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Between April and August, 1991, the Department of Archaeological Research of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation conducted a Phase II survey of the Locust Grove Tract at Carter’s Grove. This project was undertaken at the request of Colonial Williamsburg’s Office of Property Development and James City County’s Department of Planning in anticipation of future development decisions, and was designed to assess the nature and condition of archaeological resources located on the parcel.

Phase II testing of eighteen Locust Grove Tract sites identified ten with potential significance. Two of these ten sites (CG-3 and CG-8) are located within the school parcel, and the remaining eight within Colonial Williamsburg holdings (Figure 1). Neither of the sites identified during Phase I survey on the James City County parcel are recommended for additional investigation.

The ten potentially-significant sites are:

**Williamsburg/James City County School Property**

*Site CG-3*  
An Archaic Period (ca. 2000 B.C.) procurement camp located at the head of an interior ravine. The setting of the site, and the presence of an undisturbed layer offer unusual opportunities to draw together an environmental reconstruction for the period. Since the end of Phase II field work in 1991, recommended Phase III excavation has been completed, and a report is forthcoming.

*Site CG-8*  
An early seventeenth-century domestic site, dating clearly to period 1630-1650. While no features were identified during this testing phase, the distinct clustering of architectural material at the site’s southern edge suggests the location of a structure. Since the end of Phase II field work in 1991, recommended Phase III excavation has been completed, and a report is forthcoming.

**Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Property**

*Site CG-2*  
One of the earliest and best preserved of the seventeenth-century sites examined during Phase II investigation of the Locust Grove Tract. A large dark loamy midden with heavy concentrations of domestic artifacts appears to mark the location of a structure, although no structural features were identified. There is at least one trash pit evident, and the site appears to be unplowed. Due to its early occupation and unusual state of preservation, it is recommended that CG-2 be protected, rather than fully excavated. Phase III investigation should be conducted only if there are no options for site avoidance.
Site CG-9  A minimally-disturbed Middle Woodland campsite dating to the period 500 B.C.-900 A.D. The most outstanding feature on the site is a well-preserved roasting pit or hearth. The presence of this undisturbed prehistoric feature may help to answer questions regarding environmental conditions, diet, and site chronology, and thus contributes significantly to the site’s informative potential. Phase III excavation is recommended if future construction plans threaten the site.

Site CG-10  A seventeenth-century house site which appears to have been abandoned sometime after 1680, based on the presence of such artifacts as a fluted delftware bowl and a latten spoon recovered from a rich ravine deposit. Three separate post holes were identified at this site; one post was replaced twice, suggesting a reasonably long occupation. Site CG-10 is recommended for Phase III study based not only on its own obvious merits, but also on the fact that it post-dated the other seventeenth-century sites discov-
Site CG-11
An early to mid-seventeenth century house site that appears relatively undisturbed by later farming and logging. Like CG-2, the center of the site seems to be marked by a large dark loamy midden yielding high concentrations of seventeenth-century domestic artifacts. Unlike CG-2, a clear structural posthole was identified at Site 11, suggesting that evidence still exists for the dwelling. Additional features appear to be tree-falls which were later filled with a variety of domestic trash. As an unplowed, early seventeenth-century site, CG-11 is valuable enough to make preservation or protection the preferred treatment. If future construction plans leave no alternative, Phase III excavation should be undertaken. Because of the shallowness of the site and the abundance of intact features, machinery should not be used to strip the overburden.

Site F
A multi-component site, first found by Ivor Noël Hume in 1978, containing both an early to mid seventeenth-century occupation and a Middle Woodland Period procurement camp. A large fortification ditch and a number of brick rubble features were identified on this site, although the ditch is more likely to be related to Site G, located to the southeast. Excavation of this feature should help to determine whether pales were set in the ditch to form a fence, or whether it acted as a less assertive property boundary.

The Woodland Period component of Site F is characterized by large quantities of pottery and fire-cracked rock, concentrated at the head of a ravine. A possible hearth was also identified, and will require additional investigation.

In the event that the site is affected by future development, Phase III excavation should be conducted on Site F. Machinery may be used to strip the overburden, as the site has already been extensively plowed.

Site G
A multi-component early seventeenth-century and Middle Woodland Period site, very similar to Site F, which is located less than 50 yards away. Seventeenth-century occupation seems somewhat earlier than on Site F, and is more clearly domestic. One structural posthole was identified through testing.

The Woodland Period component is likely to be associated with Site F. Although the recovery of prehistoric artifacts was not as uniform on Site G, a number of test units yielded significant quantities of Mockley ware.
In the event that the site is affected by future development, Phase III excavation should be conducted. As on Site F, machinery may be used to strip the overburden, since the site has been extensively plowed.

**Site CG-19**  
A Late Woodland Period camp site that was either repeatedly occupied or occupied for an extended period of time. Testing on this site revealed two shell middens, one of which overlies a hearth feature containing deer bones. Excavation of these features should provide information concerning diet, and the environmental conditions, and may provide a carbon sample which can be used in dating the site. Due to the unusually thin scatter of artifacts across this peninsula, the recommendation for further study is limited to two 2-by-2 meter squares in the middens.

**Matilda Jones Cemetery**  
A nineteenth-century burial ground so designated for its only marked grave. It appears to be associated with “Locust Grove,” a farm structure located to the northeast. Testing produced evidence for at least nine burials, and has provided site boundaries. Avoidance of these burials is strongly recommended.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>More Work Needed?</th>
<th>Scope of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CG-2</td>
<td>Pre-1650</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Avoidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG-3</td>
<td>Middle and Late Archaic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Phase III excavation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG-4</td>
<td>Middle Archaic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No further work necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG-5</td>
<td>See CG-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG-6</td>
<td>18th/19th century</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No further work necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG-7</td>
<td>18th-20th century</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Additional photo-documentation of cellar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG-8</td>
<td>Pre-1650</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Phase III excavation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG-9</td>
<td>Early Woodland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Phase III excavation within prescribed boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG-10</td>
<td>Mid-late 17th century</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Phase III excavation within prescribed boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG-11</td>
<td>Pre-1650</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Avoidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG-12</td>
<td>Multi-component: Archaic/18th century</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No further work necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG-13</td>
<td>Early 18th century</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No further work necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG-19</td>
<td>Early-Middle Woodland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Two 2x2 meter squares over identified features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG-22</td>
<td>Undefined historic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No further work necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site F</td>
<td>See CG-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site G</td>
<td>Pre-1650</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Phase III excavation within prescribed boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Early-Mid 19th century</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Avoidance or testing to identify boundaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1.
Introduction

Between April and August, 1991, the Department of Archaeological Research of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation conducted a Phase II survey of the Locust Grove Tract at Carter’s Grove. This project was undertaken at the request of Colonial Williamsburg’s Office of Property Development and James City County’s Department of Planning in anticipation of future development decisions, and was designed to assess the nature and condition of archaeological resources located on the parcel. This document describes the results of the investigation, and provides recommendations for the future management of these resources.

The Locust Grove Tract is located approximately one-quarter mile from the James River, between Carter’s Grove plantation and the Ball Metal plant (Figure 2). Since 1969, this 230-acre parcel has been owned and managed by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, and has provided revenue in the form of harvestable timber. In 1990, as part of an effort to better utilize its property holdings, the Foundation decided to divide the Locust Grove Tract, transferring small portions to the Williamsburg/James City County School System and to James City County. Archaeological testing was recommended prior to that conveyance in light of the property’s association with the seventeenth-century Martin’s Hundred settlement, as well as the general suitability of the terrain for prehistoric and historic occupation.

The physical isolation of the Locust Grove Tract, and the consequent protection afforded its cultural resources, have resulted in a slow but steady accumulation of archaeological data. During the mid 1970s, Ivor Noël Hume discovered Wolstenholme Towne, a fortified seventeenth-century settlement just one-quarter mile west of the Locust Grove Tract. By 1978, the Wolstenholme Towne investigation had spread to the Locust Grove Tract, where a partial survey resulted in the identification of ten sites. As these sites were in no way threatened at the time, eight of the ten remained unexplored, and no attempt was made to complete a survey of the tract’s 230 acres.

In 1990 and 1991, discussions of impending development rekindled an interest in the Locust Grove Tract’s archaeological resources. A complete Phase I survey conducted by the Department of Archaeological Research at that time identified a total of eighteen sites, ranging in date from the Archaic Period (8000 B.C.-3000 B.C.) to the nineteenth century, and including such evidence as hearths, campsites, house remains, trash pits, and cellars. Two of these sites were located on the designated school parcel, two on the parcel to be transferred to James City County, and the remaining fourteen lay within the bounds of the parcel retained by Colonial Williamsburg.

This survey, or identification phase, of the Locust Grove Tract investigation was completed in February 1991. Phase II, during which identified sites are tested to determine archaeological significance, began in April, 1991, and involved the excavation of test units aimed at clarifying site boundaries, determining the degree
of soil disturbance by later agricultural activities, and locating any intact features. This report describes the results of Phase II testing. Based on the merits of each site, one of four recommendations was made for future treatment. Some sites will require no further investigation, either because they lack integrity, or because they exhibit insufficient archaeological evidence. Others have been recommended for full-scale (Phase III) excavation. A third category of sites will require a more focussed treatment, with only specific areas targeted for intensive investigation. Finally, avoidance has been recommended for three sites: a nineteenth-century cemetery and two undisturbed seventeenth-century sites which could not be responsibly or appropriately explored in a salvage excavation.

Phase II testing on the Locust Grove Tract was carried out under the general supervision of Marley R. Brown, III, Director of the Department of Archaeological Research, and Staff Archaeologist David Muraca. Staff Archaeologist Meredith Moodey supervised the field work and prepared this report with help from the field staff: Steve Atkins, Gunnar Brockett, Cara Harbecke, Beau Harbin, Jennifer Jones, Brad McDonald, and John Metz. All recovered artifacts were washed, numbered, identified and coded by Laboratory Analyst Amy Kowalski and Laboratory Technicians Lisa Youngers, Pegeen McLaughlin-Pullins, and Michael

Figure 2. Locust Grove Tract (shaded).
Bradshaw under the general direction of William Pittman, Supervisor of Archaeological Collections Research. Kimberly Wagner and Virginia Caldwell Brown provided the maps for this report, and Ms. Wagner produced all artifact illustrations.

**Project Area Description**

The Locust Grove Tract, now part of Carter’s Grove plantation, is located in Grove, Virginia, a small scattered community seven miles southeast of Williamsburg (Figure 3). Approximately 230 acres were included in this investigation in an area bounded by Route 60 on the north, the Ball Metal plant on the east, and Grice’s Run on the south. The northern portion of this project area is relatively flat, and is characterized by formerly-plowed fields, recently planted in loblolly pines. Sloping wooded terraces that drain sequentially from large ravines, into Grice’s Run and ultimately the James River characterize the southern portions. During the winter months, and after very heavy rains, water does flow through some of the larger ravines, but there are no perennial streams currently found within the project area.

**Environmental Setting**

Carter’s Grove plantation comprises approximately 800 acres situated on the north bank of the James River, between Grice’s Run (which borders the property to the southeast) and Wareham’s Run, a little over one mile to the northwest.

![Figure 3. Project area.](image_url)
Centering on a neck of high ground, and separated from the adjoining countryside by ravines and swamps, the property is ideally suited for agricultural activity. The Kingsmill scarp, an ancient beachhead, forms a distinct high-ground topographic feature trending east-west and fronting onto the James River. This high ground gently slopes to an ancient river terrace approximately 30 feet above sea level. Most of the direct river frontage from that point consists of steep, eroded bluffs.

While this particular area appears to have been mostly open farmland, cultivated over the past several hundred years, there is little or no agricultural activity at present. The wooded southern half of the project area includes mature stands of mixed loblolly pine, oak, spruce, fir, cedar and holly, with an understory of dense honeysuckle, various ivies, and greenbriar. A large logging project has just been completed to the south of the project area.

The climate is typical of the east-central portion of the Virginia Coastal Plain, where the average winter temperature is 41 degrees Fahrenheit and the average spring/summer temperature 76 degrees. The average relative humidity ranges from 80% or less in the morning to 60% or less in the afternoon. Prevailing winds are generally strong (over 15 mph), mostly originating from the southwest.

Erosion appears to have been a significant process in the development of existing topography, with slopes of the scarps receiving the greatest impact. Between this erosion and repeated plowing in the past, no archaeological material is expected to survive on any slopes. Natural erosion, particularly in areas along rivers and streams, appears more substantial than in other regions. Plowed fields left exposed to wind and water processes were generally devastated by these erosional elements. The severe storms characteristic of the James River area are probably the most significant natural earth-moving factors.
Chapter 2. Prehistoric Overview

Like the rest of eastern Virginia, the Locust Grove Tract has been occupied for several thousand years. Aboriginal Native Americans, who first occupied the Eastern seaboard no later than 12,000 years ago, hunted on, and later cultivated the land long before the arrival of the first European settlers. For convenience, archaeologists and ethnohistorians have sub-divided this long history into rough chronological periods that mirror changes in adaptive strategies. These periods—the Paleo-Indian (9500 B.C.-8000 B.C.), Archaic (8000 B.C.-1200 B.C.) and Woodland (1200 B.C.-1560 A.D.)—have been used for several decades (Figure 4). Recent researchers, including Gardner (1980) and Custer (1984), have provided a more refined, behaviorally-based classification scheme that will be used here as a basis for discussion, although the earlier scheme will be used for convenience and compatibility with other research in the site description and analysis sections.

The earliest phase of aboriginal occupation on the James-York peninsula includes periods traditionally referred to as the Paleo-Indian (9500-8000 B.C.) and the Early Archaic (8000-6500 B.C.). Most archaeologists regard cultural evolution during this period as a direct adaptation to the rigors of Pleistocene and post-Pleistocene environments. Though a variety of food resources were locally available, hunting provided the main basis for subsistence. The transition from a colder Pleistocene environment in the latter part of this first phase probably reduced the numbers of local “megafauna,” forcing greater reliance on elk and deer as the main food sources. Social groups most likely organized themselves at the band level, an alliance of several family groups that remained flexible enough to adapt to the changes in land and resource availability brought on by seasonal cycles and long-term environmental changes.

These earliest hunters selected high-quality lithic materials from which to produce their tools, primarily double-sided implements called bifaces. Finely-crafted fluted points of non-local cryptocrystallines (especially jasper and chert) remain the sole diagnostic artifact for the Paleo-Indian period. While in most cases the discovery of a single fluted point is sufficient to prove Paleo-Indian occupation, these points are quite rare, due to the simplicity of a high-quality tool kit, and sites are correspondingly difficult to find. The preference during the early part of this first phase for high-quality, non-local lithic materials may have limited a group’s range of subsistence and, depending on availability, may have increased the competition for scarce lithic resources.

The settlement patterns of these early hunters remain unclear. This is primarily due to the near absence of available data. No one has yet reported the discovery of an undisturbed early hunter site on the lower James-York peninsula. The few discoveries within other parts of Virginia’s Coastal Plain do suggest possible higher population densities than local data reveals. Despite this lack of data, however, Robert Hunter has proposed a preliminary site model. Early hunters, he has
suggested, would have located on “Late Pleistocene-Early Holocene landforms that provided a water source and game attracting capability. Anticipated site types for the area would include small, short-duration campsites and possibly kill and butchering sites” (Hunter 1986). However, the scarcity of research on the nature of paleo-environments makes site prediction difficult at best.

The second chronological period of the new scheme (6500-2000 B.C.) falls entirely within the period commonly referred to as the Archaic. Significant environmental changes occurred over this long time period. Warmer climates, together with an increase in annual rainfall and the growth of deciduous forests, produced an even greater diversity in both plant and animal communities. This in turn allowed a corresponding shift in the lifeways of aboriginal groups. It was probably during the last part of this long phase, after 3000 B.C., that the estuarine environment stabilized.

Important changes in tool production and use also occurred during this phase. The production of tools from locally-available lithic materials, a trend that had begun late in the first phase, supplanted earlier reliance on non-local cryptocrystalline materials. In response to changes in the variety of food resources, Native Americans developed an increasingly specialized tool kit, including ground stone tools such as axes, grinding stones, and other plant-processing tools.

According to Gardner (1980) and Custer (1984), several types of sites characterize this period. Permanent sites, whose locations were linked to the availability of food resources and thus to the carrying capacity of the ecosystem, include macroband (large) and microband (small) base camps. Hunting and gathering forays were conducted from transient or procurement sites in an effort to exploit specific resources.

The third phase in the new scheme includes periods traditionally known as the Late Archaic/Transitional (2000-1200 B.C.), the Early Woodland (1200-500 B.C.), and the Middle Woodland (500 B.C.-1000 A.D.). This grouping, according to Robert Hunter (1986), not only emphasizes cultural continuity, but also affords a more pragmatic solution to the multi-component and non-discrete nature of sites in this area. A large quantity of archaeological and environmental data has allowed archaeologists to study this phase in greater detail than the others. Though much of the environmental data has been extrapolated from elsewhere, several important environmental changes including a stabilized sea level, an increase in the salinization of coastal rivers, and an increase in the numbers of anadromous fish and
shellfish, particularly oysters. This appears to have initiated the shift to a more sedentary economy, one based increasingly on estuarine and riverine resources. Groups established and maintained larger camps for longer periods, and in response to these changing conditions developed new technologies for the acquisition, storage, and preparation of food. Despite this more sedentary lifestyle, however, seasonal forays into the interior zones for game, particularly deer and turkey, and other foodstuffs would have continued.

The number and variety of diagnostic artifacts increases on sites of this phase. Bowls made of steatite, a non-local material, appear early in the phase, but are quickly replaced by a ceramic technology whose range of variability in form, tempering agents, and surface treatments and decorations provides archaeologists with another possible means of classifying cultural change and determining exchange systems. The settlement pattern proposed by Gardner (1980) and Custer (1984) is similar to that for the previous period. Groups established base camps on “elevated landforms adjacent to a high productivity, riverine or estuarine setting.” Procurement sites were likely situated “along interior watercourses in areas varying from small rises along streams to high hilltops” (Hunter 1986).

The final phase, corresponding roughly to the period previously identified as Late Woodland, extends from 1000 to 1560 A.D., the latter date being considered as the beginning of contact with Europeans. During this phase, settlement sites became increasingly permanent. European accounts of aboriginal lifeways during the period of early contact describe groups as settling more intensively within Inner Coastal areas. The greater diversity of resources farther upstream would have supported broader-based consumption. It seems clear that groups were becoming more reliant on agricultural products like beans, maize, and squash. Thus a desire to locate near agriculturally productive areas probably would have influenced site location.

Significant changes in the manufacture of ceramics occur during this phase. The use of shell as a tempering agent becomes predominant, and various types of exterior decoration appear more commonly. Style and form in both ceramics and lithics seem to have become increasingly localized. This has made it possible for archaeologists to better identify and understand the movements and distributions of various groups, though it is by no means well-understood. One thing seems clear, however—within the Mid-Atlantic, the network of exchange and interaction grew in size and intricacy during this period.
Chapter 3.
Historical Overview, by Jennifer A. Jones

The historic-period occupation of the Locust Grove Tract began early in the seventeenth century with the settlement of a “private plantation,” Martin’s Hundred. In 1618, the Society for Martin’s Hundred was granted a 20,000-acre tract of land that stretched along the James River from Skiffe’s Creek to Wareham’s Run. The 230 acres now known as the Locust Grove Tract lies less than a mile away from what was Wolstenholme Towne, the original center of settlement for Martin’s Hundred. On prime agricultural land, the area was occupied continuously from the seventeenth century through the first half of the twentieth century.

Settlement of Martin’s Hundred

Martin’s Hundred was born of the failure of the Virginia Company. Over the course of eleven years the Company had sent hundreds of people to Virginia. By 1618, however, stockholders had failed to see any return on their investment. Colonial promoters and settlers realized soon after initial settlement that Virginia would not yield vast stores of gold or silver, but the colonists were reluctant to turn their attention to any of the other items that the Company hoped to export. A 1628 letter to England from the governor, council and planters in Virginia enumerated the reasons why settlers had not exported any of the products or materials that England wanted. The lack of horses, the danger from treacherous Indians, and lack of workmen and tools, it was claimed, prevented the export of such things as pipe-staves, potash, pitch and tar. Little progress had been made in the production of iron, and sericulture, a particularly appealing venture to the King, had shown little potential over the past twelve years (Hening 1823 (I): 134). By 1618, the only item that seemed to be a promising export was tobacco.

Originally imported for medicinal purposes, tobacco was beginning to be smoked recreationally by people in early seventeenth-century England. Virginia Company officials, worried that the only export from the colony fueled a harmful and immoral new vice, placed limits on the amount of tobacco farmers could grow and encouraged the diversification of activities in Virginia. But the demand in England pushed the price of tobacco up, and Virginians began to plant as much tobacco as they could. Critics of the colony in 1697 complained that because of tobacco profits and the seasonal nature of tobacco farming in Virginia planters “acquire great habits of idleness all the rest of the year” (Hartwell et al. 1697: 9).

Not only had the colony failed to produce desirable export goods, but by 1618 the Virginia Company was nearly bankrupt. Investors had failed to see their colonizing dreams materialize, and factions developed within the struggling organization. All the factions agreed on the need for restructuring, but the wealthier men in the company were willing to wait a little longer for results from the colonial venture. Sir Edwin Sandys, the leader of a faction of less wealthy and less patient investors, emerged as the leader of the new company. In the post of treasurer, he
steered the colony in a new direction. Realizing that greater individual financial incentives had to be offered to investors if the colony was to prosper, Sandys rescinded the _Laws Divine, Morall and Martiall_ and proposed a series of reforms (Morgan 1975: 92-6; Craven 1932: 47-57).

The man chosen to replace Governor Thomas Dale in Virginia and institute the new reforms was Sir George Yeardley. Yeardley was to secure the food supply by turning planters away from tobacco cultivation and encouraging the planting of food crops. He was to enforce standards of behavior among the colonists by suppressing gambling, idleness, and drunkenness, and he was also to reorganize the colony’s public magazine. London officials also hoped that the abolition of martial law in Virginia would attract more settlers by making life in the colony less severe. Sandys and Yeardley instituted a representative government to replace the military rule of Governor Dale, and all areas of the colony sent representatives to the Legislative Assembly that met for the first time in 1619.

The reform measures also changed the conditions of land tenure. Company officials aimed to reward planters already in the colony while at the same time attracting new colonists. Men who had settled in Virginia prior to Governor Dale’s departure in the spring of 1616 were deemed “ancient planters” and received 100 acres of land each plus another 100 acres for every share they held in the company. Planters who arrived after 1616 received land under the headright system. They secured fifty acres for themselves if they paid for their own passage and a “headright” of fifty acres for every person whose passage they paid to the colony. A system of quitrent collection was proposed to bring in further revenue. So, too, would the establishment of public lands to be worked by servants sent at the company’s expense (Morgan 1975: 94-5; Craven 1932: 54-7).

Another important aspect of reform was the establishment of private or “particular” plantations. These private plantations were designed to appeal to the personal interests of investors in the company. The plan allowed stockholders to pool their resources and purchase interest in a portion of the colony. The investors could then settle and administer their private or “particular” plantations in any way they pleased. The tenants sent over to work the land would function as an independent community subject to the laws of the colony but administered and supplied by private individuals (Morgan 1975: 94).

Martin’s Hundred was the largest of these particular plantations. It was established in the same year as Sandys’ reforms by the Society for Martin’s Hundred and named after Richard Martin, a prominent investor in the Virginia Company. In 1618, two hundred and twenty settlers left England on the _Gift of God_ to take up residence on their twenty thousand acres of land seven miles downriver from Jamestown. Their leader, William Harwood, arrived in 1620, and joined the settlers who had already established an administrative center for the plantation called Wolstenholme Towne (Noël Hume 1983: 62-7).
Indian Relations

One of the challenges facing the settlement in its early years was its relationship to the neighboring Indians. Initially, that relationship was relatively amicable. The celebrated marriage between John Rolfe and Pocahontas in 1614 secured eight years of peaceful relations between the English and the natives. During that time, officials in the colony and in London expressed hope that the settlers could successfully bring the Indians into the English community and under the authority of the English King. Martin’s Hundred was designated the site of a planned Indian school for training young Indians in English religion and social customs. The colonial officials encouraged English families to take Indian children into their homes and proposed that in return, English people be sent to live with the natives (Kingsbury 1906 (III): 446, 584).

The Indian uprising changed early English optimism about the ability to Christianize and civilize the natives. Early settlers to Virginia believed that Indians worshiped the devil. One of the earliest visitors to Tidewater Virginia wrote that the Powhatans “have conference with [the devil], and fashion themselves in their disguisements as neere to his shape as they can imagyn” (Strachey 1612: 82-4). As important as commerce was to the colonizing venture, the settlers were also expected to turn their attention to the conversion of these savage natives. The first charter for the colony stipulated that the settlers were to bring the Indians to “the true service and knowledge of God” (Hening 1823 (I): 68-9). Indian relations between 1607 and 1622, though often turbulent, were marked by a degree of optimism on the part of colonial officials.

In 1622, the Virginians’ hopes for friendly relations with the Indians came to a sudden and violent end. The Powhatan Indians attacked the English settlers in an attempt to drive them out of Virginia. Martin’s Hundred was hard hit. Nearly eighty people were killed or abducted, and the survivors were forced to take refuge in Jamestown. When the settlers returned a few weeks later, they found that the Indians had wreaked further damage on the area. Much of the settlement had been burned, and only “two houses and a peece of a church” still stood (Kingsbury 1906 (IV): 41).

The destruction of Martin’s Hundred and the other damage to the colony during the uprising marked a dramatic change in the relationship to the Indians. After 1622, the settlers no longer entertained hopes of an integrated community. English attitudes quickly turned to fear and hate. These attitudes, combined with a shortage of food, led Francis Wyatt to proclaim in 1622 that in order to get food the colonists could “make warre, kill, spoile, and take by force” any corn that belonged to the Indians (WMQ 1927: 46-7). The colony instead took measures to defend itself militarily against the Indians and to rid the lower peninsula of any remaining Indians. Governor Wyatt appointed military commanders to have “absolute power and comanda in all matters of warre” in the more vulnerable outlying areas. Ralph Hamor of Hog Island was appointed commander of Martin’s Hundred (WMQ 1927: 43). Why the governor of Martin’s Hundred, William Harwood, could not have commanded his own plantation is unclear, but he seems to have been absent in the months surrounding the uprising, and Hamor’s
appointment seems to have been only a military, not a civil, one. Colonial officials impressed by the Martin’s Hundred settlers’ fortitude in reclaiming their plantation sent supplies of arms and munitions to the settlers so that by the muster of 1624, the settlers were very well armed.

William Harwood’s household, for example, contained only four adult males in 1624, yet the inventory of his military hardware reads: “Powder, 60 lb; Peeces fixt, 10; Machcocks, 25 and 10 lb of Match.; Peece of Ordnance, 1 wth all things thereto belonging; Shott, 300 lb; Armours, 8; Coats of Male, 10; Coats of Steele, 3 and 20 Swords” (Jester 1987: 45).

In 1634, still concerned with the Indian threat, Virginians erected a palisade from Archer’s Hope through Middle Plantation to the York River. The purpose of the palisade was twofold. It was designed to be a boundary east of which no Indians would be allowed, and it was intended as a barrier to keep domestic animals confined to the area of English settlement. In 1626, Governor Wyatt wrote to the Privie Council in London of the need to secure the lower peninsula with a palisade. With the construction of a palisade, he wrote:

> wee shall gain free from any possibility of any annoyance by the Salvages, a rich ceramite of ground contayneing little lesse the 300,000 acres of land, which will feed such numbers of people, with plentiful range for Cattle as may bee able to defend the plantation against any enimy whatsoever (VMHB (II) 1895: 52).

The palisade was not intended to be defensive. It was instead constructed as a line beyond which no Indians would be allowed. To this end, the palisade was to serve the expansive policies of Governor Wyatt (Muraca 1992). It also marked the end of English optimism about the conversion and assimilation of the Indians under English law and government. After the uprising, civilizing and Christianizing the Indians seemed “unreal beyond practical reason” (Pearce 1988: 15).

The palisade did not, however, insure that the Indians would stay out of the territory that the English claimed for themselves. Martin’s Hundred residents still received visits from strange Indians (WMQ (VII) 1927: 248-9). As a result of the continued Indian presence, the assembly legislated in the 1630’s that houses be palisaded for defense and that commanders of particular plantations insure that their settlements were adequately armed (WMQ (VII) 1927: 42-4). In 1644, the Indians made a final effort to rid the land of the English presence by once again attacking the settlers. Over five hundred colonists were slain, but Governor William Berkeley led a contingent of men against the remaining Indians. The Pamunkey tribe was driven far enough out of the area to allow the colonists to expand their settlement (Morgan 1975: 149).

Despite these successes, however, the Martin’s Hundred settlement never fully recovered from the 1622 uprising. Moreover, within two years, the King dissolved the Virginia Company, and the particular plantations no longer existed as formal administrative entities. But even more important in the post-1622 development of Martin’s Hundred were the forces shaping colonial Virginia. The key to understanding the later settlement pattern of Martin’s Hundred lies in the tremendous importance of tobacco monoculture.
Tobacco Culture

In 1624, tobacco reached an all-time high of 3 shillings per pound. During this “boom time” in tobacco production, planters could make a considerable profit in a short period of time. Except for those men with many servants, Virginia planters could not usually expect to make a quick fortune. Still, in Virginia, a man could potentially make more in a year growing tobacco than he could make in several years in England doing almost anything else, and this prevented settlers from turning their attention to anything but tobacco throughout the seventeenth century. Tobacco, wrote Harwell, Blair and Chilton in 1697, “swallows up all other Things, every thing else is neglected, and all Markets are often so glutted with bad Tobacco, that it becomes a meer Drug, and will not clear the Freight and Custom” (Hartwell et al. 1697: 7).

The push to become rich through tobacco caused numerous problems in the colony. Virginians planted tobacco at the expense of other crops. In 1623, Governor Francis Wyatt charged that Virginia planters were so greedy in their rush to cash in on the tobacco boom that their families go hungry from the failure to plant enough food crops. Consequently, for the first years of the colony, there was a chronic shortage of food. Richard Frethorne, a servant at Martin’s Hundred in 1623, complained that “I have eaten more in day [sic] at home than I have allowed me here for a Weeke” (Kingsbury 1906 (III): 59). Frethorne suffered the fate of hundreds of people in seventeenth-century Virginia. Sick, cold and underfed in 1623, Frethorne was dead by the following spring (Hotten 1962: 192). Well into the 1620s, the settlers relied on the Indians to secure their corn supply. Even after the 1622 uprising, Virginians traveled to other parts of the country to trade for corn with friendly natives. The General Assembly saw it necessary to legislate the planting of sufficient corn to sustain the colony, and after awhile the trade for corn with the Indians was prohibited (Hening 1823 (I): 126). In 1629, the assembly legislated that two acres of corn be planted for every worker in the colony “to prevent the want of corne which oftentimes doth happen to this colony by reason of the neglect of planting sufficient quantities” (Hening 1823 (I): 152).

Tobacco cultivation was well suited to New World conditions. It required a great deal of land and the ability to move on when the soil was depleted. Soil depletion occurred after only three or four years of tobacco cultivation. After that land was turned over to corn or wheat for a few years, and within ten years a given plot of land was completely exhausted. Farmers could do little more than move on to fresh tracts of land and leave the old land to fallow (Craven 1926: 30-2). Critics of the colony at the end of the seventeenth century described the way Virginia looked after this kind of intensive agriculture. “As fast as the Ground is worn out with Tobacco and Corn,” he wrote, “it runs up again in Underwoods, and in many Places of the Country, that which has been clear’d is thicker in Woods than it was before clearing” (Hartwell et al. 1697: 8). Because planters moved on so quickly with little concern for the land, tracts of land were rarely completely cleared. Tobacco fields were riddled with stumps and roots which rendered the use of a plow impossible. Tobacco cultivation until the end of the eighteenth century was done by hand; wave after wave of indentured servants (and later slaves) tilled
the land with hoes. This simply precipitated quicker soil exhaustion since hoeing could not penetrate the lower levels of soil and bring up new nutrients (Craven 1926: 34-5).

The conditions that accompanied tobacco cultivation meant that settlers quickly spread out in the open territory. Land was originally abundant, but later in the century newly freed servants found acquiring land difficult. In the first few decades of the seventeenth century, when mortality was high, there was no need for settlers to acquire huge tracts of land. Servants often died before they could collect the freedom dues owed to them by custom from their masters. But the death rate began to fall by mid-century, resulting in greater pressure on the available land. As expectation of land ownership rose, demand for land and the value of each tract also rose. Consequently, men were motivated to acquire land not just for their immediate use but also for the future. Planters bought up tracts of land intending to bequeath them to sons or sell them at a profit to newly freed servants. By the 1660s, all the land on the James and York rivers below the Fall Line was claimed, and speculators were already patenting huge tracts along the Rappahannock and Potomac (Morgan 1975: 217-20).

The land scarcity in the 1660s and 1670s was artificial. The land was owned, but vast tracts of it were not planted. Once a planter patented a tract of land, the law required that the he “seat” the land: he had to build a house, plant some corn or tobacco, and pay a quitrent. Taxes were not systematically collected until the eighteenth century, and often all a planter did was plant a little corn and throw up a shack. Consequently, “tho’ all the good Land of the Country is taken up, yet there is very little Improvement on it” (Hartwell et al. 1697: 20; Morgan 1975: 220). The land owned by the Martin’s Hundred Society was characteristic of how huge tracts of land in the colony were owned by few individuals. Over 20,000 acres were owned by the society for only a handful of people. This huge, unplanted acreage began to concern colonial officials as early as the 1630s. “The land must lye wast and uncultivated,” a company official wrote of land engrossment in Virginia, “especially the greate quantities challenged by the Sociyetie of Marttins hundred” (VMHB (II) 1895: 52).

To the settlers who lived in Martin’s Hundred, as to the rest of the settlers in Virginia, hopes of prosperity depended upon success in tobacco cultivation. The settlers in Martin’s Hundred in the years after the uprising almost certainly were planting tobacco. Despite the protests from the company and crown, planters still turned to tobacco as the easiest way to make money in the colony. Company officials hoped to convince tenants on particular plantations to turn their efforts to other projects such as silk production, but like the rest of the settlers in Virginia, residents of the particular plantations planted tobacco instead. “Nothing is done in anie one of [these other projects],” complained one Company official, “but all is vanished into smoke (that is to say into tobaccoe)” (Kingsbury 1906 (IV): 109).

**Settlers of Martin’s Hundred**

After the Indian uprising in 1622, colonial officials ordered that a muster be taken of all the inhabitants in Virginia. The muster of 1624 provides an unusually full
picture of the people present in Martin’s Hundred in the mid-1620s. At least twenty-seven people were associated with Martin’s Hundred in 1624, a far smaller number than the 140 or so settlers who had been there before the 1622 uprising. Of those twenty-seven, all but one, Robert Scotchmore, appeared to be present in the settlement. Other than Scotchmore’s, there were six households in Martin’s Hundred according to the muster. One of these, the household of plantation commander William Harwood, was headed by an unmarried man. Another was headed by two single men. The heads of the other four households were married men: Ellis Emerson, Samuel March, Augustine Leak, and John Jackson. The Leak and March households each had another man listed who was not a servant. Eleven individuals at the plantation were servants. William Harwood had six servants, John Jackson and Ellis Emerson each had two, and the Leak household had one servant. Finally, two children were present (Jester 1956: 45-6).

Historians have used the muster of 1624 to trace the unique demographic trends of the early Chesapeake. While too few people lived in Martin’s Hundred in 1624 to make a statistical comparison with the rest of the colony, in some ways the small community around Wolstenholme Towne was demographically distinct. The muster shows that 1,128 people lived in Virginia in 1624. Of these, only 44 people—less than 3%—arrived in the colony with their spouses. Yet in Martin’s Hundred two settlers, John Jackson and Ellis Emerson, travelled to Virginia with their wives. Additionally, Emerson was one of only eight people to come to the colony with a son or daughter. Like the rest of Virginia, Martin’s Hundred had an imbalanced sex ratio. Men outnumbered women four to one in the colony and three to one in Martin’s Hundred. But while married people were a minority in the colony (less than 30% of the settlers had spouses), four out of seven households in Martin’s Hundred were headed by a married man (Hecht 1973: 83).

The muster of 1624 points out some very curious facts about the commander of the plantation. William Harwood was originally from Barnstaple in Devonshire, and he arrived in the colony in 1620 on the Francis Bonaventure. Throughout the 1620s he appeared in the documents as the commander of Martin’s Hundred, often in conflict with Ralph Hamor of Hog Island. In 1629, he mysteriously disappears from the documents.

Harwood was a relatively prosperous colonist. According to the muster he had six servants. Few households in Virginia had more than two servants, and more than half of the servants in the colony were concentrated in only fourteen households (Hecht 1973: 75-8). Harwood’s household was far from the largest in the colony. Abraham Peirsey, the richest man in Virginia, had thirty-nine servants. Still, Harwood’s six servants indicates that he was a prosperous man. He was also wealthy enough to dress in a refined manner. In the 1976 excavation of Martin’s Hundred, Ivor Noël Hume uncovered the site that was probably Harwood’s home. One of the artifacts retrieved was a small gold point like those that adorned the clothes of wealthy or prosperous men in the first quarter of the seventeenth century (Noël Hume 1983: 57-60).

Harwood was also distinguished by a title. In the muster, he is listed with the honorary title “mr,” a designation of high social standing in the seventeenth century. Only sixty-two persons in the colony were titled in some way, and of these, forty-
six received the designation “muster head.” Eight of the titled persons not designated as the head of a muster were women, and two more were children. Only six titled men in the colony were not heads of musters, and William Harwood was one of these (Hecht 1973: 74). A muster connotes a military inventory, which is probably what the muster of 1624 was intended to be in light of the 1622 uprising. That William Harwood was not listed as the head of a muster may have some kind of military meaning even though his household was well armed. It might also have some relationship to Wyatt’s placing Ralph Hamor in control of military affairs for Martin’s Hundred in 1622. Unfortunately, however, the documents reveal little about William Harwood’s life in Virginia, and he remains an enigma.

These twenty-seven settlers listed in the muster probably did not stay close to Wolstenholme Towne for long. The forces which propelled Virginians to spread out from the original centers of settlement almost certainly affected these early settlers in Martin’s Hundred. Indeed, the 20,000 acres originally granted to the private plantation was ample room for the few settlers who remained around Wolstenholme Towne to carve out larger farms after 1622. With the Indian threat diminished and tobacco prices high, the Martin’s Hundred settlers, like most inhabitants of Virginia, would have dispersed in the years following the dissolution of the Virginia Company. By 1626, Ellis Emerson was dead, and Augustine Leak and his household had moved out of Martin’s Hundred altogether. Unfortunately, the documents do not illuminate what happened to the other settlers in Martin’s Hundred in the years after 1624. To identify for certain who lived on the Locust Grove Tract land between 1630 and 1730 is almost impossible. A settler identified in the documents as residing in Martin’s Hundred after 1630 could have lived anywhere from Skiffe’s Creek, to the French Ordinary in the middle of the peninsula, to Wareham’s Run.

Seventeenth-century land patents, however, provide some clue as to who may have lived in the vicinity of the Locust Grove Tract in the seventeenth century. Based on the patents of people in Martin’s Hundred it is likely that the Locust Grove Tract land was part of the holdings of Thomas Kingston in the 1630s. After Kingston’s death, his widow was married to Thomas Loving by 1639, and Loving proceeded to patent other tracts of land in Martin’s Hundred (Nugent (I) 1934: 30, 118, 137; VMHB (X) 1903: 379; VMHB (XII) 1905: 388).

Community Ties

The fact that planters moved away from original centers of settlement undermined the ability of Virginians to form community and neighborly ties. That settlers lived so far away from one another was a problem that concerned colonial officials. Virginia’s settlement in the seventeenth century was characterized by the absence of towns. Since nearly all the settlers turned their attention exclusively to tobacco and snatched up land as quickly as possible, settlement was dispersed. The high prices of tobacco made planting any other crop economically unattractive. Moreover, few settlers were motivated to turn their attention to other pursuits such as trade or manufacturing. Seventeenth-century Virginia lacked agricultural diversity and people to engage in skilled trades. “For want of Towns, Markets, and Money.”
critics wrote at the end of the century, “there is but little Encouragement for Tradesmen and Artificers, and therefore little Choice of them, and their Labour very der in the Country” (Hartwell et al. 1697: 9-10). The dispersed settlement weakened economic and social ties between people and probably partially led to Bacon’s Rebellion in 1676 (Rainbolt 1969: 346).

Because of dispersed settlement, Virginians had many more barriers to the development of communities than did their counterparts to the North. New England settlers arrived in families and quickly formed nucleated communities. Virginians faced greater impediments to the development of closely-knit communities. Tobacco monoculture, social barriers, poor transportation, and demographics all inhibited the formation of community ties. Because of economic forces, Virginians needed large tracts of land. Consequently, a settler’s nearest neighbors were often miles away. In the early seventeenth century, the dearth of horses and lack of roads produced physical barriers to personal interaction. Social barriers also reduced the amount of personal interaction in the colony. Many of the people who came to Virginia were servants whose relationships with others in the colony were limited by English social custom. Moreover, poorer farmers could not interact with the richer planters on an equal basis (Walsh 1988: 218).

Even when settlers lived close enough to interact, barriers to community still existed. Mortality was very high in the early Chesapeake; people simply did not live long enough to form strong ties with other people. Moreover, while people were alive and relatively healthy, they were often forced to move around because of economic imperatives. By the middle of the century so much land had been claimed along the tidal rivers that newly freed servants had to move to find land or a place to become a tenant farmer. By the 1660s and 1670s the large number of landless, unmarried young men had begun to cause instability and turmoil in the colony which culminated in Bacon’s Rebellion (Morgan 1975; Walsh 1988: 215). Even the more established planter families were not immune to the forces propelling geographic mobility. As land got used up by intensive tobacco cultivation, established planters moved on to fresh tracts of land. These more prosperous planters often purchased tracts of land elsewhere in order to secure an inheritance for their offspring. Under such circumstances of geographic mobility, the development of long-term, stable communities was difficult (Walsh 1988: 226-8).

Still, the settlers in Martin’s Hundred probably developed some sort of community network. The original Martin’s Hundred settlers were bound together by a commonality of purpose in that they all lived and worked on a single sub-corporation. Even when settlers began to move outward, the boundaries of Martin’s Hundred were not small enough that settlers would not have dealt with each other face-to-face on a regular basis. Moreover, despite physical barriers, people could use the rivers to get around. At least three people in Martin’s Hundred owned boats in the 1620s, and the importance of boats is evidenced by the fact that in 1622 the assembly saw the need to enact a provision punishing those who stole other people’s boats (WMQ (VII): 247; McIlwaine 1979: 188). Richard Frethorne wrote to his parents that John Jackson, a planter in Martin’s Hundred in the 1620s, regularly took Frethorne with him to Jamestown by boat.
Social bonds were formed more easily by planters who had government authority (Kingsbury 1906 (III): 59). Martin’s Hundred sent delegates to every legislative assembly until 1634 when counties were formed in Virginia. Those men who went to the legislative assembly were the more prosperous male householders in Martin’s Hundred. William Harwood, John Jackson and Ellis Emerson appear in court records throughout the 1620s as delegates to the Assembly or as members of coroner’s inquests. The names Thomas Kingston and David Mancell appear in the documents for the 1630s as prominent householders (McIlwaine 1979: 38, 53; Hening 1823 (I): 137, 148, 179, 203). Clearly, very few residents of Martin’s Hundred appear in the historical record in a way that makes it possible to trace community ties. Still, it is possible to discern the personal ties that prominent men made in the administrative center of the colony.

Even for people who did not have the opportunity to travel to Jamestown or other parts of the colony, the potential to make neighborly ties still existed. The problem for the historian, however, is that most social bonds would have existed on an informal, face-to-face basis, and thus would not show up in the documents. But the presence of a local church throughout Martin’s Hundred’s history indicates that many people in the area came together on a regular basis. Religion was an important part of the lives of early Virginians. The assembly legislated that settlers pay for the building or repairing of parish churches (Hening 1823 (I): 160). A church was present in Martin’s Hundred by 1622 and was likely near the Wolstenholme Towne complex. It was partially destroyed in the Indian uprising of that year, but another one was erected by 1638 about a mile away. David Mancell patented 250 acres in 1638, and in his patent it is recorded that the northern boundary was “by a ridge of land whereon the Church standeth” (Nugent 1934 (I): 106). This church served the parish of Martin’s Hundred which was formed in 1634. Early in the twentieth century, Bishop Meade was able to identify the precise location of this church by the presence of a grave marker of a man who died in the parish in 1694 (Meade 1906 (I): 242). Although Francis Wyatt lamented in the 1630s that Virginians were “bereft of the friendly converse, and mutual society one of another in religious duties, the first fruicts of civility,” Martin’s Hundred residents seemed to have enjoyed such friendly converse and mutual society throughout the seventeenth century (WMQ 1927 (I): 44).

By the end of the seventeenth century, the Martin’s Hundred Parish was impoverished. Church officials complained that “as for Gleabe or Gleabes, wee have none, nor other giftes for any pious use.” Indeed the only object the Martin’s Hundred church could claim to own was “one silver bowle for a Comunion Cup” (Palmer 1968: 72). The impoverished state of the Martin’s Hundred church led to the petition by residents to join Yorkhampton Parish in 1713. Thus, Martin’s Hundred, as an ecclesiastical or governmental entity, came to an end (McIlwaine 1925 (III): 316).
The Locust Grove Tract after the Seventeenth Century

Exactly what happened to the Locust Grove Tract parcel in the early eighteenth century is unclear. Between 1710 and 1720, Robert Carter bought 1400 acres in James City County that possibly included part of the Locust Grove Tract. By 1782, however, the Carter’s Grove and Locust Grove Tract lands were separate properties. In 1782, Joseph Wade owned 400 acres of land, 126 of which was part of the Locust Grove Tract (James City County Tax Records). Wade continued to own this land throughout the first three decades of the nineteenth century.

In 1830, the land was purchased by William Taylor. Taylor acquired an additional 100 acres from Thomas Wade three years later. Thomas Wade was taxed on this parcel of land and other land from 1818 to 1833 (James City County Tax Records). Thomas Wade’s land was taxed at $4.50 per acre, and he had a building on the property worth another $100.00.

By 1834, William Taylor owned the entire Locust Grove Tract, but the parcel of land obtained from Joseph and Thomas Wade continued to be taxed separately. In 1841, the land acquired from Joseph Wade was valued at $8.17 an acre with a building valued at $400.00. The property acquired from Thomas Wade was valued at $5.00 an acre (James City County Tax Records). In 1843, William Taylor died, and the property was purchased by Humphrey Harwood. As late as 1850, this property was still considered to be two separate parcels, but by 1856 the property was valued at a single rate, $10.00 per acre with one structure valued at $500.00 (James City County Tax Records).

When Humphrey Harwood died in 1859, his sister inherited his holdings in James City County. She in turn deeded two tracts of land to her daughters. Elizabeth (Bet) Curtis received a 226-acre farm which became known as Locust Grove and later the Locust Grove Tract. Her sister, Frances, was given 400 acres to the west of the Locust Grove. This farm was called Green Mount. Both sisters also received an allotment of slaves. In the 1850’s, both sisters married. Elizabeth (Bet) Curtis married William Baker Wynne and her sister married his brother, Thomas G. Wynne (Figure 5). Thus, both farms came into possession of the Wynne family (Johnson 1985: 84-6).

The Wynne family owned other property in the area around Locust Grove in the first half of the nineteenth century. In the 1840s and 1850s, members of the Wynne family owned five farms in the area (Figure 6). In addition to Thomas Wynne’s Green Mount and William Baker Wynne’s Locust Grove, Richard C. Wynne, their father, owned Helicon and Poplar Grove in an area which is now across Route 60 from the Locust Grove Tract (Johnson 1985: 83). Additionally, Richard’s brother, Thomas, owned Carter’s Grove from 1839 until his death in 1854 (Powers 1984: 10).

Bet and Baker Wynne lived at Locust Grove from sometime in the 1850s until 1861. The original house on the Locust Grove property probably dated to the eighteenth century. A photograph taken by Singleton Moorehead in the 1930’s, shows an eighteenth century chimney attached to a later structure. When the original structure was removed or altered is not known. At some point, a larger house was
built to the north of this structure and this smaller building was demoted to a kitchen. This second house was probably built by subsequent owners of Locust Grove. Bet and Baker Wynne most likely lived in the eighteenth-century structure during the years that they lived on the farm (Frederick Boelt, personal communication).
Baker Wynne was a fairly wealthy man. In 1860, he owned 220 acres of improved land and another 106 acres of unimproved land. The cash value of his farm was a substantial $7,000, although this was scarcely one-fifth the value of George Blow’s farm. Blow, the richest man in the area, owned over 1500 acres of land at a cash value of $36,000 (James City County Tax Records). Still, Wynne’s 220 acres and sixteen slaves made him a large farmer even if he was not a member of the planter elite.

When the Civil War began, Bet and Baker Wynne fled to North Carolina leaving Baker’s brother, Thomas, to tend to the farm. While in North Carolina, Bet Wynne died, and William Baker Wynne remarried. After the war, Baker returned to James City County with his new wife, Bettie. They lived at Locust Grove until 1873 when Wynne sold the farm. The farm was purchased by Freeman S. Mulford and James W. Pancost (James City County Deeds). Freeman Mulford’s daughter inherited his part of the property in 1881 and sold the property three years later, to Freeman’s partner, James Pancost (James City County Deeds).

The Locust Grove Tract was transferred several times after this. Ultimately it ended up in the possession of Bige and Virginia Greene. Bige Greene died in 1965, and his widow sold the property to the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation in 1969.
Chapter 4.
Previous Archaeology

Archaeological investigations have been carried out intermittently on the Carter’s Grove property since 1971, first under the direction of Ivor Noël Hume (1971-1984) and later under Marley R. Brown III (1984-present). At the outset of this project, fourteen historic and prehistoric sites had been registered with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources. Site reports have been completed for most of the excavations, and descriptions of the remainder are currently being compiled by Mr. Noël Hume. The absence of completed archaeological reports for some sites requires a more general review than would normally be necessary.

The Carter’s Grove Mansion with its associated archaeological remains is a major eighteenth-century archaeological resource. Built in the 1750s, this colonial estate was constructed by Carter Burwell and occupied by his descendants until 1838. In 1971, two years after the property was acquired by Colonial Williamsburg, several outbuildings associated with the mansion were uncovered during machine and hand excavation (state site no. 44JC109). Additional eighteenth-century features identified at this time included fence lines, ditches, terraces, formal gardens, paths, a possible dairy, another dwelling, and an icehouse. The formal gardens, dairy, additional dwelling, and ice house were subsequently excavated.

In addition to aiding in reconstruction of the plantation grounds, archaeological inquiry has broadened historical interpretation of the property. During the early 1970s, several rectangular features (44JC110), identified initially as tanning pits, were located during survey work west of the house. Subsequent excavation of these pits proved them to be wood-lined (in many cases), debris-filled root cellars associated with colonial slave quarters. Over twenty such cellars were identified in what is now interpreted as a late eighteenth-century slave compound. The entire complex was excavated, including portions of a nearby ravine containing domestic refuse from the compound.

To the southeast of the mansion five large areas of burnt subsoil were uncovered and interpreted as brick clamps (44JC111). One of the areas contained artifacts that suggested a 1740 to 1750 date range. Several features were found in association with the burned areas included clay pits, post holes, and two wells. The brick making complex was completely excavated in 1971.

Certainly the most celebrated archaeological undertaking at Carter’s Grove has been the excavation of Martin’s Hundred during mid to late 1970s. Sites A, B, C, D, E, and H were part of this large settlement which was established in 1619, and survived until the end of the seventeenth century, despite a near-fatal encounter during the Indian Uprising of 1622. In his book entitled Martin’s Hundred, Noël Hume chronicles the excavation and recovery of a fortified early administrative complex and several outlying dwellings, as well as depicting the everyday life of Martin’s Hundred residents. The sites that have been assigned state site numbers as a result of this excavation include 44JC120, a seventeenth-century site of
unknown function located northwest of Wolstenholme Towne; Site D (44JC114), a small post structure; Site A (44JC116), a structural complex including buildings, fences, and graves; Site C (44JC115), the company compound and fort; and Site E (44JC117,) a single seventeenth-century structure located to the north of Wolstenholme Towne.

Prehistoric sites investigated in this area include several shell middens (44JC118 and 44JC119) and a Woodland period ossuary (44JC119), all of which are located on an ancient river bank near where the Winthrop Rockefeller Archaeological Museum now stands. Sites on this ridge have been examined by Keith Bott, of the Virginia Research Center for Archaeology, who explored the western portion; Norman Barka of the College of William and Mary, who examined part of the ossuary; and David Muraca, of the Department of Archaeological Research, who, in 1986, excavated the eastern part of the site, where the archeological museum now stands. Several other shell middens have been identified on this property, including 44JC130 which was located on the bank of the James River. Threatened by erosion, this site may since have been destroyed.

In 1984, Robin Duffy, under the supervision of Ivor Noël Hume, excavated a large Middle Woodland site (44JC158) where the Carter’s Grove Visitor Center now stands, as well as two post-built houses located under the entrance to the Visitor’s Center. Considered part of Site J, these structures dated to the 1680s. Earlier exploratory excavations on Site J, under the direction of John Hamant, had revealed a large complex of 17th-century features, ranging in date from the 1620s to 1710. Most of this site remains unexamined.

**Previous Archaeology of the Locust Grove Tract**

The proliferation of archaeological sites surrounding Carter’s Grove plantation delayed investigation of outlying areas until the late 1970s. In 1977, having been lured to the plantation’s easternmost extent through excavation of Site A, excavators crossed the ravine to the Locust Grove Tract and began their examination of Site B. A grant from the National Geographic Society funded full-scale excavation of this small seventeenth-century domestic complex, revealing a 37 x 19 foot dwelling, a small shed and an infant burial. Dating information which included a dated slipware dish (1631), suggests that Site B was associated with the reoccupation of Martin’s Hundred after 1622.

In 1978, an intensive survey of a wooded portion of the Locust Grove Tract conducted by Ivor Noël Hume identified two additional Martin’s Hundred period sites (Sites F and G), as well as five prehistoric, and three later historic sites (Figure 7). Limited shovel testing on Site F revealed a large ash-filled pit and a concentration of brick chips and burnt clay. Half of the pit fill was excavated in 1978, with the excavation being completed in 1989 by the Department of Archaeological Research at the request of Noël Hume. A light scatter of artifacts was recovered by shovel testing in the area surrounding the pit and brick concentration. The limits or function of the site were not determined at that time. Shovel testing on Site G recovered a small assemblage of early seventeenth-century domestic artifacts. Further testing of both sites was included in the current project.
Finally, a single marked grave, that of Matilda Jones, was noted by Noël Hume during the 1978 survey. Although this feature dates as recently as the mid-nineteenth century (1848), neither Noël Hume nor subsequent researchers have successfully traced this individual through James City County records.

Figure 7. 1978 archaeological survey.
Chapter 5.
Field Methods

The goals of Phase II testing on the Locust Grove Tract were to clarify individual site boundaries, locate activity areas and intact features, and to determine the degree of integrity of both prehistoric and historic sites. An additional goal, that of determining site function, was accomplished mainly through artifact analysis after the completion of field work.

A grid system imposed over each site provided horizontal control over recovered information. Test units were placed at ten meter intervals, which was deemed sufficiently close to detect artifact distributions and to identify activity areas. The size of individual test units varied according to the nature of the site. As prehistoric sites are generally characterized by uneven scatters of artifacts distributed across large areas, smaller (50 × 50-cm.) units were used to adequately cover the physically larger areas. Historic sites, which are relatively concentrated and exhibit more features, required fewer but larger (75 × 75-cm.) test units to uncover feature boundaries. By shifting the testing interval in relation to unit size, a consistent 1% sample was obtained from each of the sites investigated.

Poor ground visibility due to dense vegetation prohibited any type of surface sampling. All testing was therefore “sub-surface,” with test units excavated by stratigraphic layers using shovels and hand trowels (Figure 8). Soil was screened through ¼-inch mesh and all artifacts were collected, regardless of age. Features were exposed (if necessary by expanding test units), recorded, and drawn in plan, but were not generally excavated, in keeping with the objective of minimal site disturbance (Figure 9). Physical descriptions of both layers and features were recorded using the Department’s standardized context recording form.

Each site’s grid coordinates were tied to a single datum point, marked with an iron reinforcing rod. Context numbers were assigned sequentially to each unit. All measurements were recorded using the metric

Figure 8. Field work: hand excavation.
system, in keeping with the standard recording procedures of the Department of Archaeological Research. In the case of architectural measurements, for example the dimensions of a cellar or the distance between postholes, measurements in feet and inches have also been provided.

A sketch map showing terrain, modern disturbances, and unit location was produced for each site. Color slides and black and white photographs were taken of selected features, for documentation of site disturbances, and as a general chronicle of the testing process.

All finds were washed, sorted, and inventoried using a standard descriptive typology for both historic and prehistoric materials. No minimum vessel counts were estimated due to the limited number of finds. Faunal remains were identified by taxon and element. Artifacts in need of immediate stabilization were sent to Colonial Williamsburg’s Department of Conservation. All other material, along with the documentation, is stored at the laboratory and staff offices of the Department of Archaeological Research.

Figure 9. Field work: mapping.
Chapter 6.
Site Descriptions and Recommendations

Site CG-2 (44JC628)
Seventeenth-Century Domestic Site

Site CG-2, an undisturbed seventeenth-century site, is located on a small, gently sloping terrace that overlooks the western branch of Grice’s Run. Steep ravines bound the southern and eastern sides of the site, while less rugged terrain to the north and west provide the locations for CG-8 and Site B. The site is located in a well-developed mixed hardwood forest, and appears to have been protected from plowing by virtue of its proximity to the ravines.

Phase I investigation identified CG-2 as a multi-component site, comprised of seventeenth-century and Woodland-period occupations (Figure 10). The prehistoric component was made up of a single fragment of a Middle Woodland gravel-tempered pottery known as Varina type, generally dated between 200 B.C. and 400 A.D. Layers (containing brick fragments, a wrought nail, and case bottle glass), and one large feature comprised the historic component. Additional testing was recommended in order to establish site boundaries, identify prehistoric activity areas, and to locate any possible architectural features related to seventeenth-century occupation.

Figure 10. CG-2: Phase I shovel tests.
A total of fifty-one 75 × 75 cm. test units were excavated at CG-2, revealing two cultural layers. The upper, which contained most of the historical artifacts, was a dark brown sandy loam topsoil ranging in thickness from 15 to 20 cm. Below the topsoil, a yellow tan sandy clay layer contained historic artifacts in the upper few centimeters, but was otherwise sterile. The subsoil was an orange clay.

Test units across the site were systematically excavated at 10-meter intervals, though this interval was collapsed to 5 meters in areas of artifact concentrations (Figure 11). These concentrations showed some spatial separation between the prehistoric and historic occupations, with prehistoric activity concentrating to the north and the historic occupation located to the south. Testing in the prehistoric area produced few artifacts and no features.

While a scatter of historical artifacts covered a 50 × 60-meter area on CG-2, the heaviest concentration clustered in a much smaller 20 × 30-meter area near the southern end of the terrace. Here testing revealed what appears to be a large midden—a rich dark artifact-laden area created by the disposal and decay of organic material and household debris. While middens develop around most house sites through the accumulation of garbage, later plowing generally scatters the evidence. The fact that a midden has survived on CG-2 suggests, first, that there is likely to have been a structure on the site, and secondly, that disturbances have been minimal.

Near the midden was an oval-shaped pit feature with well-defined edges, measuring roughly 10 meters in diameter and more than 70 cm. deep. Filled with a black ashy loam, this feature contained a variety of locally-manufactured pipestems (one with a hexagonal cross-section), and local ceramics, as well as imported

Figure 11. CG-2: Phase II test units.
delftware, lead-glazed earthenwares, and large quantities of flint. Architectural materials included nails, some of which had been burnt, and brick fragments.

Similar features recently excavated at two Middle Plantation sites (44JC500 near Carter’s Grove and 44WB49 at College Landing) and at a major seventeenth-century complex in Hampton, Virginia (44HT55) have been interpreted as borrow pits, where clay was mined for brickmaking (Muraca n.d.; Edwards et al. 1989). Once the clay had been quarried, these large circular holes were quickly filled with waste from nearby dwellings.

Analysis of the artifact distribution reveals a concentration of architectural material just east of the midden, near the oval feature. Domestic artifacts such as glass, ceramics, and tobacco pipes concentrate in the midden itself, reinforcing the conclusion that a dwelling was located nearby. This structure is likely to have had at least a brick chimney, based on the large number of brick chips scattered over the site.

Ceramics recovered from CG-2 are typical of early seventeenth-century assemblages, exhibiting large numbers of local and imported coarsewares, slipwares, and tin-glazed wares. The absence of wine bottle glass, a major component on post-1650 occupations, suggests that the site was abandoned by this date.

The recovery of lead shot, lead casting waste, and large quantities of gun flint appear to represent hunting rather than military activities. Food probably came, however, primarily from the resident’s own pigs and cows, as these were the only identifiable bones on the site.

Interpretation

The nature and variety of the artifact assemblage recovered from CG-2 support the conclusion that this is a domestic occupation associated with Martin’s Hundred. The absence of wine bottle glass and the wide range of ceramic wares present suggest that the farmstead was first occupied between 1625 and 1635 and was abandoned by 1650.

While no structural evidence was identified, a large dark midden near the center of the site may represent an area of domestic trash disposal. Site CG-2 appears to have suffered no subsequent occupation, erosion, or plowing, and therefore represents a unique opportunity to excavate an undisturbed early colonial site.

No significant remains of the prehistoric occupation have survived and no further work is necessary for this component.

Recommendations

So few sites dating from the early seventeenth century have been identified in the Chesapeake that CG-2 would warrant protection or further study on this basis alone. The fact that the site is undisturbed, and can be placed within the context of the Wolstenholme Towne excavations, only adds to its significance. While the first few years of this settlement have been fairly well explored through the excavations
of Noël Hume, an understanding of post-1622 Martin’s Hundred has yet to be
developed by historians or anthropologists.

Protection of the site is the preferred option, but Phase III data recovery is
recommended if avoidance is not feasible. The layers should be hand-excavated,
with all exposed features being mapped, recorded, photographed, and excavated.
Attention should be paid to the retrieval of special categories of artifacts that
usually survive only on unplowed sites. Soil from the midden area and the borrow
pit should undergo chemical flotation in order to retrieve floral specimens. Scientific
testing of these areas should include soil chemistry, pollen and phytolith analysis.
Since midden areas are well known for their excellent preservation, there should
be a large conservation budget for metals and organic material, along with the
proper facilities for these sometimes-delicate specimens. Preparation for the re-
trieval of unusual and difficult materials should be made well before they are encoun-
tered in the ground. The Noël Hume excavations have convincingly demonstrated
the possibility of rare and fragile finds on these sites, and excavators should be
prepared to handle similar types of artifacts.

Site CG-3 (44JC633)
Archaic Period Procurement Camp

Site CG-3, an Archaic Period hunting and gathering camp, occupies the eastern
half of a ridge between major ravines feeding Grice’s Run. The ridge slopes gently
towards the south into a third large ravine, leaving CG-3 high and well drained.
Current vegetation is dominated by an immature pine plantation, and by the un-
derlying brush and scrub weeds. While there is no apparent water source to sup-
ply the site, traces of small springs still exist in and near the ravines.

Phase I shovel testing produced a moderate scatter of quartzite flakes, but
no diagnostic artifacts. While the absence of pottery suggested an Archaic-period
occupation, neither the site date nor site function were clearly understood, and
recommendations for additional testing therefore focussed on these issues. The
identification of activity areas was also established as a priority for Phase II
investigation.

Sixty-two 50 × 50 cm. test units were used to delineate the boundaries of
the Archaic lithic scatter (Figure 12). Two layers sealed subsoil across the ridge,
including a modern plowzone, ranging from 20 to 30 cm. in depth, and a layer of
10 cm. thick yellowish tan sandy clay. The plowzone contained a moderate density
of flakes including shatter, primary reduction, secondary thinning, and retouch
flakes, a light scatter of fire-cracked rock, and one diagnostic hafted biface, identified
as a Morrow Mountain II type (4000-3000 B.C.). A second quartzite point,
medium-sized with convex edges and a straight base, was not identifiable to type.
Other tools recovered from the plowzone included one hammerstone, one biface
chopper, one quartz perforator, one quartzite biface end scraper, two quartzite
side scrapers, two modified flakes, and one possible quartz point stem.

The second layer, confined to a 40 × 20-meter area on the northwestern
side of the ridge, contained several distinct clusters of artifacts that may represent
features. As age often leeches the color from Archaic-period features, it is not uncommon to identify these features solely through artifact concentrations. Small flakes produced in the sharpening of stone tools made up the bulk of this recovered assemblage. What appeared to be subsoil was excavated to an arbitrary depth of 10 cm., resulting in the occasional recovery of a flake.

To the south of the ridge, erosion had deposited two distinct layers of water deposited gray silty loam below a modern plowzone. These layers, which reached a combined depth of more than 40 cm., yielded light concentrations of fire-cracked rock and quartzite flakes.

Two distinct soil stains or features were discovered during the testing of CG-3, both with natural rather than cultural origins. A test unit excavated in the middle of an amorphous feature near the site’s northeastern boundary was enlarged to reveal several small circular stains (Munsell color 10YR4/2) surrounded by an orange clay with large flecks of charcoal. The surface of the feature measured roughly 1.5 × 1.4 meters. One small circular stain and a portion of the clay were excavated, producing a small assemblage of fire-cracked rock and quartz debitage. Based on the feature’s amorphous shape, and the similarity of the recovered artifacts to the rest of the site assemblage, it appears to have been caused by an overturned tree. The presence of artifacts in this feature suggests that the tree fell either during or after the occupation of the site.

Sectioning of a small, irregular feature near the southeastern edge of the site revealed a dark fill measuring 85 cm. deep. The irregularity of the sides and the dark fill suggest that this feature is a silted animal burrow, perhaps created by groundhogs, which are still found in the area.
**Interpretation**

The recovered lithic material and the absence of pottery on site CG-3 suggest a Native American occupation during the Archaic Period (pre-2000 B.C.). This period (ca. 6000-2000 B.C.) saw significant environmental changes including a warming climate, an increase in annual rainfall, and the growth of deciduous forests. The resulting diversification of plant and animal communities encouraged, among other things, the development of a more specialized tool kit using locally available stone.

Procurement sites such as CG-3 are temporary camps which were occupied during hunting or gathering forays. While these sites may have been visited repeatedly, or occasionally for extended periods, it was as part of an effort to supply the more permanent base camps with specific resources. The large number of foray camps identified near sources of water is often countered by the scant evidence that they produce.

The stated goals of identifying activity areas, occupation dates and site boundaries were frustrated by extensive plowing. The only diagnostic artifact, a small shale Morrow Mountain II point, was recovered from the plowzone. Likewise the lithic assemblage, consisting primarily of quartz and quartzite flakes, was concentrated in this disturbed layer, although one undisturbed activity area was identified on the knoll. The heavy representation of retouch flakes in this layer suggests that tool use, rather than manufacture, was the primary activity in this area.

The small number of primary reduction flakes supports the conclusion that this was a hunting and gathering camp. Diagnostic tools and hafted bifaces suggest a several short sporadic occupations spanning the Middle and Late Archaic periods. The discovery of several similar artifact scatters on the opposite side of the ravine to the east supports this conclusion. The entire area was used on a sporadic basis for small hunting and gathering, was uncovered.

**Recommendations**

Site CG-3 represents an important archaeological resource for the study of Archaic-period settlement patterns along the James River drainage. The presence of an undisturbed layer located at the head of an interior ravine presents a unique opportunity to help in the fabrication of a broad-based environmental reconstruction for this time period.

Phase III data recovery is recommended if the site is threatened by future construction. The plowzone should be further sampled, using small units to collect artifacts in a systematic fashion. When this is completed, the plowzone may be removed by machine. Large-scale block excavation will allow for identification of spatial concentrations of artifacts as well as any stratigraphic sequences. Features or heavy concentrations of lithics should be piece-plotted. It is recommended that 80 square meters, or approximately 20% of the site, be excavated in this fashion.
Sites CG-4 and CG-5 (44JC653 and 44JC645)
Middle Archaic Period Procurement Camp

Sites CG-4 and CG-5, identified as separate concentrations during Phase I testing, appear to represent a single occupation dating to the latter end of the Middle Archaic Period (6500-3000 B.C.). The sites are located on the lower portion of a gently-sloping terrace overlooking a feeder ravine for Grice’s Run. Approximately 80% of the combined site area lies in a formerly plowed and logged field, now covered in grasses and young loblolly pine. The remaining 20% lies within a wooded border surrounding the ravine.

Historic uses of site CG-4/5 have obscured much of the evidence of prehistoric occupation. Repeated plowing from the eighteenth through the twentieth centuries has disturbed soil layers and created slope-wash affecting soils and the artifacts contained in them. Logging operations, the most recent of which occurred in 1989, resulted in tire ruts more than a foot deep along the treeline, and produced a road that transects the site.

Phase I investigation of sites CG-4 and CG-5 identified two separate concentrations, nearly contiguous, bordering the ravine. While both sites yielded artifacts dating to the Archaic period, the recovery of brick, delft, and pearlware from site CG-4 suggested an additional eighteenth-century component.

Phase II testing was conducted separately on sites CG-4 and CG-5 based on spatial separation and the multi-component nature of CG-4. On both sites 50 × 50 cm. test squares were excavated stratigraphically to the level of subsoil in order to identify site boundaries and any subsurface features, and to determine the degree of integrity of the soil layers (Figure 13).

Site CG-4

Ninety 50 × 50 cm. test units were excavated at CG-4 at 10-meter intervals across an area 150 meters north-south × 130 meters east-west. These holes were expanded to 75 × 75 cm. in areas where Phase I testing had produced the largest quantities of historic artifacts. Of the total number of units, fifteen lay within the wooded area, with the remaining 75 excavated in open fields.

The unprotected units, those lying in the field, produced widely-varying stratigraphy characteristic of heavy disturbance. Obvious mottling and clear mixing of prehistoric and historic-period artifacts characterized a 50 cm. plowzone which, in most areas, extended into a sterile orange-yellow clay subsoil. Near the logging road transecting the site, this plowzone layer was shallow and very compact, while just outside the wooded area, deep tire ruts prevented the definition of any soil layers at all.

One small pocket of an intact prehistoric layer appeared to have survived on the upper portion of the site, but the swirled appearance of this light sand, combined with sloping stratigraphy, suggests that this may represent a natural gully silted in during the prehistoric period. Because they are likely to have been carried to their present location as runoff, artifacts recovered from this “layer” (approximately two dozen flakes, three fire-cracked rocks and a tested cobble) lack any real archaeological integrity.
The wooded portion of the site produced a much more consistent stratigraphy. Three layers sealed subsoil, including a dark brown sandy loam topsoil, 13 to 21 cm. of olive brown loamy sand, and a thin layer (approximately 10 cm.) of pale tan sand. Prehistoric artifacts were recovered from each of the bottom two layers, suggesting long or repeated occupation, although in the absence of diagnostic artifacts a chronological distinction between the layers was impossible.

Some 247 fragments of stone and shatter produced during the stone-working process made up the bulk of the artifact assemblage recovered from site CG-4. While large quantities of primary and secondary thinning flakes and fire-cracked rock would seem to indicate that only the roughest stages of stone-working were being performed at this site, the use of fairly large, ¼" screens to recover artifacts may be responsible for the lack of more refined finishing flakes in the assemblage. Consequently, while stone was certainly being worked at CG-4, it is difficult to say with certainty whether flakes were being prepared for later working, or whether tools were actually produced.

No features were identified at CG-4, nor were any diagnostic artifacts recovered from the fifteen undisturbed test units bordering the ravine. The remaining
units excavated in a plowed field produced three datable artifacts—a Morrow Mountain I point (ca. 3000 B.C.) and pieces of possible Guilford (ca. 4000 B.C.) and Halifax points (ca. 3000 B.C.) (Figures 14 and 15). Although these artifacts were recovered from a disturbed context, all three suggest an occupation date near the end of the Middle Archaic period.

The historic component identified during Phase I survey produced moderate quantities of nails, window glass, and tobacco pipes during Phase II investigation. However, as these artifacts appeared to be randomly scattered, particularly across the upper portions of the site, it was concluded that they represent a light eighteenth- and nineteenth-century deposit washed down the hill from site CG-7.

**Site CG-5**

Like CG-4, site CG-5 has suffered the cumulative effects of three centuries of plowing and more recent intensive logging activity. Approximately half of the 100 × 50-meter area that was tested lies in open fields, with the remainder located along the ravine inside the treeline. Unlike site CG-4, the trees have afforded little protection for soil layers, as nineteenth- and twentieth-century trash disposal and animal confinement have proven equally destructive forces. A large trash dump fills one portion of the ravine and covers the adjacent slope, while piles of discarded tires and torn sections of barbed wire fencing litter the ground surface.

Thirty-eight 50 × 50 cm. holes excavated at 10-meter intervals encountered significant disturbance across much of the tested area (see Figure 13). Along the upper open portions of the site, repeated agricultural activities have created a deep, two-level plowzone extending to subsoil. Those units placed within the wooded area encountered a rich gray-brown loamy topsoil, containing a variety of nineteenth- and twentieth-century artifacts, as well as flakes of worked stone. An olive-gray second layer yielded a more consistent prehistoric assemblage, although a handful of nails and colorless glass suggest disturbance to the upper few centimeters.

![Figure 14. CG-4: Morrow Mountain point.](image1)

![Figure 15. CG-4: Halifax point.](image2)
One historic-period feature—a twentieth-century pipe trench—was identified through testing. This feature, which appeared beneath topsoil, was filled with mottled gray-brown loam containing pieces of iron, brick chunks, and fire-cracked rock. The iron pipe ran in an east-west direction, undoubtedly from site CG-7 above to a brick catchment basin near the bottom of the ravine.

As on CG-4, the bulk of the prehistoric assemblage was made up of stone fragments and shatter produced during the stone-working process. Small numbers of primary reduction, thinning, and retouched flakes were also recovered, in addition to fire-cracked rock and three unidentifiable tools. It should be noted that in spite of its prehistoric nature, the presence of a modern trash dump at CG-5 weighed the artifact assemblage heavily toward the late historic period.

In a final assessment, while lacking diagnostic artifacts, site CG-5 mirrors the proportions of prehistoric artifacts recovered from site CG-4. More importantly, when artifact distributions were plotted for each site, there was no discernable break between the areas. Given these facts, CG-4/5 was created as a description for the combined site area.

**Interpretation**

CG-4/5 is a Middle Archaic period site that appears to fit the generalized definition of a temporary resource procurement camp. This particular camp appears to have been occupied repeatedly, although not intensively, perhaps during seasonal hunting and gathering expeditions.

The location of CG-4/5 is fairly typical of sites that attracted prehistoric occupation in this region. Fresh water springs that still flow through the ravine were undoubtedly the primary attraction, drawing both Native Americans and the game that they pursued. In addition to water, the ravine provided cobbles which could be worked into tools and implements. Similarities between the cobbles in the ravine and worked stone recovered from CG-4/5 indicate clearly that local resources were being exploited, yet the small quantity of recovered stone discourages an interpretation of this as a quarrying site. Rather, it appears that cobbles were collected as needed, and that lithic reduction was an incidental activity.

The absence of prehistoric pottery and subsurface features at CG-4/5 suggests that occupation was confined to the Archaic period, yet more refined dating was difficult due to historic-period disturbances. All diagnostic artifacts were recovered from a heavily-disturbed plowzone, and were therefore without intact archaeological context. The undisturbed portion of the site clearly illustrates that there were two separate periods of occupation, but yielded no diagnostic artifacts in clear stratigraphic context. Therefore, while the occupation of CG-4/5 can be placed with some confidence in the Middle Archaic Period, a more accurate statement might be that the last occupation of the site occurred at that time.

Unfortunately, extensive agricultural activity at CG-4/5 has limited the informative potential of the site. Based on soil stratigraphy, at least 80% of site CG-4/5 has been significantly disturbed in such a way as to compromise the data that might be recovered from it. Although isolated pockets of a possible prehistoric layer underlie these disturbed layers, it can safely be said that the only intact portion
of the site is the westernmost 20% surrounding the ravine—and modern dumping has called the integrity of this strip into question as well.

Recommendations

Because all archaeological information is based on context, that is, on the relationship between artifacts and soil layers, the integrity of archaeological information on site CG-4/5 has been severely compromised. Approximately 80% of the site, including a possible eighteenth-century component, has been lost to plowing and logging activities, and while there are still significant numbers of artifacts in the plowzone, their informative potential is limited. No further work is recommended on this site.

Site CG-6 (44JC654)
Slope Wash

Site CG-6 was identified during Phase I testing as a prehistoric camp located on an ancient beachhead. As prehistoric sites are generally found along the edges of rivers, ravines and other sources of fresh water, and as CG-6 lacks access to such resources, the site presented an opportunity to challenge this long-held model of prehistoric site location.

Phase I investigation of CG-6 produced one non-diagnostic preform and a light scatter of flakes across an area measuring 320 feet north-south × 480 feet east-west. A small number of historic period artifacts were also recovered, although these were believed to have been dragged downslope from CG-7 via plowing or erosion. Recommendations for future work stressed the need to better understand the site’s function and period of occupation, especially in light of its unusual location.

Phase II testing involved the excavation of thirty 50 × 50 cm. units at 10-meter intervals across the beachhead and on the slopes both above and below the ridge (Figure 16). Deep stratigraphy demonstrated the extent of slope wash in this area, with many units reaching one meter in depth before encountering the underlying subsoil. Most units contained three soil layers, all of which were light in color and very silty, showing evidence of having been washed down from the slope above.

In spite of extensive testing, the sloping portions of CG-6 showed little evidence of prehistoric occupation. In fact, only one test unit produced any prehistoric artifacts at all. A light scatter of 20 prehistoric flakes was found at the base of this slope, but as most of these were recovered from the plowzone layer, there is a high probability that they reached their final destination through plowing or erosion.

An unexpected result of the testing process at CG-6 was the retrieval of seventeenth- through nineteenth-century artifacts along the ridge below the slope. Sherds of delftware, white salt-glazed stoneware, agateware, and case bottle glass, in addition to clay tobacco pipes, nails and colorless glass, suggest an historic occupation. Given, however, the fact that this concentration lies at the base of a hill, that nearly all historic artifacts were retrieved from the plowzone, and that only
one unit exhibited what appeared to be an intact soil layer, there is significant reason to doubt the integrity of the deposit.

**Interpretation**

Based on the data obtained through Phase II testing, site CG-6 appears not to be a site at all, but rather a concentration of artifacts washed downslope from site CG-7 by repeated plowing and subsequent erosion.

**Recommendations**

The degree of plowing above site CG-6, and the resulting erosion, would suggest that the “site” was actually created by these forces. No further work is necessary.

**Site CG-7 (44JC646)**

**Locust Grove**

Site CG-7 is a multi-component historic site, occupied from the eighteenth through the twentieth centuries. The site includes the concrete-encased brick foundation of a nineteenth-century structure, concrete foundations for related sheds, barns and garages, and a brick cellar marking the site of an eighteenth-century farmstead later known as Locust Grove. The focus of Phase II testing at this site was on exposing, recording and dating the cellar.

Locust Grove is located in a small copse of trees in the center of an otherwise plowed and logged field. Occupying a small knoll, the site overlooks CG-4/5 and CG-6, and was once easily accessible from Route 60 via a drive that has since become overgrown. Roses, locust and cedar trees still line this drive. Six maple
trees delineate the northeast boundary of the yard, while a fruit orchard, no longer bearing, acts as the southeastern border. Blackberry bushes proliferate, hindering access to the site during the early summer months.

Phase I investigation of CG-7 focussed on surface and sub-surface testing around the brick cellar. The dimensions and bonding pattern of the cellar walls were noted, as well as evidence for modern repair. Shovel tests in the yard produced late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century ceramics, and possible evidence for brick foundation outbuildings. Priorities for future investigation included further documentation of the cellar and systematic testing of the yard to locate associated structures.

Phase II examination of CG-7 consisted of both field testing and documentary research. The former, conducted in early June 1991, involved excavation of 75 × 75 cm. test units at 10-meter intervals on all sides of the brick cellar. In addition, the cellar was cleared of much of its rubble fill, a section of the builder’s trench was examined, and a 1.5 × 6-meter test trench was excavated from the northeast corner of the cellar to explore the possibility of a building extension (Figure 17). All surviving above-ground features were drawn and photographed.

A total of sixteen 75 × 75 cm. test units were excavated at CG-7, revealing a varied stratigraphy (Figure 18). North of the cellar, that is along the front of the house, was a medium gray-brown topsoil layer averaging 17 cm. in depth, and below that, 8 cm. of mottled tan silty clay loam sealing subsoil. Plowing in the adjacent field came extraordinarily close to the rear of the structure, however, and plowscars cut directly into subsoil in this area. West of the cellar, a layer of redeposited subsoil under the topsoil layer marked the location of a former drive. Soil layers across the site have been so disturbed by plowing over the last 150 years that all contain artifacts post-dating the Civil War.

Figure 17. Locust Grove cellar excavation.
As is often the case on nineteenth- and twentieth-century sites, excavation of soil layers at CG-7 produced overwhelming artifactual evidence—more than 2300 objects from 16 test units. Container glass comprised the bulk of this assemblage, followed closely by nails, brick, and an assortment of refined earthenwares. Some of the more interesting items recovered included a decorative book clasp, an iron padlock, a furniture handle and a horseshoe. While architectural evidence ultimately proved Locust Grove’s eighteenth-century construction date, the strong representation of such eighteenth-century artifacts as case and wine bottle glass, undecorated creamware and pearlware, Westerwald stoneware, and pipestems supports this date.

**Cellar**

Surviving above-ground evidence for Locust Grove consists primarily of a brick-lined cellar, currently filled with rubble from its own chimney, and debris from an adjacent structure. Approximately one meter deep, the cellar has interior dimensions of 4.0 × 4.25 meters (13.2 feet × 14.1 feet). As is typical of colonial and early nineteenth-century construction, cellar walls are laid in English bond with shell mortar, although there are visible modern repairs. A formidable brick pile at the cellar’s west end marks the former location of an exterior chimney, which appears, based on a 1932 sketch, to have been of eighteenth-century construction (Figure 19).

While features are rarely excavated during the course of Phase II investigations, a 1-meter long section of the builder’s trench was removed in an effort to date the structure. Seven to nine cm. wide, the gray-brown loam filling the
trench contained brick chips and mortar, but no datable artifacts. The only artifact useful in establishing a construction date was a large piece of 1870s transfer-printed whiteware found on top of the feature (see below). Since this ceramic was pressed into the top of the builder’s trench, the cellar was clearly completed before the 1870s.

There have been a number of modern repairs and additions to this cellar, most of which involved sealing leaking or decaying brick under layers of poured concrete. The bulkhead was one of the first areas to receive such treatment. Concrete was also poured over a crushed brick floor in the cellar, perhaps in an effort to reduce the dampness which seemed so problematic. A section of this modern flooring, once cleared of debris, was pulled up to expose the brick rubble

Figure 19. Locust Grove chimney. (Based on 1932 sketch by Singleton P. Moorehead.)
underneath and the underlying subsoil. No artifacts were found in association with any of the floor layers (Figure 20).

Another visible improvement to the structure was a concrete apron poured around the base of the exterior wall, in yet another attempt to exclude ground water. Precisely when this repair occurred is difficult to determine, but the large piece of 1870s transfer-printed whiteware sealed beneath the apron indicates that it occurred sometime after that date.

The thicknesses of cellar walls at CG-7 varied from 1½ bricks on the north, south, and west sides to 1 brick on the east, suggesting that the latter was not a weight-bearing exterior wall. A large test trench (6 m. × 1.5 m.) excavated from the northeast corner of the cellar successfully located the missing structural evidence in the form of a shallow builder’s trench. While not fully excavated, removal of a small section of the builder’s trench indicated that it was deep enough to seat two courses of brick. Nearly 5 meters in length, this house addition expanded the exterior dimensions of the structure to approximately 10 m. north-south × 4.75 m. east-west, or roughly 32 feet × 16 feet (Figure 21).

Also identified while exposing the builder’s trench was a brick chimney base opposite the one earlier identified. This feature measured 2.5 meters in length (nearly 8 feet) and was two bricks wide. While the single remaining row of bricks was not mortared, all had mortar on their top surfaces, suggesting more sturdy construction above ground level.

**Collapsed Chimneys**

Undoubtedly the most perplexing features encountered at CG-7 were two large brick “pads,” measuring more than ten feet in length and composed of mortared bricks lying on their sides. Half a brick thick, these features had struck joints on

![Figure 20. Locust Grove flooring layers (left-right; subsoil, crushed brick, concrete).](image)
their downward-facing mortared surfaces, and appeared to represent sections of flimsy, toppled walls.

Comparison of the ground evidence with a 1932 photograph finally identified these features as chimney stacks from the nineteenth-century structure at right angles to the original house. Evidently when this larger house was demolished, the chimney stacks fell outward, splitting open on impact. The result was long and
relatively flat sections of brick with edges that turned up at an angle of about 70 degrees. The absence of any visible ash or soot on the brick surfaces can probably be attributed to more than twenty years of exposure to rain and snow.

**Plowed Trash Deposit**

A twentieth-century trash deposit represents the single non-structural feature identified at CG-7. Located approximately 10 meters southwest of the bulkhead, the top of this feature has clearly been plowed.

The 75 × 75-cm. unit used to test the deposit was unsuccessful in identifying feature boundaries, nor was it large enough to give a clear indication of the shape of the feature bottom. The designation of this unit as a feature was, instead, based on the recovery of 240 historic-period artifacts from the second and third layers in this test unit. Layer two, a light gray compact sandy loam, measured 27 cm. in depth, while the third layer, a pale tan sand mottled with gray-brown and orange, was 12 cm. thick.

A variety of household artifacts including container and window glass, decorated and undecorated whiteware and pearlware, porcelain, and animal bone made up the bulk of this assemblage. Also present were a ceramic tobacco pipe, a glass marble, and large quantities of brick and nails. Dates for the layers in this deposit were derived from a marked glass Clorox bottle in layer two (post-1903), and colorless non-leaded glass (post-1864) in layer three.

**Interpretation**

The interpretation of CG-7, or Locust Grove, owes much to the availability of photographic and written documents, and to personal communication with Frederick Boelt, a descendant of one-time owner William Baker Wynne. Other information is derived from comparisons between this cellar and the standing structure known as Green Mount which was occupied by Wynne’s brother during the same period of time.

Based on a 1932 photograph depicting a chimney with a massive T-shaped stack, decorated with a chevron pattern, the original house at Locust Grove was apparently constructed sometime during the eighteenth century (Figure 22). In all likelihood, it was two-room frame house resting on a shallow brick foundation. The identification of a much smaller chimney base at the structure’s east end would suggest that both of the rooms were heated. Whether the cellar was part of this original phase of construction is uncertain.

Sometime during the late nineteenth century, perhaps in 1873 when Wynne sold the property, the structure appears to have undergone a dramatic transformation. Construction of a larger house just to the north and at right angles to the present cellar appears to have prompted the remodelling of Locust Grove into a kitchen. Archaeological evidence suggests that the structure was removed from its continuous brick foundation, leaving the cellar to support the west half and piers to support the eastern portion. Clay pads, discovered archaeologically, appear to represent the seatings for these piers.
That Locust Grove later became a kitchen is a conclusion drawn from documentary and archaeological evidence. A second photograph taken of Locust Grove in 1932 depicts a frame structure with no windows across the south or back wall—a feature which, in a dwelling, would cause some obvious inconvenience (Figure 23). The number of chimneys was also reduced. With fire needed only to cook, and not to heat the structure, the smaller east end chimney was removed. The fact that plow scars have damaged the smaller chimney base while the larger is still buried under four feet of rubble confirms the more recent use of the latter feature.

Locust Grove stood, probably abandoned and in disrepair, until the late 1960s, when both houses were simultaneously removed. Based on artifacts recovered from both the cellar and the ground surface, occupation of at least the larger structure continued until its demolition. It is likely that this structure was still in reasonably good repair at the time of its demolition, as the chimneys seem to have survived the fall intact.

**Recommendations**

Unlike many James City County sites, the history of “Locust Grove” appears to be well documented, having benefitted from the diligence of family historian Frederick Boelt. Still, this is not a particularly unusual structure, and it is not necessary to preserve or further excavate what remains. It is important, however, that the structure be adequately recorded prior to any possible impact. Field drawings have been made, and the cellar has been photographed. Additional photographs should be taken once the leaves have fallen and lighting conditions have improved.
Site CG-8 (44JC647)  
Seventeenth-Century Domestic Site

Site CG-8 is a seventeenth-century domestic site that appears to be associated with the post-1622 resettlement of Martin's Hundred. Located on a terrace just west of CG-3, CG-8 occupies the area’s highest point, with ravines to the south, east, and west. Testing indicated that the site extended into the western ravine. Vegetation across the terrace includes weeds, briars, and such grasses as are normally associated with immature pines.

The Phase I investigation uncovered a light scatter of seventeenth-century artifacts, including case bottle glass and locally manufactured pipestems, but no features or artifact concentrations. While the degree to which artifacts were scattered suggested that plowing on the terrace had caused significant damage, the integrity of overlying soil layers was not determined at this time. Objectives for future treatment of site CG-8 included determining its state of preservation and identifying site boundaries and site function.

To this end, forty 75 × 75-cm. test units were excavated at 10-meter intervals across the site (Figure 24). Stratigraphic evidence from these units proved that plowing had indeed been deep, and had eradicated all cultural soil layers. The resulting plowzone, a brown sandy loam layer, ranged in depth from 20 to 30 cm., and contained all of the recovered artifacts. An orange sandy clay subsoil underly- ing the plowzone was excavated to an arbitrary depth of 10 cm., but no additional artifacts were recovered.

Figure 23. Locust Grove demoted to a kitchen. (Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.)
While no features were identified during Phase II testing, the artifact assemblage points strongly to a domestic function. In the absence of obvious structural evidence such as postholes, an alternative effort to locate a building at CG-8 focussed on the distribution of certain artifact types. Architectural debris, including brick bats, window glass, and nails, clustered nicely in the site’s northeastern corner, as did ceramics, bottle glass, and tobacco pipes. A secondary clustering of architectural material—this one without a domestic counterpart—on the southern edge of the site suggests that an outbuilding may have been associated with the structure. While the site’s southern edge is in fact on a gentle slope, erosion cannot account for one class of artifacts being washed down a slope and not others.

Within the area tested, 12 test units exhibited a high concentration of seventeenth-century material. Architectural remains consisted of 15 nail fragments. Glass was represented by 29 sherds of case bottle glass, with the absence of round wine bottle glass suggesting that the site was abandoned before the 1650s. The ceramic assemblage, consisting of 32 sherds, was made up of a variety of seventeenth-century types, including Iberian or Mediterranean sgraffito slipware and a sherd of North Italian marbleized polychrome slipware, dating between 1610 and 1650. Imported and domestic coarsewares, lead glazed redwares, and red sandy wares were dispersed throughout the test units.

A total of 16 tobacco pipe bowls and stem fragments, both locally manufactured and imported, were recovered from the terrace. One domestic pipe bowl, decorated with rouletting, was manufactured from multi-colored clay. Another pipe bowl, this one imported, bore a maker’s mark of “WC,” possibly “William Collins,” a London pipe-maker who died during the 1660s. Similar marks have been identified on pipes from other Martin’s Hundred sites, including one on Site G.

Figure 24. CG-8: Phase II test units.
**Interpretation**

A combination of artifactual and historical evidence suggests that site CG-8 is a domestic occupation associated with the reoccupation of Martin’s Hundred. Recovered artifacts suggest that the site was occupied during the second quarter of the seventeenth century and was abandoned (based on the absence of cylindrical wine bottle glass) before 1650. The fact that no industrial or craft-related artifacts were recovered suggests that the site was formed around a dwelling, probably related to a small plantation. While no structural evidence for this dwelling was identified, artifact distribution patterns point to the site’s northeast corner as the area of greatest potential.

**Recommendations**

Only eight archaeological sites predating 1650 yet have been identified in James City County, making CG-8 an important resource of national significance. For this reason, the site was recommended for Phase III data recovery to include extensive systematic testing of the plowzone and, following the machine removal of this disturbed layer, the excavation of all remaining features intruding subsoil.

During the summer of 1991, staff members from the Department of Archaeological Research, aided by William and Mary field school students, undertook and completed this excavation. Post holes delineating a small 5.2 m. × 7.3 m. (18 × 24 foot) structure with a lean-to addition (3.4 m. × 2.2 m.) were discovered in precisely the location of highest architectural debris. In addition, two trash pits were identified and excavated, as were the trenches for a number of slot fences (Figure 25). Based on the recovered artifacts, this is a briefly occupied domestic site that appears to date to the 1630s. A full description and analysis of the site is forthcoming (Edwards 1992).

**Site CG-9 (44JC648) Middle Woodland Period Hearth**

Site CG-9 is located on a narrow, flat plateau between large ravines feeding Grice’s Run. As the width of this plateau has discouraged twentieth-century logging activities, mature stands of poplar, beech, dogwood, sweet gum and holly cover the site.

Phase I testing, which was conducted during the winter of 1990/91, produced a handful of flaked stone, two iron nail fragments, and an unexplained area of burned clay and charcoal approximately 8 cm. thick (Figure 26). Given the presence of both historic and prehistoric artifacts in association with this feature, additional testing was recommended to determine whether it represented a temporary prehistoric encampment or a mid-winter fire set by loggers in the more recent past. If the feature was found to mark a prehistoric site, additional goals included dating the occupation and establishing site boundaries.

Phase II investigation focussed on the area where test holes that had yielded burned clay. A 2 × 3-meter excavation unit laid out to encompass these holes
Figure 25. CG-8: Structural features uncovered during Phase III excavation.

Figure 26. CG-9: Phase I shovel tests.
successfully exposed the boundaries of the feature. Roughly circular, it measures 1.5 meters across and appears from its surface as a concentration of fire-cracked rock and river cobbles surrounded by chunks of burnt clay (Figure 27). The feature is sealed by approximately 5 cm. of topsoil.

Surface characteristics, combined with the absence of cans, straws, pull-tabs, or soft drink bottles, suggest that this is a prehistoric hearth or roasting pit rather than the remains of a logging fire, but the period of occupation was unclear. While hearths are generally considered to be Woodland Period features (due to the poor preservation of similar features from the earlier Archaic Period), excavation of the overlying topsoil failed to produce any artifacts which narrowed the period of occupation. Additional test squares were therefore excavated to recover diagnostic artifacts and to establish site boundaries.

A total of nine 50 × 50-cm. square test units were laid out north and east of the hearth. Seven of these were placed at 10-meter intervals, with the remaining two excavated at a collapsed 5-meter interval where artifact concentrations were highest (Figure 28). Stratigraphy was uniform across the terrace, and included two soil layers—a 5-cm. thick layer of topsoil, and a 10-15 cm. light gray silty clay layer—overlying subsoil. No testing was conducted south or west of the hearth where ravines formed natural site boundaries.

Artifacts were recovered from both layers in seven of the nine test units, and included four fire-cracked rocks, eight pieces of flaked stone, charcoal, and six fragments of a sand-tempered, net-impressed aboriginal pottery known as Varina-

Figure 27. CG-9: Middle Woodland period hearth.
type. Varina wares are characteristic of the Middle Woodland period, and are thought to date from the period 200 B.C. to 400 A.D.

**Interpretation**

CG-9 appears to be a small, minimally disturbed campsite that was visited repeatedly during the Middle Woodland Period (500 B.C.-900 A.D). The evenness of the terrain and the availability of fresh water would have made this an attractive location for short-term encampment during seasonal hunting and gathering forays. There is no indication of specialized activities on the site, although the flaked stone recovered from test units may have been quarried from sources in the adjacent ravines.

A clearly delineated hearth or roasting pit is the site’s most obvious feature, and was undoubtedly the focus of activity during the occupation. A similar feature encountered during excavation of the Carter’s Grove Museum site yielded dietary information, through the recovery of deer, duck and snapping turtle bones, and radiocarbon samples which were used to date the site.

**Recommendations**

So little is known about prehistoric occupation in this area that all sites exhibiting a reasonable degree of integrity are generally recommended for further testing. The presence of an undisturbed prehistoric feature at site CG-9 permits questions regarding environmental conditions, diet, and site chronology to be addressed, and thus contributes significantly to its informative potential. Phase III excavation will be necessary if the site cannot be avoided.
CG-9 is among the few sites in the survey area that has escaped considerable disturbance in the last 200 years. The peninsula on which the site is located is sufficiently narrow to have discouraged plowing and logging in the past, and consequently soil layers are intact. It is recommended, therefore that additional excavation be carried out by hand, rather than by machine-stripping.

Site CG-10 (44JC655)
Late Seventeenth-Century Domestic Site

CG-10 is the latest of the seventeenth-century sites tested on the Locust Grove Tract, appearing to have been occupied until sometime after 1680. The site is located at the edge of a formerly plowed terrace that, within the last five years, has suffered extensive damage from logging operations. The western edge of CG-10 extends into this clear-cut area, and has been disturbed by heavy rutting. Protection for the eastern portion of the site has been afforded by the wooded border enclosing a small ravine. This ravine drains into the eastern branch of Grice’s Run. Beech, poplar, white oak, and sweet gum predominate on the eastern portion of the site, with poison ivy as ground cover.

Phase I investigation proved CG-10 to be a site rich in both artifacts and features. Forty-four shovel tests produced more than 300 artifacts including a Charles I Rose farthing (dated 1625-1644), and led to the identification of a structural posthole and what appeared to be a trash deposit at the edge of the ravine. It appeared that CG-10 was a domestic site, possibly contemporaneous with Martin’s Hundred, and recommendations for its further study included not only establishing a clear date of occupation and identifying site boundaries, but locating architectural features and activity areas as well.

Phase II testing conducted during June 1991 employed a regular grid with test units placed at 5-meter intervals along the central north-south and east-west axes. This testing interval was continued in the northwest quadrant where the return in features and artifacts was high, but was expanded to 10 meters in the southwest quadrant as recovery diminished. Testing efforts were lessened east of the center line where the ravine formed a natural site boundary.

A total of twenty-eight 75 × 75-cm. test holes were excavated at CG-10, with five of these expanded to explore and expose feature boundaries (Figure 29). Soil layers were very shallow, and typical stratigraphy included 10 cm. of gray-brown silty loam plowzone overlying 6 cm. of yellowish tan sandy clay. Plow scars in some of these units cut directly into the subsoil—an indication of the extent of agricultural damage.

A wide range of seventeenth-century domestic and architectural artifacts were recovered from both soil layers. Included in the assemblage were large quantities of nails, imported and domestic tobacco pipes (Figure 30), worked flint, brick, wine and case bottle glass, a selection of coarse earthenwares (English, Italian, and local), German stoneware, animal bone, ceramic roofing tile, a glass bead, and a few fragments of window glass. Of special relevance for dating purposes were three pipe bowls stamped with the mark of Llewellyn Evans (“LE”), a Bris-
tol pipe-maker who began producing and marking his pipes in 1661 (Walker 1977: 1131) (Figure 31). The abundance of wine bottle glass on the site confirmed a post-1650 occupation date.

In addition to the two soil layers described above, an erosional event of undetermined nature left its mark on the stratigraphy of CG-10. A layer of clay was found between the plowzone and subsoil on a southeast slope near the ravine. Orange and “baked” in appearance, this layer mimicked subsoil, yet came up in chunks containing nails, brick chips, pipe bowls and pipe stems. Initially the clay was thought to be confined to a cut or gully on this southeastern slope, as the layer thickened dramatically—from 1 cm. to 40 cm.—within a 10-meter area. However,
testing along the upper, more level reaches of the site, revealed a number of postholes sealed by a similar redeposited clay layer. While clearly the result of some disturbance, either natural or man-made, the nature and extent of this layer may not be discernable without fully exposing its limits.

Four structural postholes were identified at CG-10 in addition to the one found during Phase I investigation (Figure 32). None of these features was excavated. In addition to these features, the boundaries and depth of a previously reported trash feature were also explored through excavation of a 75 × 75 cm. test unit. The posthole identified during earlier testing appears to represent the last in a series of three successive support posts. The original posthole (#1), which was sealed by the redeposited clay layer, is obviously quite large, although neither of its sides was completely exposed. Measuring more than 65 cm. × 70 cm. it was filled with deep subsoil clay that was both darker and more clayey than the surrounding subsoil. There was no visible postmold associated with this feature.

The replacement for this post (#2), located slightly to the south and west, was also identified below the redeposited clay layer. Filled with dark orange plastic clay flecked with gray and gold, and with patches of yellow sandy subsoil, the posthole measured approximately 75 cm. north-south × 65 cm. east-west. Near the center of the feature was a square maroon-red postmold containing charcoal and flecks of either rotten brick or burned clay. The mold, which measured

Figure 32. CG-10: Locations of identified features.
approximately 20 cm. square, appeared to be quite ashy, and was the most clearly visible of the features in this sequence.

The final hole in the sequence (#3) was the posthole discovered during Phase I testing. The only feature to cut the redeposited clay layer, it measured 44 cm. east-west x 52 cm. north-south and was filled with dark grayish brown loam lightly mottled with orange clay. The circular postmold was somewhat ashy in appearance, and contained brick chips and a few flecks of charcoal.

Another structural posthole (#4) was identified approximately 5.8 meters (19 feet) north and west of this complex of holes and replacements. The least complicated and most clearly visible of the exposed features, this hole measured 85 cm. east-west, and was filled with dark orange clay mottled with brighter orange, gray, and gold clays and with sandy yellow subsoil. The postmold was nearly identical to the second postmold described above, measuring approximately 20 cm. square and filled with a maroon ashy fill. Neither this posthole nor the mold were sealed by the redeposited clay described earlier.

The final posthole (#5) identified at CG-10 was located approximately 8.5 meters (28 feet) due north of the first complex of posts and molds (#1-3). Sealed by the layer of redeposited clay, this feature was difficult to distinguish from the surrounding subsoil, and was identified more on the basis of mottling than on any significant color difference. The fill was predominantly dark orange and contained roughly 5% light yellow subsoil. Neither the north-south nor the east-west dimensions were entirely exposed.

The only sign of a postmold associated with this feature was a circular, dark brown loamy area most recently occupied by a tree root. The fill contained chunks of charcoal or, more likely, rotting wood. Whether or not this represents the actual postmold is unclear, and if the entire posthole is exposed in the future, redefinition of the mold may be necessary.

One non-structural feature—what appears to be a ravine-side trash-pit, or perhaps a spring house, nearly 1 meter deep—was also examined at CG-10. Identified during Phase I testing as an unusually high concentration of artifacts, the nature and depth of this feature were probed through excavation of a 75 x 75-cm. test unit. Three fill layers were found to underlie approximately 10 cm. of topsoil. The first, a medium yellowish brown layer 10 cm. thick, contained large quantities of ash, charcoal and animal bone, as well as pipe bowl and stem fragments, nails, and German stoneware.

The second and most prolific fill layer, a very thick medium brown deposit sloping significantly towards the ravine, produced nearly 350 seventeenth-century artifacts. Included in this assemblage was most of a fluted delftware bowl dating to 1680 or 1690 (John Austin, personal communication); an earthenware paving tile which appears, based on puddled glaze on its surface, to have been reused in a kiln; and a well-worn latten spoon of a form described as “pied de biche,” or deer’s foot, which came into fashion around 1663 (Price 1908: 44-5) (Figure 33). The silvery appearance of the spoon, and the stamp in its bowl which reads “Double Whited,” further confirms the 1680 date supplied by the delftware bowl. Other artifacts recovered from this layer included 33 imported pipe bowls, worked flint, nails, brick, animal bone, undecorated and polychrome delftware fragments,
Figure 33. CG-10: Latten spoon.
lead-glazed earthenware, and blue and purple sprig-molded stoneware fragments. Two unidentified objects, a small ceramic tile marked with a circular stamp and an incised, freehand star (Figure 34), and a lead spatulate tool with a serrated edge (Figure 35), have been illustrated in the hope that they may be identified through similarities to material found on other sites.

Artifact concentrations dropped significantly in the third fill layer, which was yellowish brown, compact and sandy. Animal bone was the most heavily represented category, comprising half of the 126-item assemblage. Other artifacts retrieved from the layer included architectural debris (nails and brick), pipe stems and bowls (one of which bore the maker’s mark “RW”), an iron stirrup manufactured ca. 1660-1680, wine bottle and window glass, stoneware, and a fragment of combed and dotted slipware dating to 1670. A thin, sterile wash layer marked the bottom of the feature fill. The total depth of this ravine deposit was 95 cm., or approximately 3 feet.

Boundaries for the ravine feature were established through a combination of Phase I and Phase II testing. While the 95-cm.-deep excavation unit described above hit clearly within the feature fill, a Phase I shovel test placed 5 meters to the north reached subsoil within 26 cm. As the northern boundary must lie somewhere between the two holes, a test trench 25 cm. × 150 cm. was excavated from the edge of the shovel test southward toward the excavation unit. A clear edge was identified approximately 80 cm. south of the Phase I shovel test. The southern boundary of this feature, based on earlier testing, is known to lie between 5 and 10 m. south of the excavation unit.

**Interpretation**

Site CG-10 is a late seventeenth-century domestic site showing clear evidence of at least one structure. Three separate postholes, nearly three feet on a side, suggest a reasonably substantial dwelling that was occupied long enough to require at least two repairs. Based on a hypothesized average survival rate of 10 to 12 years per post, this structure may have been standing for as long as 35 years.

The dimensions, orientation and appearance of the house are difficult to determine, given the available evidence. As seventeenth-century structures rarely

---

**Figure 34.** CG-10: Gaming piece (?).  
**Figure 35.** CG-10: Lead tool.
had regular bays, there can be little confidence in the usual methods of predicting missing post locations. One reasonable certainty, however, is that given the relative flimsiness of post-construction buildings, the site’s single roofing tile probably never had a place on this structure.

The 1680s date assigned to CG-10 is derived predominantly from artifacts in the trash deposit. Ceramic mends between sherds from the top and bottom layers of this meter-deep deposit suggest that the pit was filled quickly, and may be an abandonment deposit, marking the end of the site’s occupation.

The obvious difference in the assemblage size between CG-10 (dated to ca. 1680), and earlier sites such as CG-11, CG-2, F and G, highlights some important changes taking place during the second half of the seventeenth century. By the 1680s, planters were less likely to view their situation as a temporary one, and had begun to acquire a wider range of material goods—to settle in, so to speak. In addition, time had produced a group of native-born elite who had begun to vie for relative social position through acquisition of available goods. On a more practical level, however, the assemblage from CG-10 is considerably larger than those recovered from earlier sites simply because one 75 × 75-cm. test hole intercepted the corner of a trash-filled feature. The majority of artifacts was retrieved from this single hole, and it is important to remember that each of the Locust Grove Tract sites may include similarly rich and informative features.

Recommendations

Because of its richness and archaeological integrity, both independently and in relation to the other seventeenth-century sites identified during this survey, CG-10 will require Phase III excavation if any part of the site falls within the area scheduled for development.

Like many sites in this area, CG-10 has been affected by plowing, logging, and the resulting erosion. On the gradual slope between the house site and the ravine, erosion has left the former very thinly, and the latter very heavily, covered by plowzone. In spite of these visible scars, however, the well-preserved state of the postholes suggests that much of the site survives.

Plowing, logging, and even erosion are common disturbances on archaeological sites, and while they are not regarded as major detractions from the site’s informative potential, they should be used to inform future excavation procedures. Because of these disturbances, it is recommended that the layers that overlie the site be machine-striped rather than hand excavated in the interest of conserving time and effort. Further, because a number of the postholes were found approximately 5 cm. below a dark orange clay presumed to be subsoil, the backhoe should strip this wash layer as well.

Site CG-11 (44JC656)

Early to Mid Seventeenth-Century Domestic Site

CG-11 is an early to mid-seventeenth-century house site that, despite recent logging, appears relatively undisturbed by agricultural activities. The site is located near the edge of a broad, flat peninsula that is covered in thorny scrub growth and
young trees. These thickets are quite dense, and extensive clearing was necessary prior to testing.

Phase I identification was based on the recovery of early seventeenth-century ceramic and case bottle fragments, and large quantities of nails, brick bats, and other building materials (Figure 36). Although the assemblage indicated a domestic site, no architectural features were identified in testing. The scope of work recommended for Phase II testing included establishing site boundaries, identifying architectural features, and delineating non-architectural activity areas.

A regular grid was established over an 80(NS) × 90(EW) meter area, based on two lines of test units intersecting near the site’s center. While these units were laid out at 10-meter intervals, the distance was collapsed to 5 meters where artifact concentrations were heaviest, in an effort to locate related features (Figure 37). The 10-meter interval was retained near the edges of the site to facilitate identification of the site boundaries.

A total of thirty-eight 75 × 75-cm. test units revealed three soil layers overlying subsoil. The center of the site was dominated by an extraordinarily rich, dark brown “midden,” measuring roughly 20 by 25 meters, and containing large quantities of ceramic, case bottle glass, brick, nails, tobacco pipes and bone. Towards the edges of the site, this top layer lost its loamy, midden-like characteristics, and became much lighter in color and sandier in texture. The second layer, a mixed gray-brown loam, ranged in depth from 8 to 14 cm., and sealed layer three, a thin layer of pale tan, sandy clay.

Figure 36. CG-11: Phase I shovel tests.
All of the features identified at CG-11 were found within the midden area close to the site’s center. A clearly delineated posthole and postmold, which cut the third soil layer, offered the most promising structural evidence (Figure 38). Measuring approximately 60 cm. square, the posthole (A) was filled with dark orange subsoil mottled with brown and yellow clay. A squarish postmold (B) contained significant quantities of brick and charcoal, and was filled with a gray-brown ashy loam.

The southwest corner of this original posthole was cut by what appears to be a smaller replacement hole (C). While this feature was not entirely exposed, it measured 30 cm. east-west and was filled with brown loam containing charcoal and brick chunks. There was no apparent associated postmold.

A third possible feature (D) was identified in the southwest corner of this unit after the site had been soaked by a summer storm. Roughly square, its fill was a fine gray-brown loam with orange subsoil mottlings. The boundaries of this feature were not completely uncovered, and so its measurements are unclear. Its relationship to A and C are also unknown at this stage of the excavation.

Three non-structural, pit-like features were also identified at CG-11. While no feature boundaries were visible from the surface, the topsoil layer in each case was exceptionally dark—nearly black—and contained very high concentrations of local and domestic pipes, gunflints, ceramic, case bottle glass, bone, brick, and nails, all dating to the seventeenth century. Based on two excavated units, the depressions themselves were quite shallow. The irregular bottom displayed in one of these features suggests a tree hole that was later filled with domestic debris.

Figure 37. CG-11: Phase II test units.
The historic-period artifacts recovered from CG-11 were clearly concentrated in the dark “midden” area near the center of the site, and particularly in the upper two layers. Artifacts included local and domestic pipes, large quantities of coarse English earthenware and some North Italian marbleized polychrome earthenwares, and manganese decorated delftware (dated to ca. 1640). Lead shot, an iron ring suspected to have come from a suit of chain mail, and concentrations of worked gray flint, perhaps for use in a flintlock, represent personal arms. Architectural debris, including nails and bricks, was the most heavily represented artifact category.

A small prehistoric scatter, consisting of three sherds of Mockley ware (dated 200-400 A.D.) and a handful of lithic flakes, speaks to occupation of the site during the late Middle Woodland Period. This component was neither heavy enough nor concentrated in such a way as to make identification of an activity area possible.

**Interpretation**

Based on the types and variety of artifacts recovered from CG-11, this site is an early to mid seventeenth-century domestic site that appears to have been associated with Martin’s Hundred. A large, clearly delineated posthole provides evidence for a dwelling, while a replacement for that post suggests that the occupation was fairly extended.

A large, dark artifact-rich midden near the site’s center appears to represent the house and its associated trash pits. Organic material and domestic refuse discarded around the house would account for the richness of both the soil and the assemblage in the midden area. The fact that this material is not significantly dispersed by later plowing proves that disturbance to CG-11 has been minimal.
**Recommendations**

Like CG-2, CG-11 is a rare, well-preserved domestic site dating from the reoccupation of Martin’s Hundred. The fact that this site can be placed within the context of Noël Hume’s previous Wolstenholme Towne research increases its significance within the framework of local and regional studies of the seventeenth-century Chesapeake.

Based on the historical significance and archaeological integrity of CG-11, the most appropriate management strategy is to “bank” the site, that is, to preserve it in place until it can be approached with adequate time and funding, and with more sophisticated data recovery methods. In the event that avoidance is not feasible, Phase III data recovery should proceed without the aid of machinery. Soil layers should be excavated by hand, and all exposed features should be mapped, recorded, photographed, and excavated. Soil samples taken from the midden area and borrow pit should be chemically floated in order to retrieve plant material that is often preserved in these undisturbed contexts. Scientific testing of these areas should include soil chemistry, pollen, and phytolith analysis.

As recommended for CG-2, excavation of site CG-11 will require a large conservation budget to treat metal and organic materials, as well as the proper facilities to examine and store these sometimes-delicate specimens. Preparation for the retrieval of unusual and difficult materials should be made well in advance of their discovery in the ground.

**Site CG-12 (44JC657)**

**Middle to Late Archaic Procurement Camp and Late Eighteenth-Century Domestic Site**

Site CG-12, located on the James City County Parcel of the Locust Grove Tract, is a Middle to Late Archaic special purpose site with a redeposited colonial component. The site is located on a gently sloping terrace, bounded on the west by a deep ravine feeding Wood Creek. The area has been extensively logged, and is currently covered in dense thorn thickets and small stands of dogwood, beech, poplar, and locust saplings.

A Phase I investigation of CG-12 in February 1991 located a small concentration of lithic debris near its southwest corner, and a light scatter of quartzite debitage and wrought nails at the north end of the site. Further testing was recommended in order to refine the spatial and temporal boundaries of the both components, and to assess the integrity of the cultural remains.

Plowing, logging, and erosion have combined to produce a variable stratigraphy. A typical profile for CG-12 includes a 10-cm. thick surface layer of dark brown sandy loam, a 15-cm. yellowish brown sandy loam layer, and 15 cm. of a light yellowish brown sandy clay sealing sterile subsoil. The effects of erosion are most noticeable along the edge of the ravine, while disturbance due to agricultural and subsequent logging activities increases towards the eastern border of the site.
A total of fifty-three 50 × 50-cm. test units were excavated at 5-meter intervals across the site to define the boundaries of the historic and prehistoric components (Figure 39). Confirming the results of Phase I investigation, testing revealed lithic debris in the southwest corner of the site and a light scatter of colonial artifacts 20 meters away in the site’s northwest quadrant.

The prehistoric component, which covers an area of 400 square meters in the site’s southwest corner, consisted of a light scatter of debitage along the edge of the ravine. Despite the extensive disturbance to the site, this component appears to be largely intact. Three layers of soil were encountered in all but four of the test units excavated in this area. A disturbed surface layer, judged to be plowzone, produced 7% of the assemblage, while the second (64%) and third (29%) layers produced a majority of the artifacts recovered. No features were discovered.

Fourteen test units used to investigate the prehistoric component of CG-12 yielded twenty-seven artifacts. Only one of these artifacts, a kaolin pipe bowl fragment, dates to the historic period. The remaining artifacts from the prehistoric assemblage include fifteen pieces of quartzite shatter, nine fragments of fire cracked rock, and one retouched flake. Artifact counts were generally low, however some slight clustering may suggest the presence of two discrete activity areas.

The historic component of CG-12 is concentrated in a 20 by 25-meter area within the site’s northwest quadrant. Phase II testing determined that disturbance from past agricultural and logging activities was much greater in this area than along the ravine, with stratigraphy reduced to two layers above subsoil. Topsoil, a 10-cm. thick gray brown silty clay loam, appears to have been redeposited as a result of erosion after the area was clear-cut. Sealed beneath topsoil was a mottled, yellowish brown sandy clay layer, approximately 15 cm. thick. Prehistoric and

Figure 39. CG-12: Phase II test units.
historic artifacts were mixed throughout both of these layers. Testing failed to reveal any features.

The excavation of twenty-seven test units within the historic concentration revealed a light scatter of lithic debris including fire-cracked rock, quartzite shatter, and primary reduction flakes. The majority of recovered artifacts, however, date to the historic period, and include brick and nail fragments, found interspersed throughout the eastern half this area, as well as a 5 by 5-meter area of concentrated domestic debris. The presence of tire ruts and evidence of heavy washing, however, indicate that much of the historic component on CG-12 may have been redeposited as a result of recent logging activity.

**Interpretation**

Analysis of the artifact assemblage recovered from CG-12 suggests that the prehistoric component functioned as a short-term special-purpose site. Both areas of lithic concentration produced a high percentage of fragment/shatter debitage, cortical debitage, and fire-cracked rock, indicating early stages of lithic reduction. The low frequency of secondary/thinning flakes and the absence of tertiary/re-touch flakes from both areas corroborate this interpretation. The predominance of quartz and quartzite within the assemblage and the location of the site along the ravine suggest that Native Americans used river cobbles as they eroded from the adjacent stream bed. A review of the lithic materials represented within the assemblage indicates that at least nine cobbles were worked on the site. The presence of locally-available quartz and quartzite and the absence of features and diagnostic artifacts suggest that the prehistoric component on CG-12 dates from the Middle to Late Archaic period.

Historic artifacts, which account for 44% of the total assemblage recovered from CG-12, appear to represent a sequence of redeposition resulting from plowing and logging activity in the area. Except for one fragment of a tobacco pipe bowl, the entire assemblage was concentrated in the northeast quadrant of the site. The historic assemblage includes twenty pieces of brick, eighteen iron nail fragments, two sherds of coarse earthenware, three pipe stems, five pipe bowl fragments, and one small piece of mirrored glass. Despite the paucity of datable artifacts, the presence of a glass mirror fragment and three kaolin pipe stems with bores measuring 4/64 of an inch suggest a late colonial affiliation for the assemblage.

**Recommendations**

The Phase II testing of CG-12 recovered sufficient data to interpret the prehistoric component as a Middle to Late Archaic lithic reduction site. The disturbance resulting from logging activities has, however, significantly compromised the research potential of both this site and the historic component. No further work is recommended.
Site CG-13 (44JC649)
Disturbed Eighteenth-Century Site

Site CG-13, identified during Phase I testing as a large (10 × 6 m.), rectangular, cellar-like depression, is located along the eastern-most edge of the James City County parcel. Situated on a terrace just west of a ravine feeding Wood Creek, the site is covered by dense thorn thickets and small stands of holly and yellow poplar. The presence of cattails and marsh grasses within the rectangular depression suggests that the feature contains standing water most of the year.

Earlier assessment of the site in February 1991 produced an unclear picture of its date and function. Three shovel tests placed in the rectangular feature at that time produced brick and wrought nail fragments, suggesting colonial occupation. While additional shovel testing of the surrounding area also yielded brick fragments, these were retrieved from soil layers that were highly disturbed. The purpose of Phase II investigation was to clarify the nature and integrity of this deposit.

A total of sixteen 75 × 75-cm. test units were excavated at 5-meter intervals across the site in order to locate features and determine the extent of plowing and logging disturbances (Figure 40). In addition, a larger 2 × 2-meter test unit was placed in the northeast corner of the depression, revealing it to be a shallow feature filled with orange and gray mottled clay. While no diagnostic artifacts were retrieved from this feature fill, a tan sandy wash layer, which covered the sloping edge of the hole, produced several kaolin pipe stems, one local pipe stem, one kaolin pipe bowl fragment, a single piece of ceramic, and a few fragments of brick. Beneath this wash layer, a layer of very light tan compact sand proved sterile.

Figure 40. CG-13: Phase II test units.
The sixteen 75 × 75-cm. test holes were concentrated in the areas north and east of the depression. Three units placed closest to the ravine displayed stratigraphy similar to that of the larger hole, including the obvious erosion layer washed in from some unknown location. Excavation of eleven squares north of the depression revealed two shallow layers overlying subsoil: a dark brown sandy loam topsoil layer and a yellowish tan sandy loam, both containing brick fragments. A fragment of a wrought nail was the only artifact other than brick found in any of the eleven units. No features were identified anywhere on the site.

While the 5-meter testing interval called for a number of 75-cm. test units within the depression, only one could be excavated due to swampy conditions. Beneath topsoil in this unit, a homogeneous orange clay with gray and iron inclusions was partially excavated to a depth of 26 cm. A brick bat encountered at this depth prompted the use of an auger for further exploration of the clay deposit. Coring established that the orange clay layer graded into a naturally occurring gray clay.

**Interpretation**

Based on shallow stratigraphy, the lack of features, and the paucity of domestic artifacts at CG-13, it seems clear that the area has been highly disturbed by agricultural activities, clear cut logging and erosion. In fact, much of the stratigraphy in this section of the Locust Grove Tract has been removed down to subsoil.

Although intentionally dug, the function of the rectangular feature, the focus of this investigation, is not readily apparent. Neither its contents nor its depth indicate that it ever served as a cellar, as such a feature would be deep and straight-sided, and should contain occupational debris. The single layer that did yield historic-period artifacts was clearly deposited as a result of erosion, and is undoubtedly all that remains of a late seventeenth- or early eighteenth-century site near this location.

**Recommendations**

The Phase II investigation of CG-13 indicates that past logging activity and erosion have compromised the integrity of the site to the extent that no firm interpretation can be made. Clearly it is of limited research potential, and further exploration is not necessary.

**Sites F and CG-15 (44JC627 and 44JC658) Middle Woodland Camp and Seventeenth-Century Domestic Site with Enclosure**

Site F, which now includes what was formerly designated CG-15, is a multi-component site exhibiting evidence of both Middle Woodland and seventeenth-century occupations. Located on a small terrace overlooking one of the major feeder ravines for Grice’s Run, the site escaped logging activities in the late 1980s, and is consequently wooded in mature stands of hardwood pine, beech, oak, and poplar. Poison ivy proliferates.
The site was first identified in 1978 during an archaeological survey under the direction of Ivor Noël Hume. At that time, only the seventeenth-century component, consisting of a large ash-filled pit and a concentration of brick chips and burnt clay, was noted. The former was half-excavated, and yielded two early seventeenth-century hoe blades, as well as pipe stems, case bottle glass, and several nails. Remaining fill removed from the feature in 1989 produced few artifacts, and none that were diagnostic. The brick concentration was never examined.

Since 1978, logging activities have indirectly affected significant portions of Sites F and G. While clear-cutting was prohibited on the sites themselves, logging machinery passing repeatedly over the area created roads and ruts which now bisect both sites. Damage, though severe, is limited to specific areas.

The 1990-91 Carter’s Grove survey conducted no additional testing on Site F due to previous knowledge of its nature and location. Recommendations for its future treatment were, however, made at that time. These included further excavation aimed at the definition of temporal and spatial boundaries, and the identification of architectural features (such as a main house or outbuildings) and activity areas.

Phase II investigation was undertaken with the understanding that Site F was a single-component, seventeenth-century site, and that the prehistoric component, CG-15, existed as a separate entity. Testing was therefore conducted at different times and in different areas, using the methodologies appropriate for each occupation. Because the overlapping nature of the two sites was only discovered through this testing process, results of each site investigation are discussed separately in this section.

Site F

A total of thirty-eight 75 × 75-cm. test units were excavated at Site F, two of which were expanded to expose the boundaries of identified features (Figure 41). The regular 10-meter testing interval was reduced to 5-meters in the vicinity of each of these features, and near the boundaries of the ash-pit identified in 1978. The total area covered by test units measures approximately 140 m. north-south × 120 m. east-west.

While past plowing has caused a certain amount of disturbance to site stratigraphy, two layers were generally found above subsoil. The first was a layer of brown sandy loam, ranging in depth from 9 to 17 cm. and yielding both historic and prehistoric artifacts. Between 4 and 9 cm. of yellowish brown silty loam underlay this layer across much of the site, although irregularities caused by later disturbances were common. Like the topsoil layer, layer two contained a variety of prehistoric and historic artifacts, suggesting that plowing over the last three hundred years had been at times quite deep. The only portions of the site that appear to have escaped disturbance are the northern and western extremes, which did so by virtue of their proximity to ravines.

As on many early seventeenth-century sites, the artifact assemblage from Site F was not highly varied. Bricks and nails comprised by far the largest category, followed by coarse earthenware and case bottle glass fragments and local and
imported tobacco pipes. Lead shot and chunks of worked flint were recovered from test units, as was the eye from a hoe similar to those retrieved by Noël Hume in 1978.

The assemblage of prehistoric material recovered from Site F included thirty-two flakes, forty-four fire-cracked rocks, and four fragments of aboriginal pottery. The presence of both Mockley (200-900 A.D.) and Varina (200 B.C.-400 A.D.) pottery suggests that the site may have seen repeated occupation during the mid-and late Middle Woodland Period. Prehistoric artifacts were recovered primarily, though not exclusively, from the northern half of the site.

**Enclosure**

Four features were identified at Site F, representing both prehistoric and historic occupation (Figure 42). The most dramatic evidence of historic occupation was a ditch measuring 30 inches wide, and at least 75 feet long (Figure 43). Initial identification of this feature in a 75 × 75-cm. test prompted enlargement of the unit to expose feature boundaries. Running from southwest to northeast, the line of the ditch fades as it approaches the ravine at its southwest end. At its northern extreme the feature makes a clear turn of more than 90 degrees, and continues to the southeast for an undetermined distance. There is evidence of a possible post at the outside corner of this turn, although the loaminess of the fill seems more characteristic of a tree or large root.

The ditch fill was characterized as a dark brown sandy clay loam that was ashy or greasy to the touch. While not fully excavated, removal of a narrow (24 cm.) section revealed the feature to extend to a depth of 24 cm., and to have a “stepped” bottom, deeper on the inside of the wall. While there appeared to be two layers filling the trench, the distinction between them is a matter of soil texture rather than appearance, with the bottom 8 cm. more gritty than the upper fill. The
Figure 42. Features on Sites F and G.

Figure 43. Site F: Soil stain marking enclosure.
A grittier layer is evident not only in the deep half of the feature, but up the sides as well. This fact, and the absence of silt in the bottom of the ditch, suggest that it was not left open for any appreciable length of time, and is therefore unlikely to represent a boundary ditch.

The construction date for the ditch is difficult to establish, as little of the fill was removed. Two severely burned pieces of coarseware and a very large fire-cracked rock, neither of them datable, were the only artifacts visible from the surface of the feature. The ditch, however, cuts a 7 cm. thick yellow-tan layer just above subsoil, and future excavation of this layer may aid in establishing a construction date.

One additional related feature that warrants discussion is an area of brick rubble located approximately 20 cm. from the southwest line of the ditch, and 1.5 m. from its north corner. This was a fairly small concentration, ultimately measuring 30 cm. square, although its size had gradually decreased with successive cleanings. Mention is made of this feature because, in spite of the absence of clear boundaries, it may mark the location of a post erected on the outside of the fortification.

**Brick Rubble Feature**

Another brick rubble feature was identified at Site F approximately 20 meters northeast of the fortification ditch. Roughly “L” shaped, this feature measured approximately 60 cm. on each arm, and contained large and distinct areas of brick in an orange and tan mottled clay matrix. No artifacts other than brick were found in association. While this feature was not readily identifiable, it appears similar, based on written description, to the concentration of brick chips and burned clay located by Noël Hume in 1978.

**Unidentified Feature**

A test unit placed just southeast of the pit excavated by Noël Hume in 1978 identified a cluster of heat-treated and fire-cracked rock beneath three soil layers. Though originally identified as a prehistoric hearth, this feature was surrounded by brick chips, and sealed what appears to be a small posthole containing two chunks of brick.

**Prehistoric Feature**

A possible prehistoric feature identified at Site F will warrant further investigation if this site is to be developed. Located at the head of a ravine along the site’s northern boundary, this feature appeared as an area of gray loamy fill with charcoal and nodules of burned clay. The two overlying soil layers produced four flakes, but no additional evidence that might establish the nature of this feature.

**CG-15**

Site CG-15 is located on a broad flat peninsula northwest of Site F. This peninsula has not been heavily disturbed by plowing, as evidenced by surviving historic-period ditch and berm features, nor does logging appear to have been a factor in site preservation.
The site was originally identified during the 1978 survey as four shell middens, each of which was assigned a site number. While intensive shovel testing at 5-meter intervals failed to locate these features during Phase II testing, there was clear evidence of a Woodland-period occupation, particularly near the base of the peninsula and overlapping the northern half of site F. The first of the previously assigned numbers (CG-15) was used to identify this site.

The location of the grid for CG-15 was based on the results of intensive shovel testing mentioned above. A total of seventy 50 × 50-cm. test units were excavated at 10-meter intervals, although this interval was collapsed near the southeast boundary of the site where artifact concentrations were highest (see Figure 41). Typical stratigraphy included 10 cm. of dark gray brown topsoil, 15 cm. of olive-brown silty loam, and 6 cm. of tan sandy clay sealing topsoil. Mixing of historic and prehistoric artifacts in the top two layers suggests that plowing has occurred along the eastern edge of the site, but damage appears to be minimal. The third layer appears to be undisturbed.

Prehistoric artifacts predominate in the assemblage, with flakes and fire-cracked rock being recovered throughout all soil layers. Eleven sherds of Mockley and Varina wares suggest that occupation of the site spanned the mid- and late Middle Woodland Period (200 B.C.-900 A.D.). Two test units produced unusually high quantities of shell, and should be re-examined if any additional work is undertaken.

The historic assemblage recovered from CG-15, like the prehistoric component, was concentrated at the eastern end of the peninsula. Comprised predominantly of architectural debris (brick and nails), this assemblage undoubtedly represents an extension of the activity area identified at Site F.

**Interpretation**

Site F (including CG-15) is a multi-component site reflecting Middle Woodland and second-quarter seventeenth-century occupation. The prehistoric component of Site F is characterized by large quantities of pottery and fire-cracked rock, much of which was found in test units that also yielded historic artifacts. This concentration of prehistoric material extends north and west onto a peninsula earlier identified as the location of four prehistoric shell middens (CG-15, CG-16, CG-17, and CG-18). While shovel tests at 5-meter intervals failed to produce evidence of these middens, they did successfully locate a prehistoric activity area that cannot be physically separated from the seventeenth-century component.

Based on the recovered artifacts, Site F appears to have been a generalized encampment that was occupied repeatedly, but probably not intensively. While variations in pottery recovered from the site indicate that these seasonal visits occurred during the Middle Woodland Period, artifact concentrations are not high enough to suggest continuous occupation throughout that period. Water was undoubtedly the most attractive resource that this location had to offer—a fact that is reinforced by the visible concentration of activity around the ravine head, rather than on broad, flat areas of the peninsula. The presence of oyster shell and flakes of local stone indicate that the ravines and the James River, just a quarter of a mile to the south, were being exploited for basic resources.
Archaeological evidence from the historic component of Site F suggests that it may have had a different function than the surrounding domestic sites. The percentage of architectural evidence is unusually high, and contrasts sharply with the near lack of ceramic, bottle glass, and other domestic artifacts. Work-related artifacts, on the other hand, were abundant. Among those artifacts recovered during the 1978 Phase I and 1991 Phase II testing projects were two hoes and a hoe eye—a surprisingly high number of these objects to be gathered from a 1% sample. The pit excavated by Noël Hume in 1978 also seems somewhat out of character with a feature on a domestic site. Described as ash-filled, this pit contained two hoe blades, but was otherwise nearly devoid of artifacts. On sites where domestic activity is intense, an open pit such as this one would surely have attracted refuse from the kitchen or work areas.

The nature of the craft or activity that may have been practiced at Site F is not clear. Functional analysis does not reveal any specialized activity, although it does demonstrate that the assemblage is heavily weighted toward architectural artifacts. Based on this information, the possibility of brick-making on the site was briefly examined; on such a site, however, one would expect to find scorched earth and a large number of brick “wasters.”

Finally, the function of the ditch or enclosure on Site F has yet to be explained. Given the orientation of this central feature, and the proximity of Site F to Site G, it seems not only plausible but probable that the ditch is associated with the latter domestic site. Site F, then, may represent industrial activities which, though associated with Site G, took place outside of the domestic complex.

**Recommendations**

Given the uneasiness that undoubtedly characterized the community returning to Martin’s Hundred after 1622, enclosures, fences and fortifications are likely to have been common landscape features. At this point, because it has not been excavated, the ditch cannot be dated accurately; the one very burned piece of ceramic found at the top of the fill appears to be an Iberian storage jar. An initialled pipestem found in the layers above the feature postdates 1661, but does not indicate with any real certainty that the ditch was filled before this date.

Nevertheless, evidence from the surrounding units would suggest that this is an early to mid-seventeenth century site that will require Phase III excavation if the site lies in the way of future development.

Site F has been significantly scarred both by agricultural and logging activities. In fact, within the last two years, logging trucks have bisected the site through a set of deep tire ruts. Nevertheless, as the ash pit and ditch feature demonstrate, there is still considerable intact information below the disturbed layers.

Since there has been considerable disturbance to Site F in the last three hundred years, the plowzone can be mechanically stripped. However, as the site is currently wooded, it may be logistically difficult to strip a large enough area. Clearly, removing the trees mechanically would be extremely damaging to the remaining archaeological features, and should be avoided at all costs.
Site G (44JC655)
Middle Woodland Camp and Early Seventeenth-Century Domestic Site

At the outset of this investigation less was known about Site G than any of the other recorded sites. Like Site F, G was discovered during the 1978 survey, although exactly what was found remains unclear. Evidently it was believed to date from the Wolstenholme Towne period, as Noël Hume assigned it a letter designation, unlike the numbered prehistoric and other historic sites he discovered. Other than knowing its location, however, little was clear about its character.

Located less than 50 yards south and east of Site F, Site G is bordered on the west by a feeder ravine for Grice’s Run. The site was not logged during the 1989 campaign, and was consequently covered in mature hardwoods. As on Site F, poison ivy presented a considerable challenge to testing procedures.

The grid established over Site G picked up where testing on Site F concluded. Seventy-five cm. test units were excavated at 10-meter intervals around the site’s perimeter, and every 5 meters where activity seems to have been the most concentrated (Figure 44). Excavation of thirty-three test units suggested that in spite of the proximity to Site F, G had been less deeply plowed. Three soil layers were recorded above subsoil, including a 10-15 cm. thick layer of gray-brown topsoil, a 12 cm. olive-brown sandy loam layer and a 3-5 cm. layer of yellowish-brown clayey sand.

In spite of being somewhat smaller than Site F, Site G produced three times as many artifacts—more than 1800. While nails, as is often the case, were the most heavily represented artifact, ceramic and case bottle glass followed closely with a combined count of 415 sherds. Tobacco pipes were also extraordinarily well represented with more than 250 stems and bowls recovered.

The variety of artifacts recovered from Site G was striking, especially in contrast with the Site F assemblage. Ceramics included both imported and domestic coarsewares, delft, Frechen brown stoneware, North Italian and sgraffito slipwares, and fragments of an unglazed Staffordshire butterpot. Tobacco pipes were both locally made and imported, some with rouletted bowls. One pipe bearing the mark “WC” may have been produced by Bristol manufacturer William Collins, who died by the 1660s. Pipes attributed to this maker were found on Martin’s Hundred Site A, and locally on other sites dating from 1620 to 1660.

Worked and unworked flint were also recovered from Site G, as were eight pieces of lead shot. While prehistoric artifacts were not recovered from all areas of the site, a few units yielded large quantities of shell and sand-tempered pottery. These are undoubtedly associated with the occupation at Site F.

The first of two features identified was a structural posthole, measuring 90 cm. square and filled with mottled brown loam and orange clay (see Figure 42). What may be a round postmold near the center of this feature was too indistinct to be positively identified. Both the hole and its possible mold were exposed and photographed, but not excavated.
The second feature was located approximately 40 cm southeast of the “postmold.” Irregular in shape, this feature measured approximately 30 cm. across, and was filled with dark gray-brown loam flecked with charcoal and brick. A large piece of unidentified iron and a piece of lead shot were visible on the feature’s surface. As this feature was believed to be some sort of root disturbance, it was sectioned and excavated, revealing it to be quite shallow (10 cm.), with a flat bottom. Other artifacts recovered from the fill included a piece of pink-bodied earthenware, a fragment of a domestic tobacco pipe bowl, brick, and some other unidentified pieces of iron hardware. While the function of this feature has not been positively determined, the fact that it intrudes only 2-4 cm. into subsoil suggests that it was never very substantial.

**Interpretation**

Site G is a multi-component site reflecting what is undoubtedly the same Middle Woodland period occupation identified on Site F, along with a second-quarter seventeenth-century domestic occupation. The prehistoric component is more concentrated on this site than on Site F, but consists of similar artifact types: Mockley ware, lithic debitage and fire-cracked rock. The concentration of prehistoric material seems to focus around the ravine head directly west of the excavation area.

Due to the proximity of Sites F and G, and to the similarities in artifact assemblages, it is assumed that the prehistoric components on each represent the same prehistoric occupation. The site appears to have been a resource procurement camp that was visited repeatedly during the Middle Woodland Period. Oysters and river cobbles seem to be two of the local resources exploited.
The historic component at Site G is clearly domestic in nature, with a wide range of local and imported coarsewares, unglazed Staffordshire “butterpot” fragments (similar to those found at Wolstenholme Towne), case bottle glass, tobacco pipes, lead shot, and large quantities of brick and nails. Testing recovered more than 1800 artifacts on this site—more than three times the number yielded by Site F.

The large posthole exposed on Site G indicates both the presence of a structure and the archaeological integrity of the site. While soil layers may have been damaged by plowing and logging, archaeological evidence, in the form of features, is still discernable. The ditch identified on Site F may represent an additional feature associated with Site G. While the proximity of the sites makes spatial distinction difficult, the orientation of this ditch to Site G’s structural posthole suggests a possible relationship between the features.

**Recommendations**

Like Site F, Site G is an important seventeenth-century domestic site that will certainly require Phase III investigation if threatened. The methods used to recover archaeological evidence should be similar to those employed on Site F—that is, mechanical grading of the plowzone is acceptable, due to the degree of disturbance, but may be difficult because of the number of trees. It is further recommended that Sites F and G be investigated simultaneously, in order to determine the relationship, both spatial and chronological, between them.

**Site CG-19 (44JC659)**

**Late Woodland Period Procurement Camp**

Site CG-19 is a Late Woodland period camp site that was either repeatedly occupied or occupied for an extended period of time. Located southwest of Site G, on a small peninsula overlooking Grice’s Run, the site has been damaged by logging activities, but appears not to have suffered repeated plowing.

While Noël Hume identified CG-19 during 1978, testing at that time did little to establish the period or nature of the occupation. Based on the lack of any substantial information about the site, recommendations made in 1991 for its future investigation included systematic testing of the peninsula at 10-meter intervals, excavation of 2 × 2 meter units over identified shell middens, and mapping and photographing all physical remains.

Phase II investigation of CG-19 involved excavation of forty-five 50 × 50-cm. units at the recommended 10-meter testing interval (Figure 45). Except near the tip of the peninsula where erosion has undoubtedly been a factor, three soil layers sealed subsoil: a dark gray-brown topsoil, an olive-gray clay loam layer, and a layer of yellow-tan sandy clay. Artifact concentrations were inconsistent, with fewer than half of the excavated holes yielding prehistoric material.

Prehistoric activity on CG-19 is limited to the northwest quadrant of the site, and to the end of the peninsula. Shovel tests in both of these areas produced quantities of lithic debitage (primary reduction and secondary thinning flakes),
Varina and Mockley wares, and fire-cracked rock. One tool, a hafted biface, was not identifiable to type.

While most prehistoric artifact categories were recovered in both activity areas, a scatter of oyster shell was confined to the northwest quadrant of the site. This scatter is probably related to two shell middens identified in this area. The first midden has been heavily disturbed by logging vehicles, and was discovered through surface inspection of a road cut. The amount of shell that has been disturbed, and that now lies exposed on the surface, suggests that this was once a fairly large feature. No other artifacts were observed in association with the shell.

The second shell midden was encountered through sub-surface testing. A 50 × 50-cm. test unit excavated through a layer of dark brown clay loam recovered significant quantities of oyster shell, which became increasingly dense, ultimately forming a solid interface between the loam and an area of burned clay and charcoal below. This apparent midden and hearth feature is evidently quite small, as testing recovered its eastern boundary, and a unit placed 2.5 m. to the west recovered no evidence of either a hearth or the associated shell. Animal bone, tentatively identified as deer, was recovered in association with the shell in this feature.

Figure 45. CG-19: Phase II test units.
Interpretation

One of the characteristics of the Woodland period is an increased exploitation of marine resources, resulting in the accumulation and deposition of oyster shell middens. Site CG-19, which is thinly spread across a small peninsula, includes at least two such middens. One of these has been bisected by logging equipment, and the shells are clearly visible in the tracks. The other, discovered through testing, appears to seal a hearth feature containing deer bones. Excavation of these features should present information concerning diet and environmental conditions, and may provide a carbon sample which can be used for dating the site.

In addition to the middens, shovel tests recovered light scatters of Middle Woodland period pottery (Varina and Mockley wares), quartzite flakes, and shattered cobbles. These scatters were recovered primarily from the western tip of the peninsula.

Recommendations

While the presence of intact features at CG-19 indicates that additional investigation will be necessary, the entire site does not warrant Phase III excavation. If the site is threatened, it is recommended that a 2 × 2 or 3 × 3-meter square be excavated over the undisturbed shell midden/hearth feature, and a second, larger excavation unit be dug to explore the prehistoric concentration at the end of the peninsula.

Site CG-22 (44JC651)
Possible Nineteenth- or Twentieth-Century Clay Mining Area

Site CG-22 is a squarish depression located on a recently logged terrace just east of a ravine feeding the western branch of Grice’s Run. Scrub growth and bramble thickets cover the site, hindering access during the summer months.

Upon surface inspection of CG-22 in January 1991, the depression was identified as a brick-lined cellar dating to the colonial period. Subsequent subsurface testing recovered small numbers of nails, pipe stems and brick bats, which supported this conclusion, but did not suggest intensive historic activity on the site. Recommendations for future testing focussed on identifying these activity areas as well as testing the cellar for intact foundations, searching historical records, and documenting all identified physical remains.

In an effort to fulfill these recommendations, Phase II testing at CG-22 undertook the excavation of eight 75 × 75-cm. and 1 × 1-meter test units both inside and around the depression. A regular grid was established over the site to facilitate mapping, but the testing interval varied from 5 to 10 meters in order to examine significant features visible from the surface. Four units were placed at 5-meter intervals within the depression, with an additional five excavated around the feature and on the ditch and berm that surrounds its western side (Figure 46).
The stratigraphy revealed in test units within the “cellar” was not at all consistent with that interpretation. A top layer of light gray-brown loam in these units sealed a mottled grayish-yellow clay layer streaked with veins of bog iron. This clay layer, which bleeds almost imperceptibly into the underlying subsoil, appeared to be redeposited, based on the inclusion of small brick fragments. Bricks, in fact, were the only artifacts recovered from any of the four units within the depression. These were suspiciously modern in appearance, and concentrated near the center of the feature.

Test units excavated outside of the “cellar” exhibited a similar stratigraphic sequence, with 7-10 cm. of gray brown sandy loam overlying a layer of almost impenetrable yellow clay with iron inclusions. Again, only bricks and a late nineteenth-century cartridge case were recovered.

Only one unit excavated through a ditch and berm skirting the north and west boundaries of the depression yielded artifacts that might be attributed to the colonial period. A 75 × 75-cm. test unit placed in this location exhibited 19 cm. of sterile gray-brown sandy loam, sealing 16 cm. of silty, yellow-gray ditch fill. This fill contained one pipestem and a fragment of undecorated whiteware which established 1820 as the earliest possible date for the occupation of this “site.”

**Interpretation**

The function of site CG-22 remains something of a mystery. The depression does not contain any fill which might be interpreted as cellar fill, nor do there appear to be features which might suggest a structure. The possibility that this might be in
fact a cellar seems therefore remote. Even a farm structure, outbuildings, or barn with no basement, would be expected to leave more artifactual evidence than a pipestem and whiteware fragment.

One possible clue to the identity of this depression comes from the nature of the soil in and around the feature. All test units produced a clean, sticky clay which coring proved to extend to a depth of nearly two feet. Although nothing concrete is known of this specific area, clays have been recently mined from the Locust Grove Tract to provide the materials for brick-making. Apparently this location is recognized as a superior source for clay, and it would not be unreasonable, especially given the lack of artifacts, to assume that this resource had been exploited earlier, during the nineteenth or early twentieth century.

**Recommendations**

While CG-22 was initially identified as a cellar, testing suggests that there was never a structure in this location. Not only is there no fill in the supposed cellar, but there are also no artifacts to suggest that a structure might have been removed from this location. No further work is necessary.

**The Matilda Jones Cemetery (44JC506)**

The Matilda Jones Cemetery takes its name from a single marked grave bearing the inscription:

```
The Grave
of
Matilda
Wife of
Thos. Jones
Born 25 Feb. 1808
Died 27 March 1849
A Fond and Faithful Wife
possessing a noble nature
and a strong hope in Christ
has thus fulfilled her mission.
```

The cemetery site is located west of site CG-6 on an elevated portion of an ancient beachhead of the James River. During the same logging operation that affected sites CG-4 and CG-5, the cemetery was clear-cut, causing considerable damage to its southern and eastern extremes, and to the headstone, which was broken off at the base. At present, the site is covered in an early growth of poplar and sweet gum, with a couple of well-developed hardwood trees that were avoided by the loggers.

Noël Hume first discovered the marker during a 1976-77 archaeological survey. Subsequent attempts to trace Matilda Jones through documentary research were unsuccessful, and with the exception of a recent struggle with logging crews over protection of the stone, the site was forgotten. The potential for future
development on this ridge, however, raised the issue again, and as single graves are extremely rare, Phase II testing was recommended for the identification of additional burials and the definition of site boundaries.

Towards this end, trenches were excavated across the site, using the marked grave as a datum point. Approximately 0.5 meters in width, these trenches were excavated by shovel to the depth at which grave stains began to appear. Soil was not screened, but recovered artifacts were collected and later identified.

The first trench, trending roughly north-south, was laid out on either side of the known grave to locate burials in a line with Matilda Jones. Four graves were encountered in the north trench, and between three and five in the south trench, identification being hindered by logging disturbance. Trenches were excavated two meters beyond the last grave to define the northern and southern boundaries of the cemetery.

East-west trenches excavated from the head and the footstone of Matilda Jones were used to locate graves running parallel to the existing row. The east trench was excavated eight meters and the west nine meters without encountering additional grave stains. Random trenching along these east-west lines seemed to confirm that only one row of burials exists, and that the individuals interred in this cemetery number between eight and ten. While only one of these graves is presently marked, the fact that all ten have the same orientation suggests that they are roughly contemporary and that the others were marked at some point.

Figure 47 illustrates the cemetery plan and the test trenches excavated to identify site boundaries. The two southernmost graves (9 and 10) were disturbed to a depth of 50 cm. meters by tire ruts, and are therefore difficult to distinguish. Those graves that are identifiable measure approximately 75 cm. in width, with the exception of grave 7, which at 150 by 275 cm., would certainly have been large enough to contain two individuals or perhaps a burial vault. This grave was completely exposed and examined for evidence of multiple interments, in the form of two or more grave shafts cutting each other, but no soil distinction could be made.

Artifacts recovered from the test trenches include one sherd of English soft-paste porcelain, two nails (one identified as a machine-cut nail), two brick fragments, and a fragment of dolomite marble. The marble, which was slightly ground but not polished, appears to be a fragment of another gravestone.

**Interpretation**

The Matilda Jones cemetery appears to be a family plot enclosing one row of eight to ten burials. While earlier reports stated that no house site had yet been associated with the Matilda Jones cemetery, additional research suggests that CG-7 (Locust Grove) may have fulfilled that function. Supporting evidence is drawn from two recent studies examining the spatial relationship between farmhouses and the family cemetery (Bachman and Catts 1990; Catts and Custer 1990). The results of these studies demonstrate that the majority of family cemeteries are located to the rear of the dwelling in a semicircle, ranging from 100 to 1300 feet in distance. The average dwelling-to- cemetery distance was 832 feet in one study,
and 679 feet in the other—numbers that are not far from the 900-foot distance recorded between the Matilda Jones cemetery and CG-7. The placement of the cemetery away from any public thoroughfare is also consistent with Bachman and Catts’ finding that this common arrangement is “a means of keeping the family dead out of the public way and in a personal, more controllable space to the ‘rear’ of the farmhouse.”

Renewed attempts to identify Matilda Jones met with the same frustrations experienced by Noël Hume. Documentary research produced mention of neither Matilda, nor her husband. The dates listed on Matilda’s headstone indicate that she died during the tenure of Humphrey Harwood, although again, this information did little to reveal her identity.

It is possible that Matilda Jones was a slave or the wife of a black tenant farmer, but it seems unlikely. Whereas black cemeteries are often less regimented than white, with less attention paid to order and orientation (Combes 1972: 56),

Figure 47. The Matilda Jones Cemetery plan.
the Matilda Jones cemetery was tightly organized. The head and footstones also suggested a fair degree of affluence inconsistent with the boards and stakes and handmade concrete markers attributed to the black cemeteries of the nineteenth century.

Recommendations

The boundaries of the Matilda Jones cemetery are now known to extend at least thirteen meters in a roughly north-south direction. Due to its relatively small size, and the importance of cemeteries both as historical resources and modern sacred places, it is recommended in the strongest possible terms that the site be avoided. A fence or other marker to identify the location will help ensure the future protection of interred remains.
Chapter 7.
Assessing the Archaeology of the Locust Grove Tract

Phase II testing of the Locust Grove Tract has produced evidence for more than 20 occupations, the many unique characteristics of which invite investigation beyond a descriptive level. Perhaps the most obvious of these characteristics is the large number of separate occupations, which span 6000 years from the Archaic Period through the early twentieth century, and provide an evolutionary perspective on patterns of land use through this period. Equally important is the possibility of inter-site comparisons among sites of the Woodland Period and the early seventeenth century.

Although all periods are clearly important, much of this analysis will focus specifically on sites of the early seventeenth century. As of early 1992, fewer than ten other sites dating from this period had been identified in James City County, making each of the six Locust Grove Tract examples a rarity in itself. With the cost of excavation increasing, so too does the need to gather as much information as possible at the testing phase, since this limited glimpse of each site may be the last that is economically feasible.

Finally, individual merit aside, the five sites identified as belonging to the Martin’s Hundred period provide an unusual opportunity to study a community, and especially a community for which the background has already been so colorfully described (Noël Hume 1991). If the analysis to follow focuses heavily on a comparison of the seventeenth-century sites, it is due both to their scarcity, and to the strength of the context into which this information may be placed.

With a balanced appreciation then for the limitations of a Phase II analysis and the special qualities of these sites, the questions selected for this analysis revolve around the issues of time, space and function—questions that can be addressed with some confidence based on the limited results of archaeological testing. Particularly, analysis will focus on how people distributed themselves across the landscape, and how that pattern changed over time; how people used the land that they claimed for themselves; what people were doing at Martin’s Hundred; and how these activities are reflected in the resulting artifact assemblages.

The Prehistoric Sites

The 230 acres which comprise the Locust Grove Tract include environments ranging from relatively flat, well-drained uplands bordering the present Route 60, to swamps and ravines which characterize the southwestern portion of the property. Given this wide environmental diversity, the choice of site location was undoubtedly a deliberate one, and appears to have followed consistent patterns throughout the prehistoric and historic periods.
As predicted by current locational models (Hunter 1987), both the Archaic and the Woodland sites on the Locust Grove Tract cluster consistently around water sources. The margins of creeks and ravines, as well as nearby terraces and peninsulas, are dotted with temporary or seasonally-occupied campsites. While the remaining archaeological evidence is often insufficient to identify specific resources exploited by each camp, the availability of a wide range of food and other material resources at these so called “ecotones” is likely to have been the deciding factor in selecting site location. However, it appears that the types of resources exploited changed over time, and this change resulted in the choice of different site locations during the Woodland Period than during the earlier Archaic.

The Archaic Period sites, including CG-3, CG-4, and CG-5, are located along the edges of interior ravines, where springs appear to have continuously washed cobbles into the channel (Figure 48). While stone debitage recovered from each of these sites confirms the fact that local cobbles were gathered and worked into tools and weapons, the quantity of waste material is not sufficient to suggest quarrying as the principal focus of these encampments. More likely, the Native Americans who occupied the sites were exploiting another resource that is not visible archaeologically—perhaps a plant or some animal drawn by fresh water—and tool production occurred as an incidental activity.

While Archaic Period sites were consistently located along interior springs, sites attributed to the ensuing Woodland Period (CG-9, CG-19, and components of CG-2, CG-11, and Sites F and G) were found on peninsulas and terraces closer to the James River (see Figure 48). Not only did this environment offer navigable water for fishing, but also what appear to have once been abundant oyster beds. The presence of shell middens on many of these sites indicates that oysters were extensively exploited, and suggests that site locations may have been dictated by the accessibility of this resource.

Interestingly, the factors that attracted Woodland Period occupation of the Locust Grove Tract appear to have influenced early seventeenth-century settlement as well, since all but one of these historic sites included a Woodland component. This phenomenon has been noted in other areas of Virginia and Maryland as well (Smolek 1984: 11; Potter and Waselkov 1984), and has been used in support of various theories regarding European-Indian relations—for example, that colonists chose to settle on land already cleared by Native American populations, or that Native Americans knew good growing soil, and may have passed this information on, if only by example, to European settlers.

Although the temporary nature of the Locust Grove Tract’s prehistoric sites makes the matter of site distribution (or the way in which people settled in relation to one another) somewhat ambiguous, it is important to recognize that these temporary encampments were almost certainly consistently revisited. As the quantity of material that might be left on a single visit to a site of short duration would be insufficient to permit visibility in the archaeological record, the recorded sites should be regarded as successful or choice locations. One subject that warrants exploration as the prehistoric sites are more thoroughly investigated, however, is whether occupations can be separated to provide chronological distinctions within the Archaic and Woodland periods, and thus whether it is feasible to begin to see possibly coterminous occupations.
The Historic-Period Sites

While, like the prehistoric inhabitants of the Locust Grove Tract, occupants during the seventeenth-, eighteenth-, and nineteenth centuries expressed dependence on specific resources through their choices of site location, those resources (as in earlier periods) are not always readily identifiable. During the seventeenth century, necessary resources appear to have been available along the edges of ravines, as all of the six sites dating from that period are similarly placed in relation to these features (Figure 49).

What made ravines attractive to seventeenth-century settlers is not difficult to imagine. The availability of an adequate drinking water source was undoubtedly of paramount importance, particularly to the early colonists who, intent on planting tobacco and returning to England, had neither the time nor the inclination to dig wells. In a paper addressing settlement patterns among Maryland’s frontier plantations, Michael Smolek notes that:

![Figure 48. Location of Archaic and Woodland Period sites.](image)
...it is the location of spring heads that appears to have shaped the specific location of western shore Maryland seventeenth-century house sites. There is an almost perfect correlation between known seventeenth-century sites and the close proximity of the spring heads (Smolek 1984: 10).

Other factors, such as the quality and condition of soils, may also have played a role in the consistent choice of ravine-side locations for house sites, although just how much was known about soils and the nutrient requirements of various crops during the early seventeenth century is uncertain. Michael Smolek argues that most planters were reasonably well-informed, whether through Native American sources, the example of other planters, or the English farming tradition, and probably knew that tobacco (like most crops), grows best in areas of well-drained soils—often referred to as “light soils” (Smolek 1984: 10). The high correlation between light soils and an easily accessible water source supports soil quality as an explanation for the ravine-side placement of these small plantations.

Finally, ease of transportation is a possible explanation for the proximity of seventeenth-century house sites to the ravines. But while waterways functioned during the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries as the roadways of later periods, and while at least two residents of Martin’s Hundred are known to have

Figure 49. Location of seventeenth-century sites.
owned boats, it is highly unlikely that any of the small streams feeding Grice’s Run were navigable. More likely, the boats were kept near Grice’s Run, and were used in expeditions to Jamestown, ten miles downriver.

By the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries ties to potable drinking water had lessened somewhat as a permanent population assumed responsibility for digging wells. Moreover, experience and agricultural advances produced arable land from what was previously considered infertile. While there are few sites on the Locust Grove Tract from this period, the single eighteenth/nineteenth-century example, “Locust Grove” (CG-7), is situated on high ground overlooking the formerly-occupied ravines and creeks (Figure 50). Not only is this farmstead far removed from any natural water source, but its isolation as the single domestic site on the tract from this period provides lingering evidence of the dispersed plantation system that resulted from the tobacco economy launched during the early seventeenth century.

Site Distribution

Site distribution takes into consideration not only the locations of sites, but the rough dates and the sequence of their occupation as well. Clearly the way in which

Figure 50. Location of eighteenth/nineteenth-century sites.
people distributed themselves across the landscape and in relation to one another is a moot point if those people missed one another by centuries.

The handful of individuals who returned to Martin’s Hundred following the Indian uprising in 1622 provide an interesting start for a discussion of site distribution, clearly they were not landless by any means. The particular plantation to which they returned included 21,500 acres stretching from Skiff’s Creek to Warham Run. As this survey has shown, however, settlement was hardly dispersed, with at least four pre-1650 sites (CG-2, CG-8, CG-11, and Site G) lying within a radius of about one-half mile (Figure 51).

Explanations for this clustering are probably fairly simple. Following the 1622 uprising, the threat of another Indian attack was undoubtedly a very real one in the minds of those who repopulated Martin’s Hundred. With their numbers severely depleted, and their original settlement burned, they found themselves in a worse defensive position than they had been prior to the attack. A 1623 letter written by Richard Frethorne, a servant at Martin’s Hundred, to his parents in England explains

“…wee live in feare of the Enimy.... for wee are in great danger, for or Plantacon is very weake, by reason of the dearth, and sicknes, of or Companie...” (Records of the Virginia Company, March 20, April 2 and 3, 1623).

Figure 51. Clustering of pre-1650 sites.
Lacking fortification such as they had enjoyed at Wolstenholme Towne prior to the uprising, the returning settlers would have been wise to remain in close contact. Indeed, spreading themselves thinly across the company’s 21,500 acre holdings would have been both dangerous and foolish.

That fear of a second Indian attack influenced the distribution of settlement at Martin’s Hundred seems clear in comparison with the arrangement of sites from the same period at Flowerdew Hundred, another particular plantation on the opposite shore of the James River. Unlike the ill-fated residents of Wolstenholme Towne, Flowerdew Hundred warded off the 1622 Indian attack with little damage. Perhaps confident in their ability to again resist invasion, the occupants of Flowerdew remained stretched out along the shore, rather than clustering for protection (Figure 52).

A second factor in the clustering of homesteads may have been a continued dependence upon the company administrator, William Harwood, for civil or military
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Figure 52. Location of seventeenth-century sites at Flowerdew Hundred.
guidance, or more simply as the focus for community interaction. During the early 1970s Ivor Noël Hume excavated Site A, a fenced complex of structures which he believes to be Harwood’s post-uprising plantation (Noël Hume 1979). Located in the extreme north of the settlement “cluster,” Site A is no further than one-half mile from any of the early seventeenth-century sites identified in this investigation (Figure 53).

Although particular plantations ceased to function officially as administrative entities in 1624, ties are unlikely to have been severed immediately—especially at a time when the community felt particularly vulnerable to attack. Parishes and counties, the administrative successors to particular plantations, were not established until 1634, leaving settlers without strong direction for nearly ten years. It seems likely that individuals accustomed to strong leadership might continue to cluster around this leader, even after he had been officially relieved of that post. Certainly there was security in the familiar, as well as in the fact that Harwood was the only man in the company to possess a cannon.
But while protection and community maintenance may provide adequate explanations for a clustered settlement, this arrangement is incompatible with the demands of intensive tobacco cultivation. The settlers who so boldly returned to Martin’s Hundred in spite of all fears were undoubtedly enticed, as others were, by the opportunity for wealth. By 1624, rising tobacco prices reached a high of 3 s. per pound, further fueling a “tobacco-mania” throughout the Chesapeake.

Tobacco cultivation required tremendous amounts of land. Not only were the planted areas large (50 acres per hand), but the crop quickly depleted the soil, rendering it useless within three years. Replacement crops of corn and beans were often planted on spent fields, with tobacco cultivation resuming on fresh soil. Tobacco’s relentless appetite for new soil drove planters during the early years of settlement to snatch up large holdings in anticipation of their future needs.

Those who repopulated Martin’s Hundred following the Indian attack were left to reconcile their fear and need for community with the demands of tobacco cultivation; the fact that they appear reluctant to disperse undoubtedly challenged their creativity. One solution may have been to establish a community at the center of the settlement—the “cluster” previously mentioned—and to arrange fields in a radial pattern on the outside of this circle. It was traditional in England for farmers to walk to their fields from the village, and this settlement pattern may therefore have been familiar to planters who were, after all, still recent immigrants.

The form, size and durability of houses may also reflect a concession to the strict requirements of tobacco cultivation. Historical documentation and archaeological evidence have shown the relatively low level of importance that early settlers attached to their dwellings. Almost without exception, they built earthfast structures, poorly constructed, with a duration—at least in the humid climes of Virginia—of 10 to 12 years (Carson et al. 1981) These dwellings, though miserably small (typically measuring 15 × 20 feet), often housed six to eight people. The construction of impermanent, earthfast structures, and the association of such structures with artifact assemblages reflecting reasonable affluence, suggests that early Virginians, regardless of means, cared little for their dwellings—and with good reason. As most intended to remain in the colonies only long enough to become wealthy, and then return to England, a structure that lasted ten years, with frequent repairs, would suit most planters well.

This low level of importance assigned to housing helps to explain the location of seventeenth-century sites on the Locust Grove Tract. As previously noted, all of these sites were perched along the edges of ravines—so close as to be on land considered marginal to the broad, flat peninsulas that they bound. This pattern seems so unlikely that logging and farming were initially blamed for destroying evidence of sites more centrally located on each of the peninsulas. Extensive testing has now determined, however, that no other sites existed.

What may, in fact, be demonstrated by this pattern of construction along ravines is that planters were using their best land for growing crops, and were cultivating as much of this property as they were able. Dwellings, almost an afterthought, were hastily and cheaply constructed along the periphery where they would not impede tobacco cultivation. This arrangement provides a sharp contrast
to the substantial eighteenth-/nineteenth-century farmstead at CG-7, which was centrally located and surrounded by fields.

The clustered arrangement of seventeenth-century sites on the Locust Grove Tract therefore, while curious given the vast acreage available, finds explanation in the particular circumstances faced by the Martin’s Hundred community. The unsuccessfully repelled Indian attack of 1622 and the formal dissolution of particular plantations may have engendered a need for community that was at odds with the demands of tobacco cultivation. Attempts to reconcile these two objectives, though difficult to identify archaeologically, may in fact be visible in the location and distribution of early seventeenth-century domestic sites.

**Site Dating**

To this point, the seventeenth-century sites identified on the Locust Grove Tract have been discussed as if they had been built, occupied, and deserted simultaneously. The likelihood of this is obviously slight, but it does reflect the difficulty that archaeologists sometimes have in dating sites from the early seventeenth century. The rapidly changing ceramic technology that would provide numerous chronological markers during the mid-eighteenth century had yet to occur, leaving archaeologists to analyze a wide variety of wares whose dates of manufacture are often poorly understood.

Alternatively, archaeological dating can rely on the less secure ground of negative evidence. Wine bottles, fragments of which can make up half of archaeological assemblages, are not evident on sites until after 1650, when they replace straight-sided case bottles. A site that yields no curved glass fragments, but rather case bottle glass, is therefore assumed to pre-date 1650. As only one of the recently identified seventeenth-century sites, CG-10, yielded wine bottle glass, CG-2, CG-8, CG-11, Site F and Site G were all believed to pre-date 1650.

While we may never be able to establish anything more than a date range for any of the seventeenth-century sites on the Locust Grove Tract, one useful approach to their investigation is to compare the occupations chronologically. The value of this exercise was demonstrated clearly in a 1988 study conducted by James Deetz on eighteen sites at Flowerdew Hundred. Using samples of ceramic pipestems collected from each of the sites, Deetz was able to sort the sites chronologically into three groups, and to link changing settlement patterns to the historical events that influenced them (Figure 54).

The pipestem dating method employed by Deetz is one of the most frequently used by historical archaeologists for dating seventeenth-century sites. As Deetz describes it, the technique is based on J.C. Harrington’s observation that “over time, the average diameter of stem bores underwent a rather linear reduction between 1590 and 1800, from 9/64 inch to 4/64 inch, a rate of approximately 1/64 every 30 years” (Deetz 1988: 239). Deriving Harrington dates is a simple matter of measuring the bore diameters of all pipestem fragments recovered from a site using a graduated set of drill bits, and preparing a histogram illustrating the percentage of each diameter in the total sample. A site that produces a predominance
of 5/64” bores is, according to Figure 55, most likely to have been occupied between 1710 and 1750. Length of occupation is also demonstrated through these histograms, with long occupations appearing as low, relatively flat profiles, while sharp peaks signify brief occupations.

The Harrington dating technique was applied to seven seventeenth-century sites on the Carter’s Grove Locust Grove Tract not in an effort to derive absolute dates, but to determine whether the sites were occupied simultaneously, or in an order that was not clear from the recovered artifacts. Included in the study were five sites that testing identified as pre-dating 1650 (CG-2, CG-8, CG-11, Site F and Site G), and one that appears to have been abandoned after 1680 (CG-10).

A comparison of the histograms (Figure 56) prepared for each of the sites shows that they, like the sites at Flowerdew, fall into three distinct categories. The
Figure 55. Harrington histogram. (From Harrington 1954.)

Figure 56. Stem bore diameter profiles for Locust Grove Tract sites.
first and largest group, consisting of sites CG-2, CG-11, and Site G, produced strikingly similar histograms with peaks in the 9/64” range (Harrington’s earliest division), dropping off by 1650. The years encompassed by these three sites—from the early 1620s to nearly 1650—was a period that saw a tremendous tobacco boom followed by a slow and steady economic decline.

The second group, represented by Sites F and CG-8, appears to have gotten its start sometime after the initial settlement, with its peak a decade or so after. Site CG-8 appears to fail quickly—sooner in fact than the sites from Group I, which leads one to suspect the influence of a very small pipestem sample. That Site F is somehow related to Site G, located only 50 yards to the south, seems to be confirmed by the precipitous drop near the end of the former’s histogram, making Sites F and G appear to be abandoned simultaneously.

Finally, site CG-10, the only member of the third “group,” demonstrates a low, relatively flat profile with its peak (unpronounced as it is) within the 1650 to 1680 range. While this date does little more than confirm what was already known from artifactual evidence—that is, that the site was occupied later than many of the others tested—the profile shape provides new data to indicate that this occupation was also of longer duration.

The use of Harrington histograms appears therefore, to produce a plausible sequence for the reoccupation of Martin’s Hundred (Figure 57). Group I represents the initial resettlement which occurred sometime soon after the massacre. This settlement consisted of a cluster of post-constructed buildings (CG-2, CG-11 and Site G) occupied by small planters with access to enough land to make relocation unnecessary for as long as twenty years.

Group II, though displaying a profile distinct from the earlier Group I, seems to meet its demise through similar processes. The fact that CG-8 and Site F show a rapid decline at roughly the same time as that experienced on Site G, CG-2 and CG-11, leads one to suspect economic factors as contributing to each.

Finally, CG-10, the single component of Group III demonstrates sustained growth and development over a considerably longer period than the sites of Groups I and II. While only a faint mark on the scale during the initial settlement’s boom period, CG-10 goes on to thrive as the first group declines. The profile suggests that CG-10 may be unaffected by the factors that influenced the earlier settlements, and that brought about their rather precipitous declines.

### Functional Analysis

In order to try to see pattern in site type and function, functional analysis of the type advocated by Stanley South (1977) was attempted. Functional analysis separates the assemblage of artifacts recovered from a site into groups that reflect specific site activities: the “kitchen” group includes all ceramics and glass; the “architectural,” all brick, nails and window glass; the “arms” category includes military (as opposed to hunting) weapons and related equipment; the “tobacco” group is reserved strictly for tobacco pipes; and the “activities” group, no doubt the most varied, includes all artifacts that can be traced to any activity not essential to the functioning of a household—from casting waste to curry combs. Once
artifacts have been placed in these categories, the relative contribution of each activity to the assemblage is then calculated, and the resulting ratio can be used to identify site type.

Site type is often determined through variations on a “domestic” site pattern. High percentages of kitchen debris (reflecting the everyday preparation, consumption, and discard of food) and architectural artifacts mark most domestic sites, with “clothing,” “arms,” “tobacco,” and “activities” categories playing minor roles. A decrease in either the kitchen or architectural artifact categories, for example, coupled with increased percentages of “activities” or “arms” groups, suggests that some specialized activity was carried out on the site.

There are a number of additional applications of functional analysis that contribute to its usefulness on the Locust Grove Tract. High values in certain categories, particularly “arms,” can arguably indicate an early occupation date reflecting a situation in which defense is a primary concern.

Functional analysis can also reveal something about a site’s duration through the shifting relationship between architectural and kitchen artifacts. It may take many years for the slow accumulation of kitchen debris to overtake quantities of brick and nails required to build a house. Early in a site’s occupation therefore, architectural material will be more heavily represented, while later, with the accumulation of domestic garbage, the ratio will shift in favor of “kitchen” artifacts. If something interrupts this gradual trend, for example if the site is quickly abandoned, it would be expected to yield higher proportions of architectural artifacts.

The goal of functional analysis as conducted on the Martin’s Hundred sites was to determine the function of each through a comparison of the assemblages (Figure 58).
Although all six sites (CG-2, CG-8, CG-10, CG-11, Site F and Site G) register high proportions of architectural and kitchen artifacts, as expected on domestic sites, Site F stand outs, although not for the reasons anticipated. While the average proportion of architectural material to kitchen artifacts is 2 to 1, a ratio of more than 6 to 1 on Site F suggests that it is either a very briefly-occupied domestic site, or a different type of site altogether.

Earlier discussion suggested that Site F had some sort of specialized function, but this function is not clearly shown by basic functional analysis. An industrial or craft-related, or military site, for example, might be expected to register an inflated ratio of “activities” or “arms” or “tobacco” categories at the expense of the kitchen or architecture groups, yet Site F does not.

To test the possibility that standard functional analysis might be too coarse to interpret specialized use, Site F was subjected to a finer-grained analysis. The relative proportions of specific artifacts (rather than lumped artifact groups) were compared for Site F, the anomaly, and Site G, an undisputed domestic site. As Figure 59 demonstrates, the proportions are again relatively similar, with only one notable difference in the coarseware category. It can only be concluded that site F generally resembles the domestic sites in overall artifact content, and that South’s functional analysis, at whatever level of detail, is insufficient to isolate the principal differences, at least at this stage of excavation.

Figure 58. *Functional analysis: Seventeenth-century sites.*
But while functional analysis of the Locust Grove Tract’s seventeenth-century assemblages was unsuccessful in identifying the activity conducted on Site F, it does present some useful observations regarding the domestic sites. Five of these six sites record higher values for architectural debris than for kitchen artifacts—a characteristic of short-term sites. As already mentioned, Site F produced the most pronounced difference, although the source of this difference has yet to be resolved.

Other sites on which the representation of architectural artifacts far outnumbered the kitchen assemblage include Site G, suspected to be the earliest of the sites, and CG-10, known to be the latest. While it is certainly possible that Site G was occupied for only a brief period, the pattern displayed for CG-10 contrasts sharply with the archaeological data. Three postholes were identified on CG-10, and the fact that one of them had been replaced twice suggests more than a brief stay. One explanation for the predominance of architectural material on this site is that such evidence is likely to reside in soil layers, which are systematically tested. Kitchen refuse, on the other hand, in the seventeenth-century is deliberately dumped into trash pits and other features. As the excavation of features is avoided during Phase II testing, the results of functional analysis may be skewed.

Only CG-8 presents a situation in which the “kitchen” category overtakes the evidence reflects a site of long duration. Phase III excavation of CG-8 reveals that it was occupied for fewer than twenty years. Only additional excavation may ultimately determine whether twenty years represents the longest occupation among the seventeenth-century Locust Grove Tract sites.

The strong representation of “arms”—of weapons and supplies related to defense rather than to the procurement of food—has also been recognized as an
indication of “frontier” or initial settlement. As settlement becomes more stable, the store of arms is expected to decrease. Returning to Figure 58, it should be clear that the “strength” of arms category can only be seen in relative terms. Of all the functional categories noted, arms are the least well-represented, comprising no more than 4% of any assemblage. Within this group, however, there is some variation. The site on which the military equipment figures most prominently is Site G, suggested earlier as one of the earliest, or Group I, sites. Sites CG-2 and CG-11 which round out Group I also reflect relatively high numbers of arms. Only CG-8 intrudes on Group I’s monopoly of the “arms” category, displaying an assemblage of military equipment roughly equivalent to that recovered on CG-2.

In summary, functional analysis has proved somewhat more useful in confirming a chronological order for the Locust Grove Tract sites than it was for identifying the type of specialized activity revealed on Site F. The proportion of military hardware recovered from each site coincides nicely with the chronological groupings established through pipestem dating. Beginning with one of the earliest sites, Site G, the arms category decreases (with a minor fluctuation) steadily as settlement became increasingly secure.

An additional opportunity to investigate each site’s occupation length reveals sites CG-8, CG-2 and CG-11, through their nearly equal ratios of architectural and household artifacts, to be of the longest duration (Figure 60). Site F, on which architectural debris far outweighs household refuse, appears to be the most briefly occupied, though this pattern may still reflect a difference in function. Site G and CG-10 also appear to represent short-term sites, though the conflicting archaeological evidence retrieved from CG-10 (in the form of multiple structural repairs) counsels caution in the interpretation of functional data.
Chapter 8.
Interpretation and Conclusions

The chronological, functional and spatial analyses of six seventeenth-century sites on the Locust Grove Tract suggest that what appears to be a tightly clustered community may in fact reflect three periods of occupation. The first period, or Group I, consists of three domestic sites—CG-2, CG-11, and Site G—the last of which is enclosed. The second period, or Group II, includes one domestic site, CG-8, and Site F, which is non-domestic, though its function has yet to be determined. Finally, Group III, the third period, is represented by a single domestic site—CG-10. While these three groupings have proved useful in delineating successive communities, the absence of an historical framework prevents them from contributing to our knowledge of particular plantations, and specifically of Martin’s Hundred. In order to accomplish this task, these site groupings must first be tied to more substantial data—to the body of what we do know, based on the previous excavations and the extensive research of Ivor Noël Hume.

According to Noël Hume, any well-planned archaeological project begins with the known, and attempts to expand on it (Noël Hume 1979: 35). If this indisputable truth concerning the excavation of individual sites can be applied, by extension, to the excavation of a community, then this study is required to consult the known “universe” of Martin’s Hundred sites. This universe, which is the product of two decades of testing and excavation at Carter’s Grove plantation, consists of seven sites excavated by Noël Hume during the 1970s and 1980s (Figure 61).

The most celebrated of these occupations, Wolstenholme Towne (also known as Site C) is described, and has been reconstructed, as the initial “core” settlement, consisting of a fort, multiple dwellings, a Company barn, a Company compound, a well and a number of graves. Site H, also called the Boyes Site or the “Suburb,” is much smaller, consisting of a single household. Like Site C, Site H is fortified and yielded large numbers of military artifacts reflecting the uneasiness preceding the construction of a palisade in 1634 to eliminate the threat of an Indian attack. Unfortunately the occupants of both sites had well-founded fears, as both C and H exhibit convincing evidence of having been destroyed during the uprising of 1622.

Sites A and B are located about one-quarter mile from Wolstenholme Towne, and appear, according to Noël Hume, to represent the initial resettlement of Martin’s Hundred immediately following the 1622 uprising. Site A shows marked similarities to the Wolstenholme Towne core settlement (Site C), consisting of multiple dwellings, fences, trash pits, and graves. While not as heavily fortified as Site C, the Site A structures were surrounded by a narrow ditch which was interpreted as evidence for a slot fence. Another indication of continued distrust of the local Native American population was an unusual number of military artifacts: a cannonball, a halberd point, part of an armor backplate, and a sword pommel, to name a few.
Similar sentiments were expressed on Site B across the ravine. Pieces from a coat of mail, iron plates from a brigandine, and an elbow section from a suit of armor were included in the recovered artifact assemblage, though these contrasted sharply with some obvious indications of status: silver decorated knives and gilded spurs, among them. Strangely, the structure associated with these luxuries proved modest. Measuring only 15 × 30 feet, this building was surrounded by a possible shed, two trash pits and an infant grave. That Sites A and B were contemporaries of one another was convincingly argued through the recovery of a dated 1631 slipware plate from a trash pit on the latter site.

Site D, something of an enigma, exhibited only one pit and the posts for a non-domestic structure measuring 15 × 25 feet. The most readily datable artifact, a manganese-stippled delftware salt dish, was produced sometime between 1620 and 1640—too broad a period to add to the interpretation of Martin’s Hundred. Likewise Site E, a single 15 × 20 domestic structure, proved difficult to date. The
similarity in size, however, between this structure and those uncovered at Wolstenholme Towne, and the fact that this building was destroyed by fire, leads one to the tentative conclusion that this site was a part of the initial settlement (1619-1622).

Finally Site J, a site that has been only partially explored, appears to span the period from the abandonment of Site A (roughly 1640) to the end of the seventeenth-century. This is a complex site consisting of several structures with a possible fortification. Further research will be necessary to further delineate the archaeological evidence left on that site.

Using archaeological information from these mostly fully-excavated sites, and historical research on the growth, dissolution and dispersement of Martin’s Hundred, the task for this project is to place our three “site groups” within that existing framework.

**Group I**

Through the use of pipestem data alone, it has been difficult to place this first group of sites (CG-2, CG-11, and Site G) chronologically within the context created by Noël Hume. As Figure 62 illustrates, the pipestems recovered from the Group I sites clearly predate not only those from Group II, but from Noel Hume’s Sites A and B as well. As A and B have been identified as dating from the reoccupation of Martin’s Hundred, that is between 1622 and 1640, this evidence would seem to place the Group I sites within the Wolstenholme Towne period (1619-1622).

Perhaps the first question to be addressed is whether the Group I sites could conceivably date to the initial occupation period. Since site dating has depended heavily on the bore diameters of pipestems, the simplest means of answering this question would undoubtedly be to compare pipestem data from Sites C and H with that derived from the Group I sites. As the Wolstenholme Towne data becomes available for study, such a comparison will certainly help to unravel the mystery. In the meantime, however this determination will have to be based on other evidence.

The lack of specific chronological markers, particularly those provided by a wide variety of ceramics on later sites, hinders attempts distinguish sites occupied between 1600 and 1650. As this is a critical period in the history of Martin’s Hundred, these distinctions are often sought in other places—particularly in the numbers of specific artifacts related to the early stages of site development. High numbers of arms (including armor, chain mail and cannonballs), and low quantities of window glass, for example, are often recovered from very early or “frontier” sites. While the fact that arms factored significantly in a 1% sample from each of the Group I sites is promising, it also appears, based on evidence from Sites A and B (1623-1640) that this same pattern persists into the reoccupation period.

Window glass on the three Group I sites was consistently low: none on Site G, 2 fragments on CG-2, and 9 fragments on CG-11. Again, this is certainly a good indication that these are early sites, but it does not prove that they pre-date 1622.

In summary then, it is possible, that CG-2, CG-11 and Site G can be traced to the Wolstenholme Towne period. Evidence in support of this possibility includes
the relatively high visibility of military equipment, low quantities of window glass, and pipestem data that places the occupation of these sites prior to the occupation of Sites A and B. Countering this evidence is the absence of ash or other signs of burning that might have been produced during the 1622 uprising, (although none of the Wolstenholme Towne fort sites yielded ash), and at least three artifacts suggesting later occupation: a small fragment of ca. 1630 Italian marbleized slipware, and a 1631 William Collins pipe bowl on Site G, and a ca. 1640 manganese decorated earthenware fragment on CG-11.

Accepting then, the possibility that the Group I sites pre-date 1622, there appear to be three plausible scenarios to consider:

- **CG-2, CG-11, and Site G were considered parts of the initial Wolstenholme Towne settlement;**
- **the sites in Group I are not related to Wolstenholme Towne either spatially or in time, but simply exhibit some of the same characteristics as the initial settlement; or**
- **Site G, a strategically located and apparently enclosed site, represents a second “suburb,” with CG-2 and CG-11 as later, transitional sites.**

Taking these theories in order, the possibility that CG-2, CG-11 and Site G might be included within the bounds of the initial Wolstenholme Towne settlement seems particularly remote. The fortified settlement that was Wolstenholme Towne proper (Site C) lies more than a quarter-mile from the nearest of these sites (Site G).
and nearly a half-mile from CG-2 and CG-11. For colonists who expanded their merely borders by establishing Site H less than 500 feet away from the core settlement, such distances seem unlikely. Moreover, while it is unwise to focus on the known to the exclusion of new information, a dispersed settlement pattern is certainly uncharacteristic of any community of the early seventeenth century, whether at Flowerdew, at Jamestown, or at Martin’s Hundred.

A second, more plausible way to regard the Group I sites is as only indirectly related to Wolstenholme Towne. Rather than coexisting, this theory argues that CG-2, CG-11, and Site G, were established after the demise of that initial settlement, but continued to exhibit some of the same characteristics—particularly a defensible core (the enclosed Site G) and outlying domestic units or farmsteads (CG-2 and CG-11).

There are a number of advantages afforded by this position. Perhaps foremost is the fact that the Group I sites, through settlement patterns, site structures, and
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artifact assemblages, simply present themselves more convincingly as post-1622 occupations. Their relatively loose association, especially in comparison to Wolstenholme Towne and Site H, seems to represent a step away from the nucleated settlements of the first two decades, towards the more dispersed farmsteads which grew in numbers throughout the seventeenth century.

Structurally too, Site G, CG-2, and CG-11 seem dissimilar from the pre-1622 sites. Notably absent on two of the three Group I sites are the heavy fortifications or enclosures that characterized Wolstenholme Towne and Site H. For the occupants of CG-2 and CG-11, the omission cannot be attributed to alternative protection nearby, for as was mentioned above, these sites are widely separated by ravines and forests. The closest enclosed settlement, assuming that these sites post-date 1622, was Site G, whose surrounding ditch seems fragile in comparison to the fences and palisades that protected Wolstenholme Towne.

In addition to the lack of fortifications, the Group I sites are characterized by more variety than has been previously noted. Artifact distribution maps of the household and architectural debris on CG-2, for example, suggest that it is a very simple site encompassing a single structure (evident in the solitary “peak” representing architectural artifacts) surrounded by a heavy yard scatter or midden (Figure 64). While trash pits are not
generally visible on Phase II distribution maps (since excavation of features is avoided), these features are likely to exist. The distribution maps show little evidence of additional complexity, though it would not be unusual for the front of the structure (marked by the location of the midden) to be enclosed within a light fence.

In contrast to CG-2, CG-11 appears to sprawl along the ravine edge, demonstrating multiple “centers” of architectural activity (Figure 65). The outbuildings or additional dwellings that this pattern implies suggest a site complexity that has previously been seen only on a physically larger, nucleated site (Site C). Whether this is an indication of affluence or simply of a longer occupation cannot be determined at this stage in testing—certainly it is a question that warrants investigation—but either circumstance speaks more convincingly to post-1622 condition.

Other components of site CG-11 outside of the obvious architectural ones have been difficult to identify. Like CG-2, the site was characterized by a large artifact-rich midden, presumably marking the area around the house (Figure 66). Unfortunately, testing in and around this midden intercepted two shallow trash pits, rich enough in artifacts to create an artificial “peak” on the map for household debris.

One factor that emphasizes the similarities, rather than the differences between CG-2 and CG-11 is the high artifact density on each site. While arguably a function of having never been plowed, this trait is generally uncommon on very early sites, and even more so on sites of short duration. The probability that CG-2 and CG-11 can be attributed to the three-year Wolstenholme Towne period loses further support, therefore, in the interpretation of the artifact assemblages from these sites.

The final scenario is perhaps the most interesting, in that it incorporates the most persuasive arguments from each of the hypotheses already presented. The suggestion that Site G and Site H (the Boyes Site) might both be Wolstenholme Towne “satellites,” established at roughly the same time to serve similar functions, is based primarily on their physical similarities. Both sites are located strategically along major ravines in good defensive positions. Both are also enclosed, or
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fortified—Site H by a fence on 12-foot posts, and Site G by a 2½ foot wide ditch which may, on later excavation, prove to contain postholes.

A closer examination of site structure serves only to strengthen the resemblance between Sites G and H. An artifact distribution map produced for Site G identifies a single concentration of architectural debris suggesting that, like H, this site consists of a single, modest dwelling (Figure 67). While no trash pits were located at Site G, it appears, based on the excavation of H, that such features might be found outside the enclosure.

Other similarities between Sites G and H are less easily visible. Both sites include large numbers of “military” artifacts, indicating not only early occupation (as noted above), but presenting as well the possibility that these sites were regarded primarily as defensive. Site G, of all the sites recently tested on the Locust Grove Tract, yielded the highest proportion of “arms” in relation to other artifact types.

Additional artifact categories that support the “second suburb” theory include tobacco pipes, which rival the number of “kitchen” artifacts, and the ratio of “architectural” and the “kitchen” artifacts. Whereas most of the Locust Grove Tract sites display more balanced quantities of architectural debris and kitchen refuse, on Site G architectural material outweighs kitchen nearly three to one. Whether this disparity reflects a functional difference or, as some have argued, a particularly short occupation period is difficult to determine in the case of Site G. A functional difference has already been argued, and if this is indeed a Wolstenholme period site then the implied 1619-1622 occupation certainly matches the criterion for an abbreviated one.

If Site G is to be considered a “second suburb,” what happens to the other Group I sites—CG-2 and CG-11? Based on Phase II testing, both sites appear to be unprotected or unfortified, despite the fact that each lies at an edge of the settlement. Based on what is known about early

Figure 67. Site G: Distribution of Architectural (top) and Household (bottom) artifacts.
attempts to settle this area, precautions were taken, usually in the form of a palisade or fence.

Pipestem data also supports a very slight chronological distinction between Site G and CG-2 and 11. Figure 62 demonstrates that the former began earlier than either CG-2 or CG-11, though it comes to a close at roughly the same time. Clearly it will take additional research to resolve the issue of whether Site G belongs to the Wolstenholme Towne period. A preliminary step would involve the comparison of pipestem data from the Wolstenholme Towne sites and Site G.

To summarize what is now known about the Group I sites and their relationship to those already excavated, it is probably safe to say that all three sites were not occupied during the Wolstenholme Towne period. While retaining some of the characteristics of this early period (for example, high proportions of “military” artifacts), the distance from the fortified core settlement, the lack of fortifications around individual homesteads, and unusually high artifact densities on all three sites, argue against a three-year occupation during the most wary, “frontier” period.

While a post-1622 date seems more supportable for the group as a whole, there are minor discrepancies presented by Site G. While hardly fortified, the site is nonetheless enclosed, making it structurally more similar to Site H (1619-22) than to other sites in Group I. Also disturbing is a pipestem date that attributes Site G’s occupation to a slightly earlier period than CG-2 and CG-11, and the wide disparity between “kitchen” and “architectural” artifacts which suggests that the site was either briefly occupied, or represents a function not wholly domestic. Given the unusually high proportion of “arms” within the assemblage, some sort of defensive outpost seems the most likely possibility.

The strongest case that can be presented then, enlists Site G as the earliest of the Group I sites. While it is still unlikely that the site pre-dates 1622, occupation is likely to have occurred immediately after, at a time when protection in any form was considered essential. Sites CG-2 and CG-11, while still belonging to Group I, appear to reflect a transition between the enclosed, nucleated settlements of the Wolstenholme Towne period, and the more dispersed farmsteads that characterized Virginia for two centuries.

One problem that remains to be addressed, both by later research and excavation, surrounds the actual dating of these sites. If Site G, as the earliest representative of Group I, post-dates 1622, and if Sites A and B (Group II sites), represent the immediate repopulation of Martin’s Hundred, as maintained by Noël Hume, then “transitional” sites CG-2 and CG-11 must be squeezed into the months separating these events. Clearly this is a question that may only be resolved through the calculation of additional pipestem data, and through more extensive excavation.

**Group II**

The delineation of Group II, and the dating of sites that fall into this category, has been aided by the availability of pipestem data from Sites A and B. As a brief review, these sites were completely excavated during the 1970s, and proved to
be a large “administrative complex” perhaps occupied by Company Commander William Harwood after the 1622 Uprising, and a structurally modest, (though materially prosperous) domestic site which included a dwelling and a single outbuilding. A comparison of the pipestem data for Sites A and B (graciously supplied by Atria Noël Hume), with similar data from Phase II testing showed a particularly close correlation between the Noël Hume sites and Sites CG-8 and F. While the latter sites have only been tested, the fact that Sites A and B have been fully excavated lends considerable support to the interpretation of the Locust Grove Tract sites.

Unlike the Group I sites, which still drift disconcertingly between the nucleated settlements of pre-1622 and the dispersed farmsteads of the ensuing period, Group II is firmly rooted in the latter tradition (Figure 68). This is not to say that all of the characteristics of the Wolstenholme Towne experience were extinguished. There can be little doubt that the expansive Site A, with its multiple structures, trash pits,
and burials, assumed the role of the settlement’s “core”—the role played by fortified Wolstenholme Towne during the pre-uprising period.

Likewise, Group II includes a “peripheral” site—Site B—located across a ravine from the core settlement (Site A). This arrangement of core and periphery is strikingly similar to that exhibited by Wolstenholme Towne and the Boyes site in a number of respects—in the distance between the components (less than 500 feet in each case), in the surrounding topography (with each satellite site located across a ravine), and in the physical structure of each site (with the complex core balanced by a very simple, single-dwelling satellite). One clear difference between the “peripheral” sites is that while the Boyes site is enclosed within a substantial fortification, there appears to be no enclosure surrounding Site B. Only a heavily-weighted “military” assemblage on that site suggests that a similar purpose may have been fulfilled.

The loosening of defenses at Martin’s Hundred, evident in the contrast between stoutly fortified Wolstenholme Towne and the Boyes Site, and the indisputably armed, yet flimsily enclosed Sites A and B, is compatible with the emergence of a new group of entrepreneurs—small planters who, after 1622, returned to Martin’s Hundred’s 21,500 acres eager to share in the tobacco boom. Unable to recognize this objective within the confines of a Company compound, they established small farmsteads like CG-8 and began to distribute themselves, somewhat tentatively, across the landscape.

Judging from the archaeological data recovered from CG-8, this choice appears to have been financially unrewarding—at least initially. Phase II testing yielded no physical evidence for a structure, though a definite concentration of architectural debris near the site’s northeast quadrant suggested that a building had been present. Later excavation of the site did successfully locate this structure—an 18 × 24 foot post-supported dwelling—in the area circumscribed by architectural evidence.

Like Site B, the structure at CG-8 was architecturally unassuming. Whereas Site B, however, had been strewn with artifacts suggesting occupancy by an individual of high status, CG-8 produced no such evidence. Artifact densities were uniformly low across the site—approximately one-third of what had been found on each of the Group I sites. Moreover, an artifact distribution map could identify only one “concentration” which, upon later excavation, proved to be the location of two small trash pits (Figure 69).

In addition to the scarcity of artifacts, the composition of CG-8’s assemblage warrants scrutiny. Of the six seventeenth-century sites tested on the Locust Grove Tract, only CG-8 yielded a greater number of “kitchen” artifacts than “architectural” debris. As discussed earlier in the report, this pattern is often interpreted as reflecting a long-term occupation, since it may take years for the gradual accumulation of kitchen refuse to surpass the quantity of bricks, nails and glass brought to a site in its first few weeks. If CG-8 was in fact a long-term occupation, however, the scarcity of artifacts is even more striking. These were not planters who simply did not stay long enough to produce a large assemblage, they were individuals who had extraordinarily little for the duration of their occupancy.
So was CG-8 a long-term occupation? While the kitchen to architecture ratio suggests that it was, the question is difficult to resolve based on Phase II data alone. Later excavation of the site revealed a repair to only one of the structural posts, indicating that while occupation was not brief, neither was it particularly extended. A ten-year survival rate for posts seated in the damp soils of Virginia’s peninsula would suggest that the CG-8 farmstead stood for about that long.

Site F, believed to be some sort of industrial or manufacturing site, provides a contrast not only to CG-8, but to all of the domestic sites tested on the Locust Grove Tract. While its extraordinarily high proportion of architectural artifacts (more than 15% higher than any other seventeenth-century site) seems incompatible with an absence of structural features, a distribution map shows a number of architectural concentrations. Clearly there is at least one structure at Site F, perhaps incorporating the patches of brick noted during both testing projects that have occurred here (Figure 70).

But even allowing the presence of a structure or structures on Site F, the site’s function remains clearly non-domestic. Open pits within the site were filled with ash, but devoid of the kitchen debris that inevitably invades such spaces on heavily occupied sites. Moreover, the artifact assemblage shows a striking lack of ceramics—a heavily represented category on most domestic sites—and an unusual number of tobacco pipes.

The Group II sites, then, seem to demonstrate the beginnings of a dispersal of both domestic units and activity areas from within the settlement’s core, where they were established during the Wolstenholme Towne period, to the less confining surrounding territory. While the motivation behind this move is not recoverable archaeologically, it was undoubtedly related to the allure of tobacco and a recognition of its vast appetite for land. Manufacturing or specialized activities,
such as appear to be represented on Site F, may have been pushed onto lands already spent by tobacco—in this particular case, to the periphery of the earlier Site G. Alternatively, Site F may simply be located so as to obtain a resource most readily available at the head of Grice’s Run.

In addition to dispersal, the Group II sites also demonstrate a degree of diversity that seemed less prevalent in the earlier periods. The difference between a Site B and a CG-8 is striking, and serves as a reminder that while tobacco lured small planters with the promise of riches, it may not have delivered consistently. There were undoubtedly successful planters and those who failed, and in between, a large group who, like the occupants of CG-8, got by.

Finally, the locations of the Group II sites provide additional evidence that may be helpful in establishing a chronology for the settlement of Martin’s Hundred. Comparing the period maps for Groups I and II leads one to the conclusion that settlement proceeded from the southeast to the northwest. What this pattern may be arguing, however, is that at least two of the first period sites (CG-2 and CG-11) were still occupied at the time that Group II was established, and that these properties were therefore unavailable.

The possibility that Groups I and II overlapped, or even co-existed, calls attention to one of the few pieces of historical documentation available for Martin’s Hundred. The Muster of 1624/25 shows that by that time seven households had returned to this particular plantation. One of those who the Muster names is Company administrator, William Harwood, conspicuous both on paper and in the ground (Site A) by the three houses listed among his possessions. If one of the Group II sites can be attributed to the mid-1620s, then it is certainly plausible that Groups I and II are both described within the body of that muster.

Finally, with the chronological distinctions between Groups I and II still somewhat clouded, it seems appropriate to discuss the demise of this early venture.
as a single event. There are a number of possible explanations for the abandonment of the initial resettlement. With 21,500 acres on which to plant, and with the perceived threat of Indian attack diminished through the construction of a trans-peninsula palisade in 1634, it is possible that settlers chose to disperse. More likely, however, is the possibility that they had become economically encumbered by falling tobacco prices. From a high of 3 shillings a pound during the early 1620s, tobacco fell to a penny a pound in 1630. Repeated attempts to revive the market through planting restrictions occupied much of the 1630’s and early 1640’s, until in 1642 when the crop would bring only 2.4 pence per pound, planters were forced to recognize the end of the boom (Morgan 1975: 134-5).

Group III

While the distinctions between Groups I and II may be elusive, there can be no doubt that the final group, Group III, represents a very different and easily distinguished experience. Group III is comprised of CG-10, a domestic site whose thrice-repaired postholes suggest long occupation, and Site J, identified by Noël Hume in 1979 when road construction sliced through a late-seventeenth century trash pit. While Site J has not been tested adequately to make it comparable to other aspects of this investigation, its location is important to a discussion of changing land use on the Locust Grove Tract (Figure 71).

![Figure 71. Group III sites.](image-url)
Period maps for Group I and II depict a very clustered community at Martin’s Hundred during the years preceding 1650. In contrast, the plotted locations of Sites J and CG-10, occupied some 30 years later, clearly illustrate that landholdings were being consolidated into larger, and presumably more stable plantations.

While the sizes of these resulting farmsteads cannot be directly inferred from the acres that separate them, artifact distributions present a strong case for greater site complexity. Figure 72, illustrating the distribution of architectural debris on site CG-10, shows multiple “peaks” suggesting that the site included a number of outbuildings in addition to the main structure. How many of these dwellings were identified during the testing process is still unclear, as the postholes may be connected in a variety of ways, or conversely, may not connect at all. Only one straight-sided feature in the ravine—presumably a springhouse—can be positively identified as a structure separate from the main dwelling.

Additional evidence for a more complex site is presented through the ratio of identified features to test units excavated. The excavation of twenty-eight test units on site CG-10 revealed five structural postholes and the springhouse trash deposit, for a ratio of one feature for every 4.66 units excavated. Similar ratios from other seventeenth-century sites range from 1:12.6 for sites CG-11 and Site F, to 1:40 for CG-8. As the excavators and testing interval remained unchanged throughout the project, the only reasonable conclusion is that site CG-10 encompassed more activity, particularly in the form of construction, than the other sites.

The household assemblage from CG-10, though not as widely dispersed as the architectural debris, also suggests the possibility of multiple trash pits, consistent with a large site (Figure 73). More importantly, the composition of this assemblage, and that recovered from the Site J trash pit, was significantly different than the

Figure 72. CG-10: Distribution of Architectural artifacts.
composition of similar assemblages from Groups I and II. Perhaps the most obvious
difference was the large number of datable artifacts retrieved from Group III.
Whereas the dating of Groups I and II has been limited to the “pre-1650”
designation assigned to sites without wine bottle glass, Sites CG-10 and J yielded
tinned-brass spoons, identifiable shapes and patterns of delftware and other
ceramics, coins, and pipebowls with easily attributed makers-marks.

In effect what is being noted is not the datability of artifacts (which inevitably
becomes simpler as one approaches the present), but a variety which was clearly
lacking in the Group I and II assemblages. Not only were essential items present
on Sites J and CG-10—utensils to eat with, materials from which to construct
houses—but non-roofing tiles, and possible gaming pieces. The occupants of the
Group III sites simply had more than their predecessors.

One question that begs asking is whether this relative affluence is related to a
greater availability of material goods, or to the actual success of CG-10’s occupant.
Both factors undoubtedly contributed to the relative ease represented on the site.
Though the selection of material goods from which to choose in 1680 was clearly
greater that it was in 1640, the willingness to purchase those items reflects a sense
of security not evident on earlier sites.

Historians have pointed out that it was when the hope of instant riches through
tobacco was dashed that planters finally began to provide for themselves. Corn
was planted and livestock tended as part of an agricultural effort that was both
more diversified and more sustained. One suspects that CG-10 represents such a
settlement. Its occupants, while not immediately identifiable as members of the
“planter elite”—the Carter Burwells who in 1700 would consolidate the Locust

Figure 73. CG-10: Distribution of Household artifacts.
Grove Tract and surrounding areas under a single owner—were certainly the forerunners of that society.
Chapter 9.
Directions for Future Research

Excavation of the nine recommended sites on the Carter’s Grove Locust Grove Tract provides an opportunity to examine two very poorly understood periods of cultural history: the Middle Woodland Period (500 B.C.-900 A.D.), and the second through the fourth quarters of the seventeenth century. The Middle Woodland Period, a period that saw increasing sedentism on the part of migratory bands, is marked by the development of ceramic technology, and by the exploitation of shellfish. Clearly this latter development intensified ties to large bodies of water like the James, yet there have been no comprehensive settlement studies for this region to investigate the subtleties of this pattern.

The absence of settlement studies for the Peninsula suggests that adequate information has not been gathered to date, and to this extent, the Locust Grove Tract Survey has contributed simply by locating and identifying Woodland Period resources at CG-9, CG-19 and Sites F and G. More detailed information is known to exist on these sites, however, around hearths, in shell middens, and in scatters of pottery and lithic artifacts. Recovery and examination of Woodland Period pottery, particularly from Sites F and G where concentrations are dense, can aid in current efforts to define spatial and temporal boundaries for local ceramic traditions (Hunter 1987).

Dietary information can be gathered from the hearth or roasting pit (CG-9, CG-19), and from the shell middens (CG-19). The presence in these features of animal bone (preserved in contexts containing shell) contributes significantly to an understanding of those resources exploited by local aboriginal populations. Additionally, analysis of the bone and fossilized seeds from CG-9 and CG-19 has the potential to suggest the season and duration of each occupation.

Charcoal samples recovered from features on any of the Middle Woodland Period sites may be radiocarbon dated in order to better place these occupations chronologically. Used in conjunction with the dietary and ceramic information, C-14 dates may result in a better understanding of the events and developments of the Middle Woodland Period in a local context.

Finally, the question of curation—the care and reuse of stone tools—is an important issue, given the peninsula’s lack of any natural source of stone. Were “exotic” materials, those materials obtained from sources further west, treated differently than the inferior river cobbles fished from ravines close by? Were they more likely to be reused? And perhaps most importantly, how is an “exotic” to be defined in an area where all available stone has been transported from other locations? Attempts to identify sources through which to reconstruct trade networks are fruitless without a sense of the range and variety of material that might be deposited for local use.
Seventeenth-Century Sites

Like prehistoric sites on the Locust Grove Tract, the seventeenth-century occupations have the potential to answer broad historical questions, or more narrowly-focussed, site-specific problems. In a wider conception of colonial history, the period to which these sites speak—the second quarter of the seventeenth century—has always been something of a “black hole.” What scant evidence informed historians of the goings on within Virginia Company settlements and particular plantations ends abruptly with the dissolution of these bodies in 1624. Until the formation of counties and parishes in 1634, and more accurately, until these governing bodies began to keep consistent records around 1650 or 1660, there is little documentary evidence through which to explore the development of the colony.

Unfortunately, though perhaps predictably, the developments of this unknown period set the course for Virginia history. Prior to 1625, settlements along the James were nucleated and fortified against the threat of Spanish or Indian attack. By 1660, aided by the tobacco boom, the distinctive dispersed plantation economy that would characterize the Chesapeake for the next 200 years was firmly established. The rise of this dispersed plantation economy, currently under investigation by Colonial Williamsburg historian Lorena Walsh (Walsh, in prep), depends heavily on archaeological evidence, and further study of the Locust Grove Tract sites will contribute significantly to an understanding of when and how this settlement pattern evolved.

Architectural traditions were also transformed during the second quarter of the seventeenth century. Early settlement, as seen at Wolstenholme Towne, encompassed a wide range of building techniques reflecting adaptation to new materials and conditions. Earthfast construction was one specific development. The use of wooden shingles (in place of thatch) was another. By 1660, colonial builders had sorted the available options into those that did and did not work in their new environment, and had emerged with the rudiments of the “Virginia house” form. Though still earthfast, this structure had a regular bay system, based on four or five foot clapboards, that would endure throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Excavation of structures on sites CG-2, CG-8, CG-11 and Site G, and comparison of these dwellings with earlier (1619) and later (1680s) structures at Wolstenholme Towne and CG-10 has the potential to chronologically define this evolution.

The dietary habits of early colonists were undoubtedly transformed much as architectural traditions were—by the availability of new resources, and by the lack of those more familiar. Historical documentation attests to the fact that corn was the staple of a rather meager diet enjoyed by early Virginians, and that meat was a rarity, particularly while efforts were underway to increase the population of domestic livestock. While foodways research has assumed a steady increase in the consumption of domesticated animals in the colonies, this pattern has not been tested and verified archaeologically. Comparison of the faunal assemblage from Wolstenholme Towne, (analyzed by Stanley Olsen), with assemblages retrieved from mid-century sites (CG-2, CG-8, CG-11 or Site G), and a later seventeenth-century site (CG-10) may help to define the role of domesticated animals in the
diet of early colonists. Furthermore, this comparison can be used to explore effects of the Indian uprising on food procurement.

The economic system under which colonists were operating in the 1630s was also undergoing tremendous change. Recovered artifacts should be analyzed with an eye towards identifying locally produced goods. This type of analysis should provide details about the economic system used by these early colonists and the degree of their dependence on the homeland for basic necessities by the 1630s. Site F, once its “special-use” has been identified, may prove useful in investigating early manufacturing ventures.

In addition to broad historical questions, the seventeenth-century sites on the Locust Grove Tract may provide answers to specific questions regarding the fate of Martin’s Hundred. Some of these questions have been alluded to in the text above. It is important, for example, that the temporal relationship between Groups I and II be clarified so that we know whether these six sites could be among the seven households enumerated in the Muster of 1624/5. Noël Hume has used this muster to link the known occupants of Martin’s Hundred with particular archaeological sites (A and B), using similarities between the character of the artifacts and the inventory that accompanied the muster. It may be possible to continue this exercise based on excavated evidence from the Locust Grove Tract sites.
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Appendix 1.
1624 Muster

The census for Martin’s Hundred, taken in February of 1624/25, shows seven “extended” households as existing at the settlement. Included in the muster were:

mr William Harwood came in the Francis Bonaventure
SERVANTS
Hugh Hughs came in the Guifte.
Ann his wife — came in the Abigall.
Thomas Doughtie aged 26 — came in the Abigall.
John Hasley aged 22 yeres — came in the Abigall.
Samuell Weaver 20 in the Bony bess
Elizabeth Bygrave 12 came in the Warwick.

Their possessions included:
- Corne, 10 barrells; Fish, 12 hundred; Powder, 60 lb; Peeces fixt. 10;
- Machcocks, 25 and 10 lbs of match.; Peece of Ordnance, 1 wth all things thereto belonging; Shott. 300 lb; Armours, 8; Coats of Male, 10; Coats of Steele, 3 and 20 swords; Neat Cattell, 10 belonging to the Hundred; Houses, 3; Boat, 1.

Ellis Emerson came in the George in 1623.
Ann his wife came in the George in 1623.
Thomas his son aged 11 came in the George in 1623.
SERVANTS
Thomas Goulding aged 26 yeres came in the George in 1623.
Martin Slatier aged 20 cam fro Canada in the Swan in 1624

Their possessions included:
- Corne, 6 barrells; Fish, 3½ hundred; Powder. 12 lb; Shott, 30 lb; Peeces fixt, 1;
- Matchcock, 1; Armor, 1 and 4 headps; Coats of Male, 2; Cate of Steele, 1;
- Swords, 2; Swine, 2; House 1.

Robert Addams came in the Bona Nova
Augustine Leak came in the Bona Nova
Winifred Leak his wife came in the George in 1623.
SERVANTS
Richard Smith aged 24 yeres came in the George 1623

Their possessions included:
- Corne, 3 barrells; Fish, 11 hundred; Powder, 6 lb; Shott, 5 lb; Peeces fixt, 6;
- Armor, 1; Coat of plate, 1; Swords,2; Poggs, 2; Houses, 2; Boat, 1.
Stephen Barker came in the *James*
Humphrey Walden in the *Warwick*

Their possessions included:
Corne, 4 Barrells; Fish, 3½ hundred; Powder, 3 lb; Shott 5 lb; Peeces fixt, 2; Swords, 2

John Jackson came in the *Warwick*
Ann his wife came in the *Warwick*
A Child aged 20 weeks

**SERVANTS**

Thomas Ward aged 47 yeres came in the *Warwick*
John Steephens 35 yeres came in the *Warwick*

Their possessions included:
Corne 1½ barrell; Fish, 800; Powder, 2 lb; Shott, 6 lb; Peeces fixt, 4;
Armours, 3; Coate of Male, 1; Swords, 3; Houses, 1

Samuel March came in the *William & Thomas.*
Collice his wife in the *Ann* in 1623
Samuel Culley came in the *London Marchamt*

Their possessions included:
Corne 5 barrells; Fish, 5 hundred; Powder, 1 lb; Shott, 20 lb; Peeces fixt, 3;
Armours, 1; Swords, 2

Robert Scotchmore and his Company now planted here are reckoned before in the Maine

**DEAD at Martins Hundred this yeare**

Alice Emerson  a girl
Robert    a boy of Mr Emarsons
         a girl of John Jacksons
         a Child of Samuell March.