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ABSTRACT

This dissertation investigates inhabitants of a ridge near the present-day Fred W. Smith National Library for the Study of George Washington at Mount Vernon, Virginia. Excavations of this area from 2008-2010 uncovered three clusters of artifacts dating from 1800-1830, during Bushrod Washington’s ownership of Mount Vernon. Investigators argued that these clusters represented either three house sites or a combination of houses and an outbuilding. Researchers could find no documentary evidence that anyone lived in this area during Bushrod’s tenure.

My research employs a mixture of historical anthropological and archival analysis, archaeological analysis and evaluation of comparative evidence to examine various hypotheses about who lived at this ridge. I examine what can be told about this site from these various lines of evidence and argue that individuals previously enslaved by George Washington lived at this site. I explore what the remaining questions about this site show about how anthropologists understand racial constructs and the ways that structural racism shapes the discipline.

The Mount Vernon sites analyzed in this study illuminate how the enduring impact of past forms of structural racism continues to shape both diversity within archaeology and how archaeologists investigate and interpret sites occupied by marginalized groups. I examine how the interplay between these issues and historic preservation laws and practices can make it difficult to protect sites associated with marginalized groups. As a result, preservation laws nominally designed to protect historic sites actually act in an exclusionary manner and promote disparity in whose heritage we choose to preserve.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This project examines anthropological and archaeological understandings of race and marginalization. I investigate how historical forms of structural and institutional racism impact the types of objects that archaeologists recover from a site. However, these forms of racism are not limited to historical contexts. Similar attitudes also pervade the discipline as it exists today, shaping how we approach, understand, and preserve archaeological sites. To illustrate these issues, I use a ridge at George Washington’s Mount Vernon, which includes two study areas referred to as The Library site and Field 7 (Figure 1), as a case study. This area is somewhat of a mystery. It appears on a map from the 1850s as Field 7. However, 18th and early 19th century maps show it as lightly wooded and, as I discuss, none of the Washingtons wrote about this piece of land or its occupants.

Using documentary evidence, artifact analysis, and comparative research, I evaluate various hypotheses about who may have occupied this area and show that free African Americans were the most likely residents. However, the difficulties faced when trying to understand the occupation of this ridge illustrate the continued problems archaeologists face in trying to recognize, understand, and interpret race in the archaeological record. This project highlights the need to draw on comparative analysis when trying to understand sites occupied by economically and racially marginalized people. It also highlights the way past forms of systemic racism continue to impact both the artifacts that archaeologists recover and the shape of the discipline itself.

Between 2008-2010, Mount Vernon archaeologists conducted excavations near this area in preparation for the construction of the Fred W. Smith National Library for the Study of
George Washington’s. They found a dense clustering of artifacts in three locations, but uncovered no features, such as hearth bases or foundations (Chisholm 2011; White 2012). Artifact distributions suggest the presence of three house sites or a combination of houses and outbuildings (Breen 2015). Historic maps do not indicate any occupation, activity, or cultivation of the area during Bushrod’s tenure (1800-1829). Maps from the time of John Augustine Washington II and Jane

Figure 1: A map of the modern layout of George Washington’s Mount Vernon, made by the archaeology department in preparation for the Field 7 survey (this area is noted on the map as the proposed survey area). I circled the approximate location of the library site in green. I also circled the location of the Mansion house in blue to give a better understanding of the relationship and distance between these different areas.
Washington’s management (approximately 1829-1845) indicate that cultivation began in the 1830s, which coincides with the end of the site’s occupation (Breen 2015).

At the same time, payments from the executor’s account indicate that at least six former enslaved laborers of George Washington remained at Mount Vernon during Bushrod’s occupation, although it is unclear where they lived (Executor Account Books; White pers. comm). Runaway ads and visitor accounts reference at least two additional former slaves living at the plantation. The ridge on which both Field 7 and the Library site are located is close to a historic African American cemetery, which was possibly in use as early as the 1820s (Downer 2015). Based on this evidence, Mount Vernon archaeologists hypothesize that former George Washington slaves may have occupied this land (Breen 2015; White pers. comm.).

In December 2015, Mount Vernon archaeologists and I conducted shovel testing on land across the street from the Library site. This land, known as Field 7, is on the same ridge as the Library site but located on National Park Service land and therefore was not tested during the initial investigations. As part of this dissertation project, I analyze our findings from Field 7. Based on these findings, we believe no further excavations are necessary.

The overall goals of the dissertation are 1) to understand what can be told about the Library site occupants, and 2) examine what the gaps in knowledge, coupled with the site preservation choices, can tell us about how anthropologists understand race and how structural and systemic racism shapes archaeological practices. To achieve these goals, I focus on several major questions: What can I tell about the Library site and surrounding area using historical, archaeological, and comparative analysis? To the extent that there are unknowns about who occupied the site, what does that say about how archaeologists recognize and understand race in the archaeological record? How do those issues play into problems in historic preservation?
What are ways that archaeologists can improve our understanding of ephemeral sites when we do not have historical records to confirm who lived at a site?

I have four major hypotheses as to who lived at the Mount Vernon ridge: 1) free African Americans who were formerly enslaved by George Washington (the hypothesis put forward by Mount Vernon archaeologists); 2) enslaved laborers owned by Bushrod Washington; 3) white tenant farmers; 4) or white specialized laborers. I show that, taken as a whole, the documentary, archaeological, and comparative analyses indicate that in fact former enslaved laborers of George Washington most likely lived at this site, although this conclusion is not definitive.

The difficulty in conclusively saying who lived at this site highlights archaeologists’ continued difficulty in recognizing race in the archaeological record. Part of this difficulty stems from historic forms of racism that both shapes the types of materials and structures found at sites occupied by marginalized people and often results in a lack of documentary evidence from and about people of color. However, the problems archaeologists face recognizing race also stem from the impact of systemic racism on the discipline, which shapes archaeological methodologies and understandings.

These continued issues also contribute to the continued difficulties in protecting archaeological sites occupied by racially and economically marginalized people. To this end, I examine and critique the ways that we determine which sites are archeologically significant. Historic preservation is also shaped by systemic racism and laws do not account for the house sites of marginalized people who possibly lived in ephemeral and impermanent structures. This understanding continues to marginalize in the present those who society marginalized in the past, perpetuating this system of racism.
Through this project, I examine the nature of sites potentially associated with racially and economically marginalized people. I consider our ability to recognize these sites and explain them in the archaeological record. I illustrate the need to move beyond the use of integrity as the primary determinant of the significance of an archaeological site, as this gives primacy to elite, Anglo-American sites. Through this examination, I push the boundaries of how we classify archaeological sites to create a more inclusive understanding of the past. This investigation helps further how archaeologists understand the lives of people whom Americans often leave out of our histories, whether they be free African Americans or other groups of economically marginalized people.

This study highlights the issues both with understanding the Mount Vernon ridge and with protecting sites associated with non-whites and other marginalized groups. Based on these problems, I argue for major changes that are necessary to address the systemic racism that both shapes and is embedded in archaeology and historic preservation. It is important to have increased representation of people of color within archaeology, historic preservation, and historic foundations. This diversity needs to go beyond sites that are examined, interpreted, and protected. It is also important to increase the diversity of students, professors, and practitioners. I also advocate for the creation of new preservation laws and the need to re-evaluate the National Historic Preservation Act. Such changes can help create historic preservation guidelines that enable archaeologists to better protect non-white sites.

In Chapter Two, I explain my theoretical framework based on anthropological ideas of laws and politics, the social construction of races; and relational archaeology. I also examine how the concept of the household provides one way of looking at relationships. This theoretical framework provides both an avenue to explore interesting questions about how archaeologists
understand race and identity. This discussion also illustrates the impact of systemic racism on the archaeological record and the discipline itself.

Chapter Three explores the history of African diaspora archaeology and considers the changing trends in its research questions and interpretation. I review the flaws and strengths of different interpretations, as well as how our understanding and approaches to race and ethnicity have changed over time. I also examine the ways in which both African diaspora archaeologists and historians have researched free African Americans. In doing so, I place my research in the broader trajectory of historical archaeology and explain how it expands on these trends.

In the fourth chapter, I use historical and legal documents to explore the historical background of Mount Vernon from the time of George Washington’s tenure through the early 1830s. I examine the lives of enslaved African Americans both at the Mansion House and the outlying farm. I explain what happened to the enslaved African Americans who lived at Mount Vernon following his death in 1799.

I then discuss Mount Vernon under Bushrod Washington, including what we know about the former slaves of George Washington who remained at the estate, as well as how Bushrod viewed race, slavery, and free African Americans. These views are important to understand, since they impact the relationships in which the occupants of the ridge were involved. Using different lines of evidence, I examine who may have lived at the ridge and explain why former slaves of George Washington were the most likely occupants.

Chapter Four also examines the various laws that Virginia legislators passed during this period to constrain the movement and actions of free African Americans. Throughout the time during which people occupied the Library site, legislators passed increasingly harsh laws that
impacted free African Americas. Legislators designed these laws to control the growing free African American population, which white slaveholders viewed as a threat to the institution of slavery. These laws and perspectives impacted the lives of the Library site’s residents.

Chapter Five discusses the changing landscape and geography of the Mount Vernon ridge on which the Library and Field 7 sites are located as well as the history of archaeological investigations at the ridge. I examine the different excavations that have been carried out at the Library site both by Mount Vernon archaeologists and by the Virginia Research Center for Archaeology (VCRA). I explain the methodologies used in these different investigations and their significant findings. I also discuss our 2015 follow-up investigation at Field 7, along the same ridge.

In Chapter Six, I analyze the artifacts found at the Library site using datasets compiled in Microsoft Excel, including examining the domestic and architectural material, and discussing the minimum number of vessels counts for various ceramics. I consider the amount, size, and quality of various glassware and ceramics recovered from the site. I investigate issues of consumer choice and how the residents used the environment in daily life. I present an alternate explanation for who may have lived at this site based on the findings and explain why this alternate hypothesis is unlikely to be true. I also examine the findings from the Field 7 shovel testing and consider the possible connections between the residents of Field 7 and those of the Library site.

Chapter Seven compares the findings from this ridge located at Mount Vernon to other Virginia sites occupied by free African Americans, enslaved African Americans, and poor whites. Through these comparisons, I can see the types of material differences that existed between African Americans and poor whites living in towns, and thus closer to markets, and the
individuals living at the Mount Vernon ridge. I examine how the objects owned by enslaved African Americans differed from those owned by free African Americans. This comparison shows not just differential access to goods and different values, but also the various activities in which each group participated.

Further, comparing the assemblage of the Library site to those recovered from other sites occupied by white overseers and tenant farmers in Virginia helps support the idea that formerly enslaved African Americans may have occupied the Library site. I also investigate how racial categorization and the presence or lack of a community impacted how people constructed their identities. I consider how different environmental affordances affected the relational networks at these sites and impacted the material culture used by these different groups.

In Chapter Eight, I discuss historic preservation in United States archaeology and the criteria by which archaeological sites are judged to determine if they are historically significant. This examination addresses both the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and how private foundations choose which sites to preserve. Often the criteria used to determine if a site is historically significant privileges sites owned by wealthy Anglo-American men.

I do not intend this criticism to imply that archaeologists are racist. However, the criteria used in the NHPA were primarily chosen by white men to preserve the things they viewed as important, which may differ from the perspectives of local communities. Even though private foundations, such as Mount Vernon, do not have to follow the NHPA, these criteria still often impact what archaeological sites these organizations choose to preserve. As a result, it can be challenging to protect sites occupied in the past by racially and economically marginalized individuals, engendering the creation of very particular historical narratives that ignore the roles
of marginalized people. I discuss ways of broadening our criteria to help create more inclusive histories.

Finally, Chapter Nine presents concluding remarks and suggests some future directions for research addressing free African Americans and other racially and economically marginalized people. I end this dissertation with a summary of the significant findings of my analysis and comparison. I discuss what the results can tell us about both the lives of the people who lived at Mount Vernon as well as economically and racially marginalized people in general. I examine some avenues of future investigation as well as the steps that I undertook to facilitate this additional research.

This dissertation project increases our knowledge of the lives of free African Americans in the antebellum South, an understudied area. It will also further our understanding of the relationship between law and forms of structural violence and oppression. People’s culturally ascribed racial statuses have real and lasting social, spatial, and material implications. These effects impact how we recognize sites as historically significant today.

Through my examination of the Mount Vernon ridge, this project examines how we investigate, understand, and protect sites associated with racially and economically marginalized people. While these sites may lack integrity and have ephemeral features, they may still be locally essential and can be crucial to creating more inclusive histories. Through a better understanding of these sites and the laws and methods associated with historic preservation, I show how archaeology is impacted by past and current forms of systemic racism. I also challenge the field to make the changes necessary to promote diversity both within the field and in regards to the types of sites that archaeologists deem worthy of protection.
CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL UNDERSTANDINGS OF RACE AND RACISM

This project draws on and examines anthropological understandings of race. Here, race is a fluid social construction, partially created through laws, that helps shape people’s relationships and identities. Although socially constructed, race has real world social and material impacts on racially marginalized groups, and the historical impacts of racism continue to have influence in the present. In the field of archaeology, social constructions of race help shape who conducts archaeology, how archaeologists excavate sites, the material remains that archaeologists recover, and which archaeological sites are preserved. These factors then in turn impact the construction of memory and the molding of national histories.

In the first part of this chapter, I examine anthropological understandings of race as a social construct that has very real social and biological impacts on people deemed racially inferior. Part II examines the role that laws play in the social construction of race and how historical race relationships influence laws. I also discuss how racial marginalization can directly impact the types of sites and artifacts recovered by archaeologists.

The second part of this chapter also examines major political and legal theories about social categories. These theories discuss the different ways that classes and statuses form in society. They consider the roles of law and politics in the classification of people, how classification shapes social relationships, and the ways that laws use classification to subjugate those without power. This classification can then create perceptions that certain groups of people are inferior, and this perception can engender new laws that control the rights of marginalized people. I also explain how these theories connect to events in colonial and Early Republic Virginia.
Finally, Part III discusses the relationship between historic preservation, landscape, and the creation of social memory. Preservation is one of the ways that we help to create national historical narratives and memories. By using criteria that privileges Anglo-Americans, we enable the destruction of sites associated with economic and racial minorities, causing us to forget their communities and contributions.

**Part I: Anthropological Understandings of Race**

Racial categories are culturally constructed by specific societies. As the American Anthropological Association observes, the physical differences which form perceptions of race have no value “except the social ones that humans put on them” (AAA Statement on Race 1998). As many anthropologists note, racial categories and classifications are primarily based on perceived physical and cultural differences, but can also include other aspects such as wealth, marriage, and ancestry (Baker 2001; Epperson 1991; Orser 2004, 2007; Smedley 1998). These categories are imposed on people and groups and are used to marginalize and discriminate against people who do not fit in specific racial categories (Orser 2004).

Both Orser and Smedley view racialization as a process in which society categorizes people. Orser (2004, 2007) explains that in the process of racialization, a socially constructed racial group is compared to other racial groups and judged as inferior to some and superior to others, which creates a racial hierarchy. Smedley (1993: 6) posits that racialization began as a way for people to “interpret human differences, both biological and cultural.” Both view racialization as a process in which society assigns people to essentialized groups, which allows them to be viewed as socially or biologically unequal due to cultural practices and “phenotypical or other readily identifiable characteristics” (see Orser 2004, 2007, Smedley 1993: 6, 9).
Scholars argue that "race", at least as people in the United States understand it, was a social mechanism invented during the late 17th century to refer to those populations brought together in colonial America: the English and other European settlers, the conquered Indian peoples, and those peoples brought from Africa to provide slave labor (Baker 2001; Breen and Innes 1980; Epperson 1991; Smedley 1993). As ideologies about human differences developed, racial ideologies in different ways in the various European colonial regimes across the world.

Race became a strategy for dividing, ranking, and controlling colonized people used by colonial powers everywhere (Epperson 1991; Kendi 2016; Orser 2004). Orser (2004:150) also argues that in a slave society, a person’s status as free or enslaved may also play a role in how he or she is racialized. This intersectional notion of racialization is crucial to this dissertation as it suggests that a group’s position in a racial structure is based on more than skin color, creating the possibility that society may place phenotypically similar people in different positions in its structure (Crenshaw 1989, 1991, 2019).

Part II: Law and the Social Construction of Race

Law plays a role in the cultural construction of race and makes “racial categories seemingly immutable, natural, and permanent” (Epperson 1991). The naturalization and normalization of race is important since “race is only real” because people believe it to be so (White 2015). Smedley (1998) argues that from the 17th century onwards, the law was implicated in the social construction of race. Laws helped both reify and legitimize racial categories, as well as define their membership. Moreover, the law helped establish a hierarchy of “‘races’ for social, economic, and political purposes” (Smedley 1998).
Several anthropological and sociological scholars explore how law and politics help shape social categories, relationships, and the ways in which these categories and relationships in turn shape laws. For example, Pierre Bourdieu (1991) examines how power impacts and shapes the relationship between politics and social categories. He argues that people participate in multiple social fields during their lives, such as economics, politics, and ethnicity. Each of these fields contains different classes and different types of class struggles (Bourdieu 1991:169). Bourdieu claims that classes do not exist as real groups (Bourdieu 1991:232). That is, there is nothing inherent in classes such that all members of a particular class necessarily see themselves as members of a group. Rather, people who belong to the same class may be more likely to come together and form a group due to their shared life experiences and daily struggles (Bourdieu 1991:232).

Similarly, Max Weber (2012) observed that while social classes do not exist as real groups, they can provide the basis for communal action. On the other hand, he views status groups as real (Weber 2012:311-315). Weber distinguishes between class, which is based on economics, and status, which is based on a specific style of life as well as expectations of social behavior. So, in his understanding of relationships, similarities in people’s lifestyle and social behavior cause them to necessarily group together, whereas economic position does not (Weber 2012:311-315). However, Weber posits that there is a relationship between status and economics stratification because status is related to the monopolization of “material goods or opportunities” (Weber 2012:316).

Weber further argues that statuses influence people’s relationships, and that statuses provide restrictions on the way people interact and relate with members of other status groups, leading to forms of social castes (Weber 2012:314-315). He argues that ethnicities are status
groups that have evolved into a closed caste. The development of ethnic groups only happens in situations where status differences between different people are said to be ethnic, although it is unclear what he means by ethnic or how this idea differs from racial categories (Weber 2012:316).

Weber also connects law to the construction of social order. He argues that the existence of law necessitates a probability that a specific order will be upheld by people who will seek conformity through “physical or psychical compulsion” (Weber 2012:310). He further claims that the “structure of every legal order directly influences the distribution of power, economic or otherwise,” which engenders a relationship between people’s legal rights and their cultural status (Weber 2012:310).

Through his examination of the social order, Weber discusses how political parties attempt to gain social power in a variety of ways (Weber 2012:310). He explains that the goals of a party extend from both the causes in which its members believe as well as the personal goals of the members. Furthermore, a party’s communal actions are aimed toward maintaining their influence on the existing dominion (Weber 2012:318-319). These ideas can be seen in Virginia during the period of my investigation. Political parties in colonial and Early Republic Virginia attempted to acquire and maintain social power by enacting laws that created and supported a specific social structure that kept them in control.

Unlike Weber, Bourdieu (1991:232) argues that classes form when people mobilize based on a shared living situation. This situation can be based on more than just economics. Other forms of social categorization may also engender class formation. While classes do not exist as actual groups, they play a role in how people relate to each other and form groups (Bourdieu 1991:231-232). The presence of classes shapes peoples’ relationships, and impacts life choices
such as who they marry, with whom the associate, and where they live, reinforcing categorization (Bourdieu 1991). Classes are, therefore, “sets of agents who occupy similar positions” and have every chance of having essentially the same “similar interests, dispositions, stances, etc.” (Bourdieu 1991:231).

While Bourdieu (1991:230) draws on many Marxian concepts in his theories, he argues that one failing of Marxist theory is that it reduces the social world solely to an economic field. People’s social positions are therefore only defined in that particular field. According to Bourdieu (1991:230), Marx ignores the social positions that are based on legal categorization and status in other fields. While Marx does not consider how social class and economics interact with other aspects of identity, Bourdieu (1991) shows that the social world is multi-dimensional and contains fields (such as education, politics, bureaucracy, arts, etc.) which are strongly and directly related to the field of economic production.

Drawing on Weber, Bourdieu (1991:239, 245) defines politics as the struggle for the legitimate control of symbolic violence, or the power to impose knowledge and expressions of social reality. Bourdieu argues that the struggle for symbolic power and the control of symbolic violence does not just exist in electoral politics. Political struggles are also present in various other fields in which people participate, such as the academic, economic, and religious arenas (Bourdieu 245). Those with power in these different fields help create social categories and construct a vision of the world (Bourdieu 1991).

Bourdieu claims that the stakes of politics are the creation of common sense and the control over symbolic power, which is the ability to constitute what is perceived as given: making people see and believe the world in a certain way (Bourdieu 1991:221-226). This creation is achieved through a monopoly over legitimate naming (Bourdieu 1991:221). By this,
he means the official imposition by leaders of a seemingly legitimate vision of the social world through the creation of social divisions and the construction of social categories.

The creation of social divisions and the placement of people within these categories through politics helps shape how the public views the world and makes this categorization seem like something inherent (Bourdieu 1991). Bourdieu (1991:226) argues that as part of this process, “nothing is less innocent” than how we categorize people. The placement of people into categories shapes how individuals understand and relate to each other. It can help create classes and lead the formation of social groups (Bourdieu 1991). The political struggles in each of the fields in which individuals participate impact how they view the world.

Bourdieu (1991:226) claims that the question of knowing pertinent criteria to include in the creation of social categories is not an innocuous one. These criteria can include things that are seemingly “objective,” such as ancestry, territory, language, religion, economic activity, as well as subjective properties such as the feeling of belonging (Bourdieu 1991:226). Struggles over identity, Bourdieu (1991:226) argues, exist fundamentally through recognition by other people, concerning the imposition of categories of perception and the perception of categories.

Throughout the colonial period, Virginia legislators passed laws that named particular groups and specified their relationships with other groups. Legislators based these categories on religion, heritage, and cultural differences (Wolf 2006). Through this naming, a performative enactment of identity, these legislators helped make these groups real, constructing a particular social order and imposing racial identities onto other people. When lawmakers created new laws in the early 19th century to restrict the rights of free African Americans, they helped reshape the social divisions in the state (Wolf 2006).
On the ground, however, officials have not always carried out laws restricting the rights of certain racialized groups (Ely 2004). In some cases, the social divisions within a local area overrode the social order that state legislators envisioned (Bourdieu 1991). Moreover, racially marginalized people sometimes find ways of negotiating and resisting forms of structural racism. We must, therefore, understand the law as a means through which white legislators constructed their identity as white, and simultaneously racialized others. Law shaped critical aspects of identity, including who is legally determined to be white based on specific heritage, skin color, and perceived differences (see Baker 2001; Epperson 1991; Wolf 2006). When these laws were carried out at a local level, it helped to reinforce the differences that lawmakers created through their naming and categorization (Bourdieu 1991; Collier et al. 1995; Epperson 1991).

Legislators also created the legal entitlements that arose from having a specific racial status (Collier et al. 1995; Moore 2005). Those with more power and agency could more easily use the law to further their interests than could those whom they subjugated. Law helped create and reinforce a social hierarchy that privileged those in charge and helped enable them to remain in power (Collier et al. 1996).

Law is neither neutral nor a passive reflection of people’s beliefs. It both shapes and is shaped by our understanding of the world. As Barbra Yngvesson (2002) notes, the law is both shaped by local terms and produced through relations of power through which configurations of laws are defined. Jane Collier, Bill Mauer, and Liliana Suarez-Navaz (1996) also discuss how laws can shape social categories. They claim that the law not only enacts differences, but also provides a context for people to imagine how they differ. Laws help call forth persons with different and sometimes conflicting “natural” capacities and desires (Collier et al. 1996). They argue that law validates and requires seemingly natural identities, which are based on socially
constructed economic interests, even for people involved in struggles stressing identities (Collier et al. 1996).

They further argue that the use of law enables the members of dominant groups to blame minorities for their plight and encourages elites to develop a sense that culture is threatened (Collier et al. 1996). The essentialization and naturalization of race and ethnicity through law helps legitimize discrimination. Laws are produced through relations of power, in which “specific configurations of laws are desired” (Collier et al. 1996:12-13). By denying specific groups freedom and agency, law structures the preferences and identities of these groups.

Collier, Mauer, and Suarez-Navaz (1996) further argue that law can also elicit expressions of individual intention or will. The possibility of multiple, seemingly natural identities is inherent in the cultural logic of bourgeois legality from its inception. The authors claim that the production of law is explained in the context of ongoing relations of inequality, struggle, and cooperation (Collier et al. 1996).

These ideas can be seen in the changing legal treatment of free African Americans in Virginia during the occupation of the Library site at George Washington’s Mount Vernon. During this period, Virginia legislators feared the impact that Virginia’s rising free African American population would have on the institution of slavery (Wolf 2006). At the same time, the Haitian Revolution and Gabriel Prosser’s failed rebellion in Richmond, Virginia increased plantation owners’ concerns about possible enslaved uprisings in Virginia (Wolf 2006). As a result, white legislators created new laws limiting the rights of free African Americans. However, as Collier, Mauer, and Suarez-Navaz (1996) observe, members of oppressed groups often found ways to negotiate and navigate legal restrictions, often leading to new laws that
Engender new forms of agency (also see Newman 1983; Smedley 1993; Yngvesson 1989; Wolf 2006).

Laws help create and structure “official understandings” of the social world through their use of specific terms and categories and their ability “to shape cultural understandings of fairness, of justice, and morality” (Yngvesson 1989:1690-1692). Moreover, as Katherine Newman (1983:19) claims, law legitimates the social order it creates by making the “existing social relations normal, desirable, and just.” While culture shapes laws, laws are not “part of a pre-existing culture. Rather people create and form laws in ‘historical time’” (Moore 2005:176).

As these different ideas show, laws and politics play a role in the construction of race, along with many other social categories. Anthropologists argue that race is a culturally constructed category with no biological basis. Terrance Epperson (1991), Lee Baker (2001), and Audrey Smedley (1993, 1998) all point to the power of law in the cultural construction of race. Because people often view the law as timeless, unchanging, and natural, it takes socially constructed ideas and makes them seem natural. Epperson (1991) argues that through limiting the rights of particular social groups that possessed specific physical or cultural characteristics, laws helped construct and reify a racial hierarchy.

Legislation and the use of legal classification made racial categories seem real to ordinary people. As Epperson notes, laws help naturalize race because people often view the law as something “eternal, changeless, and above class and individual interest” (Epperson 1991:324). Lee Baker further argues that laws helped institutionalize race “as a way to structure society – subtly shifting inequality away from the social and grounding it in the natural” (Baker 2001:468).
Epperson argues that because “the Law is purportedly eternal, changeless, and above class and individual interest,” and seemingly exists “above, or outside of, daily human interaction,” law not only reifies race, it reifies the racial structure as well (1990: 324; also see Smedley 1998). At the same time, despite their fixed appearance, racial categories demonstrate historical fluidity, flexibility, and instability and, at times, can rapidly transform (Baker 1998: 1-2; Epperson 1990: 326; Smedley 1993: 32, 100-101).

In colonial Virginia, for example, people were at times classified as white regardless of skin color or cultural background. This category was connected to people’s status as free and the relationships in which people were involved (Schumann 2017). For example, during the 1730s and 1740s, the Williamsburg court classified Johanna Rawlinson as “free black,” then “white” for several years, and then “free black” again (Brewer 2005). In this case, the law based her classification on her romantic involvement with a wealthy white man. Similarly, several 18th-century personal property tax lists from southeastern Virginia classified free African Americans as “white” rather than “black” or “negro,” despite the existence of these categories (Schumann 2017).

Colonial and Early Republic Virginia provides a larger example of the connection of law in the development of conceptions of race. Following Bacon’s rebellion in 1676, the Virginia legislature passed a series of laws that separated people of different backgrounds and sought to limit and control interactions of African Americans and American Indians (Breen and Innes 1980; Epperson 1991; Smedley 1998).

Moreover, new laws in the late 17th and early 18th century prohibited marriage between whites and non-whites and subjected the children of whites and non-whites to harsh treatment (Epperson 1991). In 1705, the term white appeared in law for the first time, where it was
juxtaposed to the terms “negroes, mulattoes, and Indians” (Epperson 1991). Epperson (1991) claims ideas of race emerged through the naming of these social groups and through the proscription of their relationships in these laws.

During the Early Republic period, ideas of race in Virginia continued to change. In the early 19th century, Virginia legislators began enacting increasingly strict legal restrictions in response to the state’s rapidly increasing free African American population (Wolf 2006). These laws were both shaped by and helped to shape new racial ideas. They also decreased the economic opportunities for free African Americans in the state (Wolf 2006). As I discuss in Chapter Four, this new legislation impacted the lives of the former Washington slaves who likely lived at the Library site.

Racial ideas and categorization, shaped by laws, impact the economic prospects of racially marginalized people. Orser (2004, 2007) points out the clear historical association between people’s racial alignment and their economic potential. He argues that racial oppression and racism are a means of creating and upholding social and economic inequalities in capitalist societies (Orser 2004, 2007). W.E.B Du Bois (1994) argued that a consequence of the color line is that it prevented African American individuals from gaining social or economic equality.

These historical economic limitations created lasting effects that continue into the present. As Michael Harrington (1971:482) observes, even if we eliminated race-based laws, the “poverty that is the historical and institutionalized consequence of color” will remain. These forms of structural racism impacted the types of material remains that archaeologists recover. For example, in the 18th and 19th centuries, tenant farmers, free and enslaved African Americans, and the poorest members of societies often lived in log cabins. In some places, archaeologists have difficulties finding free African American communities, because log structures do not leave a
discernible mark in the same manner as a post-in-the-ground structure (Lounsbury 2010). In other locations, urban renewal and plowing destroyed features and the integrity of sites (Lounsbury 2010; Ridout 2014). Further, as I discuss in the next chapter, free African Americans often, but not always, owned lesser quality ceramics than middle class and elite whites. Such goods tend to have poorer preservation and identifiable characteristics in the archaeological record.

Historical forms of systemic racism continue to impact present-day archaeology in other ways as well. Colonial and antebellum laws created a system of racism that later led to Jim Crow laws and redlining. Systemic racism still impacts to whom banks choose to lend money, continuing to shape in which communities and areas African Americans are enabled to live. Historical racism therefore impacts which primary and secondary schools minorities can attend and the colleges that minorities are accepted into. As a result of the economic and social stresses caused by racism, racial minorities who attend college are often pressured to study more apparently useful and profitable disciplines. These groups often do not pursue careers in anthropology and archaeology (Babiarz 2011).

Historical forms of structural and systemic racism therefore continue to influence who gets to practice and teach archaeology and who is hired to work at certain foundations and Cultural Resource Management firms. These problems in turn shape the methodologies that archaeologists use to investigate archaeological sites, interpretation of those sites, and the value archaeologists place on these sites, which I discuss more in depth in Chapter 8. This racism leads to continued issues in interpretation of race in the archaeological record, as I will illustrate with the difficulties faced in understanding the Library site.

Part III: Racism and the Construction of Memory
The lack of racial minorities in the field of archaeology is problematic, particularly because archaeology and preservation help to shape the history that Americans are taught. One of the main public functions of archaeology and historic preservation is to aid in the construction of national and local historical narratives. Archaeology plays a major role in the reinterpretation of the past and the recreation of social memory (Paynter et al. 1994; Shackel 2003). Moreover, archaeological excavations have the potential to uncover forgotten parts of the past and give voice to those past people who were previously erased or silenced (Moyer 2015; Paynter et al. 1994; Shackel 2003; Schortman and Urban 2011).

Neither history nor memory is ever purely objective; they are socially constructed. The sensory experience of engaging with the physical world is implicated in this process. The landscape produces and negotiates aspects of social memory by helping to both commemorate and elide aspects of the past. Ruth Van Dyke (2010:277), for example views memory as “the selective preservation, construction, and obliteration of ideas about the past.” Our sensual engagements with the world shape our memories and ideas of history. Bodily experiences, meanings, and landscapes are intertwined and “inextricably bound up with remembrance and with time” (Van Dyke 2010:278).

Van Dyke (2009:22) further notes that memories are a “particularly contested and contestable domain” and that parts of “the past are memorialized, erased, celebrated, hidden, reinvented, and fabricated,” which challenges social groups in the present. After all, people misrepresent, fabricate, and manipulate parts of the past in order to address their needs in the present (Gillespie 2010:408; also see Shackel 2001). The use and manipulation of the landscape are further implicated in the construction of history, given the landscape’s role in the formation of social memory.
As the landscape changes, our historical narratives are also altered (Wasserman 2002). Thus, researching and commemorating historic sites associated with racially and economically marginalized people can bolster such people’s presence in public memory about the past. Unfortunately, public memory tends to reflect present-day conditions more than actual past events (Shackel 2001). What we value and the social conditions of the present often color how we remember the past. Moreover, the way that “the past is constantly brought forward into the present” promotes contested landscapes (Bender 1998:8). The way the present-day colors researchers’ interpretations of historic sites can leave some historical people out of public narratives and cause disagreements among present-day social groups over whose history society’s narratives remember (Bender 1998; Shackel 2001).

Forgetting is a major component of the construction of memories; acts of forgetting are often connected to what is visible in the landscape. According to Wendy Ashmore (2008:170), people “materially rewrit[e] history” by destroying and replacing buildings from earlier periods. How people remember, understand, and forget aspects of the past transforms when parts of the landscape are destroyed, transformed, reconstructed, or hidden (Mills 2008 82-83; also see Moyer 2015; Shackel 2001, 2003; Schortman and Urban 2011). Fabricating, erecting, and restoring buildings and landscapes can help support social memories, including those of mythic pasts and events that never occurred (Schortman and Urban 2011:6). Archaeological research often uncovers aspects of the landscape that were destroyed and parts of the past that present-day people do not remember. As archaeologists, we have the power to help insert forgotten people and events back into historical narratives. Archaeology, interpretation, and preservation practices impact the parts of the past included in or forgotten from our collective memories.
American heritage tourist attractions, such as Mount Vernon, are important in the creation of memories and histories (Paynter et al. 1994; Shackel 2003; Moyer 2015). These sites often pick a time period to which they reconstruct their buildings and interpret their landscape to the public. Sometimes it is a range. For example, Colonial Williamsburg focuses on the American Revolution and the years leading up to it. Mount Vernon focuses on 1799, the year of George Washington’s death. This interpretation practice means visitors do not hear about Bushrod Washington, his enslaved workforce, or the free African Americans who remained at the plantation. For historical preservation purposes, it is important to pick a time for restoration since architecture and interior design trends changed. However, focusing exclusively on one point in time silences and erases the history that came before and after.

Collective memory and public historical narratives involve not only remembering together but also forgetting together, and such collective amnesia often comes at the expense of marginalized groups. Archaeological sites are both a place of heritage as well as a place where heritage can be interpreted (Frankenberg 2014). However, the ways we judge whether an archaeological site is worthy of preservation or commemoration can lead us to undervalue historic sites associated with racial minorities. As a result, we also underestimate the roles that their residents played in shaping the past.

For many years, the common interpretation of heritage laws by archaeologists, State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO), and state review boards have caused us to overlook many sites important to the history of marginalized people (King 2012; Mayes 2016). There is little external public recognition of the relevance of many of these sites. The dearth of historical sites that we preserve, commemorate, and associate with marginalized people impacts our historical narrative; it perpetuates previous forms of structural racism in the ways we remember and
memorialize the past (Paynter et al. 1994). I examine the criteria for protection of archaeological sites, how these intersect with structural racism, and impact on the Library site in greater depth in Chapter 8.

The current pattern of neglecting sites formerly occupied by racial and economic minorities is reversible. How archaeologists, organizations, and companies interpret a historic site to the public can change over time to become more inclusive. Landscape and the development of cultural heritage have a role to play here. The continued “lack of historical places on our contemporary landscape that remind all persons of the omnipresence of African Americans throughout U.S. history” can encourage “cultural amnesia and contributes to the recreation of racism” (Paynter et al. 1994:314). Given the importance of landscape and material culture in memory making, we must consider how structural racism impacts whether sites associated with marginalized groups meet private or government criteria for preservation or commemorations. These perspectives on racialization support Bourdieu’s idea that nothing is less innocent than the categories we create and the criteria we use to categorize the world.

In the next chapter, I review the history of African diaspora archaeology. I explain the major themes and the questions that researchers in this area have tackled and how African diaspora archaeology has changed over the last 50 years. I examine how both archaeologists and historians have approached the study of free African Americans, both in Virginia and elsewhere, and I explain the strength and flaws of various approaches. Through this review, I place my research within this trajectory, explain how different approaches influenced my work, and how my work expands and improves on these earlier investigations.
CHAPTER THREE: RACE IN THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORD

Over the past 50 years, historical archaeologists have made significant strides in the study of both African diasporic individuals and communities, and racially and economically marginalized people. I examine how these studies mesh with anthropological understandings of race and the extent to which they impact archaeological methodologies and interpretations. In this chapter, I provide an overview, examine the major themes, and explore the current research directions in this field. I also place this dissertation’s research questions within the broader scope of the field. Through these discussions, I highlight both the strengths and the problematic aspects of archaeological and historical interpretations of racially and economically marginalized individuals.

In Part I of this chapter, I discuss early African diasporic archaeology, which primarily focused on enslaved African Americans. I examine the primary examples of the projects, research questions of these investigations, and their related issues. This section also examines more recent studies of ethnicity and the cultural construction of identity in African diaspora archaeology, with a particular emphasis on cultural interaction and change. Part II focuses on the explicit examination of race in archaeology, which began in the late 1990s. These investigations center on the cultural construction of race, how race differs from ethnicity, and the impact of racialization on the archaeological record.

Part III provides an overview of African diaspora household archaeology. These studies examine the relationship between people and space and consider how African American households formed and were maintained. In Part IV, I discuss the ways that different historians approached the study of antebellum free African Americans in Virginia. Finally, in Part V, I consider how archaeologists have approached the study of free African Americans and how these
different approaches influenced my investigation and interpretation of the Library site and Field 7 at Mount Vernon.

**Part I: Early Archaeology of Enslaved African Americans**

The archaeology of African American life began in the 1940s, and in the 1960s Charles Fairbanks carried out one of the first major plantation archaeological projects at Kingsley Plantation (Orser 1998). Since then, archaeologists have examined enslaved life on plantations in places such as the Upper and Lower South (Brown and Cooper 1990; Deetz 1995; Ferguson 1992; Franklin and McKee 2004; Kelso 1984; Samford 2007; Wilkie 2000); the Northeast (Hayes 2014; Mrozowski et al 2011); California (Voss 2008); the Caribbean and West Indies (Armstrong 2011; Delle 2011; Hauser 2011; Singleton 2015; Wilkie and Farnsworth 1999); South America; and Africa (Croucher 2007; Hall 2000; Jordan 2005). More recent archaeological studies investigate urban (Herman 1999; Logan 1992; Stewart-Abernathy 2004; Zierden 2010) and industrial slavery (Brandon 2013; Calfas 2013; Dew 1994; Shackel and Larsen 2000).

In early African diaspora archaeological studies, researchers centered on trying to find patterned cultural expressions of free and enslaved Africans. Orser (1994, 1998) explains that the earliest research in this area attempted to provide evidence relating to the Melville Herskovitz and Franklin Frazier debate. That is, archaeologists wanted to determine the extent to which enslaved Africans retained cultural knowledge through their harrowing journey during the Middle Passage and their captivity in the Americas (Orser 1998).

This area of research sought to answer questions such as how traditional African practices changed in enslaved contexts and how enslaved Africans formed new identities (Orser
Frazier argued that the trauma of capture and enslavement caused enslaved Africans to lose their culture. Any similarity between enslaved African practices and beliefs and traditional African practices was caused by memories rather than purposeful retention (Orser 1994:34). Herskovitz refuted this claim and argued that the “vitality of African culture” could be seen in the cultural practices from Africa that people “kept alive” in the Americas (Orser 1994:34). He also argued that enslaved Africans were especially able to keep traditional religious practices alive since it is easier to hide such ideas relative to other practices (Orser 1994:34).

Archaeologists also attempted to understand how new ethnic identities formed and were articulated in enslaved contexts (for a larger discussion, see Fesler 2010). Many archaeological studies of colonial and antebellum African American ethnicity largely drew from Richard Price and Sidney Mintz’s idea that a hybrid, creole culture developed among enslaved Africans on plantations (Mann 2001:5; Mintz and Price 1976). These studies examined the ways that enslaved Africans used objects to express and signal their identities to others.

As Garret Fesler (2010) observes, much of this early research focuses on the relationship between African ethnicity, diaspora contexts, and the restrictions of slavery. Archaeologists examined the ways that African traditions persisted during slavery. During this early period, many studies centered on merely searching for “Africanisms” or artifacts considered to be African ethnic markers. Archaeologists viewed “Africanisms” as a form of cultural retention that signaled cultural continuity, and supported Herskovitz’s idea of cultural retentions (Fesler 2010; for a larger discussion of this use of Herskovitz see Orser 1998).

These Africanisms included things such as blue beads, colonowares, subfloor pits, pots with Bakongo cosmograms, red tobacco pipes, and cowrie shells (for an extended discussion of how these items have been interpreted see Fennell 2007; Fesler 2010; Heath and Breen; Orser
Archaeologists also examined the ratio of bowls to plates (Ferguson 1992). They expected to find that sites occupied by African Americans would contain a larger number of bowls, noting that people from West and Central Africa often ate stews (Ferguson 1992; Fesler 2010). Archaeologists, therefore, expected to find a higher percentage of bowls in African American contexts. Most of these early studies, however, did not consider what these items or features meant in terms of how African Americans negotiated their identities in new, enslaved contexts (Fesler 2010; Singleton and Bograd 2000).

This way of examining African American sites and identities was problematic for many reasons. First, it often relied on ethnographic information that does not consider how cultures may have changed over a few hundred years (Ferguson 1992). Further, it does not discuss what new meanings traditional practices and objects may have taken in these new contexts (Fennell 2007; Heath and Breen 2009; Singleton and Bograd 2000). Theresa Singleton and Mark Bograd (2000) note that this cultural essentialism often meant that archaeologists focused on the presence of Africanisms to the exclusion of other research questions.

In later studies, archaeologists used the presence of these Africanisms to examine changing social relationships in plantation contexts. Deetz (1976) noted the increased presence of colonoware in Virginia during the late 1600s when Anglo-American plantation owners began housing enslaved Africans in separate quarters. Deetz argues that this change in housing required enslaved Africans to create their plates and bowls, which they created using traditional potting practices (Deetz 1976).

Many of these early slave quarters contain subfloor pits, and archaeologists commonly associated these pits with African American contexts. For many years, the presence of a subfloor pit within a structure was used as evidence that African Americans almost certainly inhabited a
location (Heath and Breen 2009). Archaeologists initially interpreted these pits as either root cellars or places that enslaved laborers might have used to hide objects from slaveholders and overseers (Deetz 1976; Neiman et al. 2000; Samford 2007). Neiman, McFaden, and Wheeler (2000) contend that enslaved Africans living in large quarters with unrelated individuals used subfloor pits as safe deposit boxes. Because these pits were highly visible to the residents, it was difficult for one occupant to steal from another without being witnessed. To help support their claim, they note that these pits disappear after the implementation of family-based quarters (Neiman et al. 2000:16).

Patricia Samford (2007), on the other hand, compared these subfloor pits, their placement in the quarter, and the objects which archaeologists recovered from them to ancestor shrines within African cultures. In large quarters with many unrelated individuals, there may have been many subfloor pits as each family could have their shrine (Samford 2007). In family-based quarters, archaeologists may only find one subfloor pit since the family now only needed one shrine (Samford 2007).

Other archaeologists have examined the contents of some subfloor pits and conducted pollen analysis to examine whether people used some of these pits as root cellars (see Heath and Breen 2009). They have also argued that whites of various social classes may have used root cellars and so the presence of a subfloor pit does not necessarily mean that the African Americans inhabited a dwelling (Heath and Breen 2009). Furthermore, in their analysis of the variability of features in 18th and 19th century Chesapeake slave dwellings, Heath and Breen (2009) showed that scholars cannot assume that African Americans did not occupy a dwelling if it did not contain subfloor pits (also see Neiman et al. 2000).
Heath and Breen (2009) also note that there is a significant similarity between the houses of free and enslaved Africans and those of lower-class individuals of other ethnic groups. These similarities can make it difficult for archaeologists to determine who lived in specific dwellings. My dissertation research also highlights the difficulty in discerning the racial categories of occupants at a site based on the house characteristics. Since historical documents and records do not reference the occupants of the ridge at Mount Vernon, it is difficult to know for sure who may have lived there.

Heath and Breen (2009) observe that, unfortunately, most of the houses occupied by racially and economically marginalized people do not have historical documents associated with them. Because of the difficulty in recognizing the racial category of occupants, archaeologists often rely on the presence or absence of Africanisms to determine who inhabited a dwelling (Heath and Breen 2009). They argue that we do not have a full enough understanding of the variability of housing to unproblematically classify structures in this manner (Heath and Breen 2009).

Likewise, some archaeologists have viewed colonoware pottery as merely a marker of African ethnic identity in slave contexts through which archaeologists can recognize the presence of African Americans (Deetz 1976; Ferguson 1978,1992; Joseph 1998). This pottery practice is considered to be a way in which African Americans continued African pottery practices in enslaved contexts, and has been used as an Africanism by some archaeologists to statistically analyze the assemblages of enslaved Africans with pattern recognition (Joseph 1998). However, archaeologists have found similar pottery on sites associated with both American Indians and Anglo-Americans (MacCord 1969; Mouer et al. 1998).
Singleton and Bograd (2000:9) assert that to understand the significance of this pottery fully, archaeologists must examine how it was “used, appropriated and transformed by its users and makers.” It is more fruitful for archaeologists to determine the role that ceramics played in relationships and the construction of identities instead of only trying to connect them with a particular ethnic group. The debates over who made and used these objects distract from discussions of cultural interaction and exchange among various groups in the Americas (Singleton and Bograd 2009).

This case highlights Armstrong’s assertion that a singular, African diasporic identity did not exist (Armstrong 2008:129). Slaveholders in different regions of the Americas used enslaved laborers of different ethnic backgrounds. Enslaved laborers also faced a variety of different living and working conditions, and these differences engendered a variety of diasporic identities, experiences, and cultural practices (Armstrong 2008:129).

Archaeology focusing on African diasporic people in the colonial and antebellum South is reluctant to deal with “transculturation, transformation, and regenesis” (Armstrong 2008:129). We ignore the frequent movement of people from a variety of cultural backgrounds throughout the South during these periods, and researchers often conflate race and ethnicity. We often seem to assume ethnicity and shared identity based on skin color rather than trying to understand lives and interactions in the past (Armstrong 2008).

As a result, we tend to focus on essentialized cultural interactions rather than “contextually defined culture change” (Armstrong 2008:125). As Armstrong (2008:125) notes, this approach cannot explain the dynamics of cultural expression in the multitude of diasporan contexts. Furthermore, this approach overlooks differences in the demographic makeup of the enslaved population (Armstrong 2008:129).
Armstrong (2008) claims that this interpretation is simply applying a “cookie-cutter” approach to archaeological interpretations. This interpretation focuses on something “imagined or ideal, the African way of life, block-lifted and uniformly applied across many settings,” including both “islands and continental regions” (Armstrong 2008:129). He notes that the operating assumption of this approach is that people are categorized as either all African American or all white, leaving little room for interaction, transformation, and diversity (Armstrong 2008:129). Similarly, Julia King and Edward Chaney (2011) argue that by placing groups of people in bounded ethnic categories, archaeologists often mask the considerable variability among people in the same category.

King and Chaney also show ethnic identity and practices are embedded in relationships. In 2011, they re-evaluated a human internment labeled as burial 18, most likely a servant boy between the ages of 15-17 years old, at a site at Patuxent Point, Maryland (King and Chaney 2011:96). Due to poor documentary records, archaeologists cannot associate the house with a particular family or individuals. Archaeological investigations in the 1990s uncovered a dwelling of an Anglo-American farmer or “planter” and an associated cemetery (King and Chaney 2011:96-97). The cemetery was divided into two main sections. Archaeologists classified the first section, which contained 14 burials, as the planter’s family and classified the second section with four graves, as servants (King and Chaney 2011). Archaeologists uncovered burial 18 in this second section (King and Chaney 2011:96-97). He was buried covered in a face shroud and with his head facing west. His hands were placed over his pelvis, and a white clay tobacco pipe was placed in his hands. Archaeologists also recovered a dome-style button (King and Chaney 2011:97).
King and Chaney note that several ethnic groups in Senegambia and Ghana bury individuals with a tobacco pipe. Archaeologists have uncovered many similar African and African American burials in the U.S., Caribbean, and Africa (King and Chaney 2011:97-103). Archaeologists have recovered buttons in several African American burials. On the other hand, Anglo-American graves rarely contain funerary objects, and tobacco pipes are seldom among objects recovered from these contexts (King and Chaney 2011:103). Based on the artifacts in the grave, analysts initially classified this person as African American, which made it the oldest African American burial in Maryland (King and Chaney 2011:103).

However, further DNA testing indicated that the mother of the young man in burial 18 was most likely European (King and Chaney 2011:103-104). The authors note the ways in which people are buried tends to be deliberate and thoughtful. They argue that burial 18 points to close relationships between Anglo-American servants at Patuxent Point and nearby African Americans. In Maryland, ethnic identities remained fluid at the end of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century and not necessarily associated with physical features or even areas of origin (King and Chaney 2011:105-106). Burial 18 demonstrates the danger of linking ethnic practices with people who use particular cultural objects and of viewing ethnicity as a given rather than a subject to investigate (King and Chaney 2011: 87).

Katherine Hayes (2011) uses ceramics at the 17\textsuperscript{th} century plantation at Sylvester Manor in New York to show how ethnic identities transform through relationships. Despite the presence of enslaved Africans in the plantation’s documentary record, archaeological investigations did not uncover material culture suggesting African traditions (Hayes 2011). Archaeologists also found no separate spaces identified as quarters for enslaved Africans. On the other hand,
American Indians are absent from the documentary record, despite the presence of their objects at the site (Hayes 2011).

Using a framework based on materiality, Hayes observes that while the non-European pottery is constructed using local Manahanset technologies and styles, the pottery contained pre-burned or shell temper and tended to be fired at lower temperatures than pre-colonial Manahanset pottery (Hayes 2013:437). Hayes (2013) notes that enslaved Africans at the manor used crushed and burned shells as temper. They also likely used this material to create quicklime for mortar and plaster at the plantation, and so they had easy access to it. However, this material is not commonly used as temper in traditional African pottery (Hayes 2013:437).

Hayes (2013:440) claims that the Manhanset and “enslaved Africans became hybrids” through the construction of “materially grounded relationships.” She argues that to associate artifacts with ethnicity, in this case, means choosing to ignore one group of people as well as discount the interactions between two non-European groups in the creation of hybrid identities (Hayes 2013:440-441). However, by focusing on materiality, we can examine the relationships between two different groups who worked together on the plantation and forged new identities.

As with ceramics, jewelry, and clothing, Barbara Heath (2014) observes that we also must be careful about how we categorize or understand buildings that were possibly connected with enslaved African Americans. She argues that archaeologists sometimes classify possible slave quarters as outbuildings because these structures lack certain Africanisms expected in slave quarters (Heath 2010). Archaeologists often expect slave quarters to include specific material culture or features such as cowrie shells, blue beads, or subfloor pits. Heath (2010) contends that buildings do not always contain material culture connected to any obvious racial or ethnic group. This lack does not necessarily mean that members of these groups did not occupy these
buildings. She argues that we need to keep in mind that space expresses and reflects social relationships. We need to examine how people constructed and resisted the imposition of racial identities using space (Heath 2010).

Barbara Voss (2015) also complicates ideas of race and ethnicity through her archaeology of ethnogenesis at El Presidio in San Francisco, California. The inhabitants of El Presidio included Spanish Americans, American Indians, and people of African descent. Voss examines the complexities of racial and ethnic categorizations and relationships at El Presidio. She notes that conducting archaeology of a specific group helps create the idea that it is static, bounded, and always existed in the same way (Voss 2015:115). She argues that social identities are ongoing social processes that emerge through relationships of sameness and difference rather than static categories (Voss 2015:14). Voss contends that identities and ideas of race and ethnicity are constantly renegotiated and in a state of flux. In El Presidio, race was categorized using a Sistema de Castas. A person’s categorization was based not only on skin color and parentage but also on the legitimacy of birth, economic status, moral conduct, dress, occupation, mannerisms, and material culture (Voss 2015:85).

A person of African heritage at El Presidio could be classified differently at different points in their lives. They could shift castas through both tangible and intangible means. They could gain the rights of Español by purchasing a license. People could also change castas through marriage, dress, and even declaration (Voss 2015:85-86). Voss notes that for people of African descent in particular, the ability to shift to a higher casta depended on their economic means, occupation, respectability, and social alliances (2015:86). Voss argues that despite the complex system of racial identities, the inhabitants of El Presidio also began to form a shared ethnic identity of Californios (2015).
Voss also discusses the ways that racial categorization and ethnicity impacted dress. During the colonial period, people of African descent were expected to dress in Bourbon fashion, which consisted of form-fitting buttoned garments, like other members of El Presidio, but the government prohibited them from wearing certain luxury goods or Indian clothing (Voss 2015:258). Men wore knee-length britches, cutaway jackets, and waistcoats while women wore floor-length skirts and close-fitting bodices. Differences in status were revealed by textile quality, patterning, and ornamentation (Voss 2015:256-257). At the same time, the troops of El Presidio wore hybrid uniforms that combined both native and Bourbon style clothing. However, with the rise of Californio identity, people of all castas began wearing silk, which would have also facilitated casta mobility (Voss 2015:274).

Her research also found different buttons in an apartment building midden and a chapel. These disparities indicated that members of El Presidio often wore plain clothes at home with minimal, drab decoration (Voss 2015:282-284). However, they presented themselves in a different fashion when in public at both religious and secular events, using overt displays of status (Voss 2015:283-284).

This examination highlights that the ways that people present themselves, including dress and appearance, are important to how they construct and negotiate ethnicity and identities. This presentation may not be consistent when interacting with different audiences. Similarly, the residents of the Library site, as well as those at the comparative sites, may have presented themselves differently in private and public, both as a means of negotiating identity and mitigating racial tension. I examine this possibility as part of my analyses in Chapter 6 and Chapter 7.
Moreover, in certain parts of North America, the areas from which enslaved Africans came shifted over time. The racial situation in Virginia was not the same as in other states such as South Carolina or Louisiana. The homogenization of African American ethnicity throughout the United States engenders an idea of “diaspora of as a single identity rather than a complex set of manifestations resulting from a range of conditions” (Armstrong 2008:130). The African diaspora affects a wide array of people who shared a common heritage, shared commonalities, but did not share “every permutation of that experience” (Armstrong 2008:130; also see Hayes 2011; King and Chaney 2011; Mullins 2008).

Further, many studies do not consider how ideas of whiteness continually changed alongside changing notions of non-whiteness. As King and Chaney (2011: 87) argue, early archaeological studies of race and ethnicity viewed African Americans, Anglo-Americans, and American Indians as “fixed, unchanging, a priori categories of identity.” This understanding of classification helped homogenize African American identity in the antebellum south and conflate categories of race and ethnicity. Through this approach, archaeologists created boundaries where they may not have existed and projected present-day understandings of race onto the past (King and Chaney 2011).

For example, in a widely cited 2005 article, Allison Bell argues that a white ethnicity that spanned across people of various economic classes and cultural backgrounds also formed alongside the construction of race (Bell 2005). Bell perceptively points out that legislators constructed their white identity through laws that limited the rights of African Americans (Bell 2005:447-448). She notes that elites also constructed a white identity through spatial separation and new architectural forms. She calls this construction of a white identity white ethnogenesis (Bell 2005:454-455).
However, Bell (2005:457) questionably applies her conclusions to all Anglo-Americans. She ignores the presence of Irish and Jewish Americans in colonial Virginia and the cultural differences between the various Anglo-Americans. Enslaved Africans in Virginia were often working alongside Irish indentured servants. While these groups of European-Americans were granted full rights of citizenship, cultural differences and marginalization may have led these groups to interact differently with American Indians and African Americans than English Americans. Bell also overlooks class differences in Virginia’s white population.

Elite, white, landowning, and often slaveholding, men created these laws. Bell does not examine whether non-elites abided by these laws and shared the sentiments of legislators or the extent to which different counties upheld these laws. She thus presents a picture of a uniform white identity that does not consider the economic and social variability among Anglo-Americans and other European-Americans. Additionally, while her study focuses on colonial Virginia, other archaeologists have used her conclusions to discuss other regions of North America and make larger claims about white ethnicity (Barnes 2015; King and Chaney 2011; Mullins 2008).

Along with white ethnogenesis, archaeology focusing on African Americans often employs an underlying assumption that a uniform African American ethnicity grew and solidified with the construction of modern, Western ideas of race. This assumption stems from the idea that the creation of a race-based institution of slavery produced the circumstances in which a creolized African American ethnicity emerged (see Wilke 2001). This assumption, however, conflates race and ethnicity and assigns ethnic identities to past groups based on physiological differences. This approach projects modern notions of race onto the past rather than recognizing the temporally and spatially contingent nature of racial perceptions and ethnic
identities. In doing so, it helps reify culturally constructed racial categories rather than disrupting assumptions about racial and ethnic ideas and interactions.

Part II: Archaeology of Race and Racism

As archaeologists started complicating ideas of ethnicity, they also began to seriously consider race as a separate part of identity. Early studies on race and racism often used the term interchangeably with ethnicity rather than distinguishing between the two and explicitly investigating racism and racialization (see Blakey 1999; Mullins 2008; Orser 1998, 2004, 2007). However, during the late 1990s, Charles Orser (1998) issued a call for archaeologists to more explicitly discuss issues of race in studies of free and enslaved Africans. He argued that most archaeological research of the African diaspora often focused on ideas of ethnicity while ignoring the construction of race and the impact of racial marginalization. He further argued that this research could provide valuable insight into race and racism, even if it could not fix the racial problems of today (Orser 1998; for a further discussion also see Blakey 1999; Harrison 1998).

Before Orser’s call, very few studies overtly considered issues of race (Babson 1990; Baker 1978; Epperson 1991). For example, Babson’s 1990 study of South Carolina plantation and Baker’s 1978 study of “Black” Lucy in Massachusetts both highlighted the problems between distinguishing race and poverty (Babson 1990; Baker 1978). Baker (1978), for example, notes that the assemblage associated with Lucy was very similar to assemblages associated with poor whites in the area in which she lived. Because class and race are often closely connected, he uses these findings to argue that it may be hard for researchers to tell whether artifact assemblages are indicative of someone’s race or just their class (Baker 1978). This study
highlights the difficulty of recognizing race in the archeological record without the use of other lines of evidence, such as the documentary record.

Epperson’s (1991) research, however, focused on the impact that the changing plantation landscape, which emerged from the rise in popularity of the Georgian worldview in the late 17th century, had on the construction of race. The Georgian worldview focused on ideas of “order and control,” where plantation houses were symmetrical, and people and activities had a particular space in the landscape (Deetz 1996:63-67). The rise of the Georgian worldview led to the introduction of outbuildings, such as the dairy and the kitchen, moving these activities out of the main houses to separate parts of the plantation landscape (Deetz 1996).

This period also saw the transition from hall and parlor houses, where enslaved Africans, indentured white servants, and free whites lived together, to separate houses. Plantation owners and their families now lived in the main house, while enslaved Africans lived in one quarter, and white indentured servants lived in another (Deetz 1996; Epperson 1991). Epperson (1991) claims the Georgian ideal of separate outbuildings for the enslaved African laborers from both plantation owners and indentured white servants helped construct ideas of race. By forcing various groups to experience the landscape differently, plantation owners helped to reinforce the idea of a difference between white indentured servants and enslaved Africans (Epperson 1991).

Over the past 20 years, archaeologists have undertaken several other studies that address the impact of overt and structural racism (Agbe-Davies 2016; Blakey 1999; Epperson 2004; Fennell 2017; Leone et al. 2005; McDavid 2007; Mullins 1999; Orser 2004; Singleton 2001). Structural racism is more insidious than open forms of hatred and violence directed towards those that dominant groups consider racially inferior. When racism permeates social structures, it
impacts the social and economic possibilities of racially marginalized people, as well as their
access to resources (see Epperson 2004; Fennell 2017; Leone et al. 2005; Orser 2004, 2007).

Since structural racism impacts areas such as employment and economic opportunities,
schools, and housing, it can create a cycle of poverty that has a lasting impact on generations of
people that dominant groups consider racially inferior. It is this form of racism that engenders the
poverty discussed by Orser (2004, 2007) and W.E.B Du Bois (1994), both in the present and the
past. Archaeological studies on racism investigate how both forms of racism impacted the type
of objects that African Americans used as well as how they navigated various social relationships
and negotiated their identity.

Singleton (2001) reexamined Cressey’s 1994 study of Hannah Jackson, a free African
American woman in 1820s Alexandria, Virginia. She notes the fact that Jackson used ceramics
for extended periods, and the presence of unmatched tea wares, does not necessarily mean that
Jackson was receiving second-hand ceramics (Singleton 2001). I discuss the Hannah Jackson
site further in this chapter and in Chapter 7. Singleton’s most important outcome of this
investigation is showing the importance of examining the choices that free individuals made in
light of overt and structural racism as well as the ways they positioned themselves vis-à-vis
enslaved Africans. Through this exploration, we can gain a better understanding of how they
constructed and negotiated their identities.

Similarly, Mullins (1999) and Wilkie (2001) also examine issues of consumer choice to
understand the impact of racism. Paul Mullins (1999) used materiality and consumer culture to
explore how postbellum African Americans in Annapolis, Maryland, constructed their identities.
Mullins argues that material goods provided African Americans with idealized opportunities and
allowed them to “imagin[e] new experiences and fresh identities” (Mullins 1999:24). At the
same, his analysis of bottles from African American households of varying social status revealed the same trend towards buying brand names rather than locally sourced goods (Mullins 1999:25). He argues that purchasing brand-named products allowed African Americans to circumvent local racist markets often created by local merchants who bottled their goods (Mullins 1999:25-26).

Wilkie notes the presence of Dr. Trichenor medicine among African Americans in postbellum Louisiana (2001). This medicine contained similar ingredients to those used in traditional African medicinal practices. However, this medicine was also used frequently by local Anglo-Americans (Wilkie 2001). Wilkie claims that by purchasing this medication, African Americans both continued cultural practices and helped forge commonalities with Anglo-Americans by showing that African Americans conformed to some Anglo-American norms. She argues that this commonality may have helped African Americans navigate some of the racial tensions that were present in Louisiana (Wilkie 2001).

My analysis of the ridge at Mount Vernon can help us better understand if free African Americans aspired to the same ideals as those of white members of society or if they rejected, either unconsciously or as a purposeful form of resistance, these ideals for some other concept of normal. Further, although my research focuses on types of ceramics (i.e., plates or bowls) found at the site, I do not see these objects simply as markers of ethnicity or race.

Rather, I view these items as a way to understand both the relationship between the occupants of the site and how they constructed their identities. For example, a large number of bowls might indicate that residents of a site cooked stews frequently and possibly made food and ate together. Finding significantly more bowls than plates could, therefore, mean that the residents lived in a communal environment where they worked together to accomplish tasks. As
the residents used objects to carry out activities together, it would have reinforced their relationships.

On the other hand, a large number of plates may show that members of each house may have had individual settings and ate things that did involve communal cooking. Through this interpretation, I view ceramics as objects which played an active role in the relationships of the inhabitants of the ridge site, leading to the emergence of new identities as social relationships and ideas of race transformed.

Other studies from the past 20 years that examined slave quarters also discuss issues of identity and race. Maria Franklin (2001) used the discovery of different pharmaceutical bottles at Rich Neck to address hygiene and medicinal practices among enslaved laborers. Similarly, Archaeologists now recognize that the presence of tea sets that we find in slave quarters does not necessarily mean that enslaved African Americans held tea ceremonies in the same way as the gentry (Franklin 2001). Instead, they may have been used in ways not intended by their makers and were a means through which African Americans negotiated their identities (Franklin 2001; also see Singleton and Bograd 2000).

We now understand that African Americans may have imbued these objects with different meanings and could have possibly used traditional practices. Archaeologists use the presence of greater bowl to plate ratios not just to indicate the maintenance of traditional African culinary practices, but also as a way that enslaved Africans used communal cooking and eating to create relationships (Armstrong 2000, 2011; Battle 2005). In this way, rather than just comparing the material culture of enslaved Africans to that of the gentry, archaeologists viewed objects as things that enslaved African Americans used to construct and negotiate identities.
Archaeologists have also shown how the agency of racialized people emerges through the use of space. Fesler (2010) notes the importance of yards as places of activity. Douglas Armstrong (2000, 2011) and Whitney Battle (2005) examined the yards of enslaved Africans at Seville Plantation in Jamaica and the Hermitage Plantation in Tennessee, respectively. Both archaeologists noted that enslaved Africans primarily clustered their activities behind their quarters, in areas that were out of sight of slaveholders (Armstrong 2000; Battle 2005).

This use of space provided these enslaved individuals with a greater degree of privacy and autonomy. These studies highlight the need for archaeologists to move beyond the public/private dichotomy when examining spatial organization (Robin and Rothschild 2002). The activities of these enslaved individuals were private from the slaveholders but often public to other enslaved Africans. Similarly, the residents of the Library site at Mount Vernon may have used space and the landscape to create private areas.

Diet and nutrition are also a way in which archaeologists have examined the impact of racism. Archaeology at Colonial Williamsburg and several other Virginia plantations illustrates that enslaved Africans laborers always received fewer desirable cuts of meat than those eaten by white planters (Bowen 1996). Several other studies have considered how enslaved Africans supplemented their provisions through hunting, fishing, and gardening (Heath and Bennett 2000; Mrozowski et al. 2011; Pogue 1995). Bioarchaeology conducted in Michael Blakey’s study of the New York African Burial Ground also illustrated the amount of hard, strenuous labor undertaken by enslaved Africans. Their bodies show signs of fractures, arthritis, and other stresses (Blakey 2001).

The archaeology project at New Philadelphia also considered the impact of overt and structural racism. New Philadelphia, Illinois, was the first town to be planned in advance and
legally founded by an African American, although Anglo-Americans also lived there (Fennell 2009, 2017). During the mid-1800s, a road planned for construction purposely bypassed the town. In the late 1860s, the railroad was also constructed in a way to avoid the town, which helped lead to its demise (Fennell 2009). Archaeological and historical research on New Philadelphia indicates that the houses of African and European-Americans were interspersed with each other, rather than having segregated neighborhoods for both social groups (Fennell 2009). However, the town initially had separate schoolhouses and graveyards for African Americans and European-Americans. Archaeological investigations also indicate that there may have been differences in the diets of African Americans and European-Americans (Fennell 2017).

Mullins (2008) argues that archaeology of race and racism are important because they allow us to understand and tackle social problems today. A vindicationist archaeology recognizes that archaeological analysis is connected to larger political issues and can “take aim at the most fundamental American assumptions” (Mullins 2008:118). His vision of diasporan archaeology seems to be one that necessarily deals with modern racial issues and the racial hierarchy. In his view, archaeology that attempts to shed light on the social construction of race and the impact of changing racial ideas necessarily speaks to societal problems today (Mullins 2008).

Mullins (2008) acknowledges that racialization in the past continues to impact present-day social relationships. In this project, I draw on these ideas to examine how racial inequalities and structural racism in the past continue to impact people in the present as well, in particular when it comes to archaeological preservation. While archaeology may not be able to solve specific social issues, it can shed light on past historical processes that created the social and
political circumstances through which these problems have developed. Through this understanding, we can begin tackling these issues.

Part III: African Diaspora Household Archaeology

A household is a social unit. It is a bundle of relationships, and the members of a household need not be biologically related. As Richard Wilk (1997) notes, people belong to multiple households at different times in their lives. While houses are essential to understanding relationships and identity, anthropologists note that we cannot conflate house, household, and family (Battle 2004; King 2006; Meskell 1998; Weismantel 1989; Wilk 1997; Yanagisako 1979). Some scholars confine the household to one structure, arguing that the relationship between the domestic structures and the people who live in them create households. While this position includes the house as part of the household, it does not recognize the relationship between other houses and their residents.

Other scholars argue that because the household is a social unit, it need not be restricted to one structure. In Mary Weismantel’s (1989) study of the Zumbagua, for example, households are comprised of people who share meals. Sylvia Yanagisako (1979) argues that household refers to people who share a hearth, regardless of whether they even reside in the same dwelling. Richard Wilk (1997) discusses how, among the Kekchi Maya, the process of building and maintaining a house structure creates and maintains the relationships that form a household. In these perspectives, households form through the relationships of different people and things.

Following earlier household anthropological studies, Barbara Heath (2010) refines the terminology African diaspora archaeologists use to discuss households and domestic space. She argues that household archaeology of the colonial and antebellum South often conflates ideas of
household and family. Instead, she understands the household as the relationship of residents occupying a single quarter and yard, while one family may have lived in different dwellings, and a dwelling may have held multiple families (Heath 2010). She also notes that slave owners often divided homes for enslaved laborers into quarters, which housed unrelated individuals, and cabins, which housed families. Members of the same family may have lived apart, possibly on different plantations, and belonged to different households (Heath 2010).

Heath points out that the domestic space of enslaved individuals extended beyond the physical structure to include the yard area (2010; also see Heath and Bennett 2000). She argues that yards were an essential part of the landscape of enslaved individuals, as residents used this space as gardens, work areas, and to raise animals. Enslaved individuals incorporated these spaces into their daily domestic activities. She also notes that documentary and archaeological evidence from antebellum Virginia illustrates that unrelated members in a single quarter often worked together to grow crops that they sold at local markets (Heath 2010). Through their shared work in the yard, these individuals formed and strengthened social relationships and helped create a sense of home.

Archaeologist Whitney Battle-Baptiste (2004), in her examination of slave quarters at the Hermitage in Tennessee, also argues that households formed when individuals worked together to complete domestic chores. Her analysis shows that cooking, food preparation, structure repairs, gardening, soap making, and laundry at the Hermitage were carried out by members of several dwellings in a shared yard area (Battle 2004:48). Given these findings, Battle (2004:49) argues that enslaved households possibly extended beyond the single-family unit and home. She claims that among the enslaved at the Hermitage, “extended family, fictive kin, and nonfamilial relations would have most likely shared in production, reproduction and other power relations.”
Garret Fesler (2010) also notes the importance of the yard for enslaved laborers. He points out that enslaved individuals often spent a great deal of their daily life in the exterior areas of their domestic spaces. In African cultures, domestic compounds contained several dwellings located around a yard space. The one-room houses where people lived was just one part of the household (Fesler 2010). The household extends to all domestic structures and people in the compound. Members of these households engaged in practices of sweeping to keep the main areas of the compound clean (Fesler 2010).

Fesler (2010) uses soil chemistry analysis and artifact distribution maps to show that enslaved Africans continued these practices in North America. His study illustrated that enslaved individuals at the late 18th century Virginia plantation, Utopia, often swept the high traffic areas around their dwellings. As a result, archaeologists found artifacts primarily distributed in a halo around the periphery of the site (Fesler 2010).

This focus on the space in and around buildings echoes the arguments made by Robin and Rothschild (2002). They note that archaeologists can only wholly understand households and homes by examining the land between houses since household activities often extend beyond the physical structure. They further claim that the different dichotomies often employed by household archaeologists and anthropologists, such as private/public, indoor/outdoor, built/natural, are not necessarily useful (Robin and Rothschild 2002).

Relationships and activities do not strictly follow these dichotomies, and we cannot assume they exist in all societies (Robin and Rothschild 2002). Similarly, Daniel Miller (2001) notes that the public and private have a place inside each other. Homes may contain aspects of privacy, but they can also be public places. By inviting guests into our home, we choose which part of the public can come inside. Moreover, as Robin and Rothschild (2002) argue, people can
carry out domestic activities outside of the house, and households can extend beyond domestic structures.

Maria Franklin (2019) complicates the public/private dichotomy and the domestic/commercial dichotomy in enslaved households through her examination of the mid-18th century Coke Plantation. The Coke Plantation was a middling plantation outside of Williamsburg, Virginia, that only had one enslaved household. The enslaved laborers worked both in the fields as well in a nearby tavern (Franklin 2019). Archaeologists did not find any metal pots at the enslaved household, as the residents most likely ate food from the tavern. Cooking, which archaeologists often view as tying together enslaved households, did not take place at the site (Franklin 2019).

At the same time, archaeologists found an unusually high amount of sewing related objects, including child-sized thimbles (Franklin 2019). She hypothesizes that the enslaved women carried out both domestic and extra-domestic sewing activities within the house and also taught children how to sew (Franklin 2019). Through the eating and sewing patterns imposed by the nature of the plantation, the enslaved householders intertwined their public and private lives (Franklin 2019).

Franklin (2019) uses her study to advocate for a contextual approach to enslaved households, where we understand households as “embedded in broader social and economic relations” and are part of broader power relations. She argues that we must see households as “dynamic and flexible in the orientation, practices, and goals” (Franklin 2019:35). This understanding enables us to see that households throughout the African diaspora, including those in the same community, can “vary with respect to status, access to resources, ritual practices, and economic activities” (Franklin 2019:6). Further, enslaved African Americans who lived at small
and middling plantations in urban centers had very different lives and access to social goods than those living on large plantations in rural areas, leading to different experiences of the household (Franklin 2019).

All of these different studies show how people relate to each other and places to form households. Feminist, African American scholar bell hooks (1990), discusses how members of African American households, particularly women, related to the physical space of a structure to create homeplaces. African Americans constructed “a safe space where [they] could affirm one another,” enabling them to “heal many of the wounds inflicted by racist domination” (hooks 1990:42). She sees the homeplace as a “community of resistance” where African Americans are able to “confront the issue of humanization” and “restore the dignity” that the outside world denied them (hooks 1990:42).

This idea of homeplace has been influential on more recent archaeological investigations on African diaspora sites (see Battle-Baptiste 2011; Martin 2018; Morris 2014, 2017; Scott 2018). For example, in her discussion of Kingsley Plantation, Battle-Baptiste (2011) expanded on the notion of the homeplace to create what she termed homespace. This area included cabins, yards, and the surrounding landscape where “African Americans felt comfortable enough to create their identity and enjoy the company of others” (Battle-Baptiste 2011; also see González-Tennant and González-Tennant 2016).

In the antebellum South, we cannot assume that domestic structures only contained one family, that an entire family lived in one domestic structure, or that a household only included either blood relatives or residents of a particular structure (Franklin 2019). In many cases, slave quarters contained multiple families or groups of unrelated people (see Bon-Harper 2009; Heath 2010; Heath and Breen 2009; Neiman 2018). Further, Franklin (2019) points out that in enslaved
contexts, households formed through both “kinship ties and residency patterns.” Further, as some archaeologists note, among West African households, the idea of family is extended to close friends or even members of the same compound (Fesler 2010; Heath 2010). In many cases, these more extended ideas of the household persisted in North America and may have been present among the residents of the Library site (see Fesler 2010; Franklin 2019).

The individuals who lived on the ridge near Mount Vernon may have had very different life experiences from one another. Some may have worked as enslaved laborers in the fields on outlying farms of Mount Vernon, a couple of miles away from the Mansion house. Others may have been enslaved laborers on the Mansion House Farm, either in the main house or the various outbuildings in the area. These differences in positions would have provided them with different access to social goods and impacted the types of households they formed. Despite these different backgrounds, they would have formed new relationships and possibly a new sense of household by living together along this ridge.

**Part IV: Historical Approaches to Free African Americans**

Luther Jackson (1927, 1939) undertook some of the earliest historical studies of Virginian free African Americans. His research centered on the importance of community knowledge and local interactions between free African Americans and the white community. He examined Virginia laws limiting freedom of free African Americans and pointed to discrepancies between laws and local practices (Jackson 1939). He argued for the importance of the connections between free African American individuals and members of local white communities in understanding the treatment of free African American individuals in Virginia (Jackson 1927, 1939). However, while Jackson illustrated the ways that some free African Americans navigated and overcame legal restrictions, he posited that this ability was not
common (Jackson 1939). Jackson showed that systemic racism shaped the lives of free African Americans, but individuals were impacted differently based on the relationships within specific communities.

Ira Berlin (1974) challenged this conception with his seminal work, *Slaves Without Masters*. He explores the difference in the lives of free African Americans in the antebellum Upper and Lower South. Berlin examines the different laws about free African Americans that the Virginia legislature passed following the American Revolution (Berlin 1974). He argued that success among free African Americans was rare due to extreme racism and legislation that limited agency and that these individuals were essentially free in name only (Berlin 1974). While his study primarily focused on the antebellum South, Berlin further posited that free African Americans throughout the colonies had a “good deal less liberty than the law allowed” (Berlin 1974:3).

Although widely regarded, Berlin’s study contains numerous problems. His examination of the reasons why legislators passed laws does not consider how officials carried out those laws in practice. He ignores the fact that these laws often reveal more about the identities and perspectives of legislators than the actual lived experiences of free African Americans. Moreover, he does not discuss the impact of later migrations or the diversity of ethnic backgrounds present in the Chesapeake area. Berlin also extends his conclusions to earlier periods without investigating if these conclusions hold in those times.

Berlin’s work also contains an implicit belief that throughout the South, free African Americans were always racialized in the same manner as enslaved blacks. Because of this belief, he assumes that free and enslaved blacks experienced a shared identity in all periods (Berlin 1974:8). Such approaches are predicated on the notion that phenotype was the primary
determinant of a group’s racialization in the South and that the racial structure remained constant following its formation.

Different areas in the Upper and Lower South contained different racial classification systems based on heritage. Unfortunately, Berlin’s idea of free African Americans as “slaves without masters” widely colors perceptions of free African Americans, even though Berlin’s study considerably generalizes the experiences of these individuals. Due to the archaeological research on these communities, archaeologists often turn to Berlin to help inform their interpretations of documentary evidence.

Despite the prominence of Berlin’s study, some studies contest his findings. T.H. Breen and Stephen Innes (1980) challenged Berlin’s interpretation of free African Americans in early colonial Virginia in their investigation into the changing understanding of race and lives of free African Americans on Virginia’s eastern shore. This area contained one of the earliest free African American communities in North America, which formed during the 1640s (Breen and Innes 1980).

They argue that up until the mid-1600s, free African Americans who were Christians received the same rights as white Christians (Breen and Innes 1980). Livestock provided free African Americans with a means of independence (Breen and Innes 1980:113). Moreover, several free African American men even had white wives and owned enslaved Africans. Finally, Breen and Innes examined local court records, and argue that clerks used the term “negro” to denote that a person was from Africa, since during this time clerks classified individuals based on their origins (1980:97).
Following the insights of Edmund Morgan’s *American Slavery, American Freedom* (1975), Terrance Epperson (1991) argues that during the 17th century, free African Americans in Virginia exercised a great deal of liberty. He claims that society viewed them differently than enslaved Africans. However, Epperson, as well as Breen and Innes, found that these dynamics changed in the late 17th and early 18th centuries. Breen and Innes note that the rights of African Americans in Virginia significantly decreased following Bacon’s rebellion in 1676 (Breen and Innes 1980). Epperson argued that laws enacted in Virginia during the 1720s greatly reduced the status and rights of free African Americans. These different studies show that the potential for the development of systemic racism began to take form in 1619 with arrival of first captive Africans in Virginia, although historical ideas of race and race relationships may have been different than those that exist today. Systemic racism then grew through the law in ways that continue to impact racially marginalized people.

These laws, enacted by elite, white legislators, engendered a society that was even more racially divided between whites and blacks and helped enslaved and free African Americans to “find a common identity and forge a collective culture of resistance” (Epperson 1991:2). Neither Epperson nor Breen and Innes explore issues of how these changing laws impacted relationships and the ways free African Americans negotiated their identities. Instead, both studies assume that free and enslaved Africans and African Americans formed a single identity based on shared African background and harsh treatment, thus affirming the picture of free African American life that Berlin painted.

Over the past ten years, other historians published studies that contested Berlin’s conclusions. For example, Eva Wolf (2006) examined changing legal restrictions placed on free African Americans during the early 1800s and argued that modern racial ideas based on skin
color only emerged after the Revolutionary War and were not consistent across all parts of the Southern United States. She also illustrates that free African Americans in Virginia often found ways of negotiating around legal restrictions (Wolf 2006).

Similarly, Amina Luqman-Dawson argues that the free African American communities of Blanford and Pocahontas Island in Petersburg, Virginia enabled free African Americans to “insulate themselves from repressive laws, pool their resources, and exercise their freedom” (Luqman-Dawson 2008:9). The lives of the residents of these places were still impacted by institutional and structural racism. However, they found ways of navigating these within their communities.

At the same time, not all free African Americans in the antebellum South were treated poorly by local white society. In *Israel on the Appomattox*, Melvin Ely (2004) explored the lives of free African Americans in Prince Edward County, Virginia, during the early 1800s. These individuals owned and sold land and other property, and many became successful entrepreneurs (Ely 2004). They managed to create a comfortable life and used the civil court to defend themselves from being forced to leave the state (Ely 2004).

Ely (2004) argues that the reputations of free African Americans in the community played a more important role than the law in determining how white society treated these individuals. Kirt von Daacke (2012) and Tara Bowen (2013) reached similar conclusions about the relationships between whites and free African Americans in Charlottesville and Mecklinberg, respectively. Bowen (2013:116) claims that the relationship between free African Americans and Anglo-Americans in Mecklinberg represented the typical free African American experience in Virginia rather than the exception.
Both Luther Jackson (1927, 1932) and these more recent historians present more nuanced images of free African American lives than Berlin did (Bowen 2013; Ely 2004; Van Daake 2012; Wolf 2006). These historical studies show that free African Americans in antebellum Virginia faced systemic racism. They were considered inferior to whites and their ability to remain in the state, obtain jobs, and own land often was dependent on either their ability to navigate racial restrictions or their relationships with whites. Further, these historic race-based restrictions impacted the ability of free African Americans to leave written records. African Americans tended to rely more on family oral histories, which academics often value less than documentary evidence (White 2016). This systemic racism therefore continues to impact the creation of histories and national and local memories.

**Part V: Free African American Archaeology**

In the last 30 years, historical archaeologists began to investigate free African Americans in antebellum Virginia. This research included communities in the cities of Alexandria, Charlottesville, and Petersburg (Cressey and Anderson 2006; Ford 2006; Laird 2006; Shephard 1987). A few of these investigations even centered on issues of race, agency, and identity.

Archaeological research in Alexandria conducted in the late 1980s and 1990s also examined how free African Americans employed objects as tactics of resistance (Cressey and Anderson 2006; Shephard 1987). These objects were used not only to further the rights of free African Americans but also to resist the institution of slavery as a whole. For example, the investigations on the property of Hannah Jackson, a free African American woman who resided in the Bottoms neighborhood in the 1830s, uncovered ceramics with evidence of extended wear (Cressey and Anderson 2006).
However, deeds of sales indicate that during the 1820s and 1830s, Jackson spent well over one thousand dollars to purchase multiple members of her family out of slavery (Singleton 2001). The archaeologists claim that Jackson, who worked in Alexandria as a laundress, purposely used ceramics for an extended period to save money to purchase enslaved relatives and friends (Cressey and Anderson 2006; Singleton 2001). The prolonged use of ceramics became a means for Jackson to advance claims of freedom for her family. I discuss these different archaeological excavations at 1820s and 1830s free African American sites more in-depth in Chapter 7 as part of a comparison to the Library site at Mount Vernon.

In 2001, Theresa Singleton examined the results of the archaeology of free African Americans in the antebellum South. She used her findings to show that many of the decisions made by free African Americans in the South, including what they purchased and where they lived, were ways of diverting the impacts of a racist structure (Singleton 2001). These choices also included either accepting a shared identity with enslaved people or distancing themselves “because they saw their fate as separate and distinct from the enslaved” (Singleton 2001:197). Such decisions were “symbolic of strategies” used to “resist racial subordination” and key ways in which free African Americans formed their identities (Singleton 2001:198). Similarly, Paul Mullins (1999) argues that the free African Americans who resided in Annapolis, Maryland in the 1850s used ceramics to “close social distance” with whites and advance claims for equality.

Douglas Armstrong (2003, 2010) examined household assemblages from different 19th century households in St. Johns East End in the Caribbean to understand changing relationships between whites, free African Americans, and enslaved African Americans. During the 19th century, the East End transformed from a community centered on land-based provisioning to one centered on maritime trade and fishing. Armstrong argues that as members of these different
social groups began working alongside each other, both racial and social boundaries collapsed (Armstrong 2003:151).

This change transformed racial relationships as whites began working with both free and enslaved African Americans. White women began engaging in a common-law marriage with free African American men. Artifact assemblages illustrate increasing creolization and a transition from households based on class to one based on family (Armstrong 2003:238-241; 2010). Armstrong’s study demonstrates the contextuality, complexity, and fluidity of racial ideas and the treatment of free African Americans. He shows the abundance of distinct cultural expression in the diasporic communities that formed throughout the Caribbean as well as other parts of the African diaspora.

Whitney Battle-Baptiste (2001) argues for a similar perspective in her re-interpretation of the archaeology of the Lucy Foster site in Massachusetts. As Battle-Baptiste notes, when Vernon Baker originally excavated and interpreted the site, he made Lucy Foster’s poverty a central point of his interpretation. Battle-Baptiste observed that she has seen a few materials about African Americans who were not poor and noted that free African American houses are often considered to be hard to distinguish from those occupied by poor whites. She questions the need for a one-to-one correlation between poverty and African Americans (2011:112-116).

Battle-Baptiste cautions against using a preconceived notion of poverty and its impact on identity. She contends that the different buttons, thimbles, and needles illustrate the performance of the various domestic tasks that occurred inside the Foster home (Battle-Baptiste 2011). She also notes the variety of different wares and vessel forms recovered at the site, which is inconsistent for someone entrenched in poverty (Battle-Baptiste 2011).
Battle-Baptiste empowers Foster, preferring to envision Foster as a woman, who, while occasionally faced with a daily struggle for survival, still managed to live independently (2011:130). This discussion of poverty and empowerment is critical at a place like the Library site at Mount Vernon, where the residents may have lived in log cabins, which are often associated with poverty, but possessed a large number of glassware and refined ceramics. Battle-Baptiste’s study shows that we cannot assume that all free African Americans were poor and that all poor people had meager or inferior forms of ceramics or other domestic objects.

As these studies show, the African diaspora affects a wide array of people who, despite a common heritage and other similarities, had a wide range of experiences that engendered a multitude of identities. We must examine “contextually defined culture change” and consider culturally and temporally dependent social interactions (Armstrong 2008:125). These studies have helped me recognize that race and ethnicity are always in the process of becoming as ideas of race transform.

By drawing on these ideas, my project investigates the impact of changing forms of structural racism during early 19th century Virginia on the residents around the ridge at Mount Vernon. Central to this work is the idea that this site was inhabited by free African Americans during this period. I investigate how residents negotiated their identities as free African Americans who continued to live on Mount Vernon, where they were formerly enslaved, as well as how they interacted with enslaved Africans during a period of increasing control over free African American bodies. I examine how they related to other social groups in light of these changing forms of legislative and structural racism.

The studies discussed in this chapter also show that it is challenging to determine race from the archaeological record. Part of this difficulty stems from the fact that, as discussed in the
previous chapter, race is a social construct and racial marginalization primarily manifests itself through beliefs and social interactions, legal restrictions, and increased poverty and differential access to goods. While artifacts are used in relationships, laws and interactions outside of the home may not be visible in household archaeology. Economic hardship can be seen archaeologically but, as some studies in this chapter show, poverty is not a reliable indication of race. It can be difficult to distinguish between houses occupied by free African Americans and poor whites.

Some archaeologists rely on Africanisms, but this practice is problematic. Not all objects and features commonly associated with African Americans are found on all sites occupied by African Americans. Further, these objects and features also may be found on sites associated with Anglo-Americans and American Indians. Finally, sites occupied by free African Americans can be difficult to distinguish from sites occupied by poor or middling Anglo-Americans when only relying on the archaeological assemblage. The documentary evidence does not help much, because racially and economically marginalized people often did not leave written evidence. Furthermore, free African Americans and poor and middling whites may not have been mentioned in the records kept by elite whites.

When trying to determine who occupied a site, not only in terms of race but also gender, sexuality, class, and other aspects of identity, we have to make educated guesses. An occupant hypothesis must rely on a mixture of archaeological and documentary evidence, and all other interpretations about the lives of the occupants then build from this hypothesis. As such, it is important to lay out the evidence that we have used to reach this interpretation.

It is also important to acknowledge that our interpretation may be wrong and could change based on future archaeological or documentary evidence. I use this approach to identify
the most likely occupants of the ridge sites at Mount Vernon, both in Chapter 5 and in Chapter 6. This approach acknowledges that our understanding of the site is only based on the evidence we currently have at hand and that our interpretation of a site may change as we find more evidence.

The trajectory of African diaspora archaeological research illustrates that we cannot try to construct a single African diasporan identity. We need to consider both local history and trajectories as well as global events and interactions. Given this importance of context, it is crucial that I consider the historical background of Mount Vernon, the Library site occupation, and race relationships in early 19th century Virginia. In the next chapter, I consider the history of Mount Vernon during the successive ownerships of George and Bushrod Washington. Using documents, I examine the evidence of who may have occupied the Mount Vernon ridge area. I argue that based on this line of research, former enslaved laborers of George Washington were the most likely residents.

I examine the way that the social and physical landscape at the estate changed after John Augustine Washington II and III inherited the plantation. I also consider the different laws that impacted Virginian free African Americans during the occupation of the Library site as well as changing race relationships in Virginia. All of these elements may have shaped the various choices that the residents made and types of objects they chose to purchase and use. As a result, these laws continue to have impact today, potentially shaping the material record left at the Mount Vernon ridge and the ability for the Library site to gain protection under historic preservation practices.
CHAPTER FOUR: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE MOUNT VERNON RIDGE

In this chapter, I review the historical background of the early 19th century occupation of the Library site and Field 7 at Mount Vernon. This chapter examines what I can tell for sure about the history of the Library site and Field 7. I try to ascertain how this area was used under George Washington and what documents tell us about the plantation under Bushrod Washington. I also examine if documents from Jane Washington and John Augustine Washington III reveal any additional information about how occupants used this land and how it changed following Bushrod’s death. I discuss the possible occupants of this area, reviewing the hypotheses that free African Americans, white tenant farmers, or enslaved laborers of Bushrod Washington lived along the ridge.

Along with investigating the documentary evidence around the Library site and surrounding ridge, I also examine the laws in Virginia that concerned free African Americans. These helped to shape the structural and institutional racism present in antebellum Virginia. This racism may have impacted the lives of the residents and affected the types of artifacts and structures used and recovered at the Mount Vernon ridge.

In Part I, I briefly examine enslaved life at Mount Vernon under George Washington, explaining the differences in the houses of those who worked close to the Mansion House and those in the outlying farms. I explore what I can tell about how the Field 7 and Library site ridge was used during the period. Finally, I discuss what happened to the enslaved workforce following the deaths of George and Martha Washington.

Part II examines Mount Vernon under Bushrod Washington. I consider his beliefs about free African Americans, his treatment of his own enslaved workforce, and the presence of former
slaves of George Washington on the estate during Bushrod’s ownership. I also examine various hypotheses as to who may have lived at the Mount Vernon ridge and lay out the logic and evidence that supports the idea that former slaves of George Washington lived in this area. In this section, I also briefly discuss changes enacted at the estate following inheritance by John Augustine Washington II.

In Part III, I review the changing Virginia laws that impacted free African Americans during this period. These laws sought to regulate the size of free African American communities. Legislators also passed laws to control the movement of free African Americans, their access to education, and their access to different types of employment. Finally, in Part IV, I examine how these laws impacted racial relationships and helped engender free African American communities. In doing so, these laws reshaped the networks of relationships in which free African Americans participated. These changes gave rise to new identities and transformed how free African American agencies emerged.

In this section, I also discuss how these laws may have impacted the relationships in which the residents of Mount Vernon were enmeshed. While racial attitudes changed in Virginia, these individuals may have been treated differently than other free African Americans, given their connection to George Washington. Regardless, their newly gained freedom and changing social circumstances in Virginia transformed how they related to other people, places, and things, in the process altering their identities and allowing new forms of agency to emerge.

**Part I: Enslaved Life and the Library Site under George Washington**
During his lifetime, George Washington amassed 8,000 acres, known as Mount Vernon, which he divided into five farms. Historical maps indicate that during his ownership, the project area was not under cultivation. The ridge that encompasses both the Library site and Field 7 appears to have been a wooded area during this time based on Washington’s own Five Farms map of 1793 (see Figure 2).

Given the vast amount of land that Washington owned and the fact that he used four of his tracts as farmland, it is not surprising that Washington would have allowed the area surrounding his mansion house to remain wooded, rather than used for cultivation.

At the time of his death, 318 enslaved laborers worked at Mount Vernon. Washington personally owned 123 of these individuals and rented 40 of these individuals from a neighbor, Mrs. French (John Milner Associates, Inc. 2004; Pogue 2003). The remaining enslaved
individuals were dower slaves belonging to Martha, except for Elish, whom she owned and chose not to manumit at her death (Pogue 2003).

Washington used different types of quarters for enslaved laborers. The layout and construction of these buildings varied based on the farm in which they were located (“Lives Bound Together”). One of the main quarters for the enslaved laborers who worked at the Mansion house was the House for Families (“Lives Bound Together”; Pogue 1995, 2002). This quarter appears to have been first occupied in the late 1750s and remained occupied until 1793 (Pogue 2002). Researchers have only found a small description of the building in the 1787 Vaughn Plan, but there is a painting of the house from 1792 by Edward Savage (Pogue 2003). If this painting is an accurate depiction of the structure, which remains unclear, then the house was most likely two stories, and built out of wood with a brick foundation (Pogue 2002). The painting also depicts a fireplace at each end of the building. This house most likely contained somewhere between four to eight rooms (“Lives Bound Together”; Pogue 2002).

In 1786, 67 enslaved individuals lived on the Mansion tract, working as house servants or in skilled positions (Pogue 1995, 2002). Most of the remaining enslaved African Americans worked as field hands in one of the other four farms. According to Thompson (2002), nearly 75% of all the enslaved individuals living at Mount Vernon worked in the field, and over 61% of these were women. Their jobs changed by the season and were often gendered. Disabled individuals were often given less demanding jobs (Thompson 2002). They were not required to work if they were sick or had broken their shoes. As a result, some may have feigned illness or disability as a form of resistance (Thompson 2002).

A significant number of skilled and domestic workers who worked at the mansion tract were of mixed ancestry (Morgan 2005; Wiencek 2003:130). Julian Niemcewicz, a Polish visitor
to Mount Vernon in 1798, even observed that “mulattoes are generally chosen for personal services” (Niemcewicz 1958:102). It appears, then, that race and racial perceptions played a role in the types of jobs that George Washington’s enslaved laborers carried out. Whether mixed-race people held these jobs due to social beliefs about biracial individuals or because Washington wanted to present a specific vision to the public is unclear (Morgan 2005; Wiencek 2003).

Archaeological excavations indicate that these individuals may have received some ceramic hand-me-downs from the Washingtons when the latter switched to new patterns. In particular, it appears that enslaved laborers received white salt-glazed stonewares (“Lives Bound Together”; Pogue 1995). Enslaved African Americans also appear to have used some colonoware dishes. I discuss the living conditions and archaeological assemblage from the House for Families in greater detail in Chapter 7 as part of the comparison between the occupation at the Library site and other archaeological sites occupied by racially and economically marginalized individuals.

The presence of lead shot and gunflints from the House for Families indicates that at least the enslaved laborers at the Mansion tract were allowed to hunt animals to supplement their rations (“Lives Bound Together”; Pogue 1995). As I discuss in greater detail in Chapter 7, archaeologists recovered a wide range of animal bones from the House for Family excavations, including but not limited to deer, turkey, fish, pig, cows, and rabbits (Pogue 1995). Some of these fish bones may have been from the herrings provided to them by Washington. However, enslaved African Americans also fished to supplement their rations. They also harvested turtles, clams, and oysters from the Potomac River (“Lives Bound Together”).

Those living at the outlying farms appear to have lived in more ephemeral, poorly built log cabins or wood and daub structures. These types of houses could be easily dismantled or
moved if necessary (Carson et al. 1981; Franklin 2004; “Lives Bound Together”). In fact, in correspondence from Washington regarding houses at Union Farm, he notes that, when considering small houses and cabins, “I presume the people” can move them themselves “with a little assistance of carts” (Washington quoted in Pogue 1995). He also claimed that “my negroes dismantle [the cabins] as their occasions require, without leave, and without scruple” (Washington quoted in Pogue 1995). Enslaved laborers most likely constructed their cabins (Pogue 1995). It is likely that the impermanent cabins built at the Mount Vernon ridge resembled those constructed in these outlying farms.

Niemcewicz provides an image of what these houses may have looked like towards the end of George Washington’s ownership of the plantation. Niemcewicz described the slave quarter as being “more miserable than the most miserable of the cottages of our peasants” (Niemcewicz quoted in Franklin 2004:209). He explained the experience, noting that “we entered some negroes’ huts – for their habitations cannot be called houses” and observed that “the husband and wife sleep on a mean pallet, the children on the ground” (Niemcewicz quoted in Franklin 2004:209).

He went on to portray the cabin as having a “very bad fireplace, some utensils for cooking, but in the middle of this poverty, some cups and a teapot” (Niemcewicz quoted in Franklin 2004:209). He described a “very small garden planted with vegetables was close by [the quarter], with 5 or 6 hens, each one leading ten to fifteen chickens. It is the only comfort that is permitted” (Niemcewicz reprinted in Lee 2006:79).

Niemcewicz noted that the enslaved laborers sold the poultry in Alexandria for a few amenities and to supplement the food provided to them by George Washington. He further claimed that “General Washington treats his slaves far more humanely than do his fellow citizens
of Virginia” (Niemcewicz quoted in Franklin 2004:209). He observed that “most of these gentlemen give to their blacks only bread, water, and blows” (Niemcewicz quoted in Franklin 2004:209).

As the above description shows, these one-room slave dwellings not only served as the main sleeping area for many individuals, but they also had to contain spaces for storing kitchenware, tools, and personal objects (Franklin 2008). African diaspora archaeologists have discussed various types of compromises and tensions that occurred in these arrangements. Individuals sometimes have felt a lack of privacy and possibly hid objects in root cellars to protect them from being stolen by other residents of the cabin (Neiman 2008). However, based on this description, at least some of these quarters at the outlying farms appear to have only contained members of the same family. This arrangement may have relieved some of the tensions present in quarters at other plantations (Neiman 2008).

Scholars do not know much about what the ridge at Mount Vernon containing the Library site was used for during George Washington’s ownership of the estate. It appears to have been a lightly forested area in Washington’s Five Farms map, which shows the layout of the estate in 1793 (see figure 2). Unfortunately, this ridge area is not described in any of Washington’s writings that I could find.

The map indicates that Washington did not use this land for farming. It is also unlikely that he would have housed enslaved individuals who worked so close to the Mansion house in this area rather than the House for Families. Washington does not mention tenant farmers or skilled laborers along the ridge in any of his journal entries, correspondence, or survey notes. Further, the Five Farms map does not show the presence of any buildings in this area, which could indicate that this land was not in use during his ownership. Based on the map and lack of
documentary evidence from Washington, who kept meticulous notes about his estate (Casper
2009; Thompson 2002), this land was most likely not in use during this period.

At his death, Washington arranged for the manumission of all the enslaved Africans that
he owned to occur following Martha’s death (George Washington’s Last Will and Testament
1799). In 1800, fearing that these enslaved individuals would kill her to gain their freedom,
Martha freed all of George Washington’s slaves (Adams 1800; Washington 1800). While many
of these freed African Americans moved away, some remained on the estate, cared for by

After her death, the “dower slaves” (those from Martha’s first marriage) were split up
among Martha’s grandchildren (John Milner Associates, Inc. 2004). These enslaved individuals
ended up at: Woodlawn (formerly Dogue Run), the property of Lawrence and Eleanor Parke
Custis Lewis; Arlington House in Arlington, Virginia, owned by George Washington Parke
Custis; Eliza Parke Custis Law’s property, Mount Washington, outside of Alexandria, Virginia;
or one of Thomas and Martha Parke Custis Peter’s Property, Tudor Place in Washington, D.C.,
or at their rural plantation located in Seneca, Maryland (“Lives Bound Together”).

Since many “dower slaves” had married enslaved individuals owned and freed by George
Washington, some families were split up, with some members being manumitted and the others
remaining enslaved (“Lives Bound Together”). Further, Martha Washington’s grandchildren
split up the “dower slaves” by assigning them monetary values and trying to create equal
inheritances. The heirs endeavored to keep children with their mothers as much as possible but
did not try to keep families fully intact (“Lives Bound Together”). As a result, the freeing of
enslaved African Americans owned by George Washington, combined with the division of the
“dower slaves” separated most enslaved families, something which George Washington tried to avoid during his life.

**Part II: Mount Vernon under and after Bushrod Washington**

After Washington’s death in 1799, the Mansion tract, which included his Mount Vernon home, was inherited by a series of Washington nephews: Bushrod; John Augustine II; and John Augustine III (Bushrod Washington, Last Will and Testament 1829; George Washington's Last Will and Testament 1799; Pogue 1995, 2003). Bushrod only inherited three of George Washington’s five farms, including Muddy Hole, Union Farm, and the Mansion tract. In total, these farms comprised about 4,000 acres, about half of George Washington’s land (George Washington’s Last Will and Testament 1799; “Growth of Mount Vernon”).

Bushrod and Lawrence Lewis served as the executors of George Washington’s will. Lewis, George Washington’s nephew, who married Martha Washington’s granddaughter Eleanor Custis, inherited Dogue Run, located directly northwest of the Mansion tract (see Figure 2) (George Washington’s Last Will and Testament 1799). On this land he built his plantation, Woodlawn (“About Woodlawn”; “Growth of Mount Vernon”). George Washington left River Farm to his nephews George Fayette Washington and Lawrence (Charles) Augustine Washington (George Washington’s Last Will and Testament 1799).
Bushrod Washington did not leave notes that were as detailed as those left by his uncle and was less actively involved in running the plantation than his uncle had been (Casper 2008).

George Washington tried to be involved in making sure that the estate operated to his liking, often visiting the different farms multiple times in a week (Thompson 2002). In contrast, Bushrod tended to leave the running of the outlying farms to his overseers and farm managers (Casper 2008). Furthermore, he often lived away from home for most of the year since he served as a Supreme Court Justice. As such, he was required to be in Philadelphia and New Jersey to sit with federal courts as part of his Supreme Court duties (Casper 2008).
The occupation of the Library site and the surrounding ridge occurred during one of the significant disruptions for the Mount Vernon community. The social landscape at Mount Vernon under Bushrod Washington changed significantly, due to both changes in free and enslaved occupants and Bushrod’s positions regarding slavery and manumission. Bushrod brought a new enslaved workforce to the plantation. Like his uncle, Bushrod and his wife, Julia Anna, never had children. However, he served as guardian for some of his nephews and nieces, who often lived at the Mansion house or the surrounding farms (Casper 2008; John Milner Associates 2004). Unlike his uncle, for the most part Bushrod did not believe in manumitting enslaved laborers and viewed free African Americans as a threat to the institution of slavery (Casper 2008; Egerton 1985; Yarema 2006).

As I discussed in Chapter 1, as a part of the research for this project, I searched for and read various documentary evidence relating to Bushrod Washington’s ownership of Mount Vernon. I examined historical maps and letters (Executor Account Books; Fairfax County Deeds; Washington 1812; Washington reprinted in Heaney 1958; Washington and Washington 1814-1846), went through the executor accounts that show provisions for former George Washington slaves, and looked at deeds involving Mount Vernon during this time.

Based on the preliminary evidence I have from the archaeological excavations of the Library site, it seems likely that the residents of the site were economically marginalized people. Given the lack of features at the Library site, the houses located along the ridge were primarily made from logs and did not have brick foundations. It is also possible, however, that these houses were constructed through other means. Bushrod experimented with pise architecture, which is construction of buildings using rammed earth, for enslaved housing (Hallock 2004). He believed that while the log or frame buildings typically occupied by enslaved African Americans
were cheap, these structures were hard to heat in the winter and were often too hot during the summer (Hallock 2004; Kraus 2014).

Along with being economical to produce, rammed earth walls helped moderate temperature better than log structures, providing better housing for enslaved African Americans (Gramlich 2013; Hallock 2004; Kraus 2014). Like log cabins, this type of construction may not have necessarily left features. In fact, of the at least eight pise structures that Bushrod constructed, archaeologists only found the foundations for three of them (Hallock 2004; Pogue 2012). However, Bushrod did not start attempting the construction of buildings using pise until 1810, and it is therefore unlikely that the structures located along the ridge were made using these methods (Hallock 2004).

Unfortunately, but unsurprisingly, I could not find any documentary evidence created by the occupants of the Library site. Marginalized people do not often leave writings or other forms of documentary evidence about their lives. This absence contributes to the difficulty in finding and interpreting sites occupied by these groups, which is compounded by the typically ephemeral signature of houses occupied that they occupied (Ridout 2014).

As part of their research into the Library site, Mount Vernon archaeologists created a list of possible occupants of this site based on different correspondences. Their list included: John Mandeville, an overseer; Colin Hayes, a manager; and Mr. Lawson. The list also includes coachmen, cabinet makers, and other white skilled laborers (White pers. Comm.). However, many of these individuals either resided at Mount Vernon before the occupation of the site or stayed at Mount Vernon for the entire occupation period and, therefore, were unlikely to be the occupants of Field 7 and the Library site.
There are not many people who could have occupied this site from around 1800 to about 1830. While Bushrod did not keep as meticulous notes about the running of the plantation as his uncle did, I was able to find some information about the enslaved workforce at the plantation during the early 1800s from the Mount Vernon Farm Book. In the Farm book, Bushrod made notes about different aspects of Mount Vernon and included inventories of both various items and of his enslaved workforce. These lists include the names and ages of enslaved African Americans that he owned, purchased, and rented. It also contains information about where each enslaved labor worked on the plantation. However, the book does not provide much information about where they lived on the plantation.

Based on this information, it appears unlikely that enslaved laborers lived along the ridge. The Farm Book suggests that Bushrod focused on agriculture in his outlying farms (Casper 2008; “Farm Book”). Based on the patterns from both George Washington’s ownership of the estate as well other large late 18th and early 19th century Virginia plantations, such as Monticello and Montpelier, the enslaved African Americans who worked in the outlying fields during Bushrod’s ownership most likely lived in small cabins close to where they worked (Heath and Breen 2009; Neiman 2018; Pogue and Sanford 2018; Reeves and Smith 2015). At some smaller plantations, such as Stratford Hall in the early 1800s, agriculture fields were often located close to the Mansion house and consolidated enslaved housing (Heath and Breen 2009; Sanford 2003). Even with reduced size, Mount Vernon during the early 19th century was too large for this layout.

The historical maps of the project area from Bushrod’s tenure indicate that he did not cultivate this area of the ridge. It appears, as in George Washington’s ownership, that this area was wooded. Bushrod’s agricultural pursuits seem to have primarily occurred at Muddy Hole and Union Farm. These maps do not hint at any occupation or activity on the ridge site, although
archaeology supports the presence of households in this area. Based on this knowledge, it is unclear how much these maps show the features and configuration of the Mount Vernon ridge under Bushrod’s management.

Based on the amount of slag that archaeologists recovered from this area, which I discuss in greater depth in Chapter 6, it is possible that enslaved laborers worked at some smelting operation located along the ridge. If such an operation took place in this area, then enslaved laborers could have lived at the Library site. However, I could find no documentary evidence that was left by Bushrod that suggests the presence of ironmaking at the plantation or provides evidence for this hypothesis.

As far as we know, the domestic enslaved laborers at Mount Vernon under Bushrod lived closer to the Mansion house. Visitors’ accounts of Mount Vernon from the 1820s describe viewing the quarters for enslaved laborers located near the greenhouse as they came through the formal approach to the Mansion (Casper 2008). Further, most enslaved quarters near Mansion houses tended to be fairly well constructed.

One possible exception may have been the circumstances of James Nugent and his family, who may have lived separately from other enslaved laborers near the ridge. According to Scott Casper (2008), the Nugent family was an enslaved family owned by Bushrod. Survey notes on a May 10th, 1831 plat map showing the land that John Augustine Washington II inherited from Bushrod mentions going to a stake “where once stood Js. Nugent’s Cabin” (see Figure 3, which includes these notes) located along the road to Gum Spring. Since John Augustine Washington only inherited the Mansion tract and Gum Springs is north of the mansion, it is possible that Nugent’s cabin was located along the ridge. The survey notes
included on the map did not mention any other houses occupied by enslaved laborers, and it is unclear if or why the Nugent family lived separately.

Both diaries and local newspaper ads from the *Alexandria Gazette* indicate that Mount Vernon went through several farm managers and overseers during Bushrod’s ownership. The Library site and ridge at Mount Vernon likely contained more than one house, which would be inconsistent with being occupied by just one overseer. Further, overseers lived closer to the quarters of enslaved laborers at many plantations (Casper 2008). Therefore, while the area could have been occupied by a single overseer, this explanation would only be sensible if enslaved individuals of whom we are unaware also lived in this area.

As I discussed earlier, however, it is doubtful that enslaved African Americans lived along the ridge. Based on the Farm Book, during the early 1800s, overseers most likely lived at Union farm, Muddy Hole, and near the Mansion house.
It is also possible that tenant farmers lived in this area. However, I could find no records of tenant farmers living in this area during Bushrod Washington’s ownership. In addition, archaeologists have not found any features which would support the presence of tenant farmers and plowing in this area, such as plow scars, although it is possible these features could have been plowed away when the land was cultivated later (White 2012). Alternatively, skilled white laborers could have occupied this land. For example, cabinet maker James Holwig mentioned in his diary that he worked at Mount Vernon from 1803-1806 (White pers. comm. 2015).

Archaeologists have not found any artifacts related to skilled occupations, such as tools, which I would expect if such skilled laborers lived at this site. However, as I will discuss in Chapter 6, the presence of a large amount of slag (a byproduct of smelting) and bricks, including overfired and underfired bricks, indicates that such laborers could have lived and worked along the ridge.

Maps and historical documents seem to support the idea that former George Washington slaves may have occupied this area. A wooded area would not have been a practical place for tenant farmers to live and work. It would be unusual for a tenant farmer to live on Mount Vernon for 30 years without people writing something about him. It also seems unlikely that enslaved Africans would have lived in this area since it was not close to the Mansion house, was far from the outlying farms, and, as far as we know, Bushrod did not have any agriculture or other endeavors in this area.

If free African Americans lived in this area, it would have kept them at a distance from the enslaved labor force. This wooded area would have also kept free African Americans out of view from both enslaved African Americans and white visitors. This distance, both from the Mansion house and from the enslaved workforce may have been something Bushrod desired,
considering his views that free Africa Americans were a danger to the institution of slavery (Casper 2008; Yamera 2006).

This ridge was also located close to the Wessenyton cemetery, which was formed at some point during the occupation of this site (see Figure 1; also Downer 2015). This cemetery contained the graves of some local African Americans, including those who shared names with the former slaves of George Washington. We do not currently know the full extent of how free African Americans living at Mount Vernon related to this cemetery. However, the cemetery is located north of Field 7, so if free African Americans lived at this ridge, it is possible that they were involved with this cemetery, either by burying people there or visiting dead individuals who were buried there and maintaining the cemetery.

Based on George Washington’s will, 123 freed African Americans were allowed to remain at Mount Vernon or the Woodlawn plantation and receive provisions and care for the rest of their lives if they wanted (George Washington's Last Will and Testament 1799; John Milner Associates 2004). They could also choose to settle somewhere else. It is unclear exactly which freed individuals stayed on at the Mount Vernon property, although based on the information in the executor account books, many of the 123 moved away from Mount Vernon (Executor Account Books).

Based on the executor accounts, some formerly enslaved individuals either moved to Alexandria or lived near Martha Washington’s heirs at Woodlawn or other estates to be close to the family from which they were separated (“Lives Bound Together”). We know from executor accounts that Molly, Judy, Landon, Molly, Jane, and Gabriel remained living at Mount Vernon or Woodlawn following George Washington’s death (Casper 2008; Executor Account Books). The executor accounts primarily mention elderly or disabled former slaves who received
financial assistance from the estate since they could not take care of themselves (“Lives Bound Together”). It is possible that other freed slaves chose to remain at Mount Vernon but were not included in executor accounts since they were able to provide for themselves. For example, newspapers and visitor accounts indicate that William and Frank Lee, as well as Sambo Anderson, remained at the estate (“Lives Bound Together”).

While executor accounts do not mention Sambo, a runaway ad for his son Ralph alludes to Sambo’s presence at the estate. The Peters in Seneca, Maryland, owned Ralph. In 1810, he ran away, possibly to be with Sambo (Alexandria Gazette 1810). A runaway ad for Ralph suggested that Sambo lived somewhere on “Judge Washington’s Estate,” so Sambo likely resided somewhere at Mount Vernon during this period (Alexandria Gazette 1810). Mount Vernon historians speculate that Sambo possibly lived somewhere on Little Hunting Creek near his family’s old cabin, but it remains uncertain where he lived and how long he resided there (Casper 2008).

Newspaper accounts also indicate that Gabriel, one of George Washington’s former enslaved laborers, lived at Dogue Run, one of George Washington’s outlying farms that Bushrod inherited. The cases of Gabriel and Sambo illustrate that some former enslaved laborers of George Washington remained at Mount Vernon but did not live near the Mansion house (Casper 2008). William Lee, whom Washington freed at his death due to loyalty during the Revolutionary War, remained at Mount Vernon and was cared for by West Ford, a free African American who I will discuss in greater detail below. Given this information, Lee likely lived near the Mansion house (Executor Account Books; Casper 2008).

Even with all the information included in the executor accounts, there are still a lot of questions about the free African Americans living at the estate during this time. It is unclear from
documents where exactly the freed African Americans mentioned in the accounts resided at Mount Vernon. It is possible that the individuals mentioned in the executor accounts do not include the freed slaves who remained at Mount Vernon and obtained paid employment. The accounts may only list those individuals who were too sick or old to work and therefore needed aid from George Washington’s heirs.

The executors of Washington’s will show an item of expenditure by 1833 of more than $10,000 to the pensioned former slaves who remained at Mount Vernon or lived near the estate (Executor Account Books). These executors’ accounts indicate that the former enslaved African Americans received food, clothing, housing, and supplies from Bushrod Washington and Lawrence Lewis (Executor Account Books). It is indeterminate as to whether these supplies included items such as ceramics or other household objects, as these particular items are never mentioned explicitly in the records. Executors’ accounts from 1820 show that Bushrod paid for “supplies, rent, and fuel” for six free African Americans living at Mount Vernon (Executor Account Books). In the same year, he provided clothes and provisions for Landon, who also appears to have been a free African American (Executor Account Books).

Two different notes in the executor account from 1820 mention six free African Americans and six free women (Executor Account Books). It is unclear if all the free African Americans at Mount Vernon at this time were women, as their gender was not mentioned in this entry. However, Landon appears to be a man’s name. By 1821 it seems as if one of these individuals died, as the executor accounts only mention five free African Americans. Also, some of these individuals had some connection to people in town (possibly Alexandria, only 8 miles away) as the record mentions that Old Judy is in town at this time (Executor Account Books; “Visit Alexandria”).
Based on Lawrence Lewis’ executor accounts, Sukey and Molly, former enslaved laborers of George Washington, lived at Woodlawn during the early 1820s (Executor Account Books). The executor accounts also indicate that the former enslaved individuals may have moved between the different estates over the years. For example, in 1820 and 1825, Molly is mentioned as residing at Woodlawn. However, in 1828, she lived at Mount Vernon (Executor Account Books). On the other hand, it is unclear if Sukey ever resided at Mount Vernon, as she is only ever mentioned by name in Lawrence Lewis’ executor accounts.

In 1824, five free African Americans resided at Mount Vernon, but only two individuals received rent and fuel. Perhaps the other three individuals spent prolonged time in town during this year (Executor Account Books). It is also possible that rent and food were only provided to those who could not provide for themselves. By 1825, one free African American had died. Again, Bushrod provided rent and fuel to two free African Americans (Executor Account Books). The accounts show that both Judy and one of the other remaining free African Americans died in 1828.

The last mention of free African Americans in the executor account book was made in 1829, the year of Bushrod Washington’s death. This entry mentions the presence of two free African American women at the estate. The entry also references the funeral expenses for three pensioners (Executor Account Books). It is unclear if the executor accounts stop mentioning former George Washington slaves at Mount Vernon because Bushrod Washington died or because the free African Americans died or moved away. John Augustine Washington did not leave any further notes in these accounts.

Bushrod most likely viewed the presence of free African Americans, especially the former enslaved laborers of his uncle, as a threat to his own enslaved workforce. Their presence
showed that African Americans did not have to be enslaved and acted as a visible reminder that enslaved people could gain their freedom if their owners desired it (Casper 2008; Egerton 1985). Based on these feelings, Bushrod most likely wanted these freed African Americans to remain separate from the enslaved population at Mount Vernon. At the same time, based on the visitor’s account, it appears as though some formerly enslaved laborers worked near the mansion during the early 1800s, so it is possible that they socialized with Bushrod’s enslaved laborers.

During Bushrod’s ownership, the estate also saw an increasing number of tourists who wanted to see the home of George Washington. These visitors often interacted with both the free and enslaved African Americans living there (Casper 2008). Charles Wilson Peale, who visited the plantation in 1810, wrote that he “went to the Quarters (an out-building so-called) had found him [William, an old servant of General Washington] making shoes” (Peale quoted in Miller 2000:696). However, Peale also said that “he inquired for the old Slave Servants of the General and was told they were all dead except William” (Peale quoted in Miller 2000:696). Based on both the executor accounts and newspaper ads, it is clear that this claim was not true, so it is unclear how much we can trust these accounts (Casper 2008:14).

It is also possible that West Ford lived at the Library site for a time. Unlike the other former enslaved laborers living at Mount Vernon, Ford had belonged to Bushrod’s family rather than to George Washington. Hannah Bushrod Washington, Bushrod’s mother, treated West Ford differently and preferentially from other enslaved African Americans (Hannah Bushrod Washington, Last Will, and Testament). She ordered him to be vaccinated as a child and trained in a profession. She also had him learn how to read and write, which was unusual for slave owners to do but was still allowed in Virginia at the time (Hannah Bushrod Washington, Last
Finally, she arranged for his manumission at the age of 21 (Hannah Bushrod Washington, Last Will, and Testament, 1801).

When Bushrod died in 1829, he left West 160 acres of land in his will, which was also unusual (Bushrod Washington, Last Will and Testament 1829). West eventually sold this land and used the money possibly to purchase some of his family out of slavery and to buy another 214 acres of land adjacent to Mount Vernon, which he later divided up among his children. This area later became known as the free African American community of Gum Spring (West Ford Deed 1833). Given his treatment by both Bushrod and his mother, historians speculate that West Ford was probably the son of either Bushrod Washington or his father (Casper 2008). Scholars do not know where he lived on the estate before he inherited this land. As discussed in Chapter 6, even if he lived along the ridge, based on the number of artifacts and their clustering, it is likely that other people also lived in this area as well.
Following Bushrod’s death, Bushrod’s nephew, John Augustine Washington II, inherited the 1000 or so acres of the Mansion house tract, a significant decrease in the amount of land associated with the estate ("Bushrod Washington Survey Map," John Milner Associates 2004. See figure 6).

Other nephews of Bushrod inherited Muddy Hole and Union Farm (Bushrod Washington, Last Will and Testament 1829). When John Augustine Washington II died in 1832 after only owning Mount Vernon for three years, he left the estate to his wife Jane, who owned it for the next 18 years and was in charge of the estate while her son was attending the University of Virginia (Casper 2008).

Jane maintained an active role in running the estate and tried to maintain it to the best of her ability (Casper 2008). Based on historical maps, it appears that during some time, John Augustine Washington III turned different areas of the Mansion tract into farmland. Based on the Walter Gillingham map (Figure 7 in the next chapter; also see Washington 1843), it is likely that
during this time the trees along the ridge that includes the Library site and the Field 7 site were cut down, and the entire area became Field 7.

It is possible that those who remained living at the ridge were displaced as part of the transformation of the landscape under John Augustine Washington. It is also possible that by this time, all former George Washington enslaved individuals had either moved off the estate or had died. A final entry in the executor account book is for the funeral expenses of three pensioners. In the previous year, only three pensioners remained at Mount Vernon.

As mentioned earlier, the executor account entries for the estate may have stopped after 1830 either because Bushrod Washington died or because all of the pensioners living at Mount Vernon died. Further, I have not been able to find any correspondence between Jane and John Augustine Washington III or maps that mention anyone living in this area. Further the existing correspondence does not discuss the ridge’s transformation to Field 7 under John Augustine Washington III or the various activities that took place under his ownership.

John’s map of his neighborhood, which he included in the Farm Book, does not show any houses in the ridge nor does any of the correspondence refer to George Washington’s formerly enslaved laborers living on the estate. On the other hand, correspondence between Jane and John Washington shows that West Ford continued to work at the estate and often ran it himself when both of them were away (Letter from Jane Washington to John Augustine Washington III 1842).

**Part III: Laws and Free African Americans from 1782-1830**

To both contextualize the archaeological findings and better understand the different relationships in which occupants of Mount Vernon ridge were enmeshed, it is essential to
examine not only the changing social landscape at Mount Vernon but also in Virginia as a whole. It is necessary to investigate the changing legal position of free African Americans in Virginia to understand how the local white population may have viewed these formerly enslaved individuals. This investigation is especially important since significant legal changes occurred in Virginia around the time of George Washington’s death. These changes impacted the lives and relationships of free African Americans, including those living at Mount Vernon. Unlike with the Mount Vernon ridge, where it is difficult to definitively say who lived in the area using documentary evidence alone, documentary evidence provides scholars with a wealth of knowledge of the changing treatment of both free and enslaved African Americans in Virginia during the early Republic.

During the occupation of the library site, there was transformation of the enslaved population in Virginia. In 1808, the United States banned the international slave trade (The Act Prohibiting the Importation of Slaves:1808). While the illegal importation of captive Africans continued, the domestic slave trade dramatically increased. Virginia had two large markets where enslaved Africans were sold, one in Richmond and one in Alexandria, only 10 miles from Mount Vernon (Artemel et al 1987; Baptist 2001; The City of Alexandria;). These markets were responsible for sending nearly one million enslaved individuals from the mid-Atlantic to the Deep South (Baptist 2001).

These changes in the enslaved population gave rise to paternalism among Virginia slaveholders. Paternalism held the idea that African Americans were childlike and unable to take care of themselves (Morgan 1998). Slaveholders viewed themselves as fathers, who provided food, shelter, and clothing for their enslaved laborers. At the same time, plantation owners encouraged their enslaved laborers to form families and have children to naturally increase the
enslaved workforce. As a result, the population of Virginian born enslaved labors dramatically increased (Morgan 1998).

At the same time, the free African American population underwent major changes. From 1723-1782, it was almost impossible for Virginian slaveholders to manumit (free) enslaved African Africans. To free an enslaved laborer, a slaveholder had to gain permission from both the governor and his general council (Morris 1996:393). Legislators enacted this law as a part of slave codes in response to an attempted slave rebellion in 1723. Virginia legislators hoped that by making manumission difficult, it would stem future uprisings. As a result of this law, only about 20 enslaved individuals gained their freedom during this time (Heinegg 2005; Morris 1996: 393). In these 20 cases, the slaveholder often showed that the enslaved laborer did something heroic and therefore deserved their freedom (Morris 1996:393; Powers 1998).

The free African American population during this period was small, consisting of only about 2,000 individuals, most of whom lived in central and southeastern Virginia (Morgan 1998:490; Morris 1996:393). As a result, until 1782, most free African Americans were of mixed heritage. They often descended from Anglo-American or Native American women and African American men (Heinegg 2005). Further, court cases indicate that despite laws against it, free African Americans still sometimes engaged in interracial relationships with Anglo-American individuals (Heinegg 2005).

The ideas of race present in Virginia during the early 19th century first began to develop over one hundred years before. Epperson, along with Breen and Innes, illustrate that during the early 17th century, religion was often more important than skin color in interactions of Virginians (Breen and Innes 1980; Epperson 1991). In some cases, Christian people of African descent married people of European descent and lived together in multicultural communities. Also,
slaveholders often lived in the same house as Irish indentured servants and enslaved African Americans (Epperson 1991; Morgan 1975).

During the 17th century, Virginia laws allowed for different treatment of free and enslaved African Americans. Free African Americans were allowed to vote, testify in court, and were even considered citizens (Hening 1819). However, following an attempted slave rebellion in Virginia in 1722, in which a few free African Americas were involved, legislators enacted laws that stripped free African Americans and American Indians of their rights to vote and testify in court. These new laws associated race with blood quantum (Hening 1819; Tomlins 2010). If a person was more than one-eighth non-Anglo-American, then he or she was considered non-Anglo-American under law.

In 1782, through the work of the Quakers, who opposed the institution of slavery, and the influence of post–Revolutionary War ideology of equality, Virginia’s legislators enacted a new manumission law (Wolf 2006). This law allowed slaveholders to emancipate enslaved individuals above the age of 18 through last wills, testaments, or deeds proved in the county court by two witnesses (Morris 1996:393–394). Children could be manumitted but were not entitled to their freedom until they reached the age of 18.

After the enactment of this law, several Quaker slaveholders in Virginia immediately freed their entire enslaved workforce, and some provided them with continued housing and provisions (Heinegg 2005; Wolf 2006). At the same time, the Virginia General Assembly emancipated many enslaved men for their services to America during the Revolutionary War. This act, coupled with the change in the manumission law, had a significant impact on the size and makeup of Virginia’s free African American population (Morgan 1998; Nicholls 1990; Wolf 2006).
Virginia’s free African American population grew significantly in the years following this new manumission law. According to Virginian judge St. George Tucker, by 1790, the free African American population had increased to 13,000 individuals, more than six times the size of the population before the Revolutionary War (Morgan 1998:490). Some areas of Virginia saw an exceptionally substantial increase in the number of free African American individuals, with these social groups suddenly comprising a major part of the free population (Heinegg 2005; Nicholls 1984).

In 1790 the free African American population represented nearly 12% of Surry County’s entire free population of the county and almost 15% of the total free population of York and Charles City County (Heinegg 2005). In the following ten years, Virginia’s free African American population continued to grow rapidly. By 1800, they represented nearly 20% of Surry and Charles City County’s free population (Wolf 2006:43). Aside from these rural counties, free African Americans also had a large presence in some of Virginia’s cities, such as Alexandria, Petersburg, and Richmond (Wolf 2006).

Anxiety among elites increased, paralleling the rising size and percentage of formerly enslaved people into the free African American population in Virginia (Wolf 2006:115-125). Census records indicate there were 34,100 enslaved Africans in Virginia in 1800 (National Historical Geographic Information System). During the same year, there were over 15,000 free African Americans in Virginia, up from approximately 2,000 in 1782 (Wolf 2006). Anglo-Americans at all social levels worried that a visible population of formerly enslaved people could cause enslaved people to become envious of the rights afforded to the newly emancipated. They believed that this envy could jeopardize the institution of slavery in Virginia by inciting a slave rebellion that would possibly lead to the institution’s demise, as was the case in Haiti (Virginia
Gabriel Prosser’s 1800 attempted rebellion in Richmond, Virginia, Denmark Vesey’s in Charleston, South Carolina in 1822, and Nat Turner’s rebellion in Southampton County, Virginia in 1831 increased these fears.

In response, the state legislature passed numerous laws that endeavored to control the movements and actions of free African Americans, impinging on their autonomy and ability to carry out specific activities (Wolf 2006:115–119). Legislators eliminated the “other free” category, giving different rights and restrictions to free African Americans and American Indians and redefining what it meant to be a free African American (Morris 1996; Wolf 2006). Jack Forbes (1993:195) further notes that by the turn of the 19th century, Virginia officials assumed that all “mulatto” individuals possessed at least a quarter of African ancestry.

Through these new laws, legislators altered racial categories to justify the continuation of slavery in light of a growing, free African American population primarily comprised of those who were not born into freedom (Heinegg 2005). These new laws made the lives of free African Americans increasingly difficult and placed their freedom in an increasingly tenuous position. Legislators endeavored to increase white social, political, and economic space and marginalize the space of free African Americans in an attempt to coerce free African Americans into leaving the state (Hening 1819; Wolf 2006).

In 1801, politicians deprived free African Americans of the right to own guns without a license. Given the struggle they faced in obtaining a license, this law made it difficult for free African Americans to physically protect themselves (Wolf 2006:120). In 1805, politicians banned free and enslaved African Americans from holding a meeting together without a white person present and declared it illegal for free African American orphans or apprentices to learn “reading, writing, or arithmetic” (Clark 1998:516; Wolf 2006:120). Their status as free no longer
entitled them to their former level of treatment, rights, or protection under the law. Instead, white legislators hoped to restrict free African American’s rights to literacy, to prevent certain forms of communication, and restrict the types of jobs to which these individuals had access (Hening 1819; Morris 1996; Wolf 2006).

This transformed legal system no longer assured free African Americans’ freedom, as legislators stripped most of their rights and allowed them to become enslaved for the first time in Virginia’s history (Wolf 2006). In 1801 the legislature declared that free African Americans who moved to a new county before securing employment could be declared vagrants and enslaved (Wolf 2006:120). Given the difficulty of finding a job without first moving to a new place, this law was designed to make it difficult for free African Americans to move within the state. This law also made it easier for Anglo-Americans to recognize when a new free African American individual moved to their community and therefore know which free African Americans lived in their county (Morris 1996; Wolf 2006).

In 1805 the legislature declared that newly freed African Americans had to leave the state within the year or risk re-enslavement unless they could successfully petition the government (Morris 1996:396–97). Through this law, legislators actively reshaped the racial structure of Virginia. If any enslaved individual could be freed and any free African American could be enslaved, then there could be little difference in how Anglo-Americans viewed free and enslaved African Americans.

The 1805 law was one of the harshest new laws that controlled the freedom of free African Americans. At a local level, however, this law was not always enforced before Nat Turner’s rebellion in 1831. In places where white communities were more accepting of free African Americans, they often ignored this law (Ely 2004; The Race and Slavery Petitions
Project; Wolf 2012). In other places, members of the white community vouched for free African American community members when they petitioned to remain in the state (Ely 2004; The Race and Slavery Petition Projects; Wolf 2006, 2012).

This law would have impacted some of the freed individuals living at Mount Vernon. Sambo, for example, eventually purchased several members of his family out of slavery. He would have either had to move out of state to be with them, successfully petitioned to allow them to remain in the state, or risk their re-enslavement by allowing them to stay with him in state without petitioning the government.

The 1806 court case, Hudgins v. Wright, further cemented these changing racial ideas. In his ruling, St. George Tucker placed the burden of proof on free African Americans in cases involving questions of freedom (Wolf 2006:149). According to the ruling, all American Indians were assumed to be free unless proven otherwise because they were light-skinned; African Americans, on the other hand, were assumed to be enslaved unless they could prove otherwise (Wolf 2006:149–151).

Tucker argued that the obligation to prove their status should be on African Americans individuals because, unlike American Indians, whites normally enslaved African Americans (Wolf 2006:149–151). This ruling reinforced the notion that free and enslaved African Americans had the same racial identity and were entitled to the same lack of protection under the law. This court case marked the first time that American Indians and free African Americans received different protections under the law. It also provided another outlet by which free African American individuals could now become enslaved (Wolf 2006:149–151).
Laws passed after the *Hudgins v. Wright* case continued to mark the difference between American Indians and African Americans (Wolf 2006). These laws helped shape and illustrate a racial hierarchy where Europeans were superior, followed by American Indians, followed by African Americans. At the same time, some whites, including Thomas Jefferson, viewed mixed-race individuals as superior to African Americans based on the belief that the addition of white blood could make them more intelligent (Jefferson 1998).

Michael Nicholls (1990) also argues that the increased number of free African American population led to fear from whites, and it created an inability to tell the difference between free and enslaved individuals. Legislators decided that it was unwise for enslaved Africans to see free African Americans enjoying privileges not allowed to enslaved individuals. As a result, legislators stripped free African Americans of their ability to own guns (Wolf 2006).

Legislators also worried that free and enslaved Africans would communicate with each other to plan another rebellion. In reaction to this concern, legislators stripped both groups of their right to education (Wolf 2006). In an attempt to control the danger of free African Americans moving freely about the state, the government required all free African Americans to register at the courthouse of the county in which they resided (Wolf 2006). Registration lists included names, descriptions, and how they obtained freedom. These lists were placed on courthouse doors.

While these lists were used to monitor and control free African Americans, today these registers are helpful for scholars trying to understand the relationships between free African Americans and the white community (for a detailed discussion, see Schumann 2013). These registers can also provide evidence that free African Americans, including formerly enslaved individuals at Mount Vernon, saved money to purchase family members out of slavery. Based on
the Fairfax County free African American Registers, scholars know that Sambo Anderson purchased his daughter, Charity, as well as two grandchildren and three great-grandchildren from slavery (“Lives Bound Together”).

Furthermore, information included in different free African American registers shows that in several rural communities such residents often worked as farmers. Free African Americans who lived in towns worked the least desirable jobs (Morgan 1998; Singleton 2000). Women tended to be laundresses and seamstresses, whereas men were fishermen, coopers, and chimney sweeps (McCarty 2000; Morgan 1998). Eventually, many of these forms of employment became associated with African Americans. In many cases, these were the only occupations for which people in town were willing to employ them, because Anglo-Americans viewed these jobs as beneath them (Singleton 2001). These occupations helped support these Anglo-Americans’ view of African Americans as unable to handle more prestigious or managerial jobs and furthered the image of these individuals as dirty (Singleton 2001).

While some of those who remained at Mount Vernon possibly gained employment as paid workers, many of the freed enslaved laborers living at Mount Vernon may not have held jobs at all and lived as pensioners (Casper 2008:4). Several of them were too old or sick to hold employment, and they were guaranteed to receive provisions from Mount Vernon estate from Washington’s will.

However, some of the formerly enslaved individuals who chose to move away from Mount Vernon and who could have remained in contact with those living on the estate may have had some employment in Alexandria. As records indicate that those living on the estate often spent time in the city of Alexandria, it is likely that they were involved in the free African American communities there and knew people who had these forms of employment. As such, the
views that local whites may have held regarding the types of jobs commonly held by free African Americans could have still impacted the relationships in which freed slaves at Mount Vernon participated.

The jobs held by free African Americans did not typically pay well, as the white community undervalued these forms of employment (Singleton 2001). As a result, free African Americans could often only afford undesirable land, or land on the margins of town, as opposed to living in the main part of town and interspersed with white families as they did during much of the 18th century. A few Virginian free African Americans found great success, though, and the local white community respected them in their occupations (Lane and Freeman 1992; Nicholls 1984, 1990). In some places such as Richmond, Williamsburg, and Alexandria, these wealthy free African Americans lived in the city centers (Cressey and Anderson 2006; Jackson 1927; Lane and Freeman 1992).

In other places where free African American individuals lived, they depended on their relationship with local whites to obtain jobs or even remain in the state (Ely 2004; The Race and Slavery Petitions Project; Wolf 2012). During the antebellum period, Quakers continued to actively oppose slavery, publishing articles against the institution and promoting abolitionist views (Catalin 2009). They also supported free African Americans throughout Virginia, including those who lived near Mount Vernon (Catalin 2009). For example, in the 1840s and 1850s, the Quakers who lived in the Woodlawn neighborhood befriended local free African Americans and encouraged them to buy land both in the Woodlawn area and in nearby Gum Springs (Catalin 2009).

Wolf (2006) argues that the late 18th and early 19th century laws pertaining to free African Americans helped reshape racial categories and race relationships in Virginia. She notes that skin
color did not become the prime factor influencing relationships between Anglo-Americans and free African Americans until after the 1782 manumission revision (Wolf 2006). While free African Americans did not have the same rights as Anglo-Americans during colonial Virginia, class was still a more important factor in these relationships.

As discussed in Chapter 2, anthropologists acknowledge that race is a social construct used to oppress some and empower others by focusing on arbitrary criteria. Wealth, status, skin color, culture, and connections all had varying degrees of importance in determining how groups were racialized. However, racially oppressed people find means to contest their place in society. At the same time, as racial ideas shift, certain groups are caught in the crossfire, and are suddenly vulnerable to different treatment and restrictions.

Virginia’s changing racial ideas and constraints affected the formerly enslaved individuals living at Mount Vernon, and the shifting racial notions impacted the condition of free African Americans’ lives. These circumstances transformed the relationships in which they were involved, engendered new relationships, and changed how their agencies emerged. The changes to race-based laws enacted during the early 1800s impacted free African Americans in Virginia on social and economic levels. These impacts continue to influence both the types of material that archaeologists recover from African American occupied sites, as well as our ability to recognize these sites. Understanding Virginia’s changing race-based laws and racial relationships during the occupation of the Library site and surrounding ridge, coupled with the Mount Vernon documentary evidence and an artifact analysis, can help determine whether formerly enslaved African Americans lived at the ridge.

In the next chapter, I explain the changing environment of the Mount Vernon ridge that includes the Library site and Field 7, from George Washington’s ownership to the present. I also
situate the ridge in the larger Mount Vernon landscape. I examine the history of archaeological excavations at the Library site. Excavations at this site began in the early 2000s in preparation for a possible parking lot. They were continued from 2008 and 2010 by Mount Vernon staff archaeologists in advance of the construction of the Fred W. Smith National Library for the Study of George Washington.

I discuss the various techniques and methods used to carry out these excavations, as well as the major findings from this research. I further discuss the reasons why constructions continued despite the possible significance of the site. I also examine the excavations at Field 7 in December 2015, which we conducted to determine if the occupation at the Library site extended along this ridge and which were carried out along the same grid established for the Library site.
CHAPTER FIVE: MAJOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS OF THE MOUNT VERNON RIDGE

This dissertation focuses on a ridge at Mount Vernon that includes both the current location of the Fred W. Smith National Library for the Study of George Washington (the Library site. See figures 7-9), as well as National Park Service land known as Field 7 (Figure 7). This area includes several pre-colonial and historic sites, including sites that contain historic period domestic artifacts. My investigation

Figure 7: A map by Walter Gillingham showing the Mount Vernon estate shortly after John Augustine Washington III sold the Mansion House to the Mount Vernon Ladies Association. This map shows Field 7 (outlined), the location of the ridge that includes both the Field 7 site and the Library site. It is located about a half mile from the Mansion, which is located in the area above, marked Ladies Association. This map shows the ridge’s potential use as an agricultural field under John Augustine Washington III, although some of the areas around Field 7 were still forested. From the Huntington Library.
focuses on sites with late 18\textsuperscript{th} and early 19\textsuperscript{th} century components. The assemblages from this period are consistent with a domestic occupation, although historical maps provide no evidence of people living in this area. This chapter discusses the changing landscape from George Washington’s ownership of the land to the present. I also discuss the methodology and major findings of the different archaeological investigations that have been carried out on this ridge.

Part I of this chapter reviews the geography of the ridge at Mount Vernon. I discuss the ridge’s location in relation to both the Mansion house and other landscape features. I also explain what the environment was like during the early 19\textsuperscript{th} century occupation of the ridge and how this area changed from George Washington’s ownership to the present.
Part II reviews the different pre-2008 excavations at the ridge. These investigations include excavations in 2000 and 2003. Part III provides an overview of the 2008-2010 Phase I shovel testing and Phase II excavations in preparation for the construction of the Fred W. Smith Library, including the methodology, findings, and preliminary analysis of artifacts.

Finally, Part IV discusses the Phase I shovel testing of Field 7 that Mount Vernon archaeologists
and I conducted in December 2015, including the methodology, processing of artifacts, and preliminary findings.

Part I: The Geography of the Mount Vernon Ridge

The Library and Field 7 sites are located along the same ridge near the Mount Vernon estate. During John Augustine Washington III’s ownership, both sites were a part of the Field 7 cultivation area (Figure 7). The western portion of the Library site contains some small streambeds (Chisholm 2001). The two sites are currently separated by the George Washington Memorial Highway, which is an artificial boundary that was not present during the time in which the site was occupied (Breen 2015). The ridge is located slightly more than a half-mile away from the Mansion house (it takes approximately 10 minutes to walk from the mansion to the Fred W. Smith Library) and slightly

Figure 10: A Close up of the Walter Gillingham Map showing the location of the Field 7 site on the right and the Library site on the left. From the Mount Vernon Department of Historic Preservation
farther away from the Potomac River. During the occupation of this area, the closest major city was Alexandria, about 8 miles away (“Visit Alexandria”).

While we do not know for certain what this landscape looked like during Bushrod Washington’s ownership, there is no documentary indication that he developed the land. Most of his farming activities occurred at Muddy Hole and Union farms (Chisholm 2011). Based on George Washington’s Five Farm maps from 1793, it appears as though this ridge was lightly wooded during George Washington’s lifetime. Archaeological excavations in the 1980s also uncovered a George Washington era ditch to the north of the Field 7 site (Breen 2015).

Based on a map made slightly after John Augustine Washington III sold the land to the Mount Vernon Ladies Association, scholars know that this ridge was under cultivation during his ownership (see Figure 7) (Breen 2015). Because John Augustine Washington III owned significantly less land than Bushrod (only one tract from the five that made up the Mount Vernon estate), it is likely that he had to start farming close to the Mansion house, whereas Bushrod and George were able to restrict agricultural activities to outlying farms (Breen 2015; Chisholm 2011). It is therefore likely that he deforested the ridge, which probably remained wooded during Bushrod’s ownership. The start of cultivation in this area likely coincided with the end of its settlement, shortly after 1830 (Breen 2015).

This ridge became heavily wooded sometime during the early-to-mid 20th century (Chisholm 2011). According to an aerial photo, a water tower and a network of roads were constructed near the Library site by 1937. The water tower was still standing in the 1960s, according to a topographic map made during that time (see Figure 9), but it was destroyed sometime in the early 1970s (Chisholm 2011). The area around the Library site was also used as a modern dump during the mid-20th century (Chisholm 2011). The Mount Vernon Ladies
Association cleared the 8-acre area of the Library site to construct Fred W. Smith National Library for the Study of George Washington and associated parking lot (Chisholm 2011; White 2012). The 5.8 acre area of the Field 7 site remains forested today (see Figure 11).

**Part II: Early Investigations of the Mount Vernon Ridge**

The Mount Vernon Ladies Association archaeologists conducted the first excavations in the area of the current location of the Fred W. Smith National site in 2000 (Breen 2015). During this time, the area was a wooded lot containing maple, pine, and oak trees (Scheid 2000). Based on 1930s aerial photos, archaeologists believe that most of these trees were no more than 60 or 70 years old (Chisholm 2010). They undertook this excavation in preparation for the possible construction of a parking lot. In total, they excavated 179 shovel test pits (STP), located on 20-foot intervals on transects that were 20 feet apart. The soil was screened through a ¼ inch mesh. Archaeologists recovered 528 artifacts during the survey (Chisholm 2010).

According to Dwayne Scheid (2000), one of the archaeologists working on this project, a substantial percentage of the STPs consisted of topsoil, a light grey layer, a yellow clay plowzone layer, and subsoil. Fifty-one of the STPs contained modern intrusions and fill from road construction. This research uncovered site 44FX2460, which would become the Library site. Scheid recommended that archaeologists continue the Phase I survey to determine the boundary of the site and conduct Phase II excavations to evaluate the significance and integrity of the site (Scheid 2000). Archaeologists found three components of precolonial activity, evidence of a 20th century water tower and later dumpsite, as well as areas of late 18th and early 19th century domestic activity.

Out of the 179 STPs, 103 contained artifacts (57.54%). Precolonial artifacts were found in 41 units, and historic period artifacts were found in 43 units (Scheid 2000). Archaeologists
recovered 112 historic period artifacts from undisturbed contexts. Glass and nails account for 47 (42%) of these artifacts, while brick and coal account for 65 artifacts (58%). The excavations also uncovered six concentrations of brick fragments (Sheid 2000). Archaeologists recovered all of these artifacts from the plowzone and topsoil.

They did not find any cultural soils below the plowzone (White 2012). Sheid recommended Phase II archaeological investigations in the areas with high artifact concentrations. He noted that while plowing may have destroyed some features, testing at closer intervals could uncover additional features (Scheid 2000).

In 2003, the Mount Vernon Ladies Association contracted Coastal Carolina Research, Inc. to create a report assessing the visual impact of placing the West Parking lot at the location of the Library site. No additional archaeological testing was undertaken for this report (Breen 2015). Ultimately the Mount Vernon Ladies Association decided that the West Parking lot should be placed in the current location under Field 7 in response to concerns about large trees (Breen 2015). The archaeological investigation in preparation for the construction of the parking lot recovered traces of an old road, but no artifacts were found in the STPs.

**Part III: Archaeology of the Library site from 2008-2010**

From 2008-2010, Mount Vernon staff archaeologists and volunteers conducted further archaeological investigations in preparation for the construction of the Fred W. Smith Library (Breen 2015; White 2012). The excavations took place on an 8-acre piece of land between Route 235 North and South and included the location of site 44FX2460. During these investigations, site 44FX2460 became known as the Library site.
Most of the archaeological testing took place on a 3.5-acre parcel of land located in the easternmost part of the project area. These excavations entailed shovel test pits that were between 12-15 inches in diameter (Breen 2015; White 2012). Archaeologists excavated these STPs at 20-foot intervals on transects that were 20 feet apart. All positive STPs were tested with radials, or STPs located to the north, south, east, and west, and which tend to be a shorter distance apart than those on the transects. These additional STPs help define the boundaries of a possible site. At the Library site, radials were located 10 feet apart from each other (Breen 2015). During 2008, these radials were excavated after the entire 3.5 acres were tested. However, in 2009, the archaeologists determined it was more time-efficient to test radials after each positive STP hit (Breen 2015; White 2012).

Archaeological testing occurred on the same grid established during the 2000 survey. Archaeologists conducted their testing and mapped using engineering scale (relying on feet and tenths of feet) rather than the metric scale because historic buildings were typically built using measurements based on feet (White 2012). The STPs were excavated based on natural soil levels and were dug down until they reached subsoil (White 2012). All soil was screened through a
1/4th-inch mesh. All artifacts were bagged, washed in the lab, and then rebagged. All artifacts were cataloged in the Mount Vernon Rediscovery system, an artifact database, by count, except for brick and slag, which were entered by weight (White 2012).

The soil was uniform across the project area. It consisted of a shallow topsoil, a plowzone ranging depth from eight-tenths of a foot to a foot and half, and then subsoil (Chisholm 2012). The plowzone was a yellowish-brown silty or clay loam. Mid-20th century roadbeds were present in some of the STPs and were comprised of bricks, stones, and concrete blocks (Chisholm 2012; White 2010). These roadbeds helped to preserve the subsoil underneath them (Chisholm 2012).

In total, archaeologists excavated 940 STPs during this testing and recovered artifacts in 339 (38% of the STPs). Ceramic fragments included types of refined earthenware called creamware, which was produced from about 1762-1800, and pearlware, which was produced from about 1775-1840 (C.A.R.T Archaeology; Miller and Hunter 2001). Historic period artifacts comprised the vast majority of artifacts recovered from the STPs (White 2010). Pearlware was the most common type of ceramic found at the site, with 247 pieces recovered. Creamware was the second most abundant type of ceramic recovered, with 159 sherds found (White 2010). Combining the 2000 and 2008 surveys together, a total of 545 ceramic sherds were recovered, with 29.2% being creamware and 45% being pearlware (White 2010).

About 89% of the ceramics recovered during the shovel tests of the site were tea wares and tableware, including refined earthenware, stoneware, and porcelain. The artifact density maps created using Surfer Pro software revealed that artifacts were clustered in three locations, running north-south along the project area (White 2012). Brick concentrations occurred more on the eastern side of the project area (Chisholm 2010).
Beginning in April of 2009, Mount Vernon archaeologists, with the help of volunteers, also conducted Phase II archaeological excavations, using a systematic random sampling strategy (White 2012). Until December 2009, the field director of these excavations was Scott Speal, after which Anne Beaubien took over these duties. The goal of these excavations was to sample the plowzone in the three artifact clusters, to refine the time during which the site was occupied, and to locate the presence of any cultural features (White 2012).

Archaeologists excavated 5 ft. by 5 ft. units within every 20 ft. by 20 ft. quadrant to sample the plowzones within each artifact cluster (White 2012). A computer program randomly chose which units should be excavated. Archaeologists decided to use this random sampling in order to recover the widest distribution of artifacts. They began Phase II with the testing of the central concentration, which contained the richest artifact assemblage recovered from Phase I (White 2010).

Archaeologists excavated these units using natural layers, and they were taken down to the subsoil, which was usually present about one foot down. All soil was screened through a 1/4th-inch wire mesh (White 2010). Although a few places initially appeared to be promising, ultimately archaeologists found no definite cultural features in these excavations (White 2010).

The construction of the Library commenced in 2011. To further discern the presence of any possible features, archaeologists mechanically removed the plowzone in a 100 ft x 60 ft. area located in the footprint of the planned building and the main areas artifact concentrations (White 2012). Again, archaeologists found no cultural features such as the visible remains of hearths, building foundations, or storage pits. However, a large, burned area was discovered throughout part of the site. It remains unclear as to what caused this burning.
In total, archaeologists and volunteers excavated 421 5 ft. by 5 ft. units. They recovered a total of 19,571 artifacts, including the artifacts from the earlier excavations (White 2012). Based on a preliminary analysis of the assemblage, 74% of the artifact’s archaeologists recovered dated to the historic period (White 2012). Refined earthenware comprised slightly over 70% of the total historic period ceramic assemblage. Again, pearlware was the most common ceramic found at the site. This pearlware assemblage includes undecorated, painted, and transfer-printed (Breen 2015; White 2012).

Coarse earthenware comprised about 15% of the assemblage, porcelain about 10%, and stoneware about 5% (White 2012). The artifact assemblage proved to be fairly rich. In total, archaeologists recovered over 25 distinct ceramic ware types from the project area (White 2012). I discuss the ceramic assemblage from the Library site in greater detail in Chapter 6. Since the artifact catalog was not finalized when this analysis was conducted, some of these numbers differ slightly from the numbers I compiled in the analysis that I conducted using Microsoft Excel.

The Mean Ceramic Date (MCD) of these artifacts was 1796 (White 2012). The MCD is determined by multiplying the count of each ceramic ware type by its midpoint manufacturing date. The results are then added up and divided by the total ceramic count. The diagnostic artifacts recovered from these units also suggest occupation of this area from the late 18th through the early 19th century. The majority of the artifacts found in these units came from the historic period plowzone (White 2012). Ceramics such as Carnaryware, Portobelloware, and Salopian Pearlware are indicative of the early 19th century. On the other hand, excavations recovered a few pieces of whiteware, which was first produced around 1820, and no transfer-printed whiteware or other ceramics “dating to the 1830s or later” (White 2012). Mount Vernon archaeologists believe that the MCD may be earlier than the actual occupation of the site. The
MCD may be more reflective of the 18th century manufacturing dates for some of the ceramics, such as salt-glazed stoneware, creamware, pearlware, and Chinese export porcelain (White 2012).

Archaeologists conducted a minimum vessel count for ware types and decorative motifs for which less than 50 sherds were recovered. Twenty ware types fit this criterion, and 26 vessels were recorded from this sample (White, no date). As a whole, this is a rich ceramic assemblage that contains some ceramic types which have not been documented archaeologically from excavations at the mansion. Given these findings, it appears as though the ceramic assemblage is not just comprised of ceramics handed down from the Washington family to the inhabitants of the site (White 2010).

Surfer Pro maps of the ceramics revealed a difference in the location of creamware and pearlware concentrations. Both creamware and pearlware had concentration peaks in the artifact clusters (Chisholm 2010). However, creamware also had a concentration in a northern spot, in a location without much other archaeological material, and pearlware had a concentration in a southern spot (Chisholm 2010). This pattern is interesting since pearlware postdates creamware in terms of ceramic production. Due to time constraints, they did not research whether these different ceramic concentrations meant people moved across the site over time, whether these concentrations were connected to different occupations, or whether these concentrations were connected to differences in households (Chisholm 2010).

As mentioned above, domestic and architectural remains comprised a major part of the historic period assemblage (Chisholm 2010; White 2012). Surfer Pro maps revealed that while the northern and southern artifact clusters contained a small number of domestic objects, both of these clusters contained a significant amount of architectural remains (Chisholm 2010). On the
other hand, the central cluster primarily contained domestic objects with relatively few architectural artifacts. Archaeologists argued that these distribution patterns suggested the southern and northern clusters may have been houses while the central area may have been used as an activity area or midden (Chisholm 2010; White 2012). A midden is formed when residents of a place primarily depose of their trash in a layered deposit in a central location (King 1988). Chisholm (2010) argues that the diversity of the domestic objects recovered from the central artifact cluster is particularly indicative of a midden.

Aside from ceramics, archaeologists also recovered copper and pewter buttons that date to the early through the mid-19th century (White 2012). They found lead shot, including three pieces of buckshot and three pieces of birdshot and gunflints. They also found a shell blank that indicates that the site’s occupants made their buttons (White 2012). They recovered glass marbles, a thimble, two copper alloy escutcheons, and, in total, about 132.5 pounds of brick were also unearthed in these units. I discuss these artifacts in greater detail in Chapter 6.

Archaeologists recovered 114 animal bones, as well as some burned seeds. They also found oyster shells, freshwater clams, and turtle shells (White 2012). These bones and seeds, along with the gunflint and shot, may provide evidence that the site’s occupants were hunting and eating on the site. It appears as though the occupants were taking advantage of the natural allowances of the area by fishing and using local materials to create different objects (White 2012).

Archaeologists generated a Surfer Pro map showing the results of the Phase I excavations. (Figure 12). It shows a large artifact cluster in the southwest, an artifact cluster in the central portion of the project area, and a small artifact cluster in the North (Chisholm 2010).
The amount of ceramics, container glass, window glass, and nails recovered from the area suggests a domestic occupation (Chisholm 2010; White 2012).

Based on the artifact distributions, archaeologists argued that the clusters of artifacts indicated the presence of either three houses or a combination of outbuildings and houses (White 2012). The absence of any features such as foundations or postholes means this interpretation is only speculative (Chisholm 2010; White 2012). During this research, archaeologists also found a burned layer that spread across part of the site (White 2012). We are still unsure of what event caused this burning.

Figure 12: A Surfer Pro map showing the distributions of artifact clusters from the 2008-2010 survey. The three clusters are located in the north, the west central area, and the south. Note that this map includes both historic and prehistoric artifacts. The color gradient shows the concentration of artifacts. The lighter color has the lowest concentration and the darker colors have the highest. From the Mount Vernon Archaeological Department.
Archaeologists argued the distribution pattern of pottery indicates that the Library site possibly had multiple occupations over the years, located at different parts of the site (Chisholm 2010). However, I believe this pattern could also mean that the site area had one occupation, and the residents of the site had varying access to goods or that the residents of the northern structure chose to use creamware ceramics for an extended period, perhaps to save money. Future statistical analysis of the differences in the distribution of other artifacts such as teawares, decorated glasswares, and other datable ceramics, may provide support for one of these hypotheses.

Figure 13: A Surfer Pro map showing the distribution of historic period artifacts recovered from the Phase II excavations at the Library site. The color gradient indicates the concentration of artifacts, with the darkest red indicating the highest concentration (about 220 artifacts) and the lightest cream indicating the lowest concentration (about 0 artifacts). From the Mount Vernon Archaeological Department.
The artifacts recovered from this project are consistent with those of domestic assemblages. This type of assemblage, however, is difficult to reconcile with the presence of so many artifacts in a broad area lacking non-natural features. This lack of features likely indicates that the individuals who occupied the ridge lived in insubstantial dwellings, such as log or wattle and daub cabins, similar to those resided in by George Washington’s enslaved laborers who worked in the outlying farms.

These types of houses do not preserve well, are not very heavy, and often do not cut into the ground, leaving few marks in the archaeological record. Dwellings of this type tended to be occupied by economically and racially marginalized individuals. This archaeological evidence suggests that the site’s occupants were among the poorest strata of society. This is somewhat at odds with the Library site’s assemblage, however, which contains a high proportion of porcelain and refined earthenware. These types of ceramics are not often associated with the very poorest individuals, and thus complicate our understanding of the site’s occupants.

Documentary research conducted as part of this project did not indicate who lived on this ridge during the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Historical maps from both George Washington and Bushrod Washington’s tenure indicate that this area was lightly wooded during the time of its occupation, and maps from John Augustine Washington’s ownership show that this land was deforested and plowed at some point after 1830, becoming part of Field 7 (see Figure 7).

Mount Vernon archaeologists hypothesize that the site may have been occupied by individuals formerly enslaved by George Washington who remained on the Mansion tract after being manumitted in 1800 (White pers. comm. 2015). While the law prohibited African Americans from owning guns during this period, lead shot was found at the House for Families, occupied by enslaved laborers at Mount Vernon from the 1760s to 1790s (Pogue 1995). The
presence of gun-related items, therefore, does not preclude the possibility that free African Americans occupied this land. It is also possible that this area was occupied by an overseer, tenant farmers, or other economically marginalized individuals (White 2010), although it seems unlikely that these individuals would live in a wooded area.

The presence of a plowzone and absence of clearly stratified historical layers means that the site technically lacked integrity (White 2012). Integrity refers to the ability of a site to convey significance. Vertical integrity means that the strata have not been disrupted. Each stratum is typically connected to a distinct occupation of a site. Horizontal integrity means that the objects were not moved across a site, that is objects were recovered in the area where people deposited them (King 2009).

In order to retain integrity, a building or site should not have been moved after its period of significance, and the surrounding environment should be fairly unaltered. The ancillary buildings and structures of a site typically need to remain standing to reflect such integrity. Further, the site needs to contain the original objects used at the site in the configuration in which they were used (NPS 1992:8-9). Plowing, which disrupts strata and the configuration of artifacts, destroys site integrity since it would no longer retain the characteristics present at the time of its significance (King 2009).

Given this lack of archeological integrity, Mount Vernon archaeologists recommended no further archaeology (White 2012). The plowzone and the lack of features also meant that the site could not be considered historically significant based on the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) standards (King 2012). As a result, the construction of the Library continued over the location of 44FX2460, and in the process destroyed the site.
Part IV: 2015 Archaeological Investigations of Field 7

For one week in December 2015, Mount Vernon archaeologists, volunteers, and I conducted further archaeological excavations at an area of National Park Service (NPS) land known as Field 7. This area is located on 5.8 acres on the same geographical ridge as the Library site across the George Washington Memorial Highway (Breen 2015). During John Augustine Washington III’s ownership of Mount Vernon, both this area and the Library site were part of Field 7 (see Figure 10). The highway acts as an artificial boundary that was not present during the 19th century, meaning that the occupation from the Library site could have continued across the rest of Field 7 (Breen 2015).

This land was not tested during the 2008-2010 excavations because it is on NPS land and not impacted by the Library’s construction (Breen 2015). Currently, this area is used by locals as a walking trail. Luke Pecoraro, Director of Archaeology at Mount Vernon from 2015-2019, was the field director of this survey, and Eleanor Breen was the Principle Investigator. This survey became known as the Field 7 survey.

In October 2015, we received a permit for archaeological investigations at Field 7 from the NPS for shovel testing. We conducted this testing to determine whether the occupations found at the Library site extended across the ridge. Finally, this survey project was part of a larger plan by the Mount Vernon Ladies Association to understand how the Mansion tract changed from George Washington’s ownership to the present (Breen 2015).

Our 2015 investigations consisted of a Phase I shovel testing that was conducted on the same grid as the 2000 and 2008 surveys. We excavated on 40 feet by 40 feet transects, a larger interval than those used in the 2008 survey. It is possible that some artifacts and features may
have been missed due to the greater distance between STPs during this survey than in the Library site survey (see figures 15 and 16).

We did not have the time to excavate radials around positive STPs, so we do not understand the full extent or boundaries of artifact dense areas. The excavation and mapping were carried out using engineering scales. Excavations were conducted by natural layers and went down to subsoil. All soils were screened through a 1/4\textsuperscript{th}-inch wire mesh. We conducted shovel testing on 16 transects. A dense area of brambles made archaeology testing difficult in several areas. In total, we were unable to excavate seven additional planned STPs due to the brambles.

The shovel testing was conducted in groups of two or three people. During this project, we received help from 12 volunteers. Archaeologists with shovel testing experience were grouped with inexperienced volunteers. When the excavation of each test unit was finished, the color of each layer was determined using a Munsell Soil Color Chart and in consultation with each team member. Excavation groups also determined the soil and sediment texture for each layer and recorded this information on unit forms. Excavation groups created profile maps of each STP after they reached subsoil. No soil samples were taken for floatation or chemical analysis.

The burned layer that was uncovered at the Library site continued on this side of the ridge. The 2015 Phase I excavations provide no further insight into what caused this burned layer. The historic period plowzone also appeared in this part of the ridge, although it was only present in the western part of the survey area. The presence of the plowzone was somewhat inconsistent. The plowzone is created when plowing occurs on a site, mixing different layers of soil. The lack of soil could indicate that plowing did not occur in this location or that some later
cultural or natural disturbance at the site, such as erosion, destroyed this layer. Some of the STPs lacked a plowzone even though they were located on the same northing or easting as other STPs that contained a plowzone. In total, the plowzone was present in 38 of the STPs. On some test unit forms, it was either not marked, or it is difficult to tell whether the plowzone was present or not. As a result, there is no data about the presence or absence of plowzone in nine of the test units.

We found 48 positive STPs in this 2015 survey. Just six of these contained precolonial material only. In total, 35 positive STPs contained only historic period material, and seven STPs contained both precolonial and historic period artifacts. Altogether, we collected 318 artifacts along with bricks, charcoal, and slag. The diagnostic pottery from this survey also points to a potential occupation during the early-to-mid 1800s. Pearlware sherds comprised the majority of ceramics recovered, although a sherd of porcelain, two sherds of red-bodied ware, and a sherd of whiteware were also found. We also recovered one button that appears to date to the early-to-mid 19th century.

We found a high concentration of historic period pottery, bricks, cut or wrought nails, and slag on transects 10 and 11, especially in the northeast part of the project area. This area also produced two pipe bowls. The ceramics and buttons that were recovered in this area, as well as the lack of occupational tools, appear consistent with an early-to-mid 19th century domestic occupation. We found several pieces of window glass, although it is difficult to discern if they date to the 18th and 19th centuries or if they are modern glass. We also found some green and brown bottle glass, some of which appear to be modern, machine-made glass and others which could be historic period glass.
Finally, we recovered some modern trash, including a golf ball, glass soda, and alcohol bottles, and a bike part, which is unsurprising given this area’s present-day use. We also found pieces of asphalt and other modern-day synthetic artifacts such as plastics and scraps. We collected the complete soda and alcohol bottles that we found, but these were not cataloged with the other glass. As with the Library site excavations, we did not locate any cultural features in Field 7 through our 2015 survey.

All artifacts were collected and bagged on the site. They were later washed and re-bagged in the Mount Vernon archaeology lab. I cataloged the artifacts using Mount Vernon’s Re-Discovery system. I also compiled this information into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The bricks, slag, coal, and charcoal were also entered into the catalog and Excel database. These were not counted but weighed. Altogether, we recovered 288.74 grams of bricks and 652.8 grams of slag.

I also measured the diameters of all rims and bases from the Library site excavations in millimeters using the Digital Archaeological Archive of Atlantic Slavery measurement charts. We did not recover any rims or bases recovered from the Field 7 excavations. I re-cataloged a few of the Library site ceramics that had been incorrectly categorized. I also measured the diameters of all the pipestems recovered from the Library site excavations. We did not find any pipestems in the Field 7 survey. For both the Library site and Field 7, I took note of any decoration found on the pipe bowls.

Based on our findings from this survey (i.e. the paucity of artifacts from the survey, especially historic period domestic debris), we feel no further archaeological excavation is necessary at this time. Further, the presence of plowzone shows that the site lacks archaeological integrity, and as with the Library site, we found no archaeological features. However, as
mentioned above, we did find an area with some 19th century domestic artifacts clustered together that could be connected to an additional dwelling.

Future research undertaken at Field 7 may test the area with 19th century artifact clusters and can help us better understand this occupation. We could conduct Phase I radials around the positive STPs and carry out Phase II 5 ft. by 5 ft. test units to better understand the boundaries of this occupation, how it connects to the other occupations along this ridge, and whether we could find any features.

In the next chapter, I analyze the artifact assemblage from both the 2008-2010 excavations and the 2015 excavations using Microsoft Excel to answer many of the questions that remain from these excavations. For the Library site, this analysis primarily draws from the findings from Phase II excavations, whereas the Field 7 analysis only relies on Phase I STPs. In my analysis, I attempt to ascertain how the occupants of the ridge related to each other, the environment, and other people, places, and things.

I compare the types of ceramics, glassware, and other household artifacts found across the various artifact clusters to examine whether they differ in any meaningful way, which may point to differential access to consumer goods. I also examine the architectural and brick remains to try to better understand the structures that were present at the Library site and Field 7. I try to determine how many dwellings were present at each of the sites and when these different structures were occupied.

I use the minimum number of vessel counts and the base and rim diameters of the ceramics to estimate the size of ceramics to understand better household dynamics, including whether the residents cook and ate together and if they shared supplies. I investigate leisure
objects, items related to personal adornment, and items related to guns to better understand how the residents interacted with each other, other people, and the environment. I discuss the results of these excavations and analyses within the theoretical framework outlined in Chapter 2 to better understand how residents of the site constructed their identities and how different objects played roles in their daily lives. Based on some of the interesting findings at the site, I also explore an alternate hypothesis for who may have lived at the site as well as discuss the problems with this other interpretation. Finally, I examine the possible connections between the Library and Field 7 sites.
CHAPTER SIX: ANALYSIS OF THE RIDGE SITE ASSEMBLAGES

This chapter uses the archaeological assemblage to examine hypotheses about who may have lived at the Mount Vernon ridge and to explore the lives of those occupants. I discuss the gaps in the documentary and archaeological evidence, as well as what these issues can reveal about archaeological understandings of race. I also examine how this information can help us reshape public memory and create more inclusive histories.

In this chapter, I discuss the statistical analyses that I conducted on the artifacts found at the Library site and Field 7. I then interpret my findings through the theoretical framework I discussed in Chapter 2. Using various analytical methods, I examine the distribution and percentages of household artifacts from the sites to determine where residents may have carried out activities and deposited items. Using the locations from which archaeologists recovered architectural artifacts, I also try to determine where residents may have constructed structures.

Through this analysis, I gain a better understanding of the lives of the inhabitants of these sites; the way they related to other people, places, and things; and how they constructed their identities in a changing world. This analysis can provide insight into the relational networks at the Library site and Field 7 and the ways in which agency emerged. The individuals who lived on this ridge may have had varied life experiences. Some may have worked in the fields of outlying farms a couple of miles away from the main Mansion. Others could have worked on the Mansion tract, either in the main house or the various outbuildings. Household archaeology can increase scholars’ knowledge of the values, identities, and relationships of the residents.

I begin this chapter by laying out the main goals of this investigation and the tools I use to carry out my analysis. I explain how I analyze different parts of the artifact assemblage to
answer these questions. In Part II of the chapter, I use data compiled with Microsoft Excel to conduct a basic examination of the Library site. This analysis investigates the amount and types of ceramics, including minimum vessel counts, glasswares, flora and fauna, architectural remains, and leisure artifacts and tools recovered from the site.

In Part III, I use Excel data sets to conduct a preliminary analysis of the Field 7 assemblage and use my findings to explore whether the site was occupied and, if so, how the occupation relates to that of the Library site. I examine what the different types of historic period artifacts recovered from the site show about the presence of potential house sites that are contemporaneous with the occupation of the Library site. In addition, I examine the distribution of historic period artifacts at Field 7, discuss where the artifact concentrations are located relative to the Library site, and consider what the distributions indicate about where researchers may conduct future excavations.

In Part IV, I provide a summary of the major findings. I examine what the data can tell scholars about the inhabitants of the site, but also how this data can shape memories and histories of Mount Vernon. I discuss the possibility that formerly enslaved individuals manumitted by George Washington lived at the site after his death. Based on some unexpected findings in the data, I also examine an alternate hypothesis that the site may have been occupied by white laborers who carried out work along the ridge and explain why this hypothesis is unlikely. The findings from this site can help scholars create more inclusive histories of Mount Vernon.

Part I: Methods of the Artifact Analysis

The analyses in this chapter helps reveal what can be determined about the lives of the residents of the Library site based on the recovered artifacts. I use my findings to examine
hypotheses regarding the site’s possible occupants, including tenant farmers, skilled laborers, or free African Americans. The results of my examination, even when combined with the documentary analysis, also highlight issues that arise when trying to understand sites occupied by racially and economically marginalized people.

I conducted a basic analysis of the artifacts from both Field 7 and the Library site using Microsoft Excel. Using the artifact catalogues from the Library site (created by Mount Vernon archaeologists), and Field 7 (which I created, and can be found in Appendix 2), I compiled several artifact tables (see Appendix 1). In these tables, I examined the artifact counts of the entire Library site assemblage as well the breakdown of artifacts within particular groups of artifacts (e.g., the number and type of decorated glasswares, the number and type of different animal bones etc.).

I calculated the minimum number of ceramic vessels (MNV) recovered from the Library site. While raw numbers of ceramic sherds are important to examine, they can be unreliable since some ceramics may break into fewer, larger sherds while others could break into many, smaller sherds. The minimum number of vessel counts can therefore provide a better idea of how many individual ceramics were recovered from a site. The results of these calculations can also be found in Appendix 1. As part of this examination, I calculated the MNV of ceramics by both form and ware.

In order to better understand the size of the ceramics found at the site, I also measured selected ceramics’ rims and diameters (see Appendix 1). This information can provide insight into whether the residents of the site ate together and stored food together. I also used the datable ceramics recovered from the Field 7 survey to determine the Mean Ceramic Date (MCD) of Field 7. The comparison of this date to the MCD of the Library site, as well as the occupation
date of the Library site that I determined through pipe stems, can help reveal whether Field 7 was contemporaneous with the Library site occupations. The connections between the structures at these different sites, if any, can provide insight into interactions and the layout of Mount Vernon during Bushrod Washington’s ownership. These investigations into possible associations between the residents of these various areas can, therefore, shed light on the relationships between the residents of the site.

**Part II: Artifact Analysis of the Library Site Assemblage**

*Ceramic Counts and Site Dating*

I began my analysis with a basic examination of the artifacts in the final artifact catalog using compilations in spreadsheets. Mount Vernon archaeologists conducted some of this analysis following the Library site excavations, but before the artifact catalog was finalized. As a result, I have decided to carry out my own examination of the assemblage using the final artifact catalog rather than relying on the earlier numbers.

In total, during the Phase II Library site excavations, archaeologists recovered 10,709 artifacts definitively from the historic period. Ceramics accounted for 5,128 (48%) of the total historic assemblage of artifacts. This total ceramic count does not include objects such as bricks, pipe stems, pipe bowls, drainage pipes, planters, tiles, and flowerpots. This total only includes ceramics that were used for dining, food preparation, and food storage.

The Library site contains 27 distinct types of wares, plus unidentified wares. Using sherd counts to compare amounts of different types of ceramics can be misleading since one piece of ceramic could break into a few large sherds, and another piece could break into many smaller pieces. However, the number of sherds can still provide some information as to the amount of
each ware. Some of these wares, such as Buckley and Astbury, both black, lead-glazed red-bodied earthenwares, only had a handful of sherds. Whiteware accounted for only 42 pieces of ceramics, or about 1% of the total ceramic assemblage, a finding that helps confirm that the site was most likely not occupied much past 1830.

On the other hand, as discussed earlier, the largest percentage of ceramics came from pearlware, which had 2,019 sherds (41% of the ceramic assemblage); creamware, which had 1,221 sherds (23%); and porcelain, which had 526 sherds (11%). These findings again confirm that the main occupation of the site began around the turn of the 19th century.

Figure 14: An ArcGIS map showing the distribution of porcelain at the Library site. The color gradient indicates the amount found in a location with the lightest colors indicating the least amount found and the darker colors being the most. Map by author.
Pearlwares, creamwares, and Chinese porcelain are all frequently found on historic period sites. Chinese porcelain was created by combining kaolin clay with finely ground feldspathic rocks and firing the pottery at high temperatures (Noel Hume 1969:258). Porcelain has a “high-gloss glaze” that does not flake and is fused to the body of ceramics (Noel Hume 1969:258). Although porcelain was only found in affluent homes during the colonial period, by the end of the 18th century, it became increasingly common as the quality and price declined (Noel Hume 1969:258).

Josiah Wedgewood introduced creamware, a refined, cream-colored earthenware, to England in 1762 (Marciniszyn 2017; Noel Hume 1969:124). Wedgewood achieved the cream color by adding copper to a lead oxide glaze (Marciniszyn 2017; Miller and Hunter 2001; Noel Hume 1969). Creamware remained common until the turn of the 19th century when the rise in popularity of pearlware led to the decline of creamware (Miller and Hunter 2001; Noel Hume 1969). Wedgewood introduced

Figure 15: An ArcGIS map showing the distribution of creamware and pearlware at the Library site. The color gradient indicates the amount found in a location with the lightest color indicating the least amount found and the dark color indicating the most. Map by author.

Noel Hume 1969:124). Wedgewood achieved the cream color by adding copper to a lead oxide glaze (Marciniszyn 2017; Miller and Hunter 2001; Noel Hume 1969). Creamware remained common until the turn of the 19th century when the rise in popularity of pearlware led to the decline of creamware (Miller and Hunter 2001; Noel Hume 1969). Wedgewood introduced
pearlware in 1779, as a ceramic that was whiter than creamware and closer in look to porcelain (Noel Hume 1969:128). He achieved this look by adding cobalt to the ceramic’s lead oxide glaze (Marciniszyn 2017; Miller and Hunter 2001).

Pearlware remained commonly used until around 1820, around the time whiteware appeared (Marciniszyn 2017). Whiteware was similar to pearlware, except that it did not use cobalt in the glaze. Whitewares are still produced today (Marciniszyn 2017). Taken together, the rise and fall of these wares’ use (creamware then pearlware then whiteware) provides a strong indication about the Library site’s occupation. Since there was a high concentration of creamware and pearlware but not whiteware, the most likely occupation of the site occurred around the turn of the 19th century (see figures 17 and 18).

In total, archaeologists recovered 119 sherds from storage vessels at the site. These vessels primarily consisted of low-cost utilitarian wares such as American Blue and Grey and English Brown. Both of these are stonewares, which were slightly less vitreous than porcelain and fired at slightly lower temperatures (Miller and Hunter 2001; MSU Campus Archaeology Program; Noel-Hume 1969). American Blue and Grey ceramics were produced from the early 1700s through the early 20th century and were an attempt to replicate German stonewares (Marciniszyn 2017). English Brown had brown salt-glazes and was produced from the 1690s until about 1775 (Samford 2014). Two of the storage vessels contained incising. A third sherd contained both incising and banding, or horizontal bands of colored slips (Florida Museum). All the other storage vessels recovered were undecorated, which is not surprising considering these vessels served a utilitarian purpose.

*Minimum Number of Vessels and Ceramic Usage*
To get a full sense of the amount of ceramics, I calculated the Minimum Number of Vessels (MNV) in the assemblage. The MNV represents the lowest number of vessels that could be present in an assemblage and is often a conservative estimate. I calculated this number relying on decorative motifs and vessel forms, as determined through rim sherds, base sherds, and large enough body sherds. Essentially, I included the first instance of each combination of ware type, form, and decoration in the MNV count.

First, I calculated the MNV for 18 different ceramic forms (see Appendix 1, Table 4 for the complete results). These forms included: bottles, bowls, cups, chamber pots, plates, platters, saucers, teacups, teabowls, teapots, pots, milk pans, and tankards. I also calculated the MNV for flatwares (a catch-all term used when archaeologists cannot tell if an object is a plate, platter, or saucer), unidentified hollowares (objects such as bowls, pots, jars) used for dining, unidentified hollowares used for storage, unidentified hollowares used for food preparation, and unidentified tea-related objects. Finally, I calculated the MNV for other ceramics, which are body pieces with indeterminate forms whose combination of ware type and decoration would not otherwise be included in the total MNV count. I also calculated the MNV for each of the different ware types found at the site (see Appendix 1, Table 5). Future research can be conducted to determine the MNV by form and ware type (i.e., figuring out how many pieces of pearlware flatware or hollowares were recovered from the site).

As with the basic sherd count, pearlware was the most common vessel recovered by MNV count, with 68 vessels. However, porcelain had the second-highest number of vessels with 28, and creamware had 18 vessels. The difference between the MNV count and sherd count may be due to the fact that while more creamware sherds were recovered from the site than porcelain, those sherds contained less diversity in form and decoration. Most pieces of creamware were
undecorated or had green scalloped edges, so I could not be sure if they were from different vessels, which leads to lower MNV counts. On the other hand, porcelain had a greater variety in terms of decoration and forms.

Unidentified, white-bodied refined ceramics had the fourth-highest MNV count, with 16 vessels. None of the remaining ceramic ware types had an MNV count higher than 10. The results of this MNV analysis shows that while the assemblage contained a great diversity in terms of ware types, the majority of the assemblage was comprised of four different types of refined earthenwares.

The MNV count of vessel forms can provide insight into what the residents ate and how they interacted with each other. A higher number of bowls and dining related hollowares are often associated with stews, which are made and eaten communally. On the other hand, a higher number of plates is often associated with more individualized food preparation and consumption. The MNV analysis shows that at least two bowls and 16 plates were recovered from the Library site, which suggests more individual activities. This picture shifts, however, when we also look at unidentifiable flatwares and unidentifiable dining related hollowares. Hollowares used for dining had an MNV count of 75 vessels, the highest count for any ceramic form at the site. Flatwares had an MNV count of 42 vessels, the second-highest count. In total, the site contained at least 77 dining related hollowares and at least 58 flatwares. The fact that both ware types have such high MNV counts and are fairly close in number could indicate that the residents may have engaged in a mixture of communal and individual food preparation and dining.

Archaeologists also recovered 392 sherds from food preparation vessels (the MNV for these vessels is 19). For the most part, these vessels were utilitarian wares including buff bodied (where the fired clay of the ceramic is buff-colored) and red-bodied (where the fired clay of the
ceramic is red-colored) ceramics. However, archaeologists also recovered two sherds of Rhenish
ware (German stoneware) food preparation vessels and one of pearlware.

The size of vessels can help determine if food preparation and food storage vessels were
used by occupants of one house or if they were shared among all the occupants. To determine the
size of the vessels, I used Monticello’s Digital Archaeological Archive of Comparative Slavery
(DAACS) measuring system to better understand the size of ceramics through the base and rim
sizes. I determined the size of different ceramic samples by measuring either their rim or base
diameter. I conducted this examination using a sample size of 32 bases and 101 rims.
Unfortunately, I was unable to measure 23 of the rims as they were either too small, the part or
type of rim did not allow for easy measurement, or the rims were too flat, as in the case of
possible plates.

Of the ceramics that I could measure, 8 of them had a diameter of 50 mm or less, 29 had
a diameter between 60 mm and 100 mm, 22 had a diameter between 110 mm and 150 mm, 10
had a diameter between 160 mm and 200 mm, and 7 had a diameter over 200 mm. Given these
findings, it seems that many of the hollowares recovered from this site were large, which is
consistent with the idea that the inhabitants of the site sometimes cooked and ate together or that
they possibly shared in food storage.

The types and sizes of ceramics can help provide insight into the relationships between
the different residents and the types of activities they conducted within their houses. For
example, the presence of large platters or cooking vessels could indicate that the occupants ate
communally. Further, as discussed in Chapter 3, archaeologists in the past associated a larger
percentage of bowls to plates with the presence of African Americans. I am not using this ratio to
racialize the site.
The presence of a higher number of bowls as opposed to plates could mean that the occupants primarily made stew, which is a communal meal that could be shared among the members of the different houses. Such a preference for stews has been associated with African American culinary traditions (Ferguson 1992). On the other hand, the presence of a larger number of plates as compared to bowls might indicate that members of each home primarily separately cooked and ate their food.

Out of this sample, it appears that 76 of these sherds came from some form of hollowware. There was at least one porcelain plate as well as seven pearlware plates and one creamware plate in the assemblage. From the size and shape of the bases, there are at least two porcelain saucers in the assemblage. Based on their size and thickness of the rims, at least five ceramic sherds may have been parts of cups. These cups include both three porcelain and two Canary ware cups. Canary ware was an English-made refined earthenware with a bright yellow glaze, that was produced from 1780 until 1835 (DAACS 2013). Finally, three of the porcelain sherds came from what appear to be different large platters.

Ceramics and glassware can also indicate how residents related to other people. The types of ceramics and glassware, their decorations, and whether they were utilitarian can help shed light on whether the residents primarily kept to themselves or gathered communally in their homes. The quality of ceramics and glassware can also indicate how the occupants chose to use their money and in what they placed value. The types and quality of these objects are, therefore, important in determining how the residents of the site negotiated their identities.

The presence and number of tea wares provide another way to examine the different relationships in which the occupants of the Library site were engaged. Archaeologists often find teawares in colonial and antebellum African American contexts. African diaspora archaeologists
have sometimes used the prevalence of tea wares in African American contexts to argue that the English preference for tea consumption was so widespread during the 18th and 19th centuries that free and enslaved African Americans also participated in it (for a larger discussion see Franklin 2001 and Singleton and Bograd 2000).

However, archaeologists are still not sure whether African Americans used and related to tea wares in the same manner as Anglo-Americans. Some enslaved African Americans may have received these items from their owners. Even if free or enslaved African Americans purchased tea wares, they may have used these items in ways that were unintended by the wares’ makers. Even if African Americans did not fully participate in tea ceremonies, the presence of tea wares at African diaspora sites show that they still placed some value on these items (Franklin 2001).

At the Library site, archaeologists recovered 42 sherds of various tea wares, including teacups, teapots, bowls, and saucers (the MNV is 13). These items include a Rockingham (an American ceramic with a glaze that contains manganese which creates a caramel-colored runny and spotted effect) teapot, pearlware cups, two porcelain saucers, one tea bowl of an indeterminate ware type, one Canary ware teacup, and redware cups with molded decorations (DAACS 2013). As can be seen, most of these tea wares do not match each other, and most of the pieces were probably not expensive. The residents do not appear to have owned a complete set of matching tea wares. Whether the residents purchased these tea wares or received these items as hand-me-downs from Bushrod Washington, it seems as if either the residents could not afford or did not value having a matching set of ceramics.

As mentioned earlier, the majority of ceramics recovered from the site were pearlware, creamware, and porcelain. However, these wares, for the most part, were not used for food storage or food preparation. Instead, ceramics made from these wares were primarily used for
serving, dining, and drinking. Along with the aforementioned wares, archaeologists also
recovered vessels made from a variety of wares including Wedgewood green wares (a ceramic
with a lustrous green glaze made by Josiah Wedgewood from 1759-1775), canarywares,
American grey stoneware, salt-glazed stonewares, lead-glazed coarse earthenwares, and
whiteware among others (DAACS 2013).

Some of these different wares were more utilitarian, but others were also expensive.
Some of the ceramics show signs of defects. Most of the salt-glazed stoneware recovered from
the site was underfired, and some coarse earthenwares found were overfired. These ceramic
pieces may have been less expensive due to their flaws. A few of the pieces of refined
earthenware were stained, but it is likely that these issues formed through their use. Some of the
porcelain and refined earthenware were also burnt. It is unclear if this happened while serving
their function or if this burning is related to the burned area located across the ridge.

Archaeologists found pearlware and Rhenish tankards, indicating that the residents drank
out of higher quality vessels rather than using less expensive, utilitarian wares. As I discussed in
the last chapter, the evidence suggests that the residents of the site were economically
marginalized individuals. It is interesting that these people had such a high number of more
expensive ceramics, including ceramics not found near the Mansion house. Given their social
standing, one might expect to find a greater percentage of utilitarian storage and serving vessels.
Archaeologists also recovered parts of two chamber pots, which also further supports the idea
that there was a domestic occupation at the Library site.

Many of these ceramics contained decorations that were common on more expensive
ceramics during the occupation of the Library site. Some of the decorations on the ceramics
including various colors of annular banding on mochaware (a ceramic ware that contains both
annular banding and a brown, fernlike decoration); green and blue scallop-edged and shell-edged creamware; and dots and diapers patterns on creamware (Noel Hume 1969:131). Archaeologists recovered both pearlware and porcelain that contained transfer printed ornamentation and the less common overglaze or underglaze painting.

Most of these painted and transfer-printed ceramics had decorations in blue paint. However, some of these decorations used brown, black, green, or red painting. These various colors tend to have been used on ceramics produced closer to 1830 (Samford 2013). Some of the ceramics, including the porcelain, contained molded decorations. One piece of pearlware appears to have had a maker’s mark, but it was missing most of it, and so it cannot be identified. One piece of whiteware and one piece of stoneware also had unidentifiable makers’ marks. Several of these objects may have also been hand-me-downs that the occupants continued to use. Others may have been purchased second-hand.

Glasswares

The assemblage contained both glass and ceramic vessels for storing foods and beverages. Archaeologists recovered a variety of glass tableware, stemwares, and other glass objects. Some of these pieces of glass show signs of burning. Residents owned a large amount of glassware that contained several types of decorations. These included engraved glass stemware, tableware, and tumbleware; tableware with acid etching and floral, botanical and wavelike designs; and glass bottles with molded decorations and paneling. Archaeologists also recovered a tumbler with flutes.

Bottles, including wine and champagne bottles, primarily comprise the glassware assemblage. The assemblage also includes various stemwares and tableware. Archaeologists
recovered 1,670 pieces of glass bottles, tableware, and stemwares from the site. Of those, 1,500 pieces of glass were made by mouth-blowing, and 170 were made using a mold. The two primary ways of making glasswares are mouth-blown and molds. Mouth-blown bottles are created and expanded using “the power of human lungs,” using a blowpipe and hand tools (Society for Historical Archaeology). Bottles were made by early mold use, including blowing the glass out, through the 1860s. However, by the early 1800s, most glass was produced by pouring hot glass into molds. The resulting vessel is more symmetrical than mouth-blown bottles and contains mold seams (Baugher-Perlin 1982; Miller and Sullivan 1984; Munsey 1970; Society for Historical Archaeology).

Archaeologists found one colorless glass bead; the only bead found at the site. They recovered 1,515 pieces of bottle glass, 1,392 of which were from wine bottles, as well as 50 pieces of tableware. Most of the glass recovered was colorless, but some of it was blue, aqua, and green. Archaeologists recovered only five pieces of glass stemware, all of which are colorless and without decorations. They found a few pieces of hollowares and one tumbler (see Appendix 1, Table 6). Researchers also recovered four patent bottles and another three medicine bottles. Unfortunately, these bottles are not complete and do not have legible markings on them. As a result, researchers cannot date these bottles, nor do they know what brand they were or what they contained.

Only 43 pieces of glass contained some form of decoration (see Appendix 1, Table 7). The vast majority of decorated glassware contained some type of molded embellishment, although a few pieces contained acid etching, engraving, facets, or panels. These decorated glasswares are primarily wine bottles and tablewares, although one tumbler and one hollowware contain some form of ornamentation. While the residents may have owned a fair amount of high
quality and expensive ceramics, the glassware assemblage indicates that they had less access to, or chose to devote less money towards, the purchase of expensive glasswares.

*Flora and Fauna*

An examination of flora and fauna at the site can help us understand how the residents related to the environment and their diet. Animal bones and remains could indicate that occupants hunted, fished, or raised their own animals. Archaeologists recovered one clamshell and 119 parts of oyster shells. This number does not include the shell blank that I discuss later. The oyster shells range in size from 0.1-61 mm in size, with 34 pieces over 10 mm.

Archaeologists recovered 110 animal bones. For the most part, these bones were fairly small in size; none were over 5 cm. The faunal remains included two turtle bones, one bone from a fowl, four rodent bones, 11 bones from small mammals, three bones from a medium animal, one bone from a large animal, and 88 bones from identified mammals. One bone showed signs of being cut, one had gnawing marks, and 11 showed signs of burning.

Based on the excavation units from which they were recovered, the bones were primarily located in the mid-part of the site, as part of the central artifact cluster. The distribution of these bones indicates that they are likely associated with the residents of the historic period occupation. The presence of these bones, coupled with the diversity of ceramics, further supports the idea that residents used this area as to dispose of refuse in a sheet-like deposition that archaeologists call a midden. The discovery of a large number of oyster shells along with the turtle shells indicates that the residents may have supplemented their diet by fishing in the Potomac River. The fact that archaeologists only found one bird bone also indicates that the
residents most likely did not raise chickens. We need to conduct further zooarchaeological analysis to identify the types of animals to which the other bones belonged.

Archaeologists also recovered 14 seeds from the Library site. Unfortunately, based on preliminary analysis for this dissertation, it is unclear whether seeds are related to the precolonial period occupation of the ridge or the early 19th-century occupation. The seeds included two walnut seeds and one cherry seed. Through future investigation, we can gain more insight into the history of these flora and fauna based on the locations from which they were recovered, how animals were killed, and potentially how the food was cooked. We did not recover any bones, seeds, or other food remains in the excavations at Field 7.

Architectural Artifacts

Archaeologists also recovered several architectural artifacts, including cut and wrought nails, window glass, and slate. These artifacts are indicative of the presence of buildings and are consistent with the idea that there may have been three different houses at the site. Archaeologists recovered 132.5 pounds (about 60 kg) of bricks. The site also contained seven pieces of ceramic tiles, two of which contained molded decorations and three of which were coarse earthenware. Finally, archaeologists found 104 grams of schist and 34 pieces of construction slate.

While some of the bricks found at the Library site are modern and machine-made, many appear to be handmade. Some of these bricks contain signs of burning, some are overfired, and many are underfired. A few bricks appear to have glaze on them. Along with whole bricks, archaeologists also recovered fragments of overfired and underfired bricks. Archaeologists primarily recovered bricks from different locations than the rest of the household objects and
architectural artifacts (see figure 14-16). Given these findings, it is likely that the occupants of the ridge constructed either log or wattle and daub cabins. These types of structures would explain the lack of features and the different locations for the bricks. It is also possible potential buildings could have been constructed using pise architecture (packed-earth architecture that Bushrod used). While pise architecture often contained brick foundations, as discussed in Chapter 3, Mount Vernon archaeologists have not found foundations for some of the pise buildings that we know were constructed near the Mansion house. However, given that Bushrod did not begin experimenting with pise architecture until 1810 and that the site was likely occupied before that time, the construction of buildings using pise architecture is unlikely.

There is also a small potential that residents constructed their houses from the bricks that archaeologists recovered from the ridge and that the bricks were moved at a later period, such as

![Figure 16: An ArcGIS map showing the distribution of bricks (in grams) at the Library site. The color gradient indicates the amount found in a location with lightest color indicating the least amount found and the darkest color indicating the most. Map by author.](image-url)
when the area was first being cultivated. Although it is possible that plowing destroyed features, it is still surprising not to find some household-related features, if only a brick hearth, on the ridge if the houses were built from bricks or had a brick foundation. Further, we would expect to have recovered more bricks than recovered from the site if they had been used in the construction of the houses. These findings seem to confirm that the residents lived in log cabins.

Archaeologists also recovered 21 kg of slag metal from the Library site, which is waste material that is separated from metal during the smelting or refining process of ore. Individuals may have been making metal objects on site. It remains uncertain if a large amount of slag has some connection to the large, burned area discussed in the previous chapter. If the slag is related to this area, this finding could indicate that the burning was related to smelting. As I discuss later, we also recovered high amounts of slag at Field 7 as well as a similar burned area on the western side of the Library site.

Interestingly, two of the rim sherds and two of the base sherds I included in my sample above showed signs of burning. It is also possible that they were blackened as part of whatever incident caused the burning across the site. It is also possible that this whole ridge was burned down as a way of getting rid of the trees to change the wooded area into the Field 7 agricultural area. Unfortunately, none of the documentary evidence I examined discusses any fire occurring along this ridge area during either Bushrod or John Augustine Washington III’s ownership of Mount Vernon.

Based on the burn marks and burned artifacts, we know that the burning extended across the ridge. However, it is unclear if the burned area has a connection to the occupation of the ridge or if the burning pre-dates or post-dates the occupation. These questions should be
researched further in the future to get a better sense of the landscape at Mount Vernon, and the potential that types of industrial activities were carried out at the Mansion tract.

Based off of the Surfer-Pro maps discussed in Chapter 5, I know that architectural remains have an area of concentration in the northwestern end and are highly concentrated in the southwestern end (Chisholm 2011). The presence of architectural remains in these two areas supports the hypothesis that houses were located along the ridge. At the same time, the lack of architectural remains in the central artifact cluster supports archaeologists’ idea that this particular area of the site may have been used as a refuse midden.

As Sara Bon-Harper (2009, 2010) argues, the presence of a midden is often connected to the presence of a house site. For enslaved African Americans, the midden is often located a short distance from the house, as they often did not want to throw away their trash directly next to their houses (Bon-Harper 2009, 2010). Inhabitants may have used or thrown away ceramics at a distance from possible houses, which in turn could mean that the inhabitants did not want trash near their houses. As such, they may not have thrown away objects in the same place that they used them.

That difference between the location of architectural remains and the location of high ceramic concentrations could mean that residents carried out some activities away from their homes. This decision may have been due to issues of visibility, as such choices might have allowed them to perform activities without being seen by outsiders, or simply due to issues of space.

Perhaps they did not have the room to carry out activities in their house or wanted to separate their domestic activities from communal activities. Fesler (2010; also see Gundaker and
McWillie 2005; Westmacott 1992) notes that in African cultures, people often spent much of their daily lives in their yards, and dwellings were grouped in a way such that compounds had communal spaces. He also notes that different activities took place in different zones of the yard. Reasoning by analogy, perhaps the different artifact concentrations found at the Library site indicates the presence of a potential communal or activity areas.

As discussed in Chapter 5, archaeologists found a large weight of both slag and bricks. For the most part, these items were not found with the architectural remains or other artifact clusters but in the eastern part of the site (Chisholm 2010). The bricks found include both overfired and underfired bricks as well as clay. The discovery of underfired bricks and clay indicates that bricks may have been made at this site, although we do not have documentary evidence supporting this hypothesis. It is unclear whether the presence of these bricks and slag is connected to the burned area or the burned and underfired ceramics.

*Leisure Artifacts and Tools*

Investigators recovered very few objects associated with leisure, including only one marble. Most of the leisure objects found were pipe related. In total, archaeologists recovered 16 pipestems and 11 pipe bowls. Some of the pipe bowls contain molded decorations and ribbing. Two of the pipes contain leaf motifs. Excavators recovered one buff-colored pipe and one red clay pipe, which were most likely made locally since most mass-manufactured pipes at this time were made from ball clay (Deetz 1996; Noel Hume 1969:307-308). The rest of the pipes from the site are white clay, which was made in England from a type of kaolin clay (Noel Hume 1969). They also found a piece of painted, decorative metal with a floral design, but could not tell the purpose of this item.
The only other leisure activity items recovered from the site were modern-day flashbulbs, toys, and records. The assemblage indicates that these houses were most likely not occupied by children, as we would expect the presence of toys if children lived at this site. It also appears as though the residents of the site may not have had much time for leisure activities outside of smoking.

One of the pipe stems recovered contains the name W. Morgan. W. Morgan pipes have been recovered from many other sites. A similar pipe stem was found in slave quarters at Southall Plantation near Williamsburg, which was occupied during the mid-to-late 18th century. The pipe found there was also stamped, indicating that it was made in Liverpool and dates from 1767-1796. Other W. Morgan pipes were found in Quebec, Calderstones Park in Great Britain, and Fort Meductic in New Brunswick dating to the early 19th century (Walker 1970). Research from both I.C. Walker and the Museum of Liverpool indicate the makers of these pipes were most likely the father and son pipe makers, William Morgan or William Morgan Jr. (Museum of Liverpool 2015; Walker 1970).

The artifacts recovered from the site can increase our understanding of how inhabitants saw themselves and related to other people in society. These items can provide insight into how the residents presented themselves to each other and any potential visitors. Not many clothing items were recovered from the sites, which is not surprising as these tend to be small objects. Further, the soil in Virginia is too often acidic to preserve clothing outside of a waterlogged environment. However, archaeologists recovered clothing-related items including a buckle, a collar stud, glass beads, and buttons made from metal and porcelain. The residents would have purchased these from a store (Heath 1997; Samford 1996).
Archaeologists also recovered a shell blank that the residents had used for making four buttons (see Figure 17). This blank shows that at some point, residents used objects afforded to them by their environment to create parts of their clothing. Excavations also recovered copper alloy thimbles and at least two pins, indicating that the residents likely at least repaired their clothes if not created some. Archaeologists also found one bale seal, which is a small artifact that resembled a coin and was used to show that a material, often fabrics, met certain standards (Canadian Museum of History). It was smaller than most seals that archaeologists found at Mount Vernon, and based on the type, it was likely used for fabrics.

These artifacts reveal that the residents chose to make some objects rather than purchase them. While they were 8 miles away from the local markets in Alexandria, as discussed in Chapter 4, records indicate that they spent time there and therefore had access to places to purchase such goods (Executor Account Books). It is possible that the residents may have created and repaired their items to save money to purchase things they valued, such as certain dining wares.

This assemblage examination allows us to see how the agencies of the residents emerged through their relationships with their environment and things. The combination of different
affordances and their own choices allowed the residents to purchase different objects, some of which were expensive, on which they put significance. The residents could have constructed social identities as free African Americans through their procurement and use of different objects, including dining wares.

Archaeologists found a wrought chisel, which could be an indication that people were making wooden items at the site rather than purchasing them. The chisel may have also been used to help maintain the log cabins. It also appears as though the residents were hunting animals in the area. Archaeologists found a British and French gunflint. Many bullets, bullet casings, shot, and shotgun shells were also recovered from the Library site.

Some of the arms items, such as Peter’s League, no. 12 and Winchester 12 repeater shotgun shells, postdate the occupation of the site, and give insight into its later usage. But other gun-related items, such as lead, copper-alloy, and brass cast bullets and shot, date to the time of Bushrod’s ownership of Mount Vernon. Interestingly, the residents used guns even though free African Americans in Virginia were not allowed to use guns during the time of this occupation (Wolf 2006). It is possible that the wooded area provided them some cover in which they could hunt, although it is unclear how they got access to the guns.

Even from this basic examination of the artifact assemblage, the findings of the Library site highlight that we cannot assume that poverty or residence in a log cabin necessitates that individuals’ ceramics were only utilitarian or received as hand-me-downs. While things like unmatched tea-sets may have been given to them by Bushrod Washington or some other benefactor, not all of the ceramics they owned were gifts.
Instead, the assemblage seems to underscore the importance of consumer choice. It illustrates how the residents both used the resources afforded to them by the environment and chose made to make and repair their objects. These choices may have enabled them to save money they needed to buy objects they valued, and which played meaningful roles in their relationships.

**PART III: Basic Field 7 Findings**

As discussed in Chapter 5, in 2015 we conducted a Phase I shovel test pit (STP) survey at Field 7 to determine if the Library site occupation continued along the ridge. As at the Library site, we found historic period plowzone and evidence of a burned area. Many of the STPs that contained this burned layer also contained some slag. Unfortunately, we did not find any additional evidence at the site that points to the cause of this burned layer.

The STPs in the Field 7 survey produced a variety of different artifacts. We recovered 19 quartz or quartzite flakes dating to the precolonial period. The only object related to personal adornment recovered from Field 7 was a complete two-piece domed, copper alloy cast button. It appears to have a bar-type shank. However, this type of button is hard to date.

There were also 236 pieces of bottle glass, most of which were modern, machine-made glass, as well as objects related to this area’s modern usage as a place within the National Parks System that contains well-traveled trails.

We found one, two-piece patent bottle made from clear glass. Unfortunately, this bottle was incomplete and did not have the brand name on the part that we found. We also found the bottom of part of a second patent bottle that said “pat d2” on it, but still did not have a brand name to help date it. “Pat d2” appears to be an incomplete patent number, and I could not find...
any information about this bottle from this fragment. The only historic period artifacts related to leisure activities that we recovered from Field 7 were pipe bowls. We found two pipe bowls, both of which were made of white clay and one of which had a ridged design.

We also recovered architectural artifacts. We found 11 pieces of window glass, but it is unclear to which period they date. We also found eight nails, and five of them appear to have been machine-cut nails as opposed to either wrought nails or modern wire nails. Wrought nails were hand made out of iron by blacksmiths and were used until the early 1800s when machine-cut nails made out of sheet iron became increasingly popular (Marciniszyn 2017). One of the remaining nails was too rusted to get a true sense of how it originally looked. Only one piece of slate was recovered from the site.

In total, we recovered 288.74 grams of bricks, which is far less than the number of bricks recovered from the Library site. These were mostly small, broken pieces of bricks rather than complete bricks. Along with these, we found areas of underfired bricks throughout Field 7, similar to some of the bricks found at the Library site. We did not collect these bricks. We also found 652.8 grams of slag in the project area, although it remains unclear from where this type of metal came.

We recovered nine sherds of ceramics from the STPs. The ceramic assemblage primarily consists of pearlware, of which we found six sherds, including one sherd with a red transfer-printed design. We found two sherds of red-bodied earthenware, including one with black lead-glaze on the inside, one sherd of porcelain, which contained diagonal lines, and one sherd of polychrome whiteware, which was popular in the mid-1820s. Using DAACs date ranges for ceramics, the MCD obtained from this ceramic assemblage is 1825.6, but this is not a completely reliable date given how few ceramics we recovered.
As with the Library site, the Field 7 site contains household objects but no features. This finding supports the idea that the houses at both the Library site and Field 7 were log cabins. However, that interpretation does not explain the number of bricks found on the site nor the amount of slag. In the following section, I discuss a couple of reasons why these objects may have been found in such great abundance along the ridge.

From the northing and eastings of the various artifacts, I know that there is a cluster of historic period artifacts throughout the eastern and central parts of the excavation area, with the strongest concentration along the eastern edge. This concentration could indicate the location of another house site. However, this area of concentration is at one of the farthest locations from the Library site. Future archaeological investigations of this area could test this eastern edge more to ascertain better if this part of the site contained any houses.

If the Library and Field 7 site occupations were connected, I would expect to find house sites located in the western portion of the project area, closer to the Library site. The artifact distribution shows that this is not the case. However, further excavations would need to be carried out in this area to determine more accurately the extent of the occupation and whether it was connected to the occupation at the Library site. These excavations may also help us understand the burned area that is present in both parts of the ridge.

**Part IV: Summary and Interpretation**

The amount and location of the architectural remains, coupled with the number of domestic objects recovered from the sites along the ridge, suggest the presence of houses along the ridge. However, we did not find any archaeological features, such as subfloor pits, brick hearth bases, postholes, or foundations, in either the Field 7 excavations or any of the
excavations at the Library site that would definitively indicate the presence of structures. I begin my discussion by examining what can be interpreted from the assemblage in terms of who occupied the Library site and what I can tell about their lives. Using the archaeological evidence, I evaluate the hypotheses that either skilled laborers or formerly enslaved individuals manumitted by George Washington lived at this site. I then discuss the remaining gaps in my understanding of the site and what this lack of knowledge reveals about the ways archaeologists understand race and class.

Based on the evidence, the types of houses that the residents constructed in this area were likely one-room cabins, meaning that individuals would entertain friends in the same space in which they slept. Due to the poor preservation of the log cabins and the lack of any architectural features, it is difficult to tell what forms these houses took and what types of building techniques were used to create them. Barbara Heath and Eleanor Breen (2014) contend that there was great variability in the forms of slave quarters. Such structures could have had many architectural features in common with dwellings occupied by free individuals of various ethnic and racial groups.

In Virginia, free African Americans often lived in Anglo-American style log cabins. However, these cabins sometimes incorporated African building techniques, such as “unfashionable” wattle and daub chimneys (Fennell 2017). These techniques may have been ways for free individuals to conform to societal expectations of housing while maintaining a shared sense of community and marking themselves as different from Anglo-Americans (Fennell 2017; Laird 2006; Ryder 1991). Ryder (1991:78) notes that most log cabins occupied by Anglo-Americans had brick and masonry chimneys.
Log cabins need frequent maintenance to keep them in good shape (Lounsbury 2010). The residents may have maintained relationships through the process of maintaining structures, in a similar way to how the Kekchi Maya created relationships through the construction of houses, as I discussed in Chapter 2 (Wilk 1993; also see Fennell 2017). Working together with the other people living on the ridge to construct and repair these houses may have been a way in which members created a new community in Harris’ (2014) sense of this idea, transforming their relationships with each other, the landscape, and objects.

It is unclear how many people lived in each of the houses, but these structures were likely small and possibly cramped. From what we can tell based on the MNV of ceramic forms, it appears that the residents sometimes engaged in communal eating and other times made and ate food individually. The estimated vessel sizes based on rim sherd measurements show that some of the food preparation vessels recovered from the site were quite large, which further supports the idea the residents made and ate food together.

The ceramics at the Library site were found in all of the artifact concentrations. Given the amount of ceramics recovered across the site and the variety of the different wares in the assemblage, it seems more likely that multiple families occupied this area than a single tenant farmer. The amount of porcelain and refined earthenwares, as well as the decorated glass stem and tablewares, is particularly interesting given that no matter who occupied this site, they were likely economically marginalized people.

The local environment provided affordances in terms of food and the ability to create objects. The residents appear to have taken advantage of these affordances to make their buttons out of oyster shells, which were found in abundance in the area. Based on the sewing implements found at the site, the residents may have made their buttons to replace the ones that they lost.
rather than purchasing commercially made buttons. This choice possibly allowed them to save money to purchase other items that they wanted or needed.

The Library site assemblage provides some insight into the diet of the people who lived in this area. The faunal assemblage shows that the residents likely obtained some food through fishing. Based on the bones recovered, the residents likely did not raise their own chickens, and it is unclear whether they raised other animals. The presence of gunflint, bullets, shot, and bones across the site indicate that the residents may have hunted for food as well.

The glass assemblage indicates that the residents enjoyed drinking wine, and the number of wine bottle pieces recovered could mean that the residents engaged in this activity together. From what we can tell based on the MNV of ceramic forms, it appears that the residents sometimes engaged in communal eating and other times made and ate food individually. The estimated vessel sizes based on rim sherd measurements show that some of the food preparation vessels recovered from the site were quite large, which further supports the idea the residents often made and ate food together.

The ceramics that archaeologists recovered in the greatest quantities at the site were porcelain, creamware, and pearlware (see figures 17 and 18). While it may seem strange that economically marginalized people would have such a large amount of refined ceramics, the site lacks some of the more overt status symbols, such as matching tea sets. Teapots, teacups, and saucers were found at the site, but these were all different types of wares, suggesting that the residents may not have been able to afford a matching set.

Further, much of the salt-glazed stoneware recovered from the site appears to have been underfired, and some of the coarse earthenware found at the site is overfired. These items may
have been inexpensive due to their defects. It seems as though while the residents may have purchased some of their ceramics, they afforded these by creating some of their other personal items to save money as well as occasionally purchasing some ceramics that had some defects. Through these choices, they were able to buy some objects that they otherwise would not have been able to afford.

The artifacts recovered from the Library site support two main hypotheses of who lived in this area. Based on the burned area at both the Library site and Field 7, the amount of slag, and a large amount of bricks, including overfired and underfired bricks, is possible that brickmakers and ironworkers lived on this ridge. I have not found historical records about such artisans, and archaeologists have not found tools related to this work. It is also unclear why this work would be carried out in a wooded area, and it is not clear when people would have carried out this work. The sheer amount of slag, bricks, and clay recovered, however, makes the presence of such artisans a possibility.

These kinds of workers tended to be economically marginalized (Crews 2006; Gaylord 2009). Brickmakers, for example, lived transient lives, often only staying at a location until they finished a project (Crews 2006). They lived at a project location but did not bring their own crew. Instead, clients provided free and enslaved laborers to help out with projects since brickmaking did not require much skill (Crews 2006). Given their itinerant life, it is likely that brickmakers lived in log cabins that could be easily taken down when they had finished a job, and they would have taken their tools with them, explaining the lack of these at the site. They may have supplemented their diets through fishing and hunting.

If the site was occupied by brickmakers and ironworkers, then it is still difficult to explain the number of refined earthenwares recovered. Given their transient nature, it is possible
that Bushrod gave them some ceramics. However, given the quantity of ceramics found, they likely bought some of these objects. It seems strange that these laborers would choose to purchase a lot of expensive ceramics that they would either have to take with them when they left or throw them away, which wasted money. I cannot account for why one or two families would have at least 230 ceramics and so much wine bottle glass.

I also cannot explain why these laborers would purchase both expensive ceramics and cheaper, underfired ceramics, knowing that they would only live at the site until they completed their project. Their itinerant lifestyle could explain the unmatched tea sets, as unmatched ceramics would enable them to save money on objects they would not keep while also allowing them to participate in tea consumption. The presence of the shell blank also poses questions as it would be unusual for Anglo-Americans to make their own buttons. Perhaps enslaved laborers lived at one of the structures at the site while working on one of these projects. While this alternative hypothesis may explain the presence of the burned area, slag, and bricks, it creates many new questions.

On the other hand, drawing from historical records and archaeological findings, it is fairly likely that George Washington’s formerly enslaved laborers lived in this area. The presence of overfired and underfired bricks recovered at both the Library site and Field 7 could mean that the residents made their own bricks at the site. These bricks may have been used to build hearths in their otherwise wattle and daub houses. When the area became a field under John Augustine Washington III, the hearths could have been dismantled, and the bricks moved to one location.

Former enslaved laborers who worked in the field would have been used to the types of cabins likely located at this site. For those who lived at the Mansion house, such structures would
represent a very different experience than that to which they were accustomed. For the former enslaved African Americans who lived in the House for Families or the newly constructed quarter near the Mansion house, such a log cabin would have been much smaller and less well constructed than their earlier residence.

The fact that these free people remained on the estate at which they had been enslaved, living in structures reminiscent of those they lived in during slavery, most likely produced mixed emotions. They were free people and were therefore permitted to do anything to which the law enabled free African Americans. They seem to have chosen on their own to remain at Mount Vernon. However, remaining at the estate in these log cabins must have been a constant reminder of the former life, which both enabled them to feel how far they had come but also how far they had to go in terms of fair treatment.

Based on both the archaeological and historical data, it seems possible that some of the former slaves of George Washington occupied this ridge. The assemblage lacks toys or other objects related to children at the site, which is consistent with houses occupied by older individuals. Regardless of who specifically occupied this site, the archaeological findings seem to indicate they were at least economically if not also racially marginalized people. As such, the interpretations in this chapter can also help us understand the lives of a group of people, which can be hard to find in the archaeological record and who are often left out of documentary records.

A large amount of refined and decorated wares recovered from the site may mean that the residents of the Library site had people over to their houses and wanted to display and use high-quality ceramics. It could also indicate the importance of dining for the inhabitants of the Library site. It seems possible that the residents may have eaten together to maintain social relationships.
While the residents may have previously lived on different farms and participated in different forms of enslaved labor under George Washington, they may have formed a new community by carrying out different activities together such as cooking and dining.

The assemblage also provides insight into how the residents related to the Anglo-Americans living at Mount Vernon as well as to the landscape. We know, based on the executor accounts, that free African Americans received clothing from Bushrod as part of his duties in carrying out George Washington’s will. Perhaps some of the nicer buttons found at the site come from the clothing that they received.

Bushrod or some other white benefactor may have given used ceramics and glassware to the residents. However, since several types of ceramics recovered from the Library site have never been found at the Mansion house, it appears likely that the residents of the site purchased at least some of their own ceramics. Archaeological studies of enslaved life in the Chesapeake have shown that enslaved African Americans in this area, especially those living close to markets, participated in the consumer revolution (Arendt et al. 2003; Breen 2013; Galle 2006, 2010, 2017; Neiman 2008).

Enslaved laborers sold food and goods at the markets and saved money in order to buy prestige items like refined ceramics and buttons (Breen 2013; Franklin 2019; Galle 2006, 2010, 2017). Galle (2010) argues that African Americans in some locations even continued to participate in local markets when it was not legal. Enslaved laborers of George Washington sold, bartered, and bought goods at the market in Alexandria (Breen 2013; Thompson 2001). It would not be surprising if they continued to be involved in the local market after they gained their freedom.
Based on the lack of low-fired earthenware, it does not seem like the residents created their ceramics or used colonoware, even though colonoware was recovered at the House for Families. The residents of the Library site did not try to save money or separate themselves from the local market by making their ceramics. However, the lack of colonoware is not surprising since, in Virginia, colonoware primarily fell out of use around the turn of the 19th century (Deetz 1976; Galke 2009).

Scholars do not know what caused this decrease in colonoware usage across the Chesapeake, but some archaeologists attribute it to the increased availability and affordability of mass-produced ceramics (Deetz 1976; Galke 2009). Further, Laura Galke (2009) argues that due to the increase in mass-produced ceramics, more people could choose to purchase ceramics to avoid the “stain” of colonoware, which was a pottery form often associated with poverty. It is possible that the residents of the ridge viewed colonoware as an object connected to their enslaved life. Since they had the means to use other ceramics, they may have chosen to stop making this pottery to separate themselves from their former lives. I further discuss the presence of colonoware at free and enslaved African American sites in Virginia in the next chapter.

While it is possible that Bushrod gave the residents some objects, despite no mention of doing so in the account books, it seems strange that he would have given so few individuals so many high-quality ceramics. Further, given his disdain for free African Americans, it seems unlikely that he gave these residents high-quality ceramics even if he had already used them. He would have believed that such gifts could sow jealousy and discord between the free and enslaved residents at Mount Vernon, which he wanted to avoid (Casper 2008). It is also possible that other white benefactors may have given the residents some ceramics, although again, it
seems likely that Bushrod would have wanted to prevent this to avoid envy among enslaved laborers.

Further, since several of these wares have not been found by the Mansion house, we can assume that the residents most likely purchased at least some of these items on their own. The archaeological assemblage, therefore, highlights inconsistencies between the types of homes in which inhabitants of the Library site resided and the objects that they owned. They lived in impermanent log cabins, which are often associated with the lower class, but they owned objects often associated with a more lavish lifestyle. It appears that the residents chose to place more monetary resources into ceramics than into their houses.

It is also possible that the residents chose to purchase objects that they could not afford or did not have access to before they gained their freedom to help craft a new, free African American identity. The freedom afforded the residents different economic and acquisition opportunities that they took advantage of because these opportunities had been denied to them as enslaved laborers. These objects may have been especially important as they remained living at the plantation at which they were previously enslaved. Through owning these ceramics, they could distance themselves from their former life mentally even if they physically remained at the plantation.

The residents may have tried to use high quality ceramics to distance themselves from their former lives, even if they could not do so through their housing or where they lived. They may have chosen to purchase these higher quality objects, at the possible expense of other items, because these were objects, they were not able to obtain when they were enslaved. Perhaps, based on the quality of the different types of ceramics and glassware and the amount of ceramics with decorations, the residents entertained or housed people who did not live at the site. These
could have been other formerly enslaved individuals who lived in the City of Alexandria or other nearby locations, rather than just the individuals remaining at Mount Vernon. It is also possible that the residents ate together and drank tea together, further building and reinforcing their sense of community.

The residents’ use of porcelains and refined earthenwares may also have been in part due to the racial beliefs of many white Virginians. Along with separating themselves from their former lives of slavery, these higher quality ceramics allowed them to challenge certain racial assumptions about free African Americans. Perhaps these enabled them to present a certain image to the public who may have been coming to Mount Vernon that contrasted with the types of houses in which they lived. Even if the white public never saw the inside of the houses at the Library site, owning these objects still allowed the residents to challenge these beliefs for themselves.

Based on the historical and archaeological evidence, it seems most likely that the Library site was occupied by free African Americans. However, nothing in this evidence definitively shows who lived at the site. The documentary evidence does not contain writings explicitly about this area of Mount Vernon by either Bushrod, John Augustine Washington II or III, or from visitors to the estate. Given both visitors’ accounts and executor accounts, free African Americans remained at the estate. The archaeological evidence also does not contain artifacts that unquestionably identify the site’s residents. At this point in my examination, based on logical reasoning and process of elimination the most likely conclusion is that the site was occupied by former George Washington enslaved laborers.

Archaeologists face continued difficulty in telling who lived at sites occupied by marginalized people without documentary evidence which names the residents. As I discussed
earlier, historical archaeology of the antebellum south still primarily focuses on enslaved African American sites and elite Anglo-American sites. There have been fewer investigations into free African American sites as well as sites occupied by poor-middle class white tenant farmers and skilled laborers. Further, marginalized people are unlikely to leave records of their own that discuss where they resided and how they lived. The dearth of documentary evidence left by these groups means that even after excavating a site occupied by marginalized people, archaeologists often still cannot tell for certain which group lived there.

Though archaeologists have gotten better in interpreting sites occupied by African Americans, we continue to have difficulty in recognizing these sites. Archaeologists have moved away from focusing on Africanisms, but scholars still do not have good methods of understanding ephemeral sites lacking documentary evidence. It remains difficult for archaeologists to tell race in the archaeological record due to how scholars understand and investigate sites, which I discuss in greater depth in Chapter 8.

These problems can make it difficult to identify these sites without documentary evidence and recognize patterns in these types of sites. As a result, archaeologists are often left puzzled when faced with a site, like the Library site, that does not fit the image of what we think a site occupied by racially or economically marginalized people should look like. The fact that it is an ephemeral site that likely contained log cabins and poorly fired ceramics on one hand, coupled with the large amount of refined earthenwares and porcelain on the other, does not fit into pre-existing images of sites occupied by these groups.

Combining yet another line of evidence can help give clarification to the question of who lived at the Library site. Along with documentary and archaeological analysis, investigating how the Library site and Field 7 compare to other sites occupied by racially and economically
marginalized individuals during this period can provide support as to who may have occupied the ridge. By conducting intra- and inter-group comparisons between a variety of sites occupied by different social and racial groups in Virginia, I help reveal patterns in the types of structures and artifact assemblages recovered from sites occupied by different groups of people. Further, comparing the unknown Mount Vernon ridge occupation to the patterns from the known occupations at other sites can lend further support as to who may have lived in this area of Mount Vernon.

In the next chapter, I compare the assemblages from the Library site and Field 7 to those from other free African American sites, enslaved African American sites, and sites occupied by poor whites. I examine how the assemblages between groups of people differed based on racial marginalization, environment, access to markets, and relationship with local estates. I examine the types of ceramics, glassware, and personal objects recovered from these sites, as well as the type of houses in which these residents lived. Further, I investigate the extent to which residents at these other sites made their objects as opposed to purchasing them. I examine how the difference in status between free and enslaved African Americans impacted their relationships and how they made and used objects. I also discuss the types of features found at the different sites and what these tell us about the types of houses in which the residents of each of the sites lived.

This comparison can give us a greater understanding of household assemblages of economically and racially marginalized individuals. Moreover, since one hypothesis is that a tenant farmer or craftsman lived at the Library site, this examination can also help us see how the assemblage from my dissertation area compares to those found at sites occupied by people with those craft and agricultural engagements. I discuss the different objects found at these sites, and
the amount and types of ceramics recovered. I also examine how the objects recovered from each site related to the professions of its occupants.

Further, this investigation can provide greater insight into the lives of people at the Library site and Field 7, illustrating how the area in which they lived, their proximity to a city, and the lack of living in a larger free African American community lead to specific relationships between people, places, and things. This contrast can help us understand how the network of relationships in which the residents were engaged, coupled with their values, shaped their lives and the contexts in which their agencies emerged. This contrast can reveal how specific circumstances, affordances, and relationships shaped the possibilities for the residents of the Library site and Field 7.
CHAPTER SEVEN: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS TO OTHER VIRGINIA SITES

In this chapter, I compare the findings from the Library site to other sites associated with free and enslaved African Americans and white tenant farmers and skilled laborers. Given the four main hypotheses about the Library site’s occupants (formerly enslaved individuals, enslaved laborers, tenant farmers, or skilled laborers), these comparative sites will help refine our understanding of the Library site occupation. Intra- and inter-group comparisons between these different types of sites can reveal patterns that can help lend support for a specific hypothesis. I have included maps of the comparative sites where possible, but I do not have them for all of the locations. Further, some of these sites are still under archaeological investigation or do not yet have published reports.

In the first part of this chapter, I outline what I hope to attain through this comparison and how I am analyzing the assemblages to achieve these goals. In Part II of this chapter, I review the comparative archaeological sites, including enslaved and free African American sites and sites occupied by poor and middling Anglo-Americans. I discuss why I chose these particular sites and review the problems that I faced in finding suitably comparable archaeological sites.

In Part III, I compare the objects, features, and housing discovered at sites occupied by enslaved African Americans in Virginia. I examine the objects which enslaved African Americans made at their sites, the materials to which they had access, and the types of activities in which they participated. These sites are made up of plantation quarters, including the House for Families at Mount Vernon, where some of the residents of the Library site may have lived when they were enslaved.
In Part IV, I compare sites occupied by free African Americans in Virginia. This examination includes sites that were occupied by free African Americans who lived as part of a community or neighborhood as well as those who lived alone. These also include sites occupied by a wealthy man and middling free African Americans with families. In Part V, I compare sites occupied by Anglo-American tenant farmers and overseers on Virginian plantations. I consider the types of houses in which they lived, typical locations of their residences, how they presented themselves, their diets, and what the archaeology reveals about their occupations.

In Part VI, I discuss the major findings of this comparison. I examine similarities between these different sites, all occupied by economically marginalized individuals, what artifacts archaeologists found at which type of site, and how the Library site can further our understanding of the lives of racially and economically marginalized individuals. Finally, in Part VII, I revisit the documentary and archaeological evidence from the previous chapters and review the four hypotheses about the Library site’s occupation. By combining this evidence with the comparative findings, we can better determine who may have been the occupants of the Mount Vernon ridge.

**Part I: The Purpose and Methods of Site Comparison**

The examination of sites occupied by free and enslaved African Americans as well as poor whites enables me to examine the impact that status (as free or enslaved) and racial classification (as either Anglo or African American) had on personal and group ideas of identity. It reveals how these different social groups made, purchased, and used objects to negotiate identities. This comparison also allows me to see the ways that environmental affordance, as well as other local affordances, including distance to the nearest market, had on the types of objects which the residents at these different sites used and made.
Through this comparison, I seek to understand how these affordances, constraints, and aspects of identity impacted types of objects recovered from archaeological sites. These findings are helpful in interpreting sites associated with racially and economically marginalized people. I also examine how the presence or absence of a community impacted the artifacts recovered from a site and the types of relationships in which a site’s residents were involved.

For places occupied by free African Americans, I chose comparison sites where individuals or a few people lived alone, and where people were part of a larger community. Based on the available data, I was only able to select enslaved African American sites where people lived in a community. On the other hand, for sites occupied by poor whites, I was only able to select sites where people lived alone. I discuss the comparison site selection process more in-depth in the next section.

This variety of sites can help highlight how the presence of a community influenced the relationships of site occupants. I examine whether being a member of a community enabled the free and enslaved African Americans who lived at these sites to form support networks. If they were a part of such a network, I compare this membership to the small group of Library site occupants as well as to individuals who lived alone.

As part of these comparisons, I use the artifact assemblages to better understand the lives of the people at these sites and the ways that relational networks and historical contexts shaped the lives of the formerly enslaved individuals at Mount Vernon. I examine the quantities and forms of ceramics that archaeologists recovered (i.e., whether they were tea wares, serving vessels, plates, etc.) and discuss data that shows how long people used those ceramics.
I also consider the types of wares that comprise the ceramic assemblage, including whether they were primarily fine earthenware, coarse earthenware, stoneware, or porcelain. I also consider if the composition of the ceramic assemblages varies based on social class and racial classification. I examine if the residents had matching sets of ceramics. I also explore whether the residents of these sites made any of their ceramics or used colonoware.

Further, I investigate the types of glassware recovered from these sites, and whether these were plain or decorated. Through my examination of glassware and ceramics, I try to determine whether it seems like the residents primarily chose to purchase and use utilitarian objects or if they used finer ceramics and other objects. To the extent that residents of these sites owned more expensive objects, I discuss if they purchased these objects or if these were given to them by a benefactor.

I examine artifacts related to clothing to better understand how these individuals presented themselves to other people. Enslaved African Americans may not have had a choice in the matter, as they were often expected to dress in a certain way while they worked, although they could have had a choice on what to wear on Sundays. Free African Americans and poor whites had a choice in their daily clothing but may have faced constraints due to their financial circumstances.

I discuss what the artifacts found at the sites can reveal about leisure activities, the occupations of the residents, and the various relationships in which they were engaged. I also examine whether there is any connection between the social status of the sites’ residents and the size and quality of the objects recovered at these locations. Further, at sites associated with free and enslaved African Americans, I discuss whether archaeologists recovered any objects related
to African American cultural practices. I also examine any evidence that reveals how the residents may have navigated legal or status restrictions.

The assemblages can also speak to whether the occupants lived a solitary life or if they had visitors. I examine how the artifacts recovered from these sites played an active role in the lives of the residents and how residents used objects to negotiate their identities. I also examine whether the local environment impacted the types of food that residents ate, how they cooked meals, and how they related to other people.

Further, I investigate the types of houses in which these sites’ occupants lived, including the size of the structures and the materials used in their construction. While enslaved people may not have had a choice in this matter, they may have found ways to make these places their own through features and particular domestic activities. I also investigate whether the houses occupied by free African Americans conformed to building standards set by Anglo-Americans or if they incorporated traditional African building practices. I also compare these houses to those occupied by poor whites.

I consider the extent to which free African American housing differed by community (i.e. whether they lived in separate communities, in towns, or on their own), exploring whether individuals in cities lived in houses similar to local Anglo-Americans and whether those who lived in more secluded areas used different building practices. I also consider whether the structures occupied by the poor and middling whites conformed to local Anglo-American building practices.

Of particular note are features that are present in both free and enslaved African American contexts, like subfloor pits. While such features are commonly associated with African
American houses in general, I investigate how many of the comparative sites contained these features. I also explore whether archaeologists found these features in the houses occupied by free African Americans and poor whites. Finally, I examine whether any of these sites were ephemeral in nature (i.e. with archaeologists recovering artifacts but not finding any features).

Part II: Introduction to Comparative Sites

The comparative archaeological sites in this chapter are located in Virginia and were occupied during the same period as the Mount Vernon ridge occupation (see Figure 18). This is especially important for the sites associated with free and enslaved Africans, as those sites’ occupants were subject to the same laws and possibly the same racial ideas that impacted Mount Vernon. I did not want to include significantly earlier sites such as The Utopia Plantation quarters, Richneck Quarter, and Mount Pleasant Kitchen Site, where the ideas of race were still forming and in the process of influencing new laws and relationships. On the other hand, sites with occupations that began after that of the Mount Vernon ridge faced new laws in reaction to Nat Turner’s rebellion in 1831, which led to a massive debate about slavery in Virginia.

In sites contemporaneous with the occupation at the Mount Vernon ridge, the laws and general racial perceptions in Virginia should have similar, general impacts on the assemblages and houses. Any differences across the sites instead could be due to local relationships, statuses, and the extent to which these laws were carried out, although some of the occupations at the free African American sites continued later than that of the Library site.

All except for two of the sites used in this comparison overlap with the occupation of the Library site and Field 7. The House for Families (occupied approximately from 1759-1793), while not contemporaneous with the Field 7 occupation, is included because it is also located at
Mount Vernon and it is possible that the individuals who lived at the Library site may have previously lived at the House for Families. Contemporaneous with the occupation of the House for Families is Monticello Site 8, which is included because its residents were enslaved laborers who worked in the field (Bon-Harper 2009; see Figure 18).

Figure 18: A map of Virginia which includes the locations of the plantations and communities used in this analysis. Stratford Hall, Mount Vernon, and Monticello are labeled. Poplar Forest is in Lynchburg. The Katherine Foster Site is in Charlottesville. The Charles Gilliam site is in Prince George County, directly north of Newport News. Map courtesy of the Nations Online Project.
Archaeologists have not yet found sites at Mount Vernon occupied by enslaved field laborers, possibly because they were so ephemeral, as discussed in Chapter 4. Some of the individuals who lived at the Library site may have worked in outlying farms at Mount Vernon before being freed. Though those who worked in the fields at Mount Vernon belonged to different relational networks and had different affordances, Monticello Site 8 can still provide some insight into the lives of Mount Vernon’s enslaved field laborers during the late 18th century.

This comparison includes six archaeological sites related to enslaved African Americans, including the House for Families site. I do not expect to see similar objects at the Library site and these comparison sites. I expect that the Library site and the House for Families, in particular, will have different types of artifacts due to the different relationships between inhabitants of the dwellings, and the occupants’ relationships to Anglo-Americans living at Mount Vernon, including George Washington.

This comparison includes three sites at Thomas Jefferson’s Monticello, located about 100 miles away from Mount Vernon. These sites include Site 8, which contained at least four different houses occupied by enslaved laborers who worked in the fields; Site 6; and the succeeding enslaved quarters, which appear to have been occupied during the first quarter of the 19th century and has the most overlap with the Library site of all the enslaved housing sites used in this comparison (Neiman 2018). Though this site was excavated in the summer of 2018 and the results are still being analyzed by Monticello archaeologists, the preliminary findings still provide a useful comparison (Neiman 2018).

I also examined the findings from the Elizabeth Hemmings site, which was from late 1795 through 1807, when Elizabeth Hemmings died (Lentz 2010:13). This period overlaps with
the early occupation of the Library site. Elizabeth, the mother of Sally Hemmings, worked in the Mansion house. She and her daughters were the only enslaved African Americans at Monticello who did not participate in harvesting (Gordon-Reed 2009; Lentz 2010:14). Elizabeth had a higher quality of housing and potentially better-quality possessions than the enslaved African Americans who worked in the fields.

I looked at the findings from the Quarter site at Thomas Jefferson’s Poplar Forest, which is located in Bedford County, Virginia, about 180 miles away from Mount Vernon (see Figure 18). The enslaved housing at Poplar Forest that archaeologists have excavated was occupied from approximately 1790-1812 (Heath 2004; Heath and Breen 2009). The enslaved housing at this site dates to a period of great transition among both the plantation landscape and the enslaved workforce at Poplar Forest (Heath 2004).

The last site occupied by enslaved African Americans that I examine is the Stratford Hall quarter ST116, located in Westmoreland County, about 80 miles away from Mount Vernon (see Figure 18). The Stratford Hall plantation was the historical plantation of the prominent Lee family (Sanford 2003). This site was occupied from 1770-1820, predating and overlapping with the occupation of the Library site. This was also a time of transition for the enslaved workforce due to the changes in the agricultural pursuits at the Stratford plantation (Sanford 2003).

I chose four sites associated with free African Americans for comparison. The Catherine Foster site, located approximately 110 miles away in Charlottesville, was occupied by Foster starting around the end of the Library site occupation and into the 1860s (Ford 2006). She lived at the house with her four children and worked for students at the University of Virginia (Ford 2006, 2016). As a single mother, she was involved in different familial relationships than the free African Americans at Mount Vernon.
The Catherine Foster site house was located in the Charlottesville community called Canada, which was next to the University of Virginia and remained in existence until the turn of the 20th century (Ford 2006). During the antebellum period, it was predominantly a free African American community that, based on its name, archaeologists hypothesize may have participated in the underground railroad (Ford 2006).

I also discuss the findings from the Hannah Jackson House and the Henlis House, which were located in predominantly African American neighborhoods in Alexandria, Virginia, about eight miles from Mount Vernon (Cressey and Anderson 2006; Singleton 2001). Alexandria was the closest town to Mount Vernon and is where ridge residents would have gone to shop, sell items, and go to church. As mentioned in Chapter 4, executor accounts mention that free African Americans from Mount Vernon spent time in Alexandria. The Hannah Jackson house was occupied from approximately 1820 to 1827, and the Henlis residence was occupied from approximately 1816 to 1852 (Cressey and Anderson 2006). The residents at these houses would have had access to the same markets and some of the same social networks as those living at the Library site.

Finally, I also discuss the findings from the Charles Gilliam House, located in Prince George County, about 125 miles from Mount Vernon (see Figure 18). Gilliam lived at this house from the 1820s through the 1850s (Ryder 1991). I included this site because, unlike the other free African American sites that I use for comparison, Gilliam did not live in either a separate free African American community or in an African American neighborhood in a larger town. Evidence suggests that while Charles Gillam lived on his own, he still interacted with both nearby whites and African Americans (Ryder 1991). Since the residents of the Library site did
not live in a free African American community or neighborhood, but may have maintained social
ties with the community in Alexandria, the Gilliam House provides a good point of comparison.

However, he had very different relationships with these groups than did the residents of
the other comparison sites. Charles Gilliam’s property had an outbuilding as well as an
additional small cabin, which Ryder (1991) claims Gilliam possibly used for enslaved labor.
Based on the archaeological assemblage, he appears to have been wealthier than the other free
African Americans included in this study (Ryder 1991).

It can be difficult for archaeologists to find sites that were associated with poor and
middling whites in Virginia. These individuals often lived in log cabins, which do not preserve
well and are not easy to find archaeologically. They were often located in the sections of towns
that are destroyed and built over during gentrification projects. It is also the case that their daily
daily lives and material culture were often poorly documented, and that they are not often mentioned
in public records (Lounsbury 2010).

It is often difficult to distinguish between archaeological assemblages associated with
free African Americans and lower-middle class and poor whites (see Babson 1990; Heath and
Breen 2009). This can lead to uncertainty about a site’s occupants. We still do not fully
understand how the lives and diets of enslaved and free African Americans differed from those
of tenant farmers and overseers, and my examination provides a useful starting point (see Heath
and Breen 2009).

Excavations of poor white households are often conducted as part of Cultural Resource
Management (CRM) projects, and it can be very hard to find the results of these excavations.
While I endeavored to choose sites with occupations contemporaneous with that of the Library
site, it is difficult to find archaeological studies that focus on poor and middling white Virginians from this time period. As a result, I do not include sites occupied by lower-class whites in Virginia cities in this comparison.

Instead, I examine sites occupied by tenant farmers, skilled laborers, and overseers. These sites are especially important because it is possible that one of these types of poor or middle-class white individuals lived along Mount Vernon’s ridge. It is also important to note, however, that these comparison sites highlight a particular set of people with specific relations: that of individuals in a plantation setting. Given the available data, I could not examine the lives of lower-class whites outside of this setting. Individuals who did not live on a plantation were engaged in different relationships, working different types of jobs, and surrounded by different affordances.

Specifically, I examine Site 17 from Monticello, which was occupied by Thomas Jefferson’s overseer, Edmund Bacon. Bacon lived at this site from 1806-1822 (Wilkins 2017). It is one of few overseers’ houses that have been excavated that is contemporaneous with the Library site, and thus the findings from this site can help me better determine whether an overseer lived at the Library site.

I also examine the findings from the Stewart-Watkins site, which is also located at Monticello and is associated with Jefferson’s skilled, white laborers (Gaylord 2009). This site housed a blacksmith, William Stewart, and then later a carpenter, Elisha Watkins, and their families during the early 1800s. The house was constructed around 1799 for a blacksmith who never lived there, and Stewart moved into the house about a year later (Gaylord 2009). The evidence suggests that the house was only occupied for about 10 years, and while the site
appears on historical maps that date to this 10-year period, it is not referenced in any documentary evidence that post-dates 1809 (Gaylord 2009).

As another comparison site, I include the occupation at Morven, in Albemarle County. The investigation of Morven found an early 19th century tenant farmer quarter (Morven Research 2019; WLU Dig Blog 2011). I could not find the results of these excavations published in an easily accessible archaeological report. I relied on the Washington and Lee University (WLU) Dig Blog for the archaeologists’ field notes and interpretations of the site.

The Morven Plantation was owned by Colonel William Short, who was viewed as an adopted son by Thomas Jefferson, and for whom Jefferson bought the land in 1795 (Canzi 2010). Short never lived on this property, and Jefferson ended up managing it for him and renting it to different tenant farmers (Canzi 2010). In a letter, Short instructed Jefferson to exclusively rent to a white tenant farmer; he was an abolitionist and did not want enslaved laborers to work the fields (Canzi 2010). The documentary evidence indicates that at least two tenant farmers lived at this site during the early 1800s, and that they were given explicit instructions by Jefferson on what crops to grow, when to plant them, and when to rotate the fields (Canzi 2010).

Virginia is a large state and people in different areas of the state participated in different networks. The social and consumer networks in the Charlottesville area, for example, were very different than those in Alexandria. Further, these networks changed over time, so late 18th century networks in one location would have been different from mid-19th century networks in the same location. The geographic differences of these networks could have shaped how these economically and racially marginalized people valued specific objects, which in turn influenced the types of artifacts found at the sites.
Ideally, all of the comparison sites would have been from the area around Mount Vernon and Alexandria and would have been contemporaneous with the occupation of the Mount Vernon ridge. However, given the difficulty in finding free African American and middling white sites in Virginia, I examine sites clustered in specific geographical areas. The intra-category comparisons will help reveal the differences caused by people participating in different networks. The inter-category comparisons should illustrate differences engendered by social class and racial categorization.

It is also important to note that all of the sites included in this comparison were excavated under the direction of different, and sometimes multiple, supervisors, and with different excavation techniques and sampling strategies. It is possible that some small objects were not recovered from sites where archaeologists did not include water-screening. Some sites also screened their dirt using wire mesh screens that were smaller than 1/4\textsuperscript{th} inch. These sites could have recovered smaller artifacts than those where the dirt was screened with 1/4\textsuperscript{th} inch screens. These sites were also excavated under different circumstances. Some were excavated as academic work, others were excavated by private foundations, and others were part of CRM projects.

Most of the data for the enslaved African American sites was obtained from the Digital Archaeological Archive of Comparative Slavery (DAACS), as well as a few academic articles and dissertations. The data for the House for Families primarily came from archaeological reports that were at the Fred W. Smith National Library for the Study of George Washington. The data for free African American sites was obtained through a variety of sources, including Alexandria government websites and archaeological reports. The Gilliam house information was obtained from Robin Ryder’s master’s thesis. The data for poor and middling whites also came
from a mixture of sources, including DAACS, university and foundation websites, and different dissertations.

**Part III: Findings at Sites Occupied by Enslaved African Americans**

*House for Families*

The House for Families at Mount Vernon was the main quarter for enslaved African Americans who worked at the Mansion house under George Washington. The excavated portion of the house consists of a 6 ft. by 6 ft. brick-lined cellar, which was part of a much larger, two-story building (Pogue 1995, 2002). It appears as though the cellar was filled two or three times during the structure’s occupation, and the assemblage is divided into three phases, with Mean Ceramic Dates (MCD) of 1760, 1779, and 1782. The vast majority of the assemblage comes from the first phase (Pogue and White 1991).

Archaeologists recovered over 60,000 artifacts from these excavations, including over 25,000 faunal remains representing 58 animal species (Pogue 1995:10). These species include domesticated animals, such as pigs and cows, as well as wildfowl (i.e. quail, turkeys, and geese), woodland animals (deer, squirrel and rabbit), and a variety of fish bones (Pogue 1995:10). The faunal assemblage also contained the bones of young chicken as well as parts of chicken eggs. These faunal remains point to how the residents supplemented their diets (Pogue 1995:10). Archaeologists also found a raccoon penis bone. Pogue (1995) explains how African Americans often used these bones in rituals. This object is one of the few known ritual objects that archaeologists have found at the House for Families (Pogue 1995).

Despite this variety, beef and pork seem to have been the primary sources of meat (Pogue 1995:10). According to zooarchaeologist Joanne Bowen, the proportion of beef at the House for
Families is unusually high when compared to the diets of enslaved people at other plantations. While the bones show that the residents often received poor cuts of meat, they received good cuts of meats almost as frequently (Pogue 1995:10). Because archaeologists have not found a quarter in the outlying farm, we do not know if this amount of beef is related to the status of the enslaved laborers who lived in the House for Families, or if it is due to the affluence of George Washington (Pogue 1995:10).

Archaeologists recovered gunflint, tea wares, salt-glazed stonewares, and colonowares from the site. This assemblage also contained a variety of other items such as blue glass beads; over 20 types of ceramics including refined earthenware; table glass and wine bottles; tobacco pipes; and buttons (Pogue 2003). The interpretation of the assemblage has focused on the correlation between the rich assemblage with enslaved African Americans who are “hypothesized as enjoying a position of preferment due to their proximity to and presumed intimacy with the Washington household” (Pogue 2003).

Mount Vernon archaeologists believe that many of the ceramics recovered from the House for Families site were probably given to enslaved laborers by George Washington after those objects had become unfashionable or worn (Pogue 2003). Researchers argued that glass beads are also related to African American practices. The archaeology also revealed that the house contained a brick-lined cellar. Since this cellar is the only part of the structure that survives, we do not know if the house contained subfloor pits (Pogue 1995).

Archaeologists found many objects related to personal adornment. The site appears to be an outlier, given the amount and type of clothing-related items recovered (Pogue 1995). The high number of clothing-related items may be due to the high number of enslaved domestic laborers who lived at the site (Pogue 1995). They may have been expected to dress in a specific manner
to carry out their duties in the Mansion house (Pogue 1995, 2005). Archaeologists recovered five different types of pins, including 416 straight pins. They also found six shoe buckles, which point to the occupants’ roles as enslaved workers in the Mansion house. Shoes with fashionable buckles would have been a part of the livery outfit required for the enslaved laborers who worked in the Mansion house (Pogue 1995).

In total, archaeologists recovered 133 beads, about 14% of which were blue (Pogue 1995). They believe that some of these beads could have held ritual significance to the occupants. Archaeologists also recovered a variety of jewelry and personal items, including two watch trinkets, one jewelry coil, and one jewelry clasp, copper alloy rings, 19 tobacco pipes, a fan guard, a snuff-box, and a clasp knife (Pogue 1995). Based on these findings, tobacco smoking appears to be a pastime that the residents enjoyed (Pogue 1995). This activity could be associated with either men or women.

Archaeologists also found 43 buttons (Pogue 1995). Nine of these were flat and undecorated, 14 were two-piece and undecorated, and four were two-piece and decorated (Pogue 1995). They found 13 ring buttons, one domed button, and two collar buttons. Some of these buttons contained elaborate decoration with delicately worked shell, metal, or glass faces. There was also evidence of embroidered thread buttons or buttons with multiple types of materials. They also found a metallic thread death’s head button (Pogue 1995).

These buttons are much more ornate than the types of buttons recovered from the Library site and Field 7. Many of the types of buttons recovered from the House for Families were expensive and considered to be high style at the time. However, since these enslaved laborers were required to dress well for duties in the Mansion house (Pogue 1995), it is possible that these
buttons were part of their work clothing, rather than something which the residents chose to purchase for themselves.

Monticello Site 8

The enslaved laborers at Mount Vernon were split up among the five farms, and their quality of life differed based on where on the plantation they lived (for a more complete discussion, see Chapter 4). Archaeologists have not found any sites associated with enslaved housing in the outlying farms, which is most likely due to a mixture of plowing, the impermanence of the houses, and the fact that the land was subdivided and absorbed by new town spaces after Washington’s death (Pogue 1995). Given these issues, Monticello’s Site 8 provides a good comparison to the House for Families. Archaeologists found evidence of four houses at Site 8, suggesting that it was the plantation’s main settlement for enslaved African American field laborers during the late 18th century.

Site 8 appears to have been occupied from the 1770s through the 1790s, around the same time as the House for Families. Documentary and historical evidence indicate that an overseer’s house was located near the houses at Site 8 and remained occupied for at least another decade (Bon-Harper 2009). It appears as though enslaved housing moved away from overseer housing at the Monticello plantation at the end of the 18th century. This change in enslaved housing and the relationship with overseers appears to have coincided with the plantation’s transition from tobacco farming to wheat and other agricultural pursuits (Bon-Harper 2009).

Each of these houses contained multiple subfloor pits, which contained various ceramics (Lentz 2010:17). Archaeologists also found a borrow pit that was possibly created in the construction of House 2. Pollen analysis based on pollen from two subfloor pits in House 1
(Lentz 2010) provides an interesting insight into the diets of the residents. Because the soil samples came from an interior feature, archaeologists can assume that the pollen came through foods that the residents ate. The analysis indicates that the enslaved African Americans at this site consumed a variety of foods, including peaches, apples, peas, grapes, corn, and wheat (Lentz 2010).

The Site 8 artifact assemblage contained 493 vessel fragments, most of which were undecorated creamware and pearlware. The site contained some porcelain, but only a few slipware sherds (Arendt et al. 2003). The data shows that the residents used and discarded utilitarian wares at a greater rate than tea wares and that they stored their food (Arendt et al. 2003). The MCD of Site 8 was 1790.9, which is interesting since this is towards the end of the site’s occupation. Archaeologists only recovered one straight pin from the site but found 23 buttons. Of these, 20 were flat and undecorated, two were flat and decorated, and one consisted of two undecorated pieces. They found one sleeve button from the site and did not recover any jewelry, beads, or other high-fashion accessories (Arendt et al. 2003).

The site also shows evidence that the residents possibly swept their yards. Sara Bon-Harper (2009) argues that the large subfloor pits may indicate that the residents worked together to make and store food and other goods. She further suggests that the site may have contained a multi-structure household, linked together by cooperative ties (rather than just family ties), shared yard space, and productive efforts (Bon-Harper 2009). Later studies indicate that over time, cooperation between the two households may have dwindled, resulting in the creation of more storage spaces that Monticello archaeologists (Neiman et al. 2014) claim enslaved African Americans used like safe deposit boxes.

*Monticello Site 6*
Monticello Site 6 offers insight into the houses of enslaved field laborers. The site dates to the first quarter of the 19th century, making it contemporaneous with the Library site occupation (Neiman 2018). It appears to have contained two structures: a northern household and a southern household. Monticello archaeologists and field school students excavated the site in the summer of 2018 and are still analyzing the artifacts (Neiman 2018). However, the preliminary analysis reveals some interesting findings. The assemblages for both houses contained a similar number of wrought nails and machine cut nails (Neiman 2002). Thomas Jefferson began the operation of nailery at Monticello in 1794, hoping to increase his cash flow. In 1796, he purchased a nail making machine for this endeavor (“Thomas Jefferson Encyclopedia”). Assuming that the nails from both of these houses were made on the plantation, then both houses must have been constructed no earlier than 1796.

Since wrought nails fell out of fashion around 1800 and cut nails started production at Monticello in 1796 (Marciniszyn 2017, “Thomas Jefferson Encyclopedia”), the presence of both nail types in similar quantities indicates that both houses were constructed and possibly occupied at the same time. However, the ceramic assemblage from the northern household primarily contains transfer-printed and hand-painted pearlware, while the assemblage from the southern household primarily contains plain creamwares.

The types of buttons found at the two houses provides independent evidence of the occupants’ varied wealth (Neiman 2018). The northern structure contains several metal buttons, indicating that the residents purchased fashionable vests and coats that were acquired separately from those provided by Jefferson. These buttons are not found in the assemblage from the southern structure (Neiman 2018). The window glass recovered from the excavations also shows
that the northern structure contained glazed glass windows, whereas the southern structure did not. Finally, only the northern structure contains a root cellar (Neiman 2018).

Based on the size of ceramic remains and the location where trash was found, archaeologists argue that the northern household was more permanent (Neiman 2018). Given this residential stability, the inhabitants of the northern structure were able to engage in gardening. They stored their crops in the root cellar and sold these foods at the local marketplace, using the money they received to participate in the local economy (Neiman 2018). Residencies at the southern household, however, appear more temporary. This transience means that they were unable to engage in gardening or participate in local markets (Neiman 2018).

**Elizabeth Hemmings Site**

The artifact assemblage from the Elizabeth Hemming site at Monticello is dissimilar to those from the other two sites of enslaved African American at Monticello. This finding is unsurprising. The site was occupied during the late 18th and early 19th centuries and appears on Jefferson’s survey of Monticello from 1806 (Lentz 2010:13). Only Elizabeth Hemmings occupied this house, as opposed to the many families who occupied the quarters at Sites 6 and 8. She had a very different life than the enslaved African Americans who worked in the fields. It is therefore very likely that she participated in different relational networks and had different access to goods, leading to the dissimilar artifact assemblage seen at the Elizabeth Hemmings site (Gordon-Reed 2009; Lentz 2010; Neiman et al. 2000).

Excavations revealed that the house was a log cabin that had a wattle and daub chimney with a brick base. The house also appears to have contained a green cobblestone hearth (Neiman et al. 2000). However, archaeologists did not find any evidence of a wooden floor (Lentz 2010).
They found three postholes in a linear configuration close to the house, which they argue may have been part of a fence line (Smith 2006). Archaeological findings also indicate that Hemmings may have had a garden in her backyard (Lentz 2010:13). The presence of window glass indicates that the house contained at least one window (Neiman et al. 2000:52). The house did not contain any subfloor pits, and the assemblage did not have items commonly associated with enslaved African Americans, such as colonoware, cowrie shells, or blue beads (Heath and Breen 2009:11).

Many artifacts recovered from the Elizabeth Hemming Site were found deposited behind the house. Archaeologists recovered 732 ceramic sherds, representing a minimum of 33 vessels (Lentz 2010). This site contained fewer vessels than found at Site 6 or 8, but this is to be expected since she lived alone and only occupied the house for about 12 years, whereas the other two sites were occupied for much longer and by many enslaved African Americans (Lentz 2010; Neiman et al. 2000).

Pearlware comprised 42% of the Elizabeth Hemmings Site assemblage, creamware 27%, and porcelain 24%. This site had a higher percentage of hand-painted porcelain than Site 8 or Site 6 (Lentz 2010:24; Neiman 2018). This assemblage contained the second-highest percentage of hand-painted porcelain among all sites occupied by enslaved African Americans at Monticello (Lentz 2010:26). Slipware comprised 10% of the ceramic assemblage, the highest among slave quarters at Monticello (Lentz 2010:25). About 30% of the ceramic assemblage consisted of hand-painted creamwares and pearlwares (Neiman et al. 2000). Most of the pearlware and porcelain were dinnerware and flatwares, while the majority of creamwares were tea wares. The site only contained one salt-glazed stoneware (Neiman et al. 2000:45).
Based on the proportions of different ceramics, the site had an MCD of 1796.82. The ceramics contained decorations that were popular at the time, such as rococo shell-edged pearlware and blue willows style porcelain. However, some of the ceramics contained scratches in their glaze, which attest to the fact that these were used for extended periods (Neiman et al. 2000:46). The assemblage also shows that Hemmings had at least three different stemmed glassware, including one with a copper wheel engraving (Neiman et al. 2000:52). Wine bottle glass was also found at the site (Neiman et al. 2004:52). Archaeologists also recovered a slate pencil, two pewter buttons, and a woman’s shoe buckle (Neiman et al. 2000:53). The differences between the assemblages at this site, Site 8, and Site 6 points to inequality within the slave community at Monticello.

Stratford Hall

Stratford Hall site ST116, which was in use from 1770-1820, provides an interesting look at enslaved African American housing that spanned both the occupation of the House for Families and the Library site (Heath and Breen 2009). During this particular period, Stratford Hall experienced a shift similar to that at Mount Vernon, as the agricultural ventures at the plantation shifted from tobacco to a more diversified agricultural system (Heath and Breen 2009). As a result, the Lee family sold some of their Stratford Hall land and enslaved laborers. The remaining enslaved African Americans at the plantation began to engage in a variety of tasks and trades and were relocated to newly constructed quarters closer to the Mansion house. The site referred to as ST116 appears to have been one of these newer quarters, located about 300 feet northeast from the mansion (Heath and Breen 2009).

The site contained a small earthfast dwelling measuring about 8 ft. by 8 ft., which was most likely home to one enslaved family (Ardent et al. 2003; Heath and Breen 2009). This house
is smaller than most slave quarters found at plantations. It was built using the post-in-the-ground method, which is unusual for a house constructed after the mid-18th century (Heath and Breen 2009:10) A brick foundation appears to have been added to the house at a later date (Heath and Breen 2009).

The majority of the artifact assemblage was recovered from the plowzone, and it was primarily comprised of mass-produced English goods, although over 24 types of ceramic wares were recovered (Heath and Breen 2009:9). Heath and Breen (2009:14) argue that despite their inadequate housing, the residents of the site accumulated “an impressive range of consumer goods that served as a material response to the substandard housing that they were forced to inhabit.” However, the majority of the ceramics were utilitarian wares. Like the residents of Site 8 at Monticello, the residents of ST116 used and discarded utilitarian ceramics at a higher rate than tea wares (Ardent et al. 2003). The ST116 site had an MCD of 1783. It did not contain any colonoware or subfloor pits, and archaeologists only found one blue glass bead (Heath and Breen 2009).

*Poplar Forest*

Finally, the quarter for enslaved workers at the Poplar Forest plantation provides a view of enslaved African American life at a plantation whose owner was only occasionally present, which is a similar circumstance to that of Mount Vernon under Bushrod Washington. The Poplar Forest Quarter site dates from about 1790 to 1812 (Heath 2004). During this period, enslaved African Americans often belonged to extended families and lived in kin-based households (Heath 2004). Heath (2004) notes that the occupants of the site experienced the transition of the landscape from a small farm with an absentee owner run by a plantation manager, into a retreat actively managed and designed by Thomas Jefferson. The charcoal analysis indicates further
changes in the landscape, showing that the nearby forest had decreased in size. As a result, the residents relied on less diverse and less efficient pieces of wood for the fire (Heath 2004).

The site contained three different structures. Structure 1 was 25 ft. by 15 ft. and divided into two equally sized rooms. Structure 2 was 13 sq. ft. and Structure 3 was 18.5 feet to a side (Heath 2004). Archaeologists recovered thousands of slate roofing tiles and nails around each of these structures. The lack of stone, brick, or mortar also indicates that these houses were most likely log structures (Heath 2004). Archaeologists also found evidence of a fence, a trash midden, and a garden (Heath 2004).

The residents placed their yards to face away from the overseer’s house, a way in which the inhabitants used the landscape to gain some degree of privacy from the plantation’s Anglo-American residents. DAACS researchers argue that the site had four phases of occupations (Sanford 2003). Most of the ceramics recovered from this site are associated with the third occupation phase.

Archaeologists found blue glass beads and the presence of subfloor pits. They recovered several types of artifacts related to diet, including the macroplant remains of 15 species (Heath 2004). About 80% of these plants were domesticated, and the other 20% were wild species (Heath 2004). They also found the faunal remains of beef, pork, deer, rabbit, and squirrel. Some of this meat would have been provided by Thomas Jefferson, but it also appears that the enslaved laborers supplemented their rations through hunting (Heath 2004).

The Poplar Forest Quarter site also contained evidence that enslaved laborers possessed a variety of artisanal and plantation-based skills. Archaeologists recovered cooper’s tools (for barrel making), carpenter’s tools, and other general-purpose tools (Heath 1997, 2004).
Archaeologists recovered ceramic sherds from a minimum of 131 vessels and pieces from at least 29 glass vessels (Heath 1997). They found some lead shot, gunflint, and fragments of writing slate. Excavations also uncovered stone pipe fragments and objects related to personal adornments, such as buttons (Heath 1997, 2004). Archaeologists believe that these stone pipes were produced on the site. Heath also notes that the residents discarded still-functional white metal buttons in favor of yellow metal buttons. These gilt and plain plaited buttons were in style at the beginning of the 19th century (Heath 1997).

Heath (1997) argues that none of the documentary evidence indicates that these objects were given to enslaved laborers by Jefferson. While individual items may have been cast-offs given by overseers, there is no noticeable lag time in the ceramic assemblage that indicates “systematic provisioning in this manner” (Heath 1997:2). Heath uses documentary evidence to support the hypothesis that the men and women at this quarter shared the profits of harvests and used the money to purchase goods and pay off debts at local stores. She uses this evidence to argue that by understanding that enslaved African Americans were consumers, we can begin to understand how they helped create their material world (Heath 1997:3–4).

Part IV: Findings at Sites Occupied by Free African Americans

The Charles Gilliam House

Free African Americans in antebellum Virginia lived in a variety of houses, and the assemblages found at these locations vary greatly. Archaeologists and historians often think of antebellum free African Americans as members of poor or middling households. While many of these individuals were economically marginalized, others occupied higher economic classes. For example, Charles Gilliam, a free African American who lived in rural Prince William County,
Virginia during the mid-1800s, lived a middle-class life as evidenced by the site’s artifact assemblage. However, from the outside, his house seemed unassuming to the public.

Robin Ryder (1991) examined the way Gilliam used space, landscape, and material objects to help fashion separate public and private identities. Archaeological evidence indicates that the Charles Gilliam house was a large L-shaped log cabin with a wattle and daub chimney. He had a separate kitchen building and a small slave cabin (Ryder 1991). During this time, wattle and daub chimneys are commonly associated with houses occupied by those of lower economic status (Ryder 1991).

However, Ryder argues that the chimney construction may be a combination of ethnic background and social status rather than economic status. It relied on African American building techniques even though it may have, perhaps purposely, signaled poverty to Anglo-Americans (Ryder 1991). Through a combination of archaeology and historical photography of similarly constructed log cabins from the 1850s, Ryder determined that the exterior of Gilliam’s house appeared to be run-down and typical of a lower-class house. On the other hand, the archaeological assemblage shows that he was wealthier than he revealed to the public (Ryder 1991).

The ceramic assemblage was comprised of 23% coarse earthenwares and 77% fine earthenwares. Ryder only recovered eight porcelain vessels, about 9% of the ceramics (Ryder 1991). In terms of vessel shape and function, storage vessels comprised 17% of the assemblage, and bowls only made 9% of the assemblage. Plates accounted for the highest percentage of the ceramic assemblage. Ryder argues that the ceramic assemblage is indicative of a middle-class planter (Ryder 1991).
Ryder (1991) claims that Gilliam used these fine goods when dealing with other free African Americans in the privacy of his home, away from the eyes of local whites. The activities in the private interior went against what white Virginia society considered socially acceptable behavior by free African Americans. For example, European-Americans in Virginia believed it was wrong for free African Americans to own fine ceramics (Ryder 1991). Gilliam tried to show one way of living to locally prejudiced whites and another to those who entered his house.

Ryder argues that this type of housing may have helped hide material differences between members of free African American communities to the wider public (Ryder 1991). By constructing a house that conformed to racist Anglo-American ideas about African Americans, Gilliam could live a middle-class life without drawing too much attention from the white community (Ryder 1991).

*The Henlis Family*

While Gilliam lived in a rural area, the Henlis Family lived in the free African American neighborhood of the Bottoms in Alexandria. The Bottoms began developing in 1799 and was the earliest free African American community in the area (City of Alexandria 2019). The Henlis family lived at their house from 1816-1852. It was most likely a small, wood framed building, similar to the other houses in the neighborhood (Cressey 1994).

Archaeologists recovered a variety of inexpensive and unmatched plates, bowls, saucers, and teacups that had been discarded into a well lined with barrels that had likely been turned into a trash pit after it ran dry (Cressey 1994). These ceramics are primarily plain and undecorated. The assemblage contained relatively few serving vessels, such as pitchers and bowls, and those recovered had a variety of decorations and were inexpensive (Cressey 1994).
Archaeologists also recovered other domestic debris, including clay pipes and marbles, a snuff bottle, and eyeglass lenses (Cressey 1994).

**Hannah Jackson**

Hannah Jackson lived in Hayti, a second free African American neighborhood in Alexandria that began to form in 1810 (City of Alexandria 2019). Jackson purchased her house in 1820 for five shillings and ground rent, and she was one of the first African Americans in Alexandria to own some form of property (Virginia Foundation for the Humanities 2019). This house eventually became the center of Hayti. Like the Henlis’ house, her house was most likely a wood frame house. There is also reference in her will to the Cedar Post House, a “back house” that also appears to have been wood framed (Virginia Foundation for the Humanities 2019).

Archaeologists found many artifacts that illustrate that Jackson made a living as a seamstress and laundress, including pins, needles, and a large number of shirts and underwear buttons (Singleton 2001). They also found some decomposed wood from poles that she used for laundry lines. As discussed in Chapter 3, archaeologists found ceramics and glasswares that showed signs of extended wear along the edge of their bases. The ceramics were primarily unmatched and inexpensive. Theresa Singleton (2001) analyzed documentary evidence to that show that Jackson purchased her relatives out of slavery, including her son, sister, nieces, nephews, and grandchildren. It is possible that Jackson used housewares for an extended period to save money.

**The Catherine Foster House**

Like Jackson, Catherine “Kitty” Foster, who lived in the free African American community of Canada, in Charlottesville, Virginia, also worked as a seamstress and laundress in
the 1820s and 1830s. Foster was a single mother of two daughters, Sarah and Anne, and two sons, German and Burwell (Ford 2016:19). In the early 1840s, Foster’s young granddaughter may have come to live at the house. Foster worked at the University of Virginia community beginning in the 1820s (Ford 2006, 2014). Historical documents and archeological evidence show that Foster lived in a brick house that she purchased herself. The documentary evidence also shows that the house stayed in her family for three generations, being passed down to her daughter and granddaughter (Ford 2006).

In the early 2000s, the University of Virginia hired Rivanna Archaeological Services to excavate the area around the Catherine Foster House. They found cobblestone and brick pathways around the house, a well, and Canada’s cemetery (Ford 2014:25). Archaeologists also determined that the house contained a finished, wood-lined basement, which was rare for houses in this area (Ford 2006). Given these findings, head archaeologist Benjamin Ford argued that Kitty Foster possibly played an important role in Canada and that her house possibly served as a stop on the network of escape routes for enslaved individuals called the “underground railroad” (Ford 2006:3,115). The excavations also found the remains of a brick chimney base (Ford 2006).

In total, archaeologists recovered nearly 47,500 artifacts from the excavations at the Foster site. The majority of these were tableware ceramics and glassware (Ford 2016). Excavations also recovered cut nails and window glass, which help to confirm the presence of a house in this location (Ford 2006). Archaeologists primarily found ceramics dating to the 1820s and 1830s in Stratum D, a layer of red-brown silty loam that dated from the early 19th through the late 19th century (Ford 2006:114).

The late 19th century ceramics found in Stratum C, a layer of dark brown silty loam dating from the late 19th century to the early 20th century, appears to show the later occupation
of the site (Ford 2006:114). The excavations also uncovered a substantial number of early-to-mid 19th century ceramics, including pearlware, mochaware, early 19th century whiteware, yellowware, Bennington ceramics, and transfer-printed whitewares with proverbs on them. Interestingly, the assemblage contained minimal amounts of porcelain and stoneware compared to other ceramics (Ford 2006).

Ford notes that before Foster took up residence, Abner Hawkins, a white brickman, and his family lived at the house for three years. Ford notes that some of the artifacts from Stratum D may date to this occupation (Ford 2006). He argues that the difficulty in distinguishing these two different occupations shows how hard it can be for archaeologists to tell the difference between 19th century Anglo-American and African American occupation remains (Ford 2006).

Archeologists also found objects that related to children and mothering, including 203 pieces of porcelain dolls, 75 clay marbles, tea wares, children’s toy tea sets, and various metal utensils, including a teaspoon (Ford 2006, 2016). These artifacts highlight Foster’s relationship with her daughters. They recovered items related to leisure and daily life, such as a pipe bowl fragment decorated with a molded human head, various jewelry, and toothbrush heads. The site also contained items related to writing, such as pencils and eraser holders, which indicate that the occupants of the site were probably literate (Ford 2006, 2016).

Ford (2016:14) notes that Foster was only able to own property because she was unmarried; married African American and Anglo-American women in Virginia had no status. Husbands owned any property that women brought into the marriage. Ford argues that Foster’s purchase of land was important, not just because she was a free woman of color, but also on a personal level it “was integral to her very existence” (Ford 2016:40), as it provided her with a place to perform a job.
Owning a house enabled her to carry out her job as a seamstress, including gathering water, washing, drying, and ironing. She mostly carried out these occupational activities from her yard (Ford 2016:40). The excavations found a variety of artifacts related to her occupation as a seamstress, including copper alloy thimbles, 294 buttons or button covers, scissors, straight pins, clothing closures, eyelets, an awl, and hook-and-eyes (Ford 2016).

Comparison between Free African American Households

As these sites show, free African American households differed greatly in the amounts and type of ceramics recovered which they owned, in part due to their different relational networks and how they negotiated their identities. Catherine Foster and Charles Gilliam owned higher-quality ceramics, but only Gilliam had a significant amount of porcelain vessels. On the other hand, the houses in Alexandria contained more utilitarian wares that showed signs of extended use. Hannah Jackson and Catherine Foster lived as seamstresses but had very different assemblages because they made different choices in how they spent their money. Foster spent money to support her children while Jackson spent her money to free many of her enslaved family members.

We cannot use the unmatching ceramics recovered from the Alexandria sites to say for certain that these individuals received used ceramics rather than purchasing their own. Jean Howson (1990) argues that, in some cases, free and enslaved African Americans were unconcerned with acquiring matching dishes since they were not necessarily interested in participating in the formal dining rituals that elite Anglo-Americans valued. In this way, African Americans may have viewed and used various objects in ways that were not intended by their manufacturers. Similar assemblages with unmatched have also been found at houses associated with Euro-Americans in rural Virginia during this period (Fennell 2017:100-101)
Howson (1990) argues that cost did not always determine the types of ceramics which African Americans bought. Rather they may have chosen patterns based on cultural significance or importance to their local community rather than based on the types of ceramics valued by Anglo-Americans (Howson 1990). This idea again highlights the fact that assemblages of African Americans may show great variety and may not just be determined by their socio-economic class.

Even if Jackson did receive some ceramics as gifts, she was a laundress who most likely could have afforded to purchase other dishes but chose not to. Some free African Americans faced difficulties in finding jobs due to the structural and legal racism present in Virginia. They may have faced economic hardships, and some could only find jobs that did not pay well. However, we cannot assume that all high quality or well-worn ceramics came from well-meaning Anglo-Americans. That way of thinking makes free African Americans passive recipients of the generosity of whites, ignores the relationships in which they were involved or how they used these items, and removes agency from this discussion. This understanding is especially important in regard to the Library site, given the amount of refined earthenware and porcelain recovered from the site (see Chapters 5 and 6).

Part V: Findings at Sites Occupied by Poor and Middling Anglo-Americans

During the past 20 years, archaeological research in other areas has extended the ideas of 18th and 19th century life beyond comparisons of enslaved laborers and plantation owners, or “the most impoverished and the most privileged” (Canzi 2010). At some places, such as Montpellier and Monticello, archaeological investigations have uncovered the remains of the houses occupied by overseers and skilled, white laborers who often worked alongside the enslaved workforce (Heath 1999:193). Archaeologists have compared these assemblages to those of the
gentry and enslaved laborers. While often containing higher quality objects than those found in enslaved African American contexts, the overseer assemblages still seem consistent with a middling lifestyle.

Archaeologists have also tried to find the remains of 18th and 19th century tenant farmer houses, including through a shovel test survey at the Morven Plantation, in Albemarle County. It is difficult, however, to find such tenant housing, and studying the lives of poor whites is made additionally difficult because of the lack of written records. Poor members of Virginia society often lived in log cabins that deteriorated quickly without active maintenance (Lounsbury 2010; Ridout 2014). Based on their construction, they do not often leave any archeological features, such as postholes (Ridout 2014). As a result, most of the housing associated with poor and middling whites that archaeologists have excavated are found in plantation contexts where we have some written records to help guide us.

The Stewart Watkins Site

The Stewart-Watkins site at Monticello was occupied from around 1801 to 1810. For the first seven years, William Stewart, a blacksmith who oversaw Jefferson’s nailery and performed necessary forging and mending for the plantation, lived in this house with his family (Gaylord 2009; Heath 1999:197). Documentary evidence shows that Jefferson paid Stewart $155 a year and provided him with 500 pounds of pork as well as corn (Heath 1999:197). Elisha Watkins, a carpenter, and his family occupied the house for another two years. Watkins was paid $150 a year and provided with 600 pounds of pork as well as corn (Gaylord 2009).

This Stewart-Watkins house was constructed on the southern slope of the plantation. The materials and methods used to construct the structure show the short-lived and impermanent
nature of employment for the skilled white men who worked at Monticello (Gaylord 2009). This house was larger than cabins occupied by enslaved workers (Gaylord 2009) and was constructed using inexpensive, readily available, and recycled materials. The house was made in a way such that it could be easily dismantled and moved (Gaylord 2009). Based on these findings, the house at Monticello appears to have a similar structure to those at the Library site at Mount Vernon. It also seems similar to the log cabins used in the outlying farms at Mount Vernon (see Chapter 4), except larger, which is consistent with Stewart and Watkin’s social statuses.

The archaeological evidence shows that the house at the Stewart-Watkins site contained a raised wooden floor. It appears as though the building was dismantled around 1810 after Watkins left Monticello. The house appears to have been a log construction, with a stone foundation, stone hearth, stone and brick chimney, and a large, wood-lined cellar (Heath 1999). The structure appears to have measured 18 ft. by 24 ft., and a later, eastern addition measured 18 ft. by 12 ft. and included a stone hearth and chimney. With this addition, the structure in total measured 18 ft. by 36 ft. (Heath 1999). Barbara Heath argues that the house’s cellar and chimneys show that the residents had access to a greater degree of safety, convenience, and comfort than their enslaved counterparts at Monticello (Heath 1999).

The stratigraphic evidence did not allow for a distinction between the Stewart and Watkins occupations of the house (Heath 1999:205). Investigation and analysis by Heath (1991, 1999) revealed industrial artifacts clustered in the western portion of the structure. She argues that Stewart used this area to stockpile and store metals and unfinished tools outside of the eye of Jefferson (Heath 1999). The site contained a limited faunal assemblage that shows a monotonous meat diet (Heath 1999).
Further research conducted by Monticello archaeologists found a concentration of tools and industrial artifacts in the northwest portion of the structure, and a higher proportion of bricks and nails in the southern part (Gaylord and Wheeler 2010). They also found large ceramics around the house. The Stewart-Watkins house is at the center of a large scattering of artifacts. This pattern is different than the patterns at Site 8 at Monticello, where residents moved large ceramics and wine bottles to the periphery of the site (Gaylord and Wheeler 2010).

Domestic artifacts clustered in the eastern portion of the Stewart-Watkins house included worn ceramics with little variety in the assemblage (Heath 1999). In total, 3,765 ceramic sherds (a minimum of 125 vessels) were recovered from the site, which gave the site an MCD of 1796. Like the Library site, its MCD skews earlier than the occupation of the site, likely because the occupants could not afford to keep up with ceramic styles (Heath 1999). The majority of the ceramics were pearlware and creamware with a small amount of porcelain. The site did not contain refined stonewares or other refined earthenwares. From the analysis of the ceramics, it appears as though the Stewart and Watkins families used ceramics for extended periods. (Heath 1999).

*Monticello Site 17*

Site 17, which is also at Monticello and was the home of Edmund Bacon, provides a good look at the life of an overseer during the first quarter of the 19th century. During this time, Bacon oversaw the enslaved laborers who worked at Jefferson’s nailery. Maps from 1809 help confirm that Bacon lived in this area (Wilkins 2017), and Site 17 is located close to Sites 19 and 23, which are believed to be quarters for the enslaved laborers who worked at the nailery (Wilkins 2017:352). Site 17 was excavated from 2009-2010 by Washington and Lee University field school students under the supervision of Alison Bell (Wilkins 2017:227-228).
Though archaeologists did not find any features at this site that confirm the presence of a house, artifacts were clustered in three locations (Wilkins 2017:227). Architectural artifacts, such as nails, bricks, and stones, were found in the center of the site. This cluster is also the only one that contains ceramics. The second concentration of stone and window glass was located in the northern part of the site, and archaeologists found a smaller concentration of bricks and nails in the western part of the site (Wilkins 2017).

Researchers believe the center cluster is Bacon’s house, and the other clusters may have been part of at least one outbuilding (Wilkins 2017:228). Like the Library site at Mount Vernon, Site 17 at Monticello only contains clusters of artifacts that indicate a domestic occupation in the area. However, unlike Site 17, ceramics are found in all clusters at the Library site, and archaeologists found architectural remains in two of the three clusters (Wilkins 2017). This difference seems to support the idea that the Library site contained multiple house structures.

The artifact assemblage at Site 17 was primarily composed of ceramics and glass tableware, but also included items such as a pocketknife and buttons (Wilkins 2017:229; WLU Dig Blog 2009). The site contained a variety of ceramics, including pearlware, porcelain, creamwares, and yellowwares. The ceramic forms found on the site were largely types associated with the consumption of food and drink rather than the storage and cooking of food (Wilkins 2017:229-230).

Some of the porcelain was hand-painted, and some of the pearlware at Site 17 contained brown transfer printing. Unlike the Stewart-Watkins site, the ceramics do not show evidence of extended use (Wilkins 2017). This site also has a larger proportion of pearlware. The MCD of the site, however, is 1795, which means it skews earlier than the period in which it was occupied and is about the same as the Stewart-Watkins site (Wilkins 2017:229-230).
Morven

Morven, in Albemarle County, provides a look into the life of a tenant farmer. This site was originally known as Indian Fields, and it was the home of various tenant farmers during the early 19th century. It ceased to be a tenant-based operation in 1813 (Morven Research 2019; WLU Dig Blog 2011). A Phase I archaeological survey and Phase II investigation were carried out from 2009 to 2011 by field school students from both Washington and Lee University and the University of Virginia.

The goals of this research were to identify the location of the tenant farms as well as the location of a potential contact-period settlement (Morven Research 2019). Additional research was conducted in the winter of 2009 and 2010 by Rivanna Archaeology Services. These excavations appear to have uncovered the house of at least one of Morven’s tenant farmers, at a location that was labeled Site D (MAST 2009:10).

According to documentary evidence, Site D was most likely occupied by George Haden, who had been indentured to a carpenter in Louisa County, Virginia, from the age of 5 to the age of 21 (MAST 2009:10). Archaeologists discovered features and artifacts related to plowing, including plow scars, ox artifacts, buttons, objects related to the structure such as nails and window glass, domestic artifacts such as wine bottles, and ceramic sherds (WLU Dig Blog 2011). They also recovered pipestems, table glass, and burned bones from the area of the site that appeared to be associated with the house (WLU Dig Blog 2011).

Archaeologists and field school students searched for, but could not find, the foundation of the house or postholes where the structure stood. As with the Library site, archaeologists did not find any human-made features that would confirm the presence of a structure in this location.
The domestic nature of the assemblage at the Morven site helps substantiate the idea that a house was located there (WLU Dig Blog 2011). Excavations also revealed what appears to be a door hinge, providing supporting evidence that Haden’s house was located at this site (WLU Dig Blog 2011). It is possible that Haden lived in a log cabin or that the postholes that were associated with the house structure were plowed away.

Archaeologists only found one feature, which appears to have been naturally made, that was used by the residents. This feature appears to be a ravine that inhabitants used as a trash midden (WLU Dig Blog 2011). Trash middens are features that often contain a large concentration of artifacts: food remains; old, worn or broken ceramics and glass vessels; and tools. This feature at Morven contained pieces of window and bottle glass. This midden also included a variety of ceramic sherds, including creamware, pearlware, stoneware, coarse earthenware, and a part of a large cooking pot. Archaeologists also found cow bones and an animal tooth in the midden (WLU Dig Blog 2009).

Archaeologists recovered polychrome pieces of creamware as well as polychrome and stamped pieces of pearlware. Other ceramics found at the site include undecorated creamware and pearlware, green and blue shell edged pearlware, utilitarian stonewares, and table stonewares (WLU Dig Blog 2011). The archaeologists argued that polychrome, stamped, and shell edged pearlware indicate that the inhabitants tried to keep up with current styles of earthenware ceramics, incurring cost (WLU Dig Blog 2011).

Researchers from Washington and Lee argue that it would have been cheaper to buy more plain wares but occupants used finer wares to identify with the “Caucasian ethnic group,” which was important to gain higher social standing than enslaved African Americans, whom they viewed as inferior (WLU Dig Blog 2011). The researchers argue that this was especially
important for the residents as members of the middle class. However, the pieces from the site were well-worn, showing that perhaps the residents did not have the resources to stay on top of ceramic trends (WLU Dig Blog 2011).

At the same time, it seems as though most of the ceramics recovered from the site are fairly utilitarian and are not heavily decorated. The residents also appear to have been using creamwares, even though it had mostly fallen out of fashion in favor of pearlware during the occupation of the site (Marciniszyyn 2017; WLU Dig Blog 2011). Perhaps these creamwares were used every day, and the family used the expensive pieces when they had visitors. This site does not contain a significant amount of porcelain and has far fewer ceramics in its assemblage than the amount that was recovered at the Library site.

**Part VI: Comparisons Between the Different Sites**

These comparisons reveal some of the differences between free and enslaved African American houses. Archaeologists often expect to find similar assemblages in antebellum African American contexts, no matter whether their residents are free or enslaved. Because some artifacts and features have become associated with African Americans, we have difficulty classifying sites as places that African Americans occupied when we do not find these things.

Houses owned by free African Americans show great variety. The Henlis family, Hannah Jackson, and Catherine Foster lived in houses with wooden frames that appear to be built in similar styles to the Anglo-American houses of the town in which they lived. Catherine Foster is the only one of those whom we know had a finished basement. Charles Gilliam constructed his house using a more vernacular style. He is also the only one who had an outbuilding. His
building style would have projected hardship to the local white community, which helped hide his wealth.

Houses associated with enslaved laborers differed based on whether they worked in the fields or a mansion house. The House for Families and Elizabeth Hemmings’ house were more substantial than the houses at Site 8, Site 6, the quarters at Poplar Forest, and the Stratford Hall site. The houses associated with enslaved African Americans also tended to be cabins shared by many people and were often occupied by family groups.

However, as the Elizabeth Hemmings site and ST116 at Stratford Hall show, enslaved African Americans rarely lived by themselves or in a cabin with just their family. It seems like the Library site contained log cabins, similar to those occupied by enslaved African Americans and poor whites. Unfortunately, given the ephemeral nature of the Library site, researchers do not have a good idea of how it compared in size to other log cabins.

The poor and middling whites in Virginia often seem to have lived in log cabins that were easy to dismantle. Although these types of structures were associated with lower classes, they provided more space than houses occupied by enslaved African Americans. Free and enslaved African Americans and poor whites all sometimes lived in structures that do not always leave traces in the archaeological record. The Library site, Site 17 at Monticello, and the Morven site presented no features associated with the structures of the house. The primary evidence of the Charles Gilliam House’s appearance are historical photos of similar homes, not detailed archaeological remains.

The sites associated with enslaved African Americans contained more items of personal adornment than those associated with free African Americans or poor whites. On the other hand,
the Library site appears to have a higher percentage of porcelain than any of the sites associated with enslaved African Americans, except for the Elizabeth Hemmings site. The Library site contains more decorated pearlware and glassware than most of these sites, except for the Elizabeth Hemmings site.

Meanwhile, some of the houses associated with free African Americans and poor whites contain ceramics that were used for extended periods, which archaeologists do not see to the same extent in enslaved contexts. The sites associated with enslaved African Americans contain evidence of gardening, which archaeologists have not found at the Library site. Researchers did not find evidence for this type of activity at sites associated with free African Americans or poor and middling whites.

The assemblages of both free and enslaved dwellings reveal that both free and enslaved African Americans may have occasionally received hand-me-downs or gifts from owners, former owners, or white benefactors. Expensive ceramics were found in enslaved African American contexts on several 18th-century Virginia plantations, including the House for Families and the Elizabeth Hemmings site. Archaeologists argue that enslaved laborers probably received these ceramics from slaveholders. Sometimes these ceramics had been used for long periods, as they were frequently given to enslaved laborers after these styles had fallen out of fashion.

Similarly, archaeologists recovered large quantities of refined ceramics in certain free African American contexts, such as those in Alexandria. These sites often contain more refined earthenwares and more expensive glasswares than one might associate with the socio-economic class of their occupants. One common interpretation is that free African Americans may have received these ceramics from their former owners or local white residents who took pity on poor them. However, Theresa Singleton (2001) argued that this view of consumer culture necessitates
a perspective that assumes free African Americans could not afford or would not choose to save money or store credits to purchase their ceramics.

As Singleton points out, Hannah Jackson could have easily chosen to purchase newer ceramics if she had placed more value on these than on her family (Singleton 2001). Jackson’s decision to save resources by using ceramics for an extended period to purchase freedom for enslaved family members helps reveal the network of relationships in which she was involved. Her choice illustrates her values and how she constructed her identity.

In this way, unmatched tea sets and ceramics used for an extended period recovered from free African American houses may be indicative of consumer culture and values. These individuals may have negotiated their identities by continuing to use older ceramics and spending money on other things. They prioritized family relationships over purchasing new ceramics. Similarly, the Stewart-Watkins site and Morven, occupied by middling Anglo-Americans, contained worn and older ceramics. The residents of these sites most likely did not receive these ceramics from Jefferson but rather chose to use their ceramics for an extended period of time to save money.

The choice of what types of ceramics to purchase and how long to keep them in use may have played a role in maintaining the relationships in which free and enslaved African Americans, as well as Anglo-Americans, were enmeshed. For example, Edmund Bacon and George Haden also appeared to try to keep up with ceramic trends. However, African Americans may have viewed ceramics differently than the conspicuous consumption or “material display of social standing,” in which many Anglo-Americans participated (Mullins et al. 2013:635). That is to say, Anglo-Americans and African Americans may have placed different values on ceramics, and these objects may have played differing roles in their relationships.
The ceramics that Charles Gilliam, and potentially the residents of the Library site, purchased and used among friends in private allowed these individuals to distance themselves from negative attitudes towards African Americans. The ceramics recovered from the Foster house in Charlottesville and Gilliam house in Prince George County show that we cannot assume that assemblages recovered from free African American houses are always comparable to those recovered from poor white houses. Many free African Americans were poor, but some managed to be quite successful in spite of the hurdles placed in front of them.

Foster and Gilliam purchased all of their ceramics and did not receive objects from a benefactor (Ford 2006; Ryder 1991). Both of them appear to have saved a fair amount of money, enabling them to purchase a large amount of refined ceramics. Through these purchases, they were possibly trying to distance themselves from the common, racist perceptions of free African Americans, even if only in the privacy of their own home. Similarly, if the residents of the Library site were former slaves of George Washington, they may have saved money to purchase ceramics that were in style.

The comparative data suggests that skilled laborers did not live at the Library site and that the residents were not carrying out labor in their homes. The Stewart-Watkins site contained many tools and unfinished metalworking, attesting to the fact that they worked as skilled laborers. Various tools were found in the quarter at Poplar Forest, suggesting that members of this household worked in some skilled position. Both Hannah Jackson and Catherine Foster also had objects related to their different occupations present in their assemblages.

The lack of any tools or other artifacts recovered from the Library site related to some form of employment indicates that the residents were likely not one of Bushrod’s hired artisans. However, more research needs to be conducted to understand how the slag and bricks were
connected to the site and whether the residents of the site engaged in smelting and brickmaking, which could indicate that they were hired workers at the mansion. The lack of farming-related artifacts or other findings related to farming, which archaeologists found at the Morven excavations, suggests that the Library site was not occupied by tenant farmers.

The comparative data also provides further support for the idea the Library site was most likely not occupied by an overseer. This would have been unlikely unless Bushrod Washington also housed enslaved African Americans in this area. Site 17 at Monticello shows that overseers houses were often located in proximity to houses of enslaved laborers who worked in the fields. Archaeologists have made this observation at other late 18th century archaeological sites, including Monticello’s Site 8, as well as the earlier Mount Pleasant Kitchen site at Montpelier (Reeves and Smith 2015).

On the other hand, the enslaved laborers who worked in houses tended to live in quarters located near the Mansion house (Orser and Nekola 1996:395). It seems as though plantation spaces were not necessarily based on race but were instead based on logistics. That is, in some cases enslaved African Americans and Anglo-Americans lived close to each other, although in separate quarters, if it made sense for their positions on the plantation.

I do not know for certain who occupied the Library site and surrounding ridge. The documentary evidence suggests that formerly enslaved individuals manumitted by George Washington were the most likely occupants of the area. The comparison between free and enslaved African American sites, however, shows that we cannot use the lack of specific features and artifacts to argue that Anglo-Americans did not live at the site.
The features and artifacts that archaeologists commonly associate with African Americans are, for the most part, not recovered from free African American contexts. If archaeologists make the argument that we can only know a site was occupied by African Americans if certain things are present, then these objects and features are still simply “Africanisms.” Researchers have to understand how specific groups of people used certain objects and features at a specific time and recognize the active roles these things played in relationships. In doing so, researchers can begin to investigate why specific things are found in certain contexts but not found in others.

The included comparative sites associated with free African Americans lacked beads and other ritual and non-ritual artifacts typically associated with African Americans. The Virginia houses in my comparative sample did not contain any subfloor pits, features commonly used to determine if African Americans occupied an area. In other regions, like the former Levi Jordan plantation in Brazoria, Texas (Brown 2015, 2016), subfloor pits have been found on sites associated with free African Americans. In my comparative sample, however, free individuals’ houses did not contain subfloor pits or any of the artifacts or features typically associated with African Americans, regardless of the residents’ economic status.

Three of the dwellings associated with enslaved African Americans, however, contained ritual objects and two sites contained subfloor pits. The Poplar Forest Quarter site, the House for Families at Mount Vernon, and ST116 at Stratford Hall all contained blue glass beads, although ST116 only had one glass bead (Heath and Breen 2009). The House for Families also contained other ritual objects (Heath and Breen 1995; Pogue 1995).

This variance is caused by more than just the differences in the period in which these houses were occupied. ST116, which was occupied in the last quarter of the 18th century, did not
contain any subfloor pits. However, archaeologists found subfloor pits at the Monticello and Poplar Forest sites, which were occupied during the 19th century. As discussed in Chapter 2, Monticello researchers (Neiman et al. 2000) argue that subfloor pits are primarily present in sites where enslaved African Americans lived with people to whom they were unrelated. This hypothesis would explain the presence of subfloor pits at Monticello Site 8, but not the lack of them at the House for Families.

Other archaeologists posit that residents may have used subfloor pits as shrines. While this interpretation is interesting, it does not explain why archaeologists have not found subfloor pits in the houses which appear to contain families (Samford 2007). Further, the Elizabeth Hemmings site does not contain any objects or features commonly associated with enslaved African Americans, and ST116 only contains one blue bead (Heath and Breen 2009). These objects appear to play specific roles in the contextually specific relationships of some enslaved African Americans. It is unclear why these relationships formed in some places and not at others.

None of the free African American dwellings examined in this comparison seem to contain colonoware, blue beads, cowrie shells, or other objects that archaeologists have often used to mark the presence of African Americans. Researchers still do know why such artifacts and features were not found in any free African American contexts. The absence of subfloor pits in these contexts, for example, may also be related to the absence of other rituals.

The differences at these sites illustrate the problems with trying to ascribe racial categories to an archaeological site based on an archaeological assemblage. The objects and features that archaeologists have historically associated with African Americans and used to determine who lived at a site are not always found at the sites at which they lived. We cannot
assume that they did not live there if we do not find these objects, especially at sites from the 19th century or sites that are associated with free African Americans (Heath and Breen 2009).

Colonoware, which archaeologists found at the House for Families and Monticello Site 8, was not found at the Library site. In general, colonoware is not usually found at Virginian sites after 1800. However, there are some exceptions to this trend, such as the Portici Quarters in Manassas, where residents used the ware through the mid-1800s (Galke 2009). Interestingly, archaeologists did not find colonoware at ST116 at Stratford Hall, which was occupied during the last quarter of the 18th century.

Archaeologists still debate the exact reason why colonoware drops off in use after 1800. According to Laura Galke (2009), colonoware was a socioeconomic symbol linked with slavery and was stigmatized both by Anglo-Americans and free and enslaved African Americans. She argues that colonoware use dropped off around 1800 because of the increased availability of mass-produced pottery. She further claims that its continued use at some sites of enslaved African Americans through the mid-1800s was due to the community being rural, and enslaved African Americans did not have easy access to markets and little consumer choice (Galke 2009).

Galke also argues that because of the stigma associated with colonoware and its connection to slavery, free African Americans in Virginia rarely used this type of ceramic (Galke 2009). In this examination, the presence or absence of colonoware on free and enslaved African American sites could point to transforming relationships. It is important to investigate why there is this change between the type of features and objects in enslaved and free African American households and what these changes can tell us about how these groups negotiated their identities. These differences may be due to the changes in relationships that came with freedom. It also is
important to consider the various relational networks that gave rise to the use of colonoware, ritual objects, and subfloor pits at some enslaved African American contexts.

Aside from highlighting the difficulties of associating objects with particular groups, this problem also illustrates the difficulties of finding free African American houses without good written records. Often, we must make an educated guess based on our best understanding of the historical background, what we know about local social relationships, and the archaeological findings. In the case of the Library site, where we don’t have many written records to help with the interpretation, the absence of certain features and artifacts also helps to rule out the idea that overseers, tenant farmers, or skilled laborers occupied this site.

The Library site shares some interesting similarities and differences with many of the sites in this comparison. Monticello’s Site 17, for example, also lacked features and contained artifact clusters. However, Site 17 only had household artifacts in one cluster, whereas all the clusters in the Library site contained household artifacts. Given that all of the Site 17 clusters had architectural remains, it seems likely that it was a house and outbuildings. In comparison, the only cluster at the Library site without architectural remains had the largest concentration of pottery, which makes it seem likely that this site had at least two houses and a trash midden.

None of the comparison sites have a ceramic assemblage that resembles that found at the Library site. These residents had a large number of refined earthenwares, however, which archaeologists also found at the House for Families, Elizabeth Hemmings Site, Catherine Foster Site, Charles Gilliam House, and Monticello Site 17. The Library site also had a large percentage of porcelains. While the Elizabeth Hemmings site also contained a higher percentage of porcelain, it did not have the richness of the Library site assemblage.
At the same time, it appears as though the residents of the Library site made sacrifices in terms of the quality of other ceramics. They made some objects on-site to afford to purchase these ceramics. The had mismatching tea sets, similar to what was found at the Hannah Jackson and Henlis site, though this may have been a choice due to pattern preference rather than to save money. The Library site also contained underfired refined earthenware and overfired coarse earthenware. These more poorly made items, which could have cost less, were not found at any of the other sites.

The comparison between these different sites shows how class, status (as either a free or enslaved African American), and race intersected in people’s lives. This analysis reveals the ways objects play a role in expressing different values and ways in which people negotiated their identities. The different types of relationships in which free and enslaved African Americans were involved may have impacted how they expressed themselves, the roles that specific objects played in their lives, and the things and ideas that they valued.

This comparison helps demonstrate how economic and racial marginalization impacts the types of artifacts and features we find at archaeological sites, showing the variety in the artifact assemblage of those who live in economic precarity. People do not always act in ways that make economic sense. Researchers cannot assume that just because people may have been poor or lived in an impermanent structure, that their assemblage will necessarily have mainly utilitarian or inferior vessels. There may also be differences in what people revealed to the public and how they lived privately. This examination shows that there is a wide variety of assemblages that are associated with economically and racially marginalized people.

More importantly, this comparison highlights Whitney Battle-Baptiste’s concern with the way archaeologists focus on poverty (2011). We also must look at how people navigated social
restrictions and issues of consumer choice. Charles Gilliam constructed a house using a style that archaeologists associate with poverty to obscure his wealth. Hannah Jackson and Catherine Foster both amassed enough money, despite being perceived as poor by society, which they used to purchase freedom for relatives or to buy ceramics and glassware.

We cannot assume that all African Americans lived in poverty. Further, we cannot presuppose that the assemblages of economically marginalized people must contain inferior objects. Many people of color managed to build wealth and those who did not often made choices that allowed them to save to purchase expensive items or free their relatives. Even for those who were poor, we should focus more on how their agency and identity emerged from their relationships with people, objects, and places rather than focusing on their poverty.

Part VII: The Residents of the Library Site

The results of this comparative analysis show interesting patterns in the material differences between sites occupied by free and enslaved African Americans and Anglo-Americans in the early 19th century. Unfortunately, researchers lack historical records that definitively show who lived at the ridge at Mount Vernon during Bushrod Washington’s ownership. However, the comparative analysis of Virginia sites coupled with the documentary evidence reviewed in Chapter 4 and the archaeological findings discussed in Chapter 5 and 6 can help determine who may have lived at the Library site and surrounding area.

Based on the distribution of the artifacts, the Library site contains a central midden, two houses, and a large area of bricks. The evidence from the executor accounts, historical newspapers, other documentary records, and the archaeological assemblage, points to four major hypotheses as to who may have lived along this ridge. It is possible that the area may have been
occupied by enslaved laborers of Bushrod and possibly an overseer. On the other hand, Anglo-
American laborers working at the estate, particularly ironworkers or brickmakers, could have
lived in this area. Tenant farmers may have also resided at the Library site. Finally, formerly
enslaved laborers of George Washington who remained at Mount Vernon under Bushrod’s
ownership may have lived at the site.

The documentary evidence discussed in Chapter 4 indicates that the houses on the ridge
were not likely used as quarters for enslaved field laborers or as an overseer’s house. This data
suggests that Bushrod’s crop fields were located on other tracts on the estate. It is likely that
Bushrod would not want crops to be grown so close to the plantation house if the crops could be
planted in fields located farther away. The Library site and surrounding area were not
transformed into fields until John Augustine Washington III’s ownership, when the size of the
Mount Vernon estate had decreased. Moreover, the assemblage recovered from the Library site
was comprised of much higher quality ceramics than those recovered from either Monticello Site
6 or 8, further supporting the idea that the Library site did not contain quarters for enslaved field
laborers.

It is also possible that enslaved laborers who worked at the Mount Vernon mansion lived
at the ridge. Like the Library site, both Elizabeth Hemmings and residents of The House for
Families had higher quality and fashionable ceramics. These may have been hand-me-downs
from Thomas Jefferson and George Washington, respectively. However, the structures at the
Elizabeth Hemmings and House for Families sites seem sturdier than those at the Library site.
Both of these sites also contained more ornate, fashion-related items than those found at the
Library site, indicating that Elizabeth Hemmings and the residents of the House for Families had
access to nicer clothing than the residents of the Library site.
The Library site is located a half mile away from the mansion, which would be fairly far for slave quarters. The House for Families was located a short distance from the Mount Vernon mansion and Elizabeth Hemming’s site was close to the Monticello mansion. It is likely that the enslaved African Americans who worked at the Mount Vernon mansion during Bushrod’s ownership lived closer to the house than a half mile away. Thus, despite the similarities between the ceramic assemblages at these three sites, it is unlikely that enslaved laborers who worked at the mansion lived at the Library site.

Another hypothesis is that Anglo-American laborers, particularly brickmakers and ironworkers who worked on projects at the estate, lived at the Library site with their families. These workers would have relied on help from some of Bushrod’s enslaved laborers and would have remained at the plantation until their work was done. For comparison, the Stewart-Watkins house could be easily disassembled but contained a cellar and a stone foundation and appeared sturdier than what would have been present at the Library site.

Such Anglo-American laborers are not mentioned in the documentary record from Bushrod’s ownership, it is unknown if they were present and, if so, who they were. The presence of underfired and overfired bricks and clay indicate that bricks may have been made in this location at some point. Additionally, the large amount of slag found throughout the ridge could indicate that someone smelt iron in this area. It is therefore possible that Anglo-American laborers lived at this site.

The Library site bears some similarities to the Stewart-Watkins site at Monticello, where some of Jefferson’s skilled Anglo-American laborers lived. Both sites contained ceramic assemblages dominated by pearlware. However, the Library site had a much larger amount of porcelain than the Stewart-Watkins site. The Library site also contained refined stonewares and
other refined earthenware. In general, it had a wider variety of ceramics than the Stewart-Watkins site. Both sites also contained houses that could easily be dismantled. However, the Stewart-Watkins house seems more substantial than the Library site houses. It had a cellar, stone foundation, and stone chimney, none of which were part of the houses at the Library site. The Stewart-Watkins house also lacked a midden.

The Stewart-Watkins site also contained several items relating to its residents’ occupations including tools, industrial objects, metal, and unfinished products. In contrast, only one tool was found at the Library site, and archaeologists did not find any industrial objects. As I mentioned in Chapter 6, while it is possible that these houses were occupied by laborers that then took their tools with them once they moved away, this was not seen at the Stewart-Watkins site. I would therefore expect to find some evidence that Library site residents carried out specific jobs.

The Library site may have also been occupied by tenant farmers, although, like skilled Anglo-American laborers, these are not mentioned in the documentary evidence. The Morven site also lacked features that would conclusively show the presence of a structure. Like the Library site, the archaeologists only identified the presence of a house through domestic artifacts since this house may have been a log cabin. The Morven site also contained a trash midden that was located close to the house, like the Library site.

However, there are many differences between the two sites. The Haden family at Morven owned some high-quality ceramic pieces, but most of their ceramics were lower quality and utilitarian. The Haden family also used a lot of older creamware pieces. While creamware was also found at the Library site, the residents of that site also owned a large amount of porcelain and pearlware. The Library site assemblage was dominated by refined earthenware, with far fewer utilitarian wares. At Morven, archaeologists found plow scars as well as ox related items.
and artifacts related to farming. None of these features or artifacts were found at the Library site. In general, it is unlikely that a tenant farmer lived at the site since the Mount Vernon ridge was not a field during its occupation.

The last hypothesis is that the Library site was occupied by formerly enslaved individuals manumitted by George Washington who remained at Mount Vernon following his death. Records show that these individuals lived at the estate during Bushrod’s ownership, but it remains unclear where they lived, except for Gabriel, who documents show lived at Dogue Run. If this hypothesis is correct, the residents of the library site could have included individuals named Sambo, William and Frank Lee, Molly, Judy, Landon, Molly, and Jane. These were probably older individuals who could no longer work and relied on provisions from the estate.

It appears as though some of the formerly enslaved African Americans moved between the estate and other locations. Based on the executor accounts, I know that some of these people spent time in the City of Alexandria, where they may have purchased objects. Some of them also moved between Mount Vernon and the Woodlawn estate. Based on this evidence, it is possible that different individuals may have lived at the Library site at different times. Further, there may have been additional former enslaved laborers who lived on the estate, possibly at the Library site, but did not need the support and therefore were not mentioned in the executor accounts.

There was a wide variety in the assemblages and houses associated with free African Americans in Virginia, and the Library site had commonalities with all of them. At the same time, the archaeological data from the Library site is somewhat unique in terms of the amount and quality of ceramics coupled with the lack of features. However, given the documentary and archaeological evidence, along with the comparative evidence and process of elimination, it seems likely that formerly enslaved laborers of George Washington lived at the Library site.
Investigating sites like the Library site can further our understanding of how economically marginalized people, who remain understudied by archaeologists, lived. These examinations reveal how anthropologists and archaeologists understand race in the present and how this understanding intersects and is shaped by historical forms of racism. These examinations highlight the difficulty in recognizing racial minorities and marginalized people in the archaeological record and the continuing impact of systemic racism. Unfortunately, despite a large number of domestic artifacts, the Mount Vernon Ladies Association did not preserve the Library site because it did not meet the criteria for protection (see Chapter 5). There are no features, no clear sign of who lived there, and the site lacked vertical integrity.

The findings from this comparison can help us better ensure that sites associated with racially and economically individuals gain protected status. In the next chapter, I discuss how historical preservation practices often fail historically underrepresented groups and those who lived in economic precarity. I discuss the history of historical preservation and especially focus on the National Historic Preservation Act and the Anglo-American centric criteria used to determine if a site is worthy of preservation. I examine how these laws shape the way preservation is carried out at Mount Vernon and other sites owned by private organizations. I also discuss different ways that we can improve historic preservation to better protect sites associated with racially and economically marginalized people.
CHAPTER EIGHT: RACE, LAW, AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION

In this chapter, I explore the dynamics of historic preservation. I examine preservation practices in both private foundations and the government under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and explain why these practices remain important in crafting national and local historical narratives. I consider the criteria that the NHPA uses for evaluating the historical significance of a site and determining its inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places, and how these sometimes privilege sites associated with wealthy, male, Anglo-Americans.

Using both Native American sites and my project area at Mount Vernon, I show how certain criteria have turned historic preservation into a tool for oppression that overlooks specific socioeconomic groups and continues to suppress in the present those whom American society marginalized in the past. The relationships between race, law, and economics contribute to types of sites that are associated with different racially and economically marginalized people and the types of material remains that we find. The criteria used to evaluate the significance of sites do not take these relationships into account.

I begin this chapter with a review of the history of historic preservation, examining the laws that Congress passed to help protect historically important sites. I discuss the goals of historic preservation and the criteria used to determine whether a site is worthy of preservation. I also highlight the issues inherent in how we determine historical significance. While Mount Vernon does not have to follow these laws as a private organization, the preservation practices of the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association (MVLA) are still largely shaped by the same assumptions and definitions that shape federal preservation practices.
In Part II, I examine how past racist policies impact the artifacts which we find and whether we deem a site historically significant. For many American Indians, challenges in gaining federal recognition have precluded these groups’ involvement in archaeological interpretation. For African Americans, racial policies often led to economic precarity, resulting in more ephemeral sites. The way the National Historic Preservation Act’s framework is currently set up, sites occupied by either of these groups may face difficulties achieving National Register status, leading to the erasure of these heritage resources from national memory.

I end this chapter with concluding thoughts on the importance of diversifying the sites that we choose to preserve and the ways that we can improve historic preservation. I consider how more inclusive preservation practices, excavations, and commemorations of sites associated with racially and economically marginalized people can lead to changes in social memory and historical narratives. Through collaborative research and more inclusive preservation practices, archaeologists can help the public understand the historical origins of present-day social inequalities.

**Part I: Trajectories of Historic Preservation**

As the previous chapters of this dissertation have shown, the archaeology of the Mount Vernon ridge containing the Library site and Field 7 can provide insight into the lives of people whose historical narratives are often silenced. Free African Americans and other economically marginalized people are often forgotten not only in Virginia specifically but the United States generally. At Mount Vernon, “Mansion Tours” often ignore the contributions and even the presence of enslaved individuals. There is also little discussion about the plantation under the ownership of Bushrod Washington.
This ridge at Mount Vernon can, therefore, shed light on the lives of marginalized people and overlooked periods, while also diversifying historical narratives. As an ephemeral site, the Library site lacked features and was mainly comprised of artifact clusters. It was therefore not considered historically significant by National Historic Preservation standards, and after three years of excavation and careful deliberation, the MVLA ultimately decided to continue building the Fred W. Smith National Library for the Study of George Washington.

The MVLA based their decision on the lack of vertical integrity and the inability to prove the presence of houses, despite the number of recovered household objects. At present, there is not yet any informational sign to commemorate the site’s former residents and to note that the Library was constructed on top of an early 19th century occupation. Given this decision, my dissertation project can also provide insight into the way archaeologists treat ephemeral sites, deem sites historically significant, and determine which sites to protect and which ones to destroy.

The Library site is an archaeological site (44FX2460) registered with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (Breen 2015), but there is a difference between designating an area as an archaeological site and protecting it or commemorating past inhabitants. This site, as well as Bushrod Washington’s legacy and much of the history of the plantation during his ownership, have been elided from the collective memory about Mount Vernon. The data recovered from the excavations can still be used, researched, and analyzed, but the public does not have access to these results and remains relatively unaware of the related histories. Consequently, the public has no sense of this past landscape or this part of the historical narrative.
Over the years, interpretations of the laws by archaeologists at State Historical Preservation Offices and state review boards have overlooked sites important to the history and memory of marginalized people (King 2009, 2012). The dearth of historical sites associated with marginalized people impacts our historical narrative, perpetuating previous forms of structural racism in the ways we remember and memorialize the past (Paynter et al. 1994). The ways in which archaeological organizations and private companies interpret historic sites to the public can change over time, however, to become more inclusive.

According to Paul Shackel (2001:662), heritage helps create “a useable past, and it generates a precedent that serves our present needs.” Lawana Holland-Moore (2016:30) argues that the rise in historic preservation was in part a “reaction to increased immigration and ethnic and class social integration” during the 19th and early 20th centuries. During this time, white Americans expected immigrants and racial minorities to adopt specific values and conform to certain norms (Holland-Moore 2016).

Some people believed that preservation could help new immigrants assimilate, conform to American ideals and values, and develop patriotism. Government representatives also believed that historic preservation would aid in the creation of American identity and a unifying historical narrative (Sprinkle 2014:7). To understand the relationships between historic preservation, heritage, historical narratives, and race, then, we must examine the development of historic preservation and national heritage laws.

The MVLA is a private organization that has followed its own historic preservation practices for over 150 years. Indeed, historical preservation was initially started and championed by private organizations like the MVLA at Mount Vernon and the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, although the federal government also passed some preservation laws in the early
1900s (Jameson Jr. 2004; Mason and Page 2003). However, the displacement of the Library site by new construction at Mount Vernon and that site’s perceived unimportance are rooted in assumptions that also affect the current legal landscape of historic preservation. These assumptions undervalue and under-recognize archaeological sites associated with people of color and other disenfranchised communities.

The National Park Service (NPS) was established in 1916, although it took 15 years for it to employ historians. By the mid-1930s, the NPS was responsible for overseeing over 80 historic properties (Sprinkle 2014:7). The Historic Sites Act, ratified in 1935, helped create the foundation for establishing a National Register of Historic Places, tasking the Department of the Interior with creating an inventory of sites that were important to the United States’ history (Sprinkle 2014:8). In the 1940s, a group of historic preservationists founded the National Council for Historic Sites and Buildings. The Council pushed for establishing the National Trust for Historic Preservation, which President Truman formally signed into law in 1949 (Sprinkle 2014:3-4).

In 1966 Congress decided the federal government should play a bigger role in protecting local and national histories. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA, Public Law 89-665) was designed to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect America’s historic and archaeological resources. Congress positioned the NPS to protect and preserve places that are determined to be important to the United States’ heritage.

The first chapter of the NHPA argues that “the spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historical heritage” (Public Law 89-665). The legislation further states that “the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development to give a sense of orientation to the American
people” (Public Law 89-665). Finally, the act claims that “historic properties significant to the Nation’s heritage are being lost or substantially altered, often inadvertently, with increasing frequency” (Public Law 89-665). The NHPA, therefore, set forth guidelines on how to determine which places and sites to protect. Section 106 of the law also required all government-funded construction projects to evaluate the historical significance of a site before the project commenced.

The NHPA established a “National Register of Historic Places composed of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture” (Public Law 89-665). The NHPA defines the Register as the “official list of the Nation’s places worthy of preservation” because they have a “significance to the history of their community state, or the nation” (Public Law 89-665). The NPS explains that the National Register is part of a larger effort to “coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect America’s historic and archeological resources” (NPS 2017).

According to the NHPA, an archaeological site is historically significant if it meets the criteria for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Such a site must be significant in one of four criteria: a) the site is associated with an important event; b) the site is associated with an important person; c) the site contains a building with distinctive characteristics or high architecture; d) the site has yielded or may yield important historical information (NPS 2017). The NPS notes that sites that are eligible for National Register status should possess integrity in several of these aspects (NPS 2017).

In order for a site to have integrity, people should not have moved any part of a building or site after its period of significance and the surrounding environment and landscape should be fairly unaltered. The ancillary buildings and structures that were present on a site need to remain
standing or must be present archaeologically. Further, the site needs to contain the original objects used at the site in the configuration in which they were used (NPS 1992:8-9).

To be deemed eligible for the register, sites must have a clear historical context as well as physical, tangible, and well-defined properties and features (King 2012). A feature is essentially material structures or elements that are made or altered by humans, but which archaeologists cannot remove from a site, such as a posthole, hearth, or wall. At archaeological sites, the NHPA does not necessarily require the presence of a standing structure. However, the law requires that the site contain features and archaeological integrity, or contain undisturbed, stratified layers (King 2012). To obtain National Register eligibility, the law requires that sites have clear boundaries, such as a district, an undisturbed site, or a “building, structure or object” (King 2009:80). The site needs to have buildings, objects, or archaeological features such as postholes, pits, or middens that reveal the types of activities and structures present during its occupation (King 2009).

The NPS argues that the integrity of materials is especially important as it “determines whether or not an authentic historic resource still exists” (NPS 1992:8). Many sites in rural locations or at former plantations can later become encompassed within agricultural fields. Plowing can destroy cultural features associated with the presence of buildings. Plowing mixes the distinct historical layers of soil into one layer, destroying soil integrity and creating one layer of soil, called a plowzone, that contains artifacts from different periods. According to the NPS, plowing destroys site integrity because the plowzone no longer retains the characteristics present at the time of the site’s significance (King 2009).

The NHPA often ignores or fails to include architecture whose meaning is not easily understood by non-community members or sites that are primarily significant to members of
non-white communities (Babiarz 2011; King 2012). As such, the National Register is functionally run by Anglo-Americans for the purpose of protecting places important to Anglo-Americans (King 2012). Further, the NHPA evaluates the intangible aspects of archaeological sites using guidelines and rules shaped by a worldview that is not held by many non-white people (White 2013).

As a result, the National Register criteria make it difficult for archaeologists to classify more ephemeral sites with few artifacts and vague features as historically significant. Such sites are most often associated with economically and racially marginalized individuals, and the criteria used to judge the significance of a site can play a major role in the failure to protect sites associated with marginalized people. These difficulties with protecting non-white sites highlights the systemic racism within archaeology and historic preservation (White 2013).

Sites may be nominated to the Register by federal, state, or local government representatives, as well as ordinary people, although most laypeople may be unaware of this fact (King 2012). The NHPA established the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation (ACHP) to promote “preservation, enhancement, and sustainable use of the nation’s diverse historic resources” as well as advise “the president and Congress on national historic preservation policy” (ACHP 2018). The NHPA also established State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) to review sites to determine if they are eligible for the National Register (King 2012; Public Law 89-665). While archaeologists play a role in nominating sites for the Register and establishing their eligibility, the final authority for determining whether a site receives National Register status lies with SHPO and state review boards (King 2012).

Section 106 of the NHPA furthered both historic preservation and archaeology by helping create the field of Cultural Resource Management (CRM) to evaluate the potential historical
significance of government-funded project areas (King 2012). This section of the NHPA “requires agencies to consider the effects of an undertaking on historic properties and to seek ways to mitigate any adverse” effects to identified historic properties (Dongoske and Pasqual 2016:67). Researchers must “identify and evaluate historic properties that may be located within the area of potential effects of” a project (Dongoske and Pasqual 2016:68). This pre-construction research is often carried out by archaeologists in CRM firms (Dongoske and Pasqual 2016).

Most archaeology is practiced through CRM projects rather than projects connected to universities or private foundations. Babaiarz (2011) notes that time and budget limitations often prevent community outreach or in-depth historical research that could help archaeologists figure out the most logical locations and distance to place test units. Some CRM projects are more flexible and do allow for research, development, and community engagement (Babiarz 2011). In projects with strict budgets and timelines, though, these constraints can impact the quality that can be put into developing good historical contexts and researching primary sources.

Archaeologist William White (2020) claims that archaeologists “co-opted the preservation process” laid out in the NHPA and turned it into a “professional service” that can be offered at a low price. He argues CRM has become very good at efficiently conducting and completing the checklists necessary to comply with the law so that building, and development projects may proceed. Therefore, the CRM industry has not greatly helped conserve American heritage and is often not interested in “engaged, introspective archaeology” (White 2020).

Corporate interests can also influence the way archaeologists conduct CRM work and deem places historically significant, regardless of the desires of local communities. In Richmond, Virginia, the city attempted to construct a new baseball stadium in the location of an antebellum African American cemetery (Williams 2014). Many community members and local
archaeologists argued that this construction “would desecrate a place of profound suffering” (Williams 2014). However, this construction was the lynchpin of the Revitalize Richmond, Virginia (RVA) project that planned to extensively develop the area to improve its economic situation and increase city revenue (Moomaw 2014).

The Richmond mayor and other project developers refused to recognize the site’s significance for the community and conducted CRM work in preparation for construction. After arranging this CRM work, there were months of protests and public outcry, including several archaeologists speaking out against the development, and the city halted their plans. Archaeologist Terry Brock argued that it is “incumbent upon the project developers to expand their understanding of what is considered historically significant” (Brock 2014). He further observed that the government has “a legal and ethical responsibility to either preserve their archaeological remnants in place or make sure they are excavated before construction” (Brock 2014). This example highlights archaeologist Thomas King’s (2016) claim that through the NHPA we have constructed “a system that ignores all parts of the human environment that don’t fit on the National Register of Historic Places.”

While it is designed to protect historical sites, the NHPA acts in an exclusionary manner and promotes disparity in whose history is represented and constructed at protected sites. The varying levels of legal protection offered by NHPA mirror broader public understandings of what makes a historic site valuable. They also mirror the biases present in those who created this law. As Charles Orser (2010:133) notes, “many of the most venerated places are those relating to elite members of society, or indeed built by them, [which] merely highlights the role of class identity in the creation of heritage.” By not legally protecting or venerating certain historical sites, we are silencing parts of the past. The selective valorization of certain types of heritage
denies both the history of past marginalized individuals and respect for the continued presence
and accomplishments of their descendants.

**Part II: Historical Racism and Historic Preservation Practices**

The people who created and transformed the NHPA were not necessarily racist, but the
NHPA reflects systemic racism within archaeology and historic preservation (for more on this
topic see White 2013, 2020). It is problematic to judge all sites by the same criteria, particularly
when economically and racially marginalized groups may have lived differently than socially
privileged whites. Areas that were historically occupied by these marginalized people often lack
the elements needed to be considered historically significant, such as stratified evidence, site
integrity, and numerous artifacts (Babiarz 2011; King 2009, 2012). Beyond its exclusionary
criteria, the National Register of Historic Places is also made less accessible through the very
practice of registering sites, because such action is most likely to be undertaken by those with an
higher socio-economic status (King 2009).

As Gail Dubrow (2016:73) observes, “the process of identifying places associated with
previously neglected aspects of our history has begun to reveal the limits of foundational policies
and practices.” CRM archaeologists primarily evaluate the potential impact of projects on a site
by trying to determine if any aspect of the project area meets the National Register’s criteria
(King 2009). This strategy leads CRM archaeologists to determine significance by focusing on
artifact quantity and favoring large sites with elaborate architecture and numerous features.
Thomas King (2016:36) contends that CRM “practitioners are expected to ignore impacts on
cultural places that they find don’t meet narrow technical criteria.” By focusing on these aspects
of a site, this approach privileges locations occupied by wealthy Anglo-Americans (Babiarz
2011; King 2009).
King (2012) argues that during the last 50 years, the National Register turned into a list of places officially deemed important to professionals by professionals, rather than a list of places important to local communities. In discussing the 50th anniversary of the NHPA, King (2016:38) further asserts that “despite earnest expressions of support for diversity, minority involvement, and sensitivity to multiple cultural values,” the NHPA still maintains an agenda “developed by white, male, NPS architectural historians with cultural roots in the eastern United States.” Rather than a way of recognizing and preserving a variety of sites, and creating diverse and inclusive histories, the NHPA remains a means “to list, honor, and document the buildings” that historic preservationists consider important (King 2016:38).

In its application to the preservation of Native American heritage, the NHPA purports to aspire to increase the diversity of protected historic sites. It requires project archaeologists to consult with any federally recognized tribes in the project area and consider their interests (Daehnke 2007). While archaeologists can also consult with non-federally recognized tribes, archaeologists often view these groups as an outside interest group. The input of these tribes therefore does not carry the same weight as that from federally recognized tribes (Daehnke 2007: 264).

Federal recognition provides American Indians protections under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA, Public Law 101-601), allowing members to retain objects of cultural heritage as well as the bodies of their ancestors. In addition, federal recognition provides tribes with the legal standing to participate in heritage management projects. Tribes who lack federally recognized status may not be able to fully participate in the management of their archaeological heritage (Daehnke 2007: 264).
Chip Colwell-Chanthaphohn and T. J. Ferguson (2006) argue that these NAGPRA issues impact who controls heritage resources and how these resources are used, preserved, and protected. They note that different tribes may have varied interpretations of the same site. Members of tribes have emotional responses to sites and feel positive and negative energy connected to a place that may not be understood by Anglo-Americans (Colwell-Chanthaphohn and Ferguson 2006). Moreover, not every cultural group shares Anglo-American views of history and the past in terms of Cartesian time and space. In favoring consultation with tribes possessing federally recognized status, archaeologists may lack interpretation of a site from all tribes for whom that site is meaningful, leading to a misunderstanding of the full importance of a place (Colwell-Chanthaphohn and Ferguson 2006).

Kurt Dongoske, Michael Yeattes, Roger Anyon, and T. J. Ferguson (1997) argue that collaboration with American Indian groups is essential because much of what defines cultural or ethnic identity is contained within the history of the members of that culture. Members of the tribes understand the land and are in a good position to identify the traits that are used for self-identification (Dongoske et al. 1997). The criteria for federal recognition of American Indian tribes helps to shape ideas of heritage and cultural protection. Unfortunately, in places like Virginia, many tribes struggle to obtain federal recognition, and this impacts how places that are important to them are understood and protected (Cook 2015).

To receive federal recognition, American Indians need a detailed record of tribal ancestry. They also must provide documentary evidence showing that the tribe maintained American Indian status continuously since 1900 (Cook 2015). In Virginia, it took until 2015 for the Pamunkey to gain recognition even though they had a reservation since the mid-1600s.
Another ten Virginian tribes finally gained federal recognition in 2018, including the Mattaponi, who also had a reservation since the mid-1600s (Cook 2015; Portnoy 2018).

Walter Plecker’s actions as registrar of the Virginia Bureau of Vital Statistics during the 1920s made this proof hard to deliver (Cook 2002). Plecker argued that the only two racial categories among Virginia residents were “black” and “white.” He believed that all living Virginia Indians had some African American ancestry. Following this belief, he changed the racial classification on the birth certificates of Virginia Indians to “black” (Cook 2002). As a result, many Virginian Indian tribes lack tribal records. The birth certificates of the ancestors of many modern members now list them as African Americans, and thus seem to show a break in continuous tribal ancestry (Cook 2002, 2015). As a result, Virginia Indian tribes faced a difficult fight in trying to gain federal recognition even though many of these tribes appear in 17th and 18th century documents (Cook 2015).

Other social factors can also hinder a tribe’s ability to gain federally recognized status. It took the Pamunkey years of fighting to gain federal recognition, and unlike most other Virginian tribes, their reservation and tribal records could show that the tribe upheld American Indian status for hundreds of years (Heim 2015a). Virginia tribes without these records faced an even lengthier fight and did not receive federal recognition until 2018 (Portnoy 2018).

Several members of the African American caucus in the United States Senate attempted to stop the Pamunkey from receiving federal recognition. During the early 20th century, partially in response to Plecker’s notion of the racial impurity of Virginia Indians, the Pamunkey enacted tribal laws against marrying African Americans (Heim 2015b). Members of the African American caucus in Congress argued that these laws were racist and asked President Obama to refrain from granting the Pamunkey’s petition (Heim 2015b). As this example shows, racial
ideas and categories continue a real impact on modern social relationships that, in turn, shape our understanding of cultural heritage sites.

Despite these hurdles, some archaeologists have worked on updating National Register listings to include Native American components. For example, the Camden Plantation in central Virginia is celebrated for its Italian-style villa architecture and its association with wealthy Anglo-Americans (Novelli et al. 2015:17). Camden also includes the presence of a late 17th century Native American community, which Howard MacCord excavated in the 1960s (MacCord 1969). However, this part of Camden Plantation’s past was not included in the original National Register listing (Hodges 1986). Further excavations in the 1980s by the NPS helped to uncover the full extent of the site. At that time, Mary Ellen Hodges, the lead archaeologist, worked on updating the National Register listing, and the NPS sought and was granted a conservation easement to protect this part of the site (Hodges 1986).

Outside of amendments made to the NHPA in 1992 that specifically mentioned the need to consult with federally recognized American Indian stakeholders (As of 2021 there are 574 federally recognized tribes and an additional 63 tribes recognized by state governments but not the federal government), no other minority groups are mentioned in the act (National Conference of State Legislatures; National Congress of American Indians; Public Law 102-575). The act does not explicitly mention the word “diversity” itself, and all sites are judged by the same criteria, no matter with which social group they are associated. Archaeologists do not have to consult with other non-white groups, who may be adversely impacted by archaeological projects. Outside of federally recognized tribes, marginalized groups are often unable to comment or give input on projects and do not play a role in helping to excavate or mitigate archaeological sites.
(White 2020). By using the same criteria to evaluate all sites regardless of who occupied those places, the NHPA makes it more difficult to protect sites associated with minorities.

Those responsible for determining eligibility often focus on high architecture and properties historically associated with Anglo-Americans. Sites associated with racially marginalized people and protected by the Act tend to be eligible for the National Register under criterion D, which emphasizes the potential for the recovery and analysis of historical information (ACHP Questions and Answers 2018: Section 36). The ACHP emphasizes the importance of context in establishing sites on the National Register under criterion D (ACHP Questions and Answers 2018: Section 36, 40), and regular plowing may disrupt a site’s integrity and thus its chance for approval.

The results of archaeological excavations at the Mount Vernon ridge provide a good example of the way the NHPA continues to perpetuate structural inequalities, silencing the voices of those marginalized in the past. As discussed in Chapter 5, both the Library site and Field 7 at Mount Vernon suffered from a lack of archaeological integrity, as they contained a plowzone rather than different stratigraphic layers. This lack of integrity ultimately factored into the ridge’s classification by the MVLA as not historically significant.

The type of structures constructed at the Library site also factored into its classification. In the 18th and 19th centuries, tenant farmers, free and enslaved African Americans, and the poorest members of societies often lived in log cabins (Lounsbury 2010, Ridout 2014). It is difficult for archaeologists to identify these buildings during research, as they often leave little evidence of a household outside of an ephemeral scattering of domestic artifacts, such as the findings at the Library site (Lounsbury 2010).
Log structures do not leave a discernible mark in the same manner of post-in-the-ground structures or buildings with brick or stone foundations. They do not preserve well, are often hard to distinguish in the archaeological record, and are rarely associated with cultural features (Lounsbury 2010). Our understanding of these structures primarily comes from descriptions in tax records, diaries, and other historical documents. In some locations, none of these houses remain standing (Lounsbury 2010; Ridout 2014). As a result, occupations associated with log cabins leave either ephemeral features or no features at all. Often all that remains is a cluster of household-related artifacts, as were found at Mount Vernon’s ridge.

Architectural history studies by Lounsbury (2010) and Ridout (2014) using property records show that the 18th century Chesapeake landscape was filled with these types of log houses. They argue that archaeologists may not have a full grasp of how the 18th century Chesapeake landscape appeared. Further, Heath and Breen (2009) note that there are relatively few houses that we can definitively state African Americans inhabited and relatively few houses that we can definitively state poor whites inhabited. Houses inhabited by these groups show great diversity and overlap in their architectural elements, making it difficult for archaeologists to distinguish between houses belonging to poor whites and African Americans (Heath and Breen 2009).

Historic preservation practitioners tend to marginalize “vernacular structures owned or built” by African Americans and other economically marginalized individuals, even if the structures are standing, because they are not built in a grand architectural tradition and their landscapes are not classically styled (Fly 2016). These houses and their occupants often go unnoticed by archaeologists. Jennifer Babiarz (2011) further observes that African American
sites often lack integrity as a result of urban renewal, gentrification, and development that specifically targets areas occupied by racially marginalized people (also see Fennell 2017).

As a result, we are judging sites associated with racial and ethnic minorities by Anglo-American standards of what should be considered important. While the criteria of the NHPA makes it difficult to nominate sites associated with minorities, some SHPOs have worked to diversify the types of sites nominated, protected, and interpreted. For example, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR), which serves as Virginia’s SHPO, is working towards diversifying the groups that are represented in the state’s historical highway markers (VDHR 2018).

The VDHR also acknowledges that racial and economic minorities are not that well represented on the National Register. Their current comprehensive plan aims to diversify the sites they nominate to the National Register and include racial minorities as stakeholders (VDHR 2015). The North Carolina Department of Natural and Cultural Resources (NCDNCR) also acknowledges similar issues with the lack of diversity in historic preservation and their current three-year plan is working to address these problems (NCDNCR 2013, 2019)

Despite these preservation efforts, Monacans in Virginia are currently struggling to prevent their 17th century capital, Rassawek, from being used by the James River Water Authority as a water pump and intake station (Cultural Heritage Partners: Save Rassawek 2019). This potential construction would destroy the site and disturb burials. In Richmond, Lenora McQueen has fought to prevent construction through a historic African American burial ground for years, and the site still does not have government protection (Willis 2019).
Tom Mayes, the President of the National Trust of Historic Preservation, contends that even 50 years after its creation, the National Register does not represent the full diversity of American people (Mayes 2016). The NHPA does allow some flexibility in what sites can be nominated to the National Register, and many archaeologists have fought for the inclusion of sites associated with marginalized people (Mayes 2016). However, these efforts have sometimes been stymied by the way that state review boards have interpreted the NHPA (Mayes 2016).

Racial ideas and categorization impact the economic prospects of racially marginalized people (Du Bois 1994; Orser 2004). While the category of race is socially constructed, it has very real economic, material, and social consequences. Historically and today, racial minorities often have harder times accessing higher levels of education and getting hired in white collar and other well-paying jobs.

Historically, racial minorities often lived in smaller, less ornate houses, and had fewer fine goods than wealthy Anglo-Americans. As Charles Orser (2004, 2007) points out, there is a clear historical association between people’s racial alignment and their economic potential. He argues that racial oppression and racism are a means of creating and upholding social and economic inequalities in capitalist societies. W. E. B. Du Bois (1994) argued that a consequence of the color line is that it prevented African American individuals from gaining social or economic equality.

Race-based laws furthered the economic interests of wealthy, Anglo-American legislators. In the process, these laws shaped and restricted the possibilities of those deemed racially inferior, hindering their ability to achieve economic success. These economic limitations create lasting effects. These economic effects on people of color impact the material that
archaeologists recover and whether sites associated with marginalized people meet the criteria for inclusion on the National Register.

Audrey Smedley (2007) argues that “the racial identity imposed on Africa Americans was successful in keeping too many of them in the role of the underdogs of American society.” White society often excluded African Americans from industrial jobs. Legislators created laws and policies that both prevented African Americans from competing with white labor and forbade them from learning skills that would have enabled them to better their economic situation (Smedley 2007; also see Singleton 2001; Wolf 2006).

These laws contributed to the economic marginalization of racially marginalized people by restricting types of jobs; the ability to move to other counties; and the ability to learn reading, writing, and arithmetic. Free African Americans turned to different means and tactics to navigate these laws and negotiate their places in society, and some individuals managed to achieve some success (Schumann 2017). However, free African American registers from numerous Virginia counties indicate that farming was one of the most common occupations for free African Americans, especially for those in rural areas (Schumann 2013). The economic opportunities afforded to racially marginalized people, in turn, impact archaeological findings, the implementation of heritage laws, and the construction of the historical narrative. As a result, it can be extremely difficult for archaeological sites associated with economically and racially marginalized individuals to meet the NHPA criteria and become “legally recognized as important to America” (Babiarz 2011: 52).

Since Mount Vernon is privately owned by the MVLA, it does not have to follow the framework of Section 106 of the NHPA. For years, however, the MVLA has had archaeological staff conduct research before construction to understand the area being displaced (White pers.
comm. 2015). Similarly, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation does not need to adhere to the NHPA but chooses to conduct archaeology prior to new construction. The results of excavations factor into decisions about whether construction plans should change, in the same way that CRM archaeology can alter government-funded construction plans.

I want to make it clear that I do not think the MVLA made the wrong decision in proceeding with the construction of the Fred W. Smith National Library for the Study of George Washington. While a commemoration may have been appropriate, the final decision was made after careful archaeology and lengthy deliberations about whether construction should continue. I also do not necessarily think that private organizations or the federal government have made the wrong decisions after conducting CRM investigations. We cannot preserve everything.

While individual decisions to destroy a site may be correct, the aggregate effect of these choices is that organizations consistently build over sites associated with racially marginalized people. The results of these choices therefore highlight the systemic inequalities built into preservation practices. The MVLA’s handling and management of the Library site show how past forms of racial and economic marginalization coupled with current preservation practices of an organization can impact historical narratives.

Babiarz (2011) observes that not only is it difficult for sites associated with marginalized people to meet the criteria for historical significance, but it can also be hard for CRM archaeologists even to recognize these sites. These past forms of structural racism continue to impact present-day education and training in archaeology, shaping the way we research and interpret sites. To become an archaeologist, individuals need a college degree or, at a minimum, training at an archaeological field school (Babiarz 2011:53).
These requirements often exclude poor individuals, who cannot afford to pay for field school or must work in lieu of attending summer classes, from becoming archaeologists. These requirements combine with hundreds of years of structural racism to negatively impact minority individuals more than whites (Babiarz 2011). After the end of slavery, African Americans continued to face restrictions on where they were allowed live and the jobs they could hold (Wolf 2006).

Similar issues, such as redlining in the mid-20th century, continued to shape where racial minorities live today (Blaisdell 2016; Rothstein 2013; Zenou and Boccard 2000). Neighborhoods that are primarily occupied by racial minorities tend to be poorer than those occupied by whites. This difference impacts the primary and secondary schools that many non-white children attend, which are often worse than those that children of middle and upper-class whites attend. This in turn impacts whether non-white children pursue post-secondary education, which college they attend, and which jobs they obtain (Blaisdell 2016; Babiarz 2011; Rothstein 2016; White 2020). Members of racially marginalized groups are often trapped in a cycle of poverty as a result of this systemic racism.

African American and other racial minority college students are often encouraged to obtain a degree in something practical and profitable, rather than archaeology (Babiarz 2011:53 also see White 2020). Further, academic jobs are difficult to obtain and CRM positions are often unstable and do not pay well (Babiarz 2011; White 2020). These students are therefore often pressured to go into areas of study that pay better. Archaeology is thus seen as a white discipline and not inviting students of color, which can discourage them from entering the field (Babiarz 2011; White 2015, 2020). Within archaeology, societies, seminars, and meetings are often very white spaces which can also discourage people of color from participating (White 2020).
As a result, most archaeologists in the field of CRM are white (Babiarz 2011; Graves 2012; White 2015, 2020). As Everett Fly (2016:84) argues, in the field of historic preservation, “black historic resources and black practitioners have been systematically and institutionally undervalued and disrespected.” Donna Graves (2012:2) notes that the vast majority of “preservation leaders are white, with two percent identifying as either African American and Asian/Pacific Islander American, and one percent as Latino.” This lack of diversity is significant because, as Page and Miller (2016:13) point out, if “the community of preservation professionals does not reflect the American public,” it can jeopardize the ability of the field to stay relevant.

Similarly, Kerri Barile (2004) argues that “inherent prejudices influence one’s valuation of certain site types, especially when historical context is a secondary consideration or denied consideration at all.” She further observes that the failure to address the criteria of a site’s historical context is one of the leading threats to sites associated with populations that Eric Wolf terms as “people without history” in the United States today (Barile 2004:92; Wolf 1982). We cannot assume the lives of different groups of people result in the same type of sites. However, the NHPA criteria for historical significance places value on particular kinds of sites. Our difficulty in recognizing sites associated with racially and economically marginalized individuals, coupled with these criteria, contributes to the overwhelming number of white sites on the National Register.

Even the way we are taught to conduct archaeology influences our ability to recognize particular sites. White (2015) contends that archaeological methods limit our understanding of the past as it forces us to think in terms of “bounded archaeological sites.” Our research designs and excavation methods often neglect or disregard certain types of sites, such as ephemeral sites associated with marginalized individuals. He also notes that “personal research interests” can
impact the way “that we understand the significance of the site and its eligibility for the register” (White 2015).

The National Register permits locally important places to be destroyed because they are not recognized as important by archaeological professionals and corporations with a vested interest in building on a site. In doing so, the criteria impact the way we will remember the American past in the future. As White (2015) notes, the places that we deem eligible for the National Register of Historic Places will likely be passed down to the next generation. They will remain a part of the landscape for people to visit and celebrate. On the other hand, sites that are not deemed eligible have almost no chance of surviving (see Little and Shackel 2014; Page and Miller 2016; Shackel 2001, 2003; Van Dyke 2010).

The majority of the sites of the National Register are standing buildings, which are often associated with elite whites (Babiarz 2011; Barile 2004; Virginia Department of Historic Resources 2015). Archaeologists have the ability to shed light on the lives of people whose material remains cannot be viewed on the landscape and can help diversify our understanding of the American past. Places on private land that do not receive federal funding, such as Mount Vernon, do not have to follow the guidelines set out in the NHPA. This gives them the ability to preserve and commemorate sites that may not meet the NHPA criteria because they are important to the history of racially and economically marginalized people. Unfortunately, as the case of the Library site shows, private organizations do not always take advantage of these opportunities.

The lack of sites on the National Register associated with marginalized people and the subsequent government-approved destruction of such sites, as well as the demolition of these sites on private land, helps the American public continue to forget aspects of their national
history associated with marginalized groups. While forgetting is a major part of the construction of collective memory, it is a great loss to our understanding of the past. Many sites associated with and important to racially and economically marginalized people remain forgotten because they do not meet biased criteria that privilege wealthy, white individuals.

Part III: Historic Preservation and the Construction of Memory

One of the main points in creating historic preservation laws has always been to aid in the construction of national and local historical narratives. The NPS even has a website devoted to teaching that employs sites on the National Register of Historic Places as a guide. The website discusses a way to use sites on the National Register in lesson planning for history, social studies, civics, and geography classes. By determining which sites should be protected and which can be destroyed, the NHPA thus plays a role in the creation of collective memories.

Barile (2004:98) observes that “a denial of eligibility [for the National Register] not only sends a very particular message to the public about what is considered important” in terms of history but also prevents sites not included in the register from gaining certain privileges and protections associated with the National Register status. This lack of protection can lead to the demolition of sites associated with racially and economically marginalized individuals through government-financed construction projects (Fennell 2017:249).

Our heritage laws enable both archaeologists and the larger public to overlook archaeological sites that are important to the memory and history of underrepresented groups. These laws allow us to continue to marginalize in the present those marginalized in the past and to perpetuate racism. It creates a collective memory that underplays and even forgets the roles of racially and economically marginalized individuals. As Robert Paynter, Susan Hautaniemi, and
Nancy Muller (1994:314) argue, “the lack of historical places on our contemporary landscape that remind all persons of the omnipresence of African Americans throughout U.S. history . . . helps create cultural amnesia and contributes to the recreation of racism.”

In this way, historic preservation laws and archaeology become tools for racial oppression. The designation of colonial and antebellum sites as heritage sites are often grounded in narratives that focus on a specific person or group of people. These narratives often neglect the presence and reliance on enslaved laborers with their own experience of the landscape and ignored the multiple genders, racial, ethnic, economic, and social groups engaged with and inhabited this landscape at various times.

Archaeological methods and historic preservation should be an engagement in making “people without history” visible (Wolf 1982). The recognition of historic sites helps shape historical narratives, form a shared American identity, and create what it means to be American. Barbara Little and Paul Shackel (2014) contends that the categorization of and promotion of places as heritage sites are inherently political acts. The laws governing historical preservation are entrenched in cultural practice concerning how we confront, embrace, absorb, and reject our past. As Babiarz notes (2010; also see Barile 2004), if historic sites connected to racially marginalized groups are less represented on the National Register of Historic Places, which is used to create a national identity, then we are saying only certain groups are considered truly American.

At some historic sites, archaeologists and private foundations have made headway in recognizing minorities and reshaping our narratives about these places. These efforts involved new forms of interpretation, new approaches to commemoration, and new kinds of interactions
between archaeologists and the public. These acts help shape our historical narrative in ways that the NHPA and National Register are not always able.

Archaeology at Mount Vernon has helped to create alternative historical narratives, even when the MVLA has sometimes worked to avoid discussion of a painful history. In the past few years, the foundation has worked with the archaeologists to create a special exhibit called “Lives Bound Together”: Slavery at George Washington’s Mount Vernon (Dingfelder 2019; Mount Vernon 2019). This exhibit explores the lives of the enslaved workers using a mixture of artifacts and documentary evidence. However, this exhibit is only temporary and due to its painful nature, may be less visited by tourists than the permanent exhibit on Washington (Dingfelder 2019).

Further, tours of the Mansion house have historically avoided discussions of slavery (Dingfelder 2019). George Washington is depicted both in these tours and by some of the reenactors at the plantation as a self-made man who accomplished everything on his own (Dingfelder 2019). For an additional cost, separate tours discuss slavery at the plantation, but visitors should not have to go on a separate tour to hear how Washington benefited from the labor coerced and stolen from those people whom he enslaved (Dingfelder 2019).

The archaeologists at Mount Vernon use excavations as a means of discussing enslaved life and inserting enslaved people into the narrative to which tourists are exposed. They seek to transform how tourists relate to and experience the plantation landscape and connect the site’s past to present-day communities. While interning at the plantation, I observed archaeologists at the slave cemetery exposing grave shafts and speaking with the site’s visitors. They would recount the discovery of several infant bodies buried together as well as the east-west orientation of most bodies in the cemetery and its connection to traditional African religious beliefs. In
doing so, they increased visitors’ knowledge of the past and helped change the collective memory of Mount Vernon.

Despite changes, there remains work to do. It is still possible to walk through places like Colonial Williamsburg and Mount Vernon without learning about the lives of racial minorities who lived there (unless attending specific tours or visiting specific locations). Heritage sites often have to balance trying to explain painful histories to the public with the need to attract visitors, some of whom are not interested in hearing about slavery and the plight of racial minorities at these sites (Brockell 2019; Dingfelder 2019).

A further problem with historical sites such as these is that they restrict their reconstruction efforts to a specific time, essentially crafting an experience for visitors that erases things that came before or after a specific period. For example, Colonial Williamsburg is interpreted during the Revolutionary War, and Mount Vernon is interpreted during 1799. Colonial Williamsburg therefore does not discuss the lives of poor white and African American occupants of the town during the 19th century, and tours of Mount Vernon do not discuss the plantation under Bushrod Washington’s ownership. The MVLA has also torn down previously reconstructed buildings, such as porter’s lodges built with pise (rammed earth) methods, when they learned that Bushrod constructed the originals (Pogue 2012).

While such practices make sense for architectural restoration purposes, it silences and erases people who lived before or after a particular period. At sites with a known historical presence of African American or Native American people, reconstructions set to a specific time may elide or downplay their existence. History does not stop simply because an event occurs, or the elite owner of a plantation dies. While archaeologists help provide alternative narratives,
there are still more things we can do to protect and commemorate sites as well as explain the importance of these sites to the public.

**Part IV: Future Directions in Historic Preservation**

The difficulties in classifying an ephemeral site like the Mount Vernon ridge illustrates how preservation laws contribute to shaping collective memories, in part by silencing and whitewashing history. History is with us everywhere. We cannot preserve or memorialize everything. However, we should be careful in judging sites associated with Anglo-Americans and racial or ethnic minorities by the same criteria, as this may erase important sites occupied by people of color from public memory.

We must consider what each site may contribute to our understanding of a specific location, its importance to the local community, and how it furthers our understanding of broader regional and national histories. Further, we must consider the ways that the law economically and politically marginalized particular racial groups in the past, since such historical marginalization may, in turn, impact archaeological findings today and influence whether a site is preserved. Archaeologists and historic preservationists have begun to rethink how we study and commemorate sites historically associated with people of color. Even at these historic properties, though, what we choose to preserve or commemorate largely depends on whether a site meets specific criteria or falls within a specific time frame.

These criteria may be developed independently, as in the case of the MVLA, or they may be based on historic preservation laws, and in particular, the NHPA. Ultimately, these practices enable archaeologists, SHPO officers, and private historical foundations to erase or ignore many sites associated with racial minorities. The ways we categorize, discuss, preserve, and
commemorate archaeological sites and landscapes influence their interpretation and public presentation. Archaeological research and historic preservation shape how people experience and remember the landscape and the past. Archaeologists, private historical foundations, and SHPO officers have a responsibility to make sure they can identify areas previously occupied by marginalized people and use those areas to diversify and expand the larger historical narrative.

There are several ways that historic sites can create more inclusive histories. Informational signs can be placed at that could not be preserved, discussing the occupants and history of the local landscape. That way visitors at least know that other people lived in an area. These signs can be used to shed light on the lives of people who were contemporaneous with the time period to which the site is interpreted as well those who pre-date and post-date this period. Such a change can help expand the narrative of a site beyond a particular time.

Historic sites can also change how docents and interpreters discuss activities that historically took place. Actions should be attributed to the people who actually carried them out. For example, rather than saying George Washington planted crops, tour guides should say that enslaved laborers planted them. Instead of saying that the house was cleaned in preparation for a ball, tour guides should say that enslaved laborers cleaned the house.

A place like George Washington’s Mount Vernon could also move away from focusing their interpretation on one particular person to discussing the communities of people who lived on the estate. This approach allows for a more complete understanding of life under George Washington’s ownership by allowing comparison between white privileged life, the lives of the enslaved community who lived at the Mansion house Farm, and the lives of the enslaved who lived in outlying farms. But a focus on changing communities rather than a person or time also
gives space for the discussion of life under Bushrod or John Augustine Washington, as well as the development of the Mount Vernon Ladies Association.

Collaborative and activist archaeology provides another way of moving beyond some of these issues. However, these approaches are often difficult to practice in CRM settings where money and time constraints are an issue. Section 106 of the NHPA must evolve to recognize that diverse groups resided at different types of sites, and that current methods of fulfilling these requirements may not truly evaluate the impact of construction in an area. Government agencies should allow extra time to conduct site impact assessments, which would allow CRM projects to reach out for input and insight from local and descendant populations.

Archaeology can play a powerful role in shaping how visitors experience a site. Our findings can contribute to the reconstruction of buildings and the creation of memorials that change the way visitors perceive and experience such heritage sites. As the landscape is transformed and reconstructed through the results of archaeological excavations, so too are people’s perceptions of the past. Archaeological research and historical commemoration of historically underrepresented groups can help shape people’s sensory experience of the present-day landscape and their understanding of the past. In the process, we can reshape social memory and add marginalized people back into the historical narrative.

The power of archaeology goes beyond using our findings in the creation of commemorative buildings or historical reconstructions at archaeological sites. We can help to reshape the historical narrative itself through the way that we acknowledge and discuss the inhabitants of sites who are often left out of that narrative. In addition, excavations at sites associated with marginalized people can promote community publicly accessible and civically
engaged involvement and help researchers establish and strengthen relationships with the descendants of individuals who are often overlooked in grand historical narratives.

As I alluded to earlier, a major issue in the field of archaeology is that sites that were occupied by people of color are often investigated solely by white archaeologists who have only been taught by white professors. It is important that the field does a better job recruiting and retaining students of color and hiring people of color as archaeologists in both CRM and academia. Most people of color are unable to take archaeology classes taught by people who look like them or have had similar life experiences. Archaeology needs to amplify the voices of African Americans, Native Americans, and other racial minorities in order to create methodologies that better fit the sites being investigated, to understand and interpret the findings through different worldviews, and to better understand the significance of sites occupied by racially marginalized people (Babiarz 2011; Page and Miller 2016; White 2015, 2020).

White (2020), an archaeologist of African American heritage, emphasizes that archaeologists cannot put all the onus of change onto the people of color in the field. Practitioners need to do a better job creating spaces where people of color feel welcome and to move away from ideas of expertise that silence non-white voices (White 2020). For example, the Society for American Archaeology, the largest archaeology conference in the United States, is a very white space. It often lacks the participation of people of color and makes them feel unwelcome (White 2015). It is important that societies, academia, and CRM have policies and create spaces that allow for minority voices to be heard. The presence of different voices in the field may help white archaeologists question their interpretations and the status quo when it comes to preservation (Babiarz 2011; Barile 2004; Graves 2012; Little and Shackel 2014; Page and Miller 2016; White 2020).
In the next chapter, I discuss my conclusions from this project. I review the major findings from the investigation and analysis of the Library site and Field 7. I explain how they support the idea that individuals formerly enslaved by George Washington occupied this site. I discuss what the artifact assemblage can tell us about how the residents negotiated their identities during this period of increased racism and changing social relationships. I explore possible future avenues of investigation to continue this project, including both what further excavations at Field 7 could reveal as well as how future statistical analysis can help us advance our understanding of the site.

Finally, I explain how investigations that examine the impact of past racial policies and structural racism, like this one, are important for understanding and combating present-day racism. Through examining past racial inequalities, we can better understand how present-day race relations and social problems were formed. By displacing sites associated with racially and economically marginalized people, we erase this part of our history and hurt our ability to understand and improve the present. I also explore some of the different ways that we can combat the biases in our historic preservation laws to help us create more inclusive histories.
PART I: Major Findings

The comparative examination, combined with the documentary and archaeological evidence and the process of elimination, suggests that formerly enslaved laborers of George Washington most likely lived at the Library site at Mount Vernon. From the archaeological evidence, there are several things that I can say for certain about the residents of the Library site. Based on the lack of features and the separation of the concentration of architectural artifacts from the concentration of underfired bricks, it seems likely that the occupants lived in log cabins. This finding supports the idea that the site was likely occupied by a group of economically marginalized individuals. The amount of ceramics and the clustering of artifacts suggests that the site contained at least two houses.

The Library site residents owned a large amount of refined ceramics, which is surprising for a group of economically marginalized people. Although the site was occupied by people who lived on the margins, they still had access to some luxury goods. The site also contained some underfired ceramics, indicating that the residents may have saved money by purchasing less desirable ceramics. Based on the size of some of the ceramics as well as the amount of ceramics and wine bottles, it appears as though several residents ate together. The lack of toys and similar artifacts suggests that children did not live at the site. The faunal assemblage indicates that the residents hunted and fished for some of their food but did not raise chickens.

Neither the artifact analysis nor the historical analysis provided definitive proof that the site was occupied by free African Americans who were formerly enslaved by George
Washington. However, the comparison of the different Virginia archaeological sites associated with free and enslaved African Americans and poor and middling Anglo-Americans in Chapter 7 provides insight into the occupants of the results. The results of the comparative examination coupled with the other lines of evidence enable me to say that free African Americans likely lived along the Mount Vernon ridge.

This comparison revealed several interesting patterns between the different social groups. Enslaved African Americans often used colonoware and had subfloor pits in their houses. Their housing was dependent on whether residents worked in the fields or Mansion house. Enslaved Mansion house laborers often lived in more substantial, permanent buildings compared to the easily dismantled buildings of the enslaved field labors. Enslaved Mansion house laborers also tended to have access to nicer ceramics and clothing than enslaved laborers working in fields.

The Library site bears some similarity to the Morven site, Stewart-Watkins site, and houses occupied by enslaved laborers who worked at plantation houses. Poor and middling Anglo-Americans also lived in easily deconstructed buildings, but they lived by themselves in single family cabins whereas enslaved African Americans often lived with multiple families. Poor and middling Anglo-Americans also tried to keep up with ceramic fashions, but still tended to own many utilitarian ceramics.

I also found a wide variety of features and artifacts in the houses and assemblages associated with free African Americans. The differences in these sites were connected not just to economic differences but also the social relationships in which their occupants were engaged and the various choices they made in negotiating their identities. At the same time, all of these sites
lacked subfloor pits, colonoware, or other artifacts commonly associated with enslaved African Americans.

The absence of these artifacts and features at Virginia free African American sites highlights the difficulty in determining race in an archaeological site without documentary evidence. The comparison of these different sites also illustrates the importance of focusing on more than just poverty when interpreting free African American assemblages. Structural racism had social, economic, and physical effects on free African Americans, shaping the materials that archaeologists find. At the same time, sites occupied by free African Americans often bear similarities to those occupied by other marginalized groups. Structural racism impacts archaeological and preservation practices in more ways than the material investigators find. It also influences who practices, teaches, and makes decisions about archaeology and preservation. This in turn can hinder our ability to recognize, understand, and protect sites associated with marginalized groups.

While the Library site can provide exciting, new information about an underrepresented group in the historical narrative and was registered as a historical site, it was still displaced in order to build The Fred W. Smith Library National Library for the Study of George Washington at Mount Vernon. The Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association’s (MVLA) decision to continue the Library construction may have also been influenced by the period of the site’s occupation. The historical reconstruction of Mount Vernon and the interpretation of the estate that docents present to visitors focuses on the estate in the year 1799 (Martinko 2020).

The Library site post-dates that year, and in general Bushrod Washington is rarely mentioned in estate tours. Further, not only was the excavation of the Library site brought to a close to construct the library, but the MVLA has not placed a sign or memorial acknowledging
the presence of the site and its occupants. The site’s location also complicates public access, since the Fred W. Smith Library and the site is typically accessible only to scholars and not to the general public.

The effect of these impediments is that this site has not penetrated the collective public memory about Mount Vernon. This lack of recognition extends further to the history of the plantation during Bushrod Washington’s ownership and indeed Bushrod himself. While the data recovered from the excavations at the Library site can still be accessed and analyzed by researchers, the broader public lacks a sense of this past landscape or this part of the estate’s historical narrative.

**Part II: Future Research**

There are many avenues for additional research at the Library site and Field 7. Further research will help analysts determine with more certainty whether the occupation at Field 7 was contemporaneous with the Library site, as is suggested by the survey data. Based on the occupation date calculated from the historic period artifacts that were recovered from Field 7, it seems likely that these two parts of the ridge were occupied during Bushrod’s ownership of Mount Vernon. Given these findings, it is possible that there may have been one occupation that extended across the entire ridge during the early 1800s. Perhaps the residents of the Library site moved from one area of the ridge to a different area.

It is possible that the occupation at the Field 7 site could have been where James Nugent and his family lived, as discussed in Chapter 4. We also know that the Library site and Field 7 archaeological area was in the part of the landscape known as Field 7 under John Augustine Washington, based on the Walter Gillingham map (see Figure 7 in Chapter 5). The fact that both
were part of Field 7 would further suggest a possible connection between the occupations along this ridge. Both the Library site and Field 7 contain the large, burned area as well as pockets of underfired bricks, which further supports the idea of a connection between these areas.

It is possible that formerly enslaved laborers of George Washington occupied this area, and then the land could have been later cleared to make room for agricultural endeavors. Given their proximity, it would not be surprising if the

Figure 19: A map of sites around the Mount Vernon ridge (north of the Mansion House). The Field 7 survey area is outlined and 44FX2460 is the Library site. 44FX3584 and 44FX3600 are two other sites that VCRA discovered during the survey in preparation for the construction of the Library. 44FX0804, 44FX0805, and 44FX0836, above Field 7, are sites discovered during a 1980s-survey commissioned by the National Park Service. Future research could try to examine if and how these sites are related. From the Mount Vernon Historic Preservation Department.
Library site and Field 7 were part of one large occupation. Furthermore, the George Washington Memorial Highway, which splits the ridge and separates the Library site from the Field 7 site, is a recent addition to the landscape (see figure 19).

If the Library site and Field 7 were part of the same occupation, we would expect to find more artifacts along the western edge of Field 7, closer to the Library site. However, most of the historic period artifacts recovered from the Field 7 shovel testing come from the eastern part of that site. Further research will need to be undertaken to determine the connection between these two sites.

Such investigations can enable archaeologists to learn more about the number of people living at the site, the types of objects they chose to purchase, how they connected to their environment, and the relationships in which they were involved. Excavations can reveal whether this occupation also consisted of ephemeral houses and a large amount of ceramics, which would help strengthen the idea of a connection between the occupation at the ridge.

Future excavations could show if there was only one house site located at the Field 7 site or if there were others. If there was only one house, then this occupation was likely separate from the Library site. However, the presence of many homes could suggest that the occupation spanned the entire ridge and was possibly connected with the sites to the north of Field 7 (see figure 19). Archaeologists could also talk to the descendants of those who lived in the area during the early 19th century, including the enslaved laborers whom George Washington freed. These descendants may have oral histories or insights which could serve as another line of evidence for determining who may have lived at the site.
Continued research would also help researchers more accurately date the site to determine if it was contemporaneous with the Library site. It is possible that if all these houses were contemporaneous, they might have been some of the wooden structures described by visitors that could be seen as they traveled the road from Alexandria to Mount Vernon. Measures should be taken to ensure that this research is conducted with a diverse group of archaeologists, whose voices may provide different interpretations of the artifacts and structures discovered at the site.

Further investigations can also help researchers understand the burned area discovered at both the Library site and Field 7. It is possible that some industrial activity occurred at this site, which can also explain the amount of slag we recovered during the Field 7 shovel testing. As this type of activity was not recorded in notes by George, Bushrod, or John Augustine Washington III, further investigation could enable researchers to better understand the changing landscape at Mount Vernon. For this investigation, I did not have the information necessary to link the presence of slag or the burned area to particular test units and therefore could not make maps with ArcGIS computer software to show their distributions across the Library site. However, future research could produce such maps and help illustrate potential continuity across the ridge.

It also remains unclear whether this potential activity at Field 7 is contemporaneous with the occupations along the ridge area, given the fact that the Field 7 area is mostly plowzone. Given my findings, it makes sense to start any future investigations of Field 7 at the northeastern part of the site, where archaeologists recovered most of the historic period artifacts during the 2015 Shovel Test Pit survey. This additional investigation could help researchers better determine the extent of household occupations along the ridge and how potential houses at Field 7 related to those investigated at the Library site.
Future viewshed analysis in ArcGIS could help us better understand issues of visibility and privacy during the time that the site was occupied. Further, using ArcGIS software to map the distribution of bones and other food remains could enable us to see if and how these remains line up with the presence of house sites or the midden. Such comparative distributions can allow us to examine activities such as cooking and eating. This analysis might show whether the residents cooked near each of their homes or in a centralized location and can help us better understand the different household relationships.

Another future research avenue is a zooarchaeological study of the bones recovered from the Library site. Since the bones were mostly found near the midden, it is likely that these were connected to the early 19th century occupation of the ridge. Unfortunately, I did not have the expertise or time necessary to identify bones in terms of species or body parts beyond the original archaeological cataloguing. A more in-depth analysis could help researchers better understand the types of animals included in the assemblage, and could tell scholars with what sort of animals the residents interacted, which animals were eaten, how the animals died, and how old they were when they died (which can help show whether the residents used any animals in farm work).

There are also a few possible future research avenues involving comparative analysis. As I mentioned in Chapter 5, it remains unclear whether the difference in the distribution of the creamware and pearlware ceramics at the Library site is due to multiple, sequential occupations, or whether the residents had differential access to goods. Comparing the spatial distribution of other expensive items, such as decorated glass and enameled porcelain, as well as the distribution of other ceramics with relatively short production dates, can help researchers better understand
the number of occupations at the Library site, the timing of the occupation(s), and how residents related to each other.

At a broader level, researchers could also compare the findings of the Library site and Field 7 to three other sites in the area. During the 1980s, the MVLA worked with the Virginia Department of Landmarks (which later changed its name to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources) to conduct research north of the location of the Field 7 survey (Breen 2015). This land was part of the Mansion tract at Mount Vernon and was owned by Bushrod Washington and John Augustine Washington III. It is currently owned by the National Parks Service. The 1980s archaeological research uncovered three sites that contained early 19th century artifacts (see Figure 19) (Breen 2015). A comparison between these five sites could help scholars better understand both the connection, if any, between the sites and the social and physical landscape of Mount Vernon during Bushrod’s ownership.

Future investigations can also compare the spatial distribution of artifacts at the Library sites to those at other sites occupied by racially and economically marginalized people. This analysis could focus on the presence and location of different artifact classes (i.e., tablewares, architectural objects, storage vessels, items of personal adornment, etc.). The comparison of assemblages in Chapter 7 is useful to understand who lived along the Mount Vernon ridge as well as highlight differences between the assemblages of free African Americans, enslaved African Americans, and poor-to-middling Anglo-Americans.

A comparison of spatial distributions of artifacts at these sites will enable archaeologists to see if there are any patterns in how racially and economically marginalized people lived across different landscapes. These findings can help scholars recognize and interpret the more ephemeral sites often associated with marginalized people. Understanding these sites can help
scholars both diversify our historical narrative and fight for changes in how researchers and
governments determine which sites to preserve.

**Part III: Creating a More Inclusive Historic Preservation**

This project helps to illustrate the issues archaeologists face in understanding sites occupied by economically and racially marginalized people. It highlights the ways that systemic racism not only impacts the types of artifacts and features that archaeologists recover but also the ways it has penetrated the discipline. Historical forms of racism still shape which groups often work and teach in archaeology, which in turn impacts how students learn to think about archaeological questions, methods, and interpretations. These problems impact archaeologists’ ability to recognize sites occupied by marginalized people and to understand the sites that are uncovered. Such challenges contribute to the continued difficulty in how we understand race in the archaeological record.

The lack of preservation and commemoration at the Library site shows how past forms of racial and economic marginalization, coupled with our current preservation practices, can impact which sites we preserve or commemorate and who gets to be included in historical narratives. The research at the Library site helps illustrate ways that historic preservation can and needs to be improved and highlights the importance of raising awareness of sites associated with racially and economically marginalized people. Both the Library site and comparative research helps shed light on the way people navigated these forms of systematic racism. This investigation is vital since the consumer choices that economically and racially marginalized people make may not seem rational to present-day outsiders.
It is important to understand and recognize sites occupied by racially and economically marginalized individuals in the archaeological record so we can find better ways to protect them. It is especially imperative in this time of racial and economic tensions to expand our understanding of the past. Through creating more inclusive histories, we can help people better understand the racial injustices that shape present-day economic and racial inequality.

Further, it is important that we improve the criteria we use to judge sites as historically significant so sites associated with racially and economically marginalized people can be more easily preserved. What is needed are laws and practices that enable us to create more inclusive historical narratives that do not favor a past focused on privileged Anglo-Americans. It is imperative that we recognize the broad diversity of American experiences to preserve and commemorate historical sites that represent diverse voices. We cannot continue to categorize places that were formerly occupied by racially and economically marginalized people as unimportant because these places do not meet criteria that inherently privilege the spaces of Anglo-Americans. Even in cases where we cannot preserve a site, we should find ways to commemorate it, so it does not remain forgotten.

The research in this dissertation is essential to better understand the formation and impact of forms of structural racism. Historical racial policies impacted various aspects of African American life, including their financial being, consumer culture, housing, and education. The effect of these policies shaped how Anglo-Americans viewed racial minorities, which in turn engendered newer forms of structural and institutional racism, including Jim Crow laws, redlining, and a prison industrial complex that continues to disenfranchise African Americans to a greater extent than Anglo-Americans (Alexander 2013).
The impact of these historical policies continues to affect people in the present, including where racial minorities live and their ability to own homes, the schools they attend, and the jobs in which they are employed. These historical laws helped to create a cycle of poverty that has impacted racially marginalized people for generations. It is hard to understand and combat racism today without an awareness of the historical policies and forms of racism that helped to shape present-day social relationships.

Modern-day forms of structural inequalities ultimately impact how we interpret archaeological sites due to the lack of racial minorities in academia. Few minority students choose to pursue a path of archaeology. There are very few archaeology professors in the United States who are racial minorities, and this disparity is significant since academic training can play a crucial role in shaping the way we see and understand the world and interpret our findings. As a result, both academic and Cultural Resource Management (CRM) archaeologists are often not trained to recognize housing patterns or artifact distributions associated with historically under-represented groups.

This lack of training and representation may cause us to fail to design archaeological studies that capture these elements in the archaeological record (Babiarz 2010). It can also be difficult for some CRM professionals and academics to grasp the historical significance of sites associated with non-white individuals. These issues can make it harder for such sites to gain National Register status, and we may thus miss important parts of the site or misinterpret them.

The past is not a static construction or interpretation. Our understanding of it is always changing, and past events and racial marginalization impact the everyday lives of racial minorities in the present. This impact goes beyond which archaeological sites we choose to preserve, and affects other aspects of life such as education, housing, and jobs. We cannot
change these issues when we only try to understand and fix these problems by examining the present. Studies such as this one can help us to create more inclusive histories that enable us to see the forms of systematic racism that developed throughout the colonial, early republic, and antebellum periods and which continue to operate in the present.

We cannot continue to privilege sites that rich white men occupied while we destroy places associated with racially and economically marginalized people, like the Library site. When we fail to protect minority-occupied sites because they do not meet Anglo-American standards of significance, we erase these groups from the historical narrative. Historically under-represented groups should be involved in revising preservation laws and guiding the future of historic preservation. As Dubrow (2016:74; also see Babiarz 2010; Fly 2014) points out, we can only develop truly inclusive historic preservation practices by bringing the “experience, insights, and perspectives” of these groups “to bear on redefining the scope, policies, practices, and priorities of the preservation movement.”

Systemic racism shapes which sites meet the criteria for protection and recognition. While the National Historic Preservation guidelines for determining which sites can gain protection has been updated over the years in an attempt to be more inclusive, it still privileges sites occupied by privileged whites. These issues point to the need for increased diversity in the field. Minority voices need to be consulted in efforts to update the National Historic Preservation ACT in ways that will better protect sites occupied by racially and economically marginalized groups. Archaeologists must meaningfully consult with non-white groups who may be impacted. The field also needs to be more accepting of oral history as a line of evidence, which are often less valued by archaeologists (White 2020). Such changes could help to increase diverse perspectives and create more inclusive histories.
The management of the Library site at Mount Vernon demonstrates how some historic preservation practices and decisions are rooted in exclusionary criteria. Specifically, preservation decisions do not always consider how past social inequalities have shaped the material ephemerality of some sites. These decisions may thus unintentionally promote disparity in whose heritage is recognized at “historically significant” sites. Historical laws and preservation practices that helped marginalize and control specific social groups continue to influence the types of archaeological material that we recover, shaping the present by helping to determine whose histories we continue to remember.
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APPENDIX 1: LIBRARY SITE (44FX2460) ARTIFACT TABLES

Table 1: Historic Period Artifact Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>5128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Glass</td>
<td>1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>2336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipes</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Architectural Remains</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Artifacts</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Rim and Base Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Type</th>
<th>Base or Rim</th>
<th>Millimeters</th>
<th>notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>blue trellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>red overglaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>blue scrolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>no measurement</td>
<td>large, thick base, possibly a platter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no measurement</td>
<td>foot ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>plate base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>burned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>no measurement</td>
<td>ghost overglaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Porcelain</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>with foot ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Porcelain</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Porcelain</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Porcelain</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>large, thick base, possibly a platter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>burned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Nanking decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>platter rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>burned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Brown</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Stoneware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Grey</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Grey</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>painted with blue flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>annular band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>polychrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Porcelain</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>saucer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>green/brown band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>industrial slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>hand-painted, underglaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>blue annular design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brown underglaze annular design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>underglaze blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>brown underglaze annular design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>rim with incised lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-bodied Ceramic</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-bodied Ceramic</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-bodied Ceramic</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-bodied Ceramic</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-bodied Ceramic</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-bodied Ceramic</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-bodied Ceramic</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-bodied Ceramic</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-bodied refined</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Salt Glazed Stone Ware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Salt Glazed Stone Ware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Red Earthenware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Red Earthenware</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Red Earthenware</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Red Earthenware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Red Earthenware</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Red Earthenware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Red Earthenware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Basalt</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhenishware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhenishware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drabware</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Slipware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portobello</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Ware</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Rim</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jackfield</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>measurement</td>
<td>green, shell-edged plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>measurement</td>
<td>green, shell-edged plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>measurement</td>
<td>blue, shell-edged plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>measurement</td>
<td>green, shell-edged plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>measurement</td>
<td>blue, shell-edged plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>measurement</td>
<td>green, shell-edged plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>measurement</td>
<td>blue, shell-edged plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>measurement</td>
<td>green, shell-edged plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>measurement</td>
<td>blue, shell-edged plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaryware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaryware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaryware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaryware</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Sherd Count by Ware

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Ware</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>1221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>2109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified White-bodied</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse Earthenware</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Redware</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Refined Earthenware</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Minimum Number of Vessels (MNV) Count by Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>MNV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberpot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatware</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holloware- dining</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloware- food prep</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloware- food storage</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk pan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tankard</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teabowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea-cup</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teapot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified- tea</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>230</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: MNV Count by Ware

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>MNV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Brown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Brown</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astbury</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buff-Bodied</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaryware</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Porcelain</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped White Saltglazed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drabware</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Brown</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Dry Bodied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackfield</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portabello</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-Bodied Coarse</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-Bodied Refined</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhenish Grey</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slipware</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire Slipware</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified White Bodied</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedgewood Green</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Salt Glazed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Glassware Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glassware Form</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wine Bottle</td>
<td>1392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Bottle</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stemware</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Count of Decorated Glassware

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glassware Decoration</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acid Etched</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engraved</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facets</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panels</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Faunal Remains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rodent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammal Small</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammal Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammal Large</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Mammal</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX 2: FIELD 7 ARTIFACTS**

Table 9: Field 7 Artifact Catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Pri Material</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>BRICK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2080</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>LITHIC</td>
<td>FLAKE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - MANUFACTURING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2160</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2160</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2160</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2160</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2160</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2160</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>BRICK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2160</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>FLORAL</td>
<td>CHARCOAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS - UNSPECIFIED FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2180</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2180</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2180</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>LITHIC</td>
<td>FLAKE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - MANUFACTURING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>BRICK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (cont.)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2240</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2240</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2240</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2240</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>BRICK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2240</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>HOLLOWARE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2240</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2240</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2240</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2240</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2240</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>SLAG, METAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Fragment Count</td>
<td>Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT: KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT: KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT: KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT: KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT: KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT: KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>BRICK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT: ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>FLORAL</td>
<td>CHARCOAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT: MISCELLANEOUS - UNSPECIFIED FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>LITHIC</td>
<td>FLAKE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT: ACTIVITIES - MANUFACTURING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>FRAGMENT: MISCELLANEOUS - UNSPECIFIED FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT: MISCELLANEOUS - UNSPECIFIED FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>COMPLETE: ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>PIPE BOWL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT: ACTIVITIES - LEISURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>SLAG, METAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRAGMENT: ACTIVITIES - MANUFACTURING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>SLAG, METAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT: ACTIVITIES - MANUFACTURING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>BIKE PART</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - TRANSPORTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>BRICK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>BRICK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>BRICK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>MINERAL</td>
<td>COAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS - UNSPECIFIED FUNCTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>LITHIC</td>
<td>FLAKE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - MANUFACTURING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>LITHIC</td>
<td>FLAKE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - MANUFACTURING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>HOLLOWARE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - DINING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>HOLLOWARE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RIM FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - DINING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - DINING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - DINING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS - UNSPECIFIED FUNCTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - DINING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - DINING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - DINING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - DINING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - DINING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - DINING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS - UNSPECIFIED FUNCTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS - UNSPECIFIED FUNCTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>SLAG, METAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - MANUFACTURING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>STONE</td>
<td>STONE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (cont.)

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - MISCELLANEOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2350</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>BRICK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>BRICK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>BRICK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>BUTTON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>PERSONAL - ADORNMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>FLORAL</td>
<td>CHARCOAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS - UNSPECIFIED FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>FLORAL</td>
<td>CHARCOAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS - UNSPECIFIED FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>COIN, PENNY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>PERSONAL, CURRENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>LITHIC</td>
<td>FLAKE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - MANUFACTURING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>LITHIC</td>
<td>FLAKE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - MANUFACTURING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>NAIL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>PIPE BOWL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - LEISURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>GLASS</td>
<td>BOTTLE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>BODY FRAGMENT</td>
<td>KITCHEN - FOOD/BEVERAGE STORAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Base Fragment - Food/Beverage Storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Body Fragment - Food/Beverage Storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fragment - Architecture - Construction Material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragment - Activities - Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fragment - Activities - Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragment - Activities - Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragment - Activities - Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fragment - Architecture - Construction Material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Slag, Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragment - Activities - Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2440</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragment - Kitchen - Food/Beverage Storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2440</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragment - Kitchen - Food/Beverage Storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2440</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragment - Activities - Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2440</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragment - Miscellaneous - Unspecified Function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2440</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Slag, Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragment - Activities - Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2440</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Window</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragment - Architecture - Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2480</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Body Fragment - Kitchen - Food/Beverage Storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2480</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>CERAMIC</td>
<td>BRICK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2480</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>LITHIC</td>
<td>FLAKE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - MANUFACTURING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2480</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>LITHIC</td>
<td>FLAKE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES - MANUFACTURING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>