North Carolina



North Carolina Archaeology

October 2021

Volume 70	
	CONTENTS

Lewis and Elmwood Cemeteries: Two Enslaved Burial Communities in	
Granville County, North Carolina	
Shawn M. Patch	. 1
Two Multicomponent Precontact Sites in the North Carolina Sandhills	
Sarah A. Stephens and Christopher T. Espenshade	21
Archaeology of a Nineteenth Century Piedmont Farmstead: A Case Study at	
Constinue	
Carolina	12
Samanina Taylor, Sherry Teal, and Shawn M. Palch	43
Working Toward a Common Goal: The Role of Conservation in Archaeology	
and the Benefits of Collaboration	
Kimberlv Kenvon	69
Book Reviews	
Charles Towns on the Cana Fear: The Dise and Fall of the First Barbadian	
Southand the Capeling by lock F. Fryor, Ir	
Thomas F. Boaman, Ir	01
Inomus E. Deuman, Jr.	71
	0.6
About the Authors	-96

North Carolina Archaeology

(formerly Southern Indian Studies)

Published jointly by The North Carolina Archaeological Society, Inc. and The Research Laboratories of Archaeology University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3120

David J. Cranford, Editor

Officers of the North Carolina Archaeological Society

President: Emily Nisch Terrell, Orange County, NC.
Vice President: Theresa McReynolds Shebalin, Durham, NC.
Secretary: Linda Carnes-McNaughton, Directorate of Public Works (IMBG-PWE-DR CARNES), 2175 Reilly Road Stop A, Fort Bragg, NC 28310-5000.
Treasurer: Mary Beth Fitts, N.C. Office of State Archaeology, Historic Resources, 4619 Mail Services Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-4619.
Editor: David J. Cranford, N.C. Office of State Archaeology, Historic Resources, 4619 Mail Services Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-4619.
Associate Editor (Newsletter): Paul Mohler, Archaeology Team, Environmental Analysis Unit, NC Dept. of Transportation, 1598 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27610-1598.
At-Large Members: Jane Eastman, Jackson County, NC. Nicholas Henderson, Granville County, NC.
Downlog Hill, Durhom County, NC.

Nicholas Henderson, Granville County, NC Douglas Hill, Durham County, NC. Celeste Purvis, Wake, County, NC. Kelsey Schmitz, Orange County, NC. Sarah Watkins-Kenny, Pitt County, NC.

Information for Subscribers

North Carolina Archaeology is published once a year in October. Subscription is by membership in the North Carolina Archaeological Society, Inc. Annual dues are \$15.00 for regular members, \$25.00 for sustaining members, \$10.00 for students, \$20.00 for families, \$250.00 for life members, \$250.00 for corporate members, and \$25.00 for institutional subscribers. Members also receive four issues of the North Carolina Archaeological Society Newsletter. Membership requests, dues, subscriptions, changes of address, and back issue orders should be directed to: Mary Beth Fitts, N.C. Office of State Archaeology, Historic Resources, 4619 Mail Services Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-4619.

Information for Authors

North Carolina Archaeology publishes articles on the archaeology of North Carolina and neighboring states. One copy of each manuscript, with accompanying tables, figures, and bibliography, should be submitted to the Editor. Manuscripts should be double spaced with ample margins throughout. Style should conform to guidelines *American Antiquity* (search web for "American Antiquity style guide"). The Editor can assist those wishing to submit a manuscript but who are unfamiliar with *American Antiquity* style.

LEWIS AND ELMWOOD CEMETERIES: TWO ENSLAVED BURIAL COMMUNITIES IN GRANVILLE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA

by

Shawn M. Patch

Abstract

Lewis and Elmwood cemeteries are the final resting places of enslaved individuals from two antebellum plantations in Granville County. Archaeological investigations show both cemeteries share many of the characteristics typical of Black cemeteries beginning in the antebellum era and continuing into the postbellum period. In much of North Carolina, generally, and Granville County, specifically, cemeteries may be one of the only tangible properties associated with the Black experience during the antebellum period. This paper documents Lewis and Elmwood cemeteries, provides historic context for interpretation, and offers suggestions for preservation efforts, including listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Archaeological studies of cemeteries are a distinct subfield of historical archaeology (Baugher and Veit 2014; Crissman 1994; Jeane 1992; Rainville 2014; Veit et al. 2009). Different types have been identified, including formal cemeteries typically located in urban settings (Richardson 1989), upland/folk cemeteries typically located in rural settings (Jeane 1992), those of burial societies (Matternes and Richey 2014), churchyards (Little 1989), family cemeteries, and those of former enslaved communities (Brown 2001; Handler and Lange 1978; Rainville 2014:200; Stevenson 2008; Turner 2018; Watters 1994). Cemeteries of enslaved communities are important because they are one of the only records remaining of the lives of the enslaved, and because cemeteries were perhaps the only place where they were free to fully express their identities (Handler 1996:83; Jamieson 1995:46–47; King 2010:128; Vlach 1991).

Cemeteries are one way of understanding Black history and Black communities (Foster and Eckert 2003:486; Fountain 1995:67). Burial

patterns of Black communities in the North Carolina Piedmont have not been well documented, although there is widespread acknowledgment among archaeologists of their existence. The purpose of this article is to document Lewis and Elmwood cemeteries in Granville County, provide a context for interpreting them, and suggest ways they can be incorporated into broader preservation efforts. Both cemeteries represent Black communities from the antebellum and likely postbellum periods. Their geographic proximity to each other, although entirely coincidental, adds an interesting element because they were likely related historically and developed along similar trajectories (Figure 1).

Granville County is located in the Roanoke River Valley of northeast North Carolina, an area of rich, fertile land that was intensively farmed throughout the antebellum period. Beginning in the eighteenth century, wealthy planters from Virginia began acquiring land in Granville County for agriculture and over the next century consolidated many plantations into vast landholdings (Carlson and Brown 1988). Tobacco became a major cash crop that required the labor of thousands of enslaved African Americans (Smith 2013). Financial success of tobacco cultivation supported the development of an elite, white planter society (Carlson and Brown 1988:27). Throughout the antebellum period Granville County was consistently one of the leading tobacco producers and also had one of the highest populations of enslaved laborers in North Carolina (Carlson and Brown 1988:34-38; Fountain 2014:424; Smith 2013). In 1860, Granville County had 1,006 enslavers (second in the state) and 11,086 enslaved people (first in the state) (Carlson and Brown 1988:37). Of the slaveholding families, three owned 100–199, 372 owned 20-99, and another 197 owned between 10 and 19, numbers that made Granville the largest slaveholding county in the state (Carlson and Brown 1988:37).

Plantations contained two distinct communities: the enslaver (white) and enslaved (Black). Granville County plantations are typical because their most visible features were/are the Big House (Vlach 1993). Yet, these buildings represent only the dominant planter class and that creates an obvious bias that overemphasizes the white community and renders the Black community largely invisible. Vlach's (1993) research of plantation landscapes shifted the focus toward less prominent features, such as agricultural outbuildings and housing of the enslaved community.



Figure 1. Map showing the locations of Lewis and Elmwood Cemeteries in Granville County, North Carolina.

Lewis Cemetery (31GV345)

For discussion purposes, the Lewis name is applied to the cemetery, even though the archival record is somewhat ambiguous. During the early nineteenth century, Lewis cemetery was likely connected to the Lewis family, who are known from the adjoining Elmwood plantation. Lewis cemetery is approximately 365 meters from the Lewis house (GV146), a mid- to late-nineteenth century property on the same parcel. Samuel V. Morton (1861–1938) purchased the property along Little Grassy Creek in the 1880s, including land that may have included the extant Lewis house and cemetery (Lowry 2020:2). Although archival research could not provide a conclusive link between the Lewis House and cemetery, the preponderance of evidence suggests they are related (Lowry 2020). Dr. Willis Lewis owned a plantation in this area that likely contained the cemetery.

Dobbins and Matternes (2020) conducted detailed mapping and systematic probing to identify the number of marked and unmarked graves and delineate the boundary. Lewis cemetery measures 0.34 acre in size and lies at the headwaters of Little Grassy Creek. It contains 132 features, including 80 marked graves, 46 unmarked graves, and six isolated fieldstone markers (Figure 2). Ninety-four of the graves have an associated depression. Two graves were indicated by mounds, a characteristic noted in other Black cemeteries (Gundaker 1998; Thompson and Cornett 1981). There are 119 fieldstone markers. Seventy-eight graves have fieldstone markers at one or both ends. Two graves are marked by metal funeral home markers that were likely intended to be temporary.

Graves are generally oriented east–west, although there is slight variation in placement. Most graves were arranged in rows, with many overlapping. Two distinct clusters were identified and interpreted as likely family groups. Dobbins and Matternes (2020) interpreted the patterning as consistent with an informal cemetery rather than reflecting a comprehensive plan, such as would be expected under formal management by an individual, church, or burial society. Dobbins and Matternes (2020) stated that it could date as early as the mid-eighteenth century and was likely abandoned by the first third of the twentieth century. The continuation of burials in the postbellum period suggests the Black community still had a connection with and access to the cemetery.



Figure 2. Map of Lewis Cemetery (courtesy of New South Associates, Inc.).

Elmwood Cemetery (31GV346)

Elmwood cemetery was part of the Elmwood plantation, which was established by the Lewis family around 1805. According to the 1810 census, Howell Lewis enslaved 82 people and Willis Lewis enslaved 56. William O. Gregory (1804–1886), a major landholder and enslaver, bought the property in 1833, and it remained in his family until the early twentieth century. At its height in 1860, Elmwood was approximately 5,000 acres and Gregory owned approximately 100 enslaved people. The large number of enslaved individuals was typical for much of northern Granville County in the nineteenth century (Carlson and Brown 1988:34–37).

Elmwood cemetery is approximately 0.25-acre in size and located on a flat terrace overlooking an unnamed Little Grassy Creek tributary (Patch and Fann 2021). It is roughly 350 meters from the Elmwood (GV145) plantation house. The cemetery contains 108 unique fieldstone markers, most of which are paired headstones and footstones (Figure 3). Several of the fieldstone markers have a naturally flat, unmodified surface that defines either the (interior) head or foot of the grave. No funeral home markers or formal markers are present. There are 68 depressions that range in depth from 1-3 feet below natural grade. Combined, these features represent a minimum of 68 individuals, although more are likely present. Graves are generally oriented east-west and arranged in rows, although there is slight variation in placement. In addition to rows, loose clusters are visible that may represent family groups or burials from different periods.

Elmwood cemetery could date as early as the late-eighteenth century and was likely abandoned by the late nineteenth century. The data provided by Patch and Fann (2021) suggest an early to midnineteenth century date. No formal or metal funeral home markers are present, although continuation of burials in the postbellum period cannot be ruled out entirely.

Cemetery Context

Lewis cemetery and Elmwood cemetery are located approximately one mile apart and were likely on adjoining plantations. It is possible that they may have been on lands owned by the same family in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century. They share many of the physical



Figure 3. Map of Elmwood Cemetery (courtesy of New South Associates, Inc.).

characteristics typical of upland, folk cemeteries that are often associated with enslaved communities. These include the high number of graves (range of 70–130), the use of fieldstone markers, placement on high ground, proximity to water, a predominately east–west orientation for graves, and indications of family groupings. These shared patterns are discussed in greater detail below.

Surface decoration of graves in Black cemeteries was common across the south, although there was variation in both time and space (Combes 1974; Jamieson 1995:50; Little 1989; Matternes and Richey 2014; Smith 2009:67). Neither Lewis nor Elmwood had any associated artifacts marking graves or scatters observed around the cemetery edges that might have suggested cleaning of graves. If grave decoration was not practiced by the enslaved communities at Lewis and Elmwood, it suggests the community may have had fewer African influences, lack of access to objects that could be left as offerings, or changes in temporal patterns from the earliest periods of enslavement. The Gullah-Geechee or Sea Island Black cemetery tradition seen in the coastal zones of Georgia and the Carolinas has not been recorded in the North Carolina Piedmont. The lack of surface artifacts at Lewis and Elmwood may indicate a pattern that was unique to the Piedmont during the antebellum and postbellum periods.

Enslaved cemeteries were typically located on marginal ground that was considered unproductive by the planter (King 2010:127; Matternes and Richey 2014:259). Locations on high ground within one mile of the plantation home were common (Rainville 2014:62). Rainville (2014:109) observed that most cemeteries of enslaved communities were located on high ground within walking distance of their houses. The distance from housing for the enslaved communities is currently unknown for both Lewis and Elmwood, although both cemeteries were located less than one mile from the main house. Although both cemeteries were on somewhat elevated landforms, both were on the flanks of hillsides rather than knoll tops. This is possibly because the flat knoll east of Elmwood cemetery and the flat, broad ridge east of the Lewis cemetery were too valuable as tobacco fields to allow establishment of cemeteries.

Locations near water held importance for the enslaved community as a source of fertility and because of the symbolism associated with the journey from life to death, and possibly the ocean crossing in a return to Africa (Rainville 2014:14, 61). Both Lewis and Elmwood are located on elevated landforms adjacent to minor streams.

In antebellum Black cemeteries, graves are typically marked with simple, unmodified fieldstone, if marked at all (Little 1989:107; Rainville 2014:62). Grave markers in the postbellum period and early twentieth century show more diversity and creativity, and may include funeral home markers, homemade markers, and household items (Brown

LEWIS AND ELMWOOD CEMETERIES

2001:106; Little 1989; Matternes and Richey 2014; Smith 2009:67–68). Lewis cemetery has primarily fieldstone markers with a few funeral home markers. Elmwood has exclusively fieldstone markers.

Burial in east-west orientation with the head to the west was a common practice (Matternes and Richey 2014; Rainville 2014:64). Jamieson (1995:53) stated that among Black communities this represented a syncretism of both African and Christian beliefs. Internal variation from a rigid east-west orientation is common in many Black cemeteries (Rainville 2014:121). Variations may be due to family groupings and/or represent different times when burials occurred. Graves in both Lewis and Elmwood cemeteries generally follow and east-west orientation, although there are minor variations.

Patterns of family groupings may be tied to West African traditions and also reflect of organic development rather than mandates from a burial society, church, or other authority (Matternes and Richey 2014). The lack of regular, systematic order is common among Black cemeteries (Combes 1974:56; King 2010:127; Little 1989:106; Matternes and Richey 2014; Smith 2009:68–69). Lewis cemetery shows more variability than Elmwood, possibly due to the significantly larger number of graves. Both cemeteries appear to have loose clusters that likely represent family groups.

Burial patterns for Black communities changed through time. Enslaved individuals in the antebellum period were typically buried in a dedicated cemetery on their plantation (Matternes and Richey 2014:259). The postbellum period was a time of transition. Certain burials continued in former plantation cemeteries. In his study of Jordan Plantation in Texas, Brown (2001:106) noted that only people who were known to have spent their childhood on the plantation were buried in its Black cemetery. This raises an interesting question about how former plantation cemeteries may have been used in the postbellum period. The postbellum period also saw the emergence of private cemeteries, newly established Black churches, and/or burial societies (Little 1989; Matternes and Richey 2014:260; Rainville 2014:65, 73–74). By the early twentieth century, most Black burials were in formal cemeteries (Little 1989; Smith 2009). Both Lewis and Elmwood represent enslaved communities from the antebellum period. Lewis may have continued in use for a few decades, but burial ceased at Elmwood.

Black Cemeteries in Granville County

The listings of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) provide a county-by-county accounting of what has been considered historically important. Historic resources can be eligible for listing on the NRHP for association with key historical events, for association with important persons in history, for displaying the work of a master, for being an excellent representative of a property type, or for the potential to yield important archaeological data.

Data from HPOWeb show 28 properties from northern Granville County have been listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (Figure 4). Of this number, 23 are antebellum plantation houses, three are postbellum houses, and two are non-domestic buildings. These listings are representative of the overall plantation era from 1746–1865. Cursory review of the NRHP nominations indicates that in addition to the planter's house, other associated buildings are often listed such as agricultural outbuildings and occasionally tenant houses (Carlson and Brown 1988). These features are vestiges of former plantation landscapes. The most visible elements are the planters' houses, with their large, physically imposing buildings. Yet, these buildings represent only the white planter families, which constituted a small percentage of the total population. Rarely, references are included to housing for enslaved people, but those resources were no longer extant and were not listed as contributing elements. Cemeteries associated with either the white or Black communities are never mentioned.

The Granville County Register of Deeds contains numerous plat maps from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These maps often show a main house and associated outbuildings, tenant houses, and mills. They are also invaluable for reconstructing plantations as they may have existed in the antebellum period. Although former plantations had been subdivided, it appears that a core around the main house was still largely intact. In the case of Elmwood, the core property in 1922 was approximately 902 acres, and for Hill Airy, the core property in 1927 was approximately 473 acres (Figures 5 and 6). The Hill Airy map of the Francis Gregory property is the only one to show a "colored grave yard" (Figure 6). A plat map showing a Black cemetery is very rare (Trinkley 2006). Georeferencing these maps provide a unique view of both former plantations as they existed from the 1900s – 1930s (Figure 7).

LEWIS AND ELMWOOD CEMETERIES



Figure 4. Map showing National Register of Historic Places listings for northern Granville County, North Carolina (data extracted from NC HPOWeb).



Figure 5. Historic plat map of Elmwood (1922) (courtesy of Granville County Register of Deeds).

Black cemeteries in Granville County are a property type that also represents the historic context of the plantation era from 1746 to 1865, but that illuminates a very different aspect. The physical properties of the Black community, especially housing, are no longer extant. There are no known standing slave cabins or houses in the county. Cemeteries of enslaved people are expected to be a major exception to this trend. They are perhaps the only tangible expression of the Black experience during the plantation era. These sites hold the physical remains of most of the Black population from approximately 1746 to 1865. Even though the enslaved population was substantially larger than the white population throughout the nineteenth century, Black cemeteries are the best remaining properties of that majority population. Lewis and Elmwood are expected to be representative of the property type.

LEWIS AND ELMWOOD CEMETERIES



Figure 6. Historic plat map of Hill Airy (1927) (courtesy of Granville County Register of Deeds).

As of this writing, Lewis and Elmwood are the only cemeteries that have been identified and officially recorded with the OSA or HPO for the northern portion of Granville County, from Oxford north to the state line. Both are rural and isolated and not directly associated with historic or modern churches. Both are associated with former plantations. Site 31GV123 was recorded as a former tobacco plantation with the ruins of a main house, outbuildings, and cemetery, but the site form does not indicate ethnicity of the cemetery. There should be dozens more Black



Figure 7. Map showing locations of former Elmwood and Hill Airy Plantations between 1910 – 1930.

cemeteries in Granville County, specifically, and adjoining counties, generally. These resources need to be identified, recognized with official site numbers, and memorialized.

LEWIS AND ELMWOOD CEMETERIES

The Granville County cemetery census has identified approximately 150 cemeteries (Granville County Genealogical Society 1746, Inc. 2021). Nine of these are listed as "unknown", meaning they do not contain any marked graves that indicate surnames. In the accompanying descriptions, three are listed as likely representing either former enslaved or Black communities. The actual number of cemeteries for enslaved individuals must be significantly higher simply due to the number of plantations that are known, and the fact that the enslaved were the majority population from 1746 to 1860.

Cemeteries of enslaved communities should be present on each plantation, although they were almost never mentioned in archival sources and only rarely depicted on maps (Handler and Lange 1978:173– 174; Rainville 2014:83; Trinkley 2006). Cemeteries associated with minority communities are often marginalized, forgotten, neglected, and absent from lists of protected properties (Lemke 2020). Their low visibility is one reason why their numbers as archaeological sites are severely underrepresented in state inventories (Lemke 2020). Visibility, however, may also be affected by deliberate attempts by Black communities to shield them from view (Jamieson 1995:42; Rainville 2014:119), and by white efforts to remove all vestiges of the cemeteries (Lemke 2020). As plantation cemeteries for the enslaved were rarely plotted as separate, legal parcels, postbellum landowners often felt free to reuse those lands as agricultural fields.

Future Preservation Efforts

Cemeteries of all types are increasingly threatened in North Carolina. The problem is even more critical for Black cemeteries because they are typically less visible than other cemeteries and located in areas that are subject to increasing pressure for land development (Lemke 2020). State law offers limited protection for cemeteries, and they can still be threatened. Beyond protection, however, the need is dire for inventory, recognition, commemoration, and preservation of these unique resources.

One important step is to identify and nominate these cemeteries to the NRHP (Barile 2004). Cemeteries rarely are considered eligible for the NR unless they meet several exceptions. As Rainville (2014:135– 136) pointed out, though, only 2 percent of the NR listings nationwide relate to African American history. Because antebellum cemeteries best

capture the Black experience, cemeteries of Granville County may be eligible for the NR.

These resources should be given a high priority for research, preservation, and community outreach. In an area where tens of thousands of Black people lived, worked, and died, cemeteries may be the only tangible properties of the Black experience from the period of 1746–1865. And those are nearly invisible. As Lemke (2020) noted cemeteries are still as much a part of the living culture in an area as they were when in use.

Cemeteries are rarely excavated simply to answer archaeological research questions. Information can generally be obtained through analysis of marker styles, materials, grave orientations, and cemetery locations. More than simply data, however, cemeteries and their associated landscapes have stories to tell (King 2010:125; Rainville 2014; Veit et al. 2009:4). Black cemeteries, in particular, and especially those of Granville County, are uniquely suited to help understand the Black experience during the antebellum period. The local significance of such resources is especially high as the Granville County population contains a significant percentage of African Americans descended from those formerly enslaved in the county. Future research should focus on identifying additional cemeteries of former enslaved communities, developing social and historic contexts to provide fuller interpretations, and engaging with descendant communities.

Acknowledgments

Paula Patch, Melissa Timo, Brad Botwick, and Chris Espenshade all read versions of this paper and provided comments that helped me clarify and refine my ideas. I thank each of them for their time.

References Cited

Barile, Kerri S.

2004 Race, the National Register, and Cultural Resource Management: Creating an Historic Context for Postbellum Sites. *Historical Archaeology* 38(1):90–100.

Baugher, Sherene, and Richard Veit

2014 *The Archaeology of American Cemeteries and Gravemarkers*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Brown, Kenneth L.

2001 Interwoven Traditions: Archaeology of the Conjurer's Cabins and the African American Cemetery at the Jordan and Frogmore Plantations. In *Places of Cultural Memory: African Reflections on the American Landscape*, pp. 99–114. National Park Service, Atlanta, Georgia.

Carlson, Andrew J., and Marvin A. Brown

1988 Heritage and Homesteads: The History and Architecture of Granville, County, North Carolina. Granville County Historical Society, Granville, North Carolina.

Combes, John D.

1974 Ethnography, Archaeology, and Burial Practices Among Coastal South Carolina Blacks. In *The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers, 1972*, edited by Stanley A. South, pp. 52–61. Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

Crissman, James K.

1994 Death and Dying in Central Appalachia. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Illinois.

Dobbins, Paige, and Hugh B. Matternes

2020 Archaeological Boundary Survey and Inventory of an Unnamed Cemetery (31GV345), Granville County, North Carolina. New South Associates, Inc., Stone Mountain, Georgia.

Foster, Gary S., and Craig M. Eckert

2003 Up from the Grave: A Sociohistorical Reconstruction of an African American Community from Cemetery Data in the Rural Midwest. *Journal of Black Studies* 33(4):468–489.

Fountain, Daniel. L.

1995 Historians and Historical Archaeology: Slave Sites. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 26(1):67–77.

Fountain, Daniel L.

2014 A Broader Footprint: Slavery and Slave-holding Households in Antebellum Piedmont North Carolina. *The North Carolina Historical Review* 91(4):407–444.

Granville County Genealogical Society 1746, Inc.

2021 Granville County North Carolina Cemeteries. Granville County North Carolina Cemeteries. <u>http://cemeterycensus.com/nc/gran/</u>, accessed September 5, 2021.

Gundaker, Grey

1998 Signs of Diaspora, Diaspora of Signs, Literacies, Creolization and Vernacular Practice in African America. Oxford University Press, New York, New York.

Handler, Jerome S.

1996 A Prone Burial from a Plantation Slave Cemetery in Barbados, West Indies: Possible Evidence for an African-Type Witch or Other Negatively Viewed Person. *Historical Archaeology* 30(3):76–86.

Handler, Jerome S., and Frederick W. Lange

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

Jamieson, Ross W.

1995 Material Culture and Social Death: African American Burial Practices. *Historical Archaeology* 29(4):39–58.

Jeane, D. Gregory

1992 The Upland South Folk Cemetery Complex: Some Suggestions of Origin. In *Cemeteries and Gravemarkers: Voices of American Culture*, edited by Richard E. Meyer, pp. 107–136. Utah State University Press, Logan, Utah.

King, Charlotte

2010 Separated by Death and Color: The African American Cemetery of New Philadelphia, Illinois. *Historical Archaeology* 44(1). 1:125–137.

Lemke, Ashley

2020 "Missing Cemeteries" and Structural Racism: Historical Maps and Endangered African/African American and Hispanic Mortuary Customs in Texas. *Historical Archaeology* 54(3):605–623.

Little, M. Ruth

1989 Afro-American Gravemarkers in North Carolina. Markers, 1989.

Lowry, Sarah

2020 Pedestrian Reconnaissance Survey and Archival Research to Assess an Unnamed Cemetery (31GV345) for a Prospective Solar Farm, Granville County, North Carolina. New South Associates, Inc, Greensboro, North Carolina.

Matternes, Hugh B., and Staci Richey

2014 I Cry "I Am" for All to Hear Me: The Informal Cemetery in Central Georgia. In *Natural Expressions of the African Diaspora*, edited by Akinwumi Ogundaran and Paula Saunders, pp. 258–279. University of Indiana Press, Bloomington, Indiana.

LEWIS AND ELMWOOD CEMETERIES

Patch, Shawn M., and Velma Fann

2021 Historical Research and Archaeological Reconnaissance of Elmwood Cemetery, Granville County, North Carolina. New South Associates, Inc., Stone Mountain, Georgia.

Rainville, Lynn

2014 Hidden History: African American Cemeteries in Central Virginia. University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Richardson, Steven J.

1989 The Burial Grounds of Black Washington: 1880-1919. *Records of the Columbia Historical Society, Washington, D.C.* 52:304–326.

Smith, John David

2013 "I Was Raised Poor and Hard as Any Slave": African American Slavery in Piedmont North Carolina. *The North Carolina Historical Review* 90(1):1–25.

Smith, Jonathan

2009 Hidden and Sacred: African American Cemeteries in Eastern North Carolina. Unpublished Unpublished M.A. Thesis, East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina.

Stevenson, Christopher M.

2008 Burial Ground for Negroes, Richmond, Virginia: Validation and Assessment. Richmond, Virginia.

Thompson, Robert F., and Joseph Cornett

1981 The Four Moments of the Sun, Kongo Art in Two Worlds. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

Trinkley, Michael

2006 By the Light of the Torch. *Sciway - South Carolina's Information Highway*. <u>https://www.sciway.net/afam/slavery/burials.html</u>, accessed September 5, 2021.

Turner, Grace

2018 Honoring Ancestors in Sacred Space: The Archaeology of an Eighteenth-Century African-Bahamian Cemetery. University of Florida Press, Gainesville, Florida.

Veit, Richard F., Sherene Baugher, and Gerard P. Scharfengerber

2009 Historical Archaeology of Religious Sites and Cemeteries. *Historical Archaeology* 43(1):1–11.

Vlach, John M.

1991 By the Work of Their Hands: Studies in African-American Folk Life. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Vlach, John Michael

1993 Back of the Big House: The Architecture of Plantation Slavery. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina and London.

Watters, David

1994 Mortuary Patterns at the Harney Site Slave Cemetery, Montserrat: A Caribbean Perspective. *Historical Archaeology* 28(3):56–73.

TWO MULTICOMPONENT PRECONTACT SITES IN THE NORTH CAROLINA SANDHILLS

by

Sarah A. Stephens and Christopher T. Espenshade

Abstract

Sites 31CD967 and 31CD968 are situated in the North Carolina Sandhills on an upland setting overlooking an unnamed tributary of Rockfish Creek. Archaeological investigations produced multiple datasets including lithic and ceramic artifacts, organic absorbed residues, and thin-section ceramic samples. Analysis of these datasets revealed the sites were the product of short-term visits during the Middle Archaic and Early to Late Woodland periods. In addition, the ceramic analysis indicated a contention of assigning Hanover Fabric Impressed vessels into varieties I or II.

Sites 31CD967 and 31CD968 were initially identified during archaeological investigations for the North Carolina Department of Transportation's (NCDOT) West Fayetteville Outer Loop project in Cumberland County, North Carolina (Gunn and Sanborn 2005). The sites are located on an eastern edge of a ridge overlooking an unnamed tributary of Rockfish Creek (Figure 1). Gunn and Sanborn (2005) interpreted site 31CD967 as primarily an Archaic and Woodland period multiuse camp or village along with an early twentieth century artifact scatter and cemetery. Based on the ceramic and lithic data, site 31CD968 was interpreted as an Archaic and Woodland period base camp or village (Gunn and Sanborn 2005).

In 2019, New South Associates, Inc. (New South) conducted intensive data recovery investigations of the sites for NCDOT to mitigate adverse effects from the proposed road construction. The investigations included block excavations, sedimentology and soil chemistry analysis, optically stimulated luminescence (OSL) dating of sediments at 31CD968, along with absorbed residue and thin-section analysis of pottery. In addition, cemetery excavations were conducted at 31CD967, but are not the subject of this article. The datasets were analyzed at the

block and site level to identify distinct site use episodes (Stephens, Matternes, et al. 2021; Stephens, Espenshade, et al. 2021). Analysis revealed the sites were revisited multiple times and were the product of short-term, limited use activities.

Only the north lobe of site 31CD967 was investigated based on the proposed road design. Initial excavations included two block (2x2 m) units and a single exploratory unit (1x1 m). The blocks were supplemented with 1x1 meter units and expanded based on the artifact concentrations. The total level of effort included two blocks and a total of 21 units (20 sq. m). Excavations resulted in the recovery of 905 artifacts, comprising of lithics (n=270) and pottery (n=635). Stratigraphy was relatively consistent across the blocks with an approximately 15–20 centimeters thick historic plowzone (Ap-horizon), which represents an aeolian sand deposit formed as winds reworked surficial soils in the area. Stratum II was an E-horizon that reached a depth of approximately 50–70 cmbs, and likely associated with the late Pleistocene or early Holocene, overlying a Bw-horizon. Units were terminated at an average depth of one meter below surface.

Site 31CD968 is situated approximately 265 meters north of site 31CD967. Excavations at this site examined multiple areas and the total level of effort included 11 blocks ranging in size from a single 1x1 meter unit to 16 units. Investigations at site 31CD968 produced a high volume of lithic material (n=2,825) along with a sparse ceramic assemblage (n=272). The landform is composed of remnant marine and fluvial sand deposits overlain by a drape of aeolian sediment. A typical profile across the site consisted of a 10–25-centimeter-thick A-horizon (Stratum I). However, the A-horizon was previously disturbed by a former mobile home park and logging activities. Stratum II consisted of an E-horizon with an average thickness of 50 centimeters whereas the final stratum was a Bw-horizon that was sometimes mottled with lamellae and continued into the base of excavation. Units were typically terminated at around one meter below surface.

Lithic Analysis

Site 31CD967

Overall, the lithic assemblage throughout the blocks was low density and diversity. Lithic artifacts identified fall into three general categories: debitage, flaked stone tools, and other. No cores, informal

MULTICOMPONENT SITES IN THE SANDHILLS



Figure 1. Map showing locations of sites 31CD967 and 31CD968 in Cumberland County, North Carolina.

tools, or ground stone tools were identified in the assemblage. This indicates a lack of tool production and food processing activities in the area. The most common lithic artifact type was debitage and included general flakes (n=158), flake fragments (n=88), and angular debris (n=6). The flaked stone tools consisted of four metavolcanic PP/Ks and five bifaces. The other lithic artifact category consisted of nine pieces of fire-cracked rock (FCR).

Platform remnant analysis was completed for general flakes since platform remnants are typically the most informative attribute of lithic debitage. Although flakes contain a wide variety of attributes, only the platform remnant is found on all flakes regardless of fracture method or reduction stage. Moreover, the platform remnant is among the most statistically stable lithic attributes (Andrefsky 1998; Cotterell and Kamminga 1987; Dukeman 2002; Hall and Larson 2004; Odell 2003; Williams 2010). Of the platforms analyzed (n= 158), faceted platforms (n=62) were the most common at 39 percent. Flat platforms (n=60) closely followed at 38 percent. Three cortical platforms and 33 unknown

platforms were also identified. The similar frequencies of faceted and flat platforms within the blocks indicates a combination of early stage and late stage lithic production in the area. Additionally, the overall low density of debitage recovered indicates only brief lithic activities occurred in the area.

Only a few flaked stone tools were recovered during the archaeological investigation, consisting of five bifaces and four projectile points (Figure 2). Non-local metavolcanic materials were exclusively used. Of the five bifaces, four were incomplete, which suggests they were possibly discarded or replaced on-site. The complete biface was an awl that is not distinctive of a particular culture or period. The awl exhibits very limited use wear, indicating it was used only briefly before being discarded. The projectile points consisted of two fragments and two complete points. An intact Morrow Mountain II point (Middle Archaic) and a proximal fragment of a Morrow Mountain II point were found within Block 2, Stratum II from 15–50 cmbs. The remaining points could not be assigned a temporal or cultural affiliation because of their fragmentation.

Lithic artifacts were made from unidentified metavolcanic, quartz, and quartzite materials. However, metavolcanic artifacts are the most common (n=224), at 86.5 percent of the total. Quartz (n=33) and quartzite (n=2) account for approximately 13.5 percent. Overall, these data indicate a preference for nonlocal materials that were likely acquired through direct procurement and then brought to the site where they were deposited in what was to become the archaeological context.

This preference reflects the general trend within the Sandhills. At Fort Bragg, metavolcanic materials were brought in from the Carolina Slate Belt as blanks and preforms. This is reflected in the artifact assemblage, which is dominated by metavolcanic late-stage reduction debitage and projectile points. The majority of metavolcanic points date from the Early Archaic through Early Woodland period (Steponaitis et al. 2006). Quartz, on the other hand, was locally acquired and represented by core technology in the region (Steponaitis et al. 2006). Unfortunately, the metavolcanic materials identified during the block excavations at site 31CD967 were unable to be assigned a specific metavolcanic type and therefore cannot be associated with any known quarry areas.

MULTICOMPONENT SITES IN THE SANDHILLS



Figure 2. Projectile points recovered from 31CD967. A. Morrow Mountain II Base; B. Morrow Mountain II; C. Savannah River; D. Unidentified Quartz PPK; E. Unidentified Quartz PPK.

Site 31CD968

Excavations at site 31CD968 produced a moderate volume of lithic material (n=2,825), which consisted of debitage, flaked stone tools, FCR, and a core. The bulk of lithic artifacts was recovered from Stratum II from 20–40 cmbs (n=1,498). Only three temporally sensitive lithics were identified, all of which were Middle Archaic Morrow Mountain II type PP/Ks. One was recovered from 20–30 cmbs and the other two from 30–40 cmbs.

As with site 31CD967, platform remnants were examined on the general flakes (n=1,385). Flat platforms (n=1,041) are the dominant type at the site with 75 percent of the total. Faceted platforms (n=181) account

for 13 percent of the total, followed by unknown (n=157) at 11.4 percent and cortical (n=6) with less than one percent. The relatively low frequency of cortical platforms was likely due to the overwhelming emphasis on metavolcanic materials, which because of the form the material was being brought in typically would not have a lot of cortex. Based on the platform remnant analysis, there was a focus on early-stage reduction throughout the site along with some tool maintenance.

Of the 2,825 lithic artifacts recovered, 23 were flaked stone tools. The assemblage included formal tools (9 bifaces, 1 core, and 10 projectile point/knives) and informal tools (3 retouched flakes). Most of the bifaces (n=7; 78%) and PP/Ks (n=7; 70%) were incomplete, which suggests they were discarded or replaced on-site. Informal tools were limited to three retouched flakes. This low frequency coupled with the lack of other types, such as ground stone tools and utilized flakes, indicates very limited resource extraction and/or processing happened in the area where the excavation blocks were placed. Of the 10 PP/Ks recovered, only three were diagnostic of a temporal type due to the fragmentation of the other specimens. These points were identified as Morrow Mountain II types created from metavolcanic (n=2) and unidentified metamorphic (n=1) materials (Figure 3). Overall, the projectile point samples show evidence of wear and or/breakage suggesting that they were either at or near the end of their use lives. These likely entered the site in finished form and were deposited through loss, discard, or replacement processes.

A mix of raw materials was used for tools; however, non-local metavolcanics dominated the assemblage with 64 percent (n=16), followed by locally available quartz at 28 percent (n=7) and non-local metamorphic at eight percent (n=2). Unsurprisingly, there was a preference for high quality, non-local materials for tool production. However, groups were clearly also collecting quartz from local outcrops and utilizing it at the site for tool production.

As with the tools, the overall lithic artifacts were made from a variety of raw materials. Metavolcanic was the most common (n=1,776) material type at 63 percent. Quartz (n=762) and unidentified metamorphic materials (n=251) account for approximately 36 percent of lithic artifacts. Other raw materials such as chert, quartzite, sandstone, silicified wood, and steatite occur in lower frequencies and comprise approximately one percent of the total sample. As with site 31CD967,

MULTICOMPONENT SITES IN THE SANDHILLS



Figure 3. Projectile points recovered from 31CD968. A. Morrow Mountain II;B. Morrow Mountain II; C. Morrow Mountain II; D. Unidentified PPK;E. Proximal fragment; F. Distal and medial fragment.

the data indicate a preference for non-local materials that were likely acquired through direct procurement and then brought to the site where they were deposited into the archaeological context.

Ceramic Analysis

Site 31CD967

The site produced 112 non-residual sherds. This count includes sherds found within the cemetery scrape areas (n=3) and those found within general block contexts (n=109). The non-residual sherds were generally small with a weight ranging from 0.96 to 104.9 grams;

however, this number is skewed by a single large sherd as most of the sherds weighed under 26 grams (n=111). The mean weight was 10.9 grams. Fabric-impressed sherds dominated the assemblage (n=70) followed by cord-marked sherds (n=30) (Figure 4). Other surface treatments include three scraped, two smoothed, and one check-stamped sherd (Figure 5).

Of the 112 sherds, 63 were assigned to 15 vessels, which accounted for 64.7 percent of the pulled sherds by weight. However, nine of the 15 vessels represent less than one percent of their parent vessel, four sample vessels represent one percent of their parent vessels, one sample vessel represents two percent of its parent, and one sample vessel represents three percent of its parent (Table 1). This pattern of a site containing only small bits of many vessels is common at Fort Bragg (Patch et al. 2011).

Stratigraphically, half of the pottery recovered in the blocks and included in the vessel sort were found in Stratum II (E-horizon) (N=55). The remaining sherds (N=54) were identified in Stratum I (A-horizon).

Of the 15 sample vessels, Vessel 1 (check-stamped) was found in the cemetery scrape area. All of the other vessels had distributions focused on Block 2. Vessels 5 and 6 had one sherd each from Block 1 to the northeast. The foci for Vessels 2–15 are all within two meters of the center point of the block. This spatial co-occurrence of 14 vessels suggests one of three possibilities:

1. There was a generalized scatter of vessels throughout the site area, and similar distributions would have occurred if we had placed the large block elsewhere in the site boundaries. However, this possibility is contradicted by the low frequency of ceramics in the smaller blocks (Block 1 and 3), and by the distribution of negative shovel tests.

2. These vessels represent repeated revisits to a very specific location over decades or centuries, with the ceramic residue accruing slowly with each visit. It is hard to imagine what feature would have attracted revisits by different groups through time. There is not a topographic prominence or a spring-head at the block location. With the archaeological record of Fort Bragg being characterized by seemingly generalized settlement parameters (i.e., uplands are often almost continuous scatters of lithics and ceramics accrued from many short-term

Vessel	% of vessel	Herbert & Feathers Type	New South Type	Surface Treatment	Residue
1	<1%	N/A	Deptford Linear Check- Stamped	Check- stamped	N/A
2	1%	N/A	N/A	Scraped	Meat or fish
3	<1%	N/A	N/A	Scraped	N/A
4	<1%	New River Cord-Marked	New River Cord-Marked	Fine cord- marked	N/A
5	<1%	Cape Fear Cord-Marked	Cape Fear Cord-Marked	Cord-marked	Plant or fish
6	1%	Cape Fear Cord-Marked	Cape Fear Cord-Marked	Cord-marked	Plant or fish
7	1%	Yadkin Cord- Marked	Yadkin Cord- Marked	Cord-marked	Predominately plant, some animal resources, and possible processing of tubers
8	2%	Hanover II Fabric Impressed	New River Fabric Impressed	Fabric impressed	Fish or shellfish and plant resources
9	1%	Hanover I Fabric Impressed	Hanover Fabric Impressed	Fabric impressed	Plant, animal, and fish resources along with possible processing of tubers
10	3%	Hanover II Fabric Impressed	Hanover Fabric Impressed	Fabric impressed	Plant and animal resources, possible processing of tubers
11	<1%	Hanover Fabric Impressed	Cape Fear Fabric Impressed	Fabric impressed	Plant and animal resources, possible processing of tubers
12	<1%	Hanover I Fabric Impressed	New River Fabric Impressed	Fabric impressed	N/A
13	<1%	Hanover Fabric Impressed	New River Fabric Impressed	Fabric impressed	N/A
14	<1%	Hanover II Fabric Impressed	New River Fabric Impressed	Fabric impressed	Plant and animal resources, possible processing of tubers
15	<1%	New River Cord-marked	New River Cord-marked	Cord-marked	N/A

Table 1. Summary of Vessels at 31CD967.



Figure 4. Photograph of Vessel 8 from 31CD967.



Figure 5. Photograph of Vessel 1 from 31CD967.

MULTICOMPONENT SITES IN THE SANDHILLS

site use episodes), it is hard to model what would have triggered highly specific re-visitation/re-use beyond the span of community memory.

3. Lastly, the assemblage may represent several revisits within a relatively short time span, such that the site occupants could remember a specific tree or trail-side clearing. It is also possible that returning occupants could see surface evidence of their previous site use. By this argument, Vessels 2–15 would have been effectively contemporary, given the coarseness of archaeological dating.

In modeling various types of Woodland site use episodes in the Sandhills, Patch and Espenshade (2011) recognize the importance of considering vessel distributions. For inferred seasonal household loci, there is an expectation that sherds will have been deposited in a ring around the structure, and that distributions of individual vessels will include links across the inferred house location. In contrast, logistical camps may be represented by a single cluster of sample vessels. The vessel distribution at 31CD967 more closely matches the expectations for a logistical camp, rather than a seasonal household locus.

As to the likely typological assignments based on 40X examination, three vessels showed the much-discussed contrast between the typology of Herbert and Feathers (Herbert 2011; Herbert and Feathers 2015; Herbert et al. 2002) and that of New South (Patch et al. 2011). Not surprisingly, the typological disagreement concerns clay/grog aplastics. Under either Herbert and Feathers or New South, Vessels 9 and 10 would be assigned to the Hanover series based on the presence of a high density of very coarse to granule, angular grog temper. The straight edges and flat surfaces of the grog attests to these aplastics being crushed sherds. In all respects, these sherds match the original series description for Hanover.

Additionally, three other vessels demonstrate the major divergence between Herbert and Feathers and New South. Sample Vessel 14 had coarse, round, clay as the primary aplastic and occasional fine-medium quartz as the secondary aplastic. Sample Vessels 8 and 12 had finemedium, subangular quartz as the primary aplastic. Sample Vessel 8 had possible clay as a secondary aplastic, and Sample Vessel 12 had granule, round grog as a secondary aplastic. Under the Herbert/Feathers sorting criteria, the presence of any clay/grog aplastics results in an assignment to the Hanover series. In contrast, the New South typology does not treat grog (i.e., sherd) temper the same as incidental clay. Under the New

South approach, Sample Vessels 8, 12, and 14 would have been sorted to the New River series.

With so few attributes that can be recorded from Sample Vessels representing on average less than one percent of their parent vessel, there is not an applicable measure of similarity or variability that can be applied to these 15 vessels. The statistically unsatisfying solution is to instead ask the following: is there anything in the data to suggest that these 15 vessels are not from a single component? The answer is "yes, with a caveat." Using Herbert et al.'s (2002) published date ranges for New River (1865–130 B.C.), Yadkin (400 B.C. to A.D. 400), Hanover (300 B.C. to A.D. 900), and Cape Fear (300 B.C. to A.D. 300 and later), it is clear that a single component from the span 300–130 B.C. could be expected to yield all the recovered types.

The caveat concerns the Hanover II Fabric Impressed type of Herbert and Feathers, which they consider a much later development (Herbert 2011; Herbert and Feathers 2015; Herbert et al. 2002). If the typology and chronology of Herbert and Feathers is rigidly applied, the four Hanover II Fabric Impressed sample vessels would be out of place with the rest of the assemblage. If the Hanover II actually represents New River or Cape Fear sherds with a few incidental clay lumps, then there is not a problem with the assemblage.

Herbert and Feathers (2015) do not offer a definition of New River; however, Herbert (2011) describes the series as characterized by "quartz sand temper in high proportion, and homogeneous compact paste", with the key component being the high presence of coarse sand. Three of the Hanover II Fabric Impressed sample vessels, Vessels 8, 12, and 13, contained fine-medium subangular quartz as the primary aplastic. Vessel 8 has rare instances of possible grog/clay as the secondary aplastic and Vessel 12 granule, round clay as the secondary aplastic. Vessel 14 on the other hand has round clay as the primary aplastic and the secondary aplastic is occasional, fine-medium quartz. This is in contrast to Vessels 4 and 15, both classified as New River, which have subangular quartz as the primary aplastic and coarse or fine-medium quartz as the secondary aplastic.

Site 31CD968

The 83 non-residual sherds recovered during excavation were generally small, weighing 4.7 to 31.3 grams. The major treatments were

MULTICOMPONENT SITES IN THE SANDHILLS

fabric impressing (n=30; 335.5 grams) (Figure 6) followed by net impressing (n=18; 192.9 grams). Other surface treatments include 10 cord-marked (Figure 7), 10 scraped, 8 smoothed, and 1 smoothed fabric impressed sherd. This pattern of surface treatments is not unexpected for the region and represents ceramic types from the Early to Late Woodland period, including New River (n=21), Hanover (n=20), Cape Fear (n=8), and Yadkin (n=8).

The vessel analysis assemblage consisted of 61 of these sherds, all recovered from Stratum II (E-horizon). Of these, 80 percent were identified in the top 30 cmbs. After the initial efforts to cross-mend sherds, the sherds were sorted by Chris Espenshade into 10 vessel lots that accounted for 77.5 percent of the pulled sherds by weight (Table 2). The sample vessels are considered a very good representation of the assemblage. That said, four of the 10 sample vessels represent less than one percent of their parent vessel, five sample vessels represent one percent of their parent vessels, and one sample vessel is two percent of its parent. This pattern of a site containing only small bits of many vessels is common at Woodland sites in the region and also occurred at site 31CD967 (Patch et al. 2011; Patch and Espenshade 2019).

Four of the vessels included rim sections and no basal sherds were encountered. Patch and Espenshade (2011) have suggested that the relative frequencies of rim, body, and base sherds may reflect where in the seasonal round a site was situated relative to the pottery-production location/time. The hypothesis — which has not been validated — is that Woodland pots were generalized tools that moved through the entire seasonal round, and that the pots were not discarded upon first damage. Initial vessel damage is expected to involve the rim, with the damage trajectory moving from rim to body to base. When combined with the thin-section data that suggest a Coastal Plain source of clays, the vesselportion results may indicate site use not long after the rejuvenation of the pottery assemblage, possibly reflecting a seasonal foray into the Sandhills after some time in the Coastal Plain.

The vessel distribution at the site suggests two loci of Woodland activity (Figure 8). Vessels 1, 5, 6, and 7 occur in Block 6, with Vessel 5 also in Block 7. Vessels 2, 3, 4, 9, and 10 are focused on Blocks 3 and 4, with Vessel 8 present in Block 5 (Unit 23). There are no examples of vessels with sherds crossing from one cluster to another.
Vessel	% of vessel	Herbert & Feathers Type	New South Type	Surface Treatment	Residue
1	1	Yadkin Plain	Yadkin Plain	Smoothed	Meat, plants, and possibly tubers
2	1	Sand-tempered Scraped	Sand-tempered Scraped	Scraped	Meat, plants, and possibly tubers
3	2	New River Net Impressed	Hanover Net Impressed	Net impressed	Meat, plants, and fish
4	<1	New River Cord-marked	New River Cord-marked	Cord-marked	Meat, plants, and fish
5	1	Hanover II Fabric Impressed	Hanover II Fabric Impressed	Fabric impressed	Plants and meat
6	1	Hanover II Fabric Impressed	Hanover II Fabric Impressed	Fabric impressed	N/A
7	<1	Hanover II Fabric Impressed	Hanover II Fabric Impressed	Fabric impressed	N/A
8	1	Hanover II Fabric Impressed	Hanover II Fabric Impressed	Fabric impressed	Meat
9	<1	Hanover Fabric Impressed	Hanover Fabric Impressed	Smooth over fabric impressed	N/A
10	<1	Cape Fear Fabric Impressed	Cape Fear Fabric Impressed	Fabric impressed	N/A

Table 2. Summary of Vessels at 31CD968.

Patch and Espenshade (2019) have argued that tightly clustered vessels in the apparent absence of a notable topographic or hydrological feature suggest re-use within the span of a family memory. Rather than seeing a generalized scatter across the entire landform at site 31CD968, we see two distinct, non-overlapping foci, each represented by multiple vessels. The vessel distribution at site 31CD968 is suggestive of two separate logistical camps, each potentially revisited several times. There are no sample vessels for which the distribution crosses from one cluster to the other, as would be expected with a seasonal household locus.

The presence of two tight clusters is suggestive of two relatively short occupation spans. In examining the Block 3–5 cluster, a New River vessel implies an occupation somewhere in the span 1865–130 B.C. The Cape Fear Fabric Impressed vessel suggests an occupation between 300

MULTICOMPONENT SITES IN THE SANDHILLS



Figure 6. Photograph of Vessel 4 from 31CD968.



Figure 7. Photograph of Vessel 8 from 31CD968.



Figure 8. Sample Vessel Distribution at 31CD968.

B.C. and A.D. 300. There is not a good date range established for Hanover Net Impressed; indeed, the sorting tree of Herbert and Feathers (2015) does not allow for this type to exist at Fort Bragg. The single Hanover II Fabric Impressed vessel (another Hanover Fabric Impressed vessel could not be sorted to either I or II) suggests an occupation post-

MULTICOMPONENT SITES IN THE SANDHILLS

A.D. 1000. However, the difference between Hanover II and Hanover I fabric-impressed vessel rests solely on whether the wrap is hard or soft. A review of Herbert's assignments in Herbert and McReynolds (2008) and Herbert and Feathers (2015) failed to clarify the parameters Herbert used to distinguish between hard and soft wrap textiles. This is not meant to question Herbert's distinctions, rather to acknowledge that the present analyst may have misidentified hard wrap as soft. If the sample vessel assigned to Hanover II is actually Hanover I, the Block 3–5 cluster could represent a single component from somewhere 300–130 B.C.

There is a similar issue in the Block 6–7 cluster. Here there are vessels identified as Yadkin Plain (n=1, 400 B.C. to A.D. 400) and Hanover II (n=3, post-A.D. 1000). If the two Hanover II Fabric Impressed vessels should have instead been classified Hanover I, all the vessels from the Block 6–7 cluster could represent a single component from 300 B.C. to A.D. 300.

It is recognized that the identification of Hanover Fabric Impressed into varieties I or II is a problem. It is also recognized that there is a risk of a circular argument if the assignment is changed, thereby making the pottery types from suspected short-term occupations fit the expectations. Support for the contention that Hanover II has been misidentified by the present analyst is provided by similar results from the analysis of pottery from site 31CD967 (Stephens, Matternes, et al. 2021). At that site, 15 vessels shared a tight spatial distribution suggestive of a single component. The sample vessels at site 31CD967 included: one Deptford Check-Stamped; one Yadkin Cord-marked; one Hanover I Fabric Impressed; one Cape Fear Fabric Impressed; three New River Cordmarked; and three Hanover II Fabric Impressed. All of the vessels except the Hanover II examples could have co-occurred circa 300–130 B.C. There are two possible explanations:

1. At both loci of sites 31CD968 and 31CD967, there were occupations at circa 300–130 B.C., and then there were post-A.D.1000 occupations in the exact same locations at all three loci, or:

2. There is a problem with either the way the distinction between Hanover I and II has been defined or the way this particular analyst interpreted the distinction, and this led to the misattribution of a few vessels at each loci to Hanover II instead of Hanover I. If this problem indeed occurred and is corrected, the two loci at site 31CD968 and the

locus at site 31CD967 were all single component, and all originated somewhere in the span 300–130 B.C.

Absorbed Residues

The absorbed residue results from 31CD967 and 31CD968 are consistent indicating a similar use of ceramics at both sites. First, most of the analyzed sherds showed signatures for two or more subsistence resources (Table 3). This is contrary to the idea of specialized pots, and instead supports the idea of pots as generalized tools, which were used for a variety of dietary resources across the arc of the settlement movements. Previous studies of Woodland components in North Carolina have suggested that Woodland pots in the region were generalized tools (Patch and Espenshade 2019; Patch et al. 2011).

The second interesting point is the presence of five sherds at 31CD967 (56% of sherds analyzed) and two sherds at 31CD968 (33% of sherds analyzed) that yielded signatures of possible tuber processing among the other resource evidenced. Both of the study sites overlooked the headwaters of a small creek, a setting possibly conducive to the growth of cat-tails, groundnut, Indian turnips, arrowleaves, and yellow water lilly. Sandy upland soils would have been suited to the growth of greenbrier, which is common today in the area. All these plants produced tuberous roots known to have been used by Native Americans.

These two sites are the first Woodland assemblages in North Carolina to have yielded signatures indicating possible tuber processing. None of the 37 sherds analyzed from 31CD64, 31CD65, and 31CD871 (Patch et al. 2011) and none of the four sherds analyzed for 31GF466

Absorbed Residue Inference	31CD967	31CD968
Meat	0	1
Meat or fish	1	0
Plant or fish	2	0
Plant and meat	0	1
Meat, fish, and plant	0	2
Fish/shellfish and plant	1	0
Plant, meat, possible tubers	4	2
Plant, meat, fish, and possible tubers	1	0

Table 3. Absorbed Residue Results.

MULTICOMPONENT SITES IN THE SANDHILLS

(Patch and Espenshade 2019) yielded indications of tuber processing. The patterned positive and negative data suggest that the 31CD967 and 31CD968 results are due to on-site processing of tubers. In terms of explaining re-use of very specific locations over a short span, immobile resources such as a patch of tubers would have been attractive for seasonal revisit.

Summary and Interpretations

Sites 31CD967 and 31CD968 yielded diagnostic artifacts from both the Archaic and Woodland period. At both sites, it appears that a small group, possibly a single family, revisited the sites a dozen times, perhaps for only a few weeks for plant processing as part of seasonal rounds. This stop likely occurred relatively early in their seasonal round after they departed from the Coastal Plain.

The north lobe of site 31CD967 produced a low-frequency of diagnostic Archaic artifacts and a lack of vertical concentration of materials did not permit meaningful interpretation of Archaic site use episodes. The bulk of the identified site use episodes occurred during the Middle Woodland period. The majority of vessels identified represent a single component, most likely from some point in the span 300–130 B.C. The ceramic types identified within the block excavations include New River, Cape Fear, Yadkin, and Hanover (Hanover I/II) series. However, the Hanover typology series defined by Herbert et al. (2002) is problematic because of the lumping of temper attributes that determine a sherd is Hanover. Future research should include recording the shape, size, and density of clay/grog aplastics to refine the broad Hanover series.

Lithic artifacts made up the bulk of artifacts recovered at 31CD968, although few were temporally diagnostic and dated to the Middle Archaic period. Analysis of the lithic artifacts revealed all stages of lithic-reduction occurred on site. The vessel analysis suggests two relatively short occupations took place during the Woodland period at two separate clusters. At the Block 3–5 cluster, a New River vessel implies an occupation somewhere in the span 1865–130 B.C., a Cape Fear Fabric Impressed vessel suggests an occupation between 300 B.C. and A.D. 300, and a single Hanover II Fabric Impressed vessel suggests an occupation post-A.D. 1000. Additionally, this cluster contained a Hanover Fabric Impressed vessel that could not be sorted to either I or II.

The differentiation between Hanover II and Hanover I fabric-impressed vessel rests on whether the wrap is hard or soft. A review of Herbert and McReynolds (2008) and Herbert and Feathers (2015) failed to clarify the parameters to distinguish between hard and soft wrap textiles and the present analysis may have misidentified hard wrap as soft. If the sample vessel assigned to Hanover II is actually Hanover I, the Block 3–5 cluster could represent a single component from somewhere 300–130 B.C.

The second cluster, Block 6–7 cluster contained vessels identified as Yadkin Plain (n=1, 400 B.C. to A.D. 400) and Hanover II (n=3, post-A.D. 1000). If the two Hanover II Fabric Impressed vessels should have instead been classified as Hanover I, it is also possible that all the vessels from the Block 6–7 cluster could represent a single component from 300 B.C. to A.D. 300.

Archaic and Woodland period sites in the Sandhills continue to pose a challenge for archaeologists, especially Woodland sites that represent short-term limited occupations compared to hamlets or villages found in other regions. Sites like 31CD967 and 31CD968 typically represent brief stops along seasonal rounds with low-intensity activity areas. As such, applying current Woodland models for more permanent habitations to explain subsistence/settlement systems in the Sandhills can be problematic. Further studies on material sourcing, such as clay and lithic raw materials, along with botanical analysis, and clarifying ceramic variety sorting criteria can yield information on overall subsistence and settlement patterns of the region.

Acknowledgments

Funding for the data recovery investigations was provided by NCDOT. Paul Mohler of NCDOT managed all aspects of the project. Dr. Michael Smith completed the thin-section analysis and Dr. Nora Reber conducted the absorbed residue analysis. We thank Paul Mohler for reviewing an earlier draft of this artifact and providing helpful comments. The writing of this article was supported by New South Associates, Inc.

MULTICOMPONENT SITES IN THE SANDHILLS

References Cited

Andrefsky, William

1998 *Lithics: Macroscopic Approaches to Analysis.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, United Kingdom.

Cotterell, Brian, and Johan Kamminga

1987 The Formation of Flakes. *American Antiquity* 52(4):675–708.

- Dukeman, Casey
 - 2002 An Analysis of Analysts: A Critical Assessment of the Replicability of Debitage Attributes. MA Thesis, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming.

Gunn, Joel D., and Erica E. Sanborn

2005 Dimensions of Fall Line Site Function: Surveying and Testing the West Fayetteville Outer Loop. New South Associates Technical Report. New South Associates, Inc., Stone Mountain, Georgia.

Hall, Christopher, and Mary Lou Larson

2004 Aggregate Analysis in Chipped Stone. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Herbert, Joseph M.

2011 Recent Woodland Archaeology of Coastal North Carolina. In *The Archaeology of North Carolina: Three Archaeological Symposia*, p.4.1–4.58. 30. North Carolina Archaeological Council.

Herbert, Joseph M., and James Feathers

2015 Luminescence Dating Sandhill Ceramics: A Review. North Carolina Archaeology 64:68–103.

Herbert, Joseph M., James K. Feathers, and Ann S. Cordell

2002 Building Chronologies with Thermoluminescence Dating: A Case Study from the Carolina Sandhills. *Southeastern Archaeology* 21(1):92–108.

Herbert, Joseph M., and Theresa E. McReynolds

2008 *Woodland Pottery Sourcing in the Carolina Sandhills*. Research Laboratories of Anthropology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Odell, George H.

2003 *Lithic Analysis*. Springer Science and Business Media, New York, New York.

Patch, Shawn M., and Christopher T. Espenshade

2019 Woodland Pottery Vessels from Site 31GF466: Classification and Interpretation. *North Carolina Archaeology* 68:1–35.

Patch, Shawn M., Christopher T. Espenshade, Keith C. Seramur, and Leslie Branch-Raymer

2011 Identifying Hunter-Gatherer Activity Areas in the North Carolina Sandhills: Data Recovery Excavations at Sites 31CD64, 31CD65, and 31CD871. Prepared for North Carolina Department of Transportation, Raleigh. New South Associates, Inc., Stone Mountain, Georgia.

Stephens, Sarah, Christopher T. Espenshade, and Keith C. Seramur 2021 Phase III Archaeological Data Recovery of Site 31CD968 (Scotts 10 Sherds Site), Cumberland County, North Carolina. New South Associates, Inc, Stone Mountain, Georgia.

Stephens, Sarah, Hugh B. Matternes, Paige Dobbins, Christopher Espenshade, and Keith C. Seramur

2021 Phase III Archaeological Data Recovery of Site 31CD967 (Chris Chaney 1907 Site), Cumberland County, North Carolina. New South Associates, Inc., Stone Mountain, Georgia.

Steponaitis, Vincas P., Jeffrey D. Irwin, Theresa E. McReynolds, and Christopher R. Moore

2006 *Stone Quarries and Sourcing in the Carolina Slate Belt.* Research Report No. 25, Research Laboratories of Archaeology. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Williams, Justin P.

2010 Debitage Attribute Replicability. Paper presented at the 67th Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference Lexington, Kentucky.

ARCHAEOLOGY OF A NINETEENTH CENTURY PIEDMONT FARMSTEAD: A CASE STUDY AT THE WESTMORELAND-SNOW FARMSTEAD (31FY1053), FORSYTH COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA

by

Samantha Taylor, Sherry Teal, and Shawn M. Patch

Abstract

There has not been a great deal of archaeological work on yeoman farmsteads in the Piedmont region of North Carolina. Excavations at the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead have contributed to this field by broadening the understanding of how the Piedmont region of North Carolina compares to that of South Carolina. Additionally, work at site 31FY1053 has provided insight into the relation between Moravians and non-Moravians in the nineteenth century and how that may or may not be reflected in the archaeological record. The Westmoreland and Snow families are both Moravian and Methodist, but their farmstead is analogous with non-Moravian farmsteads from the same period.

Site 31FY1053 (The Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead) was initially recorded in 1998 as part of an archaeological assessment for the North Carolina Department of Transportation's (NCDOT) proposed Winston-Salem Northern Beltway in Forsyth County, North Carolina (Abbott et al. 1999) (Figure 1). Abbott and his associates (1999) identified the site as the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead, an early nineteenth through middle twentieth century farmstead complex located in the Wachovia Tract. This determination was based on standing structures, census data, historic imagery, and word of mouth.

In 2019, Taylor et al. (2020) conducted intensive data recovery investigations for NCDOT to mitigate adverse effects from road construction. The investigations were multidisciplinary and included metal detection, ground-penetrating radar survey, shovel testing, large block excavation, ethnobotanical and faunal analysis, mean ceramic

dating, ceramic cost indexing, and oral history. The investigations yielded numerous datasets including abundant artifacts, features, ethnobotanical samples, and ground-penetrating radar slice maps. Taylor et al. (2020) analyzed the datasets in different levels beginning with the overall site, then individual blocks, and then specific features.

The goal was to identify temporally and spatially distinct archaeological deposits, identify refuse disposal and subsistence patterns, establish if the occupants belonged to the Moravian Church, and to determine the farmsteads association with the broader Wachovia and Daisy Station communities.

Background History

The Moravian Church, often referred to as Unitas Fratrum or the Unity of the Brethren, was one of the first religious organizations to incorporate large-scale missionary movements that sent lay people as missionaries (Vogt 2006:14). Moravians first came to North America in the 1730s settling in Pennsylvania, where the communities of Nazareth and Bethlehem were established in 1741 (The Moravian Church 2020:1).

In 1753 the Church purchased nearly 100,000 acres of land from the Earl of Granville in what would become Forsyth County, North Carolina. This land became known as Wachovia, a reference to the Moravian patron Nicholas Zinzendorf's estate Wachau. The first Moravian settlement, Bethabara, was established in the Wachovia tract in 1753 (Hamilton 1966:54). Six years later a second settlement, Bethania was established four miles northwest of Bethabara. In 1766, the Church constructed a central settlement that became known as Salem. Following the construction of Salem, Moravians began moving from Bethabara and Bethania to the central town.

By the mid-nineteenth century, the Moravian Church began selling land of the Wachovia Tract to men outside the church. This change in land holders, coupled with transportation improvements across the state, such as the North Carolina Railroad (NCRR), led to substantial population growth in Forsyth County. Moravian culture was able to flourish along the North Carolina frontier, resulting in unique social, cultural, and economic traditions. The Moravian Church had direct control over all civic and commercial activities in the Moravian settlements in Forsyth County until 1856 (Thorp 1986:28).



Figure 1. Map showing the location of the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead (31FY1053).

A loosening of control became evident with a land purchase by Martin Westmoreland from the Moravian Church. At present, the Westmorland Farmstead is on Lot 28, Block 3008 of the current Forsyth

County Tax Map. This lot measures approximately 20 acres in size and is subdivided into six lots (Forsyth County, North Carolina 2019). The data recovery primarily focused on Lot 28B, in which the log house, addition, and concrete foundation were located. Prior to the Westmoreland's ownership, the land was part of the Wachovia Tract (Table 1).

Prior to 1862, when Martin and Nancy (Fulp) Westmoreland purchased the land, John F. Linville farmed the encompassing Lot 28. Though Linville farmed the property, it was owned and eventually sold by the Moravian Church in 1862. The deed books of the Moravian Archives show that Martin Westmoreland had acquired two lots of 15 and 19.5 acres in 1862 (The Moravian Church 1877; U.S. Census Bureau 1860a:6). The Westmoreland family were Methodists that came from Virginia in the late 1700s after the Revolutionary War and settled in what was Stokes County. In 1850, the census lists Martin Westmoreland as living in Sauratown, Stokes County, North Carolina. He was 32 at the time, living with his 21-year-old wife, Nancy, who had been raised in the Moravian Church, and their two children John, 5, and Mary, 3 (U.S. Census Bureau 1860a).

By the early 1860s, the family looked southeast for a farm and found a seller in the Moravian Church. In 1862, Lot 28 was purchased from the Moravian Church by Martin and Nancy Westmoreland. The 1870 census lists Martin Westmoreland, 52, as the owner of 75 acres of improved land and 78 acres of woodland. His wife Nancy, 41, their oldest son John W. Westmoreland, and six younger children between the ages of 15 and 1 are listed as occupying the land. The oldest three children labored on the farm. Martin's farm was valued at 500 dollars and his personal estate at 150 dollars (U.S. Census Bureau 1870).

In 1873 Martin Westmoreland died, leaving the farm to Nancy. During this time, she continued to farm the land, living on the property with her five youngest children. The 1880 U.S. Census lists Nancy's sons Peter and Tandy as the primary farm laborers, with Nancy as the head of the family. The census also indicated that Nancy owned 55 acres of tilled land, seven acres of meadows/pastures, and 28 acres of woodland. The prior year the Westmoreland family grew corn, oats, wheat, apples, and peaches. The Westmoreland's also grew four acres of tobacco, produced "small numbers" of potatoes and sweet potatoes, collected 20 pounds of honey, 55 gallons of molasses, and 100 pounds of butter. The family owned two milk cows, three other cows, two horses, three sheep, five

Owner	Year Acquired	Land Use	Notes
The Moravian Church	1750	Agricultural	Allotted to John F. Linville at an unknown date
Martin and Nancy Westmoreland	1862	Domestic/Agricultural	
Nancy Westmoreland	1873	Domestic/Agricultural	
John W. Westmoreland	1886	Domestic/Agricultural	Farmstead was mortgaged during this ownership
Cynthia E. Snow	1903	Domestic/Agricultural	Farm no longer mortgaged
Walter E. Snow	1964	Agricultural	Farm worked until 1977; house not lived in

Table 1. Land Ownership of Lot 28B of the Westmoreland/Snow Farmstead Prior to Abandonment.

swine, and 22 chickens and occasionally hired outside help (U.S. Census Bureau 1880).

Nancy Westmoreland died in either 1884 or 1885, leaving her estate to be administered by her eldest son, John Wiley Westmoreland. John, often referred to as J.W., purchased 96 acres of the land from his siblings in 1886. The 1900 census indicates J.W., 54, was a merchant and widower. He lived with his son-in-law Edwin Snow, 23, his daughter Cynthia E Snow, 23, his sons Thomas, 22, and Charles, 13, and two of his maternal aunts. Edwin and Thomas were listed on the census as farm laborers. According to his obituary, J.W. owned a store at Daisy Station, a whistle stop located near the Westmoreland-Snow Farm at the intersection of Davis Road and Old Walkertown Road, for over thirty years (Winston-Salem Journal 1920:18).

In 1903, J.W. sold Lot 28 to Cynthia E. Snow for \$15. The 1920 census lists Cynthia E. Snow as Emily Snow, 45, wife of Edwin Snow, 44, who is listed as a farmer who operated a "general farm." At this time, the Snows had seven children between the ages of 18 and 6 (U.S. Census Bureau 1920) (Figure 2–3). The 1940 census suggests that Cynthia's husband, Edwin, had a source of income outside of the farmstead, though the record does not list what this source was. The census record from this



Figure 2. Emily and Edwin Snow (seated) with their children standing behind in order from oldest to youngest (left to right: James (Jim) Snow, Margaret Dean (Snow), Martin (Bub) Snow, Roy Snow, Walter (Walt) Snow, Kessie Snow, and Alvin Snow (Courtesy of Loretta Snow).



Figure 3. Left to right: unidentified male, Thomas (Fred) Westmoreland, Emily Snow (Westmoreland), Webster Westmoreland, and Moses Westmoreland (Courtesy of Loretta Snow).

year also lists an African American man named Doc Gains as a hired hand. Edwin died in 1946 (U.S. Census Bureau 1940). A 1948 aerial shows the farm still worked with strips of crop evident, but some fields are fallow and returning to sapling trees. Cynthia Emily Westmoreland-Snow died in 1964, conveying the land to be split between her children. Lot 28B, which contained the farmhouse, went to Walter E. Snow and his wife. According to descendant Loretta Snow (2020), Walter continued to farm the land until 1964 but did not reside on the property.

Farmstead Archaeology in the Piedmont Region

Few data recoveries have been conducted at nineteenth century farmsteads in the North Carolina Piedmont, despite the abundance of such sites. Due to an absence of comparable archaeological data in North Carolina it is important to also consider farmsteads in the Piedmont region of nearby states such as Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia. Substantial archaeological investigations have been completed and reported on the Finch Farm (38SP101), the Thomas B. Clinkscales Farm (38AB221), and the Lick Creek Farmstead (31DH708) (Drucker et al. 1983; Joseph et al. 1991; Lewis et al. 2008). These studies have led to the identification of settlement characteristics for upland southern farmsteads: (1) random clustering of domestic and service occupations, often on hilltops or prominent points on the farmstead, (2) the farmstead will have individual buildings with specialized functions, (3) the dwelling, well, privy, storage shed, and chicken house are placed closely together, (4) male activity areas, such as barns, large animal pens, and equipment sheds, are placed further from the dwelling area, (5) the house faces the path of human approach and is likely shaded by trees, and (6) the fields are arranged to follow natural topography with the farmstead situated to better access the fields (Joseph et al. 1991). Regarding material culture at these sites, the few personal items recovered at the sites were largely undiagnostic and provided little information about socioeconomic status other than a rough estimation of middle to low socioeconomic status (Drucker et al. 1983).

Excavation of Site 31FY1053

The site is located on a ridge toe along a first order tributary of Mill Creek. It is characterized by mixed hardwood forest that has been nearly untouched by surrounding residential and commercial zones. Stratigraphy consisted of an A Horizon approximately ten centimeters thick, followed by an AB Horizon that is ten centimeters thick, and then

a B Horizon. This soil profile varied based on the extent of cultural disturbance across the site.

During the data recovery, the stone foundation of the farmhouse and a brick well were identified at the site. Several outbuildings were located near the residence, including a smokehouse, a privy, and a corn crib. Other ancillary buildings, such as a concrete barn foundation and two log barn foundations, were identified within 50 meters of the residence. Over 35 meters south of the log house, a great distance from the historic road, was a modern trash midden in a shallow gully.

Excavations included 57.25 square meters in five discrete blocks that recovered 15,867 artifacts (Figure 4). When categorized using Orser's Functional Groups, New South recorded 37 agricultural/labor artifacts, 109 clothing artifacts, 5,504 foodways artifacts, 9,137 household/structural artifacts, 70 personal artifacts, 942 other artifacts, and 68 artifacts to which Orser's Functional Groups could not be applied (Orser et al. 1987).

Thirty-one features were identified at the site including the footprints of several buildings. Taylor et al. (2020) identified a log cabin, a frame extension, a brick porch, a corn crib, a multi-crib barn, a smokehouse, a brick well, a privy, a packhouse, and a tobacco barn at the site.

The Westmoreland-Snow Farmhouse

Excavation was limited to Lot 28B, in which the farmhouse, addition, and concrete foundation were located, as it was the only property owned by the North Carolina Department of Transportation at the time of the data recovery. As a result, the domestic nucleus of the Westmoreland-Snow farmstead was the most likely to yield diagnostic artifacts. Previous accounts of the site suggested that the stone foundation at its center belonged to the farmhouse.

The farmhouse was still extant at the time of the 1998 survey. The 1999 report described the house as a 1.5 story, single-room log house with a two-story frame addition attached to the south elevation of the log house (Figure 5). A brick fireplace and chimney were located on the southern elevation between the log house and the frame addition. The siding on the log house was attached with cut nails, suggesting it was



Source: NC Orthoimagery Program, 2018

Figure 4. Map showing the distribution of excavation units and blocks at 31FY1053.

built sometime between 1830 and 1855. As a result, Abbott hypothesized that the log house was built during the period in which the Moravian Church owned the land (Abbott et al. 1999; Orser et al. 1987). From all accounts the log house was a standard Piedmont log house.



Figure 5. Photographs showing features of standing structures in 1998.

The frame addition had collapsed eastward prior to the 1998 survey though most of the structural debris was still in situ. The siding, the debris, and absence of wire nails suggested the frame addition predated 1855 but was built sometime after the log house.

In 2019, the only evidence left of the farmhouse was the stone foundation of the log house and the brick foundation of the frame addition (Figures 6–8). The distribution of cut nails to wire nails in the interior of the log house and frame addition suggests both structures were built prior to 1890, when wire nails entered mass production (Abbott et al. 1999; Nelson 1968). Though Moravian farmer John F. Linville is listed as occupying the land prior to 1862, there is no evidence indicating that the log house was built prior to the Westmoreland's occupation of the site.

The 2019 survey determined that the log house was not built in typical Moravian style and that the reliance on cut nails could be consistent with construction at the time that the Westmorelands purchased the land. Additionally, the sale deed for the property was for land, not land and improvements, and the price is consistent with a raw land sale (Forsyth County Deed Books 2019). Lastly, despite national





Figure 7. Remains of stone foundation.

trends away from log construction after the Civil War, log construction continued to be widely used in rural areas where milled lumber was cost prohibitive relative to logs (McAlester 2013).

Landscape Analysis

Archaeology at the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead also focused on landscape analysis, or the way in which the Westmoreland and Snow families consciously and subconsciously altered the landscape to better fit their needs. The Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead follows many of the settlement characteristics listed by Joseph (1991). Buildings at the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead each served a unique function, with discernable domestic and agricultural spheres. A 1960 historic aerial picturing the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead depicted the property as it was organized prior to Cynthia Snow's death in 1964. This imagery displays a succinct domestic area and a larger, more disjointed agricultural area. The 1960 aerial indicates that the farmhouse was surrounded by agricultural fields to the north, west, and east. The area directly surrounding the house and to the south of it are lightly wooded (Figure 9).

The loosely wooded area to the south of and immediately surrounding the main dwelling can be considered the domestic sphere of the Westmoreland-Snow farmstead. This area includes the house, frame addition, well, wash area, privy, smokehouse, and surface trash midden. Household activities such as cooking, and cleaning would occur in this area. Any unidentified privies, springhouse, chicken coops, root cellars, and gardens were likely located within this zone. These activities would necessitate shade, thus rationalizing the light foliage visible around the dwelling in the 1960 historic aerial.

Agricultural structures, such as the corn crib and barns, are located along the edges of the agricultural fields. Apart from the tobacco barn (Feature 32), most of the agricultural structures are located along the historic dirt road that approached from the east. Building the barn, shed, and corn crib along the path of human approach was intentional as it allowed for the separation of domestic and agricultural spheres while also facilitating the transportation of goods and livestock into town.

Another approach to better understanding how the Westmoreland and Snow families altered the landscape is to analyze refuse disposal. The Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead follows the Piedmont Refuse Disposal Pattern (PRDP) which is characterized by refuse disposal downslope from dwellings in features such as gullies and streambeds. Often, sites exhibiting this patterning contain large quantities of architectural materials near the main dwelling and few personal items and kitchen items such as ceramics (Joseph et al. 1991). The 2019 excavations at the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead were characterized by a paucity of ceramics and personal items. One hundred and eight ceramics and 37 personal items were identified at the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead, comprising less than two percent of the entire assemblage. On the other hand, architectural materials dominated the assemblage, comprising over 45 percent of the entire assemblage. The low incidence of ceramics and personal items near the house suggests that the occupants were consciously removing waste from the vicinity of the house.

The surface trash midden (Feature 31) located in a gully downslope from the house further supports PRDP at the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead. Instead of disposing of refuse in the immediate vicinity of the



Figure 8. Planview photo of a portion of *in situ* brick feature.

house, the Westmoreland and Snow families selected a nearby gully to dispose of their trash. This area was chosen due to its topography, as it was not viable for construction or cultivation. Refuse disposal in land of low utility for other uses is a defining attribute of the PRDP (Joseph and Reed 1997; Joseph et al. 1991). The gully was located approximately



Figure 9. A 1960 historic aerial photo showing the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead.

21.8 yards (20 meters) south of the house in a lightly wooded area, far enough from the house and agricultural fields that it was not visually disruptive. The purpose of this entire process was to keep the domestic area of the property clean.

The trash midden was almost exclusively glass containers, as is characteristic of many sites exhibiting PRDP. This was due to several factors (Figure 10). First, the mass-production of glass in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century resulted in glass containers replacing traditional storage containers such as ceramics. Due to the mass production of glass containers, it became unnecessary to reuse them and thus glass was disposed of more regularly and in higher quantities than ceramics. Because glass was difficult to melt down (i.e., not suited for burn-barrel disposal), and because broken glass was a safety hazard, many people resorted to disposing it away from the household core (Joseph and Reed 1997).

The Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead shares characteristics with many early twentieth century farmsteads in the Southeast, especially concerning landscape use. The Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead represents a small-scale farming operation that was family owned and operated. Nancy Westmoreland lived on the property for over 20 years from the 1860s or 1870s until her death in 1884. During this time the farmstead underwent a period of growth and technological change. The need for larger machinery is reflected in the construction of the large double-crib barn in last quarter of the nineteenth century (Feature 28). The construction of this large structure indicated a growing need for storage space for equipment, animals, products, and large machinery. These changes do not correlate with financial success but instead reflect larger trends such as the expansion of farming that was brought on by railroad expansion and the Homestead Act during the last half of the nineteenth century (Dimitri et al. 2005; Lilly 2019).

Subsistence and Socioeconomic Patterns

Identifying subsistence patterns and socioeconomic factors is integral to understanding the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead, and by extension, other North Carolina Piedmont farmsteads that operated during the early twentieth century. Census records suggest that the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead primarily operated on a subsistence level, providing enough for the entire family to meet their survival needs

(U.S. Census Bureau 1860b). Without a sizeable faunal or botanical assemblage, it is difficult to trace how subsistence patterns changed at the site archaeologically. However, historic records, oral history, and aerial imagery provides supplementary data about the nature of agricultural activity at the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead.

The 1880 census record is currently the most detailed census record available that includes information about the inhabitants of the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead. During this period, Nancy and five of her children were the occupants of the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead. The 1880 census record indicates that Nancy Westmoreland grew 10 acres of corn, 10 acres of oats, 10 acres of wheat, 100 apple trees, 150 peach trees, and four acres of tobacco (U.S. Census Bureau 1880). Additionally, the family cut wood, collected honey, and made molasses and butter. They owned two milk cows, three other cows, two horses, three sheep, five swine, and 22 chickens. Additionally, the farm produced 55 gallons of sorghum molasses and 100 pounds of butter (U.S. Census Bureau 1880).

Corn, oats, wheat, apples, peaches, meat, milk, and eggs were likely primarily produced for subsistence, although any excess could have been sold locally. Additionally, the presence of zinc canning jars throughout the site indicates that the Westmoreland's preserved food for later use. However, the cultivation of cash crops such as tobacco and the amount of sorghum molasses is indicative of small-scale commercial agriculture. Whereas some tobacco may have been consumed by the Westmoreland family, there is minimal archaeological evidence of tobacco use near the dwelling. Minimal commercial production at the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead is further supported by the 1900 census record that listed John W. Westmoreland, who resided on the property, as the owner of the nearby Westmoreland General Store (U.S. Census Bureau 1900). John's ownership of Lot 28 was comparatively brief, only operating the farm from 1886 to 1903 when his daughter Cynthia purchased the farmstead. However, it is likely that during his tenure as the owner of the Westmoreland General Store, John W. Westmoreland sold products from the family farmstead.

The archaeology at the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead was somewhat effective in determining socioeconomic status and involvement in the local economy. The Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead operated during the late nineteenth century and throughout the first half of the twentieth century. The late nineteenth century was a period of

substantial change for farmers. As commercial production became the norm, there were relatively few small-scale family-run farms remaining. The expansion of mechanized farming increased the capital needs of the farmer. This period was also marked by increased consumerism and homogenization of material culture. Socioeconomic-based differences in material culture were still present, but to a lesser extent as poorer families were able to purchase popular goods (Groover 2008).

The Westmoreland Family was no exception to this trend; popular and accessible goods such as sponge-decorated whiteware, porcelain buttons, metal cutlery, and edged whiteware were recovered from the site. Personal items including glass jewelry, brass jewelry, a perfume jar, a brass ring, and several cosmetic jars are indicative of the Westmorelands involvement in the growing material economy (Figure 11). The presence of these items does not indicate that the family was wealthy or prosperous; instead, it suggests that the Westmoreland family was able to produce enough goods to survive while also making enough money on the side to purchase some luxury items.

The artifact assemblage from the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead is similar to that of other nineteenth and twentieth century farmsteads such as the Clinkscales Site (38AB221) in Abbeville County, South Carolina and the Finch Farm in Spartanburg County, South Carolina (Joseph et al. 1991). Both the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead and the Clinkscales Farm exhibited evidence of offsite refuse disposal, containing few ceramics and personal artifacts (Drucker et al. 1983). What few personal items were recovered at both sites were largely undiagnostic and provided little information about socioeconomic status other than a rough estimation of middle to low socioeconomic status (Drucker et al. 1983). Unlike the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead and the Clinkscales Farm, the Finch Farm included a larger, prominent household and several tenant occupants. This farmstead exhibited several different patterns of refuse disposal and had a significantly larger ceramic assemblage than either of the aforementioned sites. However, both the main house and tenant house at the Finch Farm had similar ceramic-cost index values. This suggests that material culture between yeoman farmsteads and tenant farmers barely differed (Joseph et al. 1991).

Unlike many small-scale farms in during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, by 1903 the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead was no longer mortgaged and the Snow family owned the land they



Figure 10. Selected glass artifacts from 31FY1053.

farmed (Groover 2008). When compared to sharecroppers and tenant farmers, yeoman farmers were not burdened with land-related debt and were able to have complete control over their production and yields. There is often little difference between assemblages belonging to tenants and yeoman farmers during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Despite being impoverished and riddled with debt, white tenant farmers



Figure 11. Buttons recovered from 31FY1053.

and sharecroppers were generally able to afford similar goods to those found in the houses of yeoman farmers. The affordability of these products was due to standardization and mass-production (Groover 2008). It is imperative to note that the 1880 census indicates that the Westmorelands were even able to hire outside help for two weeks, paying the laborers ten dollars (U.S. Census Bureau 1880). Hiring

outside help is indicative of not only a sizeable yield, but also that the Westmorelands had enough money to pay for temporary labor.

The 1999 architectural account of the Westmoreland's house also denotes moderate success and socioeconomic status (Abbott et al. 1999). The clapboard covering the log construction of the original structure is representative of an attempt to demonstrate social status, as log construction became considered outdated by the end of the nineteenth century (Bishir and Southern 2003; Groover 2008). Contemporary with the clapboard siding, the construction of the frame addition also suggests modest success in the early years of the farm's operation. This structure nearly tripled the amount of living space for the family, allowing for room specialization and the accumulation of more material culture. The operation of the Westmoreland General Store strengthens the argument that the Westmoreland family saw moderate material wealth, as the store likely bolstered the family's income.

During the interview, Loretta Snow indicated that cultivating and preparing tobacco for purchase was a generational practice passed down among the Snow and Westmoreland men (Snow 2020). Each of the male children helped their father (or in Edwin's case father-in-law) farm the land from the time they were adolescents. Loretta indicates that Edwin also had tobacco barns elsewhere in Middle Fork, suggesting that he cultivated tobacco for profit in addition to personal use. The presence of a packhouse on the farmstead suggests that Edwin and his descendants were able to prepare tobacco onsite for distribution (Snow 2020).

Like many other small farmsteads in the southeast, the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead represents a small yeoman farmstead that saw moderate financial success. Throughout their occupation of the site, the Westmoreland and Snow families participated in the market economy by both buying material goods and selling agricultural products. The occupants were able to produce enough product to survive, while also making a profit by growing and selling cash crops such as tobacco and occasionally hiring temporary laborers (U.S. Census Bureau 1860b). This duality of self-sufficiency and market purchases is represented by the many gallons of sorghum syrup produced at the farm and the recovery of bottles from store-bought maple syrup (Figure 10a). The Westmoreland and Snow family's socioeconomic status is critical to understanding the farmstead's role in the local community and their contribution to the market economy.

Discussion and Conclusion

The archaeological and historical work at site 31FY1053 yielded interesting information about the lives of yeoman farmers in the North Carolina Piedmont region during the late nineteenth century and first half of the twentieth century. They grew crops and raised livestock to subsist, while also selling excess product and cash crops to bolster their income. They processed and stored foods by smoking meats and canning preserves. Nearly a decade after they purchased the property, the Westmoreland's improved their quality of life by building a frame addition to their home and a large double crib barn. They relied on the local market to purchase various goods such as cleaners, perfume, food, and ceramic tableware. The Westmoreland and Snow family's relation to the nearby Moravian community is complicated because the family included both Moravians and non-members. However, archaeological evidence was not able to contribute to the current understanding of the Westmoreland and Snow's relation to the Moravian community. Instead, the interview with descendant Loretta Snow, revealed that the Snow family was both Moravian and Methodist (Snow 2020). Not enough faunal remains were recovered to determine diet and subsistence patterns beyond the items listed in the 1880 census (U.S. Census Bureau 1860b).

In many ways, the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead (31FY1053) is typical of yeoman farmstead sites in the southeast. The Westmoreland family intentionally altered the landscape to suit their needs. They grouped structures by purpose, with buildings related to household activities located close to the house and agricultural buildings located further from the house bordering the crop fields. Site 31FY1053 displayed evidence of the Piedmont Refuse Disposal Pattern (PRDP). As the name suggests, this pattern is common among farmsteads in the Piedmont regions.

There has not been a great deal of archaeological work on yeoman farmsteads in the Piedmont region of North Carolina. Excavations at the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead have contributed to this field by broadening the understanding of how the Piedmont region of North Carolina compares to that of South Carolina. Additionally, work at site 31FY1053 has provided insight into the relation between Moravians and non-Moravians in the nineteenth century and how that may or may not be reflected in the archaeological record. The Westmoreland and Snow

families are both Moravian and Methodist, but their farmstead is analogous with non-Moravian farmsteads from the same period.

Acknowledgments

Funding for the data recovery investigations was provided by NCDOT. Caleb Smith of NCDOT managed all aspects of the project. We also thank Westmoreland descendant Loretta Snow and Forsyth County historian Fam Brownlee for their contributions to the oral history portion of this project and any guidance they provided. We would like to thank the Forsyth County Public Library, North Carolina Office of State Archaeology, and the Moravian Archives for their cooperation and assistance. We thank Chris Espenshade for reviewing an earlier draft of this paper and providing helpful comments. The writing of this paper was supported by New South Associates, Inc.

References Cited

Abbott, Lawrence E., Lisa O'Steen, Natalie Adams, Denise Messick, and Erica Sanborn

1999 Winston-Salem Northern Beltway Project (Eastern Section): An Intensive Archaeological Survey of the Preferred Alternative within the Muddy Creek Drainage Basin, Forsyth County, North Carolina, NCDOT TIP U-2579. New South Associates, Inc, Stone Mountain, Georgia.

Bishir, Catherine W., and Michael T. Southern

2003 *A Guide to the Historic Architecture of Piedmont North Carolina*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Dimitri, Carolyn, Anne Effland, and Neilson Conklin 2005 The Twentieth Century Transformation of U.S. Agriculture and Farm Policy. Economic Information Bulletin. United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Drucker, Lesley M., Woody C. Meiszner, and James B. Legg 1983 The Banister Allen Plantation and Thomas B. Clinkscale Farm: Data Recovery in the Richland B. Russell Multiple Resource Area, Abbeville County, South Carolina. Russell Papers. Carolina Archaeological Services, Inc., Columbia, SC.

Forsyth County Deed Books

2019 Land Records on File From 1849 to the Present. Unpublished Deed Book. Forsyth County Hall of Justice, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Forsyth County, North Carolina

2019 Detailed property Information for Tax Parcel in Forsyth County, North Carolina. Forsyth County, North Carolina, Forsyth County, North Carolina.

Groover, Mark D.

2008 The Archaeology of North American Farmsteads: An American Experience in Archaeological Perspective. University Press of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Hamilton, Kenneth G.

Joseph, J. W., and Mary Beth Reed

1997 "We Were Just Dirt Farmers": The Archaeology of Piedmont Farmstead Landscapes. In *Carolina's Historical Landscapes: Archaeological Perspectives*, edited by Linda F. Stine, Martha A. Zierden, Lesley M. Drucker, and Christopher Judge. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville, Tennessee.

Joseph, J.W., Mary Beth Reed, and Charles Cantley

1991 Agrarian Life, Romantic Death: Archaeological and Historical Testing and Data Recovery for the I-85 Northern Alternative, Spartanburg, South Carolina. New South Associates, Inc., Stone Mountain, Georgia.

Lewis, C. Thomas, III, Ramie A. Gougeon, Jeanette Knowles, and LeeAnne J. Wendt

2008 A Phase II Cultural-Resources Survey and Evaluation of Lick Creek Farmstead (31DH708) and Cemetery (31DH709), Durham County, North Carolina. Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Lilly, J. Paul

2019 Agricultural History of North Carolina. North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

¹⁹⁶⁶ Salem in Wachovia: An Example of Moravian Colonizing Genius. Transactions of the Moravian Historical Society 21(1):53–75.

McAlester, Virginia Savage

2013 *A Field Guide to American Houses*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, New York.

Nelson, Lee H.

1968 *Technical Leaflet No. 15* 24(11). American Association for State and Local History, Nashville, Tennessee.

Orser, Charles E. Jr., Annette M. Nedola, and James L. Roark

1987 Exploring the Rustic Life: Multidisciplinary Research at Millwood Plantation, A Large Piedmont Plantation in Abbeville County, South Carolina, and Elbert County, Georgia. Report available from Mid-American Research Center, Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

Snow, Loretta

2020 Interview with Loretta Snow Concerning the Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead Interview by Sherry Teal.

Taylor, Samantha, Sarah Lowry, John Kimes, and Sherry Teal 2020 Phase III Archaeological Data Recovery of Site 31FY1053** The Westmoreland-Snow Farmstead, 1860–1964. New South Associates, Inc, Stone Mountain, Georgia.

The Moravian Church

- 1877 List of Deeds of Town Lots in Salem and Winston, North Carolina, 1813–1877. Vol. 6. The Moravian Church, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.
- 2020 *A Brief History of the Moravian Church*. The Moravian Church.

Thorp, Daniel B.

1986 Assimilation in North Carolina's Moravian Community. *The Journal of Southern History* 52(1):19–42.

U.S. Census Bureau

- 1860a Population Schedules and Agricultural Schedules for Forsyth County, North Carolina for 1860. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.
- 1860b Population Schedules and Agricultural Schedules for Shelby County, Indiana 1860. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Shelby, Indiana.

- 1870 Population Schedules and Agricultural Schedules for Forsyth County, North Carolina, for 1870. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.
- 1880 Population Schedules and Agricultural Schedules for Forsyth County, North Carolina for 1880. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.
- 1900 Population Schedules and Agricultural Schedules for Forsyth County, North Carolina, for 1900. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.
- 1920 Population Schedules and Agricultural Schedules for Forsyth County, North Carolina, for 1920. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.
- 1940 Population Schedules and Agricultural Schedules for Forsyth County, North Carolina, for 1940. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Vogt, Peter

2006 "Everywhere at Home:" The Eighteenth-Century Moravian Movement as a Transatlantic Religious Community. *Journal of Moravian History* Fall 2006(1):7–29.

Winston-Salem Journal

1920 Obituary of John W Westmoreland. *Winston-Salem Journal*, November 7, 1920, sec. Obituaries.

WORKING TOWARD A COMMON GOAL: THE ROLE OF CONSERVATION IN ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE BENEFITS OF COLLABORATION

by

Kimberly Kenyon

Abstract

Previously regarded as more of an afterthought in archaeology, conservation was at one time only considered necessary when an emergency arose or when objects were found actively deteriorating years following an excavation. As more curricula are including conservation as a component of the archaeology track, field archaeologists now have a greater appreciation for the essential need to plan for a collection's care post-recovery and the benefits of early and frequent collaboration with conservators. The ensuing discussion is meant to demystify conservation as a field; stress its critical role in archaeology and the importance of collaboration; and impart the foundations of decision making, judgement, and ethics which guide conservation professionals in practice.

Conservation is a broad career path comprising many different specialties: book and paper, art, architecture, photographic materials, textiles, furniture, and objects. While the tools and knowledge each professional possesses vary equally as much as the profession itself, the common thread among conservation practitioners is the drive to preserve, to appreciate, to understand, and to enable and inspire others to do the same.

For me, conservation has been a very rewarding career, allowing me to take an active role in the longevity of collections and to contribute directly to how the public experiences and interacts with the past. Even during my relatively short time in this field, I have witnessed the way in which conservation is practiced shift from a mysterious and little-known process to being very much part of the museum-going experience. Public outreach is rapidly becoming a significant component of conservation, with museums incorporating labs into exhibits and labs offering tours of
their facilities. This has only increased awareness among the public for responsible collections management and the need for dedicated caretakers of our fragile cultural heritage.

For as long as humans have been collectors, there has been an instinctive wish to protect and preserve that which is held dear. Early collections were often valuables and rarities precious to the holder and not necessarily meant for public consumption. Conservation entailed little more than superficial cleaning, mending, and careful handling, while preservation now incorporates a foundational comprehension of the underlying material and what contributes to degradation. The purpose of collections has gradually shifted from solely favoring what was deemed valuable or aesthetically pleasing to an individual, toward appreciating collections as a means to study the world and the human condition (Caple 2000:46–50). Modern collections and conservation work to preserve the "truth" as it represents and impacts a wider cross section of society.

The ability to explore and the potential to answer questions about the unknown past is what draws people to archaeology. Where the socially underrepresented and disenfranchised may not have equal representation in art, architecture, or written history, the archaeological record is rife with evidence of the human condition which may have been otherwise obscured. Societal constraints placed on indigenous populations, people of color, and the economically disadvantaged, or a lack of written evidence about broad swaths of time mean that archaeology has the potential to serve as the best testimony to those undocumented experiences. This concept is the driving force behind archaeological investigation and further reinforces the need for proper conservation of the resulting excavated material.

The Inception of a Conservation as a Scientific Discipline

Caple (2000) thoroughly covers the history and development of collections and conservation as a field, so this broad topic will not be further explored here. However, Caple highlights two men in particular whose efforts are worth reiterating. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, many people contributed to the development of conservation methodology, but the foundation of the modern discipline can be attributed to the principles and practices of William Morris and Friedrich Rathgen.

In the mid-19th century, a group of people in the U.K. led by William Morris, noted textile designer and social activist, vocalized concerns about the removal of historic features from buildings amid an au courant wave of Gothic revivalism. Under the guise of "restoration," a façade would be altered to fit a romanticized version of what historic architecture ought to be. Later historic additions were removed, effectively erasing the evidence for a building's history through the changing times. Morris and his compatriots founded the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings in 1877 in response to this threat to Britain's architectural monuments, acknowledging that all historic features represent a building's true nature and should be preserved as a living document of its continued existence. This concept firmly established the notion of respect for integrity as a guiding principle in preservation (Caple 2000:52-53, 64-65). In the case of both buildings and artifacts, integrity encompasses not just the state of existence at the time of creation, but evidence for continued use including wear, repairs, and later amendments.

In 1898, German chemist Friedrich Rathgen of the Royal Museums of Berlin published the first comprehensive text on the conservation of archaeological objects (Rathgen 1905; Caple 2000:53). He characterized agents of decay and shared his own knowledge of chemical processes which could be applied to artifacts to aide in their preservation. Of arguably greater significance, he documented his procedures and observations, allowing repeatability of treatments and ushering in a new age of conservation as a true science. While the methods have evolved as our understanding of materials has expanded, for the modern practitioner, the spirit of Rathgen's approach to conservation as a scientific discipline remains constant.

Conservation in Modern Practice

There are a range of careers which are related to conservation. Collections managers and curators are charged with long-term care of a collection and must be aware of good practices while recognizing signs of trouble. Conservation scientists are dedicated to new methodological and technological research, working to develop theories, test hypotheses, collect data, and analyze outcomes in a controlled manner. There are academics who work in higher education to teach method and theory to new professionals, and there are practicing conservators who work to



Figure 1. Former QAR Conservator Erik Farrell (left) and the author inspecting a cannon on display at the North Carolina Maritime Museum in Beaufort for signs of corrosion. Image by NC Department of Natural and Cultural Resources.

implement proven treatments. These different professionals often work together to solve collections-based problems (Figure 1).

In the past, conservators were perceived as following a cookbook philosophy of treatment application: if these specific directions are followed, treatment will be successful. This simplistic approach has unfortunately given rise to the misconception that "a trained monkey" could do this job. On the other end of the spectrum, an archaeologist once observed that conservation is akin to wizardry, with artifacts undergoing a magical transformation behind the scenes. Archaeological conservation in reality is a dedicated profession, whereby professionals work to solve complex problems with many possible outcomes and no one simple solution. To be adept in this field, practitioners must have an interdisciplinary foundation in chemistry, art, history, and archaeology and share common personality traits such as adaptability, foresight, and extreme patience, not to mention the manual dexterity, a keen eye for shape and form, and careful nature this work requires.



Figure 2. Paper conservator Emily Rainwater of the State Archives of North Carolina examining waterlogged paper fragments from the Queen Anne's Revenge/La Concorde collection. Image by NC Department of Natural and Cultural Resources.

An effective conservator possesses a broad knowledge base. This may include how characteristics of various burial environments, like soil pH, moisture, oxygenation, and biological activity, impact an object's survival. Chemistry is an additional building block of conservation: not only what treatments to apply and how to do so but how an applied chemical or process may impact the object in the long-term, which may in turn be critical to exhibit or curation decisions. The subfield of electrochemistry is also key to predicting how metals decay as well as creating and implementing a conservation strategy for them.

Conservators of more recent material culture regularly research the mechanics of an artifact and its moving parts in order to make good treatment decisions. An object as ubiquitous as a flintlock musket for example becomes an exercise in deconstruction and reverse engineering for a conservator, so that each component is treated appropriately, and the artifact as a whole can be faithfully reconstructed. Similarly, a working knowledge of technological developments in ordnance and artillery leads to safer decisions regarding their handling. Large scale machinery such as engines and even whole aircraft require specialized

expertise in their manufacture and operation. As archaeology inches further into the 20th century and modern technology finds its way into the archaeological record, conservators will eventually be challenged with the material remains of the digital age, further broadening the necessary scope of a practitioner's proficiency.

Measures taken to stabilize an artifact can take on different forms. Two terms often used to describe varying approaches to stabilization are preventive conservation and interventive conservation (Caple 2000:37-39). Conservation of excavated material does not always necessitate the direct application of chemicals to achieve a good result. Preventive conservation includes all the ways in which post-excavation degradation can be arrested through control of the artifact's environment. Lighting, temperature, pest control, and relative humidity are some of the contributing elements in a museum setting which may impact preservation. Curatorial staff and museum conservators are well-versed in the tools and techniques available for adjusting parameters so that each material type is stored or exhibited in its ideal environment. This knowledge and these remedial actions can be applied by anyone responsible for the care of archaeological material and are outlined in numerous articles and books. While there are many publications which characterize agents of deterioration in the museum environment, address good practices, and define parameters for care of specific material types, two excellent resources on this topic are Applebaum (1991) and Caple (2011).

Mitigation of environmental effects on a collection as well as the selection of appropriate materials for storage can mean the difference between an object's survival or continued deterioration. Inert packing materials, such as polyester cloth, acid-free paper, Tyvek, high-density polyethylene containers, and polyethylene foam should always be at hand. Other materials, such as natural-fiber cloth, cardboard, and other foam products are to be avoided due to their long-term instability and off-gassed byproducts which are detrimental to certain artifact types. Preventive measures can be easily practiced by non-conservation professionals tasked with collections care and may eliminate the need for more active methods.

The practice of actively intervening in degradation by way of chemicals or procedures applied directly to an artifact's fabric is referred to as interventive conservation. These measures generally should only be

undertaken by or under the direct guidance of a conservator, due to the many variables which inevitably arise and to the specialized training and skills honed while preparing for this full-time career. Publications dedicated to interventive conservation are innumerable, and it is imperative for a practicing conservator to remain well-read and up to date on current methods and theory. Required readings for the introductory course I teach at East Carolina University include Cronyn (1990), Caple (2000), and Hamilton (1996), among other targeted articles addressing specific material types.

The Conservator's Code of Ethics

Professional conservators live by a code of ethical standards which guides each step of an artifact's treatment. These principles have developed over time as methods have improved, thanks to advances in technology, recognition of past mistakes, and the sharing of experiences among practitioners through dissemination of information and healthy debate (Caple 2000:200–204). Regardless of a conservator's individual specialty (art, architecture, objects, etc.), these principles direct decision making, with the painting's, building's, or artifact's best interest in mind. Morris's advocacy for integrity and Rathgen's detailed documentation of procedures form the foundation for sound conservation methodology.

Respect for the True Nature of an Object

The foremost guiding principle behind conservation in practice is respect for the true nature of an object and working toward preserving its integrity. Consider an artifact as a document containing information about a specific event or a broader period of time. While words on a paper document may directly convey the writer's specific experiences or point of view, an object may require more work to extract the unseen information it holds about the user's life. As with a damaged paper document, missing archaeological evidence leads to misinterpretation and loss of valuable data about the past. Indeed, improper conservation can also lead to irreparable loss of information.

Integrity comprises not just the physical form, but also microscopic evidence which may not be obvious to the naked eye. Microarchaeology includes elemental analysis, radiocarbon dating, the study of pollen, residues, proteins, and stable isotopes, along with countless other invisible information which all constitute an object's true nature (Price and Burton 2012). Through mishandling, lack of conservation, improper

conservation, or unsuitable storage, this microscopic evidence can be irrevocably destroyed, thus effectively eliminating certain avenues of research. A conservator's insights from the beginning can help not only mitigate loss of data at this level but also offer further investigative tools to expand research possibilities and maximize the information gathered about an object (Cronyn 1990:1–4).

Minimal Intervention and Suitability of Treatment

For any given material type, there are many approaches to an artifact's conservation. A capable conservator is able to weigh multiple strategies and the pros and cons for each against a specific object's properties, including its current state of preservation, mode of manufacture, burial environment, and even use-wear to determine the best way forward. This is only the beginning of the decision-making process.

Selecting a suitable treatment begins with the questions, "is this harmful to the object?" and "is this necessary?" For some objects, preventive measures may be all that is required to retain stability, and active intervention may not be warranted. It is imperative that all available information about the artifact and any applicable courses of action be weighed against the desired outcome before proceeding. Only treatments which have a long standing in the conservation community and have undergone rigorous empirical scientific testing and peer review are appropriate for consideration. For example, proprietary chemicals sold under a trade name are not suitable since product manufacturers are not required to disclose a full list of ingredients. Applying unknown chemical compounds to an artifact may be considered unethical, as it puts the artifact at further risk for negative interactions and unforeseen future problems.

As treatment options are explored, the least invasive method which still achieves the desired stability should always be considered first. It must be acknowledged that interventive conservation results in altering an object's structure, in favor of its preservation, and ethical guidelines state that this must be kept to a minimum where possible. This can be a difficult decision when faced with loss in the most extreme cases, but by thoughtfully and patiently weighing various proposed methods, artifacts are assured to receive the attention and consideration they deserve. For instance, while it may be tempting to remove all encrustation or staining

from a ceramic sherd, the question must be posited whether it is necessary. The acids needed to achieve this goal may dissolve a diagnostic glaze, and it may be possible to glean information, such as residues, vessel form, paste, etc., from the visible portion anyway. In this case, what point does further cleaning serve?

Similarly, conservators avoid extensive esthetic reintegration. Overrestoration can be visually jarring to museum patrons and archaeologists alike and misrepresents the object's true form. Morris laid the groundwork for this idea with his firm stance against excessive "restoration" to buildings. The intent of conservation is not to restore an object to an idealized, "new" state, but to stabilize it in its current condition, including the use-wear and depositional damage serving as a document of an artifact's existence, and to prevent further degradation.

Finally, the cost of a treatment should never be the deciding factor on which treatment to employ. Realistically, cost of course factors into feasibility and availability of certain equipment, but the cheapest option is not always suitable, and decisions about what is appropriate should not be skewed by what is affordable.

Reversibility

The concept of reversibility has been a long-standing principle and aligns with the notion of respecting the object's true nature. Ideally, any chemical or process applied to an artifact should be fully reversible to allow for future retreatment or further study. It is not uncommon in conservation that one treatment, once universally accepted, is many years later found to be unstable or detrimental. Even standard treatments now are not considered permanent, and we accept that artifacts may not always remain stable.

If a treatment can be reversed, a new treatment may be applied to prolong the life of the artifact. However, it is also generally acknowledged that most treatments are not fully reversible, and conservators may contest the necessity of reversibility as a consideration for active intervention. This remains a personal choice of individual conservators and is a perfect example of using one's best judgment when making difficult decisions.

Professional Development and Recognizing Limitations

Since conservation is a science, it is not a static discipline. New methods are developed each year, and the body of research into materials science continues to expand. It is imperative that conservators remain cognizant of new research and techniques to make the most informed treatment decisions. What was once common practice may now be considered detrimental. A chemical which once showed promise may now be known to degrade and cause more damage than good. This constant change is also why there is no one singular compendium, or "cookbook," on conservation methodology.

Despite the importance of staying current, there are occasions when one's professional limitations become apparent. When we discovered waterlogged paper among the Queen Anne's Revenge/La Concorde assemblage (Farrell et al. 2018), we as archaeological conservators recognized an immediate need to consult paper conservators and ultimately transferred the paper to the care of our colleagues at the State Archives of North Carolina for treatment (Figure 2). Their staff and facility are better trained and equipped to handle such a fragile find. Making decisions that are in the best interest of the object sometimes equates to recognizing and acknowledging one's own professional boundaries. If a conservator lacks training and experience on the treatment options for a certain material type, they should not undertake treatment of the object. This should not be viewed as a shortcoming but an opportunity to develop stronger collaborative and interdisciplinary ties to other professionals beyond one's immediate field of expertise.

Single Standard

A conservator does not take into consideration an object's perceived value, rarity, or quality when devising a treatment strategy. Every artifact deserves equal attention and is subject to the same high standard of work. Quality of treatment does not vary based on these factors. Over 250,000 individual pieces of lead shot have been found on the Queen Anne's Revenge/La Concorde wreck site to date, and regardless of this abundance of one material, it is not deemed expendable nor less worthy of good decision making. As pervasive as lead shot is in the historical record, and even on this archaeological site alone, there is always the possibility of future research or analytical technique unknown to us at

present which could help solve a problem. Therefore, each piece of shot is treated appropriately and handled with equal care.

Training

Many conservators enter the job market after years of internships and student placements, honing practical skills and developing effective decision-making abilities under the tutelage of a seasoned professional. Professional conservators take very seriously the training of interns, students, and volunteers, to help them become better prepared to face challenges in the lab. Being that there is no cookbook methodology to planning treatments nor a simple step-by-step guide, the tools developed as a student include an array of options to consider when assessing an artifact. Working with more experienced professionals is the only way to develop this toolkit, so that a new practitioner upon entering the workforce is well-prepared to make confident choices.

Establishing Priorities

While all artifacts must be treated with equal consideration, it must be acknowledged that resources are often finite and that labs generally have a small number of staff. Many archaeological conservators are faced with the decision of how to proceed with a large collection given these limitations. Many of the assemblages I have worked on in my career have been vast, such as La Belle with nearly two million artifacts excavated (Bruseth et al. 2017), Queen Anne's Revenge/La Concorde with over 400,000 and counting (Kenyon 2016), and the thousands of ceramic sherds from the 6th-century BC shipwreck at Pabuç Burnu in Turkey, constituting a single cargo of hundreds of amphoras which necessitated reconstruction (Greene et al. 2008).

Prioritizing a collection relies on collaboration. Communication with the archaeological team establishes research goals, and if the collection is destined for display, communication with the exhibit planners helps to identify specific objects for that purpose. This does not mean that certain artifacts should be sacrificed in favor of others; the conservation needs of the collection always take priority, and it can be a fine balance to maintain.

Decision Making and Judgment

As stated previously, conservation is not as simple as following a set of directions with a guaranteed positive outcome. Despite the best intentions and following a familiar procedure to the letter, success is never guaranteed. There is an immense body of literature dedicated to the methods and theory of archaeological conservation, and practitioners must remain current on published research.

Good judgment is one of the most difficult skills to teach. Judgment can only be learned through experience, acknowledging past successes and failures, and being open to honest dialog and constantly learning new practices. At its core, judgment involves the balancing of best practices, ethical considerations, and artifact-specific problems to make the best decision for each individual object.

Planning for a Collection

Excavation results in the removal of artifacts from an environment in which they have reached a stasis (Plenderleith and Werner 1971:2–4). Once recovered, objects begin to deteriorate at a more rapid pace, risking the loss of not only the tangible object but also data which might have aided in better interpreting a site. Then, what was the point of excavating? Effective planning for conservation and curation prior to beginning fieldwork will ensure the long-term health of a collection and maximize the recovery of archaeological data for decades to come, leading to a fuller understanding of our shared cultural heritage. Future technological advances may completely revolutionize artifact analysis, in ways scientists have not yet conceptualized. Thus, best preservation practices now ensure that future research questions are still open for exploration.

A plan for conservation and storage of a collection should be established long before fieldwork begins. Early and continuous collaboration with a conservator will better guarantee that the needs of each individual object can be anticipated, offering the best chance of survival, and that the project's principal investigator can be assured of maximizing their dataset. Conservation and curation should never be an afterthought, and discussions of funding these endeavors should start in the earliest stages of preparing for fieldwork. The importance of collaboration between conservators and field archaeologists cannot be

overstated (Pedelì and Pulga 2013). A strong partnership will better ensure a successful excavation and more thorough data recovery.

First Aid in the Field

The most effective excavations have a conservation professional on site, or at minimum a designated member of the field team who is trained in appropriate measures of artifact care in the first instance (Figure 3). The excavations at Red Bay, Labrador serve as a model for successful collaboration between the field archaeologists responsible for a unique site and the conservators who can problem-solve for specific circumstances (Tuck and Logan 1987). There is no replacement for this level of specialized knowledge and care.

My own field experience has been predominately within the subfield of maritime archaeology. It has been my observation that conservation seems to be directly incorporated more frequently on submerged sites, since it is generally acknowledged that proper care and interventive measures will be necessary for waterlogged objects, given the drastic change from burial environment to storage facility. However, objects from terrestrial sites are equally in need of appropriate steps to prevent degradation. Every burial environment causes chemical, physical, and biological changes to an artifact, and it is crucial that specific environmental factors of a given site are identified before excavation begins, and a mitigation strategy implemented (Cronyn 1990:14–42). Conservators can help with this.

Recovery of any type or size of artifacts requires appropriate planning and materials. For excellent resources describing and depicting diverse methods for lifting objects from an array of environments, see Payton (1992) and Cronyn (1990:43–57). Both are useful handbooks for the field archaeologist and relay not only recovery strategies and materials but also what level of decay and/or preservation to expect from certain environments. Sease (1994) describes basic actions that can be reasonably undertaken by field archaeologists and communicates many of the ethical considerations by which conservators operate, including the importance of safety. Further, Sease stresses the significance of knowing when to then allow a dedicated conservation professional to continue. These three books are invaluable additions to the field archaeologist's library, offering practical solutions to the more common issues.

Upon recovery, it is tempting to begin cleaning artifacts in the field. However, many times the encompassing soil or encrustation acts as a barrier, protecting an object from immediate decay. Once encrustation is removed from metals, oxygen and ambient moisture can activate corrosion. Removing adhering soil from ceramics may inadvertently remove residues which could have been analyzed or may even result in weakening the clay and destabilizing the vessel (Sease 1994:28–30). Anything beyond minimal cleaning should be left to professionals within a controlled lab environment, and every action taken, even in the field, should be fully documented, along with all observations of an object's current state.

Almost without fail, the final days of an excavation can produce some of the most surprising, largest, or most fragile finds. It is not uncommon, nor should it be overlooked as an option, for artifacts to remain in situ until work can resume the following season. Rushing a removal due to limited time or resources inevitably results in unintended and irreparable damage. The intervening months will allow time to make a plan with a conservator and secure necessary resources prior to undertaking a problematic or delicate recovery.

Finally, leaving an object in situ either long-term or even indefinitely should not be discounted as a credible preservation strategy. Before beginning excavation, conversations on the purpose and practical need for recovery will help to establish specific goals. Considerations may include feasibility, public perception, loss of context, the preservation of future research avenues, cost of recovery and conservation, impacts to the natural environment, and the site's status as a landmark and repercussions of its disturbance. In situ preservation has increasingly become a viable way in which to still gather data about a significant site while preserving it in its natural setting. The Neolithic wooden trackway called the Sweet Track in Somerset, UK is a protected monument which still lies in its wetland setting. According to periodic monitoring, environmental management of the peat bog in which the trackway rests has maintained anaerobic conditions sufficient to preserve not only the wooden structure, but also other associated artifacts and attributes of its paleoenvironment (Brunning et al. 2000). The Annex to the 2001 UNESCO Convention on underwater cultural heritage (UNESCO 2001) also advocates strongly for in situ preservation as the first option for managing submerged sites, with excavation and recovery only undertaken if no other options are available. A thorough discussion

on in situ preservation measures applicable to an array of burial environments can be found in Caple (2016).

Personal Experiences in Archaeology and Conservation

As a field archaeologist and onsite conservator for several excavations as well as a conservator working in various labs in the US and abroad, I regularly draw on my past experiences and have learned valuable lessons from both the more successful undertakings and those which did not go exactly as planned. In the case of the latter, it is almost universally true that a lack of communication or lack of planning was responsible. Therefore, communication and planning are always my priorities and can never begin too early.

The Kızılburun Column Wreck Excavation

As a graduate student in Texas A&M University's Nautical Archaeology Program, I was first introduced to conservation in the field. Dr. Deborah Carlson, President of the Institute of Nautical Archaeology (INA) and assistant professor at Texas A&M, invited me to join her team for the excavation of a late Hellenistic marble carrier which sank at a remote cape called Kızılburun in the Izmir province of Turkey (Carlson and Aylward 2010). INA has a long legacy of working in extremely isolated locations in Turkey, building a camp to house the team for the season, as well as being well-equipped to handle diving emergencies in such environments.

At this particular location were the remains of a ship carrying fifty tons of Proconnesian marble, quarried from present-day Marmara Adası in the Sea of Marmara. The cargo consisted primarily of eight monumental column drums and capital destined for the never-completed Temple of Apollo at Claros, which lies approximately fifty miles to the east of the wreck site. With the goal of full recovery, pre-planning was imperative to the success of the expedition. Challenges included not only the remote location, but also the depth of the wreck at 150 feet (45 m), and the tremendous marble drums, with the largest weighing over seven tons.

Having been established in Turkey for several decades, INA benefits from a permanent staff who are instrumental in logistical planning and a dedicated facility capable of receiving a large, excavated assemblage. The head conservator communicates early and frequently

with the principal investigator prior to and during a field season, many times visiting the site to assist with recovery.

In the case of the column drums, a storage solution was established long before their removal, as was a recovery vessel capable of transporting them. During the seasons leading up to such a large lifting operation, recovery was focused on the fragile hull remains and on the smaller objects constituting the secondary cargo. The drums were moved offsite until their careful retrieval was guaranteed, both for the safety of the divers as well as for the sake of the drums. The entirety of the wreck was recovered over the course of five excavation seasons, with all artifacts transported to INA's headquarters in Bodrum, Turkey for conservation and research. Years of planning and collaboration led to the ultimately successful recovery of a truly unique cargo and expanded research of stone transport in the ancient Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean.

Shipwreck 31CR314: Queen Anne's Revenge/La Concorde

Upon the discovery of the site of Blackbeard's lost flagship, previously the slave ship La Concorde, full recovery was not undertaken until funding and a conservation facility could be secured. Prior to the establishment of the Queen Anne's Revenge Conservation Lab in 2004, only a small selection of artifacts was recovered to firmly determine the age, extent, and identity of the shipwreck (Wilde-Ramsing and Ewen 2012). Since full excavation was initiated in 2005, 302,345 artifacts have been raised. The lab serves as the repository for all site data, including provenience and field photos, within a comprehensive artifact database.

Conservation is inextricably part of the excavation. One lab staff member is designated as the field conservator and spends the entire season on site (Figure 4). As part of the field team, the site conservator holds the responsibility of overseeing safe recovery, field cataloging, initial photography, and ensuring mapping data is complete. Historically, the person in this position has also been a qualified scientific diver, able to accompany finds directly from the seabed to the surface. While this may not always be the case going forward, it has proven beneficial to the project to date. Having a permanently assigned site conservator ensures continuity of data and establishes a direct chain of custody from field to lab.



Figure 3. Former QAR Conservator Shanna Daniel monitoring dredge spoil for artifacts on site 31CR314, Queen Anne's Revenge/La Concorde. Image by NC Department of Natural and Cultural Resources.

Pre-field season planning at the lab includes preparing high pH storage solution for iron artifacts, large tanks for receipt of cannon and timbers, small triage tanks for immediate storage prior to cataloging, and long-term storage tanks. All staff are instrumental in gathering supplies and making preparations, and during the season, everyone is involved in the weekly artifact delivery on Friday afternoons. The following week in the lab is spent cataloging finds, creating new digital and paper records, x-raying concretions to ascertain their contents, and carefully moving objects into long-term storage while they await active conservation.

Over 4,000 concretions have been recovered, containing hundreds of thousands of objects. For such a large collection with a relatively small conservation staff, it is critical for priorities to be established. After examining the x-rays for each concretion, I held informal discussions with my fellow archaeologists and conservators on staff to discern concerns and research goals, as well as with museum staff to glean future exhibit plans (Kenyon 2016). Immediate conservation concerns included exposed artifacts, concretions which were deemed unstable, and unique



Figure 4. The author preparing for a dive on site 31CR314. Image by NC Department of Natural and Cultural Resources.

artifacts which if lost would severely impact site analysis. Archaeologists expressed interest in unique objects, such as tools, personal arms, instruments, and items related to the slave trade which could inform a more thorough interpretation of the shipboard experience. NCMM staff made a similar request for items which are relatable and recognizable for museumgoers, and from which broader interpretive stories could be told. Collaboration with these interested parties helped solidify a priority system for the concretions and continues to guide conservation decisions in meeting everyone's varied needs and expectations.

Texas A&M University's Conservation Research Lab

Founded by Dr. Donny Hamilton in 1978, the Conservation Research Lab (CRL) at Texas A&M University is the forerunner in contract archaeological conservation in the nation. CRL's affiliation with Texas A&M means that the faculty and students of the Anthropology Department and specifically the Nautical Archaeology Program have a valuable resource at their disposal.

Students in the Nautical Archaeology Program are required to complete at least one course in archaeological conservation in fulfillment of their degree, and some students are selected as graduate assistants based at CRL. I benefitted from this such arrangement during my time as a graduate student there, learning hands-on, real-world applications of the topics covered in the classroom. With CRL playing such a critical role in student training, alumni of the program graduate with a strong sense of the significance of conservation to archaeology and valuable technical skills which build on a classroom-based theoretical grounding. CRL and Texas A&M's courses teach students that conservation should always be considered an extension of any excavation. The standard they set encourages early and frequent collaboration between lab and field to ensure the best results.

Conclusion

Archaeological conservation is a much broader topic than can be covered in one brief article. Conservators work methodically and scientifically while abiding by a code of ethics and using our best judgement to guide decision making. Professionals possess a wide range of skills and specialized knowledge that would benefit any excavation, and conservators are eager to help and prefer to be proactively involved. Continued collaboration between field team, conservators, and curators will ensure best practices are followed and that both macroscopic and microscopic archaeological data is preserved to the highest standards well into the future.

There are many regional and national resources available to assist with conservation and curation guidance. While this list is not exhaustive, it will hopefully serve as at least a starting point for any collections-based needs:

Archaeological Conservation and Curation Facilities in North Carolina:

- North Carolina Office of State Archaeology Research Center
 <u>https://archaeology.ncdcr.gov/about/offices/research-center</u>
- Queen Anne's Revenge Conservation Lab
 <u>https://archaeology.ncdcr.gov/about/offices/conservation-lab</u>

- Conservation Labs Offering Contract Services: Conservation Research Lab- Texas A&M University <u>https://nautarch.tamu.edu/CRL/</u>
- Maryland Archaeological Conservation Lab Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum <u>https://jefpat.maryland.gov/Pages/mac-lab/mac-lab.aspx</u>

To Find a Conservator in Your Area:

- Southeast Regional Conservation Association: <u>https://sercaconservation.org/find-a-conservator/</u>
- American Institute for Conservation: <u>https://www.culturalheritage.org/about-conservation/find-a-</u> <u>conservator</u>

For Assistance with Collections Following a Disaster:

 North Carolina Cultural Resources Emergency Support Team: <u>https://www.ncdcr.gov/resources/conservation-</u> assistance/assistance-cultural-institutions

References Cited

Applebaum, Barbara

1991 *Guide to Environmental Protection of Collections*. Sound View Press: Madison.

Brunning, Richard, David Hogan, Julie Jones, Mark Jones, Ed Maltby, Mark Robinson, and Vanessa Straker

2000 Saving the Sweet Track: The In Situ Preservation of a Neolithic Wooden Trackway, Somerset, UK. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 4(1):3–20.

Bruseth, James E., Amy A. Borgens, Bradford M. Jones, and Eric D. Ray 2017 La Belle: The Archaeology of a Seventeenth-Century Ship of New World Colonization. Texas A&M University Press, College Station.

Caple, Chris

- 2000 Conservation Skills: Judgement, Method, and Decision Making. Routledge: London.
- 2011 Preventive Conservation in Museums. Routledge: London.
- 2016 Preservation of Archaeological Remain In Situ. Routledge: London.

Carlson, Deborah N., and W. Aylward

2010 The Kızılburun Shipwreck and the Temple of Apollo at Claros. *American Journal of Archaeology* 114(1):145–159.

Cronyn, J. M.

1990 The Elements of Archaeological Conservation. Routledge: London.

Farrell, Erik, Kimberly Kenyon, Sarah Watkins-Kenney, Kay Smith, and Ruth Brown

2018 Message in a Breech Block: A Fragmentary Printed Text Recovered from Queen Anne's Revenge. *The North Carolina Historical Review* 95(2):231–248.

Greene, Elizabeth S., Mark L. Lawall, and Mark E. Polzer

2008 Inconspicuous Consumption: The Sixth-Century B.C.E. Shipwreck at Pabuç Burnu, Turkey. *American Journal of Archaeology* 112(4):685–711.

Hamilton, Donny L.

1996 Basic Methods of Conserving Underwater Archaeological Material Culture. US Department of Defense Legacy Resource Management Program: Washington D.C.

Kenyon, Kimberly

2016 Prioritizing the Concretions from Queen Anne's Revenge for Conservation: A Case Study in Managing a Large Collection. In ACUA Underwater Archaeology Proceedings 2016, Paul Johnston, editor, pp. 84–89. PAST Foundation: Columbus.

Payton, Robert

1992 *Retrieval of Objects from Archaeological Sites*. Archetype Publications: Denbigh.

Pedelì, Corrado, and Stefano Pulga

2013 Conservation Practices on Archaeological Excavations: Principles and Methods. J. Paul Getty Trust: Los Angeles.

Plenderleith, H. J., and A. E. A. Werner

1971 The Conservation of Antiquities and Works of Art, Second Edition. University Press: Oxford.

Price, T. Douglas, and James H. Burton

2012 An Introduction to Archaeological Chemistry. Springer: New York.

Rathgen, Friedrich

1905 *The Preservation of Antiquities: A Handbook for Curators.* Translation by George A. Auden and Harold A. Auden. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Sease, Catherine

1994 *A Conservation Manual for the Field Archaeologist*. University of California: Los Angeles.

Tuck, James A., and Judith A. Logan

1987 Archaeology and Conservation: Working Together? In In Situ Archaeological Conservation, Proceedings of Meetings April 6–13, 1986, Miguel Angel Corzo and Henry W. M. Hodges, editors, pp. 56– 63. The Getty Conservation Institute: Los Angeles.

UNESCO

2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. In Records of the General Conference, 31st Session, Paris, 15 October to 3 November 2001, v. 1: Resolutions, pp. 50–61. Accessed May 26, 2021: <u>http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/underwatercultural-heritage/2001-convention/official-text/</u>

Wilde-Ramsing, Mark U., and Charles R. Ewen

2012. Beyond Reasonable Doubt: A Case for Queen Anne's Revenge. *Historical Archaeology* 46(2):110–133.

BOOK REVIEW

Charles Towne on the Cape Fear: The Rise and Fall of the First Barbadian Settlement in Carolina. Jack E. Fryar, Jr. Dram Tree Books, Wilmington, North Carolina, 2019. 238 pp., illustrations, end notes, appendices, bibliographic references, index. \$19.95 (trade paperback), ISBN 978-0-9844900-3-5.

Reviewed by Thomas E. Beaman, Jr.

Almost four score years after the colony at Roanoke was found mysteriously abandoned, as incursions of Virginia colonists began to dot the landscape in the Albemarle, and a Royal Charter from King Charles II was granted to eight loyal individuals to establish the lands of Carolina, in the Cape Fear region there began and shortly ended the settlements of Charles Towne.

Though Charles Towne by name has long persisted in memories of Cape Fear residents, there was not a volume of historical information as widely available as with later settlements in the region, nor had anyone attempted a formal history of the settlements. Archaeological investigations in the late 1960s and 1980s produced material evidence of part of what would be defined as a central defensive compound. Those excavations were largely discussed in several unpublished manuscripts and conference papers, none of which were readily accessible to the general public. Despite the archaeology, there still was a lack of detailed historical information on the overall settlement, its purpose, and interacting personalities from Massachusetts, Barbados, and Britain that met on the banks of the Cape Fear River.

Enter Cape Fear historian, author, and prolific publisher of Dram Tree Books, Jack Fryar. His newest work, *Charles Towne on the Cape Fear: The Rise and Fall of the First Barbadian Settlement in Carolina*, is largely borne from his 2015 M.A. thesis in History at the University of North Carolina-Wilmington. Fryar credits two of his thesis committee members, Cape Fear historian Chris Fonvielle and foremost colonial period historian Alan Watson, for helping to craft this academically thorough, yet publicly accessible account, of Charles Towne. It is to these two individuals (as well as his wife) that he dedicates this book.

Charles Towne on the Cape Fear is divided into ten chapters. The introduction melds a general introduction and the historiography chapter from Fyrar's thesis, well providing the breadth of sources consulted and available on not only Charles Towne, but on the English Revolutionary period and the history of Barbados. The first chapter well details North Carolina's early European presence by British and Spanish explorers, from Verrazanos' and Ayllon's temporary visits, Juan Pardo's trek from Santa Elena to Joara, the attempted colonization of Roanoke, to the initial entries and settlement of Virginia colonists in the Albemarle region. The next short chapter chronicles the turmoil of the English Civil War through the restoration of the monarchy to Charles II. This return of the monarchy from the years under Oliver Cromwell had a large impact, especially for eight loyal men who supported Charles II, who gratefully granted them a charter to the lands south of Virginia and north of Florida.

The longest chapter in the book details the settlement and economic development of Barbados. Fryar provides an excellent discussion of the planter class, importation of enslaved Africans, and enslaved natives that led to the development of the sugar economy on which Britain became heavily dependent. This is a particularly valuable chapter for those not familiar with the history and culture of British Barbados. Chapter 4 introduces and provides brief biographical sketches of the eight loyal men, better known as the Lords Proprietors of Carolina. The discussions of the interworking of these diverse individuals to formally establish themselves as the Lords Proprietors is particularly fascinating, but all were bound to enthusiastically populate this land and profit from it. These four chapters—which cover half of the length of the main text well establish the global historical perspective and set the stage for Charles Towne in a proper period context.

The next four chapters center on the claims, settlements, and eventual abandonments of Charles Town. Chapter 5 begins with plans by several individuals in early 17th century Britain to settle in the Cape Fear region for varied interests, all of whose efforts never got off the ground. Fear of encroachment into the area by the Spanish settling the area was also ever present. This chapter also details the first settlement in 1663 by Puritan families from Massachusetts, who moved to the area largely due to a growing population and diminished availability of land, by purchasing the area along the Cape Fear River from the local Native Americans. There are still many questions as to what Puritan families were part of this endeavor, and what types of structures might have been

BOOK REVIEWS

built for the settlement. Fryar outlines why this endeavor failed after only two months because of several factors, primarily to the rejection of the group by the newly chartered Lords Proprietors, whose sole goal was to profit from the lands and did not approve of the settlers' encroachment or politics (pp. 95–97).

The rise and fall of the second settlement of Charles Towne by groups from Barbados encompasses chapters 6, 7, and 8. The overcrowding of Barbados by immigrants from England, as well as enslaved African and Native Americans, led to a petition to the Lords Proprietors for the establishment of plantations on the mainland. John Vassall led the first group of would-be-colonists to the Cape Fear in 1664, and a second group unexpectedly arrived under John Yeamans in early 1665. Fryar provides an interesting perspective on the competing motives of these two men and the Bajans who accompanied each, even down to what style of settlement Charles Towne would be: as a selfsufficient town or a marketing nexus between Barbados and Britain. For those readers solely interesting in the political, cultural, and economic innerworkings, Fryar does a masterful job in painting a portrait of settlement, survival, and subsistence in this colony on pages 122–129.

The relationship with the Cape Fear Indians, who had met and dealt with the earlier travelers and the Puritan settlement, were initially friendly, but turned more hostile and the common resources were strained and some were taken for slave labor. Ultimately, the lack of support of the Lords Proprietors, Britain's war with the Netherlands and France that spread through islands of the Caribbean, the guerilla style attacks on settlers by Native Americans, and growing internal strife led to the demise of the second settlement of Charles Towne, which was finally decimated by a massive hurricane in September 1667. The remaining settlers chartered a ship to take them to Virginia, Massachusetts, or further south to Yeamans' Port Royal settlement, while others went to the Albemarle region. Fryar describes the end of Charles Towne as a "a victim of global events" (pg. 142). It is ironic that the global factors that led to the settlement of Charles Towne also led to its demise.

The final chapter will likely be of most interest to readers of this journal, as it encompasses the archaeology of Charles Towne and the results of the investigations. A cursory identification of the area by Stanley South in the early 1960s had "promising results" (pg. 155).

Excavations in 1969 and 1970 on the neighboring Moore House by Gerald Shinn, Gary Wheeler Stone, and William R. Henry, yielded more evidence of a 17th century component. But it was Thomas Loftfield, Anthropology Professor at the University of North Carolina-Wilmington and his archaeological field schools in the 1980s who conducted the major excavations on the site, which revealed a central defensive compound of the settlement. Frvar's account of the excavations is accompanied by field photographs. The drawing of the compound previously appeared in North Carolina Archaeology in 2005, but its reuse here is appropriate. Of particular interest was a description of the artifacts from Loftfield's investigations (pg. 158-161). While it is not clear which of the two Charles Towne settlements to which these features and artifacts relate, Loftfield's comparative research in the design of Bajan defensive settlement well argue for it being the 1664-1667 settlement. Fryar well observes the previous archaeological work was "not exhaustive. A significant portion of the site is still unexplored..." (pg. 162).

Fryar also includes five text appendices related to the period, all transcribed from the original documents. Appendix I details the 1663 declaration and proposals of the Lords Proprietors. A lengthy Appendix II outlines the concessions and agreement between the Lord's Proprietors and William Yeamans on the administration of Charles Towne. A list of settlers of the 1664–1667 colony arrived with either Vassall or Yeamans, some with a brief biographical sentence or two, is provided as Appendix III. William Hilton's description of the Cape Fear region and its native inhabitants before the 1663 settlement is Appendix IV. Appendix V is unique and most valuable, as it contains a facsimile of the signatures of the Lords Proprietors and a lone surviving record book with disbursements and receipts related to Charles Towne.

Fryar's previous works have shown him to be a conscious, thorough, and thoughtful historian, and *Charles Towne on the Cape Fear* is no exception. The footnotes from his thesis are converted to end notes for each chapter, and each chapter has an extensive amount of them. There is also a thorough bibliography organized into primary source, unpublished manuscripts, theses and dissertations, monographs, compilations, and articles. The book concludes with a complete index of people, places, and events from the text. Ultimately, this is a well-researched, scholarly, extremely readable, and affordable book about a time and event of North Carolina that had previously been under reported. Fryar has left no threads loose but has left plenty of room to continue the historical research on many of the people and archaeology of the site. Published in the typical high quality of Dram Tree Books, this reviewer's only complaint is that it is not available in a hardcover format. *Charles Towne on the Cape Fear* receives highest recommendation for those interested in early settlements of North Carolina, as well as for those who live in and love the Cape Fear region.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Thomas E. Beaman, Jr., RPA, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Wake Technical Community College, Scott Northern Wake Campus, NH 255, 6600 Louisburg Road, Raleigh, North Carolina 27616

Christopher T. Espenshade, New South Associates, Inc., 53 Central Avenue, Wellsboro, Pennsylvania 16901

Kimberly Kenyon, QAR Senior Conservator, Office of State Archaeology

Shawn M. Patch, New South Associates, Inc., 1006 Yanceyville Street, Greensboro, North Carolina 27405

Sarah A. Stephens, New South Associates, Inc., 1006 Yanceyville Street, Greensboro, North Carolina 27405

Samantha Taylor, New South Associates, Inc., 1006 Yanceyville Street, Greensboro, North Carolina 27405

Sherry Teal, New South Associates, Inc., 1006 Yanceyville Street, Greensboro, North Carolina 27405