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Introduction

In July 2002, the Department of Archaeological Research (D.A.R.) presented a summary of work done by the department between 1982 and 2002, along with a research prospectus for future work. This presented was structured using the research themes identified by the department in the early 1990s (printed in the first section of this collection), and each theme was assigned to a committee of three or four D.A.R. senior staff. This collection comprises these research summaries.

The ultimate purpose of the exercise was to take stock of archaeology’s accomplishments at Colonial Williamsburg, and to re-evaluate the work that the department has been (and is still) undertaking.

Archaeology is one of the most ancient activities at Colonial Williamsburg, having been commenced over 70 years ago with work by Prentice Duell and others at the Governor’s Palace. Virtually every reconstruction in Williamsburg was accompanied by “cross-trenching” of the property, and the architectural remains found during cross-trenching guided the placement and design of the reconstructed buildings. The arrival of British archaeologist Ivor Noël Hume in the mid-1950s led to the development of one of America’s first and most renowned programs in the emerging discipline of “historical archaeology.”

This collection largely focuses on work accomplished since 1982, after Mr. Noël Hume’s retirement, when the department’s work was continued by new director Marley R. Brown III. But the summaries provided herein discuss the pre-1982 work at length as well, and provide pointers to the numerous reports, papers, and publications that describe that work in detail.

Each summary is the product of a core committee, members of which are listed below by research topic or theme. Note that the summaries for three of the themes—Comparative Colonialism, Public Education, and Methods and Tools—are not currently completed and thus are not included in this collection. A future edition will incorporate them as well.
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Basic Research Plan
of the Department of
Archaeological Research
Beginning in 1982, the Department of Archaeological Research has undertaken a series of excavations, artifact studies, and research projects that have been both diverse in scope and oftentimes intense in detail. In planning for our future projects, it was felt that an integrated research plan would provide a basic framework for the cohesive and effective use of increasingly-scarce financial and human resources. This research design, based on an earlier research design produced in 1991, is meant to provide a general outline of the Department’s primary research interests, and to suggest those sites, collections, or bodies of material that the D.A.R. intends to study.

As with our sister departments of Historical Research and Architectural Research, the D.A.R.’s primary mission is the study of Williamsburg and the surrounding area, particularly during the colonial period. Like those other departments, however, we have determined that a much broader scope is often necessary, if only to see general patterns and trends that would otherwise go unnoticed. Thus the D.A.R. has been involved in archaeological excavations of seventeenth-century Hampton and eighteenth-century Bermuda and Barbados, studies of farm account books and faunal collections from eighteenth-and nineteenth-century New England, and research into eighteenth- and nineteenth-century merchant’s and potter’s records. In the context of resource protection planning, we have gathered and synthesized archaeological and architectural information from modern James City and York Counties, as well as Williamsburg. At the other end of the spectrum, however, we have also obtained important new data from something as seemingly insignificant as monitoring the installation of utility lines.

In the past 20 years, the D.A.R. has performed a number of major excavations and many significant research projects. Less traditionally focused research has accompanied service-related projects in response to an immediate threat to the archaeological record, from the laying of a telephone line to the grading and mechanical excavation of an entire lot.

While many of these projects involved very specific research questions, the work of the D.A.R. has contributed to a primary goal shared in large part with the rest of the Research Division: the study of material life in Williamsburg.
Overall Purpose

Williamsburg is an almost perfect site for a comprehensive, detailed study of material life in the late seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. For many years the Departments of Historical Research, Archaeological Research, and Architectural Research have built up an impressive number of detailed studies of specific properties. The Department of Architectural Research has undertaken tree-ring dating and paint analysis of a large proportion of the remaining colonial buildings in the town. The York County Project, a multi-year data gathering and analysis effort of the Department of Historical Research, has produced a powerful computerized database for the written historical record of York County. G-Sys, a geographic information system written by English archaeologist Dominic Powlesland, has been used by the Department of Archaeological Research to integrate archaeological data, maps, and historical information into a series of easily-generated computer plots and overlays.

In many ways, however, Williamsburg is very unlike many areas of colonial settlement. For 81 years, between 1699 and 1780, it was capital of the largest of the English colonies. But like most Virginia “towns,” it was never really urban in the sense of Boston, Philadelphia, New York, or Charleston. It was much smaller, with a population of only about 2000 (half of them black) in 1775. There was little occupational or neighborhood specialization. It functioned, in many ways, as a service center for local rural areas as well as a meeting place twice a year for the wealthy planters who arrived for the sessions of the Burgesses and the General Court.

Archaeology can play an important role in understanding the town. Among its most useful functions is in the comparative study of differentiation through time—how the town grew and diversified, how the landscape was altered and structured to serve particular needs, how a variety of very different individuals lived and interacted in relatively confined part of the world. It can study the physical development of neighborhoods and sectors, differences between the commercial core and the peripheral areas, and the growth of markets, stores, and commercial functions. Through its ability to view the residue of daily life, it can point out environmental changes associated with increased urbanism, as well as the ways in which life was being lived at various times by various types of people.

An important aspect of our work, of course, is concerned not only with traditional scholarly research, but with interaction with our visitors. To many if not most of the public, archaeology is exotic, exciting, and certainly attention-grabbing. Exhibition digs in the Historic Area regularly draw large crowds of enraptured visitors, and we have the opportunity to directly convey history in a way that many of our colleagues are, unfortunately, unable to match. The results of archaeological work are communicated in other ways as well, either through books and pamphlets or through the training of interpreters and visitor aides in our educational program.
Research Themes

This research design is divided into a set of overriding research “themes” that have guided our work in the past, and will continue to do so in the future. These differ somewhat from the more general themes proposed in Colonial Williamsburg’s 1985 research master plan, “Teaching History at Colonial Williamsburg,” and the updated “storylines” recently produced as part of the 1990s updating of the master plan, “Becoming Americans.” This is not because archaeology does not fit into this scheme, but because these more specific topical areas recognize the fact that archaeology, as the study of what is largely the material world, cannot address certain issues as effectively as, say, documentary research. Its strengths, on the other hand, are in looking at data that no documentary historian could otherwise ever discover, and in allowing a weaving together of the material and written records.

We feel that the ten major themes or interests that archaeology at Colonial Williamsburg can most effectively address are: (1) spatial patterns and the creation of the urban environment, (2) environmental archaeology, (3) foodways, (4) material life, (5) African American archaeology, (6) industry and economics, (7) comparative colonialism, (8) 17th-century settlement and lifeways, (9) public education, and (10) methods and tools.

Running parallel to these specific topical areas, however, are two overlying concerns: the process of town development, and the fair and complete representation of all social, economic, political, ethnic, and racial segments of the community. These factors are considered most heavily in decisions about where we dig or what we study; physical location and time period are important, as they relate to the sequence of the town’s development, and the status of the site’s occupants plays a major role in the type of research questions that can be asked. Although questions about wealthy planters, merchants, and lawyers are by no means exhausted, the primary focus groups in the future will probably be slaves, poor white tenants, craftsmen, itinerant merchants and seamen, and others whom archaeology (and traditional history) has neglected in the past.

Theme 1: Spatial Patterns and the Urban Environment

The study of spatial patterning, both on an intersite and an intrasite level, has been a major research focus of the Department of Archaeological Research since 1982. Patterns in the physical distribution of artifacts and features provide information about such diverse areas as physical growth, landscape reconstitution, urban-rural contrasts, the arrangement of social vs. work space, social and economic clustering, the formation of vastly differing sub-communities in the central portion of the town and on the outskirts (what historical geographers term the “core-periphery” model), and topographic reconstruction.

Excavation in the D.A.R. is oriented toward the maximal recovery of spatial information in the field. A computerized field inventory system, utilizing a laser theodolite for data capture and the G-Sys software program, developed by English archaeologist Dominic Powlesland, allows the spatial coordinates of each feature and object to be efficiently collected and integrated with other archaeological data. Likewise, analytic techniques in
the laboratory are largely focused on discrete features or clusters of features which can be broken down both temporally and spatially.

Excavation and research projects have been, and will continue to be, aimed at studying every sector of the community, from the “business district” on Duke of Gloucester Street near the Capitol, to the “urban plantations” in the northwestern and southwestern parts of the town, to the service-oriented sub-communities around College and Capitol Landings. The increasing elaboration and diversification of the town, from its founding in 1699 through the relocation of the capital in 1780 and beyond, is seen on various sites and in various areas. The stages leading up to the founding of the town itself, from an earlier settlement called Middle Plantation, can be viewed from the five to ten known mid-to late seventeenth-century sites in and around the Historic Area.

Spatial variation is just as important in terms of each family’s structuring of its own local environment. Architectural historians have viewed the social implications of variations in house plans (Neiman 1980; Wenger 1986), and some archaeologists and social historians have suggested that formal gardens can be seen as reflections of philosophy and world view (Leone 1984). On many sites we can see, in addition, changes in the use of space relating to occupational needs, household growth, shifts in economic or political fortunes, and natural variation through each family’s “life course.”

**Theme 2: Environmental Archaeology**

Environmental archaeology is “directed toward understanding the dynamic relationship between humans and the ecological systems in which they live” (Reitz et al. 1996: 3). Possibly one of the fastest-growing subdisciplines of archaeology, it is

With the help of D.A.R. archaeologists and research fellows Lisa Kealhofer, Steve Archer, and Joanne Bowen, a detailed program of environmental sampling has been instituted as an integral part of all major excavation projects. Phytolith and pollen analysis, parasitological studies, and intense flotation sampling have become relatively common on sites such as the St. George Tucker garden, Rich Neck Plantation, the Brush-Everard site, and site CG-10 at Carter’s Grove.

**Theme 3: Foodways**

The study of foodways, as defined by Jay Anderson (1971) and Jack Goody (1977), focuses on all aspects of food, including production, systems of procurement and distribution, methods of preparation, and customs surrounding its consumption. Since food-related objects are the most common of all artifacts found in archaeological sites, and the actual remains of food commonly survive and are recovered during excavation, much of our on-going archaeological research is food-related.

Bones, seeds, phytoliths, and other organic remains speak to the actual diet, nutrition, and health of the colonial Virginians. They also can contribute information regarding the production of foods, agriculture, animal husbandry, and gardening. Finally, they provide evidence on the consumption of all food-related material culture, particularly differences among different classes and ethnic groups.
Animal bone provides information on perhaps the widest range of topics. Aside from the more obvious evidence on diet and seasonality, from osteological measurements faunal remains can provide crucial evidence on the development of local domesticates and introduction of refined breeds into the New World. From age data we can reconstruct husbandry practices, urban household procurement practices, and the development of Williamsburg’s market. From butchering evidence, we can offer evidence on the preparation of meats, and cuts of meat commonly consumed by different classes and ethnic groups.

Other data sources are equally valuable. Artifacts, particularly ceramics, can provide evidence of preparation techniques, meal organization, and the ceremonial aspects of dining. Excavation of garden features and the reconstitution of the former landscape, along with seed, pollen, and phytolith studies, provides information on the production and consumption of plants.

Theme 4: Material Life

In its broadest definition, “material life” could include any part of the physical world that is altered by humans. The term will be used here, however, as a shorthand for examining the physical world of men and women—the daily round, usually in a family unit, in the pursuit of food, shelter, and clothing—as contrasted to larger realms such as government and philosophy.

Archaeology is especially suited to study various aspects of material life. It is, after all, no less than the study of the physical record of human existence. Historical archaeologists in particular have been instrumental in our understanding of life in the three hundred and fifty years of the European presence in the New World. Because we directly recover a physical world that is not well represented in the written record, we are able to bring fresh and important evidence to questions of material life.

The study of material life has also recently moved to the forefront of several other academic disciplines, including economic and social history. While each has differing agendas, both specialties are interested in the standard of living in various times and cultures. Through their work (Isaac 1983; Carr and Walsh 1988, n.d.), we now have an outline of a massive change in the modern era in the way that people constructed and thought about the material world that surrounded them. There seems to have been some kind of transformation in the presence, usage, and meanings of material goods in the lives of average men and women sometime in the early modern era. But scholars are currently arguing about the cause, scope, and timing of this so-called “consumer revolution” and how it related to other major economic, social, and structural changes in Western civilization.

The particular questions that archaeology can answer are varied. They include investigations of standard of living or lifestyle, consumer behavior, urban/rural contrasts, social and economic development of the community, and the “creolization” of society in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.
Theme 5: African American Archaeology

The growing popularity of African-American archaeology is due, in large part, on its very explicit concern with the connections between slave life and current concerns with racism, ethnicity, and multiculturism. D.A.R. archaeologists Maria Franklin, Ywone Edwards-Ingram, and Anna Agbe-Davies, among others (including former D.A.R. staff archaeologist Patricia Samford), have focused much of their work on studying this important component of modern historical archaeology.

In the early 1970s, Dr. William Kelso (now head of the Jamestown Rediscovery project), working under the direction of then-CW archaeologist Ivor Noel Hume, uncovered a mid-18th-century slave quarter on Carter’s Grove Plantation, one of the first such discoveries in the Chesapeake. After many years of careful research, this slave quarter has now been carefully reconstructed and is widely regarded as one of the most successful interpretive sites in the country.

More recently, an 18th-century slave quarter on Rich Neck plantation was excavated and used as the subject of Maria Franklin’s doctoral dissertation. Most significantly, this excavation proceeded with one of the most comprehensive programs of environmental sampling yet undertaken, resulting in an almost-unparalleled assemblage of faunal remains, seeds, and microbotanical remains. This fabulous opportunity to investigate slave foodways complements other work, at the Rich Neck Slave Quarter, the Palace Lands Quarter, and elsewhere, to understand other aspects of slave life.

Staff archaeologist Ywone Edwards-Ingram has concentrated much of her recent energy into investigating medicinal practices and their relation to African-American material culture. D.A.R. archaeologists have recently been invited to participate in a major study of material culture, the Digital Archaeological Archive of Chesapeake Slavery (DAACS), developed by Monticello archaeologists under the direction of Fraser Neiman for the Mellon Foundation.

Theme 6: Industry and Economics

Archaeologists are uniquely able to study aspects of the work of ordinary craftsmen that will never be fully visible in the written record. The tools which were used, the waste products and defective discards, even the workplace itself can be studied in detail. Account books, important as they are, show comparatively little of the multitude of activities that were taking place. Further, archaeology can provide information about the domestic life of the craftsperson and his or her family - what they ate, how they lived, how (or if) they divided spaces for work and socializing, the quality of their personal possessions.

We can also view, through time, the evolution of particular specialties. The rise of an industrial activity, such as blacksmithing, can best be studied by comparisons between related sites. The layout, size, and products of the John Draper forge, for instance, can be compared with the similar but larger forges behind the James Anderson House. Other Williamsburg craft activities, such as furniture making, founding, and gunsmithing, which have been investigated in past archaeological excavations, could be re-interpreted in light of more recent work.
Getting at economic life is a little less straightforward. Using tools such as Miller’s ceramic price index, however, it is possible to evaluate the cost of excavated sets of personal possessions. Consumer choice can be studied by contrasting archaeological assemblages with the known range of goods available in Williamsburg. Relative economic position, on a gross scale, can be understood by looking at the variety of table- and teawares, the cuts of meat being served, clothing and personal items, and the architectural elaboration of homes and outbuildings.

**Theme 7: Comparative Colonialism**

In order to understand the development of Williamsburg in the specific context of Virginia’s colonial history, it has become clear that historians and archaeologists need to look at other possible developmental trajectories, and that in order to do that it is necessary to look at other colonial histories. The D.A.R. has been fortunate enough to work closely with colleagues in Bermuda, Barbados, and elsewhere in a collaborative environment that has provided not only important comparative data, but also valuable assistance for these agencies as they build their own programs of research in the future.

The Bermuda National Trust and the Bermuda Maritime Museum have been extraordinarily helpful in developing an on-going program of research in Bermuda, highlighted by excavations at the President Henry Tucker House, Springfield, and Hogs Bay.

Recent work has expanded to the island of Barbados, where in 1999 archaeologists and architectural historians from Colonial Williamsburg joined the Barbados National Trust to investigate the Bush Hill House.

Several D.A.R. archaeologists, most notably Director Marley Brown and Curator of Zooarchaeology Joanne Bowen, have long-standing roots in New England, and considerable parts of their research have focused upon the differences between English colonialism in New England and the Chesapeake.

More recent interests in the development of ethnic identity have led D.A.R. research fellow Audrey Horning to a wide-ranging investigation of the social history of inhabitants of a portion of “Appalachia” in Shenandoah National Park in the western Virginia Blue Ridge Mountains. Though much of this work is concentrated on the late 19th- and 20th-century history of the families displaced by the creation of the Park in 1933, the history of many of these families extends back to the 18th-century colonization of the area by clans such as the Nicholsons, relatives of which were Williamsburg inhabitants. Dr. Horning’s current research also includes investigations in northern Ireland, a very different and potentially enlightening case of English colonialism.

**Theme 8: 17th Century Settlement and Lifeways**

Williamsburg is located at the very core of 17th-century Virginia. Within 20 minutes you can be standing on Jamestown Island, the first permanent English settlement in America, or at one of the two most important early Virginia plantations, Mulberry Island and Martin’s Hundred. Williamsburg itself is a city created at the tail end of the 1600s that had its
beginning in a much older community called Middle Plantation. Colonial Williamsburg’s archaeological research program has included work at all of these locations and has contributed greatly to the understanding of this country’s early English roots.

**Jamestown:** Early in the 1990s, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and the National Park Service entered into a cooperative agreement to assess the archaeological work done at Jamestown during the 1930s and 1950s, rethink its history and architecture, study its environmental history, and discover new archaeological sites. Information gathered and analyzed through this multidisciplinary approach will be used by the Park Service to deliver a more compelling interpretation of Virginia’s first capital as its 400th anniversary approaches.

**Middle Plantation:** As Jamestown was struggling to get established as Virginia’s capital, another settlement was evolving in the area that was to become Williamsburg. Started in 1634 as a clustering of farms around a palisade stretching across the peninsula, by 1676 Middle Plantation had become important enough for Nathaniel Bacon to use it as a locus to launch his famous rebellion. In 1693, the second oldest college in English America, the College of William & Mary, was established at Middle Plantation. Virtually all traces of the town, except the College, were wiped out when the City of Williamsburg was superimposed over it beginning in 1699. Archaeological and construction excavations over the past 70 years have produced many clues about what the “town before the town” may have looked like, and excavations by Colonial Williamsburg archaeologists at Port Anne, Bruton Parish Church, the Page House, Rich Neck Plantation, and a house in Nassau Street have been specifically aimed at understanding the ghost of the settlement better.

**Martin’s Hundred:** One of several commercial ventures promoted by English businessmen and encouraged by King James, Martin’s Hundred was established in 1619 on the north side of the James River only a few miles east of Jamestown. Although the little settlement suffered dearly in the Indian Uprising of 1622, it was shortly repopulated, becoming a group of small farms during the mid 17th century. Retired Foundation Archaeologist Ivor Noël Hume made Martin’s Hundred famous through his National Geographic-sponsored excavations in the 1970s that culminated in his book, *Martin’s Hundred*. Further excavations and historical research done by Colonial Williamsburg archaeologists over the past two decades have resulted in our being able to characterize the mid-century community that developed at Martin’s Hundred after the uprising. Even as late as 2002, a field school supported by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, the University of California at Berkeley, and the College of William & Mary, continues work at a late 17th-century farmstead at site CG-10.

**Mulberry Island:** First settled in 1619, this peninsula is located a few miles downriver from Martin’s Hundred. Originally inhabited by indentured servants the area became the home of several prominent Virginians in the second half of the century including William Peirce and Miles Cary. The area is now part of Fort Eustis, a U.S. Army installation. We have just completed preliminary assessments of seven 17th-century sites, all of which were home to indentured servants or tenants. Of particular interest was an early 17th-century site (44NN70) that contained large amounts of ceramics made by the Martin’s Hundred potter.
Colonial Williamsburg’s work in these areas over the last 30 years, combined with the archaeological awakening of the Chesapeake that started, appropriately enough, in Jamestown with Jean C. Harrington and John L. Cotter, has helped researchers more accurately describe the material and social life of the 17th-century community.

**Theme 9: Public Education**

At a teaching museum such as Colonial Williamsburg, considerable attention must be paid to educational efforts aimed at engendering an appreciation for colonial history and material culture, encouraging historic preservation, and providing a reasonably broad history of the development of the town and surrounding area. Under the leadership of educational coordinator Meredith Poole, the D.A.R. undertakes a wide variety of educational programs to accomplish this end.

Participatory programs are among the most successful of these, and have included “Learning Weeks in Archaeology,” a program designing to offer interested amateurs the opportunity to join an on-going dig for one or two weeks; an annual archaeological field school offered with the College of William & Mary, which trains 30-50 potential professional archaeologists yearly; and the “Kid’s Dig” and “Camp Dirt Diggers” programs, which provide children an opportunity to excavate a realistic but artificially created “site” under the supervision of a D.A.R. archaeologist.

The department also regularly undertakes interpreter training; provides frequent lectures for Elderhostel, the Williamsburg Institute, and local historical societies; offers undergraduate and M.A. level training for students in the College of William & Mary’s History and Anthropology departments through internships and classes; and opens its laboratory and working “exhibit digs” for interpreted tours and presentations.

**Theme 10: Methods and Tools**

Finally, in support of research and analysis of archaeological sites and collections, the Department of Archaeological Research has traditionally undertaken basic research in chronologies, sampling procedures, butchering studies, economic indexes, glossaries, and the like. These studies are aimed at producing tools which will improve our ability to date contexts, identify objects, and/or understand the processes involved in the creation of an assemblage. They are thematic in the sense that the resulting products do not apply to just one site, but become tools in the analysis of all sites.

Justification for the expenditure of the time needed to produce these studies is that they will, in the long run, save the amount of time that would be spent in piecemeal research that would occur in the course of analysis over a number of years. Secondly, this type of research is often undertaken because there is a gap in the literature on a given topic.

Among the many innovative methods and tools that the D.A.R. has employed in the past are computerized geographic mapping, stratigraphic analysis using the so-called “Harris
matrix,” thermoluminescence studies of brick and coarse earthenwares, micro-constituent analysis, and various methods of remote sensing. Environmental data has been, and will continue to be, acquired in the form of pollen, phytoliths, parasites, and seeds. Zooarchaeological advances include investigations into dietary analysis based on trace elements in bone collagen and studies of eighteenth-century butchering techniques. Artifact typologies are continually being perfected, including studies of delftware, white salt glazed stoneware, creamware, transfer printed wares, and wine bottle morphology.

A second type of thematic research is meant to facilitate the comparison of archaeological assemblages with historical records. Because it takes a major expenditure of time and funds to excavate and analyze an archaeological site, we do not have the luxury of a meaningful quantity of archaeological assemblages for comparison. In addition, archaeologists rarely have assemblages that can be tightly dated to short time periods. Documentary assemblages such as merchants’ invoices and probate inventories provide an efficient way of establishing when changes took place and the relative speed with which they occurred.
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Introduction

Material Culture studies have been conducted at Colonial Williamsburg, in one form or another, since the inception of the Restoration. The architects, who were charged with the recreation of the colonial town, searched for underground evidence that would allow them to reconstruct the town to its eighteenth-century appearance. Buried in some of their Architectural Reports are rudimentary site interpretations based on the presence or absence of artifact types that suggested trade or domestic activities. In addition, James M. Knight and Herbert S. Ragland wrote Archaeological Reports in the 1930s and 1940s that focused on architectural details and material culture evidence that was encountered in the course of digging for brick foundations and structural remains. Early research into town lot ownership revealed a wealth of information about occupants of the sites, and in some instances, opened the door for more broad-based investigation of functional areas based on rudimentary artifact analysis. Artifacts encountered during these architectural excavations were kept and labeled with block and area designations and became know as the Old Study Collection (OSC). Because the architects did not record soil features or dig stratigraphically, the artifacts cannot be related to each other in a meaningful way. Nevertheless, this portion of the Foundation’s artifact collection is a valuable comparative research and teaching tool, especially when researched along with stratigraphically excavated materials acquired since 1957.

With the introduction of structured archaeological excavation techniques in 1957, a new era of material culture research began. Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume initiated an interdisciplinary approach to archaeological investigation by widening their perspective to include historical, architectural, and material culture research (including Decorative and Fine Arts) to inform their site interpretations. For the first time, artifacts were retrieved systematically, identified, labeled, researched, discussed in site reports, and curated for future comparative analysis and study. This portion of the Foundation’s artifact collection is known as the Excavation Register (E.R.) Study Collection.

Under the directorship of Marley R. Brown III, traditional material culture research continued to answer questions about the architecture and material life of Williamsburg inhabitants, but has expanded to encompass in-depth faunal, archaeobotanical research, and landscape reconstruction using state-of-the-art retrieval and analysis techniques. In addition, computer-assisted recording, documentation, and the use of analytical software, coupled with more thorough retrieval techniques in the field have made it possible to ask and answer new questions about the relationship of Williamsburg inhabitants to their environment and the material culture they possessed. The Foundation’s artifact collection acquired since 1982 is known as the Archaeological Study Collection.
Material Life

The Rise of the Consumer Society

The Industrial Revolution in England, and in the nascent United States, had significant impact on economics and consumers in the western world. Quality of life steadily improved for most free citizens and enslaved inhabitants of the modern world as a result of the increase in industrial prowess and the development of new manufacturing technologies. Traditional scholars of the Consumer Revolution believed that the ability to produce new and better goods created a market that upwardly mobile consumers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries eagerly embraced. Recently, scholars have looked at consumerism differently; they debate which came first: the ability to produce which created a market for goods and services, or the desire of a better lifestyle that encouraged technological advances and demanded manufactured goods. The debate goes on.

Archaeologists and historians, who have studied material culture from Williamsburg sites, have asked what kinds of goods did people of the past actually acquire? How, and for how long, were they used in daily life? How would the lives of these consumers been altered without these new products? Who participated in this new consumerism and who did not? Did a physical impediment, such as slavery, indentured servitude, or poverty prevent their participation or was it a conscious and unfettered decision that prompted their non-participation? What social accomplishments, such as the use of etiquette and deportment in polite society, affect consumer choice? How evenly was wealth and marketplace buying power distributed over society? How quickly did conspicuous consumption trickle down to slaves and the disenfranchised?

Answers to these, and many other questions, can be found in documentary sources. Merchants’ records tell us who bought what, and what was available in local markets. Probate inventories tell us what was present in households at specific times and how these household items were valued. Excavated artifacts that can be associated with specific households fill in the gaps left unanswered by the written records. Among other things, they show how quickly fashion and conspicuous consumption spread through a community.

Social Status and Conspicuous Display

Archaeologists consistently use excavated artifacts to compare the relative affluence of individuals, households, and neighborhoods. Due to the wealth of documentary evidence that survives about Williamsburg residents, this inquiry continues to be of scholarly interest for many material culture specialists and historians. Even a provincial town like Williamsburg could not escape the effect of increased demand for consumer goods and the spread of manufacturing capability. As a market town, seat of government, and the home of the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg attracted more than its share of “elite trades.” Prosperous merchants and skilled craftsmen catered to the needs and wants of the gentry.
Those who could afford it took advantage of the goods and services available here for entertainment, self-aggrandizement, and conspicuous display.
Material Life in Williamsburg: Linkage to the Department of Archaeological Research Design

Material Culture, as it Relates to Spatial Patterns and the Urban Environment

The study of Williamsburg urbanization has looked at the town in terms of its demographics, economy, and occupational structure. Social ranks, based on estate values and occupations, have been defined to allow meaningful comparisons among Williamsburg residents. This social ranking is an invaluable tool for archaeologists who attempt to see the material evidence they excavate within the context of the documented households and neighborhoods that produced it. As more and more households are excavated and analyzed, a more complete picture of neighborhood development becomes apparent, as does the evolution of the community.

Urban plantations, like that of John Custis, Sir John and Peyton Randolph, and Colonel John Chiswell, provide archaeologists with an opportunity to identify modifications to the landscape and work areas that are not always as apparent on more modest properties, like those of gunsmith John Brush, or farrier John Draper. The distribution of artifacts across a site provides insight into how areas were used, altered, or neglected through time. These comparisons provide insight and perspective to the study of neighborhoods and the community at large.

Material Culture and Environmental Archaeology

Much comparative work has yet to be done which will relate the material life of Williamsburg to its past environment. The identification, analysis, and interpretation of micro- and macro-botanical remains are dependent on knowing to which period or episode of occupation they belong. Identifying and dating artifacts from sealed features that provide botanical specimens accomplish this temporal association; the reconstruction of landscapes and gardens are dependent on an accurate understanding of the material culture. Certain artifact types, such as farm implements and landscaping or gardening tools, add to our understanding of how the landscape was altered. Going a step further, kitchen equipment that was used in the household to processed flora and fauna into foodstuffs are equally revealing about the material and environmental past.

Material Culture and Foodways

Zooarchaeology has played a significant role in Williamsburg site interpretation since the 1960s. The initial work, done by Dr. Stanley Olsen, consisted of rudimentary reports that simply listed the presence of recognizable animal species. More recently, the work accomplished by Dr. Joanne Bowen and her staff has made significant contributions to our understanding of Williamsburg provisioning, animal husbandry, butchering techniques, pref-
Zooarchaeology and Environmental Archaeology are closely linked with and are interdependent on Material Culture studies. Indeed, material culture studies are the cornerstone upon which all environmental analysis is based. First, since seeds, bones, and oyster shells cannot be dated, artifacts play a key role in environmental analyses. Through association with ceramics and other artifacts with known manufacturing dates, it is possible to establish deposition dates, and with this information establish any potential association with households. Second, as spelled out in the Research Review and Strategic Plan for Foodways, any analysis of foodways requires the combined systematic analysis of the actual remains of past meals with the objects that were used to produce, process, and consume foods. Ceramics, glass, and metal table wares, hot and cold beverage preparation, consumption and storage vessels, cutlery, and the full range of food preparation and storage equipment of the kitchen and dairy, helps to complete the picture of Williamsburg Foodways.

Material Culture and African-American Archaeology

African-American Archaeology seeks to find material evidence that defines the lifestyles of slaves and Free Blacks. Because slaves arrived from Africa or the Caribbean with few or no material possessions, early studies of artifacts centered on key artifact types, such as cowrie shells, which were one of the few artifact types that could be transported. Indigenous coarse earthenware, known as Colono-indian ware and Chesapeake tobacco pipes, were thought by many scholars to have been early manifestations of slave life in the Chesapeake.

More recent scholarship has moved away from interpretations dependent on specific artifact types to a “big picture” approach that sees slaves as an integral part of the population. Growing out of this approach, artifacts are now being seen within a larger social and ideological context. Modified artifacts, such as pierced coins or spoons with incised decorations resembling African cosmograms, are thought to symbolize African belief systems and superstitions. These and other artifact types have been proposed as markers to specific ethnic behavior.

In urban situations, like Williamsburg, slave assemblages dating to the eighteenth century are thus far nonexistent. Slaves and Free Blacks lived and worked in the same spaces as Caucasians and Native Americans, and used the same objects in their daily lives. In rural situations, such as on plantations where there was generally greater separation, differences in material life are more easily seen. Free Black Settlements, which have yet to be identified and excavated, will add additional information to African-American Archaeology.

Material Culture, as it Relates to Industry and Economics

The study of material life is ideally suited to provide insight into the development of industry and the evolution of economic systems. Archaeological investigation, informed by docu-
mentary research, shows us how consumers made the transformation from handcrafted one-of-a-kind objects to factory-produced goods of consistent quality. It can also indicate the speed at which consumers adopted new fashions.

As the “chicken or the egg” debate over demand-driven consumerism versus supply-driven consumerism continues, new scholarship focuses on understanding how trades and traditional crafts were affected. Scholars generally agree that mass production techniques in new factory environments had its origins in the innovative use of labor in traditional handcrafts. These innovations, aimed at improving the efficiency of handwork and consequently the availability of economical yet fashionable goods, paved the way for industrialism.

Conspicuous consumption spurred the advance of technology, which in turn, brought about the development of modern industrial production procedures. Mass production techniques, and improvements in transportation in England and her colonies, ensured a steady flow of raw materials to factories and finished goods to local and foreign markets.

Since the 1960s, Colonial Williamsburg archaeologists have excavated many sites occupied by blacksmiths, cabinetmakers, gold and silversmiths, shoemakers, saddlers, harness makers, gunsmiths, printers, bookbinders, brass founders, button makers, nail makers, tinsmiths, dispensing physicians, apothecaries, butchers, millers, carriage makers, lawyers, tailors, barber/wigmakers and tavern keepers. The town homes of the moneyed gentry and wealthy plantation owners add to the mix of society that was eighteenth-century Williamsburg.

At the James Anderson Forge Complex, archaeologists discovered evidence of diversified manufacturing and the efficient use of workspaces that previously were thought to be a product of nineteenth-century technology. At the Anthony Hay Site, strong evidence of furniture production and repair was apparent. Discarded tools and unfinished furniture parts speak to changes in technology as well as the demand for the latest fashionable furniture styles. Metallurgical activities and the practice of medical arts were found in unexpected locations, such as at Richard Charlton’s Coffeehouse. Evidence of elite dining was encountered at taverns owned by Henry Wetherburn, Jean Marot, James Shields, and Richard Charlton.

Prentis Store, Greenhow’s Store, Tarpley’s Store, Water’s (Teterel Shop) Storehouse, Holt’s Storehouse, and Archibald Blair’s warehouse are prime examples of retail outlets that served Williamsburg consumers. Indeed, most of the trade shops that served Williamsburg clients, such as the Geddy Shop, the Margaret Hunter Shop, the Carter, McKenzie and Galt Apothecaries, the Parks and Hunter Printing Shops and Bookbinderies, sold ordinary and luxury items across the counter. Theatres and subscription balls at specially equipped taverns provided a stage upon which the gentry, and aspirants to a higher social rank, paraded their affluence and social accomplishments. Merchants, dancing masters, milliners, tailors, and wigmaker/barbers provided the costumes and props that the players strutted upon the stage.
Material Culture and Comparative Colonialism

While Comparative Colonialism is a very broad field, much of the current research that is being done focuses comparisons of lifestyles as defined through material culture. Scholars investigate how geography, politics, and the widely desperate environments affected material culture and consumerism. Recent comparative work done in Bermuda and the Caribbean will offer the opportunity to see how colonial capitals and trade centers functioned.

Material Culture and Seventeenth-Century Settlement and Lifeways

Seventeenth-Century Settlement and Lifeways research is largely dependent upon an understanding of land acquisition and use, the evolution of impermanent, vernacular and permanent architecture, and the material culture remains left behind by early households. Comparative research that shows how much and from where material goods were acquired figure prominently in understanding seventeenth-century lifestyles.

The Consumer Revolution in the Chesapeake had its beginnings in the seventeenth century with the arrival of a new breed of settler on Virginia and Maryland shores. Starting in the 1650s, ambitious younger sons of the English gentry, who had little chance of inheriting wealth or position in England, appeared on the scene intent on building a new life for themselves. These new arrivals often had connections with London merchants or had been educated in England. Accustomed to a more refined lifestyle, they demanded not only a broader range of goods, but better quality to reflect and reinforce their self-perceived position in colonial society. They married into the first generation of hard-scrapple settlers, and introduced a new level of sophistication grounded in a broader worldview.

These new consumers left their mark on the landscape. Archaeological excavations and material culture studies have shown how formal living required changes in architecture. Impermanent architecture gave way to more permanent brick construction and rooms in modern homes were designed to separate people into their social ranks. The creation of private and public rooms provided control of and insulation from unsophisticated visitors. Status and power were re-affirmed through this use of architectural spaces.

Formal living required not only more rooms for specialized functions, but also the equipment to furnish them. Dining rooms, parlors, bedrooms, and hallways appeared replacing communal rooms in which entire families eat, slept, and worked. Furnishings appeared and became more plentiful as time progressed. Dining became a means of display as well as a means of re-affirmation of social standing. The master of an old-fashioned household sat at the head of his medieval-styled rectangular table while those of lesser rank sat in order of precedence on benches or backless stools. More modern, fashionable heads of households sat with his equals at round tables with everyone sitting on matching chairs and eating from individual place settings. Sets of matching dining, and serving equipment of the latest fashion bespoke the owners’ ability to entertain his peers on a grand scale.

Gardening became a pastime as well as a means to provide sustenance. The idyllic landscape of Virginia was transformed into formal, sometimes unnatural, arrangements that were pleasing to eyes that had come to carve a new life out of the wilderness. Land
was cleared of trees, which represented the wilderness, and manicured into geometric precision that bespoke the power of elites to alter and organize their environment.

**Public Education and Methods and Tools**

Public Education and Methods and Tools are predicated on an understanding of the physical evidence found in the Historic Area and its environs. The visiting public’s appreciation of Williamsburg’s history is greatly enhanced by seeing the things of the past within an accurately reconstructed venue. Decorative Arts Curators charged with furnishing exhibit buildings in the Historic Area often use archaeological evidence to establish precedence for objects put on display. Similarly, reconstructed landscapes and gardens are based on excavated evidence of planting beds, walkways, and foundations. Excavated materials frequently validate museum exhibits.

Educational programs, such as the Archaeology Lab behind-the-scenes tours are extremely popular with visitors because of the objects we can discuss and display. Visitors are continually amazed at the quantities and diversity of the material that is excavated from Williamsburg sites and the amount of information we can extract from it.
Remedial and Future Research

The impressive amount of work that has been accomplished in the past 74 years of Architectural and Archaeological Research provides a firm foundation upon which to build a more complete understanding of Williamsburg’s physical history. Architectural site reports and house histories written between 1928 and approximately 1957 contain much information that needs to be extracted and synthesized into a user-friendly digital format that can be searched and indexed. This holds equally true for the work done during the Noël Hume era. Their more detailed, object-oriented research carries even greater potential for all the research themes currently of interest to the Department of Archaeological Research. The Excavation Register Study Collection of objects that resulted from their research remains the most important research tool used by scholars; it is the centerpiece of our Collections. Despite many years of Material Culture research, there is still much to be done.

The method of operation employed by the Department of Archaeological Research in recent years (particularly since 1989) has caused a severe reduction in the amount of material culture research that has been done. Excavation projects have been under-funded, resulting in incomplete artifact analysis and curation. The reports generated by the department in recent years emphasize the field results of excavation and rarely mention artifacts except as fragments. As an internationally recognized museum dedicated to the preservation of historic resources, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation’s aim (and our departmental goals) should be much higher. Inadequate support for comprehensive material culture research and curation has left a substantial backlog of work that will not be resolved until a change occurs in our policies and procedures. Because of the lack of completion of artifact research and curation, many projects do not reach their full potential for answering questions about Williamsburg’s Material Life, Spatial Patterning/Urban Development, Foodways, Environmental and African-American Archaeology, Industry and Economics, Comparative Colonialism, Seventeenth-Century Settlements/Lifeways, or Public Education.

Site Archives

Following a much-needed shift in departmental priorities and procedures, the first step toward making intellectual links between the Material Culture of Williamsburg and our departmental research themes, is the creation of a complete site archive of the materials we have excavated stratigraphically, with particular emphasis on the materials excavated in the past 45 years. A comprehensive site archive for the sites listed in the appendix of this review includes at least the following elements: machine-readable context records, machine-readable artifact fragment inventory, oyster shell and faunal inventories, complete machine-readable objects records (crossmend records and digital imagery of specific objects), catalogs of faunal and shell identifications, digitized documentation records (field notes and drawings, slides, field photographs, digitized plan maps and profile drawings, artifact drawings/illustrations, final and/or interim reports, and conservation records. The F.T.E. estimates of staff effort mentioned throughout the appendix are based on the cre-
ation of complete archives, however, it is realized that for some of the earlier excavation projects, complete archives as defined above may not be possible due to inconsistencies in record keeping. In addition, F.T.E. estimates include time needed to catalog environmental remains (faunal, shell, macro-botanical specimens, phytoliths, etc.) and to undertake re-analysis where older materials are obviously related to recently excavated artifacts.

The appendix that follows contains lists of existing records, publications, and remedial work in addition to a brief description of the projects. The authors of this review hasten to point out that a great deal of remedial work has been already accomplished, particularly with re-housing older portions (pre-1982 material) of the collections in warehouse bulk storage and in creating partial artifact inventories for materials excavated prior to 1982. We also recognize that the list of publications is not comprehensive; there are undoubtedly more publications and papers that pertain to these projects that the authors did not have time to review and add to the lists.
Appendix

The amount of archaeological material recovered from Williamsburg sites over the past 74 years is so immense that to review all of it to determine the extent of what has been accomplished and what is yet to be done would take months of work. Instead, the authors of this research survey have chosen to focus only on major projects or subsets of artifact assemblages that have obvious merit as research projects.

Major Projects, 1928 to approximately 1957

Many of the architectural and archaeological reports written by Herbert S. Ragland, Francis Duke, Prentice Duell, James Knight, and others, refer to material culture encountered during the course of early excavations in the Historic Area. To extract this information from these numerous reports would take more time and effort than is allowed for this research review. The following reference is provided as an example.

Vaiden Property (Alexander Craig Site, Block 17, Area J)

- **Project Description:** This site, dug in 1941, yielded artifacts that were believed to be representative of wig making, harness making, and possibly tavern activity.
- **Archaeologists/Architects/Researchers:**
  - Minor Wine Thomas
  - Rutherfoord Goodwin
- **Records:** Memorandum dated August 8, 1941 to Mr. Edward Kendrew from Rutherfoord Goodwin concerning the artifacts retrieved during the digging and their potential for site interpretation.
- **Publications:** None
- **Remedial Work:**
  - Machine-readable artifact inventory
  - Machine-readable object catalog
  - Re-evaluation of artifacts
  - Site report
  - Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
  - Re-house artifacts in warehouse bulk storage

Major Projects, Approximately 1957 to 1982 (Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume)

Virginia Gazette Printing Office (1957)

- **Project Description:** This excavation was undertaken under the aegis of the Architects’ Office before the Department of Archaeology existed at the Foundation. Ivor Noël Hume excavated and recorded small
units along side cross-trenching activities. Evidence of the printing and bookbinding trades was recovered along with domestic refuse.

Archaeologists: James M. Knight
Ivor Noël Hume
Orin M. Bullock
M. B. C. Chambers

Records: Excavation Register Field Notes

Publications:

The Virginia Gazette Site, Volume I, Record of Archaeological Excavations of 1938, compiled by Orin M. Bullock, 1954, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation

The Virginia Gazette Site, Volume II, Record of Archaeological excavations of 1951-52, compiled by Orin M. Bullock, 1954, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation

The Virginia Gazette Site, Volume III, Archaeological Laboratory Report, compiled by M.B.C. Chambers, 1954, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation

Remedial Work:
- Machine-readable artifact inventory
- Machine-readable object catalog
- Detailed analysis of printer’s type and bookbinder’s tools
- Re-housing artifacts in bulk storage
- Re-housing artifacts in drawer storage
- Digitize site plans, maps, drawings, etc.

Artifacts from this early I.N.H. project are held in 18 boxes in the warehouse and 3 full drawers in the Study Collection Room. There are few field drawings and the excavation Register notes are sketchy at best. One F.T.E. cataloger could create a partial site archive in 14 weeks.

George Wythe Well and Dairy (1958-59)

Project Description: This is another early excavation that was undertaken along side cross-trenching activities before the Department of Archaeology was established at the Foundation. An early nineteenth-century well shaft was excavated, which contained domestic refuse.

Archaeologists: James M. Knight
Ivor Noël Hume

Records: Excavation Register field notes


Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable object catalog
Digitize field drawings
Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in bulk storage

There is a surprising lack of artifacts from this early I.N.H. excavation. Eight boxes are stored in the warehouse and one drawer of objects is in drawer storage. One F.T.E. cataloger can catalog this material in 3 weeks.

First Baptist Church, 1958

Project Description: Recent interest in mounting an exhibit of artifacts from the First Baptist Church has called attention to the small quantity of material retrieved from this site.

Archaeologists: Jimmy Knight
Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume

Records: Excavation Register field notes
Finds lists
Conservation records

Publications: None

Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine readable object catalog
Digitized site plans, maps, etc.
Re-house artifacts in warehouse bulk storage
Re-analyze artifacts
Write site report and/or artifact analysis report

Only 1 partially filled box of artifacts is in the warehouse. One F.T.E. cataloger can create the site archive of this site in 1 week.

Peter Scott House (1958)

Project Description: Ivor Noël Hume excavated the home of cabinetmaker, Peter Scott in 1958. Little evidence of cabinetmaking was encountered on the site; however, there was a large amount of domestic refuse that will be a valuable comparative collection for the re-analysis of the Anthony Hay and Benjamin Bucktrout assemblages.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume

Records: Excavation Register field notes
Handwritten crossmend records
Site plans, maps, etc.

Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable object catalog
Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in bulk storage
Digitize site maps, plans, etc.

The artifacts from this excavation are contained in 15 boxes in the warehouse and in 2 drawers in the Study Collection Room. One F.T.E. cataloger can create all machine-readable records and collate the paper documentation for this site in 14 weeks.

Coke-Garrett House (1958-1959)

Project Description: The home of goldsmith and tavern keeper John Coke was partially excavated by Ivor Noël Hume in 1958-59. A considerable amount of domestic refuse was retrieved along with important evidence of metallurgical work. The domestic/tavern refuse is directly comparable to Marot/Shields Tavern, Henry Wetherburn, Raleigh Tavern, Christiana Campbell’s Tavern (Anderson House) and Charlton’s Coffeehouse, while the crucibles and metallurgical waste discarded by Coke is comparable with that found at Charlton’s Coffeehouse, the Geddy Site, and the Custis site.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume
James M. Knight

Records: Excavation Register field notes
Site Plans, maps, etc.
Crucible fragments were re-analyzed with those found recently at the Charlton House, 2002, records on file.


Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable object catalog
Digitize all site maps, plans, etc.
Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
Complete re-housing artifacts in bulk storage
Re-analyze tavern-related artifacts
Re-analyze metallurgical waste and other evidence of silver/goldsmithing

Noël Hume collected 74 boxes of artifacts from the Coke-Garrett site; there are 8 full drawers of objects from this site in the Study Collection Room. All Noël Hume site records are somewhat sketchy, but 1 F.T.E. cataloger can establish a nearly complete site archive in 50 weeks.
John Coke Office, 1958

**Project Description:** Noël Hume excavated around the John Coke Office along side the architects who were digging the site prior to reconstruction of the King’s Arms Tavern.

**Archaeologists:** Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume

**Records:** Excavation Register field notes
Finds lists

**Publications:** None

**Remedial Work:** Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable object catalog
Drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in bulk warehouse storage
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.
Create site report

1 F.T.E. cataloger can catalog this small site, which yielded 11 boxes of artifacts, in 6 weeks.

Anthony Hay House, Kitchen, and Cabinetmaker’s Shop (1960 and 1966)

**Project Description:** Ivor Noël Hume dug on this site on two occasions. The first concentrated on the Hay house and kitchen foundations and the well, and the second focused on the adjacent cabinetmaker’s shop, which contained a large quantity of organic material preserved in the streambed.

**Archaeologists:** Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume

**Records:** Excavation Register field notes
Finds lists
Artifact conservation records
Site plans, maps, etc.
Significant portions of this site were inventoried and cataloged in machine-readable format during the N.E.H.-funded cataloging Grant, 1994-1996.

**Publications:**


Remedial Work: Re-analysis of leather fragments, which may relate to pre-Anthony Hay occupation
Digitize all plans, maps, and drawings, etc.
Complete re-housing artifacts in warehouse bulk storage

United States Post Office, Block 15 (1961)

Project Description: A well and house cellar dating to the mid-eighteenth century, and another cellar dating to the nineteenth century, was excavated at the site of the United States Post Office, now Season’s Café in 1961. A large amount of faunal remains suggested the presence of a professional butchery. Because all the county records for James City County were destroyed in the Civil War, no documentation survives to inform the research. The sealed features revealed a large quantity of wine bottle glass, many with bottle seals that carried the unidentified merchant’s mark, “IBK.” Subsequent nearby excavations at the Firehouse and Williamsburg Theater further support the assumption that this was the site of an early Williamsburg butchery. (See comments under Williamsburg Movie Theater below.)

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume

Records: Excavation Register field notes
Hand-written crossmend records
Hand-written finds list
Site plans, maps, etc.


Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable crossmend records
Machine-readable object catalog
Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
Complete re-housing of artifact in bulk storage
Digitize all site plans, maps, drawings, etc.

This project yielded 58 artifact boxes that are stored in the warehouse and 24 drawers full of objects in the Study Collection Room. Marley R. Brown III excavated an area nearby (Firehouse Site) in 1983 and discovered what is believed to be an important eighteenth-century butchering site. There is no fragment inventory nor object catalog for either the Noël Hume material or the Brown material. One F.T.E. cataloger will need 50 weeks to create this site archive.
Travis House (1962)

Project Description: The home of Colonel Edward Champion Travis was excavated in 1962. It was occupied before 1765 and additions to the structure were made throughout the remainder of the century. The home of a prominent Williamsburg resident and member of the House of Burgess yielded a large quantity of elite household objects that are directly comparable with contemporaneous dwellings of Sir John and Peyton Randolph, Dr. George Gilmer, and many others.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume

Records: Excavation Register field notes
         Finds Lists
         Hand-written crossmend records
         Handwritten object catalog cards for a small portion of the assemblage
         Site plans, maps, etc.

Publications:


Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
                Machine-readable crossmend records
                Machine-readable object catalog
                Complete re-housing of artifact in warehouse bulk storage
                Digitize site plans, maps, etc.
                Re-house artifacts in drawer storage

The Travis House excavation conducted by I. Noël Hume in 1962 produced a very large assemblage of artifacts. One hundred thirty seven boxes are in the warehouse and 6 full drawers of objects are in the Study Collection Room. There are a few oversized objects including a unique and nearly complete garden bell jar. Two F.T.E. catalogers can create the site archive for this large assemblage in 50 weeks.

George Reid/Captain Orr House (1963)

Project Description: The first digging on this site occurred in 1928. Following the death of life tenant, Mrs. Emma Lou Barlow in 1962, the site was investigated archaeologically in hopes of finding evidence of Captain Hugh Orr’s blacksmith shop, which was supposed to be located on the southwest corner of Duke of Gloucester Street and Colonial Street. The excavations revealed a garden and several structures, which produced a very large quantity of faunal bone and a considerable amount of third and fourth quarter eighteenth-century domestic refuse in the form of ceramics, glass,
and household metal items. Instead of a blacksmith shop, the foundations of a store were found on the corner, and additional buildings including a kitchen, smokehouse, a diary, and well.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume

Records: Excavation Register field notes
Non-quantified artifact finds list
Hand-written crossmend records
Plan map


Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable crossmend records
Machine-readable object catalog
Re-housing of artifact in bulk storage
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.

Noël Hume excavated this domestic site in 1961, which produced 63 boxes of artifacts in the warehouse and 2 full drawers of objects in the Study Collection Room. One F.T.E. cataloger can create the site archive in 50 weeks.

Mathews Manor Excavation (1964)

Project Description: Ivor Noël Hume excavated this seventeenth-century plantation site at the request of a local land developer; Mr. L. B. Weber, who had discovered artifactual evidence of an early domestic occupation in the Denbigh section of Newport News. The site was excavated on weekends with volunteer help and revealed the house site of Colonel Samuel Mathews and his son, Governor Samuel Mathews II. The site contained a brick foundation of a storey and a half or two storied mansion house, and a subsequent earth-fast structure that showed strong evidence of blacksmithing activities dating to the third and fourth quarters of the seventeenth century. The site is considered one of the most important late seventeenth-century habitations along the James River watershed.

The artifacts in drawer storage were re-housed as they were inventoried, as have the brick specimens that are stored in the warehouse bulk storage. A complete object catalog has been created in a machine-readable format which will greatly enhance the writing of the final report descriptive catalog.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume

Records: Excavation register field notes
Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable object catalog
Site plans, maps, etc.
Artifact drawings, artifact photographs (black & white)
Crossmend records
Conservation records
Documentary and artifact research notes
Genealogy of the Mathews Family (many of the early attempts at this are incorrect)
Type-written correspondence with Mr. L. B. Weber
Typed-written correspondence with scholars

Publications:

“Can We Afford to Invest in Our Past?” a lecture by Ivor Noël Hume, 1966.


Remedial Work:
Complete revisions to “History of Samuel Mathews and his Plantation…”
Complete illustrated object catalog
Publish final site report, history, and object catalog per agreement with Mr. L. B. Weber.

**Custis Garden/Kitchen Site (1964-1968)**

**Project Description:** Following demolition of Eastern State Hospital buildings on this property, this excavation explored the remains of the kitchen and portions of John Custis’ garden.

**Archaeologists:** Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume

**Records:**
- Excavation Register
- Finds Lists
- Object catalog (partial)
- Plan maps and some profile drawings
- Floral identification list from well
- Machine-readable artifact inventory of the portions of site assemblage that were not done in N.E.H. grant supported cataloging project, 1994-1996.
- Machine-readable object catalog that was not created during N.E.H. grant-supported cataloging project, 1994-1996.

**Publications:** Ivor Noël Hume discusses several items for the well in *The Wells of Williamsburg Colonial Time Capsules*, Colonial Williamsburg Archaeological Series No. 4, 1964.
Remedial Work:  
Complete final Site Report  
Re-evaluation of macro-floral remains  
Re-evaluation of Excavation Register, plan maps, profiles, etc. to determine garden layout  
Re-evaluation of ash and Clay filled pit that may relate to Peter Hardy, metalworker (1770-1780)  
Re-evaluation of Dr. McClurg (1780-1790) refuse deposits  
Digitize all plan maps, profiles, etc.  
Complete re-housing of artifacts in warehouse bulk storage.

There has been periodic interest in reconstruction of the Custis Gardens through the years. The cataloging work for this material should be given a high priority in light of the increased interest at the Foundation for landscape and garden development. This site offers many opportunities for archaeo-botanical studies in the future.

Henry Wetherburn’s Tavern (1965-1966)

Project Description:  
Excavations on this site focused on the Henry Wetherburn property, but included small portions of adjacent properties now known as the Charlton House and Tarpley’s Store. Evidence of construction phases on the tavern structure and organization of the backyard resulted from the investigation. The sequence of outbuildings, including the wells, smokehouse, dairy, kitchens, trash pits and yard sheet refuse were also revealed and discussed in the final report. Evidence of two tenement buildings on either side of the tavern was identified.

Archaeologists:  
Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume  
R. Neil Frank, Jr.  
G. Kirk

Records:  
Non-quantified artifact finds list  
Hand-written crossmend records  
Hand-written object catalog  
Machine-readable inventory of portions of the site were created during the N.E.H.-funded Cataloging Grant, 1994-1996.  
Machine-readable object catalog of portions of the site were created during the N.E.H.-funded Cataloging Grant, 1994-1996.  
Hand-written and Machine-readable crossmend records  
Site Plan maps, profiles, etc.

Publications:  
The Wetherburn Site, Block 9, Area N, Colonial Lots 20 and 21, by Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume, May, 1970.

Remedial Work: Complete re-housing of artifacts in warehouse bulk storage
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.

**Edward Charlton Site¹ and well (1966)**

Project Description: The Charlton House Site was excavated by Noël Hume as part of the Wetherburn’s Tavern project in 1965-66.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume
R. Neil Frank, Jr.
G. Kirk

Records: Excavation Register field notes
Finds Lists
Site plans, maps, etc.


*Archaeology and Wetherburn's Tavern*, Colonial Williamsburg Archaeological Series No. 3, by Ivor Noël Hume, 1969

Remedial Work: Digitalize site plans, maps, etc.
Re-analyze in light of recent excavations at this site
Re-house artifact in drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in bulk warehouse storage

There are 31 boxes of artifacts in the warehouse and 2 full drawers of domestic objects in drawer storage in the Study Collection Room that relate to this household. One F.T.E. cataloger can create the site archive for this property in 30 weeks. A generous

---

¹ The Edward Charlton House should be considered a separate excavation project from the Wetherburn Tavern Project because of the different nature of the site. It is listed here separately for remedial work planning purposes.
additional time allotment is needed to accomplish the re-analysis with material retrieved in 2002.

Tarpley's Store\(^2\), 1966

Project Description: Several excavation units were excavated on this property as part of the 1965-66 excavations on Henry Wetherburn Tavern Site. Recently the pertinent artifacts from this 1966 excavation were re-analyzed and crossmended with materials excavated in 2001; the report for this project is being written at this time.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume  
R. Neil Frank, Jr.

Records: Excavation Register field notes  
Finds lists  
Machine-readable artifact inventory for those portions re-analyzed in 2001  
Machine-readable object catalog was created for those portions re-analyzed in 2001.

Publications:  


*Archaeology and Wetherburn's Tavern*, Colonial Williamsburg Archaeological Series No. 3, by Ivor Noël Hume, 1969

Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory  
Drawer storage of new materials resulting from recent re-analysis  
Re-house artifacts in bulk storage in the warehouse

There are 7 boxes of artifacts in the warehouse from this site; one F.T.E. cataloger can catalog this material in 5 weeks.

Brush-Everard-Gilmer Sites (1966-1967)

Project Description: The yard surrounding the home of gunsmith John Brush and Mayor Thomas Everard was excavated by Ivor Noël Hume in 1966-1967. The focus of the excavation was the original kitchen

\(^2\) The small units excavated by Noël Hume as part of the Wetherburn Tavern Project are listed separately because they have been re-analyzed in light of the 2001 excavations on this site.
and work areas of the backyard. The excavation extended over the property line onto property where the First Theater/Hustings Court House was located. Trash pits that were filled by Dr. George Gilmer were explored.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume
R. Neil Frank, Jr.

Records:
- Excavation Register field notes
- Finds lists
- Crossmend records
- Object Catalog on index cards of a few notable objects
- Site plans, maps, etc.
- Hand-written Conservation treatment records

Publications:

Remedial Work:
- Machine-readable artifact inventory
- Machine-readable object catalog
- Digitize site plans, maps, etc.
- Re-analyze gunsmithing artifacts in light of more recent excavations
- Comparative analysis of kitchen artifacts with other domestic assemblages
- Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
- Complete re-housing artifacts in warehouse bulk storage

Noël Hume excavated in the backyard of the Brush-Everard House and gathered 15 boxes of artifacts that are in the warehouse. This material needs to be cataloged with the material excavated by Marley R. Brown III in 1987-89. If this material is cataloged by itself, 1 F.T.E. cataloger will require 14 weeks to complete the project.

Gilmer Trash Pits3, 1967

Project Description: Noël Hume excavated a series of trash pits that were along side the northern wall of the structure on Block 29 that housed the First Theater and later the James City County Hustings Court. The trash pits were filled with medical refuse, including Piermont water bottles, English wine bottles, and a human jawbone. It is believed that Dr. George Gilmer, who in addition to practicing medicine nearby by was also major of Williamsburg and had offices in the building, generated the refuse.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume
R. Neil Frank, Jr.

3 The Gilmer trash pits unearthed near the boundary line separating the Brush-Everard property and the First Theater/Hustings Court House property are listed here separately. They should be considered as unrelated, but comparable, to the Thomas Everard period artifacts from the Brush-Everard Site.
Records: Excavation Register field notes
Finds lists
Site maps, plans, and profiles of the trash pit features


Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable object catalog
Drawer storage
Complete re-housing of artifacts in warehouse bulk storage
Digitize site plans, maps, and trash pit profiles

The southwestern corner of Block 29 should be re-examined and researched to more completely identify and separate the artifacts assemblages that were deposited by Dr. George Gilmer, William Levingston, The First Theater Site, and the St. George Tucker House Site. We have too little information about Levingston’s House/Tavern and First Theater in relation to the other property owners.

Noël Hume excavated 17 boxes of artifacts from the Dr. George Gilmer trash pits on the site of the First Theatre. There are no machine-readable context, inventory, or object records for this site. One F.T.E. cataloger can catalog this material in 15 weeks.


Project Description: The home and work areas of two generations of Williamsburg metalworkers were excavated in 1966 and 1967. James Geddy, Senior and his wife Anne and family, moved onto the property in 1737. Geddy, Senior was a brass founder. The second generation of the Geddy family (James, Junior, David, and William) continued metalworking trades on the site including clock making, silversmithing, gunsmithing, and cutlery work until 1777.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume
R. Neil Frank, Jr.

Records: Excavation Register field notes
Finds lists with T.P.Q. dating for most contexts
Conservation treatment records
Hand-written index card object catalog records for a few objects
Hand-written crossmend records
Site plans, maps, profile drawings, etc.
Significant portions of the artifacts from this site were inventoried in a machine-readable format during the N.E.H.-funded Cataloging Grant, 1994-1996.
Significant portions of the objects from this site were cataloged in a machine-readable format during the N.E.H.-funded Cataloging Grant, 1994-1996.
Publications:


Remedial Work: Re-analysis of metallurgical evidence along with that found at Charlton’s Coffeehouse, the Coke-Garret House, and the Charlton House.
Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
Complete re-housing artifacts in warehouse bulk storage
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.

Prentis Store (1969)

Project Description: The excavation at Prentis Store is the only archaeological investigation of an eighteenth-century retail store in Williamsburg. Noël Hume excavated areas outside the original structure and found large quantities of discarded merchandise in trash pits and trash middens. Prentis and Company operated the store from 1740 until the Revolutionary War.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume
R. Neil Frank, Jr.

Records: Excavation Register field notes
Finds lists


Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable crossmend records
Machine-readable object catalog
Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
Complete re-housing artifacts in warehouse bulk storage
Re-analyze artifacts to create a characterization of merchandise sold by Prentis and Co.
Re-analyze any surviving records to develop customer list
Re-analyze artifacts with finds from other merchants’ sites: Greenhow Store, Holt’s Storehouse, Archibald Blair warehouse, etc.

Noël Hume excavated one of the most important eighteenth-century stores in Williamsburg in 1969, which filled 83 artifact boxes in the warehouse and 6 drawers full of objects in the Study Collection Room. One F.T.E. cataloger will require 65 weeks to complete this site archive.
Wray Site, Southeast Corner of Block 31 (1969)

Project Description: Excavations conducted at site currently located under the SunTrust bank at the corner of Prince George Street and Henry Street (southeastern lot(s) on block 31). The site purchased in 1736 by joiner and glazier James Wray, who amassed a large estate, employed workmen, and owned slaves. Evidence of the glazing trade in the form of window glass, window leads, scrap metal, etc. have been unearthed. The location of the main dwelling house was estimated by the direction of drains that cut thorough the block. This block was an urban plantation and is directly comparable with the urban plantations owned by John Custis, John Chiswell, and Peyton Randolph.

The 2002 excavation project on Block 31, which precedes construction of a new parking garage for the City, has placed increased pressure on our manpower resources in the field and in the lab. The earlier excavation filled 14 artifact boxes in the warehouse and two drawers in the Study Collection Room.

The vast majority of this material has been inventoried in anticipation of re-analysis with the material being excavated in 2002. A new object catalog will be created when this work is completed. In addition, considerable work has been completed on the drawn window leads from this site, and indeed, from all window leads from archaeological deposits throughout the Historic Area. Associate Curator, Kelly Ladd, who intends to publish the results, directs the research.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume

Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory, except for objects in drawer storage
Excavation Register field notes
Finds lists
Site maps
Conservation treatment records
Site plans, maps, etc.


Remedial Work: Complete machine-readable object catalog (work currently in progress)
Re-evaluate window glazing-related artifacts in light of current excavation, 2002.
Re-analyze domestic artifacts to determine household associations
Artifact distributions across the block based on functional categories
Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
Digitize all old site plans, maps, etc.
Chiswell-Hubard House (1968-1970)

Project Description: Prior to constructing tennis courts for the Williamsburg Inn, machine grading of this site resulted in an atypical excavation project that revealed the home of Colonel John Chiswell (prior to 1766), and lawyer James Hubard (1769-1776). Hubard was a Tory and soldier in the British Army during the Revolutionary War; he fled Virginia after Cornwallis’ defeat at Yorktown in 1781, and died in New York in 1782. Hubard's wife, Frances lived on the property with her five children until the house burned in 1797. Excavations revealed the domestic refuse left by both households.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume
R. Neil Frank, Jr.

Records: Excavation Register field notes
Conservation treatment records
Finds List with Terminus Post Quem dating for most context numbers
Hand-written object catalog of a few objects written on index cards


Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable object catalog
Crossmend records
Digitize plan maps, profiles, etc.

This site was also cut from the N.E.H.-funded cataloging project, “History Through Archaeology” (1994-1996). The refuse from the Chiswell and Hubard households are well represented by 98 artifact boxes in the warehouse and 16 drawers full of objects in the Study Collection Room. This material dates to the closing years of the eighteenth century and is frequently accessed by curators and ceramic scholars for comparative analysis. One F.T.E. cataloger will be needed for 75 weeks to complete the site archive.

Morris House (1970)

Project Description: Ivor Noël Hume excavated the homes of James Morris, a Williamsburg carpenter, in 1970. Morris supervised the construction of Bruton Parish Church beginning in 1712.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume
Records: Excavation Register field notes
Finds Lists
Hand-written crossmend records
Site plans, maps, etc.

Publications: None

Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable object catalog
Locate Interim or Final Site Report
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.
Re-analyze and compare with 2002 excavation of the James Wray site, Block 31.
Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
Re-house artifact in bulk warehouse storage

Noël Hume excavated 21 boxes of artifacts, which are stored in the warehouse and 3 full drawers of objects are in the Study Collection Room. One F.T.E. cataloger can create the site archive for this material in 22 weeks.

Public Hospital (1968, 1973-74, 1982)

Project Description: These excavations were aimed at revealing the foundations of the original 1770 Public Hospital so that the building could be reconstructed. In the course of the excavations, two Middle Plantation structures, the Thomas Jones House and the Francis Nicholson House were excavated.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume
Eric Klingelhofer
John Hamant
William Myzk

Records: Excavation Register field notes
Finds Lists
Conservation Records


Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable object catalog
Machine-readable crossmend records
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.

The first episode of excavation at the Public Hospital Site generated 115 boxes of artifacts. The second phase of excavation produced a similar amount of artifacts. There are no machine-readable context, inventory, or object records for this material. Three F.T.E. catalogers could catalog this material and generate a partial site archive in 100 weeks.
Carter’s Grove Survey and Excavation around the Mansion, including root cellars (1972)

Project Description: Following the acquisition of Carter’s Grove Plantation by Colonial Williamsburg, a systematic survey of the property was conducted along with more comprehensive excavations near the mansion and at a series of root cellars nearby. Evidence of seventeenth century habitation was discovered which lead to the extensive Martin’s Hundred Excavations.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume
William M. Kelso
Eric Klingelhofer
Nicholas Lucketti
John Hamant

Records: Excavation Register field notes
Site plans, maps, etc.
Finds lists
Hand-written crossmend records

Publications:


Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Digitize all site plans, maps, etc.
Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in bulk storage

The root cellars at Carter’s Grove are frequently accessed in relation to African-American research projects, educational programs, and C.W.F. staff training. There are 6 full artifact boxes in the warehouse and two full drawers of objects in drawer storage in the Study Collection Room. The object records for the objects in drawer storage have been created, however, there are no linked inventory records for this material currently in the Re:Discovery database. All artifact and object computer files must be converted to a new software program, as Re:Discovery is no longer a viable cataloging option. One F.T.E. cataloger will need 6 weeks to complete the archive. If digitized maps are required, an additional amount of time will need to be added to this estimate.

There are 88 additional boxes of artifacts from the Kelso survey and Carter’s Grove Excavation exclusive of the Root Cellar material. There are numerous household features dating to the
last quarter of the eighteenth century. There are 6 full drawers of objects from the mansion and kitchen features in the Study Collection Room. One F.T.E. cataloger can catalog this material and collate the related documentation in 50 weeks.

James Anderson House and Forges (1975-1976)

Project Description: Ivor Noël Hume excavated the town lots where Christiana Campbell operated a tavern in the mid-eighteenth century. The property eventually became the home of James Anderson, who was Keeper of the Public Magazine for the Virginia Colony and later Armorer for the State of Virginia during the Revolutionary War. The extensive forge and manufacturing complex that Anderson built on the property was also investigated. Massive amounts of blacksmithing debris and domestic refuse were retrieved.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume
Robert Foss

Records: Excavation Register field notes
Site plans, maps, profile drawings, etc.
Detailed drawings of the forge features
Finds lists with T.P.Q. dating for most contexts
Conservation treatment records

Publications:

Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable object catalog
Machine-readable crossmend records
Re-analysis with more recently excavated material
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.
Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
Complete re-housing artifacts in warehouse bulk storage

This site was cut from the N.E.H.-funded cataloging project, “History Through Archaeology” (1994-1996). It is frequently accessed by scholars and trades people and contains a large quantity of domestic and proto-industrial material relating to the metalworking trades. There are 66 full artifact boxes in the warehouse, and 14 drawers full of objects in the Study Collection Room. One F.T.E. cataloger will need 50 weeks to complete this archive.

Peyton Randolph Office or Tenant House (1977-78)

Project Description: Ivor Noël Hume’s excavation on the Randolph site concentrated on a single structure in the northwest corner of the lot, which may have been a tenement or office for Peyton Randolph. It was briefly thought that the structure may have served as a dower-house occupied by the widow of Sir John Randolph when Peyton, their second son, inherited the property, but this assump-
Archaeologists: Eric Klingelhofer
Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume

Records: Excavation Register field notes
Finds lists
Conservation treatment records


Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable object catalog
Machine-readable crossmend records
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.
House artifacts in drawer storage
Complete re-housing artifacts in warehouse bulk storage

There are 16 boxes of artifacts in the warehouse. In light of recent excavations, this material needs to be re-cataloged and re-analyzed with the more recent (1982-85) material from this site. If this assemblage is cataloged by itself, one F.T.E. cataloger can create all the computer records in 14 weeks.

Willie Baker House (1976)

Project Description: The cellar of an eighteenth- and nineteenth-century house was excavated in conjunction with the demolition of the twentieth century house that stood on the original foundations. The excavation was a salvage operation done in 1976 that contained a considerable amount of early nineteenth-century artifacts.

Archaeologists: Ruth Anne Clarke
Eric Klingelhofer

Records: Finds lists
Excavation Register field notes
Hand-written crossmend records
Site plans, maps, etc.


Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable crossmend records
Machine readable object catalog
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.
Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in bulk storage
Re-analyze artifacts from the Charlton House (1966), which dates to the same period.
There are 16 boxes of artifacts in the warehouse and 3 drawers full of objects in drawer storage. One F.T.E. cataloger can manage this material in 10 weeks.

**Trebell's Landing**

**Project Description:** Noël Hume salvaged this plantation site located on Colonial Williamsburg Foundation property that was sold to the Anheuser Busch Corporation in 1970. The plantation contained a large quantity of domestic refuse.

**Archaeologists:** Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume

**Records:** Excavation Register field notes
Finds Lists
Hand-written crossmend records
Several typed objects records
Site plans, maps, etc.
Conservation records

**Publications:** None

**Remedial Work:** Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable object catalog
Digitized site plans, maps, etc.
Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in warehouse bulk storage

This excavation project yielded 26 artifact boxes full of fragments and 6 drawers full of objects in the Study Collection Room. One F.T.E. cataloger will need 25 weeks to complete the site archive. If a final site report exists, it must be found and added to the permanent documents collection.

**Challis Site (1963)**

**Project Description:** Noël Hume salvaged a pottery production site that was washing out of the riverbank along the James River in the 1960s. This site dates to the last quarter of the seventeenth century and extends into the first quarter of the eighteenth century.

**Archaeologists:** Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume

**Records:** Excavation Register field notes
Finds lists
Crossmend records
Incomplete object records
Site plans, maps, etc.
Conservation records

**Publications:** None

**Remedial Work:** Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable object catalog
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.
Complete site report
Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in bulk warehouse storage
Re-analyze in light of recent discoveries of other pottery production sites in the Chesapeake

In addition to earthenware pottery wasters, domestic refuse was retrieved which fills 98 artifact boxes in the warehouse and 6 full drawers in the Study Collection Room. There is a considerable amount of oversized object storage as well. One F.T.E. cataloger will need 75 weeks to create a fragment inventory and object catalog. As little is known about the site’s history, it may not be feasible to create an entire site archive, but this site’s importance as a seventeenth-century pottery production site justifies the expenditure of funds needed to document the project.

Wolstenholme Towne and Related Seventeenth-Century Martin’s Hundred Sites (1976-1983)

Project Description: The site of one of the earliest fortified settlements along the James River, Martin’s Hundred was established in 1618 as a particular plantation funded by the Society for Martin’s Hundred. The earliest settlement was planted by John Boys, which was followed by Wolstenholme town, the administrative center of the Hundred. Attacked and severely damaged in the “1619 Massacre,” Wolstenholme town was not revived, but subsequent settlements in the immediate area were occupied throughout the remainder of the seventeenth century.

Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume
Eric Klingelhofer
John Hamant
Nick Lucketti

Records: Excavation Register field notes
Finds lists
Classified indices for each of the major sites
Crossmend lists and context dating lists
Site plans, maps, profiles, etc.
Many slides and photographs
Conservation records
Artifact Illustrations
Original artwork by Richard Schlecht


Discoveries in Martin’s Hundred, Colonial Williamsburg Archaeological Series No. 10, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, by Ivor Noël Hume, 1983


“Manuscript Report to the National Geographic Society for October to December,” by Ivor Noel Hume, 1978.


“Faunal Analysis of Martin’s Hundred” By Dr. Stanley J. Olsen, manuscript report, no date.


Many progress reports submitted to the National Geographic Society, who funded the Martin’s Hundred excavations, are curated in the D.A.R. Documents Collection.

Remedial Work:

- Machine-readable artifact inventory
- Machine readable object catalog
- Digitized site plans, maps, etc.
- Machine-readable crossmend records
- Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
Commit non-illustrated objects to warehouse bulk storage
Digital imagery of all illustrated objects

These artifacts have neither been boxed nor counted so an accurate estimate of the amount of material is difficult to calculate. Sites A, B, C, and H contain large domestic assemblages, while Site D, E, and F are smaller. Excavation on Site J was never completed, but it also contains significant domestic refuse. Since the *Archaeology of Martin’s Hundred* has been published, the creation of the object catalog will be somewhat simplified as the illustrated objects are already committed to drawer storage. The un-illustrated artifacts have been plastic bagged, but not counted. A rough F.T.E. estimate for creating the remainder of a complete site archive for these sites would equal 2 catalogers for 50 weeks.

**Nicholas-Tyler House (1980-81)**

**Project Description:** Concurrent with the demolition of the Old James City County Courthouse, an excavation was mounted to salvage the remains of the foundations of the Nicholas-Tyler House. The foundations were lifted, numbered, and recorded so that they could be re-constructed in the future.

**Archaeologists:**
William Myzk
Eric Klingelhofer

**Records:**
Excavation Register field notes
Hand-written finds lists
Conservation treatment records
Brick-by-brick drawings of the foundations
Brick number list

**Publications:**

**Remedial Work:**
Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine readable object catalog
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.
Digitize brick-by-brick foundation drawings
Create drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in bulk warehouse storage

**Major Projects, 1982 to the Present (Marley R. Brown III)**

**Public Hospital (1982-1983 continuation of the Noël Hume Excavation)**

**Project Description:** This project was begun by Ivor Noël Hume and completed by Marley R. Brown III. The excavation focused on the 1770 hospital foundations, the Middle Plantation structures that preceded it, and the subsequent construction phases of the first mental hospital in North America.
Archaeologists: Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume
Eric Klingelhofer
John Hamant
Marley R. Brown III

Records: Manuscript context records
Unquantified finds lists


Remedial work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Selective crossmending of pertinent assemblages
Minimum vessel counts
Object catalog
Drawer storage
Final report
Popular pamphlet

**Peyton Randolph Backyard (1982-1985)**

Project Description: This was a detailed investigation of the backyard of the Robertson, Sir John and Lady Randolph, Peyton and Betty Randolph House to identify the evolution of the residence into an urban plantation, its landscape features, the dating and definition of activity areas, the changing functions and sizes of outbuildings, and other work areas.

Archaeologists: Marley R. Brown III
Andrew Edwards
Roy Jackson
Linda Derry

Records: Computerized artifact inventory backup on obsolete computer tape
Hard copy printout of artifact inventory
Hand-written context records
Hand-written crossmend records


“Excavation at Colonial Williamsburg Thirty Years Ago: An Archaeological Analysis of Cross-Trenching Behind the Peyton


“Predicting English Wine Bottle Shape: The Use of Forecasting Models in Archaeology, By S. Kathleen Pepper, 1985.


Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable context records
Machine-readable crossmend records
Machine-readable object catalog
Drawer storage
Complete re-housing artifacts in warehouse bulk storage

There is no machine-readable inventory, context records, or object catalog for this artifact-rich and stratigraphically complex site. Analysis was done and paper records exist for the crossmended ceramics and glass objects, but no drawer storage has been accomplished. Two F.T.E. catalogers can complete this data entry in 50 weeks.

Nicolson House (1982)

Project Description: Excavations were undertaken behind the Nicolson House in 1982 in anticipation of a waterproofing project for the building. An interesting artifact assemblage was retrieved, but analysis later indicated the disturbed nature of the fill around the building foundations.

Archaeologists: Patricia Samford

Records: Hand-written context records
Hand-written artifact inventory


**Remedial Work:**
- Machine-readable artifact inventory
- Machine-readable object catalog
- Machine-readable crossmend records
- Minimum vessel counts
- Drawer storage
- Re-house artifacts in warehouse bulk storage

**Firehouse (1983)**

**Project Description:** Prior to the demolition of the Firehouse near the corner of Nicholson and Boundary Streets in 1983, an excavation was mounted to salvage eighteenth-century archaeological resources. Evidence of a large-scale butchery was encountered along with domestic refuse. As this site was located in James City County, little documentary evidence survives to indicate lot ownership. The evidence of butchering and the strong indication that this site also housed a merchant’s base of operation suggest that this material be re-analyzed with the material Noël Hume excavated on the same site in 1961. Even though little documentary history of the site survives, there is still much that can be learned from the artifacts and faunal material.

**Archaeologists:**
- Marley R. Brown III
- Patricia Samford

**Records:**
- There is no machine-readable fragment inventory for this site, nor is there an object catalog because the material was never analyzed.

**Publications:**
- Site report

**Remedial Work:**
- Machine-readable artifact inventory
- Machine-readable context records
- Machine-readable object catalog
- Crossmending of ceramics and glass
- Digitize site plans, maps, etc.

There are numerous boxes of bone and artifacts in the warehouse. One F.T.E. cataloger will require 30 weeks to build a partial site archive for this site and its material. See: *United States Post Office, Block 15* above.

**Tazewell Hall (1984)**

**Project Description:** This salvage excavation was to retrieve archaeological evidence prior to the construction of Tazewell Hall Addition to the Williamsburg Lodge. A complete cellar, dating to the 1830s was excavated along with broader areas surrounding the structural remains.
Archaeologists: Marley R. Brown III
Ann Smart Martin
Patricia Samford

Records: Site maps, plans, etc.
Hand-written context records
Crossmending analysis hand-written records


Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable context records
Machine-readable crossmending records
Machine readable minimum vessel counts/statistical reports
Complete drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in bulk storage
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.

Shields Tavern (1985-1986)

Project Description: This was an investigation of a tavern and domestic site prior to the construction of underground kitchens for an operating tavern. Documented occupations: Jean Marot (tavern keeper), James Shields tavern keeper), and John Draper (blacksmith and farrier.) Artifact analysis focused on determining the difference between elite and middling dining known to have been enjoyed by the clientele who frequented Marot’s and Shields’ Taverns. The blacksmithing refuse deposited by John Draper provides a unique opportunity to contrast small one-forg operations with multi-forge proto-industrial operations owned and operated by James Anderson.

Archaeologists: Gregory J. Brown
Thomas F. Higgins III
David F. Muraca
S. Kathleen Pepper
Roni Polk
Joanne Bowen
William E. Pittman
Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Crossmend/minimum vessel count records
Harris matrices
Composite plan maps phased to documented occupations.

Publications:

Archaeological Investigations of the Shields Tavern Site, by Gregory J. Brown, David F. Muraca, S. Kathleen Pepper and Roni Polk, April 1990.


Remedial Work: Machine-readable crossmend records
Machine-readable object catalog
Minimum vessel counts, statistical reports
Artifact catalog
Drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in bulk storage

The fragment inventory has been created for this site and context records must be converted into a new collection management database, as Re:Discovery is no longer a viable option. Ceramic and glass crossmend records exist on paper and need to be entered into the database. Complete object catalog records have yet to be created and no drawer storage of this material has been accomplished. One F.T.E. cataloger will require 42 weeks to complete this work.
John Bates Site (1985)

Project Description: The D.A.R. staff salvaged this late seventeenth- to early eighteenth-century-merchant’s domestic and/or retail site in 1985. The landowners, the Guthrie Family, had excavated portions of the site, before Colonial Williamsburg staff were requested to take charge of the excavation. The finds are mostly ceramic and date to the late seventeenth century and first decades of the eighteenth century. The artifacts are technically the property of the Guthrie Family, but C. W. is the official custodian of them.

Archaeologists: Patricia Samford
David F. Muraca

Records: No machine-readable fragment inventory was created
The ceramics were crossmended and paper records exist to document this work.


Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable context records
Machine-readable object catalog
Digitized site plans, maps, etc.
Detailed artifact illustrations
Digital imagery of artifacts
Complete conservation restoration of ceramic vessels
Drawer storage
Complete re-housing artifacts in warehouse bulk storage

Green Hill Project (1985)

Project Description: The Department was appointed by the Court to excavate a lot on the northeast corner of Block 30 to resolve the question of ownership. A graveyard was excavated, which the Court ruled were members of the Prentis Family. Survey work on the rest of the block yielded a considerable amount of domestic refuse.

Archaeologists: Marley R. Brown III
Amy Bennett
Thomas F. Higgins III

Records: Artifact inventory for this site was done on William & Mary mainframe, the magnetic tape backup cannot be read.
Site plans, maps, etc.
Conservation treatment records

Remedial Work:  
- Machine-readable artifact inventory
- Machine-readable context records
- Machine-readable object catalog
- Digitize site plans, maps, etc.
- Digitized artifact illustrations


**Project Description:** The home/workshop of gunsmith John Brush and later the home of Mayor Thomas Everard have been excavated on several occasions. The work done by Noël Hume in 1967 has been discussed previously. The subsequent work done under the direction of Marley Brown focused on finding evidence of Brush’s gunsmithing work areas that were not previously seen by Noël Hume. Metalworking refuse, coal, and clinker were distributed over much of the excavated area suggesting that gunsmithing was done in the house and distributed over the site in a random method. Trash pit features on the adjacent property revealed refuse generated by Doctor George Gilmer, who lived nearby and was also a mayor of Williamsburg in the 1750s.

**Archaeologists:** Patricia Samford
Mary Catherine Garden
Stephen Mrozowski
Dwayne Pickett

**Records:**
- Machine-readable artifact inventory
- Machine-readable context records
- Some digitized maps, plans, etc.
- Hand-written crossmend records
- Conservation records

**Publications:**


“Dr. George Gilmer’s Pharmaceutical Wares, An Examination of some pharmaceutical wares of a Williamsburg Dispensing Physician” Ms. on file, Department of Archaeological Research, By Cheryl Beck and William Pittman, 1992.


Remedial Work: When Marley R. Brown conducted excavations on this site in 1987-89, the drawer storage materials from the I.N.H. excavations of 1966-67, then stored in four drawers, were removed from the Study Collection Room and reanalyzed.

The fragment inventory and context records exist in an earlier cataloging system and can be converted to a new collection management database.

There are no object records for either the Brown or Noël Hume period material.

Working the two episodes of excavation together to create a comprehensive site archive and recreate the object catalog and drawer storage for this site will require 2 F.T.E. catalogers 52 weeks to complete.

Numerous errors in the site report dealing with artifacts written by Patricia Samford and published in 1999 need to be corrected.

This site was crossmended and raw vessel counts were listed in various tables throughout the site report, but the context correlations established by this work were not used in the site interpretation.

There is no detailed descriptive object catalog included in the site report.
### Port Anne Development Project (1986-1987)

**Project Description:** This seventeenth-century site was surveyed and a Phase 3 excavation was completed to salvage the site prior to the construction of a housing development. Several human graves, and other large features yielded a significant amount of material culture dating to the first half of the century. The best artifacts were installed in an exhibit at the Port Anne Reception Center.

**Archaeologists:** Gregory J. Brown  
Roni H. Polk  
William E. Pittman  
Andrew C. Edwards

**Records:** Hand-written artifact inventory  
Hand-written crossmend records  
Hand-written object catalog  
Exhibit proposal


**Remedial Work:** Machine-readable artifact inventory  
Machine-readable object catalog  
Conservation records  
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.

### Route 199 Corridor (1987)

**Project Description:** The department was heavily involved with the survey of a proposed corridor for Route 199, which surrounds most of Williamsburg.

**Archaeologists:** Robert R. Hunter, Jr.  
Thomas F. Higgins, III

**Records:** Machine-readable artifact inventory  
Site plans, maps, etc.


Remedial Work: Create object catalog
Re-house artifacts in warehouse bulk storage
Drawer storage

Dr. Barraud trash pit (1988)

Project Description: A large trash pit in the backyard of the Dr. Barraud property was excavated, which revealed domestic refuse of the last quarter of the eighteenth-century. Philip and Anne Barraud lived on the property while he served was one of two Visiting Physicians at the Williamsburg Public Hospital from 1786 until 1799.

Archaeologists: Patricia Samford

Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Context records
Crossmend records
Conservation treatment records
Feature plan and profile maps


Remedial Work: Machine-readable crossmend records
Machine-readable object catalog
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.
Create drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in bulk storage

There are no context, inventory, or object records for this excavation in our current collection management database. One F.T.E. cataloger will require 6 weeks to complete the site archive for this material. If materials from the 1941 excavations on the site are needed, additional time will be required to assemble these objects and to create object records as needed.

Hampton University Sites (1989)

Project Description: Several prehistoric and a large early seventeenth-century dwelling was excavated on property that was to be developed. The property was most likely inhabited by one or both early landowners known to have settled in the Hampton area, named Windmill and Christopher. The site report for this project is the last one
written by the department that contains a detailed descriptive object catalog and in which the crossmending context correlations were used in the site interpretation. The artifacts are curated at Hampton University.

Archaeologists: Andrew C. Edwards
Thomas F. Higgins III
Meredith Poole
William E. Pittman

Records: Some artifact inventory records exist in a machine-readable form, but the entire site may not be represented. Drawn site plans, maps, etc.


Remedial Work: Complete machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable crossmend records
Machine-readable object catalog
Digitize all site plans, maps, profiles, photographs
Digitize artifact illustrations
Conservation records (William & Mary Conservation Lab.)


Project Description: Grissell Hay ran a lodging house on this property following the death of her husband, apothecary, Peter Hay. The backyard of the property was extensively excavated, but no analytical work has yet been done on the materials.

Archaeologists: Meredith Poole
Gregory Brown

Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable context records
Site plans, maps, etc.
Conservation treatment records

Publications: None

Remedial Work: Crossmend ceramic and glass artifacts
Create machine-readable crossmend records
Create minimum vessel counts
Compile crossmend correlations
Create object catalog
Drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in bulk storage
Re-analyze ceramics comparatively with other assemblages from households of the same period and a tavern assemblage to define any differences that might reflect the use of the property as a lodging house.

This complex site has produced a large amount of material that can only be curated as boxes of fragments. No crossmending or artifact analysis has been done for this material. While fragment inventory and context databases exist for the site, it is in an earlier computer cataloging system and can be converted into an appropriate database system in two weeks. There are no object records except for a few which were created for metal and organic objects that needed immediate conservation treatment at the time of excavation. Consequently, a complete site archive cannot be created until the site has been analyzed. This major undertaking will require considerable layout space and one F.T.E. cataloger for 72 weeks.

Market Square (1989)

Project Description: This excavation was an attempt to locate the Market House that is known to have existed on Market Square in the eighteenth century. The area of excavation was centered in front of the reconstructed guardhouse adjacent to the Public Magazine on the south side of Market Square. No physical evidence of the Market House was found as this area had been heavily disturbed by the construction and demolition of a large nineteenth-century church in this area. No artifact analysis was done for this site and no object catalog appears in the site report.

Archaeologists: Gregory J. Brown
David F. Muraca
Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable context records
Conservation records

Remedial Work: Determine if artifact analysis is warranted
Drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in warehouse bulk storage

Meux Site (1991)

Project Description: The D.A.R. staff salvaged this late seventeenth-century house cellar located in New Kent County on property privately owned
by the Penney Family. The site contained unique Colono-indian ware vessel forms, late seventeenth-century Midlands Slipware, German and English stoneware, and a London marked pewter porringer. The ceramics and glass were crossmended, but no site report has been written for this project. Mr. John Davis, Curator of Metals, has accessioned the porringer into the Decorative Arts Collections on long-term loan basis; it has also been cataloged into the Archaeological Collections. The ceramic and glass artifacts are curated by the D.A.R., but the artifacts remain the property of Mr. Seth Penney of Deltaville, Virginia.

Archaeologists: David F. Muraca

Records: Artifact Inventory and context records exist in an earlier cataloging system, which should be converted into a new collection management database. The ceramics were crossmended and a partial object catalog exists on paper.

Publications: None

Remedial Work: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine readable context records
Machine-readable object catalog
Write site report with vessel counts and statistical profiles of vessel forms
Capture digital imagery of artifacts
Complete conservation treatments
Drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in warehouse bulk storage

One F.T.E. cataloger will require 10 weeks to complete this work.

Bruton Parish Church Yard (1992)

Project Description: Excavations were done in the churchyard of Bruton Parish Church to expose the foundation of the First Bruton Parish Church in an attempt to understand the architecture of the building. Several previously unknown interments were discovered and the foundations were carefully mapped and documented. As expected very little material culture was encountered and no artifact analysis was done for this project.

Archaeologists: Andrew Edwards
Jennifer Jones
Marley R. Brown III

Records: Machine-readable context records
Machine readable artifact inventory

Remedial Work: Creation of minimal object catalog
Drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in warehouse bulk storage
Digitize site plans, maps, drawings, etc.

Palace Cellar Drain Monitoring and Utility Excavations (1993)

Project Description: Original paving tiles were lifted in the cellar of the Governor’s Palace in anticipation of some utility work. Very few artifacts were encountered during this excavation and no analysis was preformed.

Archaeologists: David Muraca
Christina Adinolfi

Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable context records
Site plans, maps, etc.


Remedial Work: Machine-readable object catalog
Drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in warehouse bulk storage
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.

Each year, the curatorial staff deals with numerous requests for information about artifacts retrieved from the Palace, its ancillary buildings, and gardens. All recently acquired material from the Palace needs to be properly documented so that it can be understood in relation to all the Old Study Collection Palace material dug in 1931. Even though the majority of this material was not excavated stratigraphically, it needs to be reorganized in the Old Study Collection so that it is more accessible to scholars and more useful for staff training. One F.T.E. cataloger will require 12 weeks to organize this material and install it into drawer storage.

St. George Tucker Garden (1994-1997)

Project Description: Excavations behind the St. George Tucker House to find evidence of his garden were begun with survey working 1994. A full-scale excavation was undertaken in 1997. Artifacts from the site were concentrated in areas near the house, with fewer finds located in the rear of the lot in the formal garden area. Extensive soil testing was undertaken for this site, and important environmental work with phytoliths was begun in the lab. No artifact analysis for this site has been done.

Archaeologists: Mary-Catherine Garden
Lisa Kealhofer
Kate Meatyard
Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Phytoliths and some charred macro-botanical remains
Site maps, plans, etc.


Remedial Work: Machine-readable object catalog
Drawer Storage
Complete digitizing site plans, maps, etc.
House artifacts in warehouse bulk storage


Project Description: Between the excavations carried out by Ivor Noël Hume and the subsequent work undertaken under the direction of Marley Brown, this site has seen more excavation than most sites in the Historic Area. It is also one of the most historically accurate representations of an eighteenth-century environment in the restored town. The domestic/tavern-related features and one of the forge buildings were unearthed by Noël Hume, and the additional forge buildings and evidence of button making, and tinsmithing were revealed more recently.

Archaeologists: Marley R. Brown III
Gregory J. Brown
Katherine Schupp
Meredith Poole

Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable context records
Hand-written conservation records


Remedial Work:
Crossmending of specific contexts
Analysis of metal working waste
Radiography of metal objects from Anderson features
Machine-readable crossmend records
Machine readable object catalog
Drawer Storage
Re-house artifacts in bulk storage


Project Description: This was a salvage excavation of a multi-component site containing a seventeenth-century plantation complex, and an eighteenth-century slave quarter. The crossmending and analysis of the artifacts has been done piece-meal over the years, due to a lack of funding. The site report is partially written, but the artifacts, except for those of the late eighteenth-early nineteenth-century slave quarter have not been used thus far in the report. No detail descriptive object catalog has been requested. All artifacts that have been crossmended and not chosen for drawer storage are organized and ready for boxing and transfer to the warehouse.

Archaeologists: David F. Muraca
Leslie McFaden
Amy Kowalski
Anna Agbe-Davies
Maria Franklin
Philip Levy
Ywone Edwards-Ingram

Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable crossmend and minimum vessel count records
Machine-readable context records
Conservation treatment records

Publications: Final Report in press


Remedial Work: Complete soil sample floatation
Inventory artifacts retrieved from soil floatation
Complete crossmending
Machine-readable object catalog
Complete site report
House artifacts in drawer storage
House artifacts in bulk storage
The crossmending will generate a large data entry problem that will require one F.T.E. cataloger to complete in 8 weeks with another 2 weeks spent in drawer storage and final packing of context groups for warehouse storage.
John Page House Site (1995-96) and Brick and Tile Kiln Site (1990-1991)

Project Description: This multi-component site was excavated over several years. It contained pre-historic features, a seventeenth-century domestic site with a brick/tile kiln, house, kitchen and related trash middens. The house was built by John and Alice Page in 1662 and it survived until about 1730 when it burned. The cellar contained unique objects, including, charred wheat, the earliest evidence of binning beverage bottles, iron household hardware, food storage vessels, and flower pots.

This site was extensively crossmended and vessel form analysis results are were included in tabular form in the report, however, the sections dealing with artifacts were written by persons with less experience than the senior curatorial and lab management staff and consequently are more general than they should be for a site of this importance. No descriptive object catalog was requested for this report. The faunal analysis section, written by Dr. Joanne Bowen was included in the report, but without authorship acknowledgement.

Archaeologists: John Metz
David Muraca
Jennifer Jones
Dwayne Pickett

Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable context records
Hand-written crossmend records
Hand-written minimum vessel counts
Conservation treatment records
Machine-readable object catalog (incomplete)
Digitized site maps, plans, etc.


Remedial Work: The fragment inventory and object catalog are complete except for a significant amount of uncataloged glass from the cellar. This glass was being conserved when the inventory was being compiled and is not, therefore accounted for in the database. Drawer storage has not yet been completed for the domestic and kitchen assemblages. Objects Records have not been created for the Tile Kiln. One cataloger will need 12 weeks to complete this work.

Project Description: Excavations at the site of Richard Charlton’s coffeehouse located adjacent to the capitol and on land leased from the Armistead family of Williamsburg. Revealed evidence of small metalworking pit in the back lot and numerous associated crucible fragments. Also of note, eighty wig curlers were recovered suggesting Richard Charlton was supplementing his income with wig making.

The ceramics and glass analysis from this site is incomplete. Crossmending of ceramics and glass was done for all but the material excavated from the extensive trash midden directly behind the coffeehouse. The omission of this crucial evidence impairs our understanding of the range and depth of tavern/coffeeshouse material culture and the foodways practiced on the site. The accuracy of site interpretations based on this incomplete analysis strategy is suspect.

Archaeologists: Margaret Cooper
Mary Catherine Garden
Dan Mouer
David Muraca
Beverly Binns

Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Digitized site plans, maps, etc.
Conservation records


“Out of Site, Out of Mind: Richard Charlton’s Lost Coffeehouse,” paper present at CNEHA Conference by Mary Catherine Garden, no date.

Remedial Work: Complete soil floatation
Inventory artifacts retrieved from soil floatation
Complete crossmending by working in the last season’s artifacts into what has been accomplished previously
Machine-readable crossmend records
Machine-readable object catalog
Drawer storage
Digitize site plans, maps, etc.
One F.T.E. cataloger can complete this curatorial work in 3 weeks.

As this property is lonely leased by Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, all the artifacts from this site belong to the Armistead Family; the D.A.R. curates the material.

Palace Lands (1996-1997)

Project Description: In anticipation of the construction of a parking area to serve the renovated Visitor’s Center, survey work revealed evidence of a domestic site that may have housed slaves during the eighteenth century. The Palace Lands consist of property that was previously referred to as the Palace Farm, a name that was used for this area in the eighteenth century.

Archaeologists: Dwayne Pickett
Maria Franklin
Lily Richards

Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Crossmend records
Site plans, maps, etc.


Remedial Work: These surveys yielded few artifacts, but all have been inventoried at the fragment level.

Ravenscroft-Jackson Site (1997-98) and 1954 Old Study Collection material from Lot 266

Project Description: The Ravenscroft-Jackson lots on northwest corner of Nicholson and Botetourt Streets comprise one of the most archaeologically interesting areas in the Historic Area. Containing Middle Plantation features as well as last quarter eighteenth-century domestic features; it has been partially studied by the Archaeology staff for many years. The Old Study Collection material was exca-
vated in 1954; the D.A.R. staff excavated the lot again in 1997-98. The recently excavated material needs to be re-analyzed with relevant portions of the 1954 material and compared with material from Anthony Hay excavations as these assemblages have many characteristics in common.

Archaeologists:

Jimmy Knight
Margaret Cooper
Audrey Noël Hume
Robert Mangum Barrow

Records:

Machine-readable artifact inventory for 1997-98 material only
Machine-readable context records
Site plans. Maps, profiles, etc.

Publications:


Remedial Work:

Machine-readable artifact inventory of earlier OSC material
Re-analysis of all material (OSC and 1997-98 material)
Machine-readable object catalog
Digital imagery of important objects
Drawer storage
Re-house artifacts in warehouse bulk storage
Publish report on finds

The earlier OSC material from this site is stored in 10 full drawers needs to be inventoried and object records generated. One F.T.E. cataloger will need 35 weeks to create a site archive.

Nassau Street Ordinary (1999)

Project Description:

The foundations of a Middle Plantation structure, thought to be a tavern or ordinary, were undertaken as part of the 300th Anniversary of the founding of the City of Williamsburg. Jimmy Knight had excavated a portion of the structure, but few artifacts were retrieved from this early excavation.

The building was most likely emptied at the time of its demolition, but the ceramics and glass remains were crossmended by a History 607 Apprentice and the curator. The result of their analysis was not included in the site report nor is there a descriptive object catalog.
Archaeologists: David F. Muraca  
Philip Levy  
Buddy Paulett  
Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory  
Crossmending and vessel count records  
Incomplete object catalog  
Conservation treatment records  
Publications: *Nassau Street Site Summer 1999 Excavations*, Report on file,  
Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg  
Remedial Work: Revise site report to include object catalog and vessel analysis  
Capture digital imagery of artifacts  
Drawer storage  
House artifacts in warehouse bulk storage  

Project Description: Survey work was conducted on this large tract to discover archaeological resources in anticipation of development.  
Archaeologists: Andrew Butts  
Mark Kostro  
Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory  
Site plans, maps, etc.  

**Williamsburg Movie Theater (2000)**  
Project Description: Excavations behind the Williamsburg Theater (now known as the Kimball Theater) revealed evidence of an eighteenth- and nineteenth-century butcher’s lots. This analysis should be undertaken in conjunction with work previously done by Noël Hume (United States Post Office Site) and work accomplished at the nearby Firehouse Site in 1983.  
Archaeologists: Jameson Harwood  
Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory  
Machine-readable context records  
Faunal analysis records  
Conservation treatment records

Remedial Work: Crossmend artifacts
Create machine-readable object catalog
Create machine-readable crossmend records
Drawer Storage
Re-analyze artifacts with those retrieved from Noël Hume excavation in 1961 with an eye to finding more evidence of domestic aspects of butcher’s homes, etc.
Re-catalog Noël Hume artifacts
Re-house artifacts in bulk storage
Re-organize existing drawer and cabinet storage of Study Collection from this block.


Project Description: Previously known as the Third Theater Site, this site is located on the Capitol Exchange. Foundation remains of the original theater structure have been identified and the structure may be reconstructed in the future.

Archaeologists: David Muraca
Lisa Fisher
Dwayne W. Pickett
Margaret W. Cooper

Records: Machine-readable context records
Machine-readable artifact inventory
Site plans, maps, etc.
Conservation records

Publications: Site Report in production


Remedial Work: Complete soil sample floatation
Inventory any small artifacts retrieved from floatation
Crossmending ceramics and glass
Digitize any remaining maps and plans that have not yet been done
Object Catalog
Drawer Storage
Warehouse storage of artifacts
Carter’s Grove “10” Field Schools (1999-2000)

Project Description: This late seventeenth-century domestic site will be completed in 2002. The site has produced very interesting domestic artifacts, including a smoker’s companion, late German stoneware vessels, and early English tin-glazed wares.

Archaeologists: Kevin Bartoy
Steve Archer

Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable context records
Conservation records
Site plans, maps, etc., some in digital format


Remedial Work: Complete soil sample floatation
Inventory any artifacts retrieved from floatation
Crossmending of ceramics and glass
Object catalog
Complete conservation treatment of metal objects
Drawer storage
Finalize report
Warehouse bulk storage
Tarpley’s Store (2001)

Project Description: Several excavation units were dug in the area between Wetherburn’s Tavern and Tarpley’s Store. A large trash midden was encountered that relates of refuse from the tavern and nearby structures.

The artifacts were re-analyzed with Wetherburn’s Tavern material dug in 1965-66 and numerous crossmends were found. Crossmending context correlations have been completed. A descriptive object catalog including significant objects from the earlier excavation should be compiled for the site report, but no such provision has been made in the budget for this project.

Archaeologists: Mark Kostro
David F. Muraca

Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Machine-readable context records
Incomplete machine-readable object catalog
Conservation treatment records
Hand-written crossmend records
Site plans, maps, etc.

Publications: Salvage Excavation of Colonial Lots 20 and 21, Williamsburg, Virginia, In production, Mark Kostro, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation

Remedial Work: Complete object catalog
Digitize site maps, plans, etc.
Drawer storage
House-artifacts in warehouse bulk storage

Route 60, Bus Garage Site (2001)

Project Description: This site was excavated in anticipation of construction of a bus facility for the Foundation. A multi-component site was discovered and partially excavated. Prehistoric, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century features were encountered. Funds should be sought to complete the excavation of this early site that will include a detailed artifact analysis and curation.

Archaeologists: Mark Kostro

Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Some digitized site maps, plans, etc.
Machine-readable context records


Remedial Work: Complete soil sample floatation
Inventory artifacts retrieved from floatation
Crossmend ceramics and glass
Phase the site in terms of defined occupation
Complete site report
Drawer storage
House artifacts in warehouse bulk storage

Benjamin Waller House Waterproofing (2001)

Project Description: The builder’s trenches surrounding the Benjamin Waller House were excavated in anticipation of foundation waterproofing activities. Numerous artifacts were retrieved, by no analysis was performed.

Archaeologists: Lily Richards

Records: Machine readable artifact inventory
Site plans. Maps, and profiles, etc.


Remedial Work: Even if crossmending of the ceramics and glass is not done, a descriptive object catalog should be included in the site report
Drawer storage
Complete machine-readable object catalog so artifacts can be correctly placed in warehouse bulk storage.

Kendall-Gardner Site (2001)

Project Description: This site behind the George Wythe property was the eighteenth-century location of Kendall and Gardner’s carpenter’s yard. Dug in the 1940s by Jimmy Knight, various features, including a large hole thought to be a sawpit, were explored. The most recent excavation on the site was undertaken without funding, resulting in a tremendous backlog of basic artifact processing, analysis and curation. Funds should be sought in the future to complete the excavation of this property so that a more full understanding of the land use can be constructed.

Archaeologists: Meredith Poole
Buddy Paulett

Records: Machine-readable context records, partially entered
Incomplete artifact inventory
Conservation records
Edward Charlton House (2002)

Project Description: Excavations have extended south into the yard of the reconstructed Barber Shop and the entire perimeter of the Charlton house. Wig curlers, straight pins, crucible fragments, and buttons have been excavated. Work has allowed for new interpretations as to the location of wig making, barbers, and the presence of a tailor in the non-extant “Charlton Shop/Office”. Large postholes, that pre-date the Charlton House and that are believed to be part of barn or warehouse built by William Byrd II were discovered. No funds have been budgeted for artifact analysis or curation.

Archaeologists: Lisa Fischer
Mark Kostro


Remedial Work: Crossmend ceramics and glass with pertinent material from the 1965-66 excavations
Re-analyze crucible fragments found on the site and compare with those found at Richard Charlton’s Coffeehouse and at the Cok-Garrett House in 1958-59
Create crossmend correlations of context numbers for site interpretation
Create object catalog
Drawer storage
House artifacts in warehouse bulk storage
Digitize site plans, maps, profiles, etc.

Block 31, City Parking Garage Site, Wray Site (2002)

Project Description: This project was undertaken to rescue the archaeological deposits in the center of city block 31 in anticipation of the con-
struction of a three-level parking facility for the City of Williamsburg. The site was an urban plantation owner by James Wray, a Williamsburg carpenter, glazier and joiner. Noël Hume had excavated the southeastern corner of the block in 1969 and predicted the probable location of the main house. Current excavations have uncovered two cellars, brick walkways, and many other features containing strong evidence of glazier work.

Archaeologists: Katherine W. Schupp
Jameson Harwood

Records: Machine-readable artifact inventory
Conservation records


Remedial Work: As the site is currently being dug, there is no significant remedial work other than the backlog of artifact processing and inventory that will grow in size as the summer progresses.
Research Plan:

Seventeenth-Century Archaeology at Colonial Williamsburg

Committee Members:
Andrew Edwards (chair)
   Kelly Ladd
   Steve Archer
   Joanne Bowen
   Carrie Alblinguer
Introduction

With the founding of Jamestown in 1607 and the subsequent establishment of the Virginia plantation system, the Chesapeake region became the birthplace of British colonialism, a phenomenon that would eventually encompass the globe. Because of its unique situation, the area has attracted the attention of historians, geographers, and archaeologists for over a century. Besides the formation of England’s first “Cittie” in the Americas, Virginia’s past includes such notable events as the arrival of the first Africans in the Chesapeake, the staging of the American Revolution and beginning of the United States in Williamsburg and Yorktown, as well as the seeds of its dissolution sown in the Civil War. Few, if any, places in our country can boast of such an illustrious and varied past. Few, if any, places in our country have been as intensively studied by historians and archaeologists alike. The discipline of historical archaeology, which maintains various academic organizations with memberships in the thousands, and produces several respected journals, got its beginning right here in the Chesapeake. The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, which today prides itself in having one of the largest museum-based archaeological research teams in the country, was one of the leaders in establishing the field of historical archaeology. However, the majority of the credit for founding the particular branch of archaeology dealing with global European expansion can be given to the National Park Service.

Some of the earliest archaeological work concerned with European-Americans was carried out at Jamestown over a century ago. In the 1890s, Mary Jeffrey Galt, founder of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, unearthed a portion of the so-called 1647 church. Col. Samuel Yonge, while constructing the existing seawall at Jamestown, excavated several areas including portions of the so-called Ludwell Statehouse Group. The Barneys, owners of Jamestown Island prior to it’s being acquired by the federal government in 1934, took it on themselves to dig Structure 17, believed to have been the “first statehouse.”

It wasn’t until 1936, after two years of “pot-holing” by architectural historians Henry Chanlee Forman and H. Summerfield Day, that archaeological excavations at Jamestown were actually conducted by a trained NPS archaeologist: Jean C. “Pinky” Harrington. Harrington’s discovery of the relationship between bore size and date-of-manufacture of imported English clay smoking pipes, a discovery with broad implications to historical archaeologists, was made during his excavations at Jamestown. Thus began historical archaeology in the Chesapeake. After an interruption in the monumental work at Jamestown during World War II, John Cotter took up the spade, leading the excavations at Jamestown in the 1950s. The Park Service excavations produced hundreds of thousands of artifacts from Virginia’s early European beginnings. Over the next 50 years, these objects taught a generation of historical archaeologists about material culture.

Archaeology at Williamsburg began in the late 1920s with the excavations at Raleigh Tavern, the Capitol Building, the Wren Building, and the Governor’s Palace (1930). Although the Palace Excavations were under the nominal supervision trained archaeologist Prentice Duell, by-and-large the period between 1926 and 1960 can be characterized as
driven by architectural interests. The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation committed to the reconstruction and restoration of the eighteenth-century town - primarily a brick-and-mortar pursuit. While Harrington and Cotter were using archaeology as anthropology, finding out about how people lived, Colonial Williamsburg excavators were mostly concerned with buildings.

After the bulk of reconstruction had been completed, the foundation hired British-trained archaeologist Ivor Noël Hume in the late 1950s. Noël Hume and his wife Audrey brought stratigraphic excavation, a vast knowledge of English artifacts, and the desire to concern themselves and the Foundation with the people who lived in eighteenth-century Williamsburg. Ivor Noël Hume became one of the founders of historical archaeology and an active voice in its associations. His Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America (1967) is one of the seminal reference books in historical archaeology and is still in use after 35 years.

In 1982 Noël Hume retired from directing archaeological projects at Colonial Williamsburg. Marley R. Brown III succeeded him. A student of another one of the respected founders of historical archaeology, James Deetz, Brown brought to the foundation his experience in New England and California archaeology, a concern for a more anthropologically oriented archaeology, and a keen interest in environmental archaeology. He quickly formed a lasting liaison with the College of William & Mary’s Department of Anthropology, expanded the number of permanent archaeologists working for the foundation, and created the Department of Archaeological Research. Brown’s overall plan for the direction of archaeological research at Colonial Williamsburg was explained in terms of 10 research themes, each with its own set of research objectives. The research theme with which we are concerned here was originally called Seventeenth-Century Settlement and Lifeways. The research objectives under the general theme of Seventeenth-Century Settlement are (1) settlement patterning, (2) architectural research, (3) material culture studies, (4) intrasite spatial analyses, (5) scientific studies, (6) foodways, (7) documentary studies, (8) comparative research, and (9) public interpretation.

The purpose of this narrative is to explain how the project resources, that is, the archaeological projects carried out by The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation over the past 70-odd years, address the modern research objectives of the general seventeenth-century archaeology theme. Once that is accomplished we can more clearly address the directions in which we wish to direct future research.

**Seventeenth-Century Archaeological Projects, 1926 to 1960**

**Nassau Street (1940 and 1942)**

In 1940 James Knight excavated the western half of what was then referred to as the Nassau Street Tavern. As shown in this photograph, he fully excavated the structure’s cellar, remove all soil and rubble. He came back in 1942 to trench the eastern side of the building that lay under Nassau Street in order to complete his plan drawing. Knight left a large area of fill in the east-center of the cellar unexcavated.
Wythe Area Buildings

Two brick foundations were found in Prince George Street in 1939 and 1975. Since the foundations did not align with the north-south layout of Williamsburg, they were presumed to date from the Middle Plantation period.

Wren Building

In 1929 Prentice Duell directed excavations at the Wren Building that he subsequently described in an article in *The Architectural Record* in January 1931. Duell described how the foundations were laid open, plaster removed and a thorough examination of the building walls illustrated the various changes made since the building was erected in 1695. He stressed the importance of recording all evidence as the project proceeded.

Bruton Parish Church

The foundations of the 1683 brick church were found in the summer of 1938 by Marie Bauer Hall, a self-acclaimed psychic from California. According to Ms. Hall, the exact location of the old church was revealed through the deciphering of “messages” left by freemasons on gravestones in the church yard. Digging uncovered the brick footings of the church, but it remains unclear whether Ms. Hall, the vestry, or Colonial Williamsburg architects were in charge of the excavations.

Seventeenth-Century Archaeological Projects, 1960 to 1982

Matthews Manor (Pittman) 1963

Samuel Mathews, who settled in Virginia before 1622, became one of the most prominent men in the early history of the Virginia Colony. He served on the Council and was instrumental in the “mutiny” that deposed Governor John Harvey in 1635. His manor house and domestic complex was excavated by Ivor Noël Hume beginning in 1963, and is one of the most important domestic sites in the James River Watershed. The permanent and impermanent architecture discovered on the site along with the extensive artifact collection retrieved from sealed sub-plowzone features provides a unique glimpse into the domestic and metalworking trades that were practiced on the site during the second and third quarters of the seventeenth century. A two-part site report for the excavation is being written: a detailed history of Samuel Mathews, Senior and Governor Samuel Mathews, Junior has been written, and an extensive illustrated artifact catalog will document fully the wide range of archaeological evidence that survived on the site.

Martin’s Hundred

Ivor Noël Hume/Kelso Survey. In 1971, shortly after purchasing the Carter’s Grove plantation and property, Noël Hume hired William Kelso to conduct an archaeological survey of the Foundation’s new acquisition. In addition to numerous Native American and eighteenth-century archaeological deposits, Kelso located five seventeenth-century sites, designated A through E. A subsequent survey in 1978 on the Locust Grove Tract, east of
the mansion, located Sites F and G. Site H (Boyces Sites) was located during the exploration of Wolstemholme Town (Site C).

**Wolstemholme Town**

**Site C.** Discovered on the original Kelso survey in the early 1970s, Noël Hume’s interest in Site C quickened in the wake of extra-Jamestown seventeenth-century discoveries and excavations at Flowerdew Hundred by Norman F. Barka from William & Mary, and William Kelso’s Kingsmill archaeology prompted by the Busch development goals. Wolstemholme Town was the name given to the palisade-enclosed group of earthfast buildings constructed by settlers around 1619. It was one of several Company Period “particular” plantations along the James. It was destroyed in 1622 when the local indigenous population took exception to their existence and killed 78 of the 140 residents. Site H was an “outlier,” believed to be the home of John Boise.

Site A and Site B were also investigated by Noël Hume in the late 1970s. Site A was a Post-Company Period settlement composed of several earthfast structures enclosed by a defensive fence. Site B was a small but artifact-rich earthfast dwelling. Both dated to the 1630s re-occupation of Martin’s Hundred.

Noël Hume’s book *Martin’s Hundred* was published in 1981 with the “technical” site reports appearing 20 years later.

**Seventeenth-Century Archaeological Projects, 1982-2002:**

**A Brief Review**

Right after the “Office of Excavation and Conservation” was created in 1982, archaeology began at the **Peyton Randolph House Yard**. Almost immediately, a Middle Plantation-era boundary ditch was discovered running in a northwest-to-southeast direction through the excavation area. Thus began a cumulative analysis of features and material pertaining to the seventeenth-century town preceding Williamsburg. The locations of Middle Plantation-period features and artifacts recovered during monitoring projects were noted and added to a conjectural map of Middle Plantation devised by Reps in his *Tidewater Towns* volume. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, in connection with graduate coursework at William & Mary, Andrew Edwards, Alex Bolton and Megan Halley compiled historical data on M.P. land grants and patents, attempting to place names with land holdings in the area between College Creek and Queens Creek.

Later in the 1990s, after the discovery and excavation of the **John Page House**, David Muraca, Kelly Ladd, Martha McCartney and Phil Levy researched historical documentation and artifact distributions in order to clarify the physical limits of Middle Plantation. Much of this work, including the William & Mary field school excavation of the remainder of the **Nassau Street House**, was done in connection with Cary Carson’s exhibit “When Virginia was the Wild West” at the Wallace Gallery for Williamsburg’s 300th anniversary.

Other sites excavated in connection with Middle Plantation include **44WB90 at College Landing** where a domestic complex and seventeenth-century graveyard were exca-
vated prior to the development of the Port Anne subdivision (1987). The Hornsby Site\(^1\) (44JC500), a late seventeenth domestic complex discovered on land acquired near Tutter’s Neck, was excavated in the early 1990s.

In 1992, the western end of the 1683 Bruton Parish Church was exposed archaeologically at the request of the church vestry. Also in 1992, full-scale excavations were started at the Kemp-Ludwell plantation called Rich Neck, located in the Yorkshire subdivision off Jamestown Road. Excavations prior to the construction of the so-called “tenant” house at the northwest corner of Nicholson and Botetourte, revealed what was probably a seventeenth-century house (Ravenscroft) that was used and altered well into the eighteenth century. Two archaeological surveys, one for the so-called Second Street Extension and another at Bruton Heights, turned up evidence of the 1634 Palisade which precipitated the establishment of Middle Plantation.

Several other important sites outside the Middle Plantation/Williamsburg area were examined by Colonial Williamsburg archaeologists between 1988 and 2000. This included a mid-seventeenth century domestic complex on the Hampton University Campus, 44HT55, and the Bates Site, the site of a York County Quaker merchant in the late seventeenth-early eighteenth century. Although not directly related to activities at Middle Plantation, the Hampton site was quite useful in comparing material differences in the two areas.

At Martin’s Hundred, the first site to be excavated since the 1970s, Carter’s Grove Site 8 was undertaken in 1991 after extensive surveys of the Greene and Locust Grove Tracts. Although, again, not directly related to Middle Plantation, the activities at nearby Martin’s Hundred was important at both Middle Plantation and Jamestown throughout the seventeenth century. The site was occupied by poor tenant farmers during the first half of the century and differed dramatically from contemporary sites A and B excavated by Ivor Noël Hume. Another site at Martin’s Hundred, located during a survey of the Locust Grove Area, became the focus of four years (1999-2002) of work involving the annual William & Mary/Colonial Williamsburg field school. Carter’s Grove Site 10 was a late seventeenth, early eighteenth-century domestic site located about a quarter-mile east of the Carter’s Grove mansion and some 8 miles east of contemporary Middle Plantation. In addition to sites 8 and 10, two other seventeenth-century sites were located during the 1989-1990 survey of the Locust Grove Tract at Carter’s Grove. Carter’s Grove Site 2 was an undisturbed domestic site dating to the mid-seventeenth century. Site 11 was a similar domestic mid-century site located near Site 10 in the James River Commerce Center. Both sites are currently protected by easements.

In 1993, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and the National Park Service entered into a cooperative agreement to undertake the archaeological assessment of Jamestown. Through a multidisciplinary approach, bibliographical, historical, geological, geophysical, architectural, and archaeological research was carried out in several areas both in New Town and elsewhere on the island. During the 1993 through 2000 summer seasons, with

\(^1\) Also known as Great Neck.
the assistance of the W&M/CWF field school, over fourteen areas on Jamestown Island were investigated.

Another cooperative agreement, this time with the Department of the Army, led to two seventeenth-century site evaluation surveys and a comprehensive history of Mulberry Island (Ft. Eustis). The sites explored during the survey helped round out our view of the local area in the early colonizing phase.
Each of the seventeenth-century sites investigated by Colonial Williamsburg relate, for better or for worse, to one or more of the research objectives outlined above. Sites that relate best to the specific objective are discussed.

A. Settlement Patterning

In his now classic study of prehistoric settlement patterns in Peru’s Virú Valley, Gordon Willey defined settlement patterning as “the way in which man disposed himself over the landscape on which he lived” (Willey 1953:1). Settlement patterning, Willey said, reflected the natural environment, the technological level, and the institutions of social interaction characterizing a particular culture. This general, but very useful description of settlement patterning can be used to illustrate how the British colonization of the Tidewater area took place. The archaeological locations examined by Colonial Williamsburg that have included a study of settlement patterning primarily include work at Middle Plantation, Martin’s Hundred, Jamestown and Mulberry Island.

1. Middle Plantation

The settlement of Middle Plantation was ordained by the House of Burgesses to secure the area around the Palisade of 1634. The actual specifics of “who-built-what-where” has been a bit more conjectural. Our knowledge of settlement patterning at Middle Plantation has been expanded a great deal during the last 20 years. Prior to 1982, the following sites were known: The Wren Building, Bruton Parish Church (1683), the Nassau Street “Tavern,” the houses behind the Wythe House, a cellar near the Chiswell house (Block 2, Building G) and a boundary ditch (northeast to southwest) on the Custis property near Eastern State, all summed-up in Reps’ conjectural map. Since then, seventeenth-century boundary/drainage ditches have been recorded at Peyton Randolph (northwest to southeast), Shields (north-northeast to south-southwest), and Charlton House (northeast to southwest). A portion of the 1634 palisade was located on the Bruton Heights parcel, as were a tile kiln and the remains of the 1662 Page House. The Public Hospital excavations turned up evidence of Nicholson’s and Jones’ cellars. Additional seventeenth-century features have been located and mapped at Bassett Hall, near the intersection of Waller and York Street (Bray?) and adjacent to the President’s House in the Wren Yard. Recent archaeological work on Block 31 unearthed late seventeenth-century material, suggesting a nearby Middle Plantation era structure. These features, plus Kelly Ladd’s work on plotting the locations of window leads and roofing tiles dating to the Middle Plantation Period, have given us a much finer-grained picture of the “town before the town.”

2. Martin’s Hundred

Two studies involving sites at Martin’s Hundred addressed the way in which people situated themselves on the landscape. David Muraca’s 1993 Masters thesis used the 13 known seventeenth-century sites at Martin’s Hundred to “trace changes in settlement clus-
tering and location through time” (Muraca 1993:iv). His findings suggests that settlement there began as proto-villages in the early Company Period, became more loosely clustered in the post-muster period, then finally becoming widely dispersed prior to consolidation into the “great estate.”

Marley R. Brown and Andrew Edwards (1993) also used the 13 seventeenth-century sites found over the years at Martin’s Hundred to address settlement in the early Chesapeake. Drawing upon James Deetz’s work at another particular plantation on the James, Brown and Edwards found that the Martin’s Hundred sites fell into the same temporal groups as those Deetz observed at Flowerdew. The groups were defined using Harrington histograms of white English clay tobacco pipe bore diameters.

3. Jamestown

A later application of the Deetz approach to settlement dynamics was used by Marley Brown at Jamestown, employing pipe stem data gathered there in the 1930s and 1950s. Again, Harrington Histograms were used to sort out the temporal range of various structures excavated by both Harrington and Cotter. The results were used as a guide in the phasing of New Towne as part of the Jamestown Archaeological Assessment carried out by the DAR between 1993 and 2000.

The assessment also included a Phase I-type survey conducted by the William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research that located 20 previously unknown seventeenth-century sites on Jamestown Island.

4. Mulberry Island (Carrie Alblinger)

No spatial analyses or settlement patterning studies per se were carried out incorporating the sites located on Mulberry Island. General observations based on historical and archaeological evidence, however, were put forward. The seventeenth-century sites situated on Mulberry Island appear to reflect the seventeenth-century history of the Chesapeake area in general, and may perhaps be studied as a microcosm of this greater phenomenon. The Island was among the areas first inhabited by European settlers in the early years of the seventeenth century, and was apparently continuously occupied throughout the century. As Gilmore posited, sites showing evidence of higher economic-status occupants seem to begin to appear after mid-century, when the wealthy landowners of Mulberry Island properties began to settle on this land, possibly “raising the standard of living on the island” (1999:11). The settlement of the Island seems to follow the pattern laid out by Kelly (1979) for Surry County on the south side of the James River: earlier sites tend to be located along waterways, later sites further away from the water, perhaps indicating an improvement in the inland road system, definitely showing that the more-coveted waterfront properties had been taken.

B. Architectural Research

Since the earliest beginnings of both disciplines, architectural research and historical archaeology have been closely associated. The early Chesapeake archaeology at Williamsburg
and Jamestown was fundamentally architecturally oriented. Colonial Williamsburg’s archaeology was, until the late 1950s, carried out by the architecture department with a naturally strong prejudice towards excavating items that would help with the accurate reconstruction of the eighteenth-century town. When the NPS took over Jamestown Island in 1934, the first people digging after the ruined buildings were architectural historians. Even after a trained archaeologist took over the work a few years later, the emphasis remained decidedly architectural. There is still great concern with architectural remains in the Chesapeake, as houses are infinitely interpretable and reflect people’s dealings with their environment.

The interest in architecture in the Chesapeake started out as an interest in wealthy white men’s brick houses or their appurtenances. It wasn’t until the late 1960s or early 1970s that the predominant form of architecture in seventeenth-century Tidewater was even recognized archaeologically. Even by the early 1980s when Cary Carson, Norman Barka and company published their Winterthur paper (Carson et al. 1982) dealing with earthfast construction in the Chesapeake, the inventory of archaeological examples was still quite small and the philosophy behind their construction readily debatable. Since that time, our understanding of so-called permanent architecture and our inventory of examples have expanded considerably.

1. Earthfast

A. Martin’s Hundred – Ivor Noël Hume Period

1. Site A: Found during the 1971 Kelso survey, Site A was a large, complex, fenced compound consisting of nine earthfast structures, ten refuse pits, human burials and hundreds of feet of slot fencing, all dating to the second quarter of the seventeenth century. Located on high ground near the eighteenth-century Carter’s Grove mansion, the site may have functioned as an administrative center for the re-occupation of Martin’s Hundred after the 1622 war (Noël Hume 1982). Two structures at Site A are assuredly dwellings: Structure A, a 20 by 20-foot square pit house at the south end of the site, and Structure B a 40 by 18-foot building about 75 feet north of A. Artifacts recovered from Site A suggest that the inhabitants were well-off compared with several contemporary holdings at Martin’s Hundred.

2. Site B: Rich in artifacts but poor in architectural features, Site B consisted of one 39 by 19-foot earthfast structure defined by 11 rather oddly spaced structural post holes. It was located on high ground about 500 feet east of Site A and proved to be one of the richest small early seventeenth-century sites in Tidewater. Found in the Kelso survey of 1971.

3. Site C: Wolstemholm Town. Paled-in earthfast Company period structures were made “famous” by INH’s 1982 book on Matin’s Hundred. Excavated in the mid-to-late 1970s, it was the second pre-1624 enclosed settlement excavated along the James. Similar to, but not as extensive and sophisticated as Flowerdew Hundred excavated by Barka in the early 1970s.
4. Site D: This small (16 by 25 foot) earthfast structure consisted of six post holes, three on each end. It contained a small associated rubbish pit but no other features. The configuration of the postholes was quite unusual.

5. Site E: Also discovered in the 1971 survey, Site E was a 12 by 14-foot earthfast structure located east of the mansion. Very few artifacts were recovered from its single associated refuse pit.

6. Site F: Originally located on the 1978 Locust Grove Survey, Site F was re-examined in 1991 by Meredith Moodey (Poole) under the direction of Marley Brown. It consisted mainly of a ditch, suggesting a palisadoe enclosure. No structures were located during the Phase 1 and 2 surveys.

7. Site G: Also located during the 1978 survey, Site G is a mid-seventeenth-century domestic site located less than 150 feet southeast of Site F. It is probably the domestic component to the semi-industrial Site F. One post hole was located. Only Phase 1 and 2 have been carried out.

8. Site H: Also known as the Boise Site. This was a domestic compound contemporary with Site C. It consisted of a paled-in earthfast building with a defensive cannon emplacement.

9. Site J: This late seventeenth-century complex was excavated in the early 1980s and straddled the INH/MRB transitional period. The very large, complex domestic compound dated to the last several decades of the seventeenth century. Most of the site was left intact after re-routing of the access road to the Carter’s Grove reception center.

B. Martin’s Hundred – Marley R. Brown Period

1. Site 2: Discovered during the Phase 1 testing in 1990, Site 2 is an archaeological anomaly in Chesapeake archaeology – an unplowed domestic site. Artifacts from the site suggest an occupation period from the second quarter of the seventeenth century. Although no structural post holes were found during the Phase 1 and 2, a large borrow pit was uncovered.

2. Site 8: Found on the 1990-1991 Phase 1 and 2 surveys of the Locust Grove Tract, Carter’s Grove Site 8 (44JC647) underwent full data-recovery excavations during the summer of 1991. The site consisted of one earthfast structure and three pits. The structure contained eight post holes defining a 16 by 24-foot building with a 10 by 7-foot lean-to on the east side. A slot fence constructed on the south side of the building enclosed about 725 square feet of garden space. Extensive artifact and soil analyses were conducted. A report on the site is on file.

3. Site 10: Located on the Locust Grove Phase 1 survey and further investigated in a 1991 Phase 2 follow-up, Carter’s Grove Site 10 has been the subject of three field school efforts and will be completed in 2002. This appears to be a domestic complex with an industrial or craft-related component. It was estab-
lished in the last quarter of the seventeenth century and lasted well into the first or second quarter of the eighteenth. An earthfast structure, measuring 16 feet east-west and 28 feet north-south was uncovered in 2000. The small structure had a daub chimney on the south end with a rectangular storage pit on the interior.

4. Site 11: Also located on the early-nineties surveys of the Locust Grove Tract, Carter’s Grove Site 11 appears to be a nearly intact (possibly un-ploughed) mid-seventeenth century domestic site. Only one structural post was located, but a rich, dark midden layer may represent the location of the building. The site is within an easement in the James River Commerce Center, a joint venture between CWF and James City County.

C. Hampton University (44HT55)

The Hampton Site, a second and third quarter seventeenth-century site located on the campus of Hampton University, was identified in 1979 by VDOT archaeologist Howard MacCord. In 1987 CWF was contracted to conduct data recovery excavations prior to the site’s destruction by a University construction project. The site contained five earthfast structures, three of which may have existed simultaneously:

- Structure A: Traversed-raised, two-bay structure measuring 16 by 35 feet with a brick-lined cellar on the east end.
- Structure B: Traversed-raised, two-bay structure measuring 18 by 20 feet.
- Structure C: Traverse-raised, three-bay structure measuring 20 by 40 feet.
- Structure D: Traverse-raised, two-bay structure measuring 20 by 15 feet.
- Structure E: Side-raised, two-bay structure measuring 20 by 24 feet.

D. 44JC500 (Hornsby Site/ Great Neck)

E. Rich Neck

2. Brick

A. Bruton Parish Church

One of several all-brick structures built in Middle Plantation in the last quarter of the seventeenth century. The building, located only 100 feet or so from the present Bruton Parish Church, was built in 1683 as the first brick church in Bruton Parish. It measured c. 62 feet east-west and about 30 feet north-south. It probably looked much like St. Luke’s, a standing church of the same vintage in Isle of Wight. The building was uncovered in 1938 by Marie Bauer Hall, a mystic from California seeking a legendary secret vault containing Masonic Mysteries. The DAR re-excavated a portion of the structure in 1992 at the behest of the church vestry after illegal digging by latter-day vault seekers.
B. Rich Neck
Two brick structures, the basic part of one that dates as early as 1644. Dimensions and discussion forthcoming.

C. Page
Large Brick house, constructed in Middle Plantation by John Page in 1662.

D. Ravenscroft
Portion of the brick-foundation frame house may date to the Middle Plantation Period, although there is no conclusive evidence. Located at the Northwest corner of Botetourt and Nicholson in the historic area.

E. Nassau Street House
Excavated in part by Jimmy Knight in 1940 and by David Muraca and Phil Levy in 1999 as part of the “town before the town” exhibit at the Wallace. Complete brick building with cellar, dating to the 1680s located near Bruton Parish Church.

F. Jamestown

G. Wren Yard Building
A one-brick-wide foundation of unknown dimensions was found in the Wren Yard in 1997. As the foundation appears to be at odds with the north-south axis of Williamsburg, it is assumed the building is of Middle Plantation vintage.

C. Material Culture Studies

1. Roofing Tile and Window Leads (Kelly Ladd)
While vast amounts of information has been recovered relating to the eighteenth-century town of Williamsburg, the nature and layout of Middle Plantation, the seventeenth-century community that preceded Williamsburg remains elusive. Two separate material culture studies were combined in 1998 to form a basis for identifying or predicting the location of seventeenth-century remains. Hereto un-noticed individually as signatures, ceramic roofing tiles, constructed almost exclusively during the Middle Plantation period, and window leads from casement windows, primarily a seventeenth-century phenomenon were looked at in a broader context. By combining the data gleaned from window lead studies undertaken in 1997 spanning the whole of the archaeological collections, and tile studies prompted by the excavation of the John Page site, the number of suspected Middle Plantation sites doubled, presenting a new view into the seventeenth century.

2. Local Pipes (Anna Agbe-Davies)
Locally-made pipes represent a unique mix of material, formal, and decorative attributes which distinguish them from contemporary clay tobacco smoking pipes from Native
America, Europe and Africa. Previous studies often attempted to link pipes from a single site, from the Chesapeake Bay region as a whole, with ethnicity or other social identities. Research by Anna Agbe-Davies is using materials excavated from sites at Jamestown and Middle Plantation to address questions concerning manufacture, distribution, and consumption of these pipes. The goal is to identify connections between pipe-makers and pipe-users; were these people one and the same - making pipes for household use, as generally assumed - or are Chesapeake pipes commodities produced for the local market, offering a window into early industry in the American colonies? Results from a preliminary analysis of the pipe fragments from Green Spring and the Page plantation, have demonstrated clear patterns reflected in decorative motifs, in the tools and techniques used to achieve certain forms and decoration, and in a series of measurements used to identify the different moulds in which some pipes were formed. These patterns in the pipes' variation may be thought of as representing different "workshops" which consistently produced standardized products.

3. Yellow Brick (Carrie Alblinger)

Alblinger and Keffert (2000:57-74) considered the incidence of one artifact type – yellow "Dutch" brick – at sites on Mulberry Island and at a number of other seventeenth-century sites in the Chesapeake region. Yellow brick is commonly considered a specialty architectural item because of its unusual color, its exceptional density and water-resistance, and its use in areas such as fireplaces, paving, and cellars that took advantage of these qualities. Yellow brick was found at one of the two sites that Alblinger investigated, and two of those that Gilmore studied on the Island, leading to questions about the variables that could explain the presence of this material on those sites. Alblinger and Keffert compared fifty seventeenth-century archaeological sites, including the Mulberry Island sites, in terms of occupant socio-economic status, sites’ temporal periods of occupation, presence of items of architectural embellishment (other than yellow brick), presence of imported goods, and site location near waterways and other sites with yellow brick. These data were hypothesized to have correlations with the presence of yellow brick. Out of the sample of fifty sites, only eleven instances of yellow brick on sites in the general area of the James River basin were found. The brick was found on sites that date to all quarters of the seventeenth century. They represent wealthy, middling, and poor households, and people of all social levels from Governor to indentured servant. The presence of yellow brick seems to have some, but not complete correlation with the presence of other items of architectural embellishment and with the presence of imported goods. The sites with yellow brick present do seem to be clustered in groups along major waterways.

D. Intrasite Spatial Analyses

1. Hampton University (44HT55)

A fully enclosed settlement with at least a main dwelling and two additional structures, all earthfast. The east end of the dwelling serves as part of an animal enclosure, the south side has a garden enclosure similar to the one at CG-8. A well and service/animal area are located far to the west of the house complex. All are paled in.
2. Port Anne
Since the dwelling was not located during the excavations, trying to deal with intrasite patterns is problematic. The paled-in cemetery was, however, well separated from the domestic section of the site.

3. CG-8
The main thrust of the CG8 excavation was directed at using artifacts and soil chemistry to address differential use of the yard area of a poor tenant farmer. The piece plotting of the artifacts in the plowzone over the site failed to reveal areas of varying use dependent upon artifact type. The soil chemistry was more useful, suggesting the area within the enclosure was used differently than the area just outside and to the south. Soil chemistry of the two major trash-filled pits suggests that, even though open at the same time, they were receiving very different kinds of rubbish.

4. Rich Neck
David Muraca’s research on various kinds of small finds, especially locks and gun parts, suggests differences in the use of space within the Rich Neck Plantation complex.

5. Jamestown
Audrey Horning’s Ph.D. dissertation analyzed features and finds from the “industrial enclave” in New Town, Jamestown. Survey work done by the Jamestown Archaeological Assessment team in 1995 looked at artifact scatters and concentrations within New Town.

6. CG-10
Intrasite analysis of the features uncovered between 1999 and 2001 at CG10 is currently underway. The relationships between the buildings and the ravine features have not been clearly determined. The final season of excavation, 2002, should clarify those associations.

E. Scientific Studies
1. Hampton University Site
   A. Faunal analysis
      Greg Brown, heavy reliance on domestic livestock with a significant wild faunal component.
   
   B. Oyster shell analysis
      Susan Alexandrowicz, mostly bed oysters, deep, low salinity
C. Paleobotanical analysis

Eric Voigt, 1989. Summarizes 114 flotation samples from 3 sites. The most productive site for botanicals was HT55, which yielded an abundance of maize and wheat from well and trash pit samples. Quantification is better than some reports, distinguishing between charred and fresh plant material, and some indications of non-seed material, but still problematic, no volumetric information, so no density calculations permitting cross-site comparison are possible.

2. CG-8

A. Soil Chemistry

Extensive use of elemental analysis from Va Tech. All Surfed. Vague activity areas defined.

B. Paleobotanical

Stephen A. Mrozowski, 1992. Includes a summary of 17 flotation samples. Only real result being some charred grass (Poaceae) seeds, found in association with (presumably screen recovered) charred peach pits. Small amounts of charred Chenopodium and Portulaca seeds were recovered as well, extremely common weedy associates. No quantification of soil or non-seed material. CWF retained the samples and will likely reanalyze some of this material in conjunction with CG10.

C. Faunal

By Greg Brown and Joanne Bowen – mostly domestic, no deer suggests no hunting.

3. Jamestown

A. Soil Chemistry

Used for feature-specific analyses.

B. Paleobotanical

G. Johnson et. al 2001 (?) Extensive Environmental review including geological reconstruction, a summary of vegetation surveys, macrobotanical analysis of features, and pollen, seed and phytolith analysis of cores. Many problematic aspects, but does establish some good baseline data, particularly in the swamp core. Geological summary is also a useful framework for the archaeology of the island as a whole. The site-based pollen analysis seems to validate a sampling strategy for pollen in sheltered locations, i.e., under artifacts. The seed analysis by Mrozowski is again inadequate to assess the potential of the data. Might be worth seeing if the original samples can be tracked down, but again small and sometimes unrecorded volumes limit their research potential.
C. Faunal
Joanne Bowen’s analysis of faunal remains from the ca. 1610 pit on APVA property.

D. Macrostratigraphic
Douglas Currie recovered and analyzed microstratigraphic samples from Refuse Pit 1 on NPS property and the APV A pit.

4. CG-10
Very much in-progress. Most of the phytolith analysis is complete. First phase involved looking at vertical plowzone distributions as a kind of adjunct to Kelly Sullivan’s thesis. There is variability but also a consistent change with depth in the plowzone. Unfortunately the same could not be said for our soil chemistry results that were wildly erratic. Subsequent analysis of strata within features (root cellar and ravine) showed clear differences in the deposits, some entirely dominated by European grasses, and some indications of chaff, possibly fodder indications in the base of the ravine feature.

5. Rich Neck
A. Paleobotanical
Kelly Sullivan (M.A. Thesis 1999), phytolith analysis. Plowzone study of phytolith distributions as indicators of activity areas. Seems to bear out that less-intensively plowed sites have potential for local landscape reconstruction. Five distinct phytolith patterns associated geographically with structures and features, indicating potential yard, dairy, orchard locations, using soil chemistry as a complementary line of evidence. Some of the most methodologically sound and sophisticated site-based phytolith work done at CWF. Mrozowski and Driscoll did macrobotanical work on an eighteenth-century slave quarter, no seventeenth-century macrobotanicals yet although there are extensive samples.

B. Soil Chemistry
Samples taken, no analysis.

F. Foodways Research (Joanne Bowen)
1. Public Hospital Site, ER 2625-4C
1984. Analysis of the Faunal Remains from the Public Hospital Site, ER 2625-4C, by Joanne Bowen. Analysis of bone fragments excavated from a wood-lined trash pit included a full report discussing age data, relative dietary assessments, and through the use of historical sources and comparisons made with other analyses completed by Henry Miller, Bowen attempted an analysis of Chesapeake foodways. Assemblage date 1699.
2. Archaeology at Port Anne

Faunal overview by Roni Hinote Polk. While most bone was well preserved, some required consolidation. Given the very small assemblage recovered, analysis included species identifications, fragment counts, and MNI determinations. Despite the small number of bone, deer and other wild fauna are well represented. Assemblage date early seventeenth century.

3. Hampton University Archaeological Project

Faunal analysis by Gregory Brown. Analysis of a large faunal assemblage from 44HT55 demonstrated that relative to other early seventeenth century sites analyzed by Dr. Henry Miller of the St. Mary’s City Commission, there was a low percentage of wild fauna. Brown discussed animal husbandry and the relative dietary contribution made by different taxa. He also provided a site catchment analysis on the basis of wild fauna.

4. “Upon the Palisado” and Other Stories of Place from Bruton Heights


5. “Faunal Analysis from the Carter’s Grove Site 50AJ (44JC647)”


Faunal analysis by Joanne Bowen, 1996. Full analytical report on the faunal remains from all sites excavated during the 1980s.

7. The Starving Time at Jamestown: Faunal Analysis of Pit 1, Pit 3, the Bulwark Ditch, Ditch 6, Ditch 7, and Midden 1, James City County, Virginia

Faunal analysis by Joanne Bowen and Susan Trevarthen Andrews, 2000. A full-scale report on the findings from major assemblages. Discusses the relative importance of wildlife, including medieval cuisine, and animals eaten during The Starving Time.

G. Documentary Studies

1. Middle Plantation

A. Andrew Edwards

Using Nugent’s (1979) land patents, a database was created that attempted to describe the patent boundaries in order to show relationships among the landholdings. A conjectural map of the Middle Plantation patent locations was developed.
B. Megan Haley-Newman
   Took the project started by Edwards in the late 1980s much further – created a working file to which all information, documentary and archaeological, was kept.

C. Martha McCartney
   Created a conjectural map of Middle Plantation landholdings in conjunction with the CWF city maps project. Produced "Land Ownership Patterns and Early Development in Middle Plantation" in February of 2000.

D. Philip Levy and David Muraca
   Worked with Martha on the Middle Plantation holdings in conjunction with the Nassau Street excavations in 1999.

2. Jamestown
   Martha McCartney produced three volumes of historical documentation relating to people and land holdings on Jamestown Island as part of the Jamestown Archaeological Assessment sponsored by the NPS and CWF.

H. Public Interpretation/Education
   1. Hampton University
      H.U. students were encouraged to join the excavations, but few bothered. The Daily Press and WAVY-TV did do news stories on the dig.

   2. CG-8
      Field school, public exhibit in the elementary school., SHA paper.

   3. Bruton Parish Church
      Highly publicized media event.

   4. Jamestown
      Field Schools, visitors to Jamestown, SHA and SAA papers, newspaper and television stories.

   5. Rich Neck
      Field Schools, Press stories, SHA papers, CNEHA.

   6. CG-10
      Field Schools, Web site, school tours.
7. Nassau Street

Field School, Public, Press.
Conclusions and Recommendations by Research Objective

It is clear from the preceding description of the work carried out by the foundation over the last 20 years that our knowledge of this area in the seventeenth century has expanded considerably. Numerous institutions including the College of William & Mary, the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, the National Park Service, James River Institute for Archaeology, and other contract firms have conducted further seventeenth-century research. Work in neighboring Maryland, adding to the understanding of the early Chesapeake, has been carried out by St. Mary’s City Commission, Jefferson Patterson Park, the Lost Cities of Arundell Project, and others. This brief review also suggests that there are areas of research, i.e. research objectives that have been well documented, such as earthfast architecture, and others that need more work, like paleaobotanical study.

1. Settlement Patterning

Several major studies have addressed the settlement patterning phenomenon in the seventeenth century: Meghan Haley’s dissertation work and Martha McCarney’s City Maps project are mostly grey literature or hidden on the DAR servers and accessible only to Martha and us. However, on the brighter side, knowledge of the layout and of the settlement and land ownership is believed to be accurate. Jennifer Jones also wants to do her history dissertation work on Middle Plantation; perhaps this will pull together the cumulative knowledge of Williamsburg’s predecessor and Jamestown’s nearby contemporary.

In addition to Middle Plantation patterning, David Muraca’s master’s thesis deals with the concept of community and spatial organization at Martin’s Hundred. Marley Brown and Andrew Edwards wrote a COVA paper addressing a different concept of settlement at Martin’s Hundred. Kevin Bartoy and Steve Archer are in the planning stages of a popular pamphlet dealing with the peopling of the particular plantation.

For the settlement of Jamestown Island, one can look to Martha McCartney’s Assessment work that actually put names to parcels of land. She set the stage for a future analysis of why certain individuals settled in specific places on Jamestown Island.

A needs analysis of seventeenth-century settlement patterning research should be centered upon using the databases of people and landholdings at Jamestown and Middle Plantation developed by Martha McCartney to determine the reasons behind individuals purchasing where they did. Some further research should be directed at documentary studies and Chesapeake-wide patterning.

2. Architectural Research

There has been considerable advancement in the study of seventeenth-century Chesapeake architecture since Carson et al.’s Winterthur article. The inventory of earthfast buildings has more than doubled in the last 20 years and archaeological/anthropological analy-
Fraser Neiman’s dissertation stands out among the most comprehensive. Willie Graham is in the process of compiling a current inventory. The discovery and excavation of several mid-seventeenth-century brick buildings (Rich Neck, Page, and Curles Neck to name a few) has lead some to question the “impermanent architecture” thesis developed by Carson, et al. While adding to the inventory of seventeenth-century building plans has merit, it is not an end in itself. Further and novel analyses of the data on hand would be better than acquiring more.

3. Material Culture Studies
Refer to K. Ladd Research Review, Material Culture

4. Intrasite Spatial Analysis
A number of methods have been used for trying to understand yard areas in the seventeenth century. Muraca looked at small finds, particularly locks and gun parts, analyzing the hierarchy of space at Rich Neck, while Edwards used soil chemistry at CG8. Neither method was totally successful but a combination of the two may have been. Again, re-examination of data in the context of chemistry, finds, and environment as well as the spatial relationships of buildings within a site should be one of our objectives during the next decade.

5. Scientific Studies
Steve Archer will address this in detail in his report, but it is probably the area in which most work is needed. Suggestions for further study include:

   a. Recreation of the seventeenth-century environment around Williamsburg through a comprehensive survey of chemical, paleobotanical, geological, and archaeological evidence.

   b. A more serious approach to elemental chemical data as illustrated in Lisa Fischer’s thesis.

   c. Development of a comprehensive regional paleobotanical program “for hire.”

6. Foodways
Refer to J. Bowen Research Review for Foodways.

7. Documentary Studies
Martha McCartney’s Middle Plantation and Jamestown studies as well as her volume on James City County, have added to the historical research of the area immeasurably. She may be in the process of doing a book on York County. There certainly is room for additional work, especially on what few inventories are available, diaries, travel logs, etc. May be interesting to try to get a glimpse of the environment through documents.
8. Public Education/Interpretation

In the process of being revamped.

9. Comparative Research

Amazingly enough, we have really done very little. Marley Brown, Audrey Horning, and Andrew Edwards did compare data from Martin’s Hundred/Flowerdew, Jamestown/Ireland/England, but an in-depth site-by-site comparative study has not been done for the James River Basin, let alone the Chesapeake as a whole.
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Introduction:  
“Environmental” Archaeology

Environmental Archaeology” is perhaps best viewed as a domain of archaeology involving the ways humans engage with the “natural” world. Methodologically, environmental archaeology borrows more heavily from the natural sciences than other aspects of archaeological practice. This definition is sometimes confused with a theoretical perspective concentrating on the human-environment relationship. At its most limited and unsatisfactory extreme, “Environmental archaeology” verges on environmental determinism, wherein human behavior is seen primarily as the product of natural forces or imbalances in the ecological systems people inhabit.

An “environmental” approach to archaeology is closely associated with “processual” archaeology (sometimes called “New Archaeology”), an enormously influential disciplinary movement beginning in the mid-1960s. Before processual archaeology’s proponents, archaeologists were primarily concerned with sequencing and delimiting prehistoric cultures in time and space. Causal explanations for change were generally simplistic and under-theorized. To most archaeologists of the 1930s-1950s, “pots equalled people” and little thought was given to the social and physical complexities of life in the past. The processual archaeology proponents were heavily influenced by logical positivism and natural science philosophies such as those of Carl Hempel and Karl Popper. Essentially, the “New” archaeologists, such as Lewis Binford, Kent Flannery, and Patty Jo Watson, began to see human behavior in a “natural science” mode, stressing hypothetico-deductive inquiry, predictive models, and cybernetically-derived “systems theory”. Instead of mere collections of potsherds, to processual archaeologists, the humans of the past were foremost biological organisms, using “culture” as a tool to respond to population pressures, climatic conditions, and other resource stresses.

This theoretical tide brought with it the core types of analysis generally thought of as “environmental” today, including the study of animal bones, plant remains, human skeletons, paleoclimatic reconstruction, as well as geomorphological and geochemical studies. The “natural”, ecological, and biological aspects of life were considered critical to interpretation of culture process, and many of these subfields likely view the 1960s and 1970s as a kind of “golden age” for research interest and discovery.

By the 1980s however, the problematic aspects of a processual theoretical approach were becoming readily apparent. The search for human universal “laws” of behavior and responses to environmental stress came up virtually empty-handed. Archaeologists and descendant communities developed severe rifts due to wanton excavation and treatment of human remains and other sacred materials in the name of “Science” and the denial of culture-specific phenomena and other means of knowing the past (e.g., oral histories). It became clear to many archaeologists that the culture-process paradigm was restrictive about the kinds of inquiry that could be made about the past, and furthermore, that people rarely behaved in the predictable manner of molecules or gravity. A collection of research themes loosely grouped as “post-processual” began to emerge, championed notably by...
British archaeologists such as Ian Hodder, Michael Shanks, and Christopher Tilley. Post-processual archaeology is not as easily delimited as processual archaeology, but rather ostensibly broadens the field with a number of key themes. These include a recognition of the present political nature of archaeological discourse (Shanks and Tilley 1987), the fundamentally symbolic nature of material culture (Hodder 1982), the influence of gender and identity constructs past and present (Gero and Conkey 1991), and an essential central precept that the past, as interpreted by archaeologists, is a present construction mitigated by individual and socio-political factors, as opposed to a bona fide reconstruction of a true or knowable past.

Part of this movement can be attributed to feminist and other critiques of scientific authority, stressing the problematic nature of “Science” which purports to be universal and transcendent of sociological influence, but in fact is frequently used to legitimate social inequity or is otherwise conditioned by prevailing cultural norms. This position has been especially influential among anthropologists and archaeologists who, of necessity, frequently use scientific methodologies to explore a multivalent, and fundamentally human past.

The broad acknowledgement of the “post-processual critique” has in some ways damaged specialists in materials and data sources which are affiliated with the natural sciences, such as botany, zoology, or geology. Within the profession, there is a mistaken linkage between the study of purportedly “natural” or “environmental” materials and phenomena, with the outmoded deterministic perspective (Mrozowski 1993). Nonetheless, the post-processual critique has had an appreciably lesser impact on field and laboratory methods when compared to interpretive ends (Hodder 1997). Excavations continue to excavate, record, and sample systematically for “environmental” remains, despite a widening theoretical distancing from “environmental” interpretations. Unfortunately, with few exceptions (e.g., Hastorf 1990), archaeologists have failed to avail themselves of the potential of biological or other materials with a natural aspect to address more contemporary lines of research, to which they are entirely suited, as much as any other aspect of material culture.

North American historical archaeology does not share the same developmental history as anthropological archaeology focusing on prehistory. U.S. Historical archaeology was initially very heavily oriented toward reconstructing the architecture of historic buildings. Its practitioners were more likely to be architects or historians rather than anthropologists. Indeed, many historical archaeologists of an anthropological bent, reacting against historical particularism, were pushing for broader-scale interpretations on the order of processual archaeology at the same time that many prehistorians pushed for history rather than anthropology as a model discipline for archaeology (Johnson 1999). Into this confusing theoretical array, “environmental archaeology”, lacking the strong, fairly cohesive theoretical unification of a “processual archaeology” trend in historical archaeology, has been incorporated into the practice of North American historical archaeology in a fairly eclectic manner, from which it has yet to become “mainstreamed”.
Environmental Archaeology at Colonial Williamsburg Under Ivor Noël Hume (1957-1982)

Prior to Noël Hume’s appointment as director of Archaeology in 1957, virtually nothing which could be classified as “environmental archaeology” was undertaken in the historic area of Colonial Williamsburg or its rich neighboring historical resources such as Yorktown or Jamestown Island. Architectural reconstruction was the primary goal of the rudimentary excavations, which used crude and highly destructive techniques to locate foundations and other evidence of structures.

During the stewardship of Ivor Noël Hume, Colonial Williamsburg’s archaeology program was initially operating under a common paradigm much Noël Hume himself described in a seminal paper, “Archaeology as Handmaiden to History”. The implication of this approach for environmental archaeology was a highly specific and restricted application of archaeo-biological analysis. That is, if a certain type of analysis could help to answer or clarify a specific historical question, it was considered possibly valid or worthwhile. The converse, more contemporary approach, of analyzing biological material culture in an attempt to inform socio-ecological issues not directly documented, was not a part of Noël Hume’s vision of archaeology.

The kinds of biological analysis performed under Noël Hume’s direction include studies of limited scope, predicated on rare finds during excavation. The primary unifying theme of the Noël Hume approach to biological remains on sites was that of foodways. Giving credit where it is due, it should be noted that Audrey Noël Hume was the primary proponent of foodways (and also gardening) archaeological research, the results of which were published in two significant booklets, Food (1978) and Archaeology and the Colonial Gardener (1974). Audrey’s approach to an understanding of foodways closely paralleled Ivor’s approach to artifacts. Although fundamentally not quantitative or “scientific” by any stretch, Audrey worked with both the identified animal bones (performed during this period by Dr. Stanley J. Olsen), and plant remains together with artifacts, documents and period paintings in a narrative, anecdotal style. While the goals and results of the Noël Hume approach could uncharitably be called “particularistic” by the social scientist, the idea of using multiple lines of evidence in a synthetic manner is still too often a rarity in the archaeological discipline which has been plagued by increasing hyper-specialization. While Audrey’s two publications centered on eighteenth-century Williamsburg, a much lesser-known Ph.D. dissertation heavily influenced by the Noël Humes looked at seventeenth-century foodways, using a great deal of data from the Martin’s Hundred excavations at Carter’s Grove (Spencer 1982).

The information learned from these types of analysis was not inconsequential, and in fact opened the door for later research questions, even if they were not made explicit.

1 The source for plant material identifications is unknown. Two lists of identifications made from Wetherburn’s Tavern excavations and the Custis well are uncredited.
during Noël Hume’s tenure. Minimally, the door had been opened to the addressing the role of animals, plants and gardening in colonial archaeology.
Environmental Archaeology at Colonial Williamsburg Under Marley R. Brown III (1982-present)

The appointment of Marley R. Brown III as Ivor Noël Hume’s successor as director of Archaeological Research brought with it a fundamental change in the dominant concepts of archaeological practice, from excavation through analysis and interpretation. Brown’s training as an anthropological archaeologist meant foremost that social interpretation would take precedence over Noël Hume’s focus on individuals and particular artifacts, largely in isolation from contextual concerns. Excavation methodology focused on more thorough recovery, using screens, water screening, flotation sampling, specialized sampling (pollen, soil chemistry, etc.), and recovery in disturbed contexts such as plowzone and backfill from earlier excavations, all of which were ignored or dismissed by Noël Hume.

A glance at the field methodology applied at the Peyton Randolph site (Edwards, Derry and Jackson 1988), the first major project under Brown’s tenure, reveals meticulous research design contrasting sharply with Noël Hume’s, incorporating studies of flotation samples, soil chemistry, pollen and parasite analysis, quantitative faunal sampling, dendrochronology and thermoluminescence dating of brick. While several of the techniques and analyses proved problematic or disappointing, the stage was set for a new era of environmental and scientific archaeological studies at Colonial Williamsburg.

In addition to the methodological shift in excavation came a number of significant staff and procedural changes in regard to analysis of archaeological materials. In terms of environmental archaeology, the most significant development in the early 1980s was the establishment of a zooarchaeological laboratory under the direction of Dr. Joanne Bowen in 1983.

**Faunal Analysis**

When Bowen arrived in 1983, she established the zooarchaeological laboratory. Since this time, she, her staff, and students have analyzed faunal remains excavated from sites in the Historic Area, nearby countryside, throughout the region, as well as other parts of North America and Bermuda. Initially, the Firehouse and Peyton Randolph planting bed faunal assemblages provided a glimpse at butchering practices. Later, the Shields Tavern faunal assemblages provided glimpses of tavern dining and blacksmith John Draper’s diet. Through the years, analysis of multiple sites has produced one of the largest and most comprehensive databases in the world. Although research has focused on meat, wildlife, and livestock, their research has consciously aimed at placing meat consumption into the ecological, economic, social, and cultural milieu of which it is a part.

The faunal program, like other specialized analyses, straddles a number of themes including most prominently foodways and “environmental” studies. While continuing the interest in the colonial diet around Williamsburg started under Audrey Noël Hume, Bowen
used modern techniques of analysis and quantification to address a number of new issues in a more sophisticated, systematic, and refined manner, emphasizing social and ecological processes. Much of this work is discussed and documented in the Foodways research plan (Bowen et. al. in prep), and need not be overly replicated here. Nonetheless, regarding environmental studies, much progress has been made in understanding the evolution of diet from the initial occupation of the region in 1607 through the early nineteenth century. Bowen, her staff and students have also studied variability as it related to regional agriculture and environmental changes; characterization and evolution of animal husbandry and meat provisioning, and other issues related to landscape ecology as evidenced through animal bones.

The Phytolith Program

Most of the other specialized “scientific” or environmental analyses on Colonial Williamsburg sites were contracted out to specialists at other institutions, and are discussed later in this document. The major exception to specialized environmental studies, in addition to the zooarchaeology program was the establishment of the phytolith laboratory. The phytolith program at Colonial Williamsburg began in 1995 under the direction of Dr. Lisa Kealhofer. Phytoliths have been seen as a potential solution to archaeobotanical preservation problems in the Chesapeake and other regions where conditions for preservation of organics is less than ideal. Phytoliths, being inorganic silica casts of plant cells or intercellular spaces, are highly durable indicators of plant life present in archaeological soils. Unfortunately their durability is not always coincident with taxonomic specificity, i.e., individual phytoliths can only infrequently be identified to species level. Rather, phytolith data works best on an assemblage level, permitting a partial characterization of plant communities and environmental conditions contributing to a particular deposit, rather than as a discrete record of presence and absence of particular taxa. The details of phytolith production and analytical potential is well-discussed elsewhere (Piperno 1988, Pearsall 2000) and will not be re-stated here.

The analyses produced by Kealhofer and the phytolith lab during this period reveals this tension between expectations and potential of phytoliths as an archaeological data set.

The initial foray into phytolith analysis was conducted at Tucker Garden (Kealhofer 1996). Prior to the analysis, a great deal of infrastructure was developed, including a massive reference collection of common regional wild plants, both native and introduced, as well as eighteenth century garden plants. This remains the only extant research collection specifically consisting of Mid-Atlantic phytoliths.

The Tucker analysis also ironically remains the only phytolith study conducted in the Historic Area. The major result of this study is in the demonstration of the viability of phytolith recovery in the Historic Area (many mid-Atlantic deposits do not yield enough phytoliths for statistical reliability), as well as a preliminary addressing of the issue of manuring as fertilization in the Tucker garden. Based on the dissimilarity of weed assemblage indicators in the phytolith samples, Kealhofer concluded that manuring was likely not practiced systematically through the garden.
The majority of the phytolith analysis conducted by Colonial Williamsburg has been through contractual relations with other organizations conducting archaeological projects in the region. These include major sites such as Thomas Jefferson’s plantations at Monticello and Poplar Forest, the urban site of 14 Legare in Charleston, as well as National Park Service studies at Jamestown and Yorktown undertaken by the Department of Archaeological Research.

The Jamestown and Yorktown studies typify the two broad classes of phytolith work undertaken under Kealhofer’s direction. The Jamestown study (Kealhofer 1997) used the technique of coring a natural, stratified deposition environment, in this case the backswamp of Jamestown Island. This type of analysis produces a “deep time” record of vegetation change as plant communities decay in place or are drained into a stable sediment trap such as a lake, bog or marsh. The Jamestown study documents the vegetation shifts over the past 5000 years, showing the ebb and flow of grassland communities as well as hypothesized warming trends evidencing themselves through vegetation. Unfortunately the unrefined radiocarbon dates on the core make addressing the historically-interesting contact period vegetation of the island quite difficult. While the “deep time” cores are undoubtedly of interest and importance in terms of characterizing paleoecology, in most cases they are of limited relevance to historical archaeology questions given the narrow time frameworks involved.

The Pate House study at Yorktown (Kealhofer 1998) adopts a site-based approach wherein feature deposits of varying periods in a residential lot were analyzed to determine variability in structure and function which were not apparent in the artifact assemblages. This research design, which demonstrated temporal continuity in yard function, as well as areas of unique activities, interfaces better with traditional realms of historical archaeology studies. The Pate House study, together with the Tucker Garden analysis, begin to establish the baseline data of the types of phytolith assemblages indicative of certain features or human activity patterns which skew the assemblages away from a hypothetical “environmental norm”. Although the long-duration regional coring type studies are of value in a broad context, site-based approaches are likely to be the most useful as future excavations occur in and around Williamsburg, due to the “site-based” focus of archaeology as a practice.

The most recent phytolith studies, by Kealhofer’s heirs apparent to the phytolith laboratory have both dealt with the value of phytolith analysis for understanding patterning in disturbed plowzone contexts. Kelly Sullivan’s M.A. thesis on the Rich Neck Plantation (Sullivan 1999), established that plowzone phytolith assemblages retained enough variability to predict outdoor activity areas in the Rich Neck complex of buildings, such as orchards, dairying, plant processing areas, and animal enclosures. Steve Archer and Kevin Bartoy (2000) looked at phytolith distributions as vertically stratified within plowzones at CG-10, demonstrating that the phytolith assemblages, taken with other microfossil evidence, retained some stratigraphic integrity and were also useful predictors of human activity.
Contracted Specialist Analyses

Archaeobotanical, palynological, parasitological, and other specialized studies have been conducted in relation to various excavation projects over the past twenty years. This work has largely been conducted by researchers at institutions without long-term commitments to Chesapeake archaeology, or who have performed their analysis without consultation in sampling design or other contextual information. This inherent flaw in the practice of contracted specialist analysis to some extent limits the interpretation of the resulting information. Because specialists usually operate with different methodologies for recovery and quantification of data, multiple outside analyses using different specialists has resulted in a somewhat haphazard rather than a cumulative data base.

Archaeobotanical (Macrobotanical) Studies

Until recently the majority of macrobotanical identification work has been contracted to Stephen Mrozowski of the University of Massachusetts. Mrozowski, together with his associate Leslie Driscoll provided analysis of samples from the Peyton Randolph site, Brush-Everard, Carter’s Grove Site 8, the Rich Neck Slave quarter, and features on Jamestown Island, as a result of the major 1990s environmental assessment conducted for the National Park Service. Mrozowski’s approach to flotation samples was to quantify whole seeds, either burned or fresh, and base interpretations on this data. Unfortunately this approach limits the interpretation possible. Small volume soil samples, usually ten liters or less, have proven inadequate to produce results in the Chesapeake. The omission of quantifying other botanical remains, such as charcoal, chaff, parenchymous material, and so forth prohibits any number of standard archaeobotanical ratios (Pearsall 2000, Miller 1988) used in most interpretations. What is left is basic presence and absence data. Although Mrozowski’s work is methodologically flawed, it remains some of the only extant macrobotanical work on Chesapeake historical sites, and as such establishes some baseline data from which to depart. The most extensive and contextual of these analyses was written for the Rich Neck slave quarter (Mrozowski and Driscoll n.d.).

Eric Voigt performed some earlier archaeobotanical work was done for the Hampton University project (Edwards et. al 1989). Voigt summarizes 114 flotation samples from 3 sites. The most productive site for botanicals was HT55, which yielded an abundance of maize and wheat from well and trash pit samples. Voigt analyzed some non-seed material and examined a greater number of samples than in Mrozowski’s reports, and also distinguished charred and fresh plant material, although some aspects of volumetrics and quantification are still problematic. One report on file provides one of the most sophisticated archaeobotanical analyses for a report that has not yet been completed. Paleoethnobotanist Kristen Gremillion analyzed samples from two sites as part of the “Golf Course” project. Until recently this is the only report featuring basic quantifications of weights, counts and standardized densities from flotation samples, including charcoal and amorphous plant tissue.

In more recent excavations we have significantly increased the size of flotation samples and standardized laboratory quantification methods. Beginning with excavations at CG-
In 1999, samples varying between 25 and 50 liters have been taken, and significant features have been entirely recovered using flotation. Other sites such as Rich Neck and Route 60, have adopted more economical but still significantly increased sampling strategies to begin augmenting an archaeobotanical database which is in its infancy.

One invaluable aspect of Mrozowski’s tenure as Colonial Williamsburg’s primary archaeobotanical consultant was the development of a significant reference collection of seeds, again one of the few relating specifically to historic period Chesapeake archaeobotany. This collection was developed out of a vegetation survey of Jamestown Island, as well as historic plant records. Individual seed samples were primarily donated by the herbarium of the College of William and Mary. The collection was later augmented by Jeremiah Dandoy, and is now (like the phytolith reference collection), in the process of being described and photo-documented for an eventual on-line image database.

Palynological and Parasite Analyses

Archaeologists are interested in questions of health in the colonial period. While osteological analyses are one path to addressing such questions, skeletons recovered in the region are often either poorly preserved or unexcavated for political and ethical reasons. Aspects of health and sanitation can also be addressed by parasitological examination of soils presumed to contain traces of human excrement such as privies. Karl Reinhard examined three Colonial Williamsburg sites for parasite eggs, Peyton Randolph, Tazewell Hall, and the Brush-Everard Privy. One sample from Brush-Everard evidenced a number of intestinal worm eggs of *Trichuris trichiura* and *Ascaris lumbricoides*, the first suggestion of disease resulting from sanitation conditions in eighteenth-century Williamsburg. Although the Peyton Randolph and Tazewell Hall samples did not produce evidence of parasites, such analysis can help clarify ambiguous deposits and further knowledge of health, fertilization, and sanitation in an early urban setting.

In conjunction with the parasite extractions, Reinhard, simultaneously extracted pollen from the soil samples submitted for analysis. Like phytolith analysis, archaeological palynology generally proceeds on one of two tracks, “on-site” or “off-site”. Reinhard, looking in domestic contexts, for indications of parasites was working with a more complicated palimpsest of pollen involving a highly managed urban landscape and very likely pollen ingested by humans in the case of the Brush-Everard sample. While pollen preservation in these samples was highly variable, they were dominated by arboreal pollen, and remain the best and only indicators of the level of forestation and nature of the landscape of urban Williamsburg, which was likely more heavily forested than is often presumed.

Other pollen work has been conducted through Colonial Williamsburg, primarily by Gerald Kelso and John Jones. Kelso’s major “on-site” work was on the Tucker Garden in the historic area, as well as features on Jamestown Island as part of the multifaceted Jamestown Archaeological Assessment. Kelso’s work is highly conditioned by his taphonomic concerns with pollen percolation. By calculating “percolation rates”, using the assumption that pollen is gradually water-transported downward in deposits over time, Kelso’s work is primarily concerned with formation process rather than interpretation of vegetation communities or cultural loading of soil with plant materials. Although there are
problematic aspects of inferring linear percolation rates through stratified and diversely constituted archaeological soils, Kelso’s work does seem to bear out a sampling strategy wherein pollen is best preserved beneath sheltering artifacts in sites. While the preservation was again sparse, both the Tucker and Jamestown reports again reveal a tree-dominated pollen spectrum, suggesting the “rural” nature of the area’s vegetation communities, while the sparser herbaceous spectrum gives glimpses of the domestic gardening activities. Ironically, these “on-site” analyses may reveal more about the historic landscape of the Tidewater than the off-site studies.

Jones’ (n.d.) pollen analysis of mortar samples from Peyton Randolph not only confirmed the forested eighteenth-century environment, but a nineteenth-century sample seemed to document forest clearance with a decline in pine pollen and an increased amount of weedy plants associated with disturbed soils.

The major “off-site” pollen study of note is the Vibracore-62 materials analyzed by Grace Brush in conjunction with Kealhofer’s phytolith analysis for the Jamestown assessment. Again this work spans a far greater period than the ca. 400 year colonial to recent period especially relevant to historical archaeologists, but does again establish basic data for the local region. Brush has additionally synthesized data from other projects in her chapter in Discovering the Chesapeake (2001), providing a broader regional perspective to paleoecological pollen data.

Pollen still retains enormous interpretive potential in both on- and off-site contexts. It is essential to maintain ties with highly qualified palynologists and to incorporate pollen sampling design into excavations where it may provide invaluable data on landscape characterization and on-site plant usage.
Other Types of Analysis Conducted In-House and Contracted

Two types of “environmental” analysis have been attempted by interested archaeologists in-house although some portion of the data has been generated by an outside laboratory, for example soil chemistry reports are generally sent to a facility such as A&L laboratories, although the interpretation is done by staff archaeologists rather than a specialist. In many cases this is actually an advantageous approach. Although archaeologists may not always be expert in the minutiae of a technical analysis, their familiarity with sites and contexts often provides a more meaningful archaeological interpretation than a “blind” specialist report.

Oyster Shell Analysis

Oyster shell, ubiquitous in most historical and many prehistoric excavations in the Chesapeake, can provide information on a number of factors related to human-landscape interaction. Incremental growth patterns, overall morphology, the presence of particular epibonts (parasites), and isotopic levels can all provide information on season of harvest, location of harvest, and the salinity levels of the oyster’s habitat. Susan Alexandrowicz analyzed oyster shell analysis for the Hampton University project, by Susan Alexandrowicz. J. Michael Bradshaw analyzed oyster shells for the “Golf Course” project, as well as the prehistoric site of Carter’s Grove 19 (CG-19). Dwayne Pickett and Joanne Bowen incorporated oyster shell analysis in faunal analysis of a layer at the Pate House. Further research with oyster shells will consist of a combination of in-house and contracted work. Zooarchaeologist Stephen Atkins has been pursuing morphometric and incremental growth techniques possible in our laboratory facilities, and has been establishing relationships with other institutions for the necessary isotopic work. Because of their ubiquity in nearly all excavations, oyster shells provide a ready resource for addressing both foodways and landscape issues. Additionally there is a ready stockpile of oyster from many (though not all) excavations at hands, suggesting a significant temporal and typological diversity of contexts to characterize oyster harvest in a meaningful manner.

Soil Chemistry

Soil Chemistry has potential for identifying invisible traces of repeated human activity. On a broad scale this can entail determining site locations, locations of features within site boundaries, or at a more narrow scale interpreting function of a particular deposit or feature. Of particular interest for Chesapeake historical sites is elemental analysis as a predictor of activity areas in plowzone contexts. Because most sites, particularly seventeenth-century sites have extensive plow damage, locating areas of chemical concentrations indicative of particular human activities is a tantalizing proposition. Indicators such as phosphorous (human or animal waste), calcium (bone or shell deposition), potassium (wood ash), or magnesium (burning activity) have been assayed on several projects. The most extensive chemical analysis has been at Carter’s Grove site 8 (CG-8) (Edwards 1998),
Rich Neck plantation (Sullivan 1999, in conjunction with phytolith distributions), and at Jamestown’s Structure 24 (Horning and Wehner 2001). In some cases, the soil chemistry data appears to provide excellent and complementary information to the architectural data, whereas in others it seems internally contradictory, such as in the case of radically different results obtained on horizontally identical plowzone levels sampled at different depths. (Archer and Bartoy 2000). The utility of soil chemical data is probably predicated on multiple factors, including the extent of plowing and disturbance, the stability of each element, the methods of testing, and the timeliness of soil testing after excavation. Nonetheless in the absence of other types of analysis, soil chemistry may prove valuable in the future on less-intensively plowed sites, and within features. More limited soil chemistry studies, including pH studies as a preservation indicator have been conducted at CG-19, Rich Neck, Hampton University (HT55), Peyton Randolph, and Tucker Garden. Several of these have been sampled and processed for elemental studies but the data has not been extensively analyzed.
Conclusions and Future Recommendations

Environmental aspects of archaeology are perhaps the greatest untapped resources at Colonial Williamsburg. Aspects of the past involving the human interaction with their immediate, local, and regional biological surroundings provides a level of place-specific information not accessible through the inventories of imported artifacts or architectural analysis. With the exception of the tobacco story, we know very little from documents, and even less archaeologically about the nature of local horticulture and agriculture, and how these products operated in the seventeenth and eighteenth-century economies.

Environmental archaeology is a critical component of archaeology generally. If the domain of archaeology is an understanding of the past through its material traces, we cannot afford to relegate bones, seeds, residues, phytoliths, pollen grains, microscopic, chemical and molecular evidence of the past to a supplementary role.

Future research must of necessity proceed in two directions, both an “on-site” approach, and an “off-site” focus that investigates the changes in the landscape outside of immediate habitation areas.

More often than not, our locales for excavating, i.e. “sites” are not especially conducive to a pristine reconstruction of past environments. Habitation areas or other loci of human activity are inherently unrepresentative of an environment. Cultural selection, transformation, and modification to habitats is too difficult to parse “out” of an assemblage, while “missing” factors cannot be integrated into the data set. Ultimately, what is often thought of as “environmental reconstruction” is archaeologically acontextual. Analysis of data which climatic or environmental change in deposits such as lake cores or other “traps” for physical phenomena are deprived of the contextual analysis which separates archaeology from antiquarianism. A record of paleoecology or paleoclimate can only open questions about human influence, while archaeology can answer them, at least in part.

That is only to say that paleoclimatic data is not specifically the realm of archaeology, not that paleoecology cannot inform archaeological questions. As a result, collaboration is needed between researchers in various fields. Like history, geology, sociology, and the other “sister” disciplines of archaeology, we need to establish firm research partnerships with specialists in these areas to improve the interpretations of the past and further the information available from which to draw. The Jamestown Environmental assessment is a particularly good example of the types of cooperative ventures possible with this approach. At the same time, “in-house” we need to focus on the kinds of “environmental” analysis which are best interpreted by an anthropologically-focused archaeologist rather than a paleoecologist, particularly involving on-site biological traces and their relation to complex social phenomena.

Future Directions—Archaeobotany

Many of the sites excavated over the past 50 years were sampled in ways that will provide a limited amount of meaningful archaeobotanical (i.e., macrobotanical) interpretation. Par-
particularly problematic are small-volume soil samples that, excepting the most rich and dense deposits, are unlikely to yield statistically-useful numbers of identifiable plant fragments. Assessment is ongoing to determine what sites have clusters of samples that may be combined (e.g., multiple samples from single features) to provide a more firm basis to proceed with analysis. At the present a recent spate of late seventeenth to early eighteenth-century excavations at Rich Neck, CG-10, and Route 60 have produced the most robust level of sampling. Colonial Williamsburg research associate Steve Archer is in the process of analyzing this data for Ph.D. dissertation research. At present the research potential of the historic area is somewhat limited in terms of archived samples, but future excavations will be on more secure footing for sampling and research design. Archaeobotanical analysis has a great deal of “catching up” to do with the level of knowledge obtained from the zooarchaeological program, including basic characterizations of diet and production of plant materials in the colonial period. As a standardized database continues to increase, we hope to learn more about plant use in relation to time period, urban/rural dichotomies, class and race issues, exchange networks, and many additional research themes. Many of these are also discussed in the strategic plan for foodways. Because we know so little about plant usage, from symbolic roles to the more mundane issues of basic production, processing and storage techniques, the primary goal is to begin working through the analysis of flotation samples from sites, and attempting to develop a cadre of students and volunteers who can perform basic processing of samples at a certain level of competency.

Phytolith analysis has proven itself of some value, although many avenues of its potential are yet to be explored. Future directions are likely to explore the “intermediate” ground, balancing feature- and site-specific information within a broader environmental context. Methodologically, simultaneous extractions of other types of microfossils, such as calcium spherulites and starch grains will be added to the phytolith repertoire to increase the amount and accuracy of information available from a given sample. Thematically, new types of research incorporating phytoliths can address questions outside of stratigraphic characterization or broad environmental depictions. For example, studies of the phytoliths embedded in the dental calculus of grazing animals may illuminate issues of pasture practice and landscape use during the colonial period. Continuing phytolith analysis will undoubtedly enhance gardening knowledge, a topic of perpetual interest at Colonial Williamsburg. Although it is frequently criticized for an inability to conclusively demonstrate “what plant grew in THAT hole”, phytolith research has opened up entirely new and sophisticated lines of questioning such as greater landscape transformations, gardening maintenance and fertilization practices, which are more indicative of social practice than particularistic questions.

**Future Directions—Zooarchaeology**

Assemblages which were analyzed in the 1970s before biomass, osteometrics, and tooth wear analyses were considered standard, could benefit from a second look. In addition to this, there exist gaps in the assemblages analyzed using state-of-the-art techniques. Most significantly, we need more information for the poor European households of any time period, also for the urban elite and the urban African-American.
In addition to the relative dietary data, Bowen also has focused on taphonomy, butchery, cuisine and cuts of meat, as well as animal husbandry, marketing, and the ecology of animals in the landscape. Together, these initiatives demand more analyses; they demand a merging of foodways questions with environmental goals. In pursuit of this goal, much remedial work needs to be done. Remaining to be analyzed are measurements taken for swine and ovicaprid specimens. Also not yet explored are analyzing phytoliths that survive in tooth plaque, evidence that will help to identify (1) the pasture system, (2) how livestock grazing impacted the landscape as a whole, and (3) how the plant communities changed in response to the introduction of European livestock.

**Future Directions—Other Studies**

Scientific techniques used to interpret archaeological materials continue to expand rapidly. In fact, the majority of techniques now being pioneered relate in some way to “environmental” archaeology, providing information on invisible residues of plant and animal products, or using molecular and chemical techniques to source raw materials to their origin on the landscape. As is apparent from the foregoing summary, many techniques have been attempted with wholly expected mixed results. We have learned a great deal about the productive methods of sampling and field research design, and the analytical methods which produce more or less satisfactory interpretations. The major impetus should be to continue experimentation with a variety of techniques, while attempting to standardize the results in ways that contribute to a cumulative picture of the colonial landscape rather than disparate glimpses. This includes comprehensive recovery methods for retrieving a variety of environmental data during excavation, and judicious use of resources to analyze them in a productive and meaningful manner. Furthermore, as a general theme, much remains to be done in integrating the results of both technical “scientific” as well as more traditional archaeological studies, linking artifactual, architectural and settlement pattern data with specialized studies.
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## Appendix I: Relevant Research Reports

### Pre-1982 Studies

**Anonymous**

- n.d. Identification of Plant Material from Custis Well. 1p.
- n.d. List of Plant Material Identified from Well “C” and Used in the Reconstruction of Wetherburn’s Tavern Landscape. Appendix II. 1p.

### 1982 –

**Macrobotanical**

**Archer, Steven**

- 2001 Nansemond Site (44SK11) Macrobotanical Analysis. Report prepared for JRI. MS on file, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Samples from contact-period site yielding European cereals and maize.

**Canning, Nancy M.**

- 1987 Seed Recovery By Mechanical Flotation at the Brush-Everard Site. MS on File, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Short report on testing recovery rates in a sink-flotation system.

**Dandoy, Jeremiah R.**

- 1994 Folder containing miscellaneous notes and summaries, and rough draft of Bruton Heights Floral Analysis. No full report, has some raw data.

- 2000 Archaeobotanical Analysis, Phase III Fort A.P. Hill (44CE326). MS on File, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Short report on seven samples, uses Mrozowski’s methodology.

**Gardner, Paul S.**

- 1994 Identification of an Eighteenth Century Fence Post from Williamsburg, Virginia. MS on file, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. 1 page report wood identification from Bruton Heights.

**Gremillion, Kristen J.**

- 1990 Plant Remains from Two Historic Sites in Virginia. MS on File, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Discusses macrobotanical results from two sites, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries from the “Golf Course” excavations, using standard quantitative techniques.

**Mrozowski, Stephen**

- n.d. Report of the Analysis of Macrofossil Remains from the Peyton Randolph House, Williamsburg, Virginia. MS on File, Department of Archaeological

---

Faunal Reports are not included here, to be referenced in Foodways Research Plan.
Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Full report of analysis summarized in Peyton Randolph report with data.


1992 The Results of an Archaeobotanical Analysis of Samples from CG-8, Williamsburg, Virginia. MS on file, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Brief report on seed identifications from seventeenth-century Carter’s Grove site. Only charred seeds were grass and chenopods.

Mrozowski, Stephen A. and Leslie Driscoll


Voigt, Eric

Phytolith Reports

Kealhofer, Lisa
1996 Tucker Garden Preliminary Phytolith Analysis. MS on File, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Analysis of numerous Garden Samples from the Tucker excavations.

1997 Jamestown Vibracore-62: 500 Years of Vegetation Change in the Backswamp. MS on file, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Geological core with supplementary seed and pollen data. Also included in the Jamestown Environmental Assessment report.

1998 The Thomas Pate House: 44YO755 Phytolith Analysis, MS on file, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. On-site examinations of a number of features found during waterproofing activities in Yorktown.

1999a Rumney Tavern, London Town (18AN48), Lost Towns of Anne Arundel Project Phytolith Analysis. MS on file, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.
1999b  The South Lawn at Poplar Forest: Phytolith Analysis. MS on file, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

n.d.  Poplar Forest: Phytolith Analysis. MS on file, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

Sullivan, Kelly


Palynology and Parasite Analysis
Jones, John G.
n.d.  Pollen Analysis of Sediment and Mortar Samples from the Peyton Randolph Site. Report on file, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Soil and mortar analyzed, mortar was found to be productive of much more pollen, indicating a mostly arboreal spectrum.

Kelso, Gerald K.


Reinhardt, Karl J.


**Oyster Shell Studies**

Alexandrowicz, Susan R.

1989 Oyster Shell Analysis. in Hampton University Archaeological Project: A Report on the Findings, by Andrew C. Edwards, et. al. 1989. Analysis of these shells demonstrated they grew in water of relatively low salinity. Half were bed oysters found in muddy sub tidal environments, with the rest coming from channel, sand, and reef environments.

Bradshaw, J. Michael

n.d. Oyster Shell Analysis: Archaeological Project 40BA (BW40), Bassett Hall Woods Site. Reports most shells were probably harvested in the Hampton Flats area oyster beds. Full length oyster shell report missing in files. Full site report incomplete.

1996 CG-19 Oyster Shell Analysis. In An Archaeological Evaluation of Site CG19 (44JW659) at Carter’s Grove Plantation, Williamsburg, Virginia, by Leslie McFaden. Report on File, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. A detailed analysis of a prehistoric assemblage, showing the vast majority were bed oysters, and that they had been harvested between late fall and early spring. Small size indicated they lived in a very stressful environment, and that they were shucked raw.

Doms, Keith R. and Jay F. Custer

1988 Preliminary Report on Oyster Shells from the Peyton Randolph Site, by Keith R. Doms and Jay F. Custer. In A View from the Top: Archaeological Investigations of Peyton Randolph’s Urban Plantation, by Andrew C. Edwards et. al. Analysis of oyster shells from a planted bed demonstrated oysters were all from sandy mud flats located in waters that were more than 4-5 feet deep. Incremental analyses demonstrated the shells had been harvested primarily during the late fall and early winter.

Pickett, Dwayne, and Joanne Bowen

1998 Preliminary Oyster Shell and Faunal Analysis of Dark Loam with Shell Layer in Phase III Data Recovery in Advance of Waterproofing Activities at Site 44YO755, The Thomas Pate House, Yorktown, Virginia, by Dwayne Pickett. Analysis of remains left by French officers billeted in the Pate House during the winter of 1781. Results showed a strong similarity to the local meat diet.

**Soil Chemistry Studies**

Soil Chemistry analysis has generally been incorporated into reports as written, rather than specialist analyses which frequently exist both as separate reports and integrated report
text. The following reports contain some level of soil chemistry analysis, either pH or elemental:\(^2\)

Edwards, Andrew C.
1998 Archaeology of a 17th Century Houselot at Martin’s Hundred, Virginia (CG-8). Report on File, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Extensive analysis of pH and elements, data was plotted using Surfer software.


Horning, Audrey J. and Karen Wehner
2001 *Archaeological Investigations at Jamestown’s Structure 24*. Report on File, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Extensive use of elemental data and surfer to locate activity areas around the structure.

McFaden, Leslie

McFaden, Leslie, Philip Levy, David Muraca, and Jennifer Jones

**Synthetic and Other Studies**

Brown, Marley R. III and Patricia M. Samford

Johnson, Gerald, Carl Hobbs, Stephen A. Mrozowski, Doug Currie, Gerald Kelso, Lisa Kealhofer, Dennis Blanton and Audrey Horning

---

\(^2\) Soil chemistry samples were taken and processed for the Tucker Garden excavations. Raw data exists although no final report has been written.
Krueger, Harold

Mrozowski, Stephen
1998 Plant Community Survey and Assessment of Archaeobotanical and Contextual Analysis, Jamestown Island, Virginia. MS on file, Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Early separate version of the vegetation synthesis and seed identification later included in the Johnson et. al. assessment.

Samford, Patricia
Research Plan:

**Foodways at Colonial Williamsburg**

**Committee Members:**
Joanne Bowen (chair)
Steve Archer
Stephen Atkins
William Pittman
Introduction

Archaeologists find food remains in every site in the Historic area. They find fragments of tools once used to grow plants, husband livestock, and prepare foods; fragments of vessels once used to store and consume liquids; and fragments of plates, bowls, and cutlery once used to consume food. In addition to the things colonists made to grow, prepare, and consume foods, the actual remains of past meals are found. Broken bones, seeds, and oyster shells (often numbering in the hundreds and thousands) are recovered from pits, ditches, abandoned cellars and wells, and even what had been the ground surface surrounding the buildings.

How archaeologists working in the Historic Area have dealt with these remains has changed over the years. When architects first began excavations in 1928, Colonial Williamsburg’s singular goal was to discover foundations and to reconstruct buildings that had long since disappeared. Consequently, only the most striking artifacts were kept, and thus ceramics, bones, shells, and virtually everything except architectural remains went into the backdirt pile. When Ivor Noël Hume and his wife Audrey arrived in 1957, excavating foundations remained a central goal, but they expanded their goals to establish more accurate dates. At the time, relatively little was known about colonial American material culture, and in the pursuit of this knowledge, they became international experts on a wide range of artifact categories, most notably ceramic types.

They wanted to know about daily life, and in 1959, when Ivor Noël Hume assume control of archaeology at Colonial Williamsburg, he and Audrey Noël Hume took archaeology in a new direction. Since ceramics, bottles, glassware, and tools were the tangible evidence of former lives, they began to recover artifacts in earnest. And beginning with the Anthony Hay site, Ivor Noël Hume recovered even bones, residues of past meals. Throughout his tenure, when he thought it was important, he recovered from tightly dated features, environmental material remains, including bones, crab claws, eggs, seeds, and oyster shells. An unknown person identified the seeds. Stanley J. Olsen, a well-known zooarchaeologist, identified the faunal remains and by the mid-60’s he and the Noël Humes had established a long-term partnership. Occasionally, Olsen provided total counts, but in general he followed the Noël Hume’s directive and provided them only with species lists and descriptions of what he considered to be distinctive specimens. Together with the faunal evidence, these environmental data became the lens through which Audrey reconstructed colonial Virginian dining habits, a term she used to refer to diet and the preparation and consumption of food. Primarily through her effort, the study of food became an integral part of archaeology at Colonial Williamsburg. Pots, bones, seeds, and tools were the real, the tangible remains of dining habits, and documents provided the specific context. Thus, they served as handmaidens to archaeology. Pots were broken, but Dutch paintings revealed the whole image they could not. And the whole image became visible in its social context, showing who used them, and for what purpose.

Thus, bones, crab claws, and oyster shells became the basis for reconstructing the meat diet; and ceramics, wine bottles, storage vessels, and cutlery fragments became the basis for reconstructing food preparation and dining habits. Wine bottles demonstrated
colonial Virginians preserved foods, including cherries, which were found still intact in bottles that had been buried in a cache at the Wetherburn’s Tavern. William Byrd’s diary provided the evidence to show cherries had been preserved by first being scalded, then packed in bottles. Imported stoneware jars demonstrated colonial Virginians commonly pickled foods, and receipt books and diaries showed how vinegar and fat were used to preserve meats, fruits, and vegetables, and bladders or leather were used to seal the food.

Comparing iron fragments recovered archaeologically with what information could be found in inventories, paintings, and other sources, Audrey Noël Hume showed the variety of cooking equipment used in colonial Virginia. Teakettle fragments demonstrated the popularity of tea drinking in the second half of the eighteenth century, earthenware milk pans showed taverns practiced dairying, fragments of glass salvers and stems showed elite dining was a well-dressed affair.

An avid gardener herself, Audrey Noël Hume expanded her research on food to include the production of food, or what she might have thought of as horticulture. In Williamsburg, gardens became visible through traces of shell paths that once outlined them, fences were revealed by postholes, and surviving brick steps revealed garden terraces. Archaeology and documentary evidence both worked together to reveal the urban garden landscape, a place where urban residents kept livestock and grew vegetables. Seeds found during the Wetherburn’s Tavern excavations helped to reconstruct what fruit trees were grown, and rusted fragments of hoes, spades, rakes, and sickles all provided evidence on how plants were cultivated. Results of her research are published in Archaeology and the Colonial Gardener (1974).

Unlike many who followed, she recognized the interrelationship between food-related vessels and food remains, and the interrelationship between seeds and the archaeological footprints of gardens. This permitted a breadth of interpretation to which archaeologists aspire today. Maybe even more importantly, she believed the archaeological data, not documents, were the point of departure. In doing so, she remained free of culturally biased interpretations found in the many local histories that described the meat diet as one based on pork and wildlife. She let the archaeological data speak for itself—historical sources served to flesh out the picture. Maybe for this reason, zooarchaeologists have continued to reference her research, found in a pamphlet titled, Food (1978).

In 1982, when Marley R. Brown, III assumed directorship, food research broadened to embrace foodways, a concept that sets dietary patterns, dining habits, and gardening into a holistic framework. This approach differs from Audrey Noël Hume’s in that the basic premise is one of social science, that the selection of food is not the choice of the individual. Each person lives in a society that is influenced by the environment, subsistence system (i.e., hunting and gathering, horticulture, or agriculture), and the cultural, social, and economic factors surrounding the production, distribution, preparation, and consumption of food. From the perspective of social scientists, an individual’s choice of food is a matter of availability, ethnic identity, and rank. Analyzing consumption patterns, then, became one of reconstructing the subsistence system and the value system, both set in the context of how foods were produced and distributed amongst members of a society.
From even the smallest excavations, hundreds and thousands of artifacts and environmental remains are recovered. Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume’s answer to the daunting task of analyzing material remains was to be highly selective. They relied upon excavators to recognize and to save artifacts, bones, and seeds as they troweled, and afterwards in the lab, the Noël Humes selectively chose to study specific types of artifacts, or possibly bones from tightly dated features. Some artifacts were stored for future analysis, while others were de-accessioned. Analyzing an entire assemblage, including artifacts, bones, seeds, and shells, as a unit representing the lifeways of the site’s inhabitants was not done.

Brown, as a social scientist, believed the human eye is fallible and that pattern recognition should be based on the basic quantification of material remains. Thus, he challenged his staff to recover all artifacts and environmental remains, and to analyze the entire assemblage as a coherent representation of the household(s) that occupied the site. All soil from refuse layers as well as features was to be screened through ¼” screens and gradually, and systems to recover micro-faunal and archaeobotanical remains were to be developed. Early on, archaeologists tried different recovery techniques, but as research questions became more sophisticated, so did sampling strategies. With more systematic strategies in place, the number of environmental remains recovered from any one site has grown exponentially.

As readers look through the appendices listing the various projects undertaken for different excavations, it will become obvious that for most projects, some type of food-related research was conducted. It will also become obvious that foodways-related data remain a relatively untapped resource. For several reasons, DAR has yet to reach its potential. For one, limited funds and unworkable deadlines often have prevented cross-mending, an analytical step that determines vessel forms, a key element in foodways studies. Funds also have limited completing, or at times even initiating, analyses of different categories of environmental remains.

Another reason foodways research has yet to reach its potential is that for the most part staff members have focused on their own database, rather than developed research problems that would draw on multiple sources of material culture. For example, zooarchaeologists have focused on bones, animals, and meat cuisine as the lens through which to study foodways, and lab staff has focused on one type of artifacts, at times one type of ceramics, or wine bottles, or glassware, or cutlery. And environmental specialists, who for the most part have had no long-term commitment to the Chesapeake, have generally provided lists of data accompanied by limited descriptions. What is waiting to happen is the integration of all food-related data from one site, marshaled together to answer any number of food-related research questions.

**Zooarchaeology**

When Joanne Bowen arrived in 1983, she established the zooarchaeological laboratory. Since this time, she, her staff, and students have analyzed faunal remains excavated from sites in the Historic Area, nearby countryside, throughout the region, as well as other parts of North America and Bermuda. Initially, the Firehouse and Peyton Randolph planting bed faunal assemblages provided a glimpse at butchering practices. Later, the Shields Tavern
faunal assemblages provided glimpses of tavern dining and blacksmith John Draper’s diet. Through the years, analyses of assemblages from approximately 80 sites have produced one of the largest and most comprehensive databases in the world. Although research has focused on meat, wildlife, and livestock, their research has consciously aimed at placing meat consumption into the ecological, economic, social, and cultural milieu of which it is a part. Some of the more important foodways topics pursued include:

- **Meat diet.** Focus is on how it developed from the initial occupation of the region in 1607 through the early nineteenth century. Variability as it related to regional agriculture and environmental changes, household variability related to rank, ethnicity, occupation, and urban/rural location.

- **African-American meat diet and cuisine.** Focus is on how it differed from the planters’ diets.

- **Elite cuisine.** Focus on how it reflects English high style cuisine.

- **French soldiers’ diet.** Focus is on how soldiers billeted in Yorktown depended entirely on local foods.

- **Production and procurement of food.** Focus is landscape ecology and the development of herd systems in the region.

- **Regional market system.** Focus is on the development of a provisioning system to feed Williamsburg residents.

- **Urban diet.** Focus is on how professionals, and immigrants who had no rural connections depended upon commercial food sources, while others who had kin living in the nearby countryside relied upon their own sources.

- **Commercialization of meat processing.** Focus is on how butchery techniques changed in the late eighteenth century as professionals increasingly took over meat processing that had formerly occurred in homes.

- **Actualistic research on butchery techniques.** Focus has been on defining characteristic marks left by chopping tools.

- **Famine at Jamestown.** Focus is on colonists’ survival strategies and The Starving Time.

Overall, among DAR staff members contributing to foodways studies, the zooarchaeologists have gone furthest. For the most part, faunal remains produced by major excavations sponsored by Brown have been analyzed. In addition to these assemblages, a few of the largest assemblages excavated by Noël Hume were analyzed when the foundation received a collaborative grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. In addition, through the support of this grant, as well the on-going project sponsored by Monticello to analyze and digitize African-American sites, Bowen and her staff have analyzed assemblages from sites located throughout the region. All told, they have analyzed assemblages from over 80 sites, which together form one of the largest regional databases in the country, if not the world.
Even so, a great deal remains to be done. Assemblages that were analyzed in the 1970s before biomass, osteometrics, and tooth wear analyses were considered standard could benefit from a second look. In addition to this work, there exist gaps in the database of faunal assemblages analyzed using state-of-the-art techniques. Most significantly, we need more information for the poor European households of any time period, also for the urban elite and the urban African-American.

Completing the now standard dietary analysis for assemblages not yet analyzed would go a long way toward filling in gaps of what is known about household consumption. In addition to this household-level investigation, additional work involving large-scale analyses is needed. This includes the natural and cultural processes affecting bone preservation, as well as additional work on butchery processes, wildlife procurement practices, animal husbandry, and the distribution of animals and animal products. Bowen’s more recent work examining the historical ecology of animal husbandry demands a merging of animal-related evidence with evidence obtained through environmental archaeology. And lastly, occasional exotic finds such as West African baboons demand research in new areas of animal and/or food-related activities. Here is a list of future research topics addressing foodways questions. A list of sites with faunal assemblages in need of analysis is included in Appendix 3.

- **Taphonomic research.** *Focus is on how natural processes obscure cultural evidence.*

- **Butchery techniques.** *Focus is on how they changed in response to the commercialization of meat processing.*

- **Cuts of meat.** *Focus is on how they changed in response to cultural values and the commercialization of food processing.*

- **Cuisine.** *Focus is on how bones reflect changes over time.*

- **Animal husbandry.** *Focus is on how herd system developed within Native American landscape.*

- **Landscape ecology.** *Focus is on how livestock played active role in landscape changes.*

- **Exotic animals such as cahows, peacocks, and West African baboons.** *Focus is on determining how they arrived in the colonies, who kept them, and why.*

**Oyster Shells**

Oyster shells are present, sometimes in very large numbers, in every site in the Historic Area. To Audrey Noël Hume, their ubiquitous presence was a sign of their importance, but she saw no need to save any specimens. Thus, it was only during their last major excavation, the Public Hospital, that Ivor Noël Hume saved oyster shells. When the goal shifted to recover all household-related refuse under Brown’s direction, however, archaeologists began saving shells. Since archaeologists encountered hundreds and often thousands as they dug, sampling strategies were necessarily developed. During the 1980s
samples were recovered from Hampton University, Peyton Randolph, Carter’s Grove, Golf Course, and the Brush-Everard sites. Unfortunately, because of the ubiquitous nature of these remains, lack of funding, lack of storage space, or because individuals who performed these analyses are no longer available, at times samples were not taken, or those that were collected were not studied. We are in the process of correcting this problem. Now shells are systematically recovered from all tightly dated contexts, and recently our Assistant Curator of Zooarchaeology, who has learned state-of-the-art techniques, has begun performing analyses on the Rich Neck Slave Quarter shell assemblage. Nonetheless, oyster shell analysis remains one of the greatest needs for foodways research. Listed in Appendix 4 is a list of sites with oyster shells now housed in the warehouse.

Despite the inconsistent nature of oyster shell research, early analyses of shells from Peyton Randolph and other sites have produced some interesting results. Based on one analysis, it appears colonial Virginians harvested oysters during the winter months, and all analyses indicate oysters came primarily from mud flats and sandy-clay bottoms in areas of relatively low salinity levels. In the future, a concerted effort to study both oysters now housed in our collections as well as oysters recovered from on-going excavations should build on this early work. First, by measuring the shells and studying the organisms that attached themselves to the shell, we can determine habitats and the extent to which human demand affected the oyster populations. To achieve this end, it will be necessary to develop a highly systematic approach incorporating the full recovery of all fragments from tightly dated contexts with state-of-the-art analytical techniques. Areas of future research should include:

- Incremental studies. *Analysis of growth lines present on the hinge surface will determine age, growth rate, and season of harvest.*

- Oxygen isotope studies. *Isotopic analysis of oyster shell calcium carbonate will determine water temperature and salinity level.*

- Morphometric analysis. *Measurements of oyster shell will determine habitat and impact of human demand on oyster population.*

- Epibiont analysis. *Analysis of organisms that attach themselves to oyster shells will determine water salinity.*

- Estuarine habitat growth. *Analysis of oyster shell size, shape, ribbing, and color will provide information on habitat.*

- Identify method of preparation. *Analysis of “butcher” marks on oyster shells will determine whether they were shucked raw, or cooked.*

**Archaeobotany**

The primary issue with addressing foodways through plant remains is the generation of a large database of samples that are consistently analyzed. Individual sites and contexts have had seed or other botanical identifications performed, but this has been too infrequent and the methodology has been so disparate and flawed as to prohibit much in the way of cross-site comparisons. In recent years the field sampling methodology has been
significantly improved, primarily by taking more systematic samples, and critically, increasing the volume of floated soils to compensate for the generally poor archaeobotanical preservation conditions in the Chesapeake.

Archaeological knowledge of plant use in the historic Chesapeake is quite nearly a tabula rasa. Primary issues include developing a basic understanding of:

- Local and regional production of agricultural and horticultural food plants.
- The position of raw and processed plant foods and beverages in exchange networks, local and global.
- Relative dietary importance and diversity of plant food products.
- Differential preferences, access, and preparation of plant foodstuffs in relation to class, ethnicity, gender, and other social constructions.
- Use of wild and/or local plant foods.
- The creolization of foodways, including identifying the roles of local Native American and imported African food plants and traditions in the diet.
- Methods of preparation, processing, and storage of plant foods and beverages.
- The symbolic use of plant foods.

Botanical remains, particularly macroremains, hold a great deal of promise in addressing foodways issues. Modern paleoethnobotany has moved far beyond a basic “laundry list” of identified taxa. Many of the above issues have been adequately addressed by prehistorians working in other regions. A primary component of such research has been a more detailed examination of the contents of flotation samples. They do not merely include whole seeds accidentally dropped into a deposit. An average flotation sample includes a wealth of data on cooking fuels in the form of charcoal; parenchymous and starchy residues deriving from roots, tubers or processed products like gruels; chaff and discarded parts of harvested plants indicating processing methods, in addition to the list of identifiable seeds. Closer examination and comparison of the conditions of the flotation sample contents can yield evidence of the nature of preparation, including oxidation levels and cooking temperatures. With standardized field and laboratory procedures it is possible to move beyond scattershot site-by-site reports and into a more synthetic and quantitatively valid mode, looking at Williamsburg and its environs as a whole. See the Environmental Archaeology Assessment Report for listings of soil samples in need of analysis.

**Foodways-Related Artifacts**

Understanding foodways from any perspective requires evidence for the tools of agriculture, animal husbandry, food processing, meal preparation, and consumption in both the informal and formal settings in households of all wealth and ethnic groups. Pittman’s extensive knowledge of seventeenth and eighteenth-century material culture, and his long-term effort to educate lab staff in the finer points in artifact identification, has gone a long way to identifying a wide range of food-related artifacts—hoes, flower pots, milk pans, cleavers,
bottles, glassware, cutlery, earthenware, and refined ceramics, almost anything that was used to produce, prepare, or consume food and beverages. For virtually every site DAR has excavated, artifacts have been identified to the fragment level. It would not be an exaggeration to say that for foodways studies, DAR’s collection is one of the primary resources anywhere in the world.

Addressing foodways questions through material culture, however, depends upon knowing more than artifact types, such as creamware or delftware. It depends upon taking artifacts to the object level. Artifacts need to be cross-mended and the vessel forms tabulated, and then, only then is it possible to show the range of preparation, serving, presentation, and consumption vessels present from a specific site, and to answer questions concerning food preservation, preparation, cuisine, and meal presentation. For example, the presence of bowls rather than plates signifies cuisines of stews, soups, or one-pot meals, and the presence of fine English delft tea wares in the early eighteenth century indicates the occupants participated in formal tea ceremonies. For each site, cross-mending multiple forms of ceramics, metal fragments, and glassware is essential.

Under the directorship of Ivor Noël Hume, all eighteenth-century ceramics and glassware fragments were cross-mended, then minimum vessel counts were compiled to form the database from which food preparation techniques and dining etiquette could be understood. When Marley Brown assumed directorship in 1982, archaeologists continued this detailed level of analysis for sites such as Peyton Randolph, Marot’s/Shields’ Tavern, and Brush-Everard. By 1989, however, the number of excavation projects the department undertook at any one time increased, and cutbacks reduced lab staff, making it impossible to complete anything but cross-mending selected types of artifacts. Oftentimes no cross-mending was done, and when it was, goals varied from identifying the function of a site to helping piece together the oftentimes complex puzzle of site formation processes. The end result is that for the most part our database for vessel forms is weak.

Drawing upon the earlier work and Pittman’s knowledge of what was found, it is possible to roughly outline the foodways “tool kits” for households of varying ethnic backgrounds and social and economic status in and around Williamsburg. Even with this limited and oftentimes impressionistic war chest, staff, students, and interns have pursued some interesting topic on foodways from the perspective of the material culture of colonial Virginia.

In general, they mirror studies of other aspects of material culture. Common are assumptions about the rise of a consumer society that proliferated in material goods during the eighteenth century. As the Industrial Revolution in England brought with it the development of new manufacturing technologies, new and better goods were produced at a lower cost. Early on, only the very wealthy could flaunt their wealth and position through displays of their material goods, but as the century progressed the upwardly mobile and even the middle class, who increasingly aspired to obtain the trappings of wealth, could buy into the culture of mass-produced goods. By the end of the century, data show African-Americans also became consumers, although in more modest proportions. Scholars and students studying our collection have focused on the following questions:
“What were the “tool kits” of households of differing wealth group, ethnic identity, and occupation?”

“As the eighteenth century progressed, and the Tidewater elite increasingly flaunted their wealth with conspicuous consumption and at social events, where they staged elaborate meals, how did those less well-off buy into this consumer culture?”

“Who engaged in ‘stepping up’, and how did they do it?”

“What factors aided or impeded those who ‘stepped up’?”

“How quickly were fashionable foods and rituals of consumption adopted by conspicuous consumers in Williamsburg?”

“What effects did the growing political strife between England and Virginia have on Williamsburg conspicuous consumers of tea and other imported food commodities?”

“Is the correlation between political allegiance and conspicuous consumption evident in the food remains of the archaeological record?”

Here are general descriptions of the types of research projects pursued during Brown’s tenure as director. See Appendix 2 for titles and descriptions of specific works:

- Vessel Form Analyses from several sites. Includes Peyton Randolph House, Marot’s/Shields’ Tavern, John Draper’s well, Brush-Everard House, Dr. Philip Barraud’s trash pit, Dr. George Gilmer’s trash pits, and several others.

- Beverage bottle morphology studies. Includes analysis distribution of bottles seals to demonstrate merchant/consumer relationships, merchant/merchant competition, and private (non-mercantile) owner’s seals to show social relationships of beverage consumption (work in progress).

- Gardening vessels. Analysis flower pots, blumenkubel, etc. (work in progress).

- Gardening Implements Catalog. Work in progress.

- Comparison French Historic Site assemblages with English Historic Site assemblages.

- Non-English beverage bottle distribution. Work in progress.

- German spa-water bottle distribution. Work in progress.

- Chamber pot research.

- Cutlery analysis and catalog.

- Wetherburn’s Tavern Cherry Bottles and Garden Trimmings Catalog.

- Geddy Refined Earthenware Teapot Research. Work in progress.

- Beverage bottle corking technique research.

- Beverage bottle binning comparative research. Work in progress.

- Palace Cellars (Botetourt) Inventory Analysis.
Quantified evidence on vessel forms is the first step towards taking what has been an object-focused area of research into the active world of food preparation and dining. The presence of certain types of cooking equipment, such as specialized stewpots indicate the occupants prepared high style cuisine, the “made dishes” accompanied by rich sauces. The presence of large serving trays, matched place settings, stemmed glassware, and forks indicate the occupants served these dishes in elegant style. Alternatively, the absence of these types of preparation and consumption vessels, but presence of iron kettles, unrefined earthenwares indicate the household prepared foods in the vernacular style, and dining was not the elegant affair found in elite homes. Together, the entire range of vessel forms, including preparation and consumption objects, gives a fuller picture of household consumption patterns.

Future archaeological investigations require integrating this evidence with data obtained from archaeobotanical and faunal remains. Specialty serving vessels, like asparagus trays and chestnut baskets, speak eloquently not only to the exotic plants that were consumed, but also to how dishes were served. Archaeobotanical evidence can give clues to the types of plants consumed, and who consumed them. Zooarchaeological data can reinforce the picture by showing what cuts of meat were consumed and how they were prepared. Were many fragments of the delicacy calf’s head identified? Or, as was found in the Coffeehouse faunal assemblage, were beef and veal cut into the small pieces used in “made dishes”, while pork and mutton both were left as large roasts? Each separately, material culture, archaeobotanical, and zooarchaeological evidence is only a lens into the foodways of the past households; together they provide a much more nuanced picture, one that moves beyond the “tool kit” to an understanding of the diet and cuisine of households of varying ethnic affiliations, differing rank, and occupation groups.

The pots and pans, serving pieces, tea wares, plates, bowls, animal remains, and plant remains, all are useful sources of information on cultural behavior guiding food selection, preparation, and consumption. Anthropologists studying food provide guidance in these matters. Mary Douglas (1984), Jack Goody (1982), and Susan Kalcik (1984), to name a few, help show how material culture is both the conscious and unconscious expression of our cultural selves. To paraphrase Susan Kalcik, food, or any activity related to the production, distribution, preparation, and consumption of food, can be charged with emotion and significance because food acts as a symbol of ethnic identity. Through objects, food and dishes prepared in special ways is a form of communication, a social process through which individuals and groups relate to each other (Kalcik 1984:44).

Archaeological evidence can be an important source of information to show how cultural values guide food selection. One example comes from zooarchaeology. Contemporary Americans do not view exotic animals, such as the bottle-nosed dolphin, common loon, double-crested cormorant, if great blue heron as food, but the presence of their remains in only early seventeenth-century sites shows these animals were the epitome of high style medieval cuisine (Bowen 1996; Bowen and Andrews 2000). Another example
also comes from zooarchaeology and the faunal analysis of bones from the Rich Neck slave quarter. In her dissertation, Maria Franklin describes how these remains help to show how cultural heritage influenced choices. In these assemblages are large numbers of wild taxa, a sign of their deep familiarity with the land and comfort with consuming large quantities of fish and other wildlife. Bones were chopped and highly fragmented, a sign that indicates their cuisine composed of hominy and stewed foods (Franklin 2001).

The old saying, “You are what you eat,” is a truism today, but truer words were never spoken. Jack Goody’s study of Cooking, Class, and Cuisine: A Study of Comparative Sociology (1982) provides insight into how foodways reflect the position individuals held in society of eighteenth-century Chesapeake. He wrote that societies with internally differentiated cuisines exist are stratified both politically and culturally. In Europe, an internally differentiated cuisine had existed since at least the early medieval period. By the eighteenth century in the Chesapeake the elite had formed a distinctive and powerful class within the colony. About the same time, dining in high style became a vehicle through which they could interact with each and communicate to others who they were. The cuisine that evolved reflected these political, social, and economic changes. It was based on the English high style cuisine, it was prepared with special equipment, and it consumed in dining rooms set conspicuously with expensive table settings. Eating among the elite became a ritualized ceremony of multiple courses of highly refined foods.

Brown and Bowen (1995), and Brown and Samford (1994), each have remarked that material culture, including the remains of meats and plants as well as objects used to produce, prepare, and consume foods, reflected patterns of behavior as they were part of the political, economic, and social forces at work. What archaeology, supported by probate inventories, has shown is that individuals in the different wealth groups tended to behave in similar ways, and that the material culture they kept around them, and the food they ate, was a close reflection of their position in Chesapeake society.

Martin, Brown, Samford, and Bowen, however, point out that wealth did not necessarily define one’s relationships, the material culture individuals kept around them, or the cuisine they consumed. Wealth, occupation, and ethnic identity are not the only determining factors in determining one’s social relations. The material culture recovered from archaeological sites is a window into the social relations and aspirations of the individuals who lived on the site. Individuals such as gunsmith John Brush, or blacksmith John Draper, were modestly successful, but certainly their wealth did not equate to the wealth of the powerful elite. But, both obtained objects most often recovered from sites occupied by the wealthy elite. One might say they lived beyond their means. But the evidence points out that owning the accoutrements of tea, coffee, or chocolate drinking provided them with the means to participate with, and to be part of the elite. Emulating the ways of others is never simple or straightforward, but clearly finding the remains of a monkey, delftware tea bowls, coffee or chocolate cups, in gunsmith John Brush’s trash speaks volumes about his aspirations, and possibly the social world in which he traveled (Mennell 1985).

Another example comes from zooarchaeology and the provisioning study conducted by Lorena Walsh, Ann Smart Martin, and Joanne Bowen. Comparing faunal remains
recovered from many domestic sites, it became clear social relations were an essential element in determining where one could find meat. If one had relations living in the nearby countryside, or the ability to purchase a farm outside of town, then food was obtained primarily from these sources—neither from the marketplace or merchant stores. But those who lacked rural connections, individuals such as immigrant John Draper, depended upon commercial sources of food. Social connections meant as much, or more, than wealth.
Recommendations for Remedial Analyses and Research Plan

Pursuing foodways requires a research plan that builds on the analysis of many individual sites located in both urban communities and the nearby countryside. In addition, foodways research requires a large database of sites that were occupied by households of different rank, occupations, and ethnic identities. This is a goal to which all archaeologists aspire, but since professors working in universities dig only a few sites during their lifetime, and most working in CRM move from region to region with little plan other than completing the next project, few ever succeed. Some attempt by culling comparative data from published reports and scholarly literature, but only too often they discover these data are only minimally useful because analytical techniques used vary so much.

Even though excavation goals and techniques used by Colonial Williamsburg archaeologists have changed over the years, DAR is uniquely suited to this broad comparative research. Seventy-four years of archaeology has produced an impressive collection. Despite an uneven quality of the material culture, the collection is so strong because everything comes from sites located in Williamsburg and the nearby countryside. Given a carefully crafted research plan, it is possible to study any aspects of foodways.

For example, Bowen and her staff have pursued a comparative research plan that includes assemblages from throughout the town, as well as the region. Like with the artifacts, an uneven quality exits, but the research was designed to capitalize on the strengths of the early collections. Knowing Noël Hume excavated by hand-troweling, Bowen recognized his archaeologists missed many bones from smaller fauna, but that they very likely recovered a representative sample of the larger domesticates. Consequently, dietary estimates would be skewed towards the larger domesticates, but questions about the development of an urban market, changes in size, and the distribution of cattle, swine, and sheep could be adequately answered. So too could questions about variability among households—provided they focused on cuts of beef, veal, pork, and mutton. Gradually, site-by-site, she and her staff have built a database capable of addressing questions of the larger domesticates. With the sites dug after 1982, faunal analysts completed all possible state-of-the-art analyses, including computing all four relative dietary estimates (NISPs, MNIs, Meat Weight, and Biomass), measuring the bone, estimating the age of death, and determining cuts of meat. Together with faunal data derived from sites excavated during the early years by Noël Hume, they have put together a database that is capable of answering a wide range of foodways-related questions.

Material culture studies are not in the same position. Noël Hume and his staff systematically cross-mended all eighteenth-century ceramics and some glass from each site they dug. During the 1980s, Pittman continued to cross-mend ceramics and glass, but since 1990 only minimal cross-mending has been accomplished, with the result that there is a huge backlog of work to be done. Given the labor-intensive nature of cross-mending, DAR is faced with some difficult choices. All things being equal, cross-mending provides
the most complete evidence on vessel forms, but realistically budgets for both current and future projects will never be able to absorb this backlog. Gifts and grants would help, but even here it is unrealistic to expect to get the work done. Another approach is needed, one that combines an increased level of cross-mending for important previously excavated sites with creative thinking about alternative analytical approaches.

Environmental evidence, including archaeobotanical remains and oyster shells, is in even a more difficult position. Since Noël Hume did little environmental recovery except save faunal remains, and work completed during the 1980s and early 1990s is uneven, the work backlog is not as problematical. Current assessments of soil sample housed in the warehouse call into question the wisdom of do any intensive analyses. And a quick assessment of oyster shells housed in the warehouse indicate some analysis might be useful, but further work is needed to determine how much there is to do.

At present, DAR is capable of conducting systematic analyses for macrobotanical remains, wood, phytoliths, and oyster shells, so the future is good for current and future excavations (see the environmental assessment for a full discussion). It will take years to build a database comparable to the faunal database, but the research potential is extremely high. The reward for this approach will be to produce broad comparative databases of oysters and archaeobotanicals, but when combined with evidence on faunal remains and material culture, the end result will be a rich picture of foodways in colonial Virginia.

The following list of foodways research topics is long. Priorities need to be established. Even with clear goals, students and interns will have to assist in this ambitious project. For purposes of discussion and planning with the archaeological collections, only projects focusing on archaeological records have been listed, even though companion studies with documentary sources are obviously vital to the successful completion of these projects.

For a listing of faunal and oyster shell assemblages in need of analysis see Appendices 3 and 4. For a listing of soil samples in need of some level of analysis see the environmental archaeology assessment, and for a listing of sites with features in need of analysis, see the material culture assessment.

**Production/Procurement of Food**

This phase of foodways refers to the procurement of foods through hunting, fishing, and harvesting shell fish, and through growing plants, and husbanding livestock, all viewed as part of a subsistence system that provided food for all who lived in the Chesapeake. This includes the elite planters, tenant farmers, and enslaved African-Americans living in the rural area, as well as urban residents who consumed foods that were produced in the nearby countryside. For the most part, environmental archaeology will provide the evidence for this phase.

- **Landscape and the ecology of food production.** The development of an agrarian subsistence system based in tobacco culture molded and altered a landscape that had been modified by the Native Americans for many thousands of years.
- **Environmental Archaeology.**
  - Analysis of pollen and phytoliths from cores to provide evidence on changing plant communities.
  - Analysis of phytoliths surviving in tooth plaque to provide evidence on animal husbandry.
  - Identify local and regional production of agricultural and horticultural food plants.
  - Analysis of oyster shells to determine location of harvesting.
  - Identify use of wild and/or local plant foods.

- **Zooarchaeology.**
  - Analysis of slaughter ages and long bone measurements to assess impact changing economies and herd systems on livestock.
  - Analysis of archaeological maps to identify animal containment features that were part of the colonial herd system.

- **Material culture.**
  - Studies to determine changing technologies, as in the adoption of plows in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.
  - Identify gardening and agricultural tools (for example, carrot hoes vs. tobacco hoes).

### Distribution of Food

This phase of foodways refers to foods being exchanged both within and between communities. In the Chesapeake, this refers to the international trade of imported foods and goods produced in Europe, as well as the market system that developed in the region that distributed meats and plants to Williamsburg residents.

- **Availability foods and material culture from Europe**
  - **Material culture.**
    - Studies to determine presence imported food containers.
  - **Environmental Archaeology.**
    - Archaeobotanical analysis to determine presence imported foods.
    - Development provisioning system to feed urban residents.
  - **Zooarchaeology.**
    - Analysis of slaughter ages to identify development commercial production of livestock.
    - Analysis of element distributions in urban faunal assemblages to identify development of commercially available meat in Williamsburg.
    - Actualistic research on butchery techniques to determine primary and secondary meat cuts (i.e. distinguish between professional and home processed meat).
    - Analysis of fish identified in urban and rural faunal assemblages, in particular compare species found in African-American and European faunal assemblages. Results hopefully will demonstrate role African-Americans played in supplying fish to urban residents.
Environmental Archaeology.
- Analysis of the origin oysters to determine the locations of oyster beds.
- Analysis of the incremental growth in oysters to determine the seasonality of harvesting.
- Analysis of the size of oysters to show the impact harvesting had on oyster populations.
- Identify raw and processed plant foods in local exchange networks.

Processing/Preservation/Preparation of Food
This phase of foodways refers to the processing of foods. In pre-industrial provisioning systems, it is believed most preservation and processing of foods occurred in the home, but that as the marketing of foods became increasingly commercialized, middlemen took over this function. This phase also includes the preparation of foods for the table—thus cuisine studies (vernacular vs. high style cuisine) fall into this category. Types of important studies include:

- Food Processing/preservation/preparation
  - Material Culture
    - Identify food processing tools in assemblages of domestic and tavern assemblages.
    - Identify types of cooking vessels in domestic (both European and African-American) and tavern sites to determine presence cooking vessels used to prepare vernacular and high style cuisine.
    - Identify storage and preservation vessels in domestic and tavern assemblages.
  - Zooarchaeology
    - Analysis of the butchery patterns to determine primary and secondary meat cuts.
  - Environmental Archaeology
    - Identify of the methods of preparation, processing, and storage of plant foods and beverages
    - Analysis of the breakage on oyster shells to determine whether they were shucked raw or cooked.

Consumption of Food
This phase of foodways refers to the consumption of food, one of the richest arenas for studies, since it includes dining and the rituals surrounding when, where, and why certain foods were consumed.

- Food Consumption
  - Material Culture
    - Studies of ceramics, glassware, cutlery, and other objects to determine “tool kits” of households of varying wealth groups, occupations, and ethnic affiliation
- Residue analyses of colono and other low-fired earthen wares to determine which foods were consumed

- **Zooarchaeology**
  - Strengthen regional data base for all time periods and households, but particularly sites occupied by rural tenant farmers of European descent, and urban elite and enslaved African-Americans.
  - Analyze fragmentation present in assemblages for indications of vernacular and high style cuisine and association with households of differing rank, occupation, and ethnic identity.

- **Environmental Archaeology**
  - Identify the relative dietary importance and diversity of plant food products for household of different rank, occupation, and ethnic identity.
  - Identify the symbolic uses of plant foods to establish status, religious uses.
  - Identify the role of local Native American and imported food plants. Identify traditions in the diet.
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Appendix 1.
Foodways Studies

This section lists reports that include one or more types of foodways studies. Included are studies of faunal remains, archaeobotanicals, oyster shells, and material culture.

1957 to 1982

Archaeobotanical Analysis.

a. Custis Well. No date, single page report. Unidentified specialist provided a list including a range of taxa, among them the remains of black walnut, persimmon, hickory nut, gourd, coconut, linden, grape, honey locust, sassafras, smoke tree, and domestic cherry.

b. Wetherburn’s Tavern, Well C. No date, single page report. Unidentified specialist provided a list of botanical remains, including Virginia pine, red maple, peach, apricot, and cherries, found preserved in wine bottles buried in the yard.

Faunal Analysis and Reports by Stanley Olsen:

a. Animal Remains from the Thomas Jones (James Wray I) Site: 1745-1750. No date.

b. Vertebrate Remains from the John Custis Well, 1965

c. Matthews Manor (report missing from files).


e. Faunal Analysis of the Jones and Nicholson Cellars: The Public Hospital Site. No Date.


g. Report on the Animal Bones Found at the Wray Site. No date.

1982 to Present


a. Preliminary Analysis of the Nicolson House Faunal Remains, by Joanne Bowen. This report provides quantified evidence on the relative importance of identified taxa. Combining bones from similarly-dated layers, Bowen strengthened the statistical reliability of the data to provide NISP, MNI, and Average Useable Meat Estimates. Dates of assemblages: 1770-post 1785; 1800; 1840-50s; and late nineteenth c.
Public Hospital Site, ER 2625-4C. 1984

a. Analysis of the Faunal Remains from the Public Hospital Site, ER 2625-4C, by Joanne Bowen. Analysis of bone fragments excavated from a wood-lined trash pit included a full report discussing age data, relative dietary assessments, and through the use of historical sources and comparisons made with other analyses completed by Henry Miller, Bowen attempted an analysis of Chesapeake foodways. Assemblage date 1699.

Firehouse Site, by Patricia Samford, 1985.

a. 1985. Firehouse Faunal Report, by Joanne Bowen. Large numbers of faunal remains, apparently the remains of butcher Benjamin Hanson, were analyzed. In the report, Bowen assessed the likelihood of these bones being the remains of a butcher. Includes section on ageing Ovicaprid mandibles by Nancy Demetropolis. Assemblage date mid-eighteenth c.


b. Faunal Analysis for the Tazewell Hall Site, by Nancy Demetropolis. Brief descriptions of a small assemblage, with species list included. Assemblage date 1758-late nineteenth c.

Archaeological Excavations at Site 44JC500, by David Muraca. 1986.

a. Faunal Analysis by Gregory Brown.


a. Descriptive Artifact Catalog for Port Anne, an Early 17th Century Site, by William E. Pittman. Detailed illustrations and descriptions of the vessel types and forms.

b. Faunal Overview, by Roni Hinote Polk. While most bone was well preserved, some required consolidation. Given the very small assemblage recovered, analysis included species identifications, fragment counts, and MNI determinations. Despite the small number of bone, deer and other wild fauna are well represented. Assemblage date early seventeenth century.

Archaeological Evidence of the Carter's Grove Slave Quarter: A Re-Analysis, by Patricia Samford. 1988


a. The Peyton Randolph Planting Beds: A Discussion of the Non-Dietary Use of Bone, by Joanne Bowen. Paper presented to the Society for Historical Archaeology. Analysis focused on bones recovered from the planting beds to show how bones were used for secondary purposes, such as drainage. Planting Bed Assemblage early eighteenth century.

b. Preliminary Report on Oyster Shells from the Peyton Randolph Site, by Keith R. Doms and Jay F. Custer. Analysis of oyster shells from a planted bed demonstrated oysters were all from sandy mud flats located in waters that were more than 4-5 feet deep. Incremental analyses demonstrated the shells had been harvested primarily during the late fall and early winter.

c. A Report of the Analysis of Macrofossil Remains from the Peyton Randolph House, Williamsburg, Virginia, by Stephen Mrozowski. Macrofossil remains focused on reconstructing the site landscape, characterizing the plant communities in the eighteenth century yard. Indirectly, analysis focused on foodways in that Mrozowski interpreted seeds found in the planting beds as what might have been found in the moist environment required for growing asparagus.


a. Artifact Analysis, by William E. Pittman. Analysis demonstrated the international scope of artifacts found in 44HT55. Basing his interpretation on the diversity and quantity of artifacts found at this site in comparison to other sites of similar data, plus the fact that the site was located in the early colony’s most populous and fastest growing area, Pittman attributed the remains to a household of relatively high economic status. Cross-mending analyses were performed to determine vessel form and function, and summaries were made of food preparation and consumption items.

b. Faunal Analysis, by Gregory Brown. Analysis of a large faunal assemblage from 44HT55 demonstrated that relative to other early seventeenth-century sites analyzed by Dr. Henry Miller of the St. Mary’s City Commission, there was a low percentage of wild fauna. Brown discussed animal husbandry and the relative dietary contribution made by different taxa. He also provided a site catchment analysis on the basis of wild fauna.

c. Oyster Shell Analysis, by Susan R. Alexandrowicz. Analysis of these shells demonstrated they grew in water of relatively low salinity. Half were bed oysters found in muddy sub-tidal environments, with the rest coming from channel, sand, and reef environments.

d. Paleobotanical Report, by Eric E. Voigt. Analysis of carbonized seed remains from 44HT55, 44HT36, and 44HT37. Includes both prehistoric and historic re-
mains, including hickory, pine, willow, locust, hackberry, wild beans, peach, black
gum, and maize.

The Bates Site: Investigation of a Quaker Merchant, by Patricia Samford et
al. 1990.

a. Unique Ceramic Vessel Catalog for the Bates Site, by Eric Ackermann, et.al.  
Detailed illustrations and descriptions of the vessel types and forms. Includes unique 
ceramic catalogue.

b. Analysis of the Faunal Remains from the Bates Site, by Joanne Bowen, Eric 
Ackermann, and Bill Burke. Report on a small assemblage of 1401 fragments, 
including relative frequencies for NISP and MNI’s, and the anatomical parts present 
for Bos taurus, and Sus scrofa. Assemblage date late seventeenth century through 
eighteenth century.

Golf Course Excavations. Bassett Hall Woods, BW40, by Carl Steen. Incom-
plete draft report.

a. Oyster Shell Analysis: Archaeological Project 40BA (BW40), Bassett Hall Woods 
Site, by J. Michael Bradshaw. Reports most shells were probably harvested in the 
Hampton Flats area oyster beds. Full length oyster shell report missing in files.

b. Faunal Report on 1234 fragments from Bassett Hall Woods. Brief description of 
percentages of different taxa identified in the small assemblage.

Archaeological Investigations of the Shields Tavern Site, Williamsburg, Vir-
ginia, by Gregory Brown et. al. 1990. Through the use of documentary and 
archaeological sources, this report reflects an integrative approach to the study 
of public foodways.

a. The Role of Taverns in Colonial Towns, by Gregory Brown et. al. A brief history 
of “public foodways”, and the social and economic importance of taverns in colo-
nial towns.

b. Zooarchaeological Data, by Joanne Bowen and Roni Polk. Analysis of public 
foodways during the early tavern and late tavern periods (1708-1738; 1738-
1751).


d. Artifactual Data, by William Pittman and S. Kathleen Pepper. Cross-mending 
performed for several ceramic types provided evidence of vessel forms used dur-
ing the early and late tavern periods. Includes a discussion of serving and con-
sumption vessels, food storage and preparation vessels, as well as toiletry and 
pharmaceutical vessels.


a. Oyster Shell Analysis, by Michael J. Bradshaw. A detailed analysis of a prehistoric assemblage, showing the vast majority were bed oysters, and that they had been harvested between late fall and early spring. Small size indicated they lived in a very stressful environment, and that they were shucked raw.

“Upon the Palisado” and Other Stories of Place from Bruton Heights, by John Metz, Jennifer Jones, Dwayne Pickett, and David Muraca.

a. Study of garden pots, by Kate Meatyard. History on the use of flowerpots in colonial Virginia gardening.


c. Faunal Analysis, by Joanne Bowen. Brief analysis and interpretation of the John Page household’s subsistence economy.


a. Ceramic Analysis of Dark Loam with Shell Layer, by Dwayne Pickett. Analysis of vessel types and forms in assemblage, with comparison to other historic sites occupied by French.

b. Preliminary Oyster Shell and Faunal Analysis of Dark Loam with Shell Layer, by Dwayne Pickett and Joanne Bowen. Analysis of remains left by French officers billeted in the Pate House during the winter of 1781. Results showed a strong similarity to the local meat diet.


a. Artifact Analysis of the Brush-Everard Site, by William Pittman, Kathleen Pepper, Amy Kowalski, Pegeen McLaughlin, and Ywone Edwards. Descriptions, illustra-
tions, and counts of vessel types for the John Brush, Dr. George Gilmer, and Thomas Everard households. Also African-American, Polly Valentine. Dates early eighteenth through early nineteenth centuries.


c. Ethnobotanical Results, by Stephen Mrozowski. Discussion of the cultural uses of botanical remains found in historic sites. Also discussion of pollen and parasites recovered from site. Data integrated into report text. Early through late eighteenth century.

d. Oyster Shell Analysis, by Leslie McFaden. Analysis of shells recovered from a privy. Evidence indicates shells sold in Williamsburg were primarily bed oysters, recovered by tonging in fairly deep water.


a. Artifacts, by Anna Agbe-Davies. Analysis included cross-mending and comparisons of vessel forms.

b. Faunal Analysis, by Anna Agbe-Davies. Analysis of 3442 specimens by students in the College of William and Mary’s zooarchaeology class, showed a similarity with the diet’s of others living in the region. Comparison of the MNIs to Philip Ludwell’s probate inventory showed a greater predominance of pig in the African-American assemblage.


a. Analysis of Faunal Remains, by Carrie B. Alblinger and Joanne Bowen. Analysis by Alblinger on the likelihood that this early nineteenth century assemblage is the refuse of a local butcher.


a. Artifact Analysis, by Donna Sawyers.

b. Faunal Analysis, by Joanne Bowen. Analysis of elite cuisine, as viewed through butchery patterns and period receipts.

Analyses of Chesapeake Faunal Assemblages Conducted for Other Organizations.

Final Performance Report. National Endowment for the Humanities Grant RO-22643-93. The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Analysis conducted by Stephen Atkins, Jeremiah Dandoy, Gwyneth Duncan, Susie Arter, Ethel Wu, and Susan T. Andrews. Included under this heading are faunal analyses completed by Elizabeth Reitz and Henry Miller. DAR lab staff transcribed and entered their data into the DAR computer system. In addition to this work, DAR contracted with other institutions to identify assemblages never analyzed. For these, the final NEH report contains all written information on these sites.

a. Henry Miller sites include:
   1. Bennett Farm 44YO302
   2. Kingsmill Tenement 44JC39
   3. Utopia 44JC32
   4. Pettus Plantation 44JC33
   5. Drummond Site 44JC43
   6. Kingsmill Plantation 44JC37

b. Elizabeth Reitz
   1. Reynolds Tavern, Annapolis, Maryland
   2. Calvert House, Annapolis, Maryland

c. Faunal Analyses of Noël Hume Sites
   1. Geddy Kitchen 33WB30
   2. Anthony Hay 33WB30
   3. Custis Site 33WB30

d. Not Reported Elsewhere
   1. Boothe Site 44IW111
   2. Mount Vernon South Grove 44FX762
   3. Gloucester (VIMS III) 44GL357, 44GL177
   4. Ferry Farm 44VB138
   5. Settler’s Landing Road 44HT68
   6. Grissell Hay (Blair Root Cellar)
   7. Jonas Green 18AP29
   8. Gloucester Point 44GL197
   9. Kingsmill Slave Quarter 44JC39
Contracts for Chesapeake sites included in the NEH Provisioning Project database.


Contracts for Chesapeake sites completed after NEH Provisioning Project.


g. “Zooarchaeological Analysis of the Wilton Site (44GL177), Henrico County, Virginia, by Gregory Brown. Report submitted to the William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research, College of William and Mary. 1999.


Appendix 2.
The Thematic Studies

The following is a list of specialized studies not part of an archaeological project. Here authors worked with archaeological data from one or more sites to study some aspect of foodways.

1957-1982


1982-Present

Material Culture

a. *Cutlery Study*, Senior Research in Anthropology, College of William and Mary. Examined cutlery in the archaeological collection to establish a chronology based on manufacturing technologies, form, and frequency.
b. Intern Research paper on bulk wine importation into Virginia, by Robert Galgano, College of William and Mary History Intern. 199?. Extracted references from the Virginia Gazette.
c. “A study of the ceramic and glass wares types vessels recovered from John Draper well deposits,” by Joe Jones. Intern Report, Date?


m. “Who’s Trash is it Anyway: Trash Pit and Land Use Status Analysis in Colonial Williamsburg’s Block 29,” by Anne P. McGee, Senior Research in Anthropology, College of William and Mary, 1996. Analyzed artifacts from Block 29 to determine land use indicators. Analyzed vessels in terms of functional groupings, including tea wares and table wares.


Zooarchaeology: Animal Husbandry and Landscapes


i. ICAZ presentation on animal husbandry.

**Zooarcheology: Butchery and Taphonomy Studies**


e. “Putting Flesh on the Bones: Theoretical and Methodological Approaches to Butchery Analysis in Historical Archaeology,” by Grant Gilmore. 1999. Evaluation of the analytical techniques ability to discern cultural patterning in butchery evidence.

**Foodways: Dietary and Ethnicity Studies**


Zooarchaeology and Market Systems


Appendix 3.
Sites and Assemblages in Need of Analysis

Artifact Assemblages
A list of artifact assemblages in need of analysis has been included in the Material Culture Assessment Report.

Faunal Assemblages
The following list is in two parts. The first includes all sites excavated since 1957 having faunal assemblages in need of analysis. The second includes all sites whose faunal assemblages have been analyzed. Those assemblages dating before 1982 were excavated by Ivor Noël Hume, while those dating after this were excavated by Marley R. Brown. Included in the table is the approximate number of bones, whether the excavations were Phase II, Phase III, or waterproofing, and whether Bowen or one of her associates worked on a portion of the remains. Finally, the table includes information if a report was written for the analysis.
### Faunal Assemblages Not Analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Year Dug</th>
<th>No. of Bones</th>
<th>Analyst</th>
<th>Faunal Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bassett Hall</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Waller</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiswell-Bucktrout</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2564</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracken House</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td>1968,70</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hospital</td>
<td>1968-82</td>
<td>14552</td>
<td>JB (part)</td>
<td>Analysis of Faunal Remains from the Public Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Byrd III</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallam Theater</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>5001</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetherburns Tavern</td>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>11903</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton House</td>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Forge</td>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>4019</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Forge</td>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>10705</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Reid/Capt Orr</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>3372</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Square</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau Street Site</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wren Building Lawn</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentis Store</td>
<td>1969-72</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Gazette</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Geddy Kitchen (part)</td>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>6416</td>
<td>GD, JD, SA</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Geddy</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coke-Garrett House</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayloe/A. Hay House</td>
<td>1959, 1964</td>
<td>4145</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Hay (part)</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>3443</td>
<td>GD, JD, SA</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Lot</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenscroft</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grissell Hay</td>
<td>1989, 92, 93</td>
<td>35042</td>
<td>SA, Class (part)</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timson House</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wray Site</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>3279</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatland</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faunal Assemblages Not Analyzed (cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Year Dug</th>
<th>No. of Bones</th>
<th>Analyst</th>
<th>Faunal Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>320 N. Henry St.</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northington Block</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabon House</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carters Grove</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>3625</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt 60 Project</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2567</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews Manor</td>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>14 boxes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analyzed Assemblages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Year Dug</th>
<th>No. of Bones</th>
<th>Analyst</th>
<th>Faunal Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown Assessment</td>
<td>1993-95</td>
<td>6867</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Landing</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carters Grove</td>
<td>1988,91</td>
<td>8179</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>CG-8 Phase III Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruton Heights</td>
<td>1992,95,96</td>
<td>6346</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palace Lands Quarter</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2771</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custis Site</td>
<td>1964-68</td>
<td>6179</td>
<td>GD, JD, SA</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolson House</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>JB</td>
<td>Preliminary Analysis of the Nicolson House Faunal Remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shields Tavern</td>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>8465</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Greg’s Thesis; Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firehouse Site</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>4610</td>
<td>JB</td>
<td>Analysis of the Firehouse Faunal Assemblage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsburg Movie</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3280</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Archaeological Excavation of the Williamsburg Movie Theater Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffeehouse Site</td>
<td>1995-98</td>
<td>87131</td>
<td>ST, STA, LS</td>
<td>Coffeehouse Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peyton Randolph</td>
<td>77-78, 82-85</td>
<td>39476</td>
<td>SA, JB, CA</td>
<td>A View From the Top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker Garden</td>
<td>1994-97</td>
<td>5934</td>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Thesis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brush-Everard</td>
<td>1987-89, 94</td>
<td>17417</td>
<td>SA, EM, JB</td>
<td>Archaeological Investigation at the Brush-Everard Site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analyzed Assemblages (cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Year Dug</th>
<th>No. of Bones</th>
<th>Analyst</th>
<th>Faunal Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jordan’s Journey</td>
<td>1987-91</td>
<td>21956</td>
<td>STA, GB</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins Neck</td>
<td>1991-97</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifts Plantation</td>
<td>1976-78</td>
<td>20891</td>
<td>JB</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsby Site</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Carousel</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3453</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curles Neck Plantation</td>
<td>1984-90</td>
<td>2244</td>
<td>STA</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Vernon House for Families</td>
<td>1984, 89</td>
<td>25506</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Vernon South Grove</td>
<td>1990-94</td>
<td>33691</td>
<td>SA, GB</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsmill Slave Quarter</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>14324</td>
<td>GD, JD, SA</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massie Farm</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3384</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewick Farm</td>
<td>1989-90s</td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlers Landing</td>
<td>mid-1980s</td>
<td>2184</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Brown Site</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2380</td>
<td>JB, GB, SA</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Chiswell</td>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>5144</td>
<td>JWR</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester 44GL357 &amp; 177</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7587</td>
<td>JB</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boothe Site</td>
<td>1989-92</td>
<td>7784</td>
<td>GD, JD, SA</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester Point</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>13356</td>
<td>GD, JD, SA</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3934</td>
<td>GB, STA</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Farm</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>7062</td>
<td>GD, JD, SA</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonas Green</td>
<td>1983-86</td>
<td>8260</td>
<td>GD, JD, SA</td>
<td>NEH Provisioning Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Initials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Analyst</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Analyst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Carrie Alblinger</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elaine Davis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>Susan Trevarthen Andrews</td>
<td>GD</td>
<td>Gwynth Duncan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Stephen Atkins</td>
<td>MSC</td>
<td>Michelle St. Clair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB</td>
<td>Joanne Bowen</td>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Tony Moore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Greg Brown</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Lyell Smollen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>Jerry Dandoy</td>
<td>JWR</td>
<td>Jeffrey Watts-Roy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4.  
Unanalyzed Oyster Shell Assemblages

Since no information on shells exists in Re:discovery, determining the number of sites having oyster shells, and the quantity for each site, was not a simple task. Oyster shells that have been analyzed are currently stored with shells that have never been analyzed in boxes of varying sizes, high up out of reach in the warehouse. In order to estimate the volume, we counted the boxes and its relative size, then attempted tried to standardize the number in terms of a Hollinger-size box. Future work should first assess which shells have, and which have not been analyzed, then, taking into consideration the new technologies available to us, a research plan should be developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Number of Hollinger Boxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Hospital (04C)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruton Heights (33AJ)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter’s Grove</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassett Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brush-Everard (29F)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peyton Randolph (28G&amp;H)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield’s Tavern (9L)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tazewell Hall</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholson House</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton House (09PC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 60 (51AF)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker Garden (29BB)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield’s Tavern (Draper)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarpley’s (09CC)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter’s Grove (50AV)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter’s Grove (50AP)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grissell Hay (29CA)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Theater (29G)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Neck Plantation (68AS)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Neck Slave Quarter (68AL)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armistead (17KB)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armistead (17KE)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armistead (17KD)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallam Theater (08GE)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palace Lands (33AS)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Plan:

African-American Archaeology at Colonial Williamsburg

Committee Members:
Ywone Edwards-Ingram (chair)
Anna Agbe-Davies
Steve Atkins
Marley Brown III
Introduction

In 1986, the Department of Archaeological Research (DAR) for the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation in Williamsburg, Virginia published a second edition of *Toward a Resource Protection Process: James City County, York County, City of Poquoson, and City of Williamsburg* (Brown and Bragdon 1986). This document assesses historic properties and archaeological sites within Tidewater Virginia and recommends guidelines for their study and protection. The sections on African-American Study Units outline chronologically key resources and discuss their importance as non-renewable properties. This research plan for African-American Archaeology at DAR follows the tenets of this approach. Since the publication of *Toward a Resource Protection Process*, DAR archaeologists and other researchers have studied some of the sites identified and also have uncovered other sites not discussed or identified in this document. The relevance of the document, however, has not diminished and many of its recommendations are still unrealized. This research plan for DAR is one way to refocus attention on the importance of this document, to point out other research projects and resources, as well as to chart a path forward.

The concerted study of the buried remains relating to African Americans started in the late 1960s. By the 1980s, it has developed into a fledging field of American Historical Archaeology. Early studies concentrated on plantations and mainly sought to understand the living conditions of slaves, the nature of culture change, and aspects of the African heritage. Many researchers concentrated on the southeastern areas of the United States. Since the 1980s, however, both research questions and geographic areas have broadened. Today’s topics include race, identity, Atlantic connection, ethnicity, public education, resistance, domination, and other social and cultural processes that affected the lifeways of enslaved Africans and their descendants. Study areas now include the mid-Atlantic regions and other areas of the United States, the Caribbean, South America, as well as Africa.

The DAR at Colonial Williamsburg has been keeping abreast of the scholarship in African-American archaeology. Its staff has been making significant contributions to research topics and interpretations of archaeological sites and assemblages. Since the 1980s, the Department has been working with the museum’s interpretive sites and programs to develop furnishing and other interpretive plans, and in the reconstruction of buildings of which the most notable example is the Carter’s Grove slave quarter.

The Department has been responsible for the teaching of field schools and regular college courses, artifact collection and site studies, adult education programs, internships, interpreter training, electronic field trips, collaborative studies with other institutions, and public outreach programs including exhibitions. These avenues have been effective to showcase the Department’s work and allow staff to contribute to the viability of African-American archaeology. The DAR’s achievements are also evident in publications and reports as well as undergraduate, master, and doctoral theses (for examples, Lattimore 2002; Agbe-Davies 2001, 1999b, 1995; Edwards-Ingram 2001a, 2000, 1999, 1998, 1997a, 1997b;
African-American archaeology is critical to the Foundation broad research plan to study the nature and form of social, political, and economic diversity in colonial Virginia. With its potential to highlight the material culture that has resulted from the pervasive presence of African Americans in the colonial era, archaeology is central to historical interpretation and reconstruction. This record of the past is important in presenting African Americans as major contributors to America’s history and to correct stereotypical notions about this group of people. African-American archaeology is significant to both DAR’s and Colonial Williamsburg’s overall education programs.

In our search at DAR to recover and interpret the African-American past, we have consistently examined the relevance of various theories and methodologies. For example, investigations of the Polly Valentine site at the Brush-Everard property in the late 1980s created an opportunity to investigate an urban site to find answers to research questions including the nature of the master-slave relations and the extent to which these relations influenced the material remains on a slave site (Edwards 1990). More recently, our work at the Rich Neck slave quarter focused on the utilization of the environment—mirroring the emphasis on this topic in archaeology (Franklin 1997). The faunal and botanical remains recovered from this site represent perhaps one of the most complete assemblages in the Chesapeake. The benefits from the ongoing study of this collection are valuable to our work at Colonial Williamsburg as well as to the field of African-American Archaeology.

In terms of the overall history of archaeology at Colonial Williamsburg, African-American archaeology is still a fairly recent area of study. Excavations prior to, during, and up to several years following the restoration, mostly neglected African-American remains. Studies on African Americans, when conducted, were listed as secondary goals. The search for the African-American presence was mostly confined to fields and outbuildings. Studies were mainly undertaken as part of the effort to learn more about the social statuses and the material evidence relating to affluent people of European descent. These studies failed to address, in detail, the complexity of the multi-racial and multi-ethnic society of colonial Virginia.

The archaeological record on African Americans is related and sometimes intertwined with other data relating to other ethnic and racial groups. Separating the African-American archaeological components from those of other racial and ethnic groups has proven to be most difficult. Over the years our achievements in this area have been documented, mainly, for geographically-discrete sites. Finding and understanding how African-American remains are evident in the archaeological record has tested our strength.

While sites with geographically discrete African-American remains are few (Carter’s Grove slave quarters, the Polly Valentine site, Rich Neck slave quarter, and Palace Lands are outstanding examples), most of the sites in the Historic Area of Colonial Williamsburg are complicated multi-racial sites. Different racial groups, but mainly black and white, once lived at or worked on these sites throughout Williamsburg’s colonial history. Several different households also have occupied the same site over time. These sites are constant challenges forcing us to refine our approaches to studying the past.
From our research, we have learned that the material remains from African-American sites are very similar to materials from sites occupied by whites. We have incorporated several theories and research methods to gain a better understanding about the nature of slave life, factors that affected the acquisition, use, and discard of certain material items, and slave housing. The complex nature of the “African heritage,” namely the ways people of African descent drew on African cultures in cultural and social building processes, has not been treated adequately in our archaeological program. We are seeking more fruitful ways for our research to contribute further to the study of “cultural differences” relating to African Americans that can be addressed archaeologically.

The archaeological program has to go beyond seeking archaeological correlates of facts already known to provide studies that show that African Americans were different in ways that are both meaningful and not already well understood from documentary sources. Archaeological research can help the Foundation to create a firm database for the comprehensive study of early America. This database is essential for research at local, regional, and international levels.

The archaeological staff is continuing to provide useful information to interpreters, scholars, and the general public (Abge-Davies 2001, 1999a, 1998; Edwards-Ingram 2001a, 1999, 1998, 1997a, 1997b; Edwards 1998; Mrozowski and Driscoll 1997; Edwards and Franklin 1997; Bowen 2000, 1995; Atkins 2001, 1994). The staff is constantly initiating and engaging in intellectual exchanges with scholars and other interested persons. Training and public education programs are been incorporated in our efforts to promote African-American archaeology as a viable research endeavor. The archaeological program aims to continue assessing present resources and supplementing them with newly discovered ones to make archaeology more relevant to African-American research, interpretation, and presentations.
Research Objectives and Work Plan

Facing the Problem

The pervasive presence of African Americans in Williamsburg belies any attempt to ignore this group’s contributions to everyday life in this colonial town. The nature of urban sites, particularly the continuous occupations of the same site by different groups, complicates the work of archaeologists seeking to gain a comprehensive picture of colonial life. How this concerns African-American archaeology will need to be constantly addressed in any attempt to understand cultural diversities and how these are represented in the archaeological record. We need to define “difference” long before we approach sites and collections. Our understanding of cultural diversity should not be limited to the present time but to how difference was perceived by racial and ethnic groups in the eighteenth century. Difference is far more complex and the consequences more far-reaching than variations or similarities in material culture. The various contradictions in the society and their mediations by various actors—be it individuals and as members of different groups, should be constantly addressed. The material culture of the past should be used to interpret the past from diverse social and cultural perspectives.

Almost every site within the Historic Area has the potential to address the lifeways of African Americans. African-American sites should not be defined only as those containing “ethnic markers” such as colonoware, root cellars, and cowrie shells. Neither should site areas stop at the boundaries of slave dwellings or work areas. We need to consider the African-American influence in broader perspectives, on both inter-site and intra-site scales. Finding geographically discrete African-American assemblies in the Historic Area should not be our major goal as African-American dwellings and work areas were seldom discrete from those of Euro-Americans. There are some sites (based on their associations with specific African Americans) more than others, that have the potential to yield more information and these should be studied with the added advantage of other resources.

By using relevant theories and methodologies of urban archaeology and African-American research, we can identify and study the African-American past. At times, we will only be able to address broad patterns and long term processes in the continuing development of the town and how these affected the black population, enslaved as well as free people. At other times, we may have opportunities to explore the lifeways of specific individuals in a comprehensive way, most likely with the help of documentary sources. Increasing our studies of sites that doubled as both domestic and commercial/trade sites is one way to address the intricate nature of work, and the living arrangements of both blacks and whites in greater details.

Exploring themes such as nature of African heritage and influences, the development of African-American culture, foodways, and social relationships between whites and blacks as well as the material correlates of these relationships, could set the groundwork for a stronger African-American archaeology. This research should establish the foundation for more studies that would go beyond fieldwork to creating useful interpretations that should influence ongoing scholarship and public education. Our zooarchaeological staff, for ex-
ample, has made great inroads in the scholarship on foodways. Studies since the late 1980s, have concentrated on our collections as well as others from Mount Vernon and Monticello to produce significant information about slave diets. With the Digital Archaeological Archive of Chesapeake Slavery (DAACS, http://www.monticello.org/icjs/archaeology/daacs), centered at Monticello, the faunal lab has more opportunities to study and understand slave diets and other aspects of foodways.

We need to remain rigorous and creative in our analyses of the archaeological data if we plan to be ahead or abreast of other influential institutions in archaeology. Learning more about African-American history, the African heritage of African Americans as well as African-American culture is a recommended step to achieve our goals. Different groups perceived material culture, including landscape, in their own ways and knowing how these perceptions were buttressed by traditional beliefs, adaptation, and resistance should be central to our archaeological program.

Archaeological Excavations

Surveys are important to our research and these will continue on specific properties within and adjacent to the Historic Area to determine their significance to African-American archaeology. Our efforts to understand the nature of African-American life in urban areas will strengthen our goal to integrate African-American themes in all excavations in the “Historic Area.” From site surveys and excavations we will identify discrete areas of African-American occupations and access their potential to yield further information on the African-American past. Archaeological remains will be correlated to documented-African Americans, when possible, and research will cover the compositions of different households and their transitions through time. Our search for geographically-discrete sites to excavate will continue. More projects on slave subsistence, foodways, gardening, and aesthetics will be incorporated. The results of these studies should influence thoughts about life in colonial Williamsburg, the spatial layout of the town, changes through time, and African Americans’ autonomy, resistance, adaptation, aesthetics, and “fluidity” in terms of movements, identities, relationships, and pursuits for a better life.

Re-assessment Archaeology and the Urban Landscape

While our goal is to sustain an archaeological program with ongoing excavations, it will not be possible to engage in field work at all times. Also we have features and assemblages from previous excavations that we need to revisit, from an African-American perspective, particularly sites in the Historic Area. Architectural features including post holes, root cellars, and hearths that are associated with African Americans’ occupations, as well as trash pits and occupation layers from outbuildings, will form the bases of these analyses to gain more information about where blacks lived and worked in the Historic Area. Archaeological assemblages, including faunal remains, and features from the following sites are targeted for investigation in the near future.

1. Grissell Hay
2. Peyton Randolph
3. Shields Tavern
4. Prentis Store

Artifact Collections

The identification and study of things used and discarded by African Americans are invaluable toward gaining an in-depth knowledge of the lifeways of this population. Artifact studies have been an important component in African-American archaeology since its inception. While many of these initial studies were based on overly-simplified concepts about material culture, many more sophisticated analyses have followed from these tentative beginnings. Earlier, archaeologists sought for “Africanisms”¾African cultural traits believed visible in material remains associated with African Americans. They consistently associated these traits with certain classes of data¾“markers.” A type of low-fired earthenware known as colonoware, locally-made tobacco-clay pipes, many with designs, cowrie shells, and blue beads are prominent items in the “marker” category. The search for cultural materials indicative of African connections is still central to the discipline but what has changed significantly, are ideas surrounding the origin, acquisition, use, and discard of these artifacts and the significance of particular features.

The study of colonoware demonstrates the movement towards more meaningful artifact analyses in African-American archaeology. First christened “Colono-Indian ware” by Colonial Williamsburg archaeologist Ivor Noël Hume, it was initially recognized as a distinct ware on sites in and around Williamsburg. Noël Hume, citing physical similarities with pottery from Native American sites and noting its association with contexts where slaves were present, surmised that the ceramics were inexpensive substitutes for imported pottery and, therefore, were purchased from Native American potters by slave-owners, for use by their human chattel (Noël Hume 1962). Later researchers also saw parallels with traditions among African potters (see Heath 1996 and Ferguson 1992). While the relative contributions of Native American and African pottery styles to colonoware continue to be debated (see Mouer et al 1999; Deetz 1993), the association with slaves has become established within the field of study.

There is still more to be learned about colonoware, including systematic studies of the distribution of the pottery throughout Williamsburg, and comparisons of vessels from the city with those excavated at outlying plantations (for example, Carter’s Grove, Rich Neck, Palace Lands), and even further afield, like the Meux site in New Kent. While the parameters of the type have been set, there is still a great deal to be discovered about what it further encompasses.

Likewise, there is room for additional study of locally-made tobacco pipes. Subject to a similar debate pitting proponents of “Indian” manufacture against those who see “African” elements in their attributes (Emerson 1988, 1999, Mouer et al 1999), less attention has been paid to other questions that may be asked about these artifacts. Recent work by Anna Agbe-Davies (2001) suggests that it is possible to identify “workshop groups” within assemblages of these pipes and thus learn more about the meaning of the variation within the type. Ongoing research will study the distribution of these workshop groups in assemblages from Colonial Williamsburg collections (for example, Page, Rich Neck, College...
Landing) and several other sites to develop a regional understanding of the means of production and exchange employed.

The Department has prioritized the task to define types of artifacts and features that relate to enslaved and free people. This work has paralleled the survey of in-house collections to identify African-American material items. Artifacts from “good contexts” excavated in the Ivor Noël Hume’s era of archaeological research are part of this study. Some of these contexts are associated with features like wells, privies, trash pits, and “occupation” layers. These features most likely contain slave-related materials.

The search for “markers” may be one way to begin the study of the artifact collection, especially if the historical data has already established African Americans at these sites. However, great care should be taken in this approach because there are variations in slave lifeways and material culture. Comparing these assemblies with known discrete slave assemblies in rural or semi-rural sites as well as within urban assemblies will take the study of the in-house artifact collections one step further.

Artifact studies should be informed by approaches to consumer culture, African-American culture, and how slaves used consumer products. The acquisition of popular goods should not be viewed always as contradictions in African-American culture. As African Americans observed, learned, and contributed to dominant social customs, African Americans changed and accepted new ways of doing and seeing things. Their lifeways were constrained by economic and other social means, yet their culture was not just a response to these deprivations. African Americans’ acquisition, use, and discard of material goods and the presence of these goods on the landscape must be understood from within African-American life and culture as well from broad trends and changes in the society (Edwards 1998). Equally important, is the effort to understand African Americans’ use of materials that have not been preserved in the archaeological records. These perishable materials, including gourds and wooden objects, were significant to African Americans during slavery.

Archaeological investigations, like ongoing studies of Rich Neck and Palace Lands slave quarters, have augmented our collection of artifacts from discrete sites. Assemblages thus created will continue to be useful to projects covering furnishings, costumes, and other items used for correct interpretive settings. More important, the information generated from these studies will supply much needed data to clarify and further inform about African Americans in colonial Virginia.

A number of new research themes can be developed using the slave quarter sites at Rich Neck (Franklin 2001, 1997) and Palace Lands (Franklin 1998). What social relationships existed between these outlying quarters and the nearby city of Williamsburg? To what extent did the quarter’s proximity to town affect residents’ compared with people living on home-plantation quarters and in town? Another avenue for comparison exists between the Rich Neck slave quarter and eighteenth-century contexts at Green Spring, another plantation owned by the Ludwell family. The artifacts and excavation records from Rich Neck and Palace Lands are to be included in DAACS. This project aims to provide standardized data for a large collection of slave quarter sites throughout the region and will facilitate synthetic studies.
Documentary Studies

Archaeological studies of historic sites can never be divorced from documentary analyses. The most fruitful archaeological studies, however, are those where researchers understood the nature and the limitations of both records and worked with each data from this informed perspective. For examples, ongoing studies of slave diets (Franklin 2001; Bowen 2000, 1995; Atkins 2001, 1994) and slave medicinal and maternity practices (Edwards-Ingram 2001a, 1997a) have been incorporating historical documents to better understand the archaeological evidence. Owing to the “paucity” of the documentary evidence especially in the “voice or text” of African Americans relating to the everyday lives of slaves and free blacks, archaeology has a leading role to provide much needed information about this group of people.

An in-depth examination of the documentary record, as well as oral history projects will support archaeological inquiries. Case studies of better-documented households and individuals will be collated. The York County Project Files, for example, are of immense value to the work of the Department. Of equal importance are historic maps and private papers of different Williamsburg’s families. We will need to work even more closely with historians and other researchers who use documents as their main data to further promote the importance of archaeological finding for the holistic study of African Americans. The Department has conducted historical research on early Africans and African Americans as part of collaborative studies with both the National Park Service (McCartney 2000; Edwards-Ingram 2000) and the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (Edwards-Ingram 2001b).

Comparative Research

More comparative studies of the Americas can provide more information about the African Diaspora and the commonality of the experiences of blacks during slavery. A comparative approach to the study of African-American archaeology will help us understand linkages, changes, and continuities, as well as the specificities of the Williamsburg’s experience. Our work in Bermuda and Barbados has incorporated the slave experience. Incorporating more studies of the Caribbean region is essential to creating more knowledge of the cultures of enslaved Africans in the New World. Through comparative studies we can learn about regional and environmental constraints affecting economic, social, and political priorities of colonists and how these aspirations and realities affected the enslaved population, as well as the enslaved population’s adaptation and survival under different systems of colonial slavery.

Interpretation

The African-American archaeological resources should be constantly mainstreamed in interpretation. Information from well-studied African-American sites should be used to help interpret other sites with fewer archaeological resources. The African-American archaeological materials should not be used as another evidence to underscore elite lifestyles but should be utilized to interpret and present the African-American past with a full awareness of how this story is connected to the other stories of the past.
**Inter-Department Linkages**

Strengthening ties with the Department of African-American History and Interpretation (AAHI) is important to our goal to be an institution of influence in African-American archaeology. It is expedient that archaeological research at DAR addresses questions of concerns in this Department. Likewise, AAHI can provide archaeological staff with insights about aesthetics and other affective aspects of African-American culture. Interpreters and other staff in AAHI are on the frontline and their views and awareness of issues on the public/visitor agenda can influence archaeological thoughts and programs about social, political, and other implications of archaeological research.

We should develop more inter-departmental projects with several departments. Prominent among these departments are Historical Research and Architectural Research. Historians, architectural historians, architects, and archaeologists need to work together in African-American research. Creating biographies and amassing information from documents like probate inventories, deeds, wills, and tax records, as well as documenting buildings are among projects that can be fruitfully accomplished as cooperative projects. This far from exhaust the possibilities for interdepartmental linkages and cooperation, but these examples point to positives of collaborative work and the negatives are not addressed here as we should be able to surmount these in the quest for knowledge.

**Public Education**

While teaching African-American archaeology to staff, scholars, visitors and the general public, (Edwards-Ingram 1997b; Agbe-Davies 1995; Edwards 1995) special groups can be targeted. The Foundation’s African-American staff could be one such group. However, we should be carefully in targeting groups based on their racial or ethnic identities. More time should be spent designing programs for groups based on other criterions, for example, like reaching occupation and family groups with our programs. We should increase our effort to cultivate the interest of individuals and organizations that are involved in African-American research. Projects incorporating archaeological data could be developed in association with these research organizations. This would enable the Department further to conduct research that would be relevant to general educational initiatives and community development. Special programs as Learning Weeks, Field Schools, Electronic Field trips, Lab tours and “Open Houses” could incorporate more on African-American archaeology. Employing researchers from various disciplines should be encouraged, and courses and internships should be organized to increase staff’s knowledge about the African-American past.

**Other Training Initiatives**

Our training programs need to target researchers, interpreters, and other Foundation staff, as well as other groups to teach the importance of archaeology and to highlight findings. Regular in-house demonstrations and tours, lectures and presentations within the Foundation and elsewhere will promote archaeology as a discipline useful for historical interpretation. We need to increase our effort to attract and encourage “minorities,” including African Americans, to this field.
Scholarship

African-American archaeology becomes a challenge in the absence of “cultural markers” and documentary data, leaving archaeologists hard pressed to identify the remains of African Americans. Studies of patterned human behavior offer prospects but these studies will need to go beyond counting artifacts and their types to explore their relationships to the wider nexus of domination and resistance, as well as to survival and adaptation. Nowadays, archaeologists are using artifacts from slave sites to address these issues. They are producing better studies for both scholars and the general public. Their efforts have resulted in a profusion of information on African-American foodways, ritual life, social relations, retention, and cultural continuity as well as change.

Colonial Williamsburg is known as one of the leading institutions concerned with recovering, re-creating, and presenting a multicultural history. Our archaeological program should continue to contribute to research on the African-American past. We need to continue to publish our work and reach out to the public through different media. The DAR staff has been involved in planning exhibitions at nearby institutions including the College of William and Mary, The Mariner’s Museum, and the Jamestown/ Yorktown Foundation. Artifacts from the DAR collections have been exhibited, both nearby and afar, in educational programs in the United States.

Establishing partnerships and collaborative studies with other educational institutions should help to further our goal to remain a strong research body. We will need to continue our very productive relationship with DAACS and establish a link with the new Institute of Historical Biology within the Department of Anthropology at the College of William and Mary. The latter’s focus on the colonial period and issues of health, nutrition, and other bioarchaeological matters, complements our present strengths in zooarchaeology and archaeobotany. We will have to continue rethinking and revising traditional methodologies, as well as increasing our efforts to formulate and apply new ones in our goal to conduct archaeological research with a heightened sense of social responsibility. We will have to continue producing professional studies and providing empirical evidence to substantiate our theoretical and methodological approaches to the African-American past. Hopefully, we will help to change many stereotyped assumptions and depictions of African Americans, and make the difference that knowing more about the past can provide.
Five-Year Plan: An Outline

- Complete analyses and reports on Rich Neck and Palace Lands slave quarters
- Complete cataloguing of artifact assemblages relating to African-Americans from earlier excavations
- Re-assess and complete studies of excavated sites that have African-American components namely Grissell Hay, Peyton Randolph, Prentis Store, and Shields Tavern
- Work on newly identified projects with possible African-American components, including CG-10, Block 31, and Route 60
- Find more African-American sites that are geographically-discrete to excavate
- Continue documentary studies of colonial African Americans in Williamsburg and surrounding counties
- Develop stronger educational programs
- Continue and develop more collaborative programs with museums and colleges (notably DAACS and IHB)
- Continue to strengthen inter-departmental linkages
- Work with AAHI and the African-American Cultural Resource Center
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Major African-American Archaeological Projects

Late Seventeenth- or Early Eighteenth-Century Site

Rich Neck Cellar

The site is part of the Rich Neck Plantation complex in Williamsburg that was owned and operated in colonial times by members of the prominent Ludwell family. The site known as 68 AP is primarily the remains of a cellar that related to a late seventeenth- or early eighteenth-century structure that had occupied the site. After its abandonment, the cellar was exposed to the elements for an unknown, but probably brief time. Artifacts were deposited in it during this period. The cellar was filled rapidly and intentionally during the second quarter of the eighteenth century. This filling probably related to the initial occupation and use of the nearby eighteenth-century Rich Neck Slave Quarter Site (68AL). The study of how the site was formed and used has provided more information about the probable refuse-disposal practices of the occupants of the slave quarter as well as their other activities.

Eighteenth-Century Sites

Rich Neck Slave Quarter

Excavations in 1994 and 1996 on lands formerly the Rich Neck plantation, now part of a new housing development called Holly Hills in Williamsburg, uncovered the remains of this eighteenth-century slave quarter. Rectangular features known as root cellars, a brick hearth, and postholes marked the site of this slave cabin. Artifacts found during excavations of the site include coins, buttons, ceramics, glass, bones, and seed. The most recent material dates to the late 1760s to the mid 1770s, indicating that the building was abandoned sometime around the Revolution. The papers of the Ludwell family point to twenty-one slaves living at Rich Neck during the 1760s. This site allowed us to train African-American interpreters, other staff, students, and members of the public in research and the result of African American archaeology. It provided extensive data on Williamsburg slaves in the eighteenth century. The research on this site is further linked to a broader biographical study of the eighteenth-century Williamsburg African-American community.

Palace Lands Quarter

The initial survey at the Palace Lands Quarter (1996) unearthed a light scatter of eighteenth-century domestic and architectural artifacts. The 1998 work focused on exposing features, with two exceptions: the root cellar, which was excavated and ditch one which was sampled. The 1999 work identified two more ditches as well as postholes. The artifacts found in sealed contexts are of the types common between 1740 and the mid-1770s. Many of these artifacts were common household items, along with some basic farming implements. The site appears to be the remains of a mid-eighteenth century slave quarter,
based in part on its close resemblance with materials uncovered at the Rich Neck slave quarter in 1994/95. Historical research indicated that the house was located on a 35-acre tract owned by Matthew Moody and sold in 1760 to Governor Francis Fauquier. The most likely occupants were slaves that worked lands assigned to the Governor. The site has great potential to inform researchers about the lives of individuals and households of low socio-economic status. The Palace Lands faunal assemblage is now part of the DAACS study. To date, the entire assemblage from the cellar and ditches has been identified. The analysis of these materials continues in conjunction with other studies of the site.

*Carter’s Grove Slave Quarter - Ravine Excavation*

The 1991 excavation of a nearby ravine associated with the slave quarter at Carter’s Grove represents the Foundation’s quest for more information to interpret this site. The archaeological team investigated the use of the yard-area as an extension of the slave quarter and recovered material remains from the ravine. This ravine served as a trash dump for the occupants of the quarter. The excavation yielded fragments of pottery, glass, metals, and faunal remains. The analysis of the faunal remains from this site supports the interpretation that slave diet was more diverse than plantation records indicate. Beef bones, both “good” and “poor” cuts, made up the bulk of the assemblage. Both domestic (pigs, sheep/goats) and wild (raccoon) sources are represented in the faunal remains and the variety further points to slaves’ effort to supplement their diets.

*Carter’s Grove Slave Quarter*

Working at Carter’s Grove, during the early 1970s, archaeologist William Kelso uncovered root cellars, postholes probably relating to a fenced enclosure, drainage ditches and a trash dump. The roots cellars delineated where cabins were located in the eighteenth century. The other features were related to the spatial layout and the use of the yard. Artifacts range from coarse to refined earthenware, a few small sherds of colonoware, porcelain, and stoneware. Other items include padlocks and keys, pewter spoons, glass, marbles, tobacco pipes, and gun parts, and other metal objects.

The archaeological data was the most influential evidence used to determine the site to reconstruct the cabins. The artifact assemblage helped in the furnishing plan. Today the assemblage serves as a study collection and is also incorporated in training programs for interpreters. The collection has great potentials for comparative and other studies in archaeology and material culture. Today it is one of the DAR’s main assemblages for exhibition and training.

*Nineteenth-Century Sites*

*The Polly Valentine House Site*

Documentary and archaeological records suggests that a pier-supported frame house stood on the Tucker family property in the nineteenth century. The site now is located on the neighboring Brush-Everard property. Nathaniel Beverley Tucker probably constructed
this house during the 1840’s for his children “nanny,” a slave called Polly Valentine. Valentine and her family lived in this house until the outbreak of the Civil War.

Archaeological excavations on the Brush-Everard property in 1967 by Ivor Noël Hume found that the house (measuring 15’x 25’) with a substantial brick hearth, had rested on brick and stone piers. Remnants of five piers helped the archaeologists to calculate the dimensions of the house. The site was re-excavated during the summers of 1987 through to 1989, as part of a major study of the Brush-Everard yard to learn more about slave housing and domestic life. The data from the excavations and the documentary evidence from the Tucker family papers provided important information on the material life of slaves in the nineteenth century.

**The First Baptist Church**

The First Baptist Church stood until 1957, at the northwest corner of Nassau and Francis Street (Block 14, Colonial Lot M) in Williamsburg. The Church dates to 1855 but oral history accounts for the congregation meeting as early as 1776 in open air meeting places. According to a Williamsburg Land Tax record, there was a “Baptist Meeting House” on Nassau Street by 1818. This probably was a carriage house rather than a formal church.

The 1957 excavation located the foundation of the recently demolished 1855 church which was a formal structure (60’ east/west by 30’ north/south), as well as sections of an earlier structure measuring 16.1’ north/south by 20.1’ east/west. This earlier structure had extensive damages from the many cuts caused by the later church construction. The west wall had been completely robbed of brick. A concentration of brick and mortar near the southwestern corner of the demolished building was interpreted in 1957, as the remains of entrance steps. A third foundation measuring 6.5’east/west x 12.5’north/south was identified as a privy.

All these structures—the 1855, the earlier brickwork sealed beneath it, and the smaller outbuilding—presently lie under the paved driveway onto Nassau Street. Other archaeological features recorded include a fence line along the eastern boundary of the property, which probably related to the earlier structure, and a brick drain probably associated with the 1855 church.

Excavation of the field south of this lot where the church marker is presently located is unlikely to revealed further information about the earlier meetinghouse. The evidence indicates that this structure probably lies beneath the remains of the 1855 church. Documentary evidence supports a nineteenth-century date for any earlier structure. This negates the possibilities of reconstruction and interpretation within Colonial Williamsburg eighteenth-century interpretive time frame.
Appendix.
African-American Archaeological Resources

Late Seventeenth-Century to Early Eighteenth-Century Sites

The Meux Site, New Kent County (73AA)—Salvage archaeology

Project Description: Rescue work during construction of a porch.
Archaeologist: David Muraca
Records: Field notes, field drawings, artifact assemblage, and inventory
Historical Research: Research file compiled by Y. Edwards.

Rich Neck Cellar (68AP)

Project Description: Excavation of site that consisted of primarily a cellar.
Archaeologist: Anna Agbe-Davies
Records: Excavation records, photographs and slides, artifacts and artifact inventory.

Eighteenth-Century Sites

Palace Lands Slave Quarter (33AS)

Archaeologists: Maria Franklin
Project Description: Excavation of a domestic site
Records: Excavation records, artifact inventory, artifacts, and faunal data

Rich Neck Slave Quarter (68 AL)—1994-1995 excavation

Project Description: Excavations of house site and yard areas; shovel testing of the lot.
Archaeologists: Maria Franklin - Project Archaeologist, Anna Abge-Davies - Field Technician, and Ywone Edwards - Archaeologist.
Records: Field record, maps, slides, artifacts, and artifact inventory, Faunal analysis in progress.


**Rich Neck Slave Quarter (68 AC)—Summer 1993 excavation**

**Project Description:** Preliminary excavations of foundation and root cellars and probably planting bed features associated with slave quarters. Early stage of an excavation to study material lives of Williamsburg slaves. Project linked to a larger biographical study of the Williamsburg slave community.
Archaeologists: Leslie McFaden, Project Archaeologist. David Muraca and Amy Kowalski - Archaeologists

Records: Field notes, maps, photographs, slides, artifact assemblage and artifact inventory


**Prestwould Slave Quarter** (44MC534)—1991 excavation

**Project Description:** Mainly salvage archaeology. Excavation of clay cap with possible traces of root cellars.

**Archaeologist:** Patricia Samford

**Record:** Excavation record and artifact inventory.

**Correspondence:** Miscellaneous correspondence pertaining to the site. On file, Department of Archaeological Research.

**Report:** Samford, Patricia. Archaeological Investigations of Prestwould Slave Quarter Mecklenburg County, Virginia 44MC534. Department of Archaeological Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

**Carter’s Grove Slave Quarter Ravine** (50BC)—1991 excavation

**Project Description:** Excavation of a nearby ravine associated with previously excavated slave quarters.

**Archaeologist:** Patricia Samford

**Record:** Excavation record, artifact assemblage, faunal data, and inventory.


**Bassett Hall Woods** (Site BW12)—1989-1990 excavation

**Project Description:** Excavations before the construction of a golf course.

**Archaeologist:** Carl Steen

**Record:** Excavation record, artifact assemblage, and inventory. Analysis of faunal data is completed.

**Report:** Steen, Carl R. A Report on the 1989-1990 Excavations on the
**Carter’s Grove Slave Quarter (CG)—June 1970 -Sept 1971 excavation**

**Project Description:** Excavations of the field areas of the Carter’s Grove Plantation were features that were subsequently identified as roots cellars were uncovered.

**Record:** Excavation notes, field drawings, artifact assemblage and inventory.


**Foodways and Slavery in Bermuda and the Chesapeake**

**Project Description:** Comparative study of diet in two colonial regions using documentary and zooarchaeological data. Faunal remains the Henry Tucker House and Cox slave house, along with other sites, provided some of the Bermuda material. Faunal remains also analyzed from Springfield and Stewart Hall.

**Record:**


**Mount Vernon Slave Assemblage**

**Project Description:** Zooarchaeological study of the faunal remains excavated from the House for Families storage cellars. Presently stored at the Colonial Williamsburg’s Department of Research - Faunal Laboratory.

**Zooarchaeologist:** Stephen C. Atkins

**Record:** Information on faunal materials stored in D.A.R. computer files. Faunal remains on temporary loan from the Mount Vernon Ladies Association. Slides and photographs.

**Reports:**


**St. George Tucker’s Laundry (Block 29)—Summer 1930 excavation**

**Project Description:** Excavation of the yard

**Archaeologist:** Prentice Duell

**Reports:**

**Letter:**

**Other Reports:**
Sites with African-American Components or Sites Relevant to African-American Archaeology

Eighteenth-Century Sites

**Brush Everard Site**—1987-1989 excavation

Archaeologists: Patricia Samford and Meredith Moodey

Record: Excavation record, artifacts and inventories, photographs and slides, maps


**Grissell Hay Site (29CA)**—1988-1993 excavation

Project Description: Excavation of the yard behind the Grissell Hay House to locate outbuildings, gardens and other features, and to investigate changes in yard layout, material lifestyles, architectural sequences and the appearance of particular section of eighteenth-century Williamsburg.

Archaeologists: Gregory J. Brown and Meredith Moodey.

Previous Excavations: 1930 Excavation

Archaeologist: Prentice Duell - 1960 Excavation

Archaeologist: Ivor Noël Hume - 1985 Excavation Cursory archaeological investigations


Record: Excavation record, photographs, slides, maps, artifact assemblage and inventory, faunal analysis completed on the cellar assemblage.


Peyton Randolph Site—1988-1985 excavation

Previous Archaeology: 1930, 1950 Excavations

Record: Artifact assemblage. Artifact inventory (1982-1985 excavations), Faunal analysis completed for structure F.


Nineteenth-Century Sites

Rich Neck Slave Quarter—Salvage archaeology, August 1990

Project Description: Excavation on a house lot.
Archaeologist: Patricia Samford

Record: Excavation record, artifact assemblage and inventory


Polly Valentine Site (29G)—Summers 1987-1989 excavation

Project Description: Excavation of remains of a nineteenth-century slave house. Part of a major study of the Brush-Everard work yard to learn more about slave housing and domestic life.

Archaeologists: Patricia Samford and Meredith Moodey

Record: Excavation record, artifact assemblage and inventory. Photographs and slides.


**First Baptist Church** (14FA)—1957 excavation

**Project Description:** Excavation of demolished church site in search of eighteenth-century remains.

**Archaeologist:** J Knight

**Record:** Excavation record, photographs, artifacts.

**Reports:** Archaeological Briefing:

Moodey, Meredith C. and Ywone D. Edwards. The First Baptist Church, Department of Archaeological Research, March 1993.

Samford, Patricia. First Baptist Church Archaeological Briefing, Department of Archaeological Research, 1985.

**Other Reports:** Rowe, Linda H. A Descriptive Inventory of the John Dipper Papers, 1816-1836, 54 items.

——. First Baptist Church: Chronology of Related Events. Research Department, Revised 1991.

——. Baptist Church - Nassau Street, Memo sent to Robert C. Birney, Department of Research, May 11, 1983.

**Prentis Store Site** (Block 18-1, Lot 46)—1969 excavation

**Project Description:** Excavation of features designated as Structure G and Structure J - African-American house sites.

**Previous Excavations:** 1930 and 1946

**Archaeologist:** R. Neil Frank Jr.

**Record:** Excavation record, artifact assemblage, and faunal remains


Research Plan:

Industry and Economics Studies at Colonial Williamsburg

Committee Members:
Anna Agbe-Davies (chair)
Greg Brown
Kelly Ladd
William Pittman
Introduction

In distinguishing what constitutes “industry” or “economy” in Williamsburg’s archaeological record, and our department’s research output, we have relied on a few basic concepts and limitations. These concepts and limitations have to do with temporal range as well as definitions.

The present discussion is limited to evidence from the eighteenth century. Work by Horning and Edwards (2000), Horning and Wehner (2001), as well as Metz (1999) and Metz et al. (1998) have demonstrated the seventeenth century precedence for industrial activity in the Greater Williamsburg area, but will be covered in greater detail in the discussion of our seventeenth-century research. Furthermore, our Department’s research has shown that craft production in and around Williamsburg reached a peak of sorts during the eighteenth century. The only craft specialists commonly noted in the very early records of English occupation in the Chesapeake were the coopers and carpenters who supported the tobacco trade (Carr and Walsh 1988:145; Horning and Edwards 2000:127). The efforts of Governors Harvey and Berkeley to promote industry seem to have been the exception that proves the rule (Horning and Edwards 2000; Billings 1996). According to Metz, the first quarter of the eighteenth century was an important cultural watershed, as it marked the point at which “artisans” (such as cutlers, gunsmiths and silversmiths) outnumbered other craft specialists (such as carpenters and coopers) in the York County records (Metz 1999:15). Williamsburg in the first half of the eighteenth century was a leading urban center with, for example, a printer, bookbinder, apothecary, and furniture makers. But by the 1750s, it was being eclipsed by other towns in Virginia. In fact, the archaeological record seems to show that by the 1770s, there was a reduced need for consumer goods and services, and the commercial areas contracted, or were converted to residential use (Brown and Samford 1994:237, 238-239; Samford 1996:72).

The criteria for an activity being considered industrial, is that it be a non-agricultural activity producing a surplus beyond the producer’s needs (Morand 1994:i, 1), but not necessarily the large-scale kind of industrial activities characterized by factory work, the likes of which was beginning to take place in the larger urban areas of England towards the end of the eighteenth century (Palmer and Neaverson 1998). The archaeological evidence we have comes from craft specialists working in town, on its outskirts, or on neighboring plantations. While some of these craft specialists did work alone, others drew on a labor pool of family members, apprentices, servants, and slaves, as well. Any specialized facilities were likely to be adjacent to the dwellings where these people lived, and integrated into the households that they formed.

We have decided to exclude questions of consumerism and its relation to conspicuous consumption from our consideration of “economy.” The question, which will be addressed under the heading of “material culture” and, to a certain extent “foodways,” has been a particular emphasis of research in this department for some time (e.g., Brown and Bowen 1995). Likewise, we are not addressing the role of Williamsburg and Virginia as sectors of the modern world-economy, not because this is an unimportant issue, but because much of the research dealing with international trade returns to the question of imported con-
sumer goods. There has been little research to date specifically using archaeological data from Williamsburg to understand the Atlantic world-economy except in those terms. Rather, we will be focusing on economic activity within Williamsburg, between the city and the surrounding countryside, and within the region as a whole.

The resource protection plan generated by this office in 1986 confirms the importance of studying and preserving sites that can inform our understanding of industry and economics in eighteenth-century Williamsburg. Six artisan sites are mentioned in that plan: the James Anderson forge, Elkannah Deane’s coachmaking shop, James Geddy’s shop (which housed at different times a gunsmith, brassfounder, ironworker, silversmith, and clockmaker), The Golden Ball (a jeweler and engraver), the Talliaferro-Cole chair-maker’s shop, and the sites of two cabinet makers—Anthony Hay and Peter Scott. However, a number of these sites were simply cross-trenched, and so provide only minimal information about subjects other than the location of their foundations. The Hay, Geddy and Anderson sites are the notable exceptions (Brown 1986:150).

In addition to attracting craft specialists, Williamsburg was also a center of the “service industry” in eighteenth-century Virginia. The capital of the colony was inundated with visitors for court days and when the legislature was in session, creating a demand for taverns, ordinaries, and other facilities to provide food and lodging. Among the sites mentioned in the resource protection plan are the Raleigh Tavern, Wetherburn’s Tavern, the King’s Arms Tavern, Christiana Campbell’s Tavern, the Blue Bell Tavern, Market Square Tavern, the Red Lion Inn, the Brick House Tavern, the Hartwell Perry Ordinary, Burdette’s Ordinary, and Marot’s Ordinary/Shields Tavern. Only Wetherburn’s and Marot’s/Shields were described as having been properly excavated (Brown 1986:157). Other service industries included printing and publishing, transportation services, and urban shops. Sites reflecting these aspects of the economy include the Printing Office, College Landing, the John Greenhow store, Archibald Blair’s storehouse, the Prentis Store, the Teterel Shop (Water’s Storehouse), Tarpley’s Store, Holt’s Storehouse, the Margaret Hunter shop, the Carter apothecary shop, the Pasteur-Galt Apothecary, the McKenzie Apothecary, Gilmer’s apothecary and Hunter’s Store (Brown 1986:157-158).

When viewed in terms of output, it seems that long-standing ideas about the importance of archaeological study of industry and economics (other than via the proxy of “status” or wealth) still hold. Ivor Noël Hume remarked many years ago that manufacturing sites are difficult to excavate and largely uninteresting because they offer no information about the uses to which the products will be put, and are unlikely to yield datable artifacts. The products “must be processed and fashioned before they become archaeologically informative, and even the sites where the processing was done may still not yield much more than the plant itself” (Noël Hume 1969:174-5). The emphasis, with important notable exceptions, is still on residential sites, and even at industrial sites much of the attention is on the domestic lives of the artisans. In this sense, traditional “historical archaeology” is a useful compliment to “industrial archaeology.” In the latter case, the emphasis usually falls on the technical and logistical study of an industry, at the expense of its social context (Palmer and Neaverson 1998:3). It is certainly the case that much of our research on industry and economics is contained within reports focusing on other aspects of the vari-
ous sites, masked by a tendency among historical archaeologists to treat the domestic elements of our sites as the principal significant components.

Because so much of the archaeological record represents the attempts of people to make things and make a living, virtually any site or collection could be made to pertain to the theme of “industry and economics.” Likewise, the theme intersects with the other themes articulated in our departmental research design.

**Spatial patterning** has a bearing on industry and economics insofar as we have been able to examine the development and evolution of specialized spaces within Williamsburg. Early in the city’s settlement, residential and commercial/industrial functions were not highly segregated. For example, in the early eighteenth century Block 29 included a gunsmith, theater, ordinary, bowling green, and apothecary (Brown and Samford 1994:237). Likewise, Anderson’s blacksmithing forge was not relegated to the outskirts of town, a pattern that according to Patricia Samford, reveals Williamsburg as a “preindustrial” town (Samford 1996:68). Such was not the case in the more crowded urban centers of Europe (Braudel 1973:391, 434; Weatherill and Edwards 1971:173). Towards mid-century, residents engaged in commerce, production, and service industries started to vacate certain neighborhoods and cluster near the Capitol and the College, or at the edges of the expanding town (Samford 1996:70).

**Environmental archaeology** has been implicated in the study of industrial and economic themes to the extent that the dwellings and houseyards of people engaged in production and commerce have been subjected to the same excavation and sampling regimes as purely residential sites. **Foodways** is a theme that draws a great deal on the data gathered using environmental archaeological techniques. When thinking about the connection between foodways and industry and economics one should consider such questions as the development of a market-driven animal husbandry (Trevarthen 1993) as well as the role of shopkeepers in provisioning the city of Williamsburg.

**Material culture** and industry and economics intersect, as noted above, in the topic of conspicuous consumption and the rise of consumerism in the eighteenth century. Most of the goods that fed those trends were imported from the metropole, so their manufacture is not a concern of ours, though the local distribution and significance of such goods is. It is this connection with the metropole that lies at the heart of a consideration of **comparative colonialism**. The eighteenth century was part of a golden age for mercantile capitalism that greatly enriched those located in the core, and a fair number of local elites in the semi-periphery and periphery (Paynter 1988:422; Wallerstein 1980:236). One of the recent rallying cries of historical archaeology has been for a truly global practice, that we can begin to infer system-wide meanings from local reactions to an industrializing Atlantic world-economy (Deagan 1988, Johnson 1996, Little 1996).

**African Americans**, while participating in the local economy as capital goods themselves, also acted as agents of industry and providers of services beyond the boundaries of their households. For example, the large-scale operation at Anderson forge rested in some part on the labor of people owned by James Anderson, who directed and profited by their efforts (Samford 1996:70). Philip Morgan (1998) elaborates at great length on
the ways in which enslaved men and women produced goods and provided services in urban contexts in Virginia. However, most archaeological work to date focuses on slavery in rural plantation or farming contexts (Singleton and Bograd 1995:13).

As noted previously, the eighteenth century was a time of significant specialization within the local economy, which included an expanding number of artisans and service providers. However, these trends have their roots in the seventeenth century. In fact, a significant portion of our seventeenth-century research has addressed such questions as the incipient industries of early Jamestown (Horning and Edwards 2000; Horning and Wehner 2001), and the production and distribution of kiln products in Middle Plantation (Galucci et al. 1994; Metz 1999).

**New Directions**

There are a number of new directions in which our Department could take the archaeological study of industry and economics. Samford (1996), in her review of the archaeology of eighteenth century urban Virginia, has made a number of suggestions pertinent to this topic. We might attempt to understand diachronic change through a comparison of urban industry and economies by comparing the seventeenth-century capital of Jamestown with the eighteenth-century capital of Williamsburg. The ways in which capitalism (mercantile and industrial) shaped the urban landscape is another important sub-theme. We might address the ways in which increasingly specialized production and consumption reinforced (not just reflected) the growing hierarchy of eighteenth-century societies. How did urban places function within the regional economy and how can we apply the information we obtain about particular craft-specialists to an understanding of local exchange networks? (Samford 1996:73-77).

Of course, we still need to do the basic research to be able to address questions about some industries. For example, we have good representation in the metal trades, but less so in the production and distribution of perishables such as foodstuffs, textiles and goods that are totally consumed in their use (such as soap or lime). In the past, archaeologists have considered the industries that produce durable products to be more important, because their products survive to provide dating evidence for consumer sites (Noël Hume 1969:162; cf. Cossons 1987:314). However, one could also argue that the production facilities of perishables are even more important to study archaeologically, since we cannot study the products directly. Similarly, we have many examples of taverns and ordinaries, which generate readily observable residues, but few of saw- or grist-mills. We could also follow-up on a number of sites that have already been identified through documentary research or survey. For example, the Second Street Extension and Route 199 projects demonstrated the existence of industrial production on the outskirts of Williamsburg, but neither site was subjected to Phase III excavation.

In other cases, the basic research has been done and it is a question of turning more attention to relations between craft specialists and service providers and their customers, once the production aspect is understood. Likewise, we need to consider taking advantage of situations where we can compare the products and production styles of two or more artisans engaged in the same trade (Jarvis 1999; Samford 1999:49). This would be
particularly interesting in the comparison of independent and “attached” specialists, such as John Brush. We need to consider the many taverns and shops that we have access to as businesses, active agents in the provision of goods and services to the community. The provider/consumer relationship can be more explicitly explored.

Archaeology, far from being redundant in the study of industry and economics, is absolutely essential. There is a significant gap between people’s plans, and their execution, between what was committed to the documentary record, and what the archaeologist sees in the ground (Cossons 1987:13; Noël Hume 1969:162; Paynter 1988:424). Archaeology reveals works in progress and the spatial and social relationships that shaped productive activities. Archaeology in eighteenth-century Williamsburg reveals the relations of production in a world that was becoming increasingly “industrial” (in the popular sense) and allows us to determine whether, as some assert, workers had more agency in the “preindustrial” age (Costin 1998:5). Robert Paynter concludes that the archaeological study of industrialization is most informative when we see changes in production and technology not just as innovations or temporal markers, but as markers that caused or resulted from new social relations among producers, and between producers and consumers (Paynter 1988:420).

Archaeologists are uniquely able to study aspects of the work of ordinary artisans in ways that will never be fully visible in the written record. The tools that were used, the waste products and defective discards, even the workplace itself can be studied in detail. We can also view, through time, the evolution of particular specialties. The rise of an industrial activity can be studied by comparisons between related sites (e.g., Draper and Anderson forges). Other Williamsburg craft activities, such as furniture making, founding, and gunsmithing, which have been investigated in past archaeological excavations, could be reinterpreted in light of more recent work.
Research Objectives and Work Plan

Industrial and economic studies support two overarching departmental goals. First, that we increase our understanding of the development of Williamsburg as a place and a community. Second, that we strive to produce an ever more complete picture of Williamsburg society, complete with craft specialists, householders, slaves, tenants, tavern-keepers, apprentices, merchants, and others who contributed as much to the city’s economy as the elites, who are so well known from the documentary record.

The majority of analyses of industrial or economic material have been associated with a particular site, rather than town-wide or comparative perspective. Some have revealed the extent to which citizens of Williamsburg engaged in multiple economic strategies (e.g., wigmaking and metal working at Charlton’s Coffeehouse, or Draper’s blacksmithing at Sheilds Tavern, or stores associated with the various apothecaries, or fine metalwork and tavernkeeping at Coke-Garrett). Such discoveries continue to challenge our understanding of what it meant to be a “specialist” in eighteenth-century Williamsburg.

Of the sites and collections that form our universe of data, many are represented by only the most minimal information. Sites that were excavated through the mid-1950s were usually cross-trenched. When artifacts were collected, it was not done systematically, and the reports that do exist emphasize the architectural rather than archaeological significance of the findings. On the one hand, few artifacts were retained from excavations at the Raleigh Tavern. On the other hand, the materials from the Printing Office, where significant quantities of printing and bookbinding tools were recovered, await remedial cataloging and systematic analysis. Several other sites important to our understanding of industry and economics are on the remedial cataloging list, whether to wrap up the work generated by the initial excavations, or to incorporate materials from more recent follow-up work: Anderson Forge; the Wray site (Block 31); the Prentis Store; the Challis site; Shields Tavern; the Peter Scott house; the Gilmer Apothecary trash pits; the Bates site; Block 15 (The Williamsburg Movie Theater) and Tarpley’s Store. In many cases, the remedial cataloging will systematize basic data about the sites, which is a prerequisite for further analysis and comparative research.

Other important sites are “finished” projects, to the extent that there is no remedial work, and no new excavations have prompted re-visitations of the collections. These include: Market Square Tavern; Second Street Extension; Route 199/ Indigo Dam; College Landing; Draper’s forge; Brush’s forge; the Pate house (Yorktown); Coke-Garrett (gold/silversmithing as well as tavern-keeping) and Charlton’s Coffeehouse. The Anthony Hay cabinet shop and Geddy foundry have the additional distinction of being reviewed for this department’s recent NEH-funded cataloging project.

The work that we have and will continue to produce can be effectively compared with work that has been undertaken elsewhere, offering ideas about the methods we employ, our theoretical outlook and providing us a larger context within which to place the local phenomena we are observing. For example, excavations at Fort Michilimackinac have yielded a great deal of information about craft production in a context very different from
Williamsburg’s. Many of the occupants of the fort were French and Native American, rather than English. And, of course, Fort Michilimackinac was at the edge of the howling wilderness; in comparison, Williamsburg was a great metropolis (Morand 1994). At the other end of the spectrum, we have the industrial archaeology of the British Isles, where the Industrial Revolution first took hold. Granted, the practice of assembling wage laborers in factories to work for a capitalist, under the watchful eye of hired management was really perfected only in the nineteenth century, and the sheer numbers of workers engaged in the production of surplus labor value created relations and geographies of production that were never seen in Williamsburg. Nevertheless, there were some early hints of what was to come in the later eighteenth century, particularly in the textile trades (Palmer and Neaverson 1998:23).

The archaeology of industry and economics is important to the overall social history of Williamsburg as an urban area because, as Ernst and Merrens note, it is the functioning of a place that makes a settlement “urban,” and most of the functions they, and others, find significant are producing goods and rendering services (Ernst and Merrens 1973; see also Samford 1996:68). Unlike industrial archaeology, and much prehistoric archaeology, historical archaeology as practiced at Colonial Williamsburg has placed great emphasis on domestic spaces and households (cf. Palmer 1998:3; Hendon 1996; Cossons 1987:10-11). Thus, we tend to have a better understanding of the social contexts of industrial and economic activity than do these disciplines. Our contribution is in placing these pursuits in perspective.

Within historical archaeology, our studies of urban production and services can address languishing issues within African-American archaeology. We are well aware of the fact that during the later eighteenth century, one-half of Williamsburg’s population was of African descent. We know something about the domestic settings these people lived in. However, the role of a slave in Williamsburg was to work, and unlike their plantation counterparts, relatively few archaeologists—at Williamsburg or anywhere else, have had much to say about the nature and social context of that work.

Likewise, archaeology can reveal something about some of the more “invisible” aspects of the urban economy. One of the foundations of social inequality in contemporary society is that some work is elided as “not-work.” Archaeology, through its consciousness of spatial and temporal placement of activities, is well suited to add to our understanding of how other members of a household supported the work of the person the historical record has marked as an artisan. This can be in the form of altering household activities to take up slack in other areas, or even participating in certain aspects of the production (Hendon 1996:46-7, 53-55). We are also well-equipped to consider the ways in which some productive and service industries replicated services usually provided within the domestic unit (i.e., inns and ordinaries).
Conclusion

We should reiterate here that in many cases, sites pertinent to our current and future research interests have already been excavated. For some, remedial work is needed to bring the collection to a useful state. For others, we may need to initiate excavations to follow up on sites identified by survey, or to reexamine home-based industries and shops with an emphasis on the productive activities rather than the lifeways of the artisans.

A few significant crafts have received most of the attention (i.e., metal working, and to a certain extent, woodworking). Other industrial and economic activities have been neglected, particularly those in which the final products leave little archaeological trace, though the facilities remain (e.g., milling, food processing, leather and cloth trades). Another area where there is room for new work is in the study of services. Perhaps because of the Foundation’s restoration focus, much of the work on, for example, taverns, shops, and tailors has centered on characterizing the nature of the service at that site, rather than the connection between the practitioners of those trades and their consumers. We need to build on existing studies to gain a fuller picture of economic relations in addition to economic practices.

This information will ultimately be of great use to fellow researchers. Colonial Williamsburg has a tremendous legacy in the archaeological collections we hold in stewardship, and with intelligent use of these resources we will be able to contribute a great deal to the study of industrial and economic life in the eighteenth century. We are also well-placed to provide insights to those interested in the industrial and economic life of Williamsburg, specifically. Archaeological studies can provide new information to our interpreters that cannot be derived from the documentary sources they already know so well.

The archaeological evidence of industry and economics in Williamsburg contributes substantially to the study of seventeenth-nineteenth century material and social life. The very characteristics that made Williamsburg a unique kind of place in Virginia—the concentration of productive and service industries—make this place an ideal setting for exploring these themes. Of particular importance is studying these themes through time: the changing roles of people who made their living not through farming, but by providing goods and services to their contemporaries; the evolution towards more specialized commercial neighborhoods; the relationship between Virginia’s political economy and its industrial economy.
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Major Resources

James Anderson Site

Project Description: Most excavated craftsman-related site in Williamsburg; up to ten excavation projects in various parts of the house and yard. Home of blacksmith James Anderson, one-time Public Armorer for the Colony of Virginia and Williamsburg’s most well-known blacksmith. The 1975-76 excavation led to the reconstruction of the blacksmith shops circa 1775, when Anderson employed up to 50 apprentices, servants, journeymen, and slaves in what was probably Williamsburg’s most “industrial” operation prior to 1780. Anderson’s busy wartime activity included at least one other large forge building, discovered to the east of the existing one during 1990-91 excavations, and some evidence of a possible tinsmithing operation run out of an outbuilding on the south side of the property (excavated in 2001). The assemblage of Anderson material is probably the most useful archaeological assemblage related to Virginia blacksmithing activities, and was re-catalogued under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities in the early 1990s.

Archaeologists: Robert Foss (1975-76); Gregory Brown (1990-91); Katherine Schupp and Meredith Poole (2001); various others


Shields Tavern (John Draper) Site

Project Description: Excavation of the site of a tavern and later tenement in advance of reconstruction. The excavation uncovered numerous features related to blacksmith and farrier John Draper, who lived on the property between 1768 and 1780. This included the remains of at least one exterior forge, trash pits filled with industrial debris, a possible outbuilding, and an abandoned well filled after 1774 with household debris and a great deal of industrial trash from the nearby forge.

Archaeologists: Thomas Higgins and David Muraca; reported produced by Gregory Brown
Reports:  


“My bumbling smiths…”: An inter-site comparative analysis of rural and urban blacksmithing in eighteenth-century Virginia, by Sandra Fiona Bessey 1995. M.A. Thesis, The College of William and Mary. (Compares documentary and archaeological evidence of blacksmithing from Mount Vernon with the Draper site. Finds that a model based on historical data predicting different kinds of specialization in rural and urban contexts, does not apply to these cases).

**George Gilmer Apothecary**

Project Description: Several small trash pits filled with apothecary jars and drug pots were found during excavations on the Brush-Everard and St. George Tucker sites in 1967, 1989-1991, and 1994-1996. These pits are clearly associated with the occupation of apothecary George Gilmer around 1750. Gilmer appears to have occupied what is now known as the Brush-Everard House and to have operated his business in a shop at the corner of Nicholson and Palace Streets; the small trash pits are located near the property boundary in what would have been the back yard.


Report(s):  


Archaeological Excavation at the St. George Tucker House, Williamsburg, Virginia, by Mary Catherine Garden. In production.

**John Brush Forge (Brush-Everard Site)**

Project Description: Analysis of the products of Brush’s shop (the actual structure was not located) Focuses on the gun parts and gun accoutrements (flints and shot), but this appendix, as well as Samford’s main report make it clear that forge waste was found across the site.

Archaeologist: Patricia Samford

Bates Site

Project Description: Excavation of home of Quaker merchant John Bates (site 44YO205) in upper James City County. Salvage of trash pit and other features, containing remains of over 300 ceramic vessels. A 1720 estate inventory was found and used for comparison of the contents of Bates’s store with the excavated remains.

Archaeologist: Patricia Samford


Williamsburg Movie Theater

Project Description: Excavation behind the site of the current Kimball Theater in Williamsburg’s Merchants Square, on the west end of town. Includes analysis of archaeological and historical evidence of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century butchers’ sites in the area by Carrie Alblinger and Joanne Bowen.

Archaeologist: Jameson Harwood


Second Street Survey

Project Description: Survey within proposed construction corridor for extension of Second Street, on the east end of town. Historical evidence suggests that this area was occupied by “marginal” tradesmen such as butchers and tanners. Testing suggested that intact deposits may be present, but extensive excavation has not been undertaken.

Archaeologists: Robert R. Hunter and Thomas Higgins


Route 199 (Indigo Dam)

Project Description: Possible indigo processing area found during Phase II excavations of rural property in James City County. Remains included an earthen dam 280 feet in length, two large borrow pits, a small headrace, and a possible mill structure on land owned by Philip Ludwell III in the mid-eighteenth century. Complete Phase III excavations were not undertaken.
Archaeologists: Robert R. Hunter and Thomas Higgins


Common People

Description: Description of lifeways (including diet and personal possessions) of two Williamsburg craftsmen, blacksmith and farrier John Draper and gunsmith John Brush.

Authors: Marley R. Brown III and Joanne Bowen


Analysis of Early Industries

Description: Analysis of the diversification of trades in the Chesapeake between 1600 and 1725, using occupational data from the York County records and brief descriptions of nineteen “industrial” archaeological sites, including brick and tile kilns, potteries, tobacco pipe manufactories, and a glasshouse.

Author: John Metz


Coffeehouse

Project Description: Excavations at the site of Richard Charlton’s coffeehouse located adjacent to the capitol and on land leased from the Armistead family of Williamsburg. Revealed evidence of small metalworking pit in the back lot and numerous associated crucible fragments. Also of note, eighty wig curlers were recovered suggesting Richard Carlton was supplementing his income with wig making.

Archaeologists: Margaret Cooper, Mary Catherine Garden, Dan Mouer, David Muraca


Memo: A Reinterpretation of the King’s Arms Tavern Barber Shop, by Lisa Fischer, 1999, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.


**James Wray Site**

**Project Description:** Excavations conducted at site currently located under the SunTrust bank at the corner of Prince George Street and Henry Street (southern portion of block 31). Site purchased in 1736 by joiner and glazier James Wray. Evidence of glazier craft in the form of window glass, window leads, scrap metal, etc.

**Archaeologist:** Ivor Noël Hume


**Block 31**


**Archaeologists:** Jameson Harwood, Katherine W. Schupp


James Geddy Site

Project Description: Archaeological investigations into the brass foundry and gunsmith site of James Geddy and his sons David, James, Williams, and John who took possession of the shop after their father’s death. Excavations revealed the foundry workshop, including an intact firebox, and numerous castings, both finished and completed.

Archaeologist: Ivor Noël Hume


James Geddy and Sons: Colonial Craftsman, by Ivor Noël Hume, 1970, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation


Anthony Hay Site

Project Description: From 1756 to 1767 Anthony Hay worked as a cabinetmaker in Williamsburg, his shop adjoined to his house located west of the corner of Nicholson and Botetourt. The site revealed excellent organic material preservation yielding substantial amounts of unfinished furniture, furniture hardware, and various tools.

Archaeologist: Ivor Noël Hume


Charlton Site

Project Description: Excavations have extended south into the yard of the reconstructed Barber Shop and the entire perimeter of the Charlton house. Wig curlers, straight pins, crucible fragments, and buttons have been excavated. Work has allowed for new interpretations as to the location of wig making, barbers, and the presence of a tailor in the non-extant “Charlton Shop/Office”. New questions as to whether this was an area of row houses/shops dedicated to small crafts during the latter half of the eighteenth century.

Archaeologists: Lisa Fischer, Mark Kostro, Ivor Noël Hume


Memo: A Reinterpretation of the King’s Arms Tavern Barber Shop, by Lisa Fischer, 1999, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

Summary of the 1999 Excavations Behind the Charlton House and the King’s Arms Tavern Barber Shop, by Lisa Fischer, 1999, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.


Printing Office

Project Description: Site of colonial print shop and the production area for the Virginia Gazette. Excavations revealed the main office foundation and associated workshop. Large amounts of printers type, some crucible fragments, lead waste, and bookbinders’ tools were uncovered.

Archaeologists: Ivor Noël Hume


The Virginia Gazette Site, Volume I, Record of Archaeological Excavations of 1938, compiled by Orin M. Bullock, 1954, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.
Coke-Garrett Site

Project Description: Excavations uncovered evidence of John Coke’s gold and silversmithing activities including crucible fragments bearing traces of gold and silver, and an engraver’s trial piece.

Archaeologists: Lily Richards, Ivor Noël Hume, J. M. Knight


Yorktown Pate House

Project Description: Excavations about perimeter of house and back lot. Possible evidence of French occupation as well as tailoring activities. Straight pins, bone buttons and buttons blanks excavated.

Archaeologists: Dwayne Pickett, Jameson Harwood


Archaeological Survey and testing at the Thomas Pate House, Yorktown, Virginia, by Dwayne W. Pickett and David Muraca, 1996, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.
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Introduction

One of the Department of Archaeological Research’s long-term research goals has always been the study of town development, using material culture (artifactual evidence) as well as architectural remains, landscape features, and documentary information. This short evaluation is meant to highlight the most significant contributions to this effort to date, and to discuss future work in this area that will be most useful.

Town-Level Development

Most of the DAR’s work on the large-scale study of the town as a whole has necessarily relied on the synthesis and mapping of patterns drawn from documentary records (i.e., house histories) and period cartographic resources (such as the Desandrouins and Frenchman’s maps), augmented by largely site-specific detail provided by selected archaeological or architectural studies.

In the mid-1980s, for example, interns Melanie Liddle and Christine Styrna canvassed existing house histories and produced a relatively gross set of pattern maps showing the clustering of certain occupational groups or functional categories (e.g., commercial vs. domestic). A much more detailed set of maps, again drawn from house histories, describes the sequence of architectural (and by implication social) development on Block 9. This study, produced in 1985 during the Shields Tavern excavation on that block, showed the value of such careful examination of the archaeological, architectural, and historical record on the scale of the block rather than the individual site, but unfortunately also showed the immense investment of time involved in such a study of the whole town.

In the early 1990s, historian Martha McCartney provided another important component to this study by collating the disparate cartographic resources of the area (including plats, war-era maps, and insurance documents) to present a series of “overlays” showing the town’s growth through time. These have been ground-tested in the field by a variety of excavation projects in and around the Historic Area.

Much of this “town-level” research is currently being managed in the “Urban Culture Atlas” project, where the map data can be merged with archaeological and historical databases (including period plans of several sites) to provide virtually on-demand reconstructions of specific parts of town at specific time periods.

Neighborhoods

The development of neighborhoods, or functional sectors of the town, has been studied archaeologically by looking at “prototypical” properties in detail. The sections below will list what appear to be relatively distinct town sectors, along with the properties in these sectors which have been archaeologically studied.
**Capitol Area**

The area near the Capitol, on the east end of town, appears to have been devoted primarily to “entertainment.” Taverns, particularly high-status taverns such as Richard Charlton’s Coffeehouse, and earlier Jean Marot’s Ordinary, presumably derived much of their clientele from the government officials and burgesses meeting in the Capitol building. Late in the eighteenth century, a large playhouse was built behind the Capitol (closer than the slightly earlier one on the modern Christiana Campbell’s Tavern property). A few craftsmen also lived in the area behind the Capitol.

**Governor’s Palace and Palace Green**

The Palace Green area, extending toward Market Square, was dominated by “urban plantations,” large (for Williamsburg) landholdings usually comprising four or more adjoining lots. The space behind dwelling houses in this area (which includes the archaeologically-excavated Peyton Randolph, St. George Tucker, Grissell Hay, and Brush-Everard Houses) was filled with a variety of specialized outbuildings (kitchens, smokehouses, laundries, offices, etc.) and often with large ornamental gardens (as opposed to the kitchen gardens behind the homes of craftsmen and tavern keepers elsewhere in town).

**“Downtown”**

Down the street from the Capitol, mostly along Duke of Gloucester Street, were the homes, shops, and workplaces of Williamsburg’s artisans, craftsmen, and merchants. Excavations in this area have included extensive projects on the James Anderson Blacksmith Shop site, and somewhat more limited excavations at Wetherburn’s Tavern and Prentis Store by Ivor Noël Hume.

Excavations in the “tavern” zone on the blocks nearest the Capitol have included multi-year projects at Shields Tavern (formerly Marot’s Ordinary) and the Coffeehouse site, along with Wetherburn’s. Archaeologists analyzing the Coffeehouse assemblage in the late 1990s spent considerable time on a comparison of the artifact assemblages from the various taverns excavated in the past 30 years.

**West of Market Square**

The area between Market Square and the west end of town (modern-day Merchants Square) includes other shops and workplaces, in most cases subject to less archaeological investigation (with the exception of Ivor Noël Hume’s important excavations on the James Geddy site). Limited excavations near the Magazine (in the search for traces of the town’s 1757 market house) and at the Courthouse have been undertaken, as has a limited excavation in the Bruton Parish Churchyard.

**West End of Town**

Development pressures have resulted in fairly extensive testing projects on the west end of town, in and near the modern Merchants Square. Excavations by Ivor Noël Hume on the
old Post Office site, by Samford et al. on the Firehouse site, and by Harwood et al. on the site of Kimball’s Theater have produced evidence of specialized craftsmen (butchers, for instance) in this part of town.

The current excavations on the “Sacalis” block promise to provide significant information about the layout of this part of town and the connections of this neighborhood to the more glamorous nearby area around the Governor’s Palace, to the east, and the College campus, to the west.

East Outskirts

Testing projects for the Second Street Extension, and excavation of the Golf Course parcel, have provided considerable evidence of the activities on the east end of town, like the west end likely a home for specialized craftsmen and other “middling sorts.”

Excavation for the Bruton Heights School renovation revealed, in addition to the important John Page plantation complex (destroyed about 1730), some limited evidence of the layout of lots in the post-1750 “Moody subdivision.” Although known from documentary sources, little is known yet archaeologically about the nearby Benjamin Waller subdivision, on the southeast corner of town.

Roads to the Landings

The roads to College and Capitol Landings were presumably relatively sparsely occupied, although little archaeological testing has been done, except near the landings themselves. A small survey was done of the Capitol Landing area in the mid-1990s. At College Landing, the 1774 Mathew Davenport plat shows numbered lots, many with standing buildings, that appear to have formed a sub-community on the ridge above the landing. Occupants include tavernkeepers, ferrymen, and tobacco inspectors. It is likely that the occupants of the landing communities, mostly middling working class, would have a considerably different living standard than Williamsburg’s gentry, or even perhaps Williamsburg’s middling class on Duke of Gloucester Street, but no extensive comparison has been possible because none of the eighteenth-century landing sites have been fully excavated.

Comparisons of Urban Properties

Another important part of the study of town development has been the study of specific types of urban properties. Again, the list below describes the major types of properties identified along with the archaeological sites of that type investigated.

Taverns

Taverns are perhaps the most well-understood property type in town, with excavations at Shields Tavern, the Coffeehouse site, Wetherburn’s Tavern, and others.
**Stores**

Very few stores have been excavated; the only reasonably extensive work was Ivor Noël Hume’s excavation of Prentis Store.

**Craftsmen and Artisans**

Craftsmen and artisans are relatively well represented, with excavations at two major blacksmith sites (James Anderson and the John Draper component at Shields Tavern), a brass founder (James Geddy site), a cabinetmaker (Anthony Hay), a gunsmith (John Brush), and others.

**Urban Plantations**

Urban plantations have been studied at the Brush-Everard, St. George Tucker, Peyton Randolph, and Grissell Hay sites.

**Public Buildings**

Public buildings have, in general, been studied relatively sporadically since their original restoration or reconstruction. Limited excavations have taken place in Market Square (looking for the market house), the Courthouse, the Capitol, near (though not in) the Wren Building, behind Bruton Parish Church, and near the Governor’s Palace.

Extensive excavations, however, have recently taken place on the site of the “Douglass-Hallam” Theater behind the Capitol. This will likely become the archaeologically well-known “public” building in town.

**Intrasite Spatial Patterning**

Looking at urban development on the inter-site level is probably most useful, but it seems clear that the spatial layout of the sites themselves can provide important information about those sites. In particular, the development of “period plans” (as on the Peyton Randolph and Shields Tavern sites) shows the development of architectural and landscape features as they relate to changes in the surrounding environment (both physical and cultural) and the progress of the occupants in their respective “life courses.”

Less successful, for a variety of reasons, has been the careful study of artifact distribution, most notably on two sites (James Anderson and Grissell Hay) where artifacts were individually “piece plotted.” Stratigraphic complexity, distributions from nineteenth- and twentieth-century occupants, and in one case even topographic considerations (post-depositional erosion of soils into a nearby ravine) have made it clear that even careful piece-plotting is probably not going to permit the extraordinary definition of activity areas possible at rural sites, most clearly in the work of our colleague Dominic Powlesland on an Anglican-period settlement in northeast England.

Unfortunately, it has been equally difficult to use archaeology to define the exact location of enslaved workers on the urban landscape. Among the important goals at the Brush-
Everard site, in the late 1980s, was the discovery of slave housing, or at least slave activity. The discovery of the nineteenth-century Polly Valentine house, home of a freed slave, revealed that in some cases it may be possible to find slave housing (and by extension slave material culture) physically separated from the rest of the household, but it has proven exceptionally difficult to discern this in eighteenth-century Williamsburg.

At the same time, artifact distribution mapping, on at least a generalized level, has been successful in pinpointing a certain amount of activity clustering—with the result that it is possible to make more “surgical” incisions on occasion to answer specific questions during Phase II and III excavation. Detailed stratigraphic recording has been joined with the analysis of spatial patterning on several sites, notably around the Grissell Hay House (Brown and Muraca 1993), to correlate archaeological data to the detailed historical record, and this activity should be encouraged, and perhaps enhanced with “total site recording” of the “stratigraphic” aspects of the historical and architectural record, the value of which has been shown by Martin Davies’ work at the Bixby site (Davies 1994) and Heather Harvey’s M.A. thesis (Harvey 1997).

**Comparative Patterning**

Spatial patterning, of course, can only be studied comprehensively by looking at comparisons with other places, both urban and rural. The D.A.R. has been active on local rural sites (Carter’s Grove and Rich Neck Plantation), with particular emphasis at studying the spatial patterning of ephemeral features such as slave quarters (Agbe-Davies 1994). Town development has been studied extensively during the Jamestown Archaeological Assessment, and the layout of the first capital of Virginia (as expressed particularly in the Ph.D. dissertation of Audrey Horning) has been studied from a combination of historical sources, surgical excavations, geophysical testing, environmental analysis, and detailed artifact mapping (especially of pipestems from previous excavations).

Limited excavations have been undertaken elsewhere (for example, in Bermuda and Barbados) to look at other towns, and occasionally comparisons have been made with other extensively-excavated colonial towns (Annapolis, Charleston, etc.) on the basis of published material. Of course the main difficulty with this analysis in some ways is Williamsburg’s uniqueness, in terms of excavation intensity, historical record, and its historical nature itself. Most work to date has necessarily focused on description.
Remedial and Future Work

The study of town development in Williamsburg is obviously never-ending, and because of the sheer volume of information, the primary task at this point would logically seem to be one of collation and organization. Analyzable information is scattered in reports, papers, and field notes, and it is staggering to think of how much information (even if considering that which is already in digital form) is still out there. The value of GIS technology, especially as shown to us by our friend Dominic Powlesland, lies in its ability to spatially organize this information, and the recent work on the Urban Culture Atlas (particularly with the collaboration of our colleagues in history and architectural history) suggests that it may reasonably soon be possible to intelligently assess the strengths and weaknesses of our entire, comprehensive data set.

While town-level mapping and interpretation is obviously the most immediate need, however, some major gaps in our knowledge are apparent even now. We know relatively little about merchants and tenant sites occupied by minor craftspeople. Recent historical interest in underrepresented individuals—widows, free blacks, etc.—suggests that such sites, when found, should be excavated, particularly with an eye to some of the new and innovative ways other historical archaeologists are looking at such issues. Sites on Williamsburg’s outskirts are extremely important; unfortunately, being by definition outside the Historic Area, it is often difficult to excavate such sites except in the face of imminent development.

We are fully aware of how much excavation costs, and are hesitant to recommend any specific sites for future excavation until and unless the project is fully funded as part of a gift-endowed reconstruction. We propose that the best way to obtain a good cross-section of the material culture of the town, across both space and time, is to concentrate on fully cataloguing existing collections, and particularly to complete low-level object catalogs of (as a first step) assemblages from contexts that can be reliably associated with specific household occupations. Once machine-readable, along with their accompanying context records (which sometimes must be put in digital form as well), these sites can be linked to historical and architectural information, and presumably interpreted much more thoroughly.

A few tasks can be proposed as possible master’s thesis projects, once the information is organized a bit further. These include, for instance, possibly reconstructions of the town’s topography (by looking at maps along with field notes from various archaeological excavation or monitoring projects—by no means a simple task, but theoretically doable). Logically, of course, this would also include whatever collaborative opportunities come along: work with the National Park Service on the Jamestown Archaeological Assessment, and discussions with archaeologists at Monticello and the Maryland Archaeological Trust, suggests that other institutions are working on similar problems, and are equally reaching out for collaboration.
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Appendix A.
Description of Resources

General Spatial Patterning
Liddle and Styrna

Description: Study of the formation of neighborhoods by examining property ownership in ten-year increments, based on house histories and other secondary literature. Owners and occupants were divided into 12 categories: merchant, artisan, tavern or ordinary keeper, professional, colonial or state official, county official, town official, landed gentry, minister, widow or spinster, unknown woman, or unknown man. The distribution of property ownership was mapped on the ca. 1800 Bucktrout (“College”) map.

Analysts: Melanie Liddle and Christine Styrna


Cultural Resources Mapping Project

Description: Collection and digitization of dozens of historic-period maps of Williamsburg and the surrounding area, intended to permit the overlaying of such maps using GIS technology. McCartney’s report describes the known maps and drawings from the seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries. The most significant features shown on the maps were carefully digitized in AutoCAD so that they can be scaled and overlaid; this work has been important, in addition to town development studies, for site discovery, particularly on the outskirts of town.

Analysts: Martha McCartney and Christina Adinolfi Kiddle


Block 9 in the 18th Century

Project Description: Exploration of the architectural development of Block 9, on the south side of Duke of Gloucester Street, from material in house histories and other secondary documents. The layout of buildings on the block was reconstructed on a series of “decadal” maps for the most significant years on that block in the eighteenth century—1708, 1715, 1720, 1735, 1740, 1749, 1750, 1754,
1760, 1770, 1772, 1775, and 1790. Building owners or occupants were identified on these maps, along with a background document summarizing and reprinting the most important land transfer and other records.

Analysts: Gregory J. Brown


### Resource Protection Plans

**Project Description:** Extensive evaluation of existing archaeological and architectural resources in James City County, York County, the city of Poquoson, and the city of Williamsburg, performed in the mid-1980s under a grant from the state. The locations of over 1200 sites were mapped, and these sites were placed into a typology composed of 23 “study units,” both temporal and thematic, reflecting the development of the area. This study was updated in 1991, with a complete re-cataloguing of the site inventory, by Meredith (Moodey) Poole, and was summarized in 1993 by John Metz.

Analysts: Marley R. Brown III and Kathleen Bragdon (editors); Meredith Poole; John Metz


### Middle Plantation Studies

**Project Description:** Various studies of the Middle Plantation area

Analysts: David Muraca; Kelly Ladd; Martha McCartney


*A Needle in a Haystack: Identifying the Location of Early Urban Sites*, by David Muraca and Kelly Ladd. 1998. Paper pre-
sented at Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology meet-
ing.

1699 Exhibit

Project Description: Exhibit at DeWitt Wallace Gallery celebrating Williamsburg’s 300th anniversary in 1999. Preparatory work included creation of a reconstruction of Williamsburg in the first quarter of the 18th century.

Analysts: David Muraca


Urban Culture Atlas

Project Description: Comprehensive GIS-enabled database of archaeological, architectural, and historical data for eighteenth-century Williamsburg and environs. Large-scale collaborative project currently in progress.

Archaeologists: Gregory Brown, Jennifer Jones, others

Report(s): None yet

Urban Plantations

Brush-Everard Site

Project Description: Multi-year excavation of the yard adjoining the Brush-Everard House, owned by gunsmith John Brush in the early 1700s and later owned by Thomas Everard, at one time mayor of Williamsburg, later in the century. Excavation was begun in an attempt to uncover slave-related material (especially architectural elements) from the Everard period, but also revealed a wealth of material about a craftsman (Brush), as well as the workings of what became perhaps our best example of an urban plantation. Although little was found related to eighteenth-century slave occupation, excavations also revealed the house and near yard of Polly Valentine, an early nineteenth-century freed slave; a Brush-era privy from which important environmental evidence was found; a ravine filled with material likely deposited from the nearby Governor’s Palace (including a toothbrush inscribed with “T Jefferson”); and several pits contained trash deposited by apothecary George Gilmer around 1750.

Archaeologists: Patricia Samford (1989-1991); Ivor Noël Hume (1967)


*Archaeological Excavations on the Brush-Everard Property:*. 


### Peyton Randolph

**Project Description:** Multi-year excavation of the home of planter and politician Peyton Randolph on the southwest corner of Block 29, at the corner of Nicholson and England Streets. The investigation was focused on the discovery of reconstructable outbuildings in the back yard, and uncovered not only 16 outbuilding foundations, but only the remains of numerous landscape features, including pre-Randolph period planting beds. This was the first extensive excavation of “urban plantations” in the Historic Area.

**Archaeologists:** Andrew C. Edwards; Linda K. Derry; Adrian Praetzellis


### Tazewell Hall

**Project Description:** Excavation of the home of John Randolph, brother of Peyton Randolph, on the south edge of town behind the Williamsburg Lodge. Randolph’s large dwelling house, later owned by lawyer John Tazewell and destroyed in the early nineteenth century, was uncovered, along with several landscape features and what seem to be the remains of Randolph’s large ornamental garden.

**Archaeologists:** Patricia Samford
Governor’s Palace Gardens

Project Description: Phase II excavations in the gardens of the Governor’s Palace, in preparation for the installation of a climate control system. No significant archaeological resources were found. Along with slightly earlier work in the Palace wine cellars by Frederick Smith of the D.A.R., this is the only “modern” archaeological excavation at the Governor’s Palace since the initial excavations by Prentice Duell and Herbert Ragland in 1930.

Archaeologists: Christina Adinolfi


Grissell Hay

Project Description: Excavation of home of wealthy planter Peter Hay, later owned by his widow Grissell, and reconstructed to that period (1770s). Building was first owned by John Blair, one of the most important Williamsburg residents, and excavation in advance of waterproofing in the early 1990s revealed several features, including a possible root cellar, dating to that period. Excavations in the back yard in 1992 revealed a complex set of outbuildings and landscape features, similar somewhat to (though not as complex as) the Peyton Randolph House across the street. This was one of the first, though ultimately not terribly successful, attempts at piece-plotting individual artifacts on a complex urban site.

Archaeologists: Meredith Poole and Gregory J. Brown


St. George Tucker House

Project Description: Excavation of home of wealthy planter Peter Hay, later owned by his widow Grissell, and

Archaeologists: Mary Catherine Garden and Stephen Mrozowski


*Contextualizing Tucker’s Garden: The Role of Text, Subtext and Context in the Creation of Eighteenth-Century Land-
Downtown and Capitol Area

James Anderson Site

Project Description: Most excavated craftsman-related site in Williamsburg; up to ten excavation projects in various parts of the house and yard. Home of blacksmith James Anderson, one-time Public Armorer for the Colony of Virginia and Williamsburg’s most well-known blacksmith. The 1975-76 excavation led to the reconstruction of the blacksmith shops circa 1775, when Anderson employed up to 50 apprentices, servants, journeymen, and slaves in what was probably Williamsburg’s most “industrial” operation prior to 1780. Anderson’s busy wartime activity included at least one other large forge building, discovered to the east of the existing one during 1990-91 excavations, and some evidence of a possible tinsmithing operation run out of an outbuilding on the south side of the property (excavated in 2001). The assemblage of Anderson material is probably the most useful archaeological assemblage related to Virginia blacksmithing activities, and was re-catalogued under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities in the early 1990s.

Archaeologists: Robert Foss (1975-76); Gregory Brown (1990-91); Katherine Schupp and Meredith Poole (2001); various others


Shields Tavern

Project Description: Excavation of the site of a tavern and later tenement in advance of reconstruction. The excavation uncovered three periods of occupation. The building was first constructed by tavernkeeper
Jean Marot, a Huguenot immigrant and protégé of William Byrd III, who maintained a high-style establishment between 1708 and his death in 1717. The tavern was maintained, probably as a somewhat less elite establishment, by his widow Anne Marot through 1730. In 1745 it was acquired by tavernkeeper James Shields, who had married Marot’s daughter Anne. The Shields establishment, reconstructed as an operating tavern, was apparently a middling establishment catering to the working or merchant class. Numerous features related to blacksmith and farrier John Draper, who lived on the property between 1768 and 1780, were also found. This included the remains of at least one exterior forge, trash pits filled with industrial debris, a possible outbuilding, and an abandoned well filled after 1774 with household debris and a great deal of industrial trash from the nearby forge.

Archaeologists: Thomas Higgins and David Muraca; reported produced by Gregory Brown


**Courthouse**

Project Description: Testing to locate, if present, the original placement and configuration of a chimney base in the west ancillary wing of the building. Testing revealed no structural evidence of such a wall.

Archaeologists: Patricia Samford


**Market Square**

Project Description: Excavation of an area in front of the existing Guard House on Market Square, in the hope of recovering remains from the market house built in 1757. Unfortunately, neither of the brick foundations investigated on the property showed any definite evidence of being the market house, and it is likely that the actual market house was elsewhere in the large unexcavated remainder of Market Square, possibly even in areas destroyed by the excavations for the Colonial Parkway in 1940. The report, along with background research conducted by architectural historian
Carl Lounsbury and other background detail summarized by Brown (below), did focus limited attention on this potentially important public building.

Archaeologists: Gregory J. Brown and David F. Muraca


**Coffeehouse**

Project Description: Excavation of the site of Richard Charlton’s “Coffeehouse” next to the Capitol, on land recently leased by Colonial Williamsburg from the Armistead family. The Coffeehouse was apparently a high-style establishment frequented by wealthy planters and politicians. Discoveries included a small metalworking operation in the back yard, along with extensive midden deposits of household trash. Comparisons of the artifact assemblage with contemporary taverns such as Wetherburn’s and Shields Taverns were attempted in the report.

Archaeologists: David F. Muraca; Margaret Cooper; Mary Catherine Garden; Dan Mouer


**Wetherburn’s Tavern**

Project Description: Excavation of the site of a tavern and later tenement in advance of reconstruction. The excavation uncovered numerous features related to blacksmith and farrier John Draper,

Archaeologists: Ivor Noël Hume


Douglass-Hallam Theater

**Project Description:** Excavation behind the site of the current Kimball Theater in Williamsburg’s Merchants Alblinger and Joanne Bowen.

**Archaeologist:** Lisa Fischer; Dwayne Pickett

**Report(s):**


**Other Report(s):**


West End of Town

**Block 31**

**Project Description:** Phase II testing of Block 31 (the “Sacalis” property) in preparation for construction of a City of Williamsburg parking lot. Testing revealed seventeenth-century activity as well as intact eighteenth- and nineteenth-century layers. Phase III excavation was recommended and as of March 2002 is being undertaken.

**Archaeologist:** Katherine W. Schupp

**Report(s):**

Block 23

**Project Description:** Phase II evaluation of area in Merchants Square, behind Binn’s Department Store. No significant archaeological resources survived.

**Archaeologist:** Katherine Schupp


Northington Block

**Project Description:** Phase II evaluation of City of Williamsburg-owned block west of the Historic Area. Material recovered largely related to nineteenth-century residential complex (Wheatlands) in the area. Slight evidence of eighteenth-century occupation layer (designated site 44WB76), possibly associated with Dr. James Carter, but not much remains.

**Archaeologist:** Elizabeth Grzymala

**Report(s):**

Williamsburg Movie Theater

**Project Description:** Excavation behind the site of the current Kimball Theater in Williamsburg’s Merchants Square, on the west end of town. Includes analysis of archaeological and historical evidence of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century butchers’ sites in the area by Carrie Alblinger and Joanne Bowen.

**Archaeologist:** Jameson Harwood


**Other Report(s):**
**East Outskirts**

**Second Street Survey**

**Project Description:** Survey within proposed construction corridor for extension of Second Street, on the east end of town. Historical evidence suggests that this area was occupied by “marginal” tradesmen such as butchers and tanners. Testing suggested that intact deposits may be present, but extensive excavation has not been undertaken.

**Archaeologists:** Robert R. Hunter and Patricia Samford


**Bruton Heights**

**Project Description:** Excavation of plantation house and outbuildings owned by Page family in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Plantation appears to have remained intact until destruction of house (built circa 1662 by John Page) around 1730, when it was owned by John Page III. Property later sold to Matthew Moody, who began subdividing the tract by 1750. Excavation uncovered remnants of landscape features associated with lots owned by Alexander Craig and James Barrett Southall.

**Archaeologists:** David F. Muraca; John Metz


**Roads to the Landings**

**College Landing**

**Project Description:** Survey and Phase II excavations of areas around College Landing, one of the two principal ports for Williamsburg. The 1985 survey uncovered possible evidence of a tobacco warehouse beneath several feet of fill. Further surveys on the ridge leading down to the landing uncovered, in addition to an important seventeenth-century site described in Edwards (1987), the remains of several significant sites, including the home of ferry keeper and merchant James Jordan (ca. 1770). This testing, in advance
of home construction in the Port Anne development, suggests that many of the features shown on the 1774 Mathew Davenport plat may still exist.

Archaeologists: Greg Brown (1986); Andrew Edwards (1987)

Report(s): 


Capitol Landing

Project Description: Brief survey of Capitol Landing area in anticipation of possible development.

Archaeologists: Charles Thomas; Lucie Vinciguerra

Report(s): None known

Comparisons
Jamestown

Project Description: Multidisciplinary study of the development of Jamestown in the seventeenth century, performed for the National Park Service in conjunction with the College of William & Mary. The study employed extensive documentary research (by Martha McCartney), “surgical” excavations to answer specific archaeological and historical questions, and the re-evaluation of previous archaeology in light of modern architectural knowledge of Chesapeake building traditions. Horning’s Ph.D. dissertation is one of the most comprehensive studies of town development yet undertaken in this area.

Archaeologists: Audrey J. Horning; Andrew C. Edwards


Yorktown

Project Description: Historical and archaeological assessment of Yorktown for the National Park Service. Historical work included historical overview of Yorktown, specific property histories, and a bibliography of primary sources. Archaeological work included summaries and evaluations of previous archaeological work in the town and on the battlefield. No excavation was conducted as part of this project, although several Phase I testing projects have since been conducted on specific lots in Yorktown.

Analysts: Elizabeth Gryzmala; Julie Richter

Report(s):

