Made available courtesy of Archaeological Society of South Carolina, Inc.: http://www.assc.net/home
Reprinted with permission. No further reproduction is authorized without written permission from Archaeological Society of South Carolina, Inc.
Stine, Linda F., and Natalie P. Adams. 2004. A Brief and True Account of the History of South Carolina Plantation Archaeology and the Archaeologists Who Practice It. South Carolina Antiquities 36(1, 2):22-47.

A Brief and True Account of the History of South Carolina Plantation Archaeology and the Archaeologists Who Practice It

Linda F. Stine and Natalie P. Adams

INTRODUCTION

This paper's genesis is the perception that archaeologists' communal memory of the early days of South Carolina plantation archaeology is fading, incomplete or at times overly judgmental. In order to combat this loss, some of the projects, processes and theoretical orientations that affected South Carolina's plantation studies are explored. Examples of influential forces are the growth of Cultural Research Management (CRM), burgeoning museum and university programs in historical archaeology, and initially the Tricentennial and Bicentennial.

Early references have been searched, including much of the "grey literature" and archaeologists and administrators in academia, government and private industry have been interviewed. Interview topics include early theoretical perspectives and how they relate to field and laboratory methods. Statistical methods have not been used in this study; results are interpretive and qualitative rather than quantitative. Instead, examples have been drawn from the literature of the period to illustrate trends in early South Carolina plantation archaeology.

THE FIRST PLANTATION EXCAVATIONS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Although large plantation-related CRM projects began in the late 1970s, initial plantation explorations began in South Carolina a decade earlier. In the 1960s and 1970s interest in funding historical archaeology investigations blossomed due to South Carolina and Charleston's Tricentennial (1970) and the U.S. Bicentennial (1976)-driven search for historic sites. To date the earliest recorded plantation excavation is at Old Town Plantation. In 1967-1968 the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission hired a local amateur archaeologist, John Miller, to search for the seventeenth-century Charles Towne Landing site (38CH1) (South 1971:8). Miller thought he found those ruins. Stan South and John Combes were hired in 1968-1969 through the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology (SCIAA) to do more work. Through slot-trench testing they realized that Miller had instead uncovered the remains of the Horry-Lucas House (38CH1-11), built about 1780 (South 1971:69,86). South and Combes' tests also revealed nineteenth-century slave houses' foundations (South 1971:86-88). [No colonoware is mentioned (see also South 1971:124).] The main purpose of SCIAA's work was to uncover the remains of the 1670s Charles Towne Landing site, so no more work was undertaken at the plantation ruins.

Archaeological investigations are still undertaken at federal and state-owned plantation sites. These occur under government or grant-funded professional and student research projects. An example is Beck's intriguing work at Brattonsville Plantation, a backcountry agrarian site (1998). Government-owned plantation sites are also investigated under the auspices of Cultural Resource Management (CRM) projects if legal conditions warrant it (e.g., Stine et. al. 1994).

CRM'S INITIAL AFFECT ON SC HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

In the 1960s and 1970s additional forces coalesced to foster the development of South Carolina plantation archaeology. The passage of preservation laws such as the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (as amended) and others [i.e. Executive Order 11593, the Interior Department's and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's respective regulations (Interior's 36 CFR 60, 36 CFR 63, 36 CFR 66 36 and the Council's CFR 800)] opened up additional avenues for archaeological research, offered new job opportunities, and created the need for regulatory agencies at the local, state, and national levels**.** Essentially CRM laws revolve around the fact that any project that was federally licensed, funded or permitted had to go through a series of review processes to consider the affect of the projects on cultural sites of national, regional or local significance. (See also Joseph's [2004a] discussion of the affects of CRM studies on African-American archaeology in general.)

The South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) was created in 1969 to implement these various mandated federal and state programs. In 1976 the University of South Carolina's Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology (SCIAA) was given authority and funding to curate the state's archaeological collections and to maintain an archaeological site inventory (Code of Laws of South Carolina Part 60-13-210, amended by General Appropriations Act of 1984-1985).

One key piece of legislation that spurred lowcountry plantation studies was the South Carolina Coastal Zone Management Act of 1976. It created the Coastal Council, overseeing projects requiring state or federal permitting in eight coastal counties**.** The Act states that the Coastal Council must consider the project's affect on "irreplaceable historic and archaeological sites" [Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management 1994:13, Section 48-39-150.A.(6); see also Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management 1999]. The Coastal Council identifies Geographic Areas of Particular Concern (GAPCs) that include sites that are on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Most importantly, GAPCS also include sites that are eligible for nomination to the NRHP. Although in place by 1976 (amended 1990), it took a few years for the state bureaucracy to actually consult on Coastal Council permits and thus affect plantation studies (Nancy Brock, personal communication 2001; Fritz Aichelle, personal communication 2001). Coastal Council's Steve Snyder was the first to note that his office should pass permit applications by SHPO archaeologists like Pat Cridlebough (1980s) for comment (Nancy Brock, personal communication 2001).

The permitting process lead to the discovery of various types of plantation sites. (It is ironic that many of these sites are found on lands that are now gated 'plantation communities' for the modern, lowcountry elite.) Some developers actually hired archaeologists before applying for a permit. An example is Charleston area businessman Duncan Newkirk. Archaeologists systematically surveyed his potential development lands, wrote reports and made recommendations about areas that needed more work, no more work, or that should be preserved/avoided. They tied their recommendations to each site's eligibility for nomination to the NRHP. This practice kept a few new archaeology companies in business during their early lean years (1980s). The report would be submitted to the Coastal Council and the SHPO when the permit was actually requested. The main drawback to this practice was those few occasions when the SHPO review archaeologist (such as one of the authors [Stine]) did not approve of the methods or agree with the conclusions in the report (also Nancy Brock, personal communication 2001; Fritz Aichelle, personal communication 2001).

Vast federally funded or aided construction projects led to survey, testing, and data recovery at a number of important agrarian sites, beginning in the 1970s. For example Cooper River's Yaughan and Curribou plantations (Wheaton et al. 1983) and similarly important projects such as Spiers Landing (Drucker and Anthony 1979), Daniel's Island (Zierden et. al. 1986), and Millwood Plantation (Orser and Nekola 1985; Orser et. al. 1987) would likely have not been undertaken at the same scale, if undertaken at all, if not for the existence of CRM laws.

Projects large and small commandeered a lot of archaeology staff positions. Archaeologists adapted. Some were previously trained as prehistorians; all had to learn how to best survey, test and excavate South Carolina's historic plantation sites. Field crews consisted of people trained in diverse states, including South Carolina, with different ways of dealing with features and records. They learned a new repertoire of artifacts and became familiar with regional historic documents. Stine recalls how archaeology technicians were given permission by some plantation owners to measure extant plantation outbuildings, especially slave quarters. This was done on weekends for free, by young crew who were extremely interested in their work.

Not all Carolina plantation studies have been funded through private contract archaeology. Plantation remains have been investigated with local or state grants or through field schools, such as Ferguson's University of South Carolina (USC) program at Middleburg Plantation that began in 1986 (Ferguson 1992:xxiii). Field schools that stress historical archaeology are also found at the College of Charleston, in tandem with The Charleston Museum. In the past, field school also occurred through Coastal Carolina under Jim Michie, at Richmond Hill (e.g., Michie 1987**).** The State University's Masters in Public Archaeology, implemented by 1980 (USC-Columbia program), SCIAA, The Charleston Museum, a growing number of private CRM firms plus public CRM programs provided the training ground for South Carolina's next generation of historical archaeologists while fomenting discipline growth.

METHOD AND THEORY AT EARLY PLANTATION INVESTIGATIONS

The importance of excavating plantation storage buildings, slave villages, barns, kitchens and "the big house" was recognized. Archaeologists in the 1970s early1980s did have to be educated about the multitude of other places of human activity potentially found at plantation sites. Industrial sites (e.g., brick, charcoal, pottery, tar kilns, iron works) or peripheral agricultural sites (e.g., temporary cattle pens; rice trunks, irrigation canals, boat landings, etc.) are time- and region-dependent parts of South Carolina plantations. Debates occurred about how best to search for and interpret those remains.

Initial Survey, Testing and Data Recovery Methods

Investigative methods in the 1970s were heavily influenced by a drive to develop predictive settlement models in archaeology (Ferguson and Babson 1986; see overview in Parsons 1972). This was in part a hoped for management tool of the SHPO. If the SHPO could predict where sites were most likely to occur they could better justify requiring a survey and debate the necessary level of investigation (Trinkley 1977).

The search for models was also affected by a general trend in archaeological studies emphasizing an ecological approach to research. Cultural patterns related to environmental correlates such as distance to water, elevation and slope were sought (see commentary by Trinkley 1977). One early South Carolina example is the Spiers Landing project (Drucker and Anthony 1979). In the 1977 through 1979 work archaeologists searched for patterning "guided by an ecological systems theory approach…" (Drucker and Anthony 1979:7). In other words, Drucker and Anthony had approached this CRM project as any other project, even if multi-components were anticipated (Drucker, personal communication 2001; Anthony, personal communication 2001). Their interpretations blended discussion of the changing economy and its relationship to the environment with discussion of the "socioeconomic ideologies of a slave-based plantation system…" (Drucker and Anthony 1979:21). The study of these kinds of ecological and economic variables formed part of the Millwood plantation investigations as well (Orser et. al. 1987).

CRM survey methods were based on systematic discovery shovel tests at set intervals, agreed upon in the Scopes of Work (usually 30 m or 50-100 ft). Test units were various sizes, typically ranging from 5x5s to 10x10 ft. Excavations were either by arbitrary level, natural stratigraphy, or a combination of both. Data recover methods fell into two major categories, as they do today. The first is the use of large excavation blocks. The second is the practice of grading larger expanses of the site and concentrating on mapping and removing a greater number of features. The trade off is that the former method maintains more control of stratigraphy, but covers a smaller portion of the site. The later covers more area but at the expense of some stratigraphic understanding. A sense of the debate about appropriate methods is gained in the Daniels Island report through their discussion of different types and relative values of sampling schemes (Zierden et. al. 1986:3-6 to 3-27).

Early Theoretical Approaches

Early plantation excavation methods were influenced by debates in the wider archaeological community about scientific, humanistic, or particularistic/historical theoretical orientations and related methodological debates (See historical archaeology overview in Deagan 1982 and Joseph 2004a; see also Trinkley 1977). Before the mid-1980s historical archaeologists (CRM and non-contract) described plantation settlement patterns at the site level, then linked those findings to larger, interrelated issues concerning broad questions about ecological and cultural processes such as interplay between settlement pattern and geography, acculturation, colonialism, and maintenance or consequences of status differentiation. Archaeologists debated about processualism, Marxism, ecological systems, cognitive behavior, and humanism (e.g., Cleland and Fitting 1968; Deetz 1977; Goodyear 1976; South 1977a. See general summary Deagan 1982; see also Leone 1996). Most South Carolina plantation archaeologists would agree that they had painted their explanatory interpretations with too broad a brush.

Due in part to the influential presence of Stan South at SCIAA; many of South Carolina's historical archaeologists did perceive their discipline as a social science, falling within the ‘New Archeology’ paradigm (South 1977; 1978). Al Goodyear wrote that SCIAA’s contract work results could still contribute meaningfully to theory building if undertaken with the right research design and sampling methods (1976). A few South Carolina archaeologists such as Leland Ferguson were also influenced by new cognitive or structuralist approaches to interpreting material culture offered by Deetz, Glassie and others (e.g., Deetz 1977; Ferguson 1977; Glassie 1975; see summary discussions in Deagan 1982; Joseph 2004a; South 1991).

Early South Carolina Research Designs

It is important to reiterate the concern with systematic, stratified and nonstratified random or nonrandom statistical sampling designs in much of the early research (e.g., Lees 1980; Lewis and Haskell 1980; Drucker and Anthony 1984; Wheaton et. al. 1983; Zierden et. al. 1986). These types of sampling techniques supported research designs grounded in the ‘New Archeology.” On the other hand, CRM historical archaeologists working in South Carolina in the late 1970s and 1980s worked under restrictions. In CRM projects the Scope of Work lays out the research design and subsequent methods used to carry out the project as designed. In some cases the governing agency writes a detailed scope, in others it remains somewhat generalized. Boundaries and right-of-ways are usually rigidly defined in the Scopes and archaeologists can and could rarely explore the full extent of a plantation landscape. Thus in many projects researchers were sampling a sample of the plantation universe (e.g. Lees 1980; Wheaton et. al. 1983; Zierden et. al. 1986).

Research designs and concomitant methods were also affected by general debates in social history, folklore and geography. Historians were using new source material and statistical and interpretative methods. Their results, when viewed in tandem with results of historical archaeology studies, were abrogating stereotypes about plantation life (e.g., Vlach 1980; Fox-Genovese 1988; Genovese 1974; Gutman 1976; Isaac 1982; Joyner 1984; Michie 1987; E. Morgan 1975; P. Morgan 1982; Wood 1974.) Initial and subsequent archaeological studies at slave and free black sites in Georgia (Ascher and Fairbanks 1971; Fairbanks 1972), Massachusetts (Deetz 1977), Barbados (Handler and Lang 1978), and Africa (Ferguson 1992) serve as examples (Deagan 1982 and Joseph 2004a offer additional discussions.). Due to an initial dearth of local site data South Carolina's scholars turned to information from these other regions to compare economies, settlement patterns, artifact types, and artifact patterns.

These early approaches are exemplified by Bill Lee's excellent 1977 CRM study of Limerick Plantation (Lees 1979; 1980). Lees writes, "Archaeology must actively develop general explanatory theories concerning the phenomenon with which it is concerned, from which broader theories of culture may be synthesized" (Lees 1980:11). His research design also focused on describing "intra-site artifact patterning" with special emphasis on ceramic distributions. These data were compared to architectural changes at Limerick (Lees 1980:14). This approach falls nicely within the "New Archeology" or processual tradition. A major focus in South Carolina was to figure how to identify types of plantation sites, in part based on artifact patterning and dateable artifacts. This is not surprising, since South had recently published *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology* (South 1977), which emphasized the utility of pattern recognition studies for identifying specific types of sites to illuminate cultural processes. The most difficult task was to account for idiosyncratic or particularistic site patterning at one scale of analysis while seeking patterned similarities at a different scale. Researchers then attempted to link their results to broader questions about maintenance and transformations in cultural patterns and processes (South 1977, 1978). In South's words "Historical archaeologists looking beyond their particular site can begin to delineate regularity and variability reflective of cultural systems in the form of patterned relationships from sites with similar temporal and cultural associations." (South 1978:223).

Lees placed architectural and artifact patterning differences in the early eighteenth-century plantation, in comparison to the later eighteenth-century settlement, within an explanatory economic framework comparing early cattle and later rice production economies (Lees 1979:274-281). Lees writes that "as long as this material [curated artifacts and notes] is available, the research conclusions offered in this report may be verified."

The multiplicity of evidence in plantation archaeology (various documents, archaeological material, physical environment) also can lend itself to more humanistic (particularistic) and cognitive/behavioral (generalistic) interpretations (Deagan 1982; South 1991). For example, Lees also noted a regional change towards a Georgian worldview as evidenced by his data. This is interesting, since it is based on Deetz's structuralist/cognitive examination of changes in eighteenth-century American material culture (Deetz 1977). Those using this approach can use statistical analysis to quantify changes in material culture and compare diachronic results. This approach has been successfully applied to a study of changing backcountry agrarian lifestyles (Beck 1998). On the other hand, structuralist interpretations such as offered by Deetz (1977), Beck (1998), and others although often masterfully argued, do not readily lend themselves to rigorous scientific testing in the manner required by processual archaeology (see also South 1991). Lees work serves as an example of the historical archaeologist's myriad attempts to develop linkages between their quantifiable and qualitative data sets using both processual and humanistic approaches.

Lynne Lewis' 1975 project at Drayton Hall, located northwest of Charleston is another early example of the search for pattern in the plantation record. She sought to reveal the "…pattern of life in low country South Carolina", and to show how the data demonstrate the "…rise and fall of the plantation system" (Lewis 1978:10). Lewis discussed how the plantation functioned; the discovered garbage disposal patterns; purchasing, relative costs and use of household artifacts; distribution of faunal remains in relationship to foodways, and she compared these results to generalized plantation patterns (Lewis 1978:99-111; Miller and Lewis 1978). Results indicated that Drayton was not a "typical, self-sufficient, income producing, southern plantation but rather served as a country seat and entertainment center for the family and as a business management center for the Drayton holdings" (Miller and Lewis 1978:250).

Ken Lewis, in his bicentennial-funded work at historic Camden, mentioned that upcountry plantations and farmsteads should also be investigated. This would provide a comparable database to his frontier town settlement model (1976; see also South and Hartley 1980; Hartley 1984 for discussions of testing Frontier Model). Ducker and Anthony's work at Bardwell in McCormick County is a good example of a study of a small upcountry plantation (1984). They took an ecological approach using systematic sampling methods. Their analysis shows a concern with developing comparative "artifact profile distribution(s)" to compare piedmont and coastal agrarian sites (1984:5-46). Their work serves as a good example of how researchers were comparing artifact patterns in search of meaningful similarities and differences (cf. 5-47 Table 29) (see also Zierden et. al. 1986.)

Ken Lewis, through SCIAA, also undertook excavations at Middleton Plantation in 1979 under a state grant (Lewis and Hardesty 1979; Ken Lewis, personal communication 2001). He and others later tested Hampton Plantation as part of SCIAA's CRM group (Lewis and Haskell 1980; Lewis and Haskell 1981). Lewis' theoretical orientation was essentially Marxist. He attempted to link broad studies of general processes to specific plantations site results. Lewis asked how the economy influenced settlement and social structure patterning. He sought to show how this was interconnected with ecological systems (Ken Lewis, personal communication 2001).

Settlement and Artifact Patterns, Ethnic Markers/'Africanisms' and Slave Housing - The Early Years

Settlement and Artifact Patterns- One of the large early CRM projects was Cooper River, later known for uncovering Yaughan and Curriboo slave villages. In 1979 a total of 29 structures were excavated, as well as yard areas and numerous features (Wheaton et. al. 1983). The late Vic Carbone wrote that this study "is significant …in the differences it highlights between colonial and antebellum plantation systems; in its approach to the study of the process of acculturation as revealed in the archaeological record; and finally in its contribution it makes to Black history…" (Wheaton et. al. 1983:ii; see Redfield et. al. 1936 for early views of acculturation processes). This illustrates the idealism and excitement about these early plantation studies. More prosaically, researchers questioned if time lag would be a factor in the presence or absence of specific ceramic types in the quarters; who was perhaps manufacturing colonoware, and what they were using these artifacts for; etc (Wheaton et. al. 1983; Wheaton and Garrow 1985). They hoped to use artifact types, frequencies, and general patterning to help identify and separate assemblages from overseer, house slave, and field slave quarters in part to investigate potential status differences. (The main house site fell outside the project area.) They also examined the distribution of the structural remains and yard features across the landscape, in relationship to one another and to variations in the natural environment.

The Yaughan and Curriboo laboratory analyses revealed very different functional group ratios than those developed by South for British colonial sites, that is, his Carolina Artifact Pattern (South 1977, 1978; Wheaton et. al. 1983, Wheaton and Garrow 1985). This became known as the Carolina Slave Pattern or the Slave Artifact Pattern. They also noted differences in site settlement patterns, architectural styles, and ratios of colonoware ceramics to other artifacts between the earlier and later slave villages. Wheaton et. al. explained these divergences as the result of economic change and acculturation processes that occurred over time at the two plantations (Wheaton et. al. 1983, Wheaton and Garrow 1985). To link site-specific data to general theory, researchers incorporated intensive historic research results to paint site-specific and broad regional historical backdrops. It is interesting that this early research continues to ignite controversy (e.g., Howson 1990).

The perceived importance of developing the Slave Pattern for South Carolina cannot be overstated. A perusal through the "grey literature" shows researchers consistently placed their artifacts into artifact functional groups (following South 1977 and 1978 or an adaptation thereof) for inter- and intra-site comparisons (see bibliographies such as Derting et. al. 1991; Steen et. al. 1994). Functional group patterns, as well as comparison of artifact classes were also used as a starting point for discussions of status variation on the plantation (e.g., Poplin and Scardaville 1991; Zierden et. al. 1986). Apropos research, archaeologists could test various explanations for a site's divergence from the CAP or any offered revisions thereof.

Zierden et. al. 's 1986 excellent study of Lesesne and Fairbanks Plantations on Daniel's Island demonstrates the importance of settlement and artifact pattern studies at the time. Artifact functional groups, classes and revisions of the Carolina Artifact Pattern are carefully taken under consideration (e.g., Section 7.3.2 beginning 7-72). They also discuss various settlement models at both the sites and at a comparative regional scale (e.g., 7-70 through 7-72). The study ends with a discussion of slave and planter lifestyles, including architecture, subsistence patterns, status, arrangement of houses, family types, relationship of labor type (i.e. task or gang) and major crop (cotton or rice) to settlement patterns and so forth. The authors specify cultural processes that affect certain types of artifact and feature patterning at different types of plantation loci. Orser et. al. 1987 contains an interesting series of hypotheses comparing aspects of antebellum and Postbellum plantation/farmstead culture at Millwood Plantation (see also Orser and Nekola 1985). They look at the relationship of numerous environmental and spatial variables at this nineteenth-century upland plantation.

In the same vein Joseph (1987) published a testable model for determining the type of slave labor system used at a particular plantation. He believes that task versus gang labor systems will result in different artifact patterns due to different behavioral and cultural processes. Joseph predicts that certain artifact classes will be present (presence/absence) or in greater densities at those plantation quarters where the task system is used. Personal items such as beads and buttons, luxury goods like liquor and tobacco, an increase in the variety of wild foodstuffs and other evidence of conspicuous consumption (wagons, mules, etc.) illustrating improved individual and/or family conditions are predicted to be found in greater abundance (Joseph 1987:33). It is important to note that in this article Joseph also sets up a series of paired oppositions for study such as cotton/rice; piedmont/coast; gang labor/task labor. This interest in comparing perceived opposites is seen throughout the historical archaeology plantation literature, and is still relevant today (see also Beck 1998).

Beginning in the mid-1980s some researchers began to question the utility and meaning of pattern analysis (Singleton 1985, 1990; Joseph 1989). Plantation archaeologists were still generating artifact class and functional group frequencies, seeking status indicators through ceramic types and vessel forms, and looking at intra- and inter-site settlement patterns (e.g., Poplin and Scardaville 1991). Although these kinds of quantitative studies yielded important baseline studies, researchers often failed to understand how to interpret their results within the broad framework of plantation and historical archaeology. The problems and potential of using both settlement and artifact pattern analysis in plantation studies have been aptly summarized by Joseph (1989), using lowcountry Georgia and Carolina examples (see also Joseph 2004a:18-19). He stresses taking care when comparing differential excavation techniques, and to be certain that like is compared to like- such as time period or economic basis of the plantations (Joseph 1989; see also Joseph 2004a). Such was not always the case in the early years of plantation research.

In 1985 the Council of Professional Archaeologists (COSCAPA) held a conference to discuss area plantation studies at the Charleston Museum (DePratter 1986). Trinkley's study of Elfe Plantation showed that great variability existed in plantation types and in planter's decisions as to allocation of resources. These factors influenced the resulting settlement and artifact patterning at plantation sites (Trinkley 1986). This was underlined by Friedlander's symposium paper (Friedlander 1986). Zierden described anticipated differences between urban and rural African-American sites located in Charleston's sphere of influence (Zierden 1986). Later, Anthony pressed for study of sub-regional differences in human interactions and environmental settings before comparing site-specific patterns to broad regional plantation processes (1989). In May of 1989 scholars from South Carolina and throughout the south met in Oxford Mississippi for an important conference, “Digging the Afro-American Past: Archaeology and the Black Experience” (Singleton 1990). Many ideas were exchanged and participants agreed that a newsletter was in order to continue to share information. A few years later another South Carolina symposium was held, in Mount Pleasant (McCandless 1996). These kinds of symposia have born intellectual fruit and assure fellow South Carolina scholars access to new information on plantation resources and data.

Ethnic Markers/‘Africanisms’

Archaeologists were also looking for artifact patterns and artifact types for guidance in assessing site significance for NRHP eligibility of plantation loci. On a practical note, archaeologist hoped they could use differential patterning to help identify inhabitants of sites that did not have strong supporting historical documentation. (The level of historical research needed to uncover existing documentation was usually not undertaken for surveys.) No one knew how to identify an African-American site without solid historic documentation.

Determining the significance of sites like Drayton Hall, Limerick, Curriboo and Yaughan, or Fairbanks and Lesesne was not difficult. On the other hand, how to determine the significance of a tar kiln with a handful of slave-made ceramics and a fragment of pearlware on the surface was not easy. Arguing significance for small, ephemeral agrarian surface scatters, which could represent a common site signature for slave or early Freedman sites, was difficult (Pat Garrow, personal communication 1979; Tom Wheaton, personal communication 1980; see also Joseph 2004a:22).

It was expected that some African-American work and habitation sites would, by their very nature, have few artifacts. No one had really tested that assumption. Archaeologists began to search for signs of distinctive, African-American material culture at plantation sites. Clues to African and African-American material culture were sought in folklore studies, the new social histories, and in the writings of anthropologist Melville Herskovits (Deagan 1982; Fox-Genovese 1988; Genovese 1974; Gutman 1976; Herskovits 1956; Isaac 1982; Joyner 1984; E. Morgan 1975; P. Morgan 1982; Vlach 1980; Wood 1974). These were sometimes called ‘Africanisms.’ ‘Africanism’ meant an African behavior, belief or object that was retained by African-American slaves or Freedmen. Archaeologists were looking for ‘ethnic marker artifacts’ that would be correlates or by-products of Africanisms.

Archaeologists were successful in identifying and finding one ‘marker artifact,’ eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century colonoware [from ‘colonial-ware’]. The origin or origins of South Carolina's colonoware pottery has been debated at least since the late 1970s. In 1974's Palmetto Parapets South mentions his discussions with Dick Polhemous about the possible Native American, African or African-American origins of colonoware (South 1974:181-188). Leland Ferguson wrote a considered piece about the possibly multiple ethnic origins of colonoware in 1977 (Ferguson 1978). This was followed by Ron Anthony's 1978 paper, describing his experiments testing possible manufacturing and finishing techniques of these wares during the Spiers Landing project (Anthony 1979; see also Drucker and Anthony 1979). Mike Trinkley noted a high number of colonowares at historic sites in a 1978 survey of Daniel's Island. This convinced him that Ferguson was correct assuming that some, if not most of the region's colonoware was used or made by African- American slaves (Trinkley 1978:91-92; see also Honerkamp et. al. 1982 ;112, 120). The hoped for evidence of on-site colonoware manufacturing found at Curriboo and Yaughan quarters helped verify that at least some varieties of colonoware were produced by slaves (Wheaton et. al. 1983; Wheaton and Garrow 1985). [This evidence has been disputed by researcher Carl Steen on the basis of defining very low-fired versus unfired wares (personal communication 2004).] These early studies also pointed to a possible social and economic relationship between some members of Carolina's Indian populations and African, African-American and perhaps Indian slave populations as well as the planter class.

Slave Housing

The first project to uncover a complete slave house was at Spiers Landing (Drucker and Anthony 1979). Spiers Landing data was useful as comparative data to Wheaton, Friedlander and Garrow's (1983) work at Curriboo and Yaughan slave villages. Wheaton et. al. (1983) argued that the wall trench building techniques and size of the houses found were most likely based on Caribbean and ultimately West African antecedents. [Wheaton et. al. 1983 were aware of the possible European origin of certain architectural elements that share African and Caribbean parallels (Garrow and Wheaton, personal communications 1979 and 2001)]. Zierden et. al.'s 1986 results at Lesesne and Fairbanks plantations on Daniel's Island near Charleston uncovered an interesting trend in architecture over time. They noted seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century wall trench construction supplanted by wooden post earthfast techniques in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, followed by the use of "brick piers during the early to middle nineteenth century at Lesesne" (Zierden et. al. 1986 :7-92). Various other studies, to numerous to list, have documented important information about plantation housing, outbuildings and landscapes (e.g., Orser and Nekola 1985; Orser et. al. 1987; Beck 1998).

PLANTATION ARCHAEOLOGY SINCE THE LATE 1980S

Some of the more recent research issues examined in the study of South Carolina plantations are discussed below. Although perhaps not complete, most studies fall within the categories of Landscape; Colonoware; Religion, Magic, and Ritual; and Ethnicity and Cultural Identity.

Landscape Studies

In the 1980s and '90s the quality and focus of plantation archaeology shifted. New methods such as Geographic Information Science (GIS), applied to the traditional Cultural Geographic approach of Landscape Analyses, facilitated refocusing the scale of plantation studies to the creek, watershed and region. Archaeologists look at the location of settlements, of structures within settlements, at the arrangement of structures, their physical relationship to one another, evidence and arrangement of gardens and walkways, the locations of paths and woods, and the affects major roads, topography and drainage had on these entities. Multi-scalar landscape studies are also undertaken to descry the mentality of the planter class and that of the slaves, as well as how the landscape reflected planter and slave relationships, (see, for instance, Deetz 1977 and Upton 1988).

In South Carolina an early regional attempt at looking at landscape and the plantation community was Ferguson and Babson's (1986) cartographic study of the East Branch of the Cooper River. Although they referred to it as a model for predicting site location, their study went a step further by noting that settlement factors had a role in community development. They also recognized that historic plats were probably expressions of the plantation owner's vision of the landscape. Babson (1988) used the results of this work as well as fieldwork at Limerick Plantation to examine the landscape of racism at the Tanner Road settlement. He studied plantation geography, the distribution of sites across it, and the characteristics and functions of these sites as having meaning in a contest of domination and resistance between planters and slaves. Ferguson's interest in plantation landscapes was transferred to his student Richard Affleck (1990), who examined the relationship of power and space through settlement pattern change at a single plantation.

Some of the earlier settlement studies were nascent landscape studies (Zierden et. al. 1986 and Wheaton et. al. 1983 and Orser and Nekola 1985 and Orser et. al. 1987). These settlement studies were grounded in ecological systems theory but mitigated by cultural geography, anthropology, social history and archaeology- a typical mix for historical archaeology projects at the time. For example, examination of topography and settlement at Yaughan showed that the slave settlement followed a natural slight rise and houses were not placed in a rigid straight line. This was not the pattern discerned by Orser et. al. (1987) at Millwood, a nineteenth-century piedmont plantation. They uncovered the anticipated nucleated settlement pattern with the site centered on the main house, with the overseer's house located between the that main structure and the straight slave row. Another slave village was found "clustered" around a base of a hill. This was in contrast to the later dispersed tenant farmsteads across the landscape. Zierden et. al. 1986 could see a disparity through time between a plantation orientation to the river and a later focus on the inland (road) transportation network. Synchronically, they discovered that their colonial "nucleated" or clustered plantation settlement systems contrasted sharply to a typical rice producing plantation's dispersed quarters system, such as found at Yaughan.

Jim Michie's (1987; 1990 and Michie and Mills 1988) work at Richmond Hill also examines a single plantation and much of his book looks at plantation layout, the organization of structures and places within a settlement, and the architectural design of the main house and slave houses he documented. In addition to focusing on plantation landscapes, Jim's work brings a very human touch to the buildings, places, and artifacts used by the inhabitants of Richmond Hill.

The issue of African American resistance has been discussed for quite a while by plantation archaeologists. However, there has been relatively little examination of the topic by archaeologists working in South Carolina. Ferguson, Affleck, and Adams (1990) have briefly discuss resistance and power in a 1990 paper, but note that methods for identifying evidence for these concepts are still developing. Other Ferguson students, Patti Byra (1996) and Karrie Barile (1999), have respectively examined Middleburg's landscape alterations in light the planter's ambivalence towards slavery and the affect of the Denmark Vesey slave conspiracy.

The larger South Carolina archaeological community shared this interest in landscape studies leading to the publication of "Carolina's Historical Landscapes" (Stine et al. 1997) based on a 1991 symposium. Essays related to plantation studies included those by Joseph (1997), Wayne (1997), and Ferguson and Cowan (1997). Discussants, gleaned from other fields, noted that, at the time, archaeologists were trying to reach a consensus on what was "The Landscape." Additional comments in the book, when published six years later, suggested that we were still struggling with that definition. That struggle continues today.

Landscape studies have spilled over into the interpretation of sites excavated as a result of compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Much of this work has been by architectural reconstructionist Colin Brooker who has examined many lowcountry main house complexes and slave settlements. Of particular interest is his identification of a vernacular style of main house architecture found in the Sea Islands that not only reflected the planter's vision of his world, but was also uniquely responsive to the local environment. Brooker also identified the transference of the picturesque landscape movement to the South Carolina lowcountry (see for example Brooker 1991; Brooker and Trinkley 1991; Poplin and Brooker 1994).

Colonoware Studies

Colonoware was first identified by Noel Hume (1962) as "Colono Indian ware." As mentioned, later researchers such as South (1974), Anthony (1979), and Ferguson (1980) began to believe that there was a strong African-American role in this ceramic's production in South Carolina. Wheaton et al. (1983) provided formal type descriptions, which were later refined by Garrow and Wheaton (1989) and Ferguson (1989). Garrow and Wheaton defined "Yaughan" wares, which were believed to be slave made, while Ferguson defined "River Burnished" which he documented as having been produced by Catawba Indians for trade. Based primarily on his work at Spiers Landing and Daniel's Island, Anthony (Drucker and Anthony 1979; Anthony 1986) has further refined the "Yaughan" type to include several variety: Yaughan, Lesesne Smoothed, and Lesesne Lustered.

Since that time, colonowares have fascinated us as the artifact is so uniquely tied to the plantation and is one key to our understanding of plantation culture. In the realm of contract archaeology, two notable studies were those at Broom Hall Plantation (Trinkley et al. 1995) and on Spring Island (Eubanks et. al. 1994). The work at Broom Hall synthesized previous research on colonoware and presented the results of traditional analysis with methods used by prehistoric ceramicists, as well as chemical and petrological analysis of a subset of pottery. Chris Espenshade (in Eubanks et. al. 1994 and Kennedy et al. 1994) examined clay sources in and around Spring Island and along Colleton River for potting suitability and compared colonoware sherds from the slave settlements to clay samples he fired himself. Other studies (Kennedy et al. 1994; Adams 2002) discussed the role of clay accessibility to the development of large-scale colonoware production. Adams (2002) argues that colonoware production may have occurred anywhere slaves could easily obtain usable clay on the plantation. She makes the point that, unlike the previous Native American inhabitants who could move freely across the landscape, the slaves' ability to travel was limited, making the ability to get good clay more difficult in areas where it did not naturally occur on the plantation. Espenshade (in Kennedy et al. 1994) believes that increased planter control in the early antebellum period made it more difficult for slaves to leave their plantation for any reason and may have been partially responsible for the general demise of colonoware.

Ron Anthony (2002) has described colonoware vessel attributes that indicate interaction between Indian and African slaves in the Charleston area. Most of his data for this argument comes from Stobo Plantation in the Charleston area. Carl Steen (1999) has argued that lowcountry colonoware was a New World adaptation with variable local characteristics dependent upon location, time period, and the particular mix of Indian, African, African-American and Euro-American people present. Graduate students who have studied other aspects of colonoware include Valerie Marcil's (1993) examination of colonoware as a source of African American identity and strength, and Kerry Ogata's (1995) study of the relationship between colonoware, medicine, and gender.

Recent work by Joe Joseph (2004b) in downtown Charleston is putting forth new ideas about the functions of the various types of colonowares (also see Joseph, this volume). Joseph believes that wares classified as "Yaughan" were probably made on plantations for use on the plantations where they were manufactured, most likely by enslaved Africans. He refers to this colonoware as "Village Ware." Lesesne wares and Catawba/River Burnished wares, he believes were made specifically for trade and are referred to as "Trade Ware". He has also identified burnished wares in Colonial deposits that he also thinks are trade wares made on the plantation, which he is calling Colonial Burnished. The Catawba ware is later and may have replaced the colonial burnished pottery made on plantations for trade (Joseph 2004b). These ideas are definitely interesting and worth serious consideration in future analyses.

Indirectly related to colonoware studies has been a recent interest in examining food residues. Samples of food residues from colonowares recovered at Crowfield Plantation in Berkeley County were subjected to lipid analysis (Trinkley and Hacker 2003). The effort should be applauded, but since this was the first such study on South Carolina colonowares, the results are not particularly insightful. However, it will hopefully instigate the use of lipid analysis in the future in order to build a useful database to get a better understanding of African American foodways.

Religion, Magic, and Ritual

Ferguson (1999) has published his expanded ideas on marks on the bottom of colonoware vessels. He thinks that these marks, which he believes are Bakongo cosmograms, represent elements of an American subculture reflecting ideas of religion, magic, and healing. Chris Espenshade (2003) has recently argued that Ferguson's arguments are faulty or, at least, have yet to be proven and discourages researchers to take his conclusions as fact.

The study of religious ideology, especially magic and ritual in South Carolina plantation contexts has been rather limited but is growing in popularity, particularly given the successes of archaeologists such as Ken Brown in South Carolina and other areas of the southeast (Brown 1995; 2001). In the 1970s John Combes combined ethnographic and archaeological methods to study black burial practices on the Carolina Coast (Combes 1972). Later, Cynthia Connor (1989) analyzed black mortuary behavior on the East Branch of Cooper River. Christopher Fennell (2003) has recently written an article discussing material expressions of core symbols within particular African-American religious beliefs. Archaeologists have yet to test ideas about African-America religious expression on a large scale – partly because the ideas and approaches are still developing and perhaps because the identification and interpretation of these material expressions could be difficult to discern, particularly within the constraints of "salvage archaeology." For instance, at the slave subarea structure 1, Lexington Kiln Site (38CH1086), Wayne and Dickinson discovered a 86x18 ft structure with a brick hearth and clay floor. Just against the mid-point of the outer hearth wall was a colonoware pot. On the other side of the hearth was another colonoware bowl but with a complete pearlware base nestled within it. There were also two tool caches within the structure (Wayne and Dickinson 1990:9-4 to 9-13). This has yet to be interpreted in light of Ken Brown's revelations about caches and slave floors.

Stine et al. (1996) explored the use of blue beads in lowcountry slave settlements. They found a significant correlation between the presence of blue beads at slave village and kitchen dependency loci. They postulate that the color blue grew to have special, multiple meaning in the lowcountry, especially for enslaved Africans and their descendents. These could range from personal adornment to protection to religious ritual. There may be a correlation with gender and age (predominately woman and children) but that has yet to be verified. Ferguson's student Alessia Sartorio (1994) has also explored religion and ritual as interpretive frameworks in African American archaeology.

Ethnicity and Cultural Identity

Identifying ethnicity in the archaeological record has long been a controversial interest of plantation archaeologists (Deagan 1982). Tom Wheaton told one of the authors that the original research questions at Yaughan and Curriboo were geared towards finding ethnic markers for French Huguenot planters. After determining that they were dealing with slave settlements rather than the main house, the focus changed towards looking at ethnic markers in the pottery and architecture of the slaves (Thomas Wheaton, personal communication 2001). Ethnicity and New World cultural adaptation was recently the focus of an edited volume by Joe Joseph and Martha Zierden (2002). The encounters and exchanges between British, French, German, Swiss, and African settlers within the colonial plantation society that eventually developed into a southern identity are discussed (see in particular Joseph 2002; Schlasko 2002; Steen 2002). Steen warns against attributing an ethnic origin to traditions that have parallels among Africans and Europeans living in the New World. Due to these parallels, attributing ethnicity can in fact be very difficult. Hamer and Trinkley (1997) have argued for an actual transference of African architectural styles, reminiscent of the old concept of African survivals or retention. However, too little information has been gathered on African and European architectural antecedents to draw definitive conclusions about the interplay of ethnic influences on lowcountry architectural designs (see Adams 2001).

The creolization concept often underlies many of these previously discussed studies. The use of this approach was spurred on by the early work at Yaughan and Curriboo Plantations (Wheaton et al. 1983) which used the word "acculturation" to explain identified culture change at the sites. Those critical of what they believed were Wheaton, Friedlander, and Garrow's one-way, linear approach to studying change in African-American society began to draw from Edward Brathewaite's (1971) concept of culture change based on interaction, exchange, and creativity. Creolization was seen to be more dynamic, allowing for the exchange of ideas, and leading to an almost entirely different culture (Ferguson 1992). Folklorist Charles Joyner (1984) applied the concept to the lifeways and culture of nineteenth-century slaves living on Waccamaw Neck, using linguistic concepts to describe this process of cultural creolization. Drawing from Brathwaite (1971) and Joyner (1984), Ferguson began to actively use the approach to study South Carolina slave culture. Ferguson's student Natalie Adams (1990; 2001) used the creolization concept, economic and social history, as well as aspects of landscape approaches to examine and explain architectural change in colonial slave housing in Berkeley County. Her study illustrated that houses often reflected aspects of both planter and slave society, as well as indicating how these groups interacted through time.

One recent outgrowth of creolization studies has been the development of the examination of the resulting Southern culture. The collection of essays published in Joseph and Zierden (2002) illustrates how cultural identity was expressed and why cultural diversity was eventually replaced by a common identity. Although there remained a separation based on race and status, the process of immigration, adaptation, and creolization shared by all, created a rich and diverse mosaic of cultures that became nineteenth-century Southern society. Given this groundwork, future archaeological studies can begin to better interpret and understand nineteenth-century Southern culture.

CONCLUSIONS

Early plantation archaeology studies have not lived up to their stereotypes. They had clearly stated research designs, if typically broad, and archaeologists concluded their reports by re-examining those questions in light of their data. This has not always been the case in later years. Debates about Post-Processual, Processual and Humanistic archaeology continue in the discipline at large (Cleland 2001; Noble 1996; South 1991). This is reflected in regional discussions like this one, asking why we do plantation archaeology**,** how we do it, and how best to interpret our discoveries.

The colonoware, beads, house patterns, garbage pits, and other material culture uncovered at South Carolina plantation sites in the 1960s through today represent a rich body of comparative data. As each generation reformulates the goals, theories, and methods of historical archaeology, these resources will be re-examined and reinterpreted.

For plantation archaeology to continue to develop, it is important that researchers be creative. They need to test new ideas and continue to draw from other disciplines such as geography and history to flesh out interpretations. They need to be bold with their conclusions in order to put forth new ideas on how to examine and understand the various cultures that now make up the cultural South. These new ideas can then be tested and tried, then accepted or rejected as the case warrants. Archaeology, as with history, always need to look at where it has been to understand where it needs to go. Synthesis and reflection are vital to positive growth.

REFERENCES CITED

Adams, Natalie P.

1990 Early African American Domestic Architecture from Berkeley County, South Carolina. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

2001 "In the Style of An English Cottage" Changing and Variable Influences on the Design and Construction of South Carolina Slave Houses. Paper presented at the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Chattanooga, Tennessee.

2002 A Pattern of Living: A View of the African American Slave Experience in the Pine Forests of the Lower Cape Fear. In *Another's Country: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on Cultural Interactions in the Southern Colonies*, edited by J.W. Joseph and Martha Zierden, pp. 65-78. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Affleck, Richard M.

1990 Power and Space: Settlement Pattern Change at Middleburg Plantation, Berkeley County, South Carolina. Unpublished masters thesis. Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

Anthony, Ronald W.

1979 Descriptive Analysis and Replication of Historic Earthenware: Colono Wars from the Spiers Landing Site, Berkeley County, South Carolina. *Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers* 13: 253-268.

1986 Colonowares. In *Home Upriver: Rural Life on Daniel's Island, Berkeley County, South Carolina*. Edited by Martha A. Zierden, Lesley M. Drucker, and Jeanne Calhoun, pp. 7-22 – 7-51. Carolina Archaeological Services/The Charleston Museum. Submitted to South Carolina Department of Highways and Public Transportation, Columbia.

2002 Tangible Interaction: Evidence From Stobo Plantation. In *Another's Country: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on Cultural Interactions in the Southern Colonies*, edited by J.W. Joseph and Martha Zierden, pp. 45-64. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Ascher, Robert and Charles H. Fairbanks

1971 Excavation of a Slave Cabin: Georgia, U.S.A. *Historical Archaeology* 5:3-17.

Babson, David W.

1988 *The Tanner Road Settlement: The Archaeology of Racism on Limerick Plantation*. Volumes in Historical Archaeology 4. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Barile, Kerri

1999 Causes and Creations: Exploring the Relationship Between Nineteenth Century Slave Insurrections, Landscape and Architecture at Middleburg Plantation, Berkeley County, South Carolina. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina

Beck, Monica

1998 "A Fer Ways Off from the Big House": The Changing Nature of Slavery in the South Carolina Backcountry. In *The Southern Backcountry. Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Frontier Communities,* edited by David Colin Crass, Steven D. Smith, Martha A. Zierden and Richard D. Brooks, pp. 108-136. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Brathwaite, Edward

1971 *The Development of Creole Society in Jamaica, 1770-1820.* Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Brooker, Colin

1991 Tabby Structures on Spring Island. In *The Second Phase of Archaeological Survey on Spring Island, Beaufort County South Carolina: Investigation of Prehistoric and Historic Settlement Patterns on an Isolated Sea Island,* edited by Michael Trinkley, pp. 129-151. Research Series 20. Chicora Foundation, Inc., Columbia, S.C.

Brooker, Colin and Michael Trinkley

1991 Plantation Architecture: The Lost Artifact. Research Contribution 58. Chicora Foundation, Inc., Columbia, South Carolina.

Brown, Kenneth L.

1995 Material Culture and Community Structure: The Slave and Tenant Community at Levi Jordon Plantation, 1848-1892. In *Working Toward Freedom: Slave Society and Domestic Economy in the American South,* edited by Larry E. Hudson, Jr., pp. 95-118. University of Rochester Press, Rochester, New York.

2001 The Archaeology of Ritual on South Carolina Plantation Sites: Artifacts and Context. Paper presented at the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Chattanooga, Tennessee.

Byra, Patti L.

1996 The Contextual Meaning of the 1830s Landscape at Middleburg Plantation, Berkeley County, South Carolina. Unpublished masters thesis. Department off Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

Cleland, Charles E.

2001 Historical Archaeology Adrift? *Historical Archaeology* 35(2):1-8.

Cleland, Charles and James Fitting

1968 The Crisis in Identity: Theory in Historic Sites Archeology. *Conference on Historic Sites Archeology Papers* 2(2):124-138.

Combes, John

1972 Ethnography, Archaeology, and Burial Practices Among Coastal South Carolina Blacks. *Conference on Historic Site Archaeology* 7: 52-61.

Connor, Connor

1989 "Sleep On and Take Your Rest": Black Mortuary Behavior on the East Branch of the Cooper River, South Carolina. M.A. Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

Deagan, Kathleen

1982 Avenues of Inquiry in Historical Archaeology. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, ed. Michael B. Schiffer. Vol. 5. pp.151-177. Academic Press, New York

Deetz, James

1977 *In Small Things Forgotten: The Archaeology of Early American Life*. Anchor Press, Garden City, New York.

DePratter, Chester (editor)

1986 Problems and Promises in Plantation Research. *South Carolina Antiquities* V.18 (1 and 2).

Derting, Keith M. and Sharon L. Pekrul and Charles J. Rinehart (compilers)

1991 *A Comprehensive Bibliography of South Carolina Archaeology*. Research Manuscript Series 211. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Drucker, Lesley and Ronald Anthony

1979 *The Spiers Landing Site: Archaeological Investigations in Berkeley County, South Carolina*. Prepared for the Department of the Interior, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Interagency Archaeological Services Atlanta Contract No. C5767(78). Prepared by Carolina Archaeological Services, Columbia.

1984 *An Archaeological Study of the Little River-Buffalo Creek Special Land Disposal Tract. Clarks Hill Lake, McCormick County, South Carolina. Volume 1.* Funded by the US Army Corps of Engineers, Savannah District. Prepared by Carolina Archaeological Services, Columbia. Contract No. DACW21-83-C-0049.

Espenshade, Christopher T.

2003 Colonoware Myths: The Truth Revealed. Paper presented at the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Charlotte, North Carolina.

Eubanks, Elsie, Christopher T. Espenshade, Marian Roberts, and Linda Kennedy

1994 *Data Recovery Investigations of 38BU791, Bonnie Shore Slave Row, Spring Island, Beaufort County, South Carolina.* Brockington and Associates, Atlanta, Georgia.

Fairbanks, Charles

1974 The Kingsley slave cabins in Duval County, Florida, 1968. *Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers (1972)* 7(2):62-93.

Fennell, Christopher

2003 Group Identity, Individual Creativity and Symbolic Generation in a BaKongo Diaspora. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 7(1):1-31. Kluwer Academic and Plenum Publishers.

Ferguson, Leland G.

1978 Looking for the "Afro" in Colono-Indian pottery. In *The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers* 1977. Stan South, editor. V.12:68-86. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology.

1980 Looking for the “Afro” in Colono-Indian Pottery. In *Archaeological Perspectives on Ethnicity in America*, edited by Robert L. Schuyler, pp. 14-28. Baywood, Farmingdale, New York.

1989 Low Country Plantations, the Catawba Nation, and River-Burnished Pottery. In *Studies in South Carolina Archaeology: Essays in Honor of R.S. Stephenson.* Anthropological Studies 9, ed. A.C. Goodyear III and G.T. Hanson, pp. 185-191. Occasional Papers of the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia.

1992 *Uncommon Ground: Archaeology and Early African America, 1650-1800.* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

1999 “The Cross Is a Magic Sign”: Marks on Eighteenth-Century Bowls from South Carolina. In *“I, Too, Am America”: Archaeological Studies of African-American Life*, edited by Theresa Singleton, pp. 116-131. University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville.

Ferguson, Leland, editor

1977 *Historical Archaeology and the Importance of Material Things*. Special Publication Series 2, the Society for Historical Archaeology.

Ferguson, Leland G. and David W. Babson

1986 *Survey of Plantation Sites Along the East Branch of Cooper River: A Model for Predicting Archaeological Site Location.* Report submitted to the South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

Ferguson, Leland G., Richard M. Affleck, Natalie P. Adams

1990 Eighteenth Century African-American Community in a South Carolina Rice Growing District. Paper presented to the 83rd Annual Meeting of the Organization of American Historians, Washington, D.C.

Ferguson, Terry A. and Thomas A. Cowan

1997 Iron Plantations and the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century landscape of the Northwestern South Carolina Piedmont. In *Carolina’s Historical Landscapes: Archaeological Perspectives*, pp. 113-144. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth

1988 *Within the Plantation Household : Black and White Women of the Old South.* University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Friedlander, Amy

1986 Turning Points: Some Directions for Historical Research on Southern Plantations. In *Problems and Promises in Plantation Research.* Chester DePratter, editor. Journal of the Archaeological Society of South Carolina. Columbia. Vol. 18 (1 and 2): 41-46.

Garrow, Patrick

1979 *Documented Recommendations for Additional Investigation of Historical Sites to be Impacted by Construction of the Cooper Rediversion Canal, Berkeley County, South Carolina. Project No. ES-1219.* Prepared by Soil Systems, Inc. Earth Systems Division. Prepared for the Interagency Archaeological Services, Atlanta.

Garrow, Patrick and Thomas Wheaton

1989 Colonoware Ceramics: The Evidence from Yaughan and Curriboo Plantations. In *Studies in South Carolina Archaeology: Essays in Honor of R.S. Stephenson. Anthropological Studies 9*, ed. A.C. Goodyear III and G.T. Hanson, 175-184. Occasional Papers of the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia.

Genovese, Eugene D.

1974 *Roll Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made.* Random House, New York.

Glassie, Henry

1975 *Folk Housing in Middle Virginia. A Structural Analysis of Historic Artifacts.* University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Glassow, M. A.

1977 Issues in Evaluating the Significance of Archaeological Resources. *American Antiquity* 42:413-420.

Goodyear, Albert C.

1976 *Current and Future Developments in Archaeological Theory Building within the Contract Framework. Paper Presented in the Symposium: The Archaeological Conservation Act: Retrospect and Prospect. SAA, St. Louis, May 6, 1976.* Research Manuscript Series No. 101. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia

Gutman, Herbert G.

1976 *The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom, 1750-1925.* Vintage Books, New York, New York.

Hamer, Fritz and Michael Trinkley

1997 African Architectural Transference to the South Carolina Low Country, 1700-1880. *Tennessee Anthropologist* 22(1): 1-34.

Handler, Jerome and Frederick Lange

1978 *Plantation Slavery in Barbados: An Archaeological and Historical Investigation.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Hartley, Michael O.

1984 *The Ashley River: A Survey of Seventeenth Century Sites.* Research Manuscript Series No. 192. University of South Carolina, South Carolina Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, Columbia.

Herskovits, Melville

1956 *The Myth of the Negro Past.* Beacon Press, Boston. (Reprint of 1941 edition.)

Honerkamp, Nicholas with R. Bruce Council and M. Elizabeth Will

1982 *An Archaeological Investigation of the Charleston Convention Center Site, Charleston, South Carolina.* Submitted by Brown Archaeology, University of Tennessee Chattanooga. Submitted to City of Charleston, Office of Downtown Revitalization.

Howson, Jean E.

1990 Social Relations and Material Culture: A Critique of the Archaeology of Plantation Slavery. In *Historical Archaeology of Southern Plantations and Farms*, edited by Charles E. Orser, Jr. Historical Archaeology 24(4):78-91.

Isaac, Rhys

1982 *The Transformation of Virginia. 1740-1790.* Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Joseph, J.W.

1987 Highway 17 Revisited: The Archaeology of Task Labor. *South Carolina Antiquities.* Vol. 19 (1 and 2). Pp. 29-34.

1989 Pattern and Process in the Plantation Archaeology of Georgia and South Carolina. *Historical Archaeology* 23(1):55-68.

1997 Building to Grow: Agrarian Adaptations to South Carolina's Historical Landscapes. In *Carolina's Historical Landscapes: Archaeological Perspectives*, pp. 45-61. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

2002 From Colonist to Charlestonian: The Crafting of Identity in a Colonial Southern City. In *Another's Country: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on Cultural Interactions in the Southern Colonies*, pp. 215-234. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

2004a Resistance and Compliance: CRM and the Archaeology of the Diaspora. *Historical Archaeology* 38(1):18-31.

2004b Chapter 7. The Judicial Center Site and Colonial Charleston – Interpretations and Conclusions. In *A New Look at the Old City: Archaeological Excavations of the Charleston County Judicial*

Center Site (38CH1708), Charleston, South Carolina, Theresa M. Hamby, Compiler. New South Associates Technical Report 1192. Report submitted to Charleston County. New South Associates, Stone Mountain, Georgia

Joseph, J.W. and Martha A. Zierden, editors

2002 *Another's Country: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on Cultural Interactions in the Southern Colonies*. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Joyner, Charles

1984 *Down By The Riverside: A South Carolina Slave Community*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.

Kennedy, Linda, Marian D. Roberts, and Christopher T. Espenshade

1994 *Archaeological Data Recovery at Colleton River Plantation (38BU647), Beaufort County, South Carolina: A Study of an Early Nineteenth Century Slave Settlement*. Brockington and Associates, Atlanta, Georgia.

Lees, William B.

1979 An Economic Explanation of Material Change at Limerick Plantation, South Carolina. *The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers.* 13:69 285.

1980 *Limerick. Old and in the Way: Archeological Investigations at Limerick Plantation*. Anthropological Studies 5. Occasional Papers of the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology. The University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Leone, Mark

1996 Taxonomic Descriptions and Questions About Change: Comments on Papers by Barka and Hudgins. *In The Archaeology of 18th-Century Virginia*, edited by Theodore R. Reinhart. Council of Virginia Archaeologists. Archaeological Society of Virginia. Special Publication No. 35: 57-64

Lewis, Kenneth E.

1976 *Camden; A Frontier Town.* South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology Anthropological Study Series No.2. University of South Carolina, Columbia.

1979 Hampton Place: a South Carolina rice plantation. *Research Manuscript Series No.151.* South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia.

Lewis, Kenneth E. and Donald L. Hardesty

1979 Middleton Place: Initial archaeological investigations at an Ashley River rice plantation. *Research Manuscript Series No.148*. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia.

Lewis, Kenneth E. and Helen Haskell

1980 *Hampton II: Further Archaeological Investigations at a Santee River Rice Plantation*. Research Manuscript Series No.161. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia.

1981 *The Middleton Privy; a study of discard behavior and the archaeological record*. Research Manuscript Series No.174. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia.

Lewis, Lynne G.

1978 *Drayton Hall: Preliminary Archaeological Investigation at a Low Country Plantation.* Published for the National Trust for Historic Preservation by the University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.

McCandless, Amy Thompson, editor

1996 *Mount Pleasant's Archaeological Heritage.* Proceedings of a symposium held at Lynch Hall, Dunes West, Mount Pleasant, September 21, 1996. Edited by Amy Thompson McCandless for the Town of Mt. Pleasant, South Carolina.

Marcil, Valerie G.

1993 Continuity and Change: Colono Ware as a Coping Tool for African Americans. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

Michie, James L.

1987 *Richmond Hill and Wachesaw: Am Archaeological Study of Two Rice Plantations on the Waccamaw River, Georgetown County, South Carolina.* Research Manuscript Series 203. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

1990 *Richmond Hill Plantation: 1810-1868: The Discovery of Antebellum Life on a Waccamaw Rice Plantation.* The Reprint Company, Spartanburg, South Carolina.

Michie, James L. and Jay Mills

1988 *The Search for Architectural Remains at the Planter's House and the Slave Settlement, Richmond Hill Plantation, Georgetown County, South Carolina.* Research Manuscript Series 205. South Carolina. Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Miller, Henry and Lynne Lewis

1978 Zoocultural Resource Utilization at a Low Country South Carolina Plantation. In *The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers* 1977 Volume 12. Edited by Stanley South. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia. Pp.250-265.

Mintz, Sydney and Richard Price

1976 *An Anthropological Approach to the Afro-American Past: A Caribbean Perspective.* Occasional Papers in Social Change No. 2. Institute for the Study of Human Issues, Philadelphia.

Morgan, Edmund S.

1975 *American Slavery American Freedom. The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia.* W.W. Norton and Company. New York and London.

Morgan, Phillip

1982 Work and Culture: The Task System and the World of Low County Blacks, 1700 to 1880. *The William and Mary Quarterly.* Vol. XXXIX (4):563-599.

Noble, Vergil E.

1996 Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow: A Plea for Change in the Practice of Historical Archaeology. *Historical Archaeology* 30(2):74-84.

Noel Hume, Ivor

1962 An Indian Ware of the Colonial Period. *Quarterly Bulletin, Archaeological Society of Virginia* 17:1.

Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management

1994 South Carolina's Coastal Zone Management Act: Coastal Tidelands and Wetlands. Chapter 39 of Title 48 of the 1976 Code, as Amended. Administered by the S.C. Department of Health and Environmental Controls' Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management. Beaufort, South Carolina.

1999 OCRM Regulations. Rules and Regulations for Permitting in the Critical Areas of the Coastal Zone. S.C. Department of Health and Environmental Control Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management. Beaufort, South Carolina.

Ogata, Kerry L.

1995 African American Women and Medicine: Expanding Interpretations of Colono Ware. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

Otto, John Solomon

1975 Status Differences and the Archaeological Record- A Comparison of Planter, Overseer, and Slave Sites from Cannon's Point Plantation (1794-1861). St. Simon's Island, Georgia. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Florida, Gainesville, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.

1984 *Cannon's Point Plantation, 1794-1860: Living Conditions and Status Patterns in the Old South*. Academic Press, New York.

Orser, Charles and Annette Nekola

1985 Plantation Settlement from Slavery to Tenancy: An Example from a Piedmont Plantation in South Carolina. In The *Archaeology of Slavery and Plantation Life*, edited by Teresa Singleton, pp. 67-98. Academic Press, Orlando.

Orser, Charles and Annette Nekola and James Roark

1987 *Exploring the Rustic Life Volume II.* Multidisciplinary Research at Millwood Plantation, a Large Piedmont Plantation in Abbeville County, South Carolina, and Elbert County, Georgia. Prepared for Archaeological Services Division, National Park Service, Southeast Region, Atlanta. Prepared by Mid-American Research Center, Loyola University of Chicago, Illinois.

Parsons, Jeffrey R.

1972 Archaeological Settlement Patterns. *Annual Review of Anthropology. Volume 1.* Annual Reviews, Inc., Palo Alto. Pp.127-150.

Poplin, Eric and Colin Brooker

1994 *The Historical Development of Dataw Island: Architectural and Archaeological Investigations at the Sams Plantation Complex*. Brockington and Associates, Charleston and Brooker Architectural Design Consultants, Beaufort.

Poplin, Eric and Michael Scardaville

1991 *Archaeological Data Recovery at Long Point Plantation (38CH321) Mark Clark Expressway (I-526) Charleston County, South Carolina*. Prepared for The South Carolina Department of Highways and Public Transportation. Prepared by Brockington and Associates, Atlanta.

Redfield, Robert and Ralph Linton and Melville Herskovits

1936 Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation. *American Anthropologist* 38(149-152).

Sartorio, Alessia

1994 The Path Least Traveled: Religion and Ritual as Interpretive Frameworks in African-American Archaeology. Unpublished masters thesis. Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

Schlasko, Ellen

2002 Frenchmen and Africans in South Carolina: Cultural Interaction on the Eighteenth-Century Frontier. In *Another's Country: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on Cultural Interactions in the Southern Colonies*, edited by J.W. Joseph and Martha Zierden, pp. 133-144. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

South, Stanley A.

1971 *Archeology at the Charles Towne Site (38CH1) On Albemarle Point in South Carolina. Part 1.* Research Manuscript Series #10. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

1974 *Palmetto Parapets*. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology Anthropological Study Series No.1. University of South Carolina, Columbia.

1977 *Method and Theory in Historical Archeology*. Academic Press.

1978 Pattern Recognition in Historical Archaeology. *American Antiquity*. 43(2):223-230.

1991 Draft. Strange Seed: Historical Archeology 1972-1977. To be presented at the Society for Historical Archaeology Meetings, Jamaica, January 1992. On file at the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia.

South, Stanley and Michael Hartley

1980 *Deep Water and High Ground: Seventeenth Century Low Country Settlement*. Research Manuscript Series No. 166. Prepared by the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina. Columbia.

Steen, Carl

1999 Stirring the Ethnic Stew in the South Carolina Backcountry: John de la Howe and Lethe Farm. In *Historical Archaeology, Identity Formation, and the Interpretation of Ethnicity*, edited by Maria Franklin and Garrett Fesler, pp. 93-120. Colonial Williamsburg Research Publications, Williamsburg, Virginia.

2002 John de la Howe and the Second Wave of French Refugees in the South Carolina Colony: Defining, Maintaining, and Losing Ethnicity on the Passing Frontier. In *Another's Country: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on Cultural Interactions in the Southern Colonies*, edited by J.W. Joseph and Martha Zierden, pp. 145-160. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Steen, Carl, Niels Taylor and Suzanne Rauton (compilers)

1994 *An Annotated Bibliography of Historic Sites Archaeology in the South Carolina Lowcountry Counties of Charleston, Berkeley and Dorchester*. Prepared by Diachronic Research Foundation. Prepared under a grant from the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia.

Singleton, Teresa

1990 African-American Archaeology. Newsletter of the African-American Archaeology Network. Department of Anthropology, Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC. Spring 1990. Number 1.

Stine, Linda F., Paul E. Brockington, Jr., Connie M. Huddleston

1994 *Searching for the Slave Village at Snee Farm Plantation: The 1987 Archaeological Investigation.* Prepared for the National Park Service Southeast Archaeological Center. Prepared by Brockington and Associates of Atlanta.

Stine, Linda F., Mark Groover, and Melanie Cabak

1996 Blue Beads as African-American Cultural Symbols. *Historical Archaeology* 30(3): 49-75.

Stine, Linda F., Martha Zierden, Lesley M. Drucker, Christopher Judge

1997 Carolina's Historical Landscapes: Archaeological Perspectives. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Trinkley, Michael

1977 Science with a small "s." *SEAC Newsletter. Southeastern Archaeological Conference*. Vol. 19, No. 2. October 1977. pp. 7-10.

1986 A Rich Man's Wealth: An Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Elfie Plantation. In Problems and Promises in Plantation Research. Chester DePratter, editor. *Journal of the Archaeological Society of South Carolina* V. 18 (1 and 2): 1-8.

Trinkley, Michael, Natalie Adams, and Debi Hacker

1995 *Broom Hall Plantation: "A Good One and In a Pleasant Neighborhood"*. Research Series 44. Chicora Foundation, Inc., Columbia, S.C.

Trinkley, Michael and Debi Hacker

2003 *Archaeology at an Eighteenth Century Slave Settlement in Goose Creek, South Carolina*. Research Series 57, Chicora Foundation, Inc. Columbia, S.C.

Upton, Dell

1988 White and Black Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century Virginia. In *Material Life in America, 1600-1868*, edited by Robert Blair St. George, pp. 357-369. Northeastern University Press, Boston.

Vlach, John Michael

1980 Arrival and Survival: The Maintenance of an Afro-American Tradition in Folk Art and Craft. In *Perspectives on American Folk Art*, edited by Ian M.G. Quimby and Scott T. Swank. A Winterthur Book. Pp. 177-217.

Wayne, Lucy B.

1997 "Burning Brick and Making a Large Fortune at It Too": Landscape Archaeology and Lowcountry Brickmaking. In *Carolina's Historical Landscapes: Archaeological Perspectives,* pp. 97-112. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Wayne, Lucy B. and Martin Dickinson

1990 *Four Men's Ramble: Archaeology in the Wando Neck Charleston County, South Carolina*. Prepared for Dunes West Development. Prepared by Southarc, Gainesville, Florida.

Wheaton, Thomas and P. Garrow

1985 Acculturation and the Archaeological Record in the Carolina Lowcountry. In *The Archaeology of Slavery and Plantation Life*, edited by Theresa Singleton, pp. 239-260. Academic Press, New York.

Wheaton, Thomas R., Amy Friedlander, and Patrick Garrow

1983 *Yaughan and Curriboo Plantations: Studies in Afro-American Archaeology*. Prepared for the National Park Service, Southeastern Regional Office, Archeology Branch. Contract No. C-5950(79). Prepared by Soil Systems, Inc., Marietta.

Wood, Peter

1974 *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 Through the Stono Rebellion*. W.W. Norton, New York.

Zierden, Martha

1986 The Rural-Urban Connection in the South Carolina Lowcountry. In *Problems and Promises in Plantation Research*. Chester DePratter, editor. *Journal of the Archaeological Society of South Carolina*. Columbia. V. 18 (1 and 2):33-39.

1988 The Past and the Present: African-American Archeology in Charleston, South Carolina. In *South Carolina Antiquities*. Christopher Judge, editor. Columbia. V. 20 (1 and 2).

Zierden, Martha and Lesley Drucker and Jeanne Calhoun

1986 *Home Upriver: Rural Life on Daniel's Island, Berkeley County, South Carolina.* Prepared for the South Carolina Department of Highways and Public Transportation. Prepared by Carolina Archaeological Services of Columbia and The Charleston Museum.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In the late 1970s, Skylab was falling, and ‘Mr. Bill’ did fall down the auger hole at Cooper River. Nonetheless South Carolina Plantation Archaeology survived. Thanks to those who shared their memories of plantation archaeology, especially during the early years. This includes, but is not limited to Nancy Brock, Fritz Aichelle, Pat Garrow, Michael Trinkley, Martha Zierden, Stanley South, Leland Ferguson, Joe Joseph, Tom Wheaton, Bill Lees, Ken Lewis and Carl Steen. Their comments have been taken under advisement, but we note this interpretation is our own.