted to control visitor behavior by creating separate entranceways where visitors were greeted. All featured some wooden flooring and some plaster work, specialty brick, and ceramic tile roofs, even the earthfast frame structure. Mirror glass and curtain rings were recovered from two of the four, and candle accoutrement from three of the four. Door locks and guns provided security at these houses. One house featured unglazed ceramic tiles that may have been used as window seats; another contained ornamental plasterwork.

Two architectural niceties are exclusive to this group – specialized spaces and architectural elements that were purely decorative. The principal dwelling at Rich Neck plantation features a one room addition with a full brick-lined cellar that was accessed only from the exterior of the house. This room appears to have been an office and may be where the colonial records were kept for safekeeping after Nathaniel Bacon burned Jamestown. This attempt at privacy and security is remarkable, but the planter’s efforts to offer privacy to the plantation’s women by constructing a series of rooms located in the back half of the house was not.

One other trend is evident when particular artifacts are compared from these sites – the elites from Virginia chose more amenities for their houses than their Maryland counterparts at both the provincial and the cosmopolitan levels. Fifteen types of housing-and-furnishing-related artifacts were compiled for all elite sites. Scores were calculated for each site by counting the number of artifact types that were present on each site. For example – sites in the study with no yellow brick would score zero for that artifact type. Sites with yellow brick would score a one for the presence of yellow brick. If there were more than a single site in a category the total numbers were averaged.

Using this system, Virginian cosmopolitans scored a 14 out of a possible 15. Their Maryland counterparts scored a 9.5. Virginian provincials scored a nine with their Maryland complement scoring a 6.5. That Virginian provincials scored almost as high as Maryland cosmopolitans is surprising. Maryland elites either chose not to embellish their architecture as much as Virginians or were unable to. It would be interesting to expand the artifact categories to see if non-architectural artifact classes reflect a similar pattern, but that is another paper.
What emerges from this comparison is a region in which many Chesapeake colonists were able to and did participate in larger Atlantic World trends. The spread of comfortable living, as manifested in archaeologically-identifiable items like windows, finished fireplaces, and other domestic accoutrements is one of many metropolitan trends which we increasingly see played out along the Chesapeake’s riverways. These developments were neither universal nor monolithic. From what we can see archaeologically, colonists participated in comfort’s material dimensions idiosyncratically, employing what they could when and where they could. Nevertheless, we see in these sites that crucial elements of comfortable living were available, at least in piecemeal fashion, to planters at all levels of the social hierarchy. We suggest that what typified life in the Chesapeake was not a universal material poverty, but rather, an uneven penetration of the material components of larger Atlantic World developments, like the rise of comfort.

This paper challenges the notion advanced by some scholars that most of the Chesapeake’s free population lived in small single room houses and that the Chesapeake’s substantial planters chose not to build “faire houses” like their New England and English counterparts. It also casts doubt on the well-accepted argument that, despite their station in life, all colonials owned the same goods. Architecturally this is just not accurate – there was considerable variation between classes – and colonists of different social groups were able and willing to pay for a variety of items with which to improve their homes. We have been seeing these trends at work on our sites for some time now, but the present project has enabled the types of detailed inter-site comparisons which can meaningfully add substance to otherwise potentially isolated observations.
Archaeological Indicators of Native American Influences on English Life in the Colonial Chesapeake

Edward E. Chaney

Archaeologists working on Indian sites dating to the Contact Period in English colonial North America have long noted the presence of European artifacts, the mechanisms by which they got there, and their role in Native American society. However, with a few exceptions, the significance of Indian-made artifacts found at 17th- and 18th-century European sites has generated little comment, making for an interesting paradox. Surely, if European culture and material goods had a profound effect on Native American life, then Indians and their manufactured items must have similarly had a not insubstantial impact on the newly arrived settlers. Indeed, ethnohistorians and some archaeologists have long used a term to describe the interaction between Indians and Europeans (and Africans), and the affect this interaction had on all involved: creolization. For perhaps a majority of archaeologists, however Contact Period studies largely emphasize the “mutual discovery, conflict, accommodation, military and political subjugation of Indian people, and modern Indian struggles to preserve their cultural heritage” (Grumet 1995:11).

Although American historical archaeologists in recent years have increasingly expanded their research beyond the sites of European settlers, it is still true that much of what we know about Indian influences on these colonists comes from the work of historians. As they have pointed out, “relations with Native Americans remained at the center of colonial society and policy from the first days of settlement” (Pencak 2001:334). The Native American influences may have been quite profound: the very definition of “English” identity that evolved in the 16th and 17th centuries was in part a response to the first sustained interactions with cultural “Others,” particularly Africans and Native Americans. The English found models for ideal behavior in Indian lifeways and practices, such as moderation in eating and drinking, and their “simplified” cultures were seen as having virtues which the English had lost as they joined an increasingly cosmopolitan world (Vaughan and Vaughan 1997; Kupperman 2000). And just as English identity was altered by colonial encounters with cultural others, so too was a new “American” identity forged in the creolization process. Some have even suggested that one of the foundations of American “uniqueness”—the U.S Constitution—owes a debt to the ideals of the Iroquois Confederacy (Callaway 1997:187-188).

Of course, the creolization processes that led to a new American identity did not just exist in the realm of ideas. As we all learned in grade school, through the story of Squanto teaching the Pilgrims how to plant corn with fish heads, superior Native American tools and techniques were quickly adopted by European settlers. Indian fishing and hunting methods, along with agricultural practices, crops, and food preparation skills, soon became part of colonial household repertoires. The use of certain Indian material items, such as canoes and moccasins, was widespread. Trade brought various Native American exchange items, like shell beads, into the colonial economy, and a New World plant—tobacco—was long the leading currency in the colonial Chesapeake.

Documentary evidence suggests some of the mechanisms by which Indian material culture entered colonial households. Trade, of course, was an important means of bringing Indian objects to settlers. Indians working as employees, servants, or slaves of the English would have been another source of Native American goods. For example, settlers often employed Indians as hunters. Indian men and women also traveled from plantation to plantation, manufacturing canoes. Indian and English men served in joint military expeditions, where they quartered together. Indians who attended governmental meetings would be lodged with colonists for several
days, at public expense, and those who traveled alone for other purposes often sought overnight accommodations with settlers, reciprocating when Europeans passed near their homes (Merrell 1979:558-559). Interactions at the household level took place often enough that the Maryland Assembly had to pass a law in 1654 which, at least temporarily, forbade settlers from “entertaining” Indians in their homes, except for those who arrived under “publique Treaty” (Archives of Maryland I:348). There were other, less common, routes for Native American goods to enter colonial households. One was through theft (Archives of Maryland IV:166, 209, 269). This could include even grave robbing, as occurred on the Maryland Eastern Shore in 1686 when Englishmen allegedly stole skins and shell beads from a recently deceased Indian leader’s grave (Marye 1936:41). And perhaps most interestingly, there was prostitution: in 1644, an English woman was accused of sleeping with an Indian in exchange for shell beads (Archives of Maryland IV:258). All of these mechanisms, and no doubt many more, could have brought Native American goods into English households.

In the 17th century, Indian goods at Chesapeake colonial households had a largely functional purpose, as suggested by contemporary documents. For example, eight “Indian bowles” were listed in the 1688 probate inventory of one southern Maryland settler (Inventories 9:481-485). These vessels were stored in his milk house, along with other “earthen potts,” presumably of European manufacture. No Indian wares were listed in the other buildings on the plantation. This suggests that, when present, Indian ceramics were not considered curiosities for display, but were used in food preparation or storage. In fact, early English writers praised the strength and versatility of Native American pottery, which could be used over an open fire (Kupperman 2000:164), and in Tidewater Virginia, Indian-made colonoware ceramics continued to be used throughout the 18th century (Noël Hume 1962; Henry 1992). Indian clay tobacco pipes, while largely absent from the documentary record (as are their European counterparts), also clearly found ready acceptance by colonial settlers. And lengths of shell beads, which were an integral part of Chesapeake exchange systems, are sometimes found in the probate inventories of early settlers. After the mid-17th century, references to shell beads become rare, but do still occasionally occur. As late as 1682, shell beads were exchanged as part of a peace treaty between New York Indians and the Maryland and Virginia governments (Archives of Maryland LXV:41; XVII:212). Indian-made baskets, mats, and canoes also appear in early probate inventories.

Although Indian material culture became less common in probate inventories during the course of the 17th century, it is evident that their use was not mere frontier expediency, to be abandoned as European goods became more available. For example, during Bacon’s Rebellion in 1676 Virginia, a Pamunkey Indian village was attacked and looted of “Indian matts, Basketts, matchcotes, parcells of Wampampeag and Roanoke...in Baggs, skins, Furrs, Pieces of Lynneen, Broad cloth, and divers sorts of English goods” (quoted in Oberg 1999:205). The English would not have taken these Indian goods unless they had some value to the looters. That same year, the Virginia Assembly passed an act which decreed that settlers were to only use corn to pay Indians for “fish, canooes, bowles, mattes or basketts” (quoted in Henry 1992:20). Ten years later, a traveler in Virginia noted that Indian women made pottery and pipes, and that the English paid for these pots with the amount of corn the vessels could hold (ibid). Clearly, the English were still using a wide range of Indian-made goods during the latter part of the 17th century.

However, by the 18th century, many of the Indian goods appearing in the homes of European settlers were taking on a new role—that of curio. In Europe, these goods had long been treated as novelties and collector items. For example, in 1638, Lord Baltimore, then living in England, asked Maryland Governor Leonard Calvert to send him enough Indian mats to cover the floor of a room (Hall 1967:158). In the Charter of Maryland, Lord Baltimore was required to present to the King of England two Indian arrows as annual tribute. Indian clothing, pouches, and
belts decorated with shell beads were often found in European collections. And in 1686, a Virginian sent to a friend in England “an Indian habit for your boy, the best I could procure amongst our neighbor Indians” (Feest 1989:622). These clothes were probably going to be used by a child playing “dress-up.” But in the 17th-century Chesapeake, there is little evidence for such collector behavior. No doubt the practical reality of colonial life precluded people from spending too much time on “hobbies.” But by the 18th century, however, this had begun to change. A clear example of the evolving role of Indian goods in colonial society can be seen in an incident described by Peter Kalm in 1748. He saw an Indian pot in the collection of the naturalist John Bartram, along with sherds of Native American ceramic and steatite vessels. Bartram had purchased this pot, which had been dug up from a “place where the Indians formerly lived.” To Bartram, the pot and sherds obviously had scientific significance. But interestingly, the man who first dug up the pot saw a more functional value in it, and used it to store grease (Kalm 1987[1770]:172-173).

The archaeological record of the colonial Chesapeake supports what the documents are telling us: that Indian-made objects were present in 17th- and 18th-century households. This is shown in the following analysis of the sites included in this project, along with selected other sites from the region.

It must first be acknowledged that most of the project sites contain prehistoric Native American artifacts. This is not surprising, given that a good habitation area in the 17th century was generally a good place to live or work prehistorically. The c.1620-1635 Jordan’s Journey site is a good example of this. The buildings at Jordan’s Journey were constructed on top of a Protohistoric or Early Historic Weyanoke Indian village. Nine Native American houses were uncovered there. This occupation obviously produced extensive pre-colonial artifact middens. However, by focusing on Indian artifacts in primary colonial deposits, the excavators were able to tease out evidence that the English residents of Jordan’s Journey did rely on Native Americans for some food and household objects, as well as—interestingly enough—rocks from the western Piedmont that Indians apparently provided to settlers prospecting for ore deposits (Mouer et al. 1992). This focus on primary colonial deposits is essential in studying the use of Indian-made material culture at most sites.

It must also be noted that Indian-made artifacts that plausibly could have been used by settlers form a very small percentage of the objects at English colonial sites, generally less than one percent. Obviously, many of the interactions and exchanges between Indians and Europeans resulted in the colonists receiving perishable goods like baskets, mats, food, and furs, things which don’t usually leave an obvious archaeological signature. However, although the numbers are small, Indian-made items are present at a majority of the sites included in this project, indicating that many 17th-century settlers experienced some form of direct or indirect contact with Native Americans.

Shell beads are generally rare on colonial sites, and only two project sites produced any. At the c. 1658-1690 Patuxent Point site in Maryland, two beads were recovered from two pit features. At the c. 1630-1650 Sandys site in Virginia, one bead was found. There are several possible explanations for this scarcity. One is a function of their value, since other forms of currency, like metal coinage, are also uncommon on early sites. The fragility and oftentimes small size of the beads, along with the excavation methods typically used on colonial sites, may have affected their recovery as well. At the 17th-century, Indian-occupied Posey Site in Maryland, dozens of tiny shell beads were recovered from plow zone samples water-screened through window mesh. Only a couple were recovered from the bulk of the plow zone, which was
screened through ¼-inch mesh only. Fine-screening of plow zone is not standard practice in the Chesapeake, so it is not surprising that shell beads are rarely reported.

Pottery of Indian manufacture is somewhat more common on 17th-century sites. At Jordan’s Journey, more than half of the Native American ceramics recovered were protohistoric Gaston and Roanoke wares. Most of these were no doubt associated with the Weyanoke Indian village. However, some were found in contexts that suggested possible European use. For example, in one small cellar, which was apparently quickly filled in after abandonment in the 1620s, 21 protohistoric sherds were recovered, including five rim fragments from a single vessel. In another feature, a sawpit, protohistoric sherds made up 58 percent of the Indian ceramic assemblage in the lower layers, which consisted of surface soils that had slumped into the pit. This percentage was exactly the same as that found on the site as a whole. However, in the pit’s upper layers, which represented deliberate trash disposal by the site’s English inhabitants, 68 percent of the Indian ceramics were protohistoric. Although the difference between the sawpit’s upper and lower layers was only 10 percent, this was enough to suggest to the excavators that at least some of the Indian pottery in the pit came from colonial use. At the Rich Neck site in Virginia, occupied from c. 1640 until the late 1600s, over 400 sherds of Indian-made colonoware were recovered, many of which were from European-style vessels. (Colonoware was also found at the c. 1630-1650 Reverend Buck site in Virginia, but most appeared to be of Afro-Caribbean origin). At the c. 1651-1685 Compton site in Maryland, large, mendable sherds of a Potomac Creek cord-pressed vessel were recovered from a pit. Wood ash, daub, and domestic refuse in the pit indicated it was filled when a nearby hearth was cleaned. The size of the sherds and their lack of wear suggest they were used in the 17th century, rather than being redeposited prehistoric material (Louis Berger and Associates, Inc. 1989). Thirty fragments of a Potomac Creek cord-marked vessel with a European-style rim were recovered from Maryland’s c. 1690-1711 King’s Reach Site, in association with a structure believed to have functioned as a quarter. The vessel was probably used by the servants occupying the quarter (Pogue 1997).

Terra cotta pipes are the most common type of Indian-made artifact found on colonial sites. Terra cotta pipes come in a variety of forms, and their origin has been the subject of much debate. It is likely that Europeans, Africans, and Indians all played a role in their manufacture, but it can be suggested with some reliability that molded pipes in European forms were made by colonists, while handmade pipes with traditional Native American decorative motifs were made by Indians.

The terra cotta pipe assemblages at the project sites show great variability. For example, at CG-8, the c. 1625-1650 Virginia home of poor tenants, and at the Old Chapel Field site, occupied by worldly Jesuits in Maryland between c.1637-1660, terra cotta made up more than half the pipe assemblages. But at CG-8, these pipes were mostly molded, while at Old Chapel Field they were mostly handmade. Given that the Jesuits were heavily involved in trade and missionary activities with Indians, this is not surprising. At the c. 1650-1690 Burle’s Site in Maryland, 16 percent of the pipes were terra cotta, mostly molded. The presence of a nearby English pipemaker accounts for part of this assemblage, but a few Indian-made pipes with running deer decorative motifs were found at Burle’s as well. At the roughly contemporary Patuxent Point site, terra cotta formed nearly 13 percent of the pipe assemblage, with 43 percent identified as handmade and having Native American decorative motifs. At other project sites, the proportion of terra cotta pipes is far smaller, and in some cases they are absent all together.

The abundance or absence of Indian-made artifacts on 17th-century sites does not appear to correlate closely with the status or wealth of their inhabitants, or to vary predictably through time. Rather, these objects seem to have an idiosyncratic pattern of distribution, one that probably
reflects—in part—the level of contact between the European residents of a site and local Indians, as determined by geography and any social or political barriers (such as periods of warfare) that might have existed during the site’s occupation. For example, Indian artifacts are quite rare at the project sites from Anne Arundel County, Maryland, but since the Native population had largely left this area by the beginning of the 17th-century, that absence is not too surprising.

By the 18th century, functional Indian-made artifacts are largely gone from colonial sites, except in parts of Virginia where colonoware pottery was still in production. The Indian artifacts found on these later sites appear to be the by-product of curiosity and collector activity, something not evident at the 17th-century sites, with the possible exception of the c. 1658-1686 Chaney’s Hills site in Maryland, where a celt was recovered. A celt was also recovered at Maryland’s 18th-century Bennett’s Point site, and several greenstone axes were found in 18th-century contexts at the Homewood's site in Maryland. Stone axes have also been reported from an 18th-century cellar in St. Mary’s City (Silas Hurry 2003, personal communication), and a celt and bannerstone were found in 18th-century contexts at the Ashcomb’s Quarter site in Maryland (Catts et al. 1999). Perhaps most notably, a gorget, a pestle, a well-made rhyolite biface, and an abrading stone were found in a mid-18th-century trash pit at the Smith’s St. Leonard Site in Maryland. These artifacts had marine organism deposits on them that indicated that they had been collected on a nearby beach. By this time period, the Chesapeake-region Indians who had made these objects had themselves been reduced to little more than curiosities, at least in the minds of their European neighbors.

I would like to end this paper on a personal note. Years ago, Julie King and I worked on a post-1650 Indian-occupied site. It had previously been excavated by archaeologists trained in prehistory, and their simplistic identification of European artifacts on the site led them to believe that the site was much older than it really was. By contrast, the sites included in the current project were largely excavated by historical archaeologists and with only a few exceptions—notably Jordan’s Journey—the Indian artifacts found there have been likewise identified simplistically. Often Indian pottery has not been identified as to ware type, or the pipes distinguished between molded and handmade. While it is true that Indian-made objects form just a small percentage of the artifacts on most colonial sites, the near invisibility of Indians in the historical archaeology of the Chesapeake may be more a reflection of archaeological skill than the role of Indians in colonial society.
The Camden and Posey Archaeological Sites: A Question of Native American Identity in the Late 17th Century Chesapeake

Benjamin J. Porter

This paper documents and compares the artifact assemblages from the Camden (44CE3) and Posey (18CH281) archaeological sites. Camden, located in Virginia, and Posey, located in Maryland, were both occupied by Native Americans during the second half of the 17th century. I will also use information available in existing literature about contemporary Native American and colonial sites in order to develop a better context for interpreting the two assemblages. The overall dominance of Native American material culture at both sites, the incorporation of European objects into native contexts of use, the distribution of faunal remains, and patterns of tobacco use suggest that even in the second half of the seventeenth century some if not all local Indians maintained a distinct cultural identity while participating in processes of cultural exchange and acculturation.

The Camden site is located in Caroline County, Virginia, on the south bank of the Rappahannock River, 2.5 miles east of Port Royal in the area of Nanzatico and Portobago bays. The site is part of a much larger Native American settlement in the area which appears to date from the Archaic Period through the Contact Period, with at least twenty contact period sites in or near the 54 acre field that contains 44CE3 (Hodges 1986:1-4). Camden, which dates from c.1650 until c.1690, is likely one component of a large dispersed village on land that was set aside by the Virginia government as a preserve for Indians (McCarty 2004:235).

The Posey site is located aboard the Indian Head Division of the Naval Surface Warfare Center near Mattawoman Creek on the Potomac River in Charles County, Maryland (Harmon 1999:iii). Three excavations have been done at the Posey site, the first in 1963 by Navy chemist Calvert Posey who discovered the site, the second in 1985 by William Barse, and the most recent in 1996 by Julia A. King and Edward E. Chaney. Unlike Camden, the Posey site appears to represent a small isolated occupation but also dates to the period between 1650 and 1700 (Harmon 1999:iii). The Posey site is located in the traditional territory of the Mattawoman Petty Chiefdom of the Piscataways (Clark and Rountree 1993:114; cited in Harmon 1999:17). Thus it may be that Mattawomans were the contact period inhabitants of the Posey site.

1 Camden may have been abandoned as early as c. 1680.
As part of this project, I reviewed artifact catalogs from both sites that are available electronically on the web site, www.chesapeakearchaeology.org. The databases for these sites are generally comparable, although I did need to make some adjustments to improve comparability. Modern materials associated with Navy activities were removed from the Posey database. Floral and faunal remains as well as lithics were also removed, as these classes were not quantified for the Camden collection. Nails were added to the Camden database, based on quantities reported by MacCord (1969). A Bellarmine bottle recovered from Camden was also added. The faunal assemblages from both sites will be considered separately.

At both Camden and Posey, Native American pottery makes up the largest component of the assemblage, 93 percent of the total at Camden and 82 percent of the total at Posey. European ceramics make up less than one percent of the Camden collection and 1.4 percent of the Posey materials. Many of the European ceramics represented at Camden appear to come from tablewares, including bowls, mugs, plates, and other types of hollowware. The European ceramics at Posey appear to represent more utilitarian types than those from Camden. However, some similarities are apparent. Both sites yielded Rhenish Brown and Rhenish Blue and Gray stoneware, and tin-glazed and lead-glazed earthenware. A Rhenish brown Bellarmine jug was the only vessel complete enough to be reconstructed from Camden and displays some evidence of having been burned. Although its survival may be due in part to the fact that stoneware is a comparatively tough ceramic, the face and medallion on the bottle may have had special significance to the Native Americans at Camden. There are comparatively few representations of the human form in Chesapeake Bay Indian culture and the jug’s significance may be derived from this. Most of these representations are of religious significance including shell maskettes from burial contexts (Potter 1993:215-216) and as an “Idol” or carved on posts around which ceremonial dances were held (Beverley 1947:198, 221-222). Regardless of its exact significance, the Bellarmine probably did not have the same meaning for Native Americans that it did for the colonists. Although Bellarmines are a common form, certain other ceramic types commonly found on Chesapeake English sites were not represented including North Devon gravel-tempered ware and Staffordshire slipware. There is one sherd from Posey that might possibly be North-Devon gravel-tempered, but this is not certain.

The occupants of Camden and Posey consumed tobacco using both red and white clay pipes. Tobacco pipe fragments account for 330 artifacts or 4.2% of the Camden assemblage and 519 artifacts or 8.1% of the Posey assemblage. At both sites red clay pipes occur in greater quantity than white clay pipes. Red clay pipes make up 91% or 300 objects of the total pipes at Camden and 364 artifacts or 71% of the total pipes at Posey. Interestingly, both Beverley and Dauphine state that the Indians were not growing tobacco in the second half of the 17th century (Dauphine 1934:153; Beverley 1947:145). When contemporary colonial sites are made comparable to Camden and Posey, the differences are striking. At Compton, a tobacco plantation on the Patuxent occupied about the same time as Posey and Camden, white and red clay pipe fragments make up 22% of the total artifact assemblage, with red clay pipes making up only 8% of the total number of pipes. The comparison of the Camden and Posey tobacco pipe assemblages with each other and with contemporary colonial sites suggests that the Native American inhabitants of Camden and Posey were consuming a lesser quantity of tobacco than their English neighbors. This level of consumption appears to be in keeping with more traditional patterns of tobacco use.

There are, however, many more pipes, especially white clay pipes, at Posey than at Camden. This may suggest that the inhabitants of Posey were consuming tobacco more frequently, and more frequently in European pipes than the inhabitants of Camden, or simply that
the inhabitants of the two sites had different access to European goods. Additionally, as Trubowitz concludes, the fact that native pipe forms are found in such large quantities at Native American sites suggests the continued “central importance and survival of sacred themes of the pipe/tobacco/smoking complex” and the presence of European white clay pipes on these sites suggests that their use was for “everyday recreation and pleasure” while native pipes continued to be used for sacred purposes (Trubowitz 2004:158). This conclusion could also suggest that to an extent, native religious and cultural practices, or at least some form thereof, were maintained.

Artifacts of iron, copper, brass, and lead were found at both Camden and Posey. At Camden, metal objects account for 1.8% of the assemblage while at Posey metal artifacts form 4 percent. Lithics occur at both sites as well, suggesting the concurrent use of both traditional stone technology and metal tools. Both sites yielded knife blade fragments and clinched nails. Both sites also yielded lead shot, but the only musket ball came from Posey. Camden yielded two gun parts, while Posey yielded one possible gun part. Copper or brass objects from Camden appear to be largely ornamental, including a rolled bead and two perforated copper diamonds. At Posey, copper objects included eleven triangles and two cones.

Copper triangles or conical copper objects represent a somewhat enigmatic artifact class. They have been cited as projectile points (Potter 1993:206), but also as ornamental pieces, and sometimes simply as triangles or cones. Copper or brass cones appear on sites in Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania; often in burial contexts, including the John Green Site (44GV1) in Virginia, the Piscataway Fort (18PR42) in Maryland, and the Conestoga Town (36LA52) and Conoy cemetery (36LA40) sites in Pennsylvania (Curry 1999:33; Kent 1989:204-205). Copper brass cones were recovered from the Ferguson ossuary at the Piscataway Fort near copper diamonds similar to those from Camden (Curry 1999:33-34). Copper triangles are known from Maryland at the Posey site and Heater’s Island (Dennis Curry, Personal Communication: 2006). It is not clear if their use was ornamental or as functional or symbolic projectile points. Brass projectile points are known from a number of Susquehannock sites, often occurring in burial contexts, and some examples are hafted (Kent 1989:190-192). At Posey, the forms of copper triangles appear to include entire, perforated, folded over, and bifurcated. Most of the copper triangles from Posey are of a thin gauge and were likely ornamental or intended to be made into cones (Harmon 1999:115). One bifurcated and folded over example is the most convincing “projectile point.” The 1985 excavations by Barse also reported two iron projectile points (Barse 1985:156).

Camden yielded two silver medals. No silver objects are known from the Posey site. The first medal, labeled “Ye King of Patomeck” was found on the Camden farm in 1832 and donated to the Virginia Historical Society. The second, labeled “Ye King of Machotick” was recovered during the 1965 excavation (MacCord 1969:29-31). Although some authors have suggested that the medals date to 1677, I believe both of these medals date to 1662, and that their presence at Camden indicates not that the kings of the Machotick and Potomac Indians were living there, but rather that the medals were being used for their intended purpose to ensure safe passage for Virginia’s Indians from one place to another, and they were likely lost by their owners.

Glass is also present in small quantities at both sites. At Camden, glass accounts for .23% of the assemblage, and 1.5% of the assemblage at Posey. According to MacCord, glass artifacts from Camden included one green spiral bead, one triangular projectile point, eleven fragments from case bottles and five other fragments that are probably from wine bottles (MacCord 1969:20). The database lists nine glass fragments that appear to be bottle and container glass and are green or dark green. Glass objects from Posey include four black glass
buttons, 72 fragments of bottle glass with green being the most common color, although some
fragments are amber, colorless, or blue. There are also eleven fragments of possibly green
container glass. Both sites have bottle and container glass, the largest portion of which is green in
color. The glass projectile point from Camden is particularly interesting as an example of
European material culture being incorporated into a native context. The use of glass projectile
points may have been somewhat common as Rountree and Turner (2002:144) cite a Virginia law
from the 1620s to stop the sale of glass bottles to native people. The presence of glass buttons at
Posey and brass and iron buckles at Camden (MacCord 1969:23) suggests the incorporation of
some elements of European dress at both sites. Durand de Dauphine describes the Indian men as
wearing “a shabby shirt of blue or white linen” (Dauphine 1934:153).

Faunal remains must be treated separately, as the Camden assemblage was not analyzed
by a zooarchaeologist while the Posey assemblage was. Superficially, however, the two
assemblages appear very similar and the inhabitants of both sites appear to have been utilizing a
variety of wild foods from a mix of terrestrial, freshwater, and estuarine environments but not
domesticated animals. The 1996 excavations at the Posey site recovered about 4000 faunal
remains, most of which were highly fragmented and came from plow zone contexts. These were
analyzed by Landon and Shapiro (1998:1). The majority of the faunal remains from the Posey
site are those of wild animals, but five of the specimens are from pigs (Landon and Shapiro
1998:1-2). Of the faunal specimens analyzed by Landon and Shapiro, 25 percent displayed
evidence of being burned, indicating human action; three bones had tool marks, at least one of
which appears to have been made with a metal tool, and five had carnivore gnaw marks (Landon
and Shapiro 1998:3-4). It is difficult to be certain that the five pig teeth in the assemblage were
deposited during the Native American occupation of the Posey Site given that it is a plow zone
deposit, although based on the associated materials I believe they are likely related to the Posey
occupation. There are several ways in which the site’s Indian inhabitants might have acquired
pork or pigs. It is possible that pigs or pork served as a trade item, that they were captured or
stolen from a colonial plantation, that someone at Posey owned pigs, or that pigs escaped from
colonial sites, formed a feral population and were then hunted by Native Americans. It appears
unlikely that pigs were being raised, given the small numbers of pig remains and the majority of
native animals found at Posey (Landon and Shapiro 1998:7). There are numerous historical
references to disputes between Indians and colonists over livestock including “the theft or killing
of livestock, and the despoothing of Indian cornfields and gardens by free-roaming English
livestock” (Cissna 1986:149; Merrell 1979:559-60; Waselkov 1983:20-27; Rountree 1990:92-
94,117-24; cited in Potter 1993:196). The original report on the Posey site by Calvert Posey also
mentions that the “kitchen-middens at the village site contained a fair number of pig and possibly
cattle bones” (Posey n.d.:2). None of the later reports make any mention of cattle bones and the
accuracy of Posey’s identification is not known.

It appears that the inhabitants of both Camden and Posey were not raising domesticated
animals. Landon and Shapiro state that there is little to differentiate the Posey faunal assemblage
from early prehistoric sites such as the Woodland Period Stearns Site (18CV175), Patterson Site
(18CV65), and the Patuxent Point Site (18CV271) that also contained a wide range of species,
including large numbers of deer, turtles and fish, but few birds. These sites also contain small
quantities of bones from European species that are “clearly intrusive” (Landon and Shapiro
1998:9-10). Both Camden and Posey appear markedly different from colonial sites from the
second half of the 17th century where consumption of domestic mammals was increasing and the
consumption of wild game was decreasing (Miller 1988b:187).

---

2 It is possible that some of this glass post-dates the 17th-century occupation of the Posey site.
Certain similarities between Camden and Posey are noteworthy. First, there was only one introduced species at each site. At Camden, it was represented by a single horse tooth; at Posey, it was five pig teeth. The specimen from Camden may be intrusive and probably does not represent a food source. Unlike Camden, the faunal assemblage at Posey did not contain any shark teeth, possibly used at Camden for pipe making. Deer appears to be an important food source at both sites. Other species included oysters, gastropods, raccoon, squirrel, snapping turtle and box turtle. Overall, the most significant and sound conclusion is that Native American practices of subsistence remained largely unchanged from pre-contact times and that in this respect these Native American sites are markedly different from colonial sites. The teeth from domesticated animals at both sites may be intrusive and do not appear in great quantity, but may indicate a very limited incorporation of introduced domesticates.

Brush analyzed two sediment cores from Mattawoman Creek for pollen to look at the history of vegetation. Both cores showed no evidence of deforestation or agriculture. Ragweed or marsh elder pollen is found throughout the cores (Brush 1997:1-4). This indicates that European style agriculture did not occur, which would likely have resulted in a noticeable increase in ragweed pollen.

The Camden and Posey sites are largely similar but subtle variations do exist between them. Their comparison suggests that even in the second half of the seventeenth century, Native Americans maintained traditional technologies and lifeways. Just as the colonists incorporated some objects of Indian manufacture into their daily lives (King and Chaney 2004:193-221), Native Americans incorporated objects of European manufacture.
Locally-Made Tobacco Pipes in the Colonial Chesapeake: The Material Remnant of Cultural Interaction

C. Jane Cox, Al Luckenbach, Dave Gadsby, with contribution by Shawn Sharpe

Tobacco pipes made in the colonial Chesapeake are often referred to as “terra-cotta” pipes. Made of local clays, they often exhibit a brown, reddish, or earthen color, though they also come in a fascinating array of colors from orange to pink to almost pure white.

These New World products have fascinated Tidewater archaeologists for decades. Who in colonial society most likely produced and used terra-cotta pipes has been an ongoing discussion for over three decades. Some researchers have credited their production to immigrant Europeans producing them for personal use, Native populations producing them for colonists, and Africans producing pipes with decorative motifs representative of African origins. Most recently, an appeal to consider who used these pipes, as opposed to who made them, has concluded that the servant class or bound laborers used locally-made pipes because they had limited access to imported European items (Neiman and King 1999).

As the questions of maker and of user continue to be discussed, the archaeological community appears to have found a consensus that the material culture of the 17th-century colonial Chesapeake represents a unique interaction between Native and immigrant populations. The production and use of terra-cotta—or preferably “local pipes” or “Chesapeake pipes”—are a material remnant of the complex process of cultural interaction, and of power and conflict. This paper explores the transition, nuances, and anomalies of tobacco pipe use—from a mixture of European and local pipes in the early 17th century to an almost exclusive use of European imports by the 1680s. Neiman and King have further encouraged us to look beyond authorship—who produced Chesapeake pipes? Instead they have encouraged us to also consider who was the intended audience for this product: Who, indeed, smoked Chesapeake pipes?

To address questions of makers and of users, we suggest that a consideration of the production and distribution of Chesapeake pipes may provide the best opportunity for insight. This project offers a valuable opportunity to consider the distributions of locally made pipes throughout the Chesapeake, offering data that span the most critical years of innovation and change, from the 1620s until the 1680s. Through such a comparative approach, not only can we consider the temporal and geographical distribution of Chesapeake pipes, we can also consider similarities and variation among the pipes recovered from these sites; reflections which offer insight into the unique development and creolization of Native populations meeting with European, Anglo, and even African immigrants.

But first, a few thoughts on Chesapeake pipe production.

New and exciting revelations regarding pipe production have come to light in the last several years with the discovery of the Swan Cove site in Anne Arundel County, just a few miles from Maryland’s state capital of Annapolis. Swan Cove is the only confirmed tobacco pipe production site yet investigated in the New World. Clearly, with distinctive products such as pipes from the “Bookbinder” tradition found throughout southeastern Virginia, other colonists were undertaking concerted efforts at pipe production, but these sites have not yet been identified. The copious assemblage of kiln furniture, waster pipes, tools, raw clays, and clay working pits therefore make Swan Cove an invaluable resource for exploring the production of locally-produced pipes.
Matthew Emerson (1994), whose dissertation focuses on terra cotta pipes recovered from Chesapeake sites, attributes local pipe production to something of a casual pastime, requiring little in the way of skills or tools. Firing of the pipes, he suggests, occurred within a hearth in the home space.

The Swan Cove investigations and associated experimental archaeology conducted in conjunction with those excavations have shown that pipe making is in fact a highly specialized and time-consuming effort (Luckenbach and Cox 2002). Anne Arundel County’s Lost Towns Project, with guidance from Dr. Allan Peacey, has re-created a colonial era pipe kiln, and produced and fired pipes in it, an exercise that has made several points. Finding, preparing and curing the appropriate clay, and forming and decorating pipes required a substantial time commitment (Cox 2005). Many of the locally-made pipes recovered from Anne Arundel County and from the “Bookbinder” tradition of southeastern Virginia reveal the use of specialized tools such as a pipe molds or stamps and they exhibit a clear decorative grammar (Luckenbach and Kiser, in press).

Additionally, the heat required for a successful firing (1000 degrees C/or more than 1800 degrees F) is intense, far beyond that which can be achieved in the typical colonial era open wattle and daub hearth. Producing a quality pipe was not an incidental activity but was in fact, a more specialized endeavor than has previously been recognized; one that would have required time and effort, special skills, tools, and financial investment. Producing tobacco pipes in the 17th century would have taken valuable labor away from the intensive efforts required for tobacco production, work in which we know that nearly every man, woman, and child participated in the 17th century.

Where Are Chesapeake Pipes Found?

Perhaps the most telling revelation upon review of the assemblages local pipes from the eighteen study sites used in this study is that not all sites have them. In fact, nearly half of those in the study group have only a negligible amount, accounting from none to less than 3 percent of the total tobacco pipe assemblages.

The eighteen sites divide into three groups when one considers the presence of local pipes. Group One includes eight sites with negligible representation; zero to less than 3 percent. Group Two consists of five sites with between 9 and 25 percent of their total pipe assemblage represented by locally made pipes. Finally, Group Three is comprised of five sites that have a majority - more than 50 percent of the pipe assemblages consist of local pipes.

We also examined the presence of pipes on each the sites by considering the sites’ median occupation dates. One of the problems with comparative studies such as these is that sites vary in their occupation length. Some were occupied for only one decade while others span a century or more. Interestingly, three temporal clusters appear when considering Chesapeake pipes this way: pre-1660, 1660-1680 and post-1680. Take note of the middle cluster, as this is the key transitional phase when considering Chesapeake pipes.

We’ll begin with a more detailed discussion of those sites included in Group One. Of these eight sites, two represent the earliest occupations in the full study set, including Jordan’s Point (1620-1635) and Sandy’s (1630-1650).

The Sandy’s site, with only 0.5 percent Chesapeake pipes, was occupied by merchant John Wareham from the late 1620s until 1638 (Mallios 2000). The paucity of Chesapeake-made
pipes on this early site is perhaps explained by Wareham’s occupation. As a merchant, occupying a site that may have included a storehouse, Wareham had relatively easy access to European goods, evidenced by the extensive assemblage of European marked pipes recovered from the site. He simply had no need to acquire locally-produced pipes when he had relative easy access to imported ones.

Jordan’s Point (1620-1635), a palisaded compound with multiple structures, had only 2.75 percent in local pipes (n=112). While 14 percent (n=16) of these came from a well outside Structure 18 at the northern end of the compound, 64 percent of all the Chesapeake pipes recovered at Jordan’s Point (n=72) came from the cellar fill (Feature 320) in Structure 4. According to Mouer and McLearan, Structure 4 was a large dwelling and food storage structure that intruded upon an earlier Native American structure (McLearan and Mouer 1993). Interestingly, there was also a proto-historic Native American occupation outside the Jordan’s Point palisade. Both suggest that the relatively few local pipes recovered are likely Native-American in origin. The pipes may have come from a mixed context with this underlying deposition or they have made their way inside the palisade during trade or other social interactions with the colonists who occupied Jordan’s Point.

Taft Kiser notes that the colonists at Jordan’s Point had been in Virginia for a decade prior to settling at Jordan’s. They were high status and as such most likely had a well-established system in place for acquiring material goods, presumably of European origin. As with the Sandys site, the residents of Jordan’s Point, including the family servants, had alternatives for pipe acquisition, thus negating the need for obtaining Chesapeake pipes for their own consumption (Kiser, Personal Communication December 2004). A concern for interaction with Native populations may have also played a role in the minimal count of local pipes recovered at these two early sites. As Fausz puts it, “…most colonists maintained their ethnocentric insularity and concentrated on their profitable tobacco fields” (Fausz 1988).

Other sites in Group One include Chaney’s Hills, Chalkley, Bennett’s Point, King’s Reach, Mattapany and Clift’s Plantation. These sites all represent the last half to quarter of the 17th century. Both Chaney’s Hills and Chalkley in Anne Arundel County had no local pipes in their assemblage. Both are located on upstream tributaries of the South River, a major river on the Chesapeake Bay. Notably, the Chalkley site was occupied by the Jeffe family for less than a decade; planters who existed at the very poorest end of the colonial spectrum, yet even they had the resources to procure European pipes without resorting to making their own or buying them locally (Luckenbach, Read, and Ware 1995). Inexpensive and ready access to European goods made local acquisition unnecessary.

King’s Reach, Mattapany, and Bennett’s Point are predominately occupied during the last quarter of the 17th century and in most cases, well into the 18th century. These sites each had fewer than 20 fragments of Chesapeake pipes. By the 1670s, the Bristol American Export trade had exploded, which made European pipes, and specifically English pipes from Bristol easy and cheap to obtain (Menard 1980). Coupled with a more mature and reliable trade network, local production couldn’t compete with imported pipes, making such efforts economically infeasible. In light of the work done by Neiman and King (1999) questioning who smoked Chesapeake pipes, Clift’s Plantation bears further review. Clift’s Plantation was one of four sites in their study, which used statistical modeling to determine the spatial correlation of white and “red” pipes. Their argument reasons that white imported pipe usage is limited to those who can afford to pay the costs of importation - that is the labor-owning planters (Neiman and King 1999). Based upon the discussion of pipe production offered earlier, we would suggest that in fact local pipes are not cheaper to produce or easier to acquire.
We know that, in the 17th-century, the use of space and material culture within a household was less-structured and more of an overlapping, amorphous phenomena. Servants, especially in smaller or less well-to-do households, would share in the work and to some extent the rewards of their labor in a more equal fashion (Upton 1986). While wealthier planters, with larger households, may have constructed a tenant quarter or otherwise divided the household’s social space, most would have coexisted with all members of their household and thus, servants would have lived a material life more similar to their “masters.”

The following review of the Clifts Plantation assemblage only used the pipes reported upon from major trash pit features and did not have plow zone data available to consider horizontal distribution, yet the scarcity of local pipes within later features (Phases II, III, and IV) reinforces this artifacts temporal limitation.

In fact, it appears that the use of local pipes at Clifts Plantation dropped off considerably after the first 15 years of occupation (Neiman 1980, Appendix 1). Additional review is certainly warranted to understand why servants stopped using “their” local pipes after 1685. Alternatively, did the activity areas shift when the Manor House underwent renovation, or is the transition simply a reflection of the increased availability of European goods, which were perhaps more readily available to servants and master alike. Such temporal sensitivity tempers the conclusion that primarily servants used local pipes, as these pipes all but disappear from Clifts Plantation features by 1685. Particularly in consideration of the efforts that are required for producing pipes, we would suggest that laboring servants are not the logical end-user of the locally made pipe.

While none of the Group One sites have more than a token representation of Chesapeake pipes, the presence of even a small number of pipes certainly raises questions. Are these incidental carry-overs from an earlier era? We would suggest that on sites with particularly long occupations, one must carefully review the use and context of sealed features from which local pipes are recovered, especially pipes recovered from sealed feature deposits.

Five sites in the study sample have Chesapeake pipes that account for between 9 and 25 percent of their pipe assemblages (Group Two), and all represent sites occupied in the middle to third-quarter of the 17th century. Plow zone distributions of terra cotta pipes were produced for Compton, Burle’s Town Land, Patuxent Point and Homewood’s Lot to consider the spatial and temporal distribution of local pipes in relation to their European counterparts. The maps from Patuxent Point are inconclusive for the purpose of this study, although the site certainly bears further consideration. The other three sites, however, offered interesting results.

Compton, occupied from 1651 until 1684, had nine percent locally-made pipes in its assemblage. Neiman and King (1999) concluded, based upon the statistical north to south zonation of a red-pipe index, that the northernmost house was the preserve of the owners while the southern house and the smokehouses were the preserve of bound or owned laborers. Using surface distribution maps, we too found a zonal variation between white pipes versus locally made or “red” pipes. However, when the white pipes were separated in two groups- those with bores 8/64ths-inch and larger (presumably the older pipes) and 7/64ths-inch and smaller (later pipes), the distribution of larger bore pipes marks that of the Chesapeake pipes, while the concentration of smaller (or later) bores (those 7/64ths-inch and below) moved north - away from the “servant activity area” concluded by Neiman and King. Is this shift a result of use by different occupants of the site, or is it a transition from the use of local pipes in the early years of the site’s occupation?
While Burle’s Town Land (1649-1680) revealed relatively few subsurface features, much of the site had not been plowed, so distributional analysis is particularly informative. Here, a shift in the deposition pattern of local pipes versus those of European origin appears to reflect subtle temporal shifts in the activity areas on site. The locally-made pipes correlate with European pipes that have bores 8/64ths-inch and larger in that they are denser towards the western side of the structure.

Conversely, the concentration of European pipes with bores measuring 7/64ths-inch, or less, shift to the east side of the building. Such temporal sensitivity can be seen in distribution maps, particularly if they are partnered with other temporally sensitive artifacts. Sealed features however are the most reliable method for understanding a site’s development, particularly on sites with extended occupations.

Homewood’s Lot in Anne Arundel County is more challenging to interpret in that it is continuously occupied from 1649 until 1780. The site is a hodge-podge of overlapping features and while limited salvage excavation revealed numerous buildings, the long occupation may confuse patterns of artifact distribution obtained solely from plow zone data (Franz and Luckenbach 2005, Gadsby and Callage 2002). In response, we took an approach of carefully querying pipes found in a sequence of 17th-century features. Such review adds to and further clarifies the distribution results.

The pipe data clearly reveals two phases of 17th-century occupation. The features that date to Phase I (c.1649-1675) at Homewood’s have more than 21 percent local pipes. When we look at features that are open for a longer period (c. 1649-1700), there are fewer local pipes (about 12 percent) and most of these were recovered from earlier levels of those features. Still more telling are those features that are a post-1700s context, which have only 2.4 percent local pipes.

While a vague correlation can be seen in surface distribution maps of the dense plow zone deposits, sealed features offer a chronological marker for artifact trends, as opposed to a mixture representative of the full length of the site’s occupation as seen in the surface contour maps. Such feature data is far more temporally sensitive and informative when considering the deposition patterns of all artifacts, including locally-made pipes.

Conducting a closer review of the temporal distribution for locally made pipes, whether based upon surface distribution maps or tightly-dated sealed features is necessary to fully understand the nuances of the local pipe in the Chesapeake. Without this temporal scrutiny, making assumptions about a local pipe’s use by various elements of colonial society can be tricky business.

Those sites with a majority assemblage of Chesapeake pipes include the following three—all with exclusively pre-1650s occupations; Carters Grove 8 (CG 8), Old Chapel Field, and the Reverend Buck site.

CG 8 and the Buck site both represent some of the earliest settlement in and near Virginia’s colonial population center of Jamestown. Old Chapel Field (1636-1660) represents early settlement outside the Maryland capital at St Mary’s City. It seems plausible that in the first years of settling a new town or population center, in something of a frontier land, necessity drove the use of local pipes when compared to European counterparts of both Dutch and English origin. Immature and sporadic trade networks with European sources and possibly a heightened interaction with Native populations would account for such a high percentage of local pipes.
Two obvious anomalies are found in this grouping, but they are anomalies that speak volumes for further consideration of who was producing Chesapeake pipes. The two later sites in this subset are Posey (1660-1690) and Camden (1650-1670). Both are not only occupied later than the three just mentioned, but both are occupied by Native Americans and are located further inland. The later occupations, along with such a high percentage of local pipes strongly suggests that in addition to a delayed response to the temporal sensitivity found on sites occupied by immigrant colonists, the association with Native American traditions cannot be understated.

Conclusion

The overwhelming majority of Chesapeake pipes at sites occupied by the Chesapeake English pre-date 1670, with larger assemblages occurring in pre-1650 contexts. Those earliest sites lacking local pipes are higher status or they obtain tobacco pipes through regular European-based trade systems, negating a need for local pipes. Those sites that attribute locally made pipes to a post-1670s deposition often represent a long or multi faceted occupation, which begins by mid-century—when locally made pipes are more prevalent. On those few sites where local pipes are deposited in a post-1670s context, the Native American influences are strong. As Mouer and his colleagues have argued, there needs to be a more concerted effort at Posey was a small, single occupation component, probably Native American, c. 1660 and 1690 Camden was occupied by Virginia Indians from c. 1650 until c. 1700 understanding the Native populations role in the development of a creolized 17th century colonial society in the Chesapeake (Mouer, et al. in Singleton 1999).

Sites and even features that represent the 1670s are significant to these questions, as it is an important transitional decade. This temporal shift is clearly a function of the increased production of tobacco and its corresponding lowered cost (Menard 1980), which encouraged a substantial smoking population in England that in turn fueled the explosion of the Bristol American Export trade. While some have suggested that Chesapeake pipes were used primarily by bound labor and some have even suggested that Africans were responsible for producing local pipes, it is important to note that until ca. 1680, most bound laborers in the Chesapeake were indentured servants in smaller households and not enslaved Africans (for a discussion, see Mouer et al 1999). If locally produced pipes are disappearing by the time that slavery of Africans is on the increase, then other alternatives for the production of local pipes needs to be considered.

The temporal sensitivity of locally made pipes in the colonial Chesapeake and the vagaries of their distribution should be more carefully weighed when posing the question of who was smoking these pipes. The distribution patterns found in the eighteen sites in this NEH sponsored study set along with revelations from the Swan Cove site and the Lost Towns Projects’ experimental work with a reconstructed pipe kiln, has revealed that in fact, the production of locally made pipes in the colonial Chesapeake is not a past time pursuit.

The local pipe phenomenon is relatively short-lived encompassing only about 70 years, yet it is a revealing topic for studying the transformation of colonial Chesapeake society. It appears that while early, valiant and concerted efforts were made to establish a local pipe industry in the Chesapeake, mass production of pipes from Europe eclipsed local efforts. Colonists soon found that the best way to obtain pipes was to buy one from England—rather than attempting to make their own.
Part III
The Future of Colonial Chesapeake Archaeology

During the first half of the 20th century, as the new discipline of historical archaeology was developing, Jamestown and Williamsburg, Virginia, and, to a lesser extent, St. Mary’s City, Maryland emerged as important sites commanding both scholarly and public attention. Especially with regard to Jamestown and Williamsburg, the nation came to regard these places as its birthplace. This sense of the fundamental importance of these sites and of the Chesapeake region in general was subsequently reinforced in the 1970s and 1980s, when historians and archaeologists joined forces to reveal that the 17th century looked nothing like the 18th century, and yet it was to the 17th century that we must look, not just to explain the economic, social, and political conditions of the 18th century, but the conditions of the present, here and throughout the nation. Perhaps because it was the region in North America first permanently settled by the English, the Chesapeake came to “stand for” the American past.

Beginning in the 1980s, however, something happened. Perhaps it was in part the eclipse of the “new social history” – the school out of which the majority of the Chesapeake historians had come – by new forms of scholarship, forms that emphasized micro-historical approaches and questions of mentalité. More likely, it was the result of a massive spatial re-focusing by Chesapeake historians, from a view that saw the Chesapeake as primary to one focused on a much broader geography: that of the Atlantic World. In this new context, the Chesapeake region was one of many theaters of colonial expansion, and, so it seemed, a backwater theater at that. Europe, Africa, the Caribbean, and other settlements in Central and North America had stories as compelling to tell if not more so than any in the Chesapeake. Further, for Chesapeake archaeologists who generally work for mission-focused state agencies or museums with limited resources, a broader Atlantic focus would always and of necessity play second fiddle. Valuable but limited resources are usually expended at home, not elsewhere.3

As ideas of how to approach Atlantic World history have evolved in the early 21st century, there is a growing sense that the early modern Atlantic macro-region may be too large, and in some ways, too fragmented, to be fully comprehended in anything other than a geographically recursive way. In other words, the question should not be whether or not the Chesapeake or any other region was a colonial backwater, but how do these multiple geographical parts relate to one another, and what do these relationships suggest about the greater whole? In this context, the Chesapeake region again becomes important, not necessarily because it comes to stand for some imagined national past, but because, in an Atlantic context, its history reveals the richness, complexity, and diversity of the emerging modern world.

Archaeology provides a powerful method for investigating this complexity, taking as its point of departure the material world and how it both shapes and is shaped by social life. While historians of the Chesapeake have produced important comparative work, similar, archaeologically-grounded studies have been limited, in part because of the expenses associated with the collection of archaeological data. The present project provided an opportunity for our Chesapeake study group to assemble information about 18 archaeological sites for comparative analysis. Much of the information we pulled together already existed in collections repositories.

3 A notable exception is the Department of Archaeological Research at Colonial Williamsburg, which has conducted work in Bermuda. The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, which operates Monticello, has also sent archaeologists to Jamaica for selected projects related to the Digital Archaeological Archive of Comparative Slavery (www.daacs.org).
What we have done is pull that material together in a partially standardized form, making it easier to access and to compare, and we have used basic digital technologies to deliver this information to the widest possible audience. While the dissemination of these data was not the primary purpose of the project, we could not be more delighted or excited. We anticipate that we will be mining these materials for some time, and we hope others will as well.

One of the most basic conclusions to draw from our project is the diversity of social life in the 17th- and 18th-century Chesapeake. Our work has, at a most basic level, challenged the notion of a ‘Chesapeake’ culture area. Not only has our work revealed that the material conditions of life were quite different in colonial Maryland and Virginia, but within the colonies as well, both geographically and chronologically. This variability is strikingly evident at the household level, where even contemporary, neighboring sites exhibit differences in their material patterning. In the preceding pages, we have tried to document and interpret these differences but, in truth, our effort represents a very modest beginning. And that is what is very exciting about working in Maryland and Virginia: there is much more to be learned.

The future of colonial Chesapeake archaeology is, we believe, extremely bright, in part because so many important questions remain unanswered; still others remain unasked. As the database of sites and their assemblages grows – and are made accessible – stronger patterns may become evident within the context of the subtle variations so frequently described for the sites used in this study. More importantly, those examples that appear to be exceptions or idiosyncrasies may become more relevant to the questions researchers continue to pose. For example, at both the Clifts and at Patuxent Point, a burial was encountered that calls into question how social and physical difference was understood at the end of the 17th century. Although Africans and Europeans were segregated in death within the Clifts plantation cemetery, an individual of European ancestry was interred in the area reserved for Africans. At Patuxent Point, an individual interred with a tobacco pipe – a typically African treatment – may, in fact, be of European ancestry. It may be these unusual occurrences that become the point of departure for documenting and interpreting changing notions of difference in the colonial period.

Other examples include the use of fortifications and other defensive measures at these sites. Early fortifications – such as the one at Jordan’s Point – ostensibly protected the residents from Indian attack. At the much later Clifts Plantation, the fortification there may have been in response to a general uneasiness. Over in Maryland at Lord Baltimore’s Mattapany plantation, the fortification surrounding Baltimore’s dwelling must have served for more than defense, especially given that nearby contemporary sites were not similarly enclosed. The relationships of these fortifications and enclosures, weapon and armor artifacts, and the social and political standings of their residents may reveal more complex understandings of the way the English settlers were attempting to possess and reconfigure the New World ‘wilderness.’

While Camden and Posey look very similar, especially when contrasted with the other 16 sites used in this study, it would be dangerous to assume that all other Indian-occupied sites would look just like these two. Materials from Heater’s Island, an island located in the Potomac River north of the fall line, suggests that the Piscataway Indians relocating there from Virginia in the 1690s had abandoned the production of traditional Indian pots, pipes, and shell beads. Instead, European ceramics, pipes, glass beads and copper triangles dominate the assemblage, forming an assemblage that looks very little like that described for Camden or Posey. What do these patterns suggest about Indian life in a colonial context, and how local Indians varied in their responses to the colonial condition?
These and many more questions can and should be posed for future study. The databases we have generated and which are a legacy of this project can provide the kind of context only dreamed about a few short years ago.
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