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Social relationships structure daily life in a startling, and important, variety of ways. However, when considering the social world that existed inside slave quarters across the Virginia Piedmont (and the Antebellum South), archaeologists have not been able to come to a clear consensus on how to approach the study of social networks; with some researchers focusing on social standing, seen most often through the role of material wealth to create connections, and others focusing on how interactions can be meaningfully interpreted from the archaeological record. This thesis represents an attempt to bridge these two theoretical stances, by looking to see if, in fact, wealth mattered in the social relationships within the black community at Virginia’s Montpelier plantation. By comparing the amount of costly consumer goods owned by the residents of three sites to the evidence for their social interaction with their neighbors, including gift giving, participation in intra-plantation economies, and involvement in the local spiritual community, it appears as if the amount of wealth a household displayed did not affect their social relationships within the enslaved community. Rather, a complex, overlapping, web of identity and belonging likely shaped who the women and men at Montpelier formed social connections with, and the degree these various connections mattered in their lives: influenced by, amongst other factors, gender, where these African Americans called home, and who they were “kin” to.
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CHAPTER I
UNEARTHING THE SOCIAL WORLD OF MONTPELIER’S BLACK COMMUNITY

In July, 1836, the community of Virginia’s Montpelier plantation gathered for the burial of the property’s late owner, James Madison, Jr. While the white attendants, understandably, were saddened and in mourning for the loss of their family member, friend, and fellow patriot, James Barbour noted that the attending “hundred slaves gave vent to their lamentations in one violent burst that rent the air” as their former owner was lowered into his final resting place (1836, quoted in Chambers 2005:128). On the surface, this wave of emotion for Madison’s passing from the very community he dominated and enslaved for 35 years appears to be at best an idiosyncrasy, and at worst, a byproduct of Barbour’s paternal imagination for the loss of their “kind and indulgent master” (Chambers 2005:129). However, in considering this incident from the perspective of this black community, historian Douglas Chambers suggested that the lamentation did not necessarily stem from a sense of mourning for the death of their master, but rather a collective cry of anguish for the anticipated death of their community (2005:129).

These fears proved to be well founded, as over the next 15 years the once thriving black community of Montpelier was sold piecemeal to other plantations in the Virginia Piedmont, and across the Plantation South, leaving less than twenty individuals in place (Chambers 2005:138, 140). Lost along with these dispersed individuals were the social connections and relations they enjoyed, and likely grieved for. Despite our ability to conceive of the loss of these ties, we at the present are without a firm understanding of how they worked. Who interacted with whom? What were the motivating factors behind
these relationships? Did these networks include all bondspeople equally, or were certain individuals excluded from some social networks, only to be included in others?

Frustratingly, the historical record available for Montpelier remains silent on these matters. Due to their nature as agro-industrial complexes, plantations tended to amass a large number of documents pertaining to their operations, while their secondary usage as the personal estates of the local plantocracy provides an additional set of written documents in the form of personal communications and journals penned by inhabitants and visitors. Skilled historians can glean an impressive number of details on the lives of enslaved workers at these properties through this diverse documentation. However, in the context of Montpelier, these documents are few and far between. In 1827, James Madison, in preparation for his death, began to clean out his offices by burning miscellaneous documents (Chambers 2005:137). John Payne Todd, his stepson, inherited the papers that survived this holocaust in 1836, moving them to his neighboring estate of Toddsberth. Following Todd’s death in 1852, remaining family members selected a few of Madison's personal papers to save as mementos prior to setting the rest ablaze (Chapman 2005:48). Although historians working at Montpelier (e.g. Chambers 2005; Larrabee-Cotz 2012a) have been able to provide a remarkable amount of information on the plantation’s enslaved community, the available documents are not enough to satisfy our dearth of understanding about the nature of social relations within this community during the 1800s. This, however, is not to imply that the available historical record for Montpelier is of no use to such studies, as documents provide a much needed contextual framework upon which research can be placed for further elaboration.
Archaeology, conversely, does hold the potential to suggest answers to these questions. Following Madison's death, his widow, Dolley Madison, sold the plantation to Henry Moncure in 1842, setting off a long chain of transfers which would extend through the rest of the century (Chambers 2005:138). This culminated in the purchase of the property by William DuPont in 1901, beginning an 83-year reign of the DuPont family at Montpelier. During this time, the plantation landscape only saw alterations to the mansion and its adjoining yard space; rather than being subject to the massive wave of farm revitalization and deep plowing that swept across Virginia in the early 20th century. This stroke of luck has left Montpelier with an excellently preserved archaeological record, ranging from the original 1720s home plantation, to Postbellum African American farmsteads. In 1984, Marion DuPont Scott donated the property to the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and since that time, the Montpelier Archaeology Department has conducted near continuous excavations of these deposits, providing the groundwork for answering many questions about the property’s plantation past.

In 2010, the Montpelier Archaeology Department received funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) for four years of excavations to compare enslaved life in the plantation’s various quarters. Through this grant, four households in the plantation’s domestic South Yard Quarter, one household in its craftsmen quarter, referred to as the Stable Quarter Complex, and two households in Montpelier’s agrarian Tobacco Barn Quarter saw excavation during the 2010 to 2013 field seasons. This concentrated effort to excavate the material residues of daily life within the black community, in combination with the twenty plus years of previous excavation at the plantation, finally provides the sources needed to allow for an in-depth study and
assessment of the social relations which bound together individuals and households across the wheat fields, rolling hills, and swept yards of Montpelier.

Assessing Social Relations at Montpelier

While the story of the social world created by African Americans at Montpelier has yet to be told, historical archaeologists working across the South have considered similar narratives at other plantations. Although these previous studies are discussed in detail in Chapter III, they can be broadly grouped into two theoretical categories: those which assess social hierarchies within black communities, often focusing on the role of wealth displayed by enslaved households in creating relationships, and those who consider the establishment and maintenance of social ties (generally in terms kinship or using community structures) without directly assessing the motivation behind these connections. However, with several exceptions (Barnes 2011; Brown 1994; Brown and Cooper 1990; Warner 1998), the previous research into enslaved social relations have been hindered by the fact that both material wealth and social interaction have yet to be placed into a single interpretive framework capable of suggesting, on a theoretical level, how Montpelier's early 19th century black community spun the intricate webs of social relations which structured their daily lives. Furthermore, because both theoretical camps have proposed conceptions without considering the impact of the alternative view, for instance the impact of displayed wealth on kin networks, none of the previous studies can truly be considered falsifiable.

The goal of this thesis, therefore, is to place an enslaved household’s material wealth and its social interactions within the same interpretive framework to assess the motivating factors behind the creation and maintenance of social relations within the
Montpelier community. To see this, I used two of the quarters excavated through the NEH grant: the South Yard Quarter, with two duplexes (referred to as the Southeast Duplex and Southwest Home) excavated during the 2011 field season, and the Stable Quarter Complex, with a single cabin excavated during the 2010 field season (referred to as the Stable Quarter). The decision to restrict my research to these two areas stemmed from the fact that excavations uncovered the material remains of five enslaved households located within one tenth of an acre; an intriguing data set for interpreting a broad range of questions related to the social world of Montpelier’s black community. In my attempt to marshal the wide array of artifacts recovered from these five households into an orderly representation of the complexities of social realities, items indicative of costly consumer goods formed the independent variable, against which the dependent variable of social interaction was assessed, allowing the central theme of this study to be answered: in social relationships at Montpelier, did money, or at least wealth, matter?

Ideally, a study such as this would assess each household individually, in order to provide a fine grained understanding of social life within slave quarters. While we can consider the single cabin in the Stable Quarter Complex as such, difficulties arose when attempting to see the individual households that lived in the South Yard duplexes. Previous attempts to assign the two sites’ reconstructed vessels into household assemblages failed to yield meaningful results (Dunnigan 2013), as did attempts to divide recovered buttons and glassware. Because of this, I treated both households residing in each duplex as a single analytical unit. This treatment has the unfortunate effect of obscuring some of the social relationships which existed at Montpelier, but it does not prevent this research from suggesting meaningful conclusions, as we can still glimpse
how the inhabitants of these sites displayed costly consumer goods, and interacted with their neighbors.

As displayed wealth forms the base line upon which I compared the indications of social interactions, determining the amount of wealth each household displayed was the first step in this thesis research, and is presented in Chapter IV. To interpret the wealth owned and displayed by these women and men, recovered ceramics, glass tablewares, clothing fasteners and other bodily adornment, and miscellaneous consumer goods were compared between the three sites. The wealth displayed with these items, however, did not divide evenly within the various sites. Rather, the women and men in each owned and displayed differing amounts of costly goods, and as such, displayed wealth was interpreted based on gender; with the women of the Southwest Home and the men of the Southeast Duplex displaying more wealth than their neighbors. However, based upon the entirety of the recovered assemblages, the households of the Southeast Duplex may have displayed the most wealth overall. In looking at the discrete social interactions which took place within Montpelier’s black community, this wealth does not appear to have mattered (see Chapter V). Rather, social relationships between women appear to have been selective, as only certain households maintained ties with others; connections presumably governed by kinship networks. Alternatively, the interactions which the sites’ men participated in appear to have involved all of the households, without regard to wealth, and a similar trend can be seen amongst the interactions which could not be divided by gender. In fact, the only social interaction in which wealth may have played a role is the degree to which these household participated in the local spiritual community, possibly due to the cost associated with the potential ritual assemblages excavated from
the sites. While we can suggest that wealth only played a marginal role in structuring social relationships at Montpelier, an alternative interpretation which focuses on the individual groups the residents of these sites participated in is proposed in Chapter VI.

Understanding the social limitations imposed on enslaved individuals is particularly important, as how we define the influence of an individual’s bondage effects our understanding of all aspects of enslaved life. Several scholars have focused almost entirely on the effect of slavery in structuring African American life, seeing black culture as a response to the conditions of enslavement (e.g. Genovese 1976; Mintz and Price 1992; Orser 1988). In reaction to this view, some others (e.g. Gutman 1977) have chosen to emphasize the agency of bondspeople in creating their own lifeways, independent of the indignities forced upon them. Rebuking this earlier influence of slavery on our understandings of the African American past, Leland Ferguson suggested that “slaves would [not have] identified their most important activity as producing their master’s crop; nor would they see their most important relationships as those between themselves and their overseer or master” (1992:xliv). However, it is similarly inconceivable that an institution which shackled the wrists, scarred the backs, and marred the psyches of black women and men across the Atlantic World could not have influenced how these individuals interacted with each other. Of particular relevance to this research, planters’ control over the communities they enslaved impacted the degree to which black Virginians participated in local markets, ultimately effecting their ability to acquire consumer goods and the number of people they could meet outside of their own immediate neighborhood (Heath 2004:22). In attempting to locate a conceptual middle ground between agency and slavery, historian Walter Johnson proposed what he termed
the “condition of enslaved humanity” which seeks to understand the degree to which African Americans structured their lives within the larger context of their enslavement (2011:25).

Placing Johnson’s conception into the study of enslaved social relations at Montpelier, the members of the individual households can be seen as having a choice in who they interacted with, the degree to which they associated with their neighbors, and the motivations behind these relationships. It is these choices which this research seeks to illuminate. At the same time, the role of slavery in structuring the lives of these black Virginians was recognized whenever possible, as the larger system which held these individuals captive also affected social life at Montpelier.

From a Quarter to a Plantation to a Region

This thesis only assesses social relationships amongst five households, all located within earshot of each other. While the interactions documented in the following chapters appear to have been an important aspect of the social lives of the roughly twenty-five to thirty individuals who called these sites their home,¹ the intricate network of social relations which these individual participated in was not solely contained within the areas excavated during the 2010-11 field seasons. Their family and friends almost certainly resided not only in other areas of Montpelier’s approximately 5 thousand acres, but also on the plantations and towns surrounding the property, a broad network which included a large number of individuals. The 1860 slave schedule listed 547 African Americans enslaved on 21 plantations in the vicinity of Montpelier, in addition to an unspecified number living in the three major towns in the area; a number which would

¹ Based on Eugene Genovese’s suggestion that on average five to six bondspeople occupied a single cabin (1976:524)
have been much higher prior to the 1820s, when Piedmont planters began to sell off their bondspeople due to crop failures (Reeves and Lewis 2005:23-24; also see Stefan Woehlke [2012] for an assessment of the geographic extent of social networks at Montpelier). In order to maintain contact with these extended networks, black Virginians often traveled between plantations at night or during the weekend; the former being common enough in the Piedmont that the expression “[n]egro daytime” referred to the nocturnal hours (Davis, quoted in Chambers 2005:90). While my research does not directly include this larger context in the following discussions, it does not dismiss them, as the broader networks that these women and men were involved in are considered in Chapter VI.

Lastly, it is important to remember that there is no single black past, as regional variation on both sides of the Atlantic created a multitude of unique black experiences. Because of this, my research only considers the social world of black Virginians in the 19th century Piedmont. Although the result of this analysis can be used as a point of comparison with plantation contexts outside of this time and place, helping us to see the similarities and differences in black social life, we cannot use this research as a standard to which other parts of the Atlantic World can be measured. Hopefully, as similar research is conducted in various regions of both Africa and the Americas, we can start to create regionally specific understandings of the social worlds of black communities, and the effect that slavery had upon these networks.
Measures of Comparison

When creating comparisons between multiple sites, it is imperative that we use a consistent method through which to evaluate each location evenly. Despite the fact that these three sites were excavated during different field seasons, they can easily be compared, based upon the similarities in the excavation techniques used during the 2008, 2010, and 2011 field seasons, and their use of the same excavation grid. Furthermore, their dates of occupation overlap enough for them to be assessed together, particularly from the 1810s to the 1830s. Each site, however, yielded different quantities of artifacts, a variance which must be properly understood before we can begin to draw meaningful interpretations from these three sites. For instance, 10,323 ceramic tableware sherds were recovered from the units associated with the Southeast Duplex, while those in the vicinity of the Southwest Home yielded 7,718 tableware sherds, and 12,534 tableware sherds came from the Stable Quarter. While such differences are greatly influenced by the large number of occupation features excavated from the Stable Quarter, from which 17.5 percent of the tableware sherds were recovered, and the lack of similar features in the South Yard (features only accounted for two percent of the total ceramic sherds), some system of comparison was needed for this research.

\[
AI = \frac{(\text{Artifact Type 1})}{[(\text{Artifact Type 1}) + (\text{Artifact Type 2})]}
\]

*Figure 1.* Abundance index formula. Artifact Type 1 is the category being compared between two of more sites, and Artifact Type 2, in this study, represents the weight of the recovered wine bottle glass (Galle 2010:29).
Table 1

*Olive wine bottle count and weight per site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Shard Count</th>
<th>Total Weight (g)</th>
<th>Mean Weight per Shard (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Duplex</td>
<td>2427</td>
<td>8435.13</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Home</td>
<td>2228</td>
<td>5369.80</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Quarter</td>
<td>3640</td>
<td>12678.73</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jillian Galle, in her recent study of costly consumer goods recovered from sites across Virginia, has suggested the olive green wine bottle glass was discarded at a constant rate in late 18th and early 19th century slave quarters, allowing us to possibly create a baseline through which the amount of artifacts recovered from each site can be compared (Galle 2010:29-30; also see Heath and Breen 2009:13-14). In Galle’s research this was done by comparing the amount of the recovered olive green wine bottle glass to the number of recovered artifacts through an abundance index (see Figure 1). However, due in part to the depositional history of each site, the number of shards recovered was not appropriate for this analysis, as the average weight per shard from each site ranged from 2.4 to 3.48 grams, with the smallest shards recovered for the Southwest Home (Table 1). To account for this, I opted to use the total weight of the recovered olive green bottle glass instead of the shard counts. Returning to the different amounts of tableware sherd recovered from each site, this adjusted abundance index provides us with a values of .49 to .58, suggesting that despite the different sherd counts for the three sites, their residents discarded ceramics tablewares at a roughly consistent rate. As the adjusted abundance index seems to provide a meaningful way through which comparisons of recovered material culture from the Montpelier sites can be made, it the features prominently throughout the following chapters. Rather than replicate this discussion each
time the metric is encountered, the subsequent references of this formula will simply note when it was utilized.
CHAPTER II

VIRGINIA, MONTPELIER, AND THE AFRICAN DIASPORA

In the 17-18th centuries, at least 84 thousand women and men were stolen from their families and friends in Africa, and sold to planters in Virginia after surviving a harrowing voyage across the Atlantic Ocean (Chambers 2005:77). In spite of the inhumane conditions forced upon these individuals for the rest of their lives, their African cultural backgrounds laid the framework for how they, their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren would view the world. Numerous scholars have discussed the construction of black Virginian culture and identities out of these African ethnic groups (e.g. Berlin 1998; Chambers 1996, 2005; Samford 2007), and therefore this will not be discussed below. However, an understanding of the African worldviews represented in this process is beneficial when attempting to see the broader cultural context of 19th century Virginia.

The importation of black slaves to Virginia began in 1619, with the sale of “20. and odd [sic]” Africans to local colonists (Thornton 1998). However, for the majority of the century, indentured Europeans served as the major source of labor for tobacco cultivation, with only approximately 6 thousand Africans dispersed across the colony’s fields (Chambers 2005:77). In the 18th century, due to changing conditions both in Virginia and around the broader Atlantic World (cf. Morgan 1975; Chambers 1996, 2005), the importation of African captives dramatically increased, fueled by new investors in Bristol, England (Chambers 2005:79, 81). This influx of Africans into the colony allowed what we can consider a “black Virginian” cultural identity to form, both because it marks the first large scale, concentrated arrival of black individuals to the
region (Chambers 2005:16), and because this wave of forced immigration “re-
Africanized” the pre-existing black population (see Mary Beaudry [2008] for several
examples of this process in the Americas).

The largest African ethnic group imported into Virginia during the 18th century
was the Igbo, of modern day Nigeria, sold to English slavers through the port towns of
Bonny and Calabar. This has led several researchers (e.g. Chambers 1996, 2005;
Samford 2004, 2007) to consider black Virginian culture to have its roots in Igboland.
Despite the preponderance of Igbos on Virginian plantations, members of other African
ethnic groups often lived and worked by their sides. For instance, 41 percent of the
Africans arriving in Port York, Virginia, from 1728 to 1739 originated in Angola
(Kulikoff 1978, in Lovejoy 2005:133). In considering the various African identities
coalescing into a single black Virginian identity during the 18th century, Brenda
Stevenson noted that Igbo women accounted for 27 percent of the total Africans sold to
Virginian planters, a significantly larger number than that seen amongst women of other
ethnic groups in the colony (2007:85-87). As the majority of marriageable women were
Igbo, Stevenson suggested that most country born children likely were raised eating Igbo-
inspired food made by their mothers, and learning these women’s Igbo-derived
worldviews, regardless of the ethnicity of their fathers (even if they were born in the
colony), thereby multiplying the cultural impact of the Igbo. This, of course, is not to
suggest that black Virginians actively thought of themselves as Igbos (if such a level of

---

2 See Gwendolyn Hall for the similar example of the re-Africanization of Afro-Creole children raised by
(2009) have also suggested that Igbo women may have given birth at a higher rate than women of other
African ethnicities as a particular strategy for dealing with their marginalized status within American
societies. This may have helped to further the Igboization of black Virginian culture, but further evidence
is needed to fully tease out this process.
identity even existed on either side of the Atlantic [cf. Chambers 2005:17]), but rather that Igbo ideas and understandings would have been integrated into how black Virginians comprehended the world around them.

This potential impact of black families continued to grow over the course of 18th century. Both Garrett Fesler (2004a, 2004b) and Frasier Neiman (2008) have noted that early generations of black Virginians likely lived in barracks style, co-residential dwellings, in part due to their initial lack of kin connections. However, throughout the century, single family homes became more common across the colony. While Neiman (2008) has attributed this to a shifting economic climate, brought by the move from tobacco cultivation to wheat agriculture, both Fesler (2004a) and Barbara Heath (2012b) consider this shift to be the result of increased family connections created by later generations of black Virginians. With each new generation, social contacts were created, increasing the intricate webs of kinship which helped to structure the lives of these women and men; especially on plantations that did not see the large scale movement of its black community, such as Montpelier.

Along with these changes in black culture, there was also a shift in the plantation geography in Virginia leading up to the 19th century. In the first century of Virginia’s tobacco economy, the majority of planters, and the black women and men they owned, lived in the coastal Tidewater region. However, the constant search for fresh land on which to grow this cash crop pushed plantations farther west, with Virginia’s 18th century “Black Belt” located along the fall line separating the coastal regions from the inland Piedmont (Chambers 2005:74), and more bondspeople resided in the Piedmont than the Tidewater by the 1750s (Heath 2012b:105). Despite the importance of the
Piedmont to the narrative of black Virginians, most of the previous research on these African Americans has focused on the Tidewater region (see Heath 2012a). For instance, the Digital Archaeological Archive of Comparative Slavery, which has provided the data for numerous research projects (e.g. Galle 2010, 2011), includes 13 Virginian plantations. Ten of these, however, are located in the Tidewater, with only one plantation located near the fall line (Mount Vernon), and two located in the Piedmont (Monticello and Poplar Forest), both owned by Thomas Jefferson (DAACS 2014). Barbara Heath and Eleanor Breen recently provided a more comprehensive listing of slave quarters in the state, noting that approximately 42 percent of enslaved sites are located in the Piedmont (2009:3). However, a select few plantations (again Monticello and Poplar Forest) dominate this listing, preventing us from gaining a representative view of slave life in the Virginia Piedmont (Heath and Breen 2009:3). As the Montpelier plantation lies within the Piedmont region, the data from this project can aid in our understanding of the ways in which black Virginians constructed lives for themselves outside of the Tidewater. However, as the social conditions at Montpelier were similar to Thomas Jefferson’s other large holdings (cf. Levasseur 2007), we must continue to add the social worlds of other Piedmont plantations into our understanding of the African American past in the region to provide a comprehensive understanding of this time and place.

Montpelier: A Piedmont Plantation

In 1723, Ambrose Madison and Thomas Chew, through the help of their father-in-law, James Taylor, patented 4,675 acres of land in what was to become western Orange County, with Madison dispatching an overseer and eight newly purchased Africans to make the initial changes needed to transform this land into his future plantation.
(Chambers 2005:84, 86; see Figure 2 for location of this land). By 1732, the fledgling Piedmont plantation was ready for Madison to move himself and his family to the property’s main quarter, Mount Pleasant. Six months after making this transition, however, Ambrose Madison died, presumably poisoned by two members of the plantation’s black community, working in conjunction with a man enslaved on a nearby plantation (Chambers 2005:5-9), and the property passed to his widow, Frances Taylor Madison, and later to his eldest son, James Madison, Sr., in 1744. During the remainder of the 18th century, Madison, Sr. oversaw the massive expansion of the plantation (see Chambers 1991), with the black community reaching a population of approximately one hundred and fifty individuals (Chambers 2005:129), making Montpelier one of the most prosperous properties in Orange County. Today, the most visible improvement to the plantation made during this time was the construction of a new Georgian style brick mansion, which became the Madison’s home starting in the late 1760s. Following James Madison, Sr.’s, death in 1801, mansion and property passed to his eldest son, James Madison, Jr. Fortunately for the women and men enslaved by the family at this time, the majority of the black community, around one hundred individuals, remained on the property, while the unlucky few were dispersed to the various properties owned by Madison, Sr.’s other children, including approximately twenty-five individuals who were forced to accompany Nelly Madison Hite to her husband’s Belle Grove plantation, located in in Frederick County, Virginia (Chambers 2005:134-136; Figure 2).
Figure 2. Map of Virginia depicting location of Montpelier. The property is depicted with purple star, and Orange County shown in orange. 1 depicts the location of Monticello, and 2 the location of Poplar Forrest, both owned by Thomas Jefferson. 3 depicts the location of Belle Grove. Map by Thomas Chapman (2005:11).

From 1801 until 1817, Madison Jr. primarily managed the plantation’s operations from Washington D.C., where he served as Secretary of State, and later as the 4th President of the United States. Anticipating a large wave of visitors eager to spend time at Montpelier following his retirement from public life, Madison began to expand both the mansion and the quarters needed to maintain his new social commitments. This process involved enlarging the Stable Quarter Complex, the center of the plantation’s farrier and craft activities, to care for the horses and carriages that brought guests to Montpelier. A larger change, however, involved the construction of the South Yard Quarter to expand the range of domestic services Madison could offer his guests. This work space incorporated the South Kitchen, a detached kitchen built during the initial construction of the mansion (Greer 2012a), as well as two new smokehouses to increase the number of guests that could be fed. Additionally, three 16’ x 32’ foot frame duplexes were constructed in this quarter to house the increased number of domestic laborers.
needed in the mansion during these years. The South Yard Quarter, interestingly, is located on the formal grounds of Montpelier, immediately south of the mansion; a location which would have placed the six enslaved households living in this space under constant, almost panoptical, supervision by the Madisons.\(^3\) However, despite Madison’s control over the quarter, the residents of one of these duplexes managed to keep, and later bury, a dog in the South Yard, suggesting that the enslaved community considered this area to be their own homespace (Greer 2012c). An 1837 insurance plat, commissioned by Dolley Madison, recorded the layout of this quarter (Figure 3), although the South Kitchen does not appear in this document as it was razed several years earlier (Greer 2012a).

\[\text{Figure 3.} \quad 1837 \text{ Insurance plat depicting the South Yard Quarter. Southeast Duplex and Southwest Home are shown on right edge of map. Black rectangle depicts location of the South Kitchen. Facing east (Marshall 2011:9)}\]

By the late 1820s and into the 1830s, Montpelier began to fall into economic decline, similar to many other Piedmont plantations (Chambers 2005:137; Reeves and Lewis 2005:23-24). In order to maintain their current lifestyle, the Madisons began

\(^3\) The excavations at the sites surrounding the mansion at Montpelier (all listed as site 44OR249) use a single excavation grid, with the mansion as the center. However, magnetic north lies 17º northwest of grid north. All directions given in this thesis refer to gird north.
selling segments of the plantation’s land and members of its black community, a process which continued to wreak havoc on these African Americans following James Madison, Jr.’s death in 1836 (Chambers 2005:128, 138; see Chapter I). Up until this point, five generations of black men, women, and children had called Montpelier home. As mentioned earlier, this long lasting community would have had numerous family connections running within it, and the research presented in the following chapters helps us to better understand how these kinship networks operated prior to their dismantling.

Archaeology at Montpelier

The Montpelier Archaeology Department has long concerned itself with interpreting the lives of the women and men enslaved on the plantation, with the largest concentrated effort to date being funded by a four year NEH grant in 2010 (Reeves 2010). As mentioned in the previous chapter, this project was undertaken to compare enslaved lifeways in three Montpelier quarters. As all of these areas had been previously investigated over the course of the last three decades, this effort provided staff members with the opportunity to take a comprehensive analysis of the plantation’s black history (e.g. Dunnigan 2013; Greer 2012a; Henderson 2014; Schweickart 2013). As the interpretations provided in this thesis come exclusively from the materials excavated or reassessed through this grant, I provide a history of the excavations at three sites used in my research below in order to contextualize the interpretations presented in the subsequent chapters.
Figure 4. Relevant archaeological sites at Montpelier. Contemporary visitor center complex displayed in grey and tan near center of figure to aid in spatially projecting the 19th century landscape onto the modern landscape. North is to top of map. Base map by Matthew Reeves.

South Yard Quarter

The excavation of the homespaces associated with the South Yard Quarter began in the early to mid-1990s, as part of a general exploration of the area south of the mansion (Donnes and McGinnies 2002:19). While this early work revealed a brick chimney base, and several other features (including a wooden pipe trench), the site did not receive any further attention for the next decade. In 2002, however, the 1837 insurance plat depicting the layout of this quarter was rediscovered (Figure 3), allowing the previously excavated features to be placed into a larger context. During the 2008 field season, the Montpelier Archaeology Department returned to the South Yard Quarter with the intention of excavating the southeastern duplex depicted on the insurance plat.
Despite the identification of numerous yard-related features, including two fence lines and sheet midden, no structural evidence of the home could be identified until the end of the field season, when it was discovered that the duplex sat approximately twenty feet farther west than indicated on the plat (see Trickett 2009).

**Figure 5.** 2008 excavations at the Southeast Duplex. Location of chimney base is shown in top left corner. Photograph by Matthew Reeves and illustrations by Mark Trickett (Trickett 2008:27).

Armed with the exact location of this dwelling, the Montpelier Archaeology Department returned to the South Yard for a third time during the 2011 field season, funded by the NEH grant. During this field season, the two southern duplexes in the South Yard Quarter, and their associated yardspaces, were excavated, with the southeastern duplex referred to as the Southeast Duplex, and the southwestern duplex as the Southwest Home. Although both sites were excavated during a single season, and by
the end formed a single excavation block (Figures 6 and 7), both were excavated under the direction of different field directors (M. Trickett 2013a:62, 64-65), hence the variations in the naming schema for each site (Duplex versus Home). In the final report for the 2011 field season (M. Trickett 2013a), both sites received the standardized designation of “Duplex-Home,” to provide consistency in their recordation. However, in this research I chose to keep the original designations (Southeast Duplex and Southwest Home) to make it easier for the reader to follow the discussion of these individual sites.

Figure 6. South Yard unit outlines and occupation features. North is to top of map. Southwest Home is located to the left, and Southeast Duplex the right.

Both duplexes were timber frame structures, resting above the occupation surface on piers, and were occupied following their construction in the 1810s. This occupation lasted until the early 1840s, when the plantation’s current owner, John Thornton, had them demolished as part of his reorganization of the mansion landscape. Based upon the recovered artifacts, it appear as if each duplex was occupied by two family units, with one living in each bay (M. Trickett 2103a). The piers and chimney base of the Southwest
Home were constructed of brick, with two in situ brick piers identified in the northeast quadrant of the dwelling. Both duplexes rested on a slight slope, running downhill south to north, and as such, the structural elements identified in the northern ends of both structures were more substantial, with the Southwest Home’s southern piers presumably being single bricks placed on the occupation surface (M. Trickett 2103a:102-103). Of the two South Yard sites, the Southwest Home received the most work during the initial 1990s investigations, with the site’s chimney base and a significant portion of the space underneath the home excavated (M. Trickett 2013a:102). In addition, several units were located in the yardspace off the structure’s western façade, one of which yielded the dog burial mentioned above. Approximately eight feet off the eastern façade of the Southwest Home was a series of three post holes (depicted in yellow in Figure 6), likely the supports for a porch (M. Trickett 2013a:100). Based upon the artifacts recovered from these features, this porch was probably added to the structure after its initial construction, and would have provided the site’s inhabitants with a shaded area in which to spend what little personal time they managed to obtain for themselves.
Figure 7. 2011 excavations at the South Yard Quarter. Brick chimney base of Southwest Home seen to left of photograph, and greenstone structural elements of the Southeast Duplex appear right of center. Wooden structures in the background are reconstructed timber frames marking the location of other buildings in the South Yard Quarter, and the mansion is in the right corner. Facing northeast. Photograph by Matthew Reeves (M. Trickett 2013a).

A rail fence was located immediately south of both structures, delineating the boundary of the formal mansion landscape, and separating the South Yard from the Stable Quarter, which sat approximately fifty feet to the south of these homes (Trickett 2009:26-27). The 2008 excavations of the Southeast Duplex first identified this fence line, and additional excavations in the same year were undertaken to determine the extent of the boundary (see Marshall 2009). A segment of this additional work occurred immediately off the southwest corner of the Southwest Home, and the artifacts recovered from these units have been incorporated into the site’s assemblage to provide a fuller understanding of the materials owned by the inhabits of this duplex.
Whereas the structural elements of the Southwest Home were constructed from bricks, those in the Southeast Duplex were constructed of locally available greenstone. At the moment there is no definitive suggestion for the differences between these two structures (Trickett 2103a:120). However, similar to the Southwest Home, the structural elements of the Southeast Duplex are more substantial in the dwelling’s north half, with a continuous stone foundation running along the entirety of the northern façade, and extending halfway down the western façade (Trickett 2103a:79-81). As this site was excavated both during the 2008 and 2011 field seasons, the data from both excavations were used in interpreting the lives of the women and men who lived in this duplex.

Separating the two structures was an approximately twenty foot wide central corridor running the length of the quarter. However, this area appears to have been maintained as swept clay yard surface used by the inhabitants of these sites (Trickett 2103a:9, 108). As the excavation of the two sites both assessed one-half of this area, artifacts recovered from this space were presumed to have been owned by the inhabitants of the closest duplex. It is worth mentioning that near the northern extent of the excavated area, a barbeque roasting pit was identified, likely used in the preparation of food for “Dolley Madison’s famous barbeques” (M. Trickett 2013a:86). At the moment, it is not possible to determine if the feature was in use during the domestic occupation of the South Yard or if it was filled prior to the construction of the adjacent duplexes (M. Trickett 2013a:85). However, if it was open and in use at the very time members the black community called this space home, then it serves as a reminder of the quiet power struggles that occurred in everyday spaces at Montpelier (M. Trickett 2013a:86).
While all of these occupation-related features were identified from intact 19th century surfaces, the 1840s demolition of the duplexes, and the remainder of the South Yard structures, also left their mark upon the sites’ stratigraphy. While the larger fragments of the brick and stone which made up the structural elements of these homes were carted away, a significant amount of smaller stone and brick fragments were left behind and covered with soil (M. Trickett 2103a:90-91, 95). While the artifacts recovered from these deposits were not recovered from in situ locations, they do appear to have been owned by the residents of the duplexes, based on their similarities with the material culture recovered from the intact occupation surfaces (with multiple vessels crossmending between these deposits), and therefore can be included in this analysis. As part of his new design for the South Yard, John Thornton (the current owner) directed the construction of a brick pathway south of the mansion, a segment of which was laid on top of the remains of the Southeast Duplex (Trickett 2103a:92-95; see the top right corner of the excavation block in Figure 7). After the 1840s, except for the planting of two trees in the 20th century by the DuPont family (a Spanish fir and a Nordmann fir) and the excavation of a water pipeline, no sub-surface disturbances appear to have taken place (Trickett 2103a:96-97, 113-114; 2009:37). This relatively undisturbed context allows us to easily explore the lives of the women and men who called this quarter home, and to start to suggest how they structured the social worlds they constructed for themselves.

**Stable Quarter Complex**

The Stable Quarter Complex, a large (approximately two acres) area housed the craft workshops used to keep the plantation running smoothly and care for the beasts of burden owned by both by the Madisons and their guests, was located approximately fifty
feet south of the South Yard Quarter. In the spring of 2010, the Montpelier Archaeology Department attempted to locate and excavate the remains of one of these workspaces, the eponymous 19th century stable (Marshall 2010; Trickett 2010b), although no definitive location could be proposed. However, the Stable Quarter Complex housed members of the black community, as well as the spaces they worked in. Although several households have been located within the boundaries of this quarter (cf. Trickett 2010b:33), only one has been excavated to date. This domestic space consisted of the remains of a log cabin, home to a single enslaved family, as well as their adjacent yard spaces. This cabin was referred to during excavation and its final report (Marshall 2011) as the Stable Quarter and it will continue to be referred to as such in this research, while the larger quarter in which this structure was located is referred to as the Stable Quarter Complex, in order to distinguish the two. As the Stable Quarter is the closest structure in the Stable Quarter Complex to the South Yard Quarter, lying at the border between the two quarters (approximately fifty feet south of the Southeast Duplex) the family that occupied this location likely maintained social ties with the residents of the South Yard duplexes, easily allowing them to be included in this research.
Similar to the South Yard sites, the Stable Quarter was first explored during the early to mid-1990s. However, during these excavations, only the site’s yard deposits saw excavation (Donnan and McGinnies 2002:82-94). In the summer and fall of 2010, the Montpelier Archaeology Department returned to the Stable Quarter as part of the NEH grant and during the next few months, the cabin and its yard were excavated. The cabin
itself, occupied from the 1790s to the 1830s, was revealed to have been 16 foot by 20 foot rectangular structure, divided into two rooms by an interior partition (Marshall 2011:27, 29, 40). Each bay possessed a stick and mud chimney, with the eastern room’s being the smaller of the two used for heating purposes, while the larger western chimney presumably was used for cooking the family’s meals (Marshall 2011:41). This latter interpretation is reinforced by the excavation of a large subfloor pit directly adjacent to the western fireplace, presumably used for the storage of sweet potatoes (Marshall 2011:46-53). Based upon the presence a single food storage feature, Adam Marshall suggested that this cabin was occupied by a single family (2011:iii). Several features were also identified in the swept clay yard surrounding the cabin, including a series of seven borrow pits to the south of the home (Marshall 2011:56-76). Based on loose documentary evidence, the Stable Quarter may have been occupied by “Granny Milly,” who worked in the mansion’s gardens, and her family (Marshall 2011:6).
Following its abandonment and later destruction in the 1830s, the site appears to have been only minimally impacted by human activity, most notably by a possible tree fall in the vicinity of the cabins interior (Marshall 2011:92). This has allowed the stratigraphy of the Stable Quarter to remain relatively intact, aiding our ability to interpret the lives of the women and men who lived here.
Figure 10. 2011 Stable Quarter Excavations. Archaeologists indicate the four corners of the cabin. Facing north. Photograph by Matthew Reeves.
CHAPTER III
SOCIAL RELATIONS IN THE PLANTATION SOUTH

In their broadest sense, social relationships refer to the interactions between two or more individuals. However, moving beyond this basic definition, social relations form a complex web of interactions which structure daily life within communities on a variety of levels. In the context of the Plantation South, these extensive connections not only ordered the way that local elite and their tenants interacted during the colonial era (cf. Bell 2002), but also were built into the very structures in which these individuals lived. In 17th and early 18th century Chesapeake, colonists of all statuses resided in earthfast dwellings; structures which, due to the exposure of their wooden foundational features to the elements, required regular repairs at five to 10 year intervals. These constant repairs established social and economic relationships between local residents and the craftsmen they hired to ensure their homes remained structurally sound (Shackel 1998:97-99).

Social relationships, perhaps more importantly, also structured the interaction between slaveholders, and the women and men they held in bondage, structuring not only how black and white individuals experienced one another, but also the power inequalities which created plantation slavery. Given the importance of this topic, archaeologists researching the African diaspora in the region began to study social relations in the 1970-1980s, not long after archaeological research into the African American past began. These early studies (e.g. Adams and Boiling 1989; Moore 1985; Orser 1988, 1989; Otto 1975, 1977, 1980, 1984; see Thomas 1995:4-10 for a review of these early trends) tended to focus on the Coastal Lowlands of Georgia, one of the important hotbeds of early plantation archaeology, or else operated strictly on a theoretical level (e.g. Howson
1990). Since the 1990s, archaeologists have continued to carry out similar studies in the Lowlands (e.g. Zierden 2010), as well as other regions of the Antebellum South: including the Lower Mississippi Valley (e.g. Scott 2001), the Upland South (e.g. Peres 2008; Thomas 1998), and the Chesapeake (e.g. Bowes 2011; Bowes and Trigg 2012; Edwards-Ingram 2001; Greer 2012c; Nieman 2008), in addition to the expansion of such studies to the Caribbean (e.g. Armstrong 2013; Camp 2007; Chenoweth 2011; Delle 2000), and South America (e.g. Symanski 2013). This research provides us with an understanding of the relations and tensions which shaped the interactions and power struggles between masters and their slaves, often drawing heavily from Marxist theories.

Despite the incredible benefit of such work, our study of the African diaspora lacked a firm understanding of the social relations which structured the social life of African Americans within their own communities; interactions which may have been the most important to black Southerners (Ferguson 1992: xliv).\(^4\) Scholars have worked to fill this interpretive gap for the last two decades, focusing on the Upland South (Galle 2004; Thomas 1995, 1998, 2001; Young 1995, 1997a, 2003, 2004), the Lower Mississippi Valley (Young 2003; Young et al. 2001), the Lowlands of Georgia and South Carolina (Kowal 2006, 2007), and the Chesapeake’s Tidewater (Boroughs 2013; Fesler 2004b; Galle 2006, 2010) and Piedmont regions (Greer 2012b, 2013; Heath 2012b; Lee 2012; Nieman et al. 2013; Reeves and Greer 2012). During the same time span, archaeologists working in the Caribbean, primarily in Jamaica (e.g. Agorsah 1999; Armstrong 1990; Armstrong and Fleischman 2003; Galle 2011; Hauser 2013; Hauser and Armstrong 1999; Nieman 2008), and South America (e.g. Symanski 2013).

\(^4\) A similar gap is present in the lack of studies archaeologically assessing the social relations which occurred between poorer white Southerners and African Americans. However, as these interactions are not easily interpreted from the archaeological record, due to their ephemeral nature, this line of research has not been pursued. See Jeff Forret (2004) for an example of these relationships the historical literature.
Reeves 1997, 2011), but also on other islands (see Wilkie and Farnsworth 2005 for work in the Bahamas), and in South America (e.g. de Souza and Agostini 2013), conducted similar research on the social interactions which occurred between enslaved households.

Recently, historians have similarly expanded their studies of social relations to interpret similar questions about intra-community interactions in the Antebellum South (e.g. Camp 2004; Forret 2008; Hudson 1994; Johnson 1981; Kaye 2007; Kyles 2008; Penningroth 1997, 2003), and other parts of the larger Atlantic World (e.g. Penningroth 2007; Sweet 2011). Although the end of slavery changed many aspects of daily life for black Americans, historical archaeologists have been successful in studying the social relations which continued to define a large portion of the interactions between African Americans after freedom, both in the South (Barnes 2011; Brown 1994; Brown and Copper 1990; Warner 1998; Wilkie 2000a) and in the North (Cabak et al. 1995; Landon and Bulger 2013).

Despite the late entry of historical archaeologists into the study of intra-community social relations in the African diaspora, ethnographers began studying these trends in the 1960-1970s. These studies, such as Carol Stack’s (1974) and Joyce Aschenbrenner’s (1975) research on black families in Illinois, Lincoln Keiser’s (1969) examination of social relations within Chicago’s black gangs, and Melvin Williams (1974) work on community in a Pentecostal congregation in Pittsburg, tended to focus on communities transplanted to the urban North during the Great Migration. Fewer researchers, however, looked at the South at this time (cf. Kunkel and Kennard 1969). However, research into this region has expanded in the last thirty years, including

---

5 It is interesting to note that the Case Studies in Cultural Anthropology series (published by Holt, Rienhart and Winston) produced several of these early studies (e.g. Aschenbrenner 1975; Keiser 1969; Kunkel and Kennard 1971).
Marilyn Thomas-Houston’s (2005) use of intimate culture groups to structure social life within the black community of Lafayette County, Mississippi (see Chapter VI), and the kinship studies included in Robert Hall’s and Carol Stack’s edited volume *Holding on the Lord* (1982; see Day 1982; Jones 1982; Nathans 1982). Cross-cutting all of these far-flung archaeological, historical, and ethnographic studies are the unifying themes of property, kinship, and community.

**Between the Household and the Community**

The study of social relations occupies a somewhat ambiguous position within the archaeological literature due to the scale at which we make our interpretations. While a household level of analysis forms the core of such research, analyzing individual homes in their individual context reveals little of the overarching threads which tied them together. Similarly, while multiple households form a community, interpreting these individual households as a homogenized whole, functioning as, in this instance, the “enslaved community of Montpelier,” glosses over the differences between the various domestic sites, flattening the internal social terrain of these communities. Therefore the study of social relations must situate itself between the household and the community. This conceptual middle ground is gaining favor in the study of Piedmont plantations, with Matthew Reeves referring to it as “a community of households” (2010). While Barbara Heath (2012b) recently summarized the interaction between these levels of analysis, a brief overview of household and community archaeology is provided below, along with some of the theoretical concerns which accompany their utilization in the study of social relations at Montpelier.
Household archaeology originated amongst Mesoamericanists in the 1970s (cf. Flannery ed. 1976), before archaeologists working on prehistoric (e.g. Pluckhahn 2010; Wesson 2008; Wilk and Rathje 1982) and historic (e.g. Allison 1998, 1999; Barile and Brandon eds. 2004) sites in the United States adopted the concept. Such studies place the focus of their research on individual homespaces, assuming that these are the smallest unit through which “subsistence, craft production, divisions of labor, and status” can be assessed with the archaeological record, providing “micro-scale evidence” of past communities (Heath 2012b:106-107; King 2006:299). Generally, we conceive of households as both the individuals living in a single space, and the daily activities that occurred within its confines (Allison 1998:16). However, the conception of households has been expanded spatially to include a networks of “nested households” connected through kinship or other social relations, operating as a single unit (see Barile and Brandon eds. 2004).

In assessing the Montpelier sites used in this thesis, a household level of analysis gives us the ability to look at each of the five excavated households and assess the amount of wealth they displayed based on the entirety of their associated assemblages; the results of which will be interpreted in Chapter IV (even if the families residing in the duplex are treated as a single unit of analysis). Later, in Chapter V, individual households will serve as nodes in the social networks of Montpelier’s enslaved community (see Herzfeld 2001:133-151), as the material culture deposited from a household’s daily activities provides tantalizing suggestions about the social interactions they involved themselves in. However, when considering households in the archaeology of the African diaspora, several concerns must be addressed.
When condensing several, potentially diverse, individuals into the single unit of analysis of a household, a person’s unique variation may become obscured (Nieman et al. 2013:2). However, when considering the households at the South Yard, and the Stable Quarter, the dwellings appear to have been occupied by family (see Chapter II). Dylan Penningroth suggested that property and wealth in enslaved kin groups were accessible to all members of the group (2003), allowing the usage of a household in this case to potentially avoid skewing our results toward the study of the various heads of these households, especially when considering the wealth displayed by them. Furthermore, this collapsing of individual actors into a single unit can obscure gender differences within a single home. However, a careful consideration of the artifacts involved in this research can try to ensure that we represent the social lives of both the women and men who called these sites home. Jillian Galle (2010) suggested that expensive metallic alloy buttons were likely to be owned and used by men, while costly ceramics were most likely to be displayed by women. Therefore, assessing these two discrete indexes for interpreting the amount of wealth each household displayed should allow for an engendered understanding of wealth within these sites (Chapter IV). Second, the fact that multiple threads of evidence will be used to assess social interactions, including items associated with both male (e.g. woodworking and hunting tools) and female activities (e.g. sewing related objects) allows for a gendered understanding of these trends within the theoretical confines of the household.

Barbara Voss (2008), additionally, has suggested that the conception of the household as a viable unit of archaeological analysis cannot be applied uncritically to all sites encountered by historical archaeologists. In the case of Montpelier, even though the
individual dwellings appear to have been occupied by families, the presence of multi-household kinship groups may have overshadowed these discrete units in the minds of the plantation’s black community, creating networks of nested households throughout the surrounding region. However, as noted below (e.g. Stack 1974; Thomas 1995), in these cases items may have been exchanged between the individual excavated households, processes which should be visible in the assessment of the social interactions between the households used in this study. This prevents the study’s focus on individual homesites from creating myopic assumptions about the size and range of enslaved households and kin networks.

Situated outside the confining walls of household studies, archaeological community studies, popularized in the 1990s and 2000s (e.g. Cusick 1995; Canuto and Yaeger eds. 2000), look at how individuals interact with others “in their broader cultural context” (Heath 2012b:107). While these studies have provided valuable insight into the social common senses of past communities, unless they are able to move between household and community levels of analysis, the particularities of the social relations within these communities will remain obscured. However, Barbara Heath has stated that if this middle ground is sought, then “archaeologists can explore the material, spatial, and social dynamics of enslaved groups” (2012b:107).

The influence of these two scales of analysis also extends into the historiography surrounding the study of enslaved social relations. The contemporary study of enslaved families (operating essentially at the household level of analysis) has its roots in Herbert Gutman’s *The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom* (1977). Both this work and later works (cf. Pargas 2011; Regosin 2002) have demonstrated that African Americans were
able to form long lasting family connections despite of the harsh realities of plantation slavery. However, they generally have not assessed the larger kinship and social networks which bound together individual families, and as such, can only provide limited insight into the study of enslaved social relations. Likewise, research into black communities began in the early 1970s with John Blassingame’s classic work *The Slave Community* (1972), and has continued into the 21st century (cf. Kaye 2007). While this line of inquiry has provided tremendous insight into the existence, and the scale, of enslaved communities, with the exception of the works noted in this chapter, it has rarely set its focus on the social mechanisms at work within these communities, and therefore cannot adequately assess the social relations within these groups.

**Property, Kinship, and Community**

When considering the broad array of literature listed above, the themes of property, kinship, and community provide useful poles around which scholars have directed their conceptions of social relations in the Antebellum South, and the broader African Atlantic. Therefore, many of the key studies referenced above will be discussed in greater detail below, organized around these themes, to provide a layout of the current understandings and conceptions researchers have used in the study of the social relations between individuals caught up in the diasporic trajectories of the black Atlantic.

Property plays two roles in the study of enslaved social relations, the first of which revolves around the ability of the wealth displayed by an individual or household to gain prestige within their local community. Jillian Galle’s (2006, 2010, 2011) use of cost signaling forms perhaps the most explicitly stated example of the impact of wealth on social relations. Cost signaling is a theoretical perspective, acquired from
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6 See Laura Ogden (2011:22) for a discussion of “poles” as navigational points in scholarly research.
evolutionary theory, which states that an individual will utilize displays of their value (wealth, evolutionary fitness etc.) in order to attract others to them, whether as a potential mate or for some other relationship (Galle 2010:21-25). In applying this to Antebellum Virginia, Galle argued that the near ubiquitous presence of cost signaling devices at quarters across the state, identified as fine ceramics and metallic buttons, indicated that black Virginians actively procured expensive items with the purpose of securing romantic, social, and economic relationships. However, when considering the broader impact of these actions, Galle suggested that cost signaling, particularly when seen in fine clothing, was likely a more important strategy for African Americans to use when attempting to create social relations in areas with larger populations, such as urban areas, to maximize the amount of individuals receiving the signaling device, and in situations where the majority of the population did not know the signaler, as it is hard to believe that a person’s previous experience could be swayed by such exterior displays (Galle 2010:22, 24-25, 37). Building upon these considerations, Douglas Sanford elaborated upon the potential impact for cost signaling devices to influence social relations in the context of urban slavery (2012:150-151), and I recently explored the possible use of fine clothing and jewelry as cost signaling devices by individuals seeking to enter into new social networks while escaping slavery in Mississippi (2014b; in press; n.d.). In addition to the potential for using portable cost signaling devices outside of an individual’s home community, Galle also included expensive ceramics used within a household as signaling devices, suggesting that the social ties displays of wealth created could take place within a community (2010).
Ceramics have long been used to suggest social and economic status in Antebellum plantations, both between the various social / racial groups residing within a plantation’s boundaries (e.g. Otto 1977), and between various enslaved households (e.g. Moore 1985). In her recent interpretation of costly consumption and community interactions in Lowland South Carolina, Amy Kowal (2006, 2007) proposed that enslaved households purchased expensive ceramics to increase their status inside of their home communities. She demonstrated this trend by identifying that the black inhabitants of the Snee Farm purchased a large portion of their household ceramics from external markets, as evidence by a lack of colonoware. Within the excavated assemblages, high rates (37 percent) of decorated ceramics were recovered, suggesting that the enslaved individuals were intentionally selecting expensive ceramics in order to demonstrate their status within their communities for a variety of social purposes (Kowal 2007:8).

Matthew Reeves (1997, 2011) similarly used the economic value of enslaved household’s assemblages to determine social status amongst African Americans, using the materials recovered from two 19th century Jamaican plantations. At the first of these two sites, the coffee plantation of Juan de Bolas, all six of the excavated households possessed relatively equal material wealth. At the second, the sugar estate of Thetford, three of the excavated households possessed equal amounts of material wealth, while a fourth home possessed more wealth than the others (Reeves 2011a:194-199). This distribution, Reeves suggested, was due to the labor practices imposed upon these black communities through the crops they cultivated. Coffee plantations tended to operate on a task system, which divided the labor relatively evenly within a community, while sugar plantations, such as Thetford, often employed enslaved drivers to supervise gangs of
laborers. Applying the effect of these labor systems to the excavated households, the sites at Juan de Bolas appear to reflect the lack of imposed social order on the enslaved community, while at Thetford, the high amount of wealth seen at a single household likely correlates to the dwelling of a driver, who were often able to use their power to gain additional income (Reeves 2011a:204-206). Historians (e.g. Clifton 1981) and archaeologists (e.g. Orser 1986) have similarly noted the potential social power that drivers and other assigned leaders across the South could wield. Reeves’s work, while demonstrating the presence of differing economic statuses within slave quarters, also serves as a useful reminder that, due to the nature of slavery, forces outside the direct control of the community members could have profound effects on the social relations they participated in.

Historicizing the use of wealth in demonstrating social status, Larry Hudson (1994) suggested that prior to the 19th century, the internal economies linking together enslaved households operated through personal connections and kinship ties. However, he suggested that the increased access to cash available to black Southerners during the course of the 19th century through their participation in local informal economies led to profound shifts in the social relations within enslaved communities. These changes manifested themselves in the greater role of wealth in defining relationships, including courting and the general social status of individuals within enslaved communities.

In all of these studies, however, there is an underlying assumption that economic status plays a role in defining social status. Often, historical archaeologists working with this conception use the term “socio-economic status” without pausing to consider the potential methodological complications that arise from this conglomeration (see Monks
Generally, it is true that differences between the various social strata present in the 19th century tended to correlate to economic disparities, making the use of socio-economic status a potentially useful catchall term. Similarly, between members of society’s elite, economic differences may have manifested into internal divisions, which could also be termed socio-economic status (cf. Baugher and Venable 1987). However, despite the potential appropriateness of combining social and economic statuses in these cases, we cannot assume the correlation between them in all situations. This is particularly true amongst subaltern populations, in this case African Americans, who, due to their oppression, may have developed alternative ways of viewing social status, and as such, the connection between social and economic status must be interpreted from the available evidence, rather than be assumed to operate identically on both sides of the color line.

Kenneth Brown (1994; Brown and Cooper 1990), using data from Texas’ Levi Jordan plantation, has previously assessed the interplay between these two definitions of status. He found that while certain African American households, such as the plantation’s blacksmith, possessed greater material wealth, such items did not equal greater social positions within this plantation community. Rather, the status of an individual rested upon the role they played in the internal economy that existed within the bounds of the local black social network. Such roles included “quilter, munitions maker, hunter, bone and shell carver, the seamstresses, political leader, and the magician/curer” (1994:107), each affording individuals various levels of prestige and influence within the community.
However, Brown’s results possess two considerations which prevent us from applying them directly to other black communities across the South. First, although the Levi Jordan plantation was occupied during the Antebellum era, the bulk of the recovered assemblage, and the interpretations derived from it, date to the third quarter of the 19th century. While similar traditions may have existed at the site prior to emancipation, given the large shifts in African American culture which accompanied freedom (c.f. Wilkie 2000a) this historic continuity cannot be assumed without further support. Secondly, the availability (or lack thereof) of consumer goods in eastern Texas may have created a social environment which differed from other regions of the South (Brown 1994:107), suggesting that, again, Brown’s conclusions should be reassessed in other parts of the South in order to determine their broader applicability.

Studies on three additional Postbellum communities, however, further suggest that, at least after freedom, economic status may not have been an important consideration amongst African Americans. In her assessment of a black community in Appalachia, Jodi Barnes (2011) noted that the wealthiest members, a status determined through historical documents, did not possess significantly more expensive artifact assemblages than the rest of the community. Barnes suggested that this practice may have been influenced by the need of this community to come together as a unified whole in order to communally overcome the issues of institutionalized racism in the predominantly white county in which they resided. Similarly, Mark Warner (1998) and Paul Mullins (1999) both proposed that economic status differences within the black community in Annapolis, Maryland, were publicly downplayed, in order to present a more acceptable public façade to the city’s white populace. Chinese communities in the
Mississippi Delta used a similar strategy in the mid-20th century (Loewen 1988), suggesting that group unity may be an adaptation widely used by subaltern communities in the United States. Furthermore, Joe Saunders noted that in the 1930s, white tenant farmers were more concerned with their social and economic standing than their black counterparts due to their greater potential for social mobility (1982:183). However, as noted with Brown’s research, while these studies suggest possibilities for the social relationship that existed prior to emancipation, these trends must be assessed amongst Antebellum communities.

In summary, the works presented so far conceive of property, as indicated by recovered consumer goods, as an indication of economic wealth and as a tool through which black Southerners either gained social prestige or mitigated social differences. Other scholars, however, choose to interpret specific material items as direct, or indirect, indicators of the interactions between enslaved households. Returning again to Kenneth Brown’s research at Levi Jordan, the various social roles occupied within the plantation community were defined by their related material culture. For example, excavations at the home of the plantation’s magician/curer yielded small dolls, fake knife blades, and cubes of chalk, all of which are associated with African ritual assemblages (1994:108-109). Therefore, the recovered artifacts serve as indirect indicators of the social position of their owners.

Building upon similar assumptions, Jillian Galle (2004) assessed the amount of social capital a single enslaved family possessed at Tennessee’s Hermitage plantation. She noted that the occupations assigned to individuals by plantation managers, such as a wagoner or a seamstress, afforded them not only an increased access to material
possessions through their interactions with white families, but also the potential to sway the views of their masters for their own purposes, if even to a minor degree. Amy Young has also suggested that women enslaved in domestic capacities could obtain a certain amount of power over the decisions of their masters in order to protect their own families (2004:142). The combination of these two factors could afford individuals with higher amounts of influence they could wield within their community; specifically in Galle’s case, the homes of these African Americans became an important node in local social interactions. These conceptions support historian John Blassingame’s suggestion that bondspeople could climb the social ladder within their own communities through their ability to help others in these groups (1972:142).

Moving beyond the realm of material culture, several scholars have suggested additional attributes or activities that individuals could use to directly increase their prestige within black communities. Historian Perry Kyles (2008) proposed that within slave quarters, African Americans could gain political power through their ability to organize activities of resistance. Also along martial lines, Sergio Lussana (2010) noted that fighting contests commonly occurred between bondsmen living on the same, and neighboring, plantations. Although Lussana focused his discussion on the role of these fights in the creation of masculinity, the prestige that these men could gain from their victories could create social capital, a trend also seen amongst West African cultures in general (Lussana 2010:918; Obi 2008), and amongst the Igbo in particular (Achebe 1988:7).

Gender roles may have also played a part in the creation of social capital within enslaved communities. In his research on Afro-Caribbean social relations, Peter Wilson
proposed the importance of respectability and reputation in creating social standing (Besson 2002:12-14), with women gaining respect through their belonging to European-influenced institutions, such as church groups, and their ability to bear children. Alternatively, men gained reputation through their solidarity with other men, as well as their ability to father children, who were referred to as “poor men’s riches” (Wilson, quoted in Besson 2002:14). While Jean Besson has noted the numerous androcentric biases inherent in Wilson’s argument (2002:14-16), his suggestion that social status amongst women and men may not operate through the same mechanisms is important to keep in mind.

The search for social capital in black communities, despite its utility in expanding the way in which social relations are conceived of within these groups, are still closely related to the way in which wealth operated within these social settings in that they revolve around ordering the households within a community to establish a social hierarchy, with indexes of wealth substituted for indexes of social status. Other researchers, however, focused on the role of social interactions occurring within a community, using recovered material culture as an indirect measure of social interactions. These interactions, similar to social relations, are a common part of daily life. In any given day, an individual can interact with someone with whom they are not in a social relationship with. However, the archaeologically visible indications of social interactions tend to center around demonstrating patterned, repetitive interactions between two or more individuals or households, and because the observed interactions are routine, they indicate social relationships rather than more ephemeral social connections. Alternatively, Lori Lee (2012) has suggested that the exchange of meaningful items
between two individuals may, even if it is a onetime occurrence, reflect long term, or at least significant, social interaction between these persons, providing an additional level in the assessment of the social transfer of goods.

In the early stages of this thesis research, I looked at the indications of social interaction between the residents of the Stable Quarter and the Southeast Duplex to determine if social interaction at Montpelier was confined to the arbitrary boundaries of the quarter complexes (Greer 2012b; Reeves and Greer 2012). This looked at the distribution of vessels acquired from the Madison’s dining room, equestrian related items, and woodworking tools, concluding that social interaction flowed freely between these sites, and therefore social relations between the households residing in different quarters existed at Montpelier.

While I only looked at a segment of the ceramic vessels recovered from these two sites, Amy Young, in her research at Kentucky’s Locust Grove plantation (1995, 1997a, 2003, 2004) assessed the signs of social interaction present in the entire ceramic assemblage of three enslaved households (see Greer 2013 for an application of this at Montpelier). In conducting her study, Young suggested that individual vessels from one household could be given to another household as a form of gift giving, and as such, a lone vessel from a set that is predominantly associated with one household recovered from another may indicate these connections. Based upon this premise, Young demonstrated that all three households she looked at maintained social connections with each other through gift giving, conducted for the purpose of creating social ties and relations between the themselves as a risk management strategy (2004:144-146).
Moving beyond Young’s research into the creation of social ties, other researchers have focused their interpretations on the way that existing social ties functioned, as Brian Thomas did in his analysis of the social relations at the Hermitage plantation in Tennessee (1995, 1998, 2001). This work suggested that, based upon the distribution of certain artifacts, such as vessels acquired from the mansion, the enslaved community at the Hermitage interacted with each other across the boundaries of the plantation’s distinct quarters, which Thomas termed a cooperative model of social relations (versus an adversarial model in which internal division within a plantation, imparted by occupation duties, creates smaller groups within the community). Motivating these interactions, Thomas suggested, was a network of kin relations which incorporated all corners of the plantation, regardless of the occupation of their members. This work serves a reminder to researchers that kin connections are rarely contained within the discrete areas excavated by archaeologists, and that these networks can be responsible for a wide variety of artifacts recovered from a single household.

Given the material nature of archaeological research, it is no surprise that physical property played a large role in the studies of biological and fictive kinship above. However, two works outside of archaeology suggest that this trend may, in fact, be reflective of African American culture, rather than a bias imparted by the sources we employ in our studies of the past. Carol Stack (1974) studied an inner-city black community in Illinois, focusing on the strategies that poor families used to survive poverty. One of the key facets she identified was the transfer of money and goods within extended kin networks. These transfers, while occasionally negatively affecting the individual or couple from whom these goods originated, allowed resources to reach those
in need while strengthening the bonds of kinship between family members. Similarly, friends of family members could be incorporated into these kin networks, provided they participated in the exchange of goods and services.

Due to Stack’s interest in the survival strategies used in the particular environment of northern ghettos, she placed a heavy emphasis on the role of poverty in the creation of these systems. However, the similarity of these exchange networks to those noted by Amy Young (e.g. 2004) and Brian Thomas (e.g. 1995), suggests that they have deeper roots within African American culture. Historian Dylan Penningroth (1997, 2003) also proposed the existence of Antebellum exchange patterns amongst kin networks, which operated much like those Stack observed in the 20th century.  

Penningroth, however, further expanded the conception of these kinship bonds beyond a mechanism through which property could be transferred, to the very apparatus through which all wealth, social relations, and intra-quarter politics in enslaved communities originated. This trend, he suggested, has its roots in West African cultures where kin groups, as opposed to individuals, held property communally, rather than such common senses being an adaptation to the conditions of slavery in the Americas. While Penningroth’s interpretations suggest significantly deeper roots to the observations Stack made about the importance of property in kin groups, his sources date roughly to the 1860s and are not regionally focused within the South, making it somewhat problematic to impose his findings at large without further assessment.

These kinship webs did not solely confine themselves to the transfer of consumer goods. Amy Young (2003; Young et al. 2001) suggested that group hunting was also an
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important way in which men were integrated into new social networks, given the
importance of wild food sources to the security and survival of these communities.

Similarly, Jessica Bowes proposed that enslaved individuals passed around the location
of valuable plant resources to other members of their community (2011:104). While
Bowes did not assess the networks through which individuals passed this information,
one would suspect that this occurred between individuals with pre-established social
relations. Although not directly related to archaeology of the African diaspora, Heather
Trigg (2003) similarly noted that the transfer of food, as well of other commodities,
played an important role in the creation and maintenance of social relation in the colonial
Southwest.

Kinship was not a static, or even an automatic, category in which individuals were
placed, as who a person was socially recognized to be related to was negotiable, despite
shared linages (Penningroth 2003; Stack 1974). For instance, courtship, marriage, and
sexual relations could have profound effects on individuals incorporated into various kin
networks (Fraser 2007; Penningroth 2003). Biological kinship may not have been the
only form of kinship operating with slave quarters, as Thomas Webber suggested that
reciprocal networks could also extend to members not related by blood (1978:66-67; also
see Young 1997a:26), indicating that complex systems of fictive kinship also connected
individual African Americans.

While social relations could be a positive force within an enslaved community,
allowing for the creation and maintenance of social ties, these forces also had the
potential to divide individuals within these groups. Such divisions could structure male /
female relations within a household (see Wilkie 2000b), or cause enough tension to result
in physical violence between individuals (see Forret 2008). However, the negative consequences of social relations are most visible in the archaeological record through artifacts and features used to prevent theft, including certain ritual deposits intended to vex thieves (Reeves in press; n.d.), the use of subfloor pits as “safety deposits boxes” (Nieman 1997; Samford 2008:138-149) and the use of locks to secure valuable items (e.g. Genovese 1976: 696-697; Heath 1999b:64; Reeves and Greer 2012:78). It is also imperative to keep in mind that in addition to these material protections, a variety of social mechanism existed for African Americans to socially claim possessions, thereby reducing the ability of others to lay claim to an item, or to publicly shame a suspected thief, damaging their prestige in current or future social networks (Penningroth 2003:91-101). While these instances are discussed in further detail in Chapter V, they are an important counterpoint to other, positive, social relations discussed in this chapter, one which rarely is explicitly stated in the previous archaeological literature (Dylan Penningroth’s Claims of Kinfolk [2003] is one noteworthy exception). Care, however, must be taken when looking at the negative side of black social relations. As Dylan Penningroth has noted, the continued use of such studies to otherize the African Americans (both past and present) from white American society (2003:12).

Lastly, several scholars have placed their study of enslaved social relations at a community level: either by looking at the overall household composition of a community, or by suggesting ways in which social interaction connected a variety of individuals. Garret Fesler (2004a, 2004b), in assessing early housing patterns at Virginia’s Utopia site, suggested that women and men enslaved in the colony, at least into the early 18th century, were able to organize their living quarters to imitate communal spatial
arrangements found in West Africa. Such an arrangement had the potential of ordering the social relations of the individuals residing in these homes toward inclusive fictive kin networks. As the 18th century wore on, however, families became more common throughout Virginia (see Chapter II). One result of this increase for black Virginians was a shift in residence patterns toward single family housing (Fesler 2004a; Heath 2012b), potentially shifting social relations amongst kin groups from a single locus to several surrounding households.

Extended kin networks operating within slave quarters, and the social arrangements they created, could also structure the physical layout of these communities. Kofi Agorsah (1983), through his ethno-archaeological research in Ghana, observed that spatial organization in settlements tended to revolve around family or clan group associations, thereby allowing spatial relations to indicate social relations. This projection of social understandings on the built landscape accompanied captive Africans through the Middle Passage, and influenced the spatial organization of black settlements in Jamaica. These can be seen most explicitly in the presence of observable pathways connecting households of related community members (e.g. Agorsah 1999; Armstrong 1990), and in the clustering of households within local villages (Armstrong 1999; Armstrong and Fleischman 2003). Although these examples come from areas of the Atlantic World in which Africans maintained the ability to structure their own settlement patterns (and therefore do not directly apply to the sites used in this research), the potential for the physical layout of a slave quarter to mirror the social relations occurring within its boundaries in the Antebellum South exists, particularly in field quarters located beyond the panoptical gaze of planters.
In contrast to these kin based conceptions, Frasier Nieman et al. (2013) suggested that the interaction between households was driven by an evolutionary need for cooperation. In this proposal, Niemen et al. used game theory’s prisoner’s dilemma, which assesses the likelihood of cooperation between two or more individuals, to model the interaction between several enslaved households at Monticello. His results, showing that the households kept the yards between each other clean of trash, even if they did not share resources, indicates that some level of cooperation existed between the site’s households. Similarly, Whitney Battle (2004) suggested that individual living in the same quarter could create social bonds through seeing each other, and interacting, on a daily basis.

Moving further beyond the household, larger forms of community interactions have the potential of ordering the social relationships which structured their member’s social life. Both historians (Kaye 2007) and archaeologists (e.g. Boroughs 2013) have noted that neighborhoods, formed from the interaction of bondspeople from adjacent plantations, created regional communities through which African Americans interacted and maintained social ties. Such ties could create social relationships through a variety of mechanisms, including trade networks (e.g. Hauser 2013; Hauser and Armstrong 1999), or local spiritual communities (e.g. Sweet 2011). Certain locations also had the potential of becoming meeting points, facilitating further interactions within these communities (see Boroughs 2013; Brock 2011). One such location was churches, and while these have not been extensively studied in the Antebellum South, several examples from outside of this time and place can serve to illustrate the interactions which may have occurred at meeting houses across the South. Many of these sites have yielded the remains of
communal feasting (Baumann 2009; Beaudry and Berkland 2007; Cabak et al. 1995; Landon and Bulger 2013), indicating that such activities may have structured the social relationships which occurred within these congregations. Furthermore, Melanie Cabak et al. (1995) suggested that medical services were available at some churches, providing additional levels of social interactions to these sacred places.

When considering the three poles of property, kinship, and community, we can further condense them into two broad groupings: studies which focus on social standing, generally indicated by economic status, and studies which focus on the establishment and maintenance of social ties. However, with the exception of Kenneth Brown’s research (1994; Brown and Cooper 1990), and to a lesser extent the other Postbellum studies (Barnes 2011; Mullins 1999; Warner 1998), the scholarship detailed in this chapter has yet to combine these two factors into a single interpretive framework capable of testing these assertions against each other. In weaving together these two research threads, this thesis will aid in assessing their applicability, and hopefully help to further the discussion of the social relations which created friends and business partners, aunts and nephews, out of individual African Americans.
CHAPTER IV

ASSESSING THE HOUSEHOLDS’ DISPLAYED WEALTH

Before we can begin to determine if wealth mattered in structuring social relations within Montpelier’s black community, we must first attempt to see how much wealth each household possessed. To interpret this from the broken dishes and other items left behind by the families that lived in the South Yard and Stable Quarters, costly consumer goods available in local markets across the Virginia Piedmont were identified and compared between the various sites. The expensive items used in this study were costly ceramics, glass tableware, clothing and bodily adornments, and other miscellaneous consumer goods.

While we can easily assess the relative cost of the artifacts deposited by an enslaved household, through contemporary price guides and other metrics, teasing out deeper meanings about the individuals who owned them is more difficult. Amongst black Virginians, there were an infinite number of possibilities for how a family may have used the resources they were able to earn. For instance, they may have spent copious amounts of their hard earned cash on fine clothing to adorn their bodies, and transferprinted plates or porcelain bowls to eat from. Alternatively, a family could choose to invest their earnings in livestock or tools, allowing their investments to create further income for the household. In considering these different approaches, Barbara Heath (2004), using the account book from Thomas Jefferson’s Monticello plantation, suggested that household composition played a critical role in determining how enslaved families chose to spend their resources and the degree to which they participated in local economies. She suggested that families with younger children may have chosen to focus
on securing enough food to feed themselves, while those with older children, or none at all, may have had surplus resources to invest in local economies and the purchase of consumer goods (Heath 2004:25, 31). Glimpsing such diverse patterns through the lens of the archaeological record further complicates our ability to understand, in its entirety, how and where enslaved families spent their resources, as we are never able to see all of the possessions they owned. This becomes especially problematic when dealing with the latter example, as the artifacts associated with a relatively wealthy family who chose not to purchase costly consumer goods and a family with less wealth might appear nearly identical to researchers.

If, however, we choose not to focus directly on a household’s wealth, but rather on the way in which they displayed that wealth, costly consumer goods can be used in a more reliable fashion. Therefore, I will be looking at expensive consumer goods as “displayed wealth,” which transfers the emphasis from interpreting the overall wealth a household possessed, to the way in which they used consumer goods to express wealth to other members of their community. Returning again to the example of the three households above, the family which purchased fine clothing and ceramics would be seen to have a large amount of displayed wealth compared to the other two, who did not, or could not, make similar investments in these potential status symbols. As displayed wealth is concerned only with the external appearance of wealth, it serves as a better lens through which to approach the study of enslaved social relations than a household’s total wealth, as wealth which is not publicly displayed has little chance of being used to create and maintain social bonds. In many ways, this conception of displayed wealth is similar to conspicuous consumption (e.g. Cook et al. 1996; Heinrich 2014), and Jillian Galle’s
use of cost signaling (2006, 2010, 2011). Both of these conceptions, however, carry with them an implied meaning for their social implications; namely, that expensive goods indicated the wealth of their owners for their social benefit. For this research, such a connection, while possible, remains to be determined by assessing the role of costly consumer goods in social relations, and therefore, the less weighted conception of displayed wealth was used.

When dealing with material culture, the objects people chose to own and display could always have been selected for their ability to outwardly demonstrate an identity the individual wished to portray (cf. Thomas and Thomas 2004; Wilkie 2000a). Because of this, the items which the residents of the South Yard or Stable Quarters chose to purchase may have been selected for a variety of reasons relating to what they wished to say about themselves, in addition to the everyday uses they were put to. However, when consumer goods are used in this fashion, there is still a fixed price associated with the selected items, and therefore, cost must be considered as a factor, especially when more expensive wares were selected over less expensive ones. Furthermore, the cost associated with the item might in-and-of itself be used to signal an aspect of its owners identity (e.g. Galle 2010). For instance, if one of the residents of the Southwest Home decided to purchase a teacup to hold the sauces and relishes which she made to flavor her family’s meals, the selection of the vessel form, and its use, along with the flavoring it provided their meals, signaled her ethnic identity as black Virginians (see below). She, however, would have had a wide range of teacups available from which to make this statement, ranging from inexpensive, undecorated common creamware, to handpainted teacups and expensive transfer printed vessels. As that none of the residents of this site appear to have chosen
the least expensive common creamware indicates that they might have been displaying wealth as a facet of their identity to the other members of community. Because of this, the acquisition and display of expensive consumer goods used in their daily live by Montpelier’s black community can be seen as a way in which they could have created and displayed aspects of their identity, images of themselves which may have had social implications within this group.

From Informal Economies to World Markets

Before members of Montpelier’s black community could begin to socially use costly ceramics and fine clothing, the wealth these items represented had to be created. As these individuals were enslaved, they did not receive compensation for the crops, crafts, and domestic chores they produced during the long hours the Madisons controlled their labor. Regardless, they managed to carve out free time for themselves after they completed their daily tasks and on Sundays. It was at this time that black Southerners could work their garden plots, make crafts, and sell their skills to local land owners, all of which provided potential sources of income which created the wealth seen in the South Yard and Stable Quarter assemblages. Despite the importance of such activities to the inhabitants of quarters throughout the Atlantic World, these aspects of daily life were not explored until the late 1980s (Berlin and Morgan 1991:1-2). Since then, researchers focusing on the American South (e.g. Berlin and Morgan eds. 1991; Wood 1995), the Caribbean (e.g. Hauser 2013), and South America (e.g. Sweet 2011) have greatly expanded our understanding of black economic interests, and the social systems they created. While these studies have labeled these networks as informal economies, internal economies, and the slaves’ economies due to their semi-legal and often unrecognized
status, these black markets could wield influence over large areas and structure many facets of daily life (cf. Hauser 2013).

As these informal economies operated throughout the Americas, large regional variations existed, influenced by such factors as the crops African Americans labored to grow, the skills they had at their disposal, and the attitudes of the local plantocracy. In the Piedmont, black Virginians possessed a variety of options available to them, as both Barbara Heath (2004) and John Schlotterbeck (1991) have illustrated. Standard practice on local plantations was to allow enslaved individuals and families to work a garden plot on which they could grow a variety of food to supplement the meager, monotonous rations issued to them by planters (Samford 2004:156). The presence of flower pot fragments from all three sites and the recovery of a scythe blade from the Southeast Duplex illustrate some of the gardening practices the residents of these quarters participated in. Similarly, local bondspeople had the ability to raise smaller livestock, such as chickens, which provided an additional food source. Gullet stones, small pebbles and ceramic sherds swallowed whole by chickens to aid in digesting food, as well as egg shell fragments were recovered at all three sites, suggesting that these households kept, or at least butchered, fowl in their yards. Enslaved Virginians also used their free time to acquire a wide array of wild food sources. These included local flora, such as nuts and berries (cf. Bowes 2010), as well as fish and small game (cf. McKee 1999). Considering the role of hunting in feeding quarter communities, Amy Young et al. (2001) suggested that such activities were important enough to be used in integrating new men into existing social networks. Excavations at the Montpelier sites yielded several wild species, including various species of fish, turtle, berries and nuts (Chance Copperstone, personal
e-mail, April 21, 2014; Henderson 2014), indicating that the residents of the South Yard and Stable Quarters spent a portion of their free time hunting and gathering across the plantation’s woodlots, fields, and rolling hills.

While most of this food was consumed by members of the households who worked to acquire them on Sundays and during the can’t see hours, some families were able to secure surplus, which could be sold for cash or credit. Similarly, the sale of surplus furs from the small game enslaved hunters killed provided another source of potential income. Local planters often purchased this foodstuff, as Barbara Heath demonstrated at Monticello (2004). This practice also occurred at Montpelier. In particular “‘Old Sawney’…. had his house and ground, where he raised his favorite vegetables, cabbages and sweet potatoes, as well as chickens and eggs, to be sold to ‘Miss Dolley’ [Madison]” (Cutts 1817, quoted in Miller 2007:108-109). Although located further afield, black Virginians also hawked their surplus foodstuffs in local markets. The towns of Orange, Gordonsville and Somerset all were within walking distance of Montpelier, providing the black community such trade outlets. Lastly, members of enslaved communities and neighborhoods could also barter, trade, and sell extra food amongst themselves, providing a further outlet for surplus resources (cf. Westmacott 1992:88).

While producing and procuring adequate food was a major activity to which black Virginians dedicated their free time, these were not the only financial opportunities available. Woodworking and basketry, along with a host of other skills, allowed enslaved individuals to create and sell a wide variety of goods in the venues listed above, furthering their ability to earn cash. Some bondspeople could also “hire out” their free
time to local planters or poorer white farmers, providing a direct source of income from their labors (cf. Schlotterbeck 1991:174). Lastly, some black Southerners became directly involved in local commerce by buying, transporting, and selling items for profit (cf. Hudson 1994:87).

As bondspeople only had the ability to grow, make, gather, or sell anything mentioned above outside of their official work hours, the duties they were assigned impacted the free time black Virginians had to acquire material possessions. Amongst agricultural laborers, work assignments were typically conducted either by individuals cultivating specific areas until their assigned tasked was completed, or by gangs working together until their supervisor dismissed them for the day. Several scholars have considered the impact of these two systems on the ability of these bondspeople to gain free time for themselves (e.g. Olin 2008; Young 1997b), concluding that the task system, which allowed labors to stop working once they had completed their daily assignments, gave African Americans the most time to dedicate toward local informal economies and creating wealth. However, when dealing with the Montpelier sites, these models lose their applicability as the South Yard was intended to house domestic laborers, and the Stable Quarter enslaved craftsmen and women. Nevertheless, given the round the clock nature of domestic labor, it may have had similar implications as the gang system. Alternatively, as craftsmen generally worked in smaller groups, focusing on individual projects, the task system might be roughly analogous.

---

8 Brian Thomas (1995) noted that enslaved households often contained family member who labored in various parts of a planation, indicating that any of the five households in this study may have housed enslaved agricultural laborers. However, we can most likely assume that a majority of the individuals in these quarters performed the work for which they were intended (Chapter V).
As seen in the data presented below, however, the daily duties at which the residents of the South Yard and Stable Quarter toiled may not have prevented them from entering into local markets. It is possible that as this black community was in its fourth generation by the time they began living in the South Yard Quarter, these families had had plenty of time to accumulate sources of income which could benefit their children and grandchildren. Alternatively, several researchers have suggested that domestic labor afforded bondspeople increased opportunity for material gain (e.g. Galle 2004:40, 54). Similarly, the residents of the Stable Quarter may have leveraged their occupational skills into providing sources of income which allowed them to display a similar amount of wealth as their neighbors residing in the nearby duplexes. Regardless, now that excavations are complete at one of Montpelier’s contemporary field quarters, researchers can begin to tease out the influence of work schedules on the ability of enslaved families to participate in local markets in the Virginia Piedmont.

Once Montpelier’s black community managed to scrape together cash or credit through these various activities, they could begin to use it in local markets. What these individual chose to buy varied widely, as seen in the analysis below. Yet despite the influence of the individual choices these five households made, the consumer goods they purchased generally had one thing in common: they were distributed globally from new economic and industrial centers in Europe, predominantly England. Once manufactured, these various items were shipped out to local markets across the world, with near identical ceramics being recovered from Virginia to Jamaica, and Canada to the British colonies in South Africa. Therefore, when the members of Montpelier’s black community purchased the goods discussed in detail below, they were actively
participating in this new world market, using this mass-produced material culture to fit into their own cultural context.

Not all households, however, possessed equal access to the goods provided by this world market. For instance, various regions of the American South had different amounts of consumer goods shipped to them, as Kenneth Brown discussed in the apparent disconnect between wealth and social status at the Levi Jordan plantation (1994:107; see chapter III). Furthermore, even within a region, the location of slave quarters in comparison to local market towns could differ, allowing some African Americans a more ready access to mass-produced consumer goods than others. Because of this, when comparing communities enslaved in different parts of a region, the potential access each had to markets must be assessed (cf. Reeves 2011a). The families that resided at the sites used for this thesis, being as they all lived within an area of tenth of an acre, can all be assumed to have had equal access to the local market towns of Orange, Gordonville, and Somerset, which were only a few hours away by foot; a distance that could easily be covered during their few days off (Woehlke 2012). Furthermore, the remarkable diversity of consumer goods these African Americans owned speaks to their ready ability to access these markets. As all five households, therefore, had roughly equal access to these goods, differences between the assemblages of each site can be seen as the result of the choices these enslaved individuals made, demonstrated through what they did and did not purchase, and when they decided to acquire more expensive goods over cheaper items, their decision can be interpreted from the archaeological record.
Costly Ceramics

Perhaps one of the most ubiquitous artifacts recovered from slave quarters across the South are the broken remnants of the plates, bowls, and cups from which African Americans prepared and ate their daily meals. Ceramics have long been used to determine economic and social status within plantation communities, beginning with John Otto’s work at Georgia’s Cannon Point plantation (1975, 1977, 1984), research which Sue Mullins Moore continued during the 1980s (1985). The ability of historical archaeologists dealing with early 19th century sites to determine the relative cost of their ceramic assemblages greatly increased when George Miller introduced his Common Creamware (CC) Index in 1980, which he later refined in 1991(a). It is through Miller’s ordering of the various decorative techniques of the era into cost categories, based on their cost relative to common creamware, the cheapest refined earthenware readily available, that the research presented below will attempt to see the cost of the ceramics the residents of the Montpelier sites owned.

From the various excavations of the three sites, beginning with their preliminary investigations in the 1990s, and extending through the 2010-11 work funded by the NEH, approximately 30 thousand ceramic sherds were recovered. From this assemblage, Kimberly Trickett, the Laboratory Director for the Montpelier Archaeology Department, reconstructed 473 of the individual vessels the sites’ residents owned, and later discarded. While only one vessel crossmended between the Stable Quarter and the South Yard sites, a substantial number of vessels mended between the Southeast Duplex and the Southwest Home, due in part to the proximity of these two sites. These comingled vessels were assigned to a single site based upon the number of sherds recovered from strata
associated with the 19th century occupation (Greer 2013:3-4). However, 63 vessels were found to have ambiguous distributions between these two sites, and were excluded from further research. Based on this division, 155 vessels are associated with the residents of the Southeast Duplex, 85 vessels are associated with the households of the Southwest Home, and 170 vessels are associated with the family living in the Stable Quarter (Table 2). Some of the differences in the number of vessels reconstructed from each site are likely the result of the size of each assemblage. However, comparing the sites through an abundance index (see Chapter II) shows that, despite the assemblage sizes, the residents of the Southeast Duplex discarded the most vessels, while the family in the Stable Quarter discarded ceramics at the lowest rate. While this does present some difficulties in comparing these sites, the trend seems to be the result of the overall wealth each household displayed (see below) and therefore, should not skew the results of this analysis.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Vessels</th>
<th>Wine Bottle Glass (g)</th>
<th>Abundance Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Duplex</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>8,435</td>
<td>0.18044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Home</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5,369</td>
<td>0.15584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Quarter</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>12,678</td>
<td>0.13231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before we look any further into these vessels, it is important to understand how the residents of these sites may have come to own them. Several archaeologists have suggested that planters distributed most of the ceramics used by the communities they enslaved (cf. Galle 2004:46). In considering this suggestion, we can assume that if a planter, especially one as affluent as James Madison, Jr., purchased vessels for their enslaved community, then these would come in bulk orders, with the resulting household
assemblages being fairly uniform in their decorative techniques and motifs (Olin 2008:42-43, 72). The assemblages from the Montpelier sites, however, display a wide array of decorative motifs, suggesting that the black community purchased the majority of their ceramics. This is a critical determination in allowing the recovered ceramics to serve as items through which we can see the wealth displayed by these households, as it indicates that the enslaved community exercised their own choice when selecting the ceramics they both used and were seen using.

Other scholars have focused on the role of hand-me-down vessels entering into enslaved homes after a planter no longer had a use for them at their table (e.g. Lentz 2010; Samford 2007:137-138). As stated earlier, one of the reasons that Montpelier serves as an excellent location in which to situate this research is the large amount of work that has taken place on the plantation over the course of the last twenty years, allowing comparisons between various sites to illuminate the past lifeways of the planation’s inhabitants. One important site in this process is Dolley’s Midden: a 19th century midden associated with refuse from the Madison’s extensive dining activities (Trickett 2010a), from which the Montpelier Archaeology Department has managed to gain a sense of the vessels used in the mansion (see Rich and Reeves 2009). Because of our understanding of this assemblage, the presence of several specific vessel sets recovered from enslaved contexts around Montpelier can be determined to have originated from the Madison’s dining room. These vessel sets predominantly are expensive English, French, and Chinese porcelain, which were not available in local markets, and were generally purchased in large sets from overseas merchants. These stipulations make it improbable that any of the enslaved families could have acquired
these vessels from a source other than the Madisons. Several additional vessel sets, such as green shell edge table settings, were also recovered from Dolley’s Midden (Rich and Reeves 2009:18), but as these were widely available in the 19th century Virginia Piedmont, the original source of these vessels cannot be determined. When vessels from the mansion are recovered from the homes of Montpelier’s black community, it indicates that these families chose to use and display them in their homes, rather than trading them for other goods or services. This indicates that they may have formed a component of the wealth displayed by these homes, and therefore vessels acquired from the Madisons and those purchased by these households can be compared together (see Galle [2010:26] for a similar discussion of acquired ceramics, and vessels traded within the black community are addressed in Chapter V).

*Miller CC Index*

George Miller’s CC Index works best when applied to early 19th century refined earthenwares (Miller 1991a), which, generally speaking can be defined as pearlware and common creamware. The decorative techniques he assessed include, from cheapest to most expensive, undecorated common creamware, annular / slip decorated ceramics and edge wares (both similarly priced and collectively referred to as minimally decorated wares), handpainted wares, and finally transfer printed wares (Miller 1980). While Miller did not tie porcelain into this interpretive schema, this ceramic type was more expensive than any of the earthenwares listed in the CC Index (in the 1770s, porcelain was two to six times more expensive than refined earthenwares [Martin 1994, quoted in Neiman et al 2000:52]), and as such, it was used as a fifth category for this research.
Amongst the Montpelier sites, these five categories comprised 73 percent of the vessels recovered from the Southeast Duplex (50 percent pearlware and common creamware, 23 percent porcelain), 62 percent of the vessels recovered from the Southwest Home (41 percent pearlware and common creamware, 20 percent porcelain), and 76 percent of the vessels recovered from the Stable Quarter (57 percent pearlware and common creamware, 19 percent porcelain). As these ceramic types are the majority of the vessels recovered from the sites, and as they date to the occupation of these sites, they can serve as one of the main indicators of the wealth displayed amongst the ceramics owned by these families. However, both earlier ceramic types (creamware, whieldon-wedgewood, etc.), and later ceramic types (whitewares, yellowware, and ironstone) will be compared later to round out the trends seen in the Miller CC Index, and add historical depth to our understanding of displayed wealth at Montpelier.

In comparing the five different categories from the adjusted Miller CC Index, several trends can be seen (Figure 11). Although the Southeast Duplex and Stable Quarter both yielded relatively similar amounts of common creamware, the Southwest Home only yielded a single vessel. All three sites possessed similar percentages of minimally decorated wares, roughly 34 percent of their reconstructed vessels. The Stable Quarter had the highest percentage of handpainted wares, while the Southeast Duplex came second, and the Southwest Home had the smallest percentage. The residents of the Southwest Home discarded the highest percentage of transferprinted wares, followed by the Southeast Duplex, and lastly the Stable Quarter. Finally, The Southwest Home and the Southeast Duplex both had similar percentages of porcelain vessels (approximately 32 percent), while the Stable Quarter yielded the smallest amount. The Southwest Home,
as it contained the fewest inexpensive common creamware vessels, and higher amounts of expensive transferprinted and porcelain vessels, appears that have displayed the most wealth. The Southeast Duplex appears to have displayed slightly more wealth than the Stable Quarter, based on their greater percentage of porcelain, but the Stable Quarter also possessed higher amounts of transferprinted wares. Because of this, we cannot definitively say at the moment which of these two sites displayed the most wealth, but the Southeast Duplex may have had slightly more expensive ceramics.
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**Figure 11.** Miller CC Index by site. Earlier and later ceramics not included in graph.

While using the Miller CC Index in this broad comparison illustrates several trends, it can obscure others. When looking at the decorative techniques used in this system, they tended to be influenced by the form of the vessel they were applied to. For instance, shell edge predominantly adorned plates and other flatware, while annular slips and hand painted motifs most often occurred on hollowware and tea sets. Accounting for these differences, and their implications, allows us to see larger trends in this data. This
analysis will not include serving wares, as they were not recovered in sufficient enough number to allow for further comparison.

Amongst the vessels used in the Miller CC Index, all three sites have consistent percentage of flatware (approximately 43 percent, see Figure 12). However, the Stable Quarter yielded the highest percentage of hollowware, while the Southwest Home and Southeast Duplex both yielded approximately 19 percent of these vessels. Lastly, the Southwest Home yielded the highest percentage of teawares, followed by the Southeast Duplex and the Stable Quarter. These trends may have implications for the amount of wealth the residents of these sites chose to spend on each of these vessel categories.

Amongst the flatware recovered from these three sites, shell edged plates were the most common vessel recovered, ranging from 48-63 percent of the flatware assemblages (Figure 13). The residents of the Southeast Duplex and Stable Quarter both chose to invest in small amounts of common creamware plates, while the residents of the Southwest Home did not. Conversely, the residents of the Southwest Home discarded the highest amount of transferprinted vessels. Based upon the distribution of the flat refined
earthenwares, it appears as if the residents of the Southwest Home were displaying the most wealth with these ceramics. All three sites, however, yielded roughly similar amounts of porcelain flatware.

![Figure 13. Flatware per site by Miller CC Index category.](image-url)

The teawares recovered from each of these sites followed a similar distribution as the flatware (Figure 14). The residents of the Southeast Duplex and Stable Quarter invested in larger amounts of cheaper, handpainted vessels, and the Stable Quarter even yielded a common creamware saucer. Alternatively, the residents of the Southwest Home invested in more transferprinted teawares than their neighbors. Again, residents of the Southwest Home and the Southeast Duplex discarded relatively even amounts of porcelain, both at a higher rate than the Stable Quarter.
At the moment, we cannot say for sure what these recovered teawares were used for. During the course of the 18th century, tea drinking increased in popularity across colonial America; especially amongst the upper class (Bedell and Scharfenberger 2000:35). Tied into this process was an increase in the material culture associated with the preparation and consumption of the beverage. Often, as these were used in formal tea services, teawares were a popular way for Americans to display various facets of their identity, including the display of wealth, and gender and class ideologies (e.g. Shackel and Palus 2006:831; Wall 1991). Specifically when considering wealth, quickly changing styles could require affluent Americans to continuously acquire to latest style in teawares, resulting in Virginian planters routinely purchasing new vessel sets. For instance, at Montpelier, 22 unique tea sets were recovered from Dolley’s Midden (Rich and Reeves 2009:23-27). As many times, the older, less desirable teawares were still serviceable, they tended to make their way into black households. This practice can also be seen at Montpelier, as 30 percent of the reconstructed porcelain and transferprinted...
teawares from the South Yard and Stable Quarter sites belong to vessel sets recovered from Dolley’s Midden (handpainted wares at Montpelier are generally not associated with dining activities in the mansion [Rich and Reeves 2009:28-29]). The highest concentration of these are seen in the porcelain teawares recovered from the Southwest Home, half of which appear to have been acquired from the mansion. However, as the inhabitants of these sites independently purchased 70 percent of the recovered porcelain and transferprinted teawares, they must have had a reason for selecting these more expensive vessels instead of less expensive handpainted teawares. Several researchers have suggested that bondspeople, particularly those working in domestic capacities, adopted the practice of drinking tea, thereby explaining the presence of vessels relating to this activity from enslaved contexts (Lentz 2010:29; Nieman et al. 2000:19), and Timothy Baumann, in his discussion of “soul food,” listed tea as a “Traditional Black Core Food” (2009:66). Other groups in the Americas brought into contact with new world markets during the 19th century, such as the Inuit, adopted the practice of tea drinking, indicating that the consumption of this commodity crossed ethnic boundaries (Cabak and Loring 2000). Mark Warner (1998) noted that Annapolis’s black elite routinely held tea parties as an element of genteel consumption (see Mullins 1999). African American’s consumption of tea, however, must not be looked at as a historic constant, since an examination of ex-slave narratives only indicates the practice of drinking herbal teas for medicinal purposes, although coffee and chicory do appear to have been imbibed (Wilkie 2000a:146). This suggests that Warner’s example might be a reflection of the adjustment to Post Emancipation racial discrimination rather than a tradition dating back

---

9 See Brooks and Rodríguez (2012:84) for a similar discussion of teaware used for other hot beverages in South America, and Samford (2007:99) for a similar dismissal of tea drinking amongst Black Virginians.
to the Antebellum South. Even if the recovered teawares did not hold tea, or other hot beverages, there is a possibility that the inhabitants of these sites used teacups for other liquids (Galle 2010:26), but the amount of glass tablewares, specifically tumblers and stemware, each site yielded throws some doubt on this interpretation (see below).

Kenneth Brown and Doreen Copper previously cautioned historical archaeologists from dividing the object used by past cultural groups into functional categories based upon our own contemporary views on how items should be used, instead arguing that recovered assemblages should be assessed within their larger context before meaningful interpretations of their use can be proposed (1990:7-8). This is particularly true when interpreting the role of material culture marketed globally to different cultures and subaltern groups, who may have purchased items intended for one purpose by its manufacturer, and used it for another. When constructing contextual frameworks from which alternative interpretations of teawares in 19th century America can be extrapolated, researchers have generally taken two different approaches. The first, exemplified by Elizabeth Scott (1997), uses historical documents, often cookbooks, to see how material culture was used in the past, suggesting that many tablewares and utensils, including teawares, where used for a variety of purposes; such as food preparation. Alternatively, the functional attributes of these vessels can be used to suggest that, physically, teawares could hold food or condiments just as easily as they could hold hot beverages. This has led some researchers (e.g. Huddleston and Poplin 2003) to suggest that in lower and even middle income households, teawares may have served a role in food consumption.
A third line of research for suggesting the role of teawares in food consumption at the Montpelier sites, however, can be provided by a study of African American foodways, particularly amongst black Virginians. Traditionally, much of the discussion of the food cooked and eaten within slave quarters has focused on main dishes. These are either seen through interpreting the animal bones discarded at these sites (e.g. Brunache 2011; McKee 1999; Scott 2001), or gleaned from firsthand accounts of the starches that served as the main components of the meals eaten by black families (e.g. Bowes 2011:95; Brunache 2011:246; Samford 2007:137). Less discussion has focused on the condiments which African Americans flavored their foods with, in large part due to the difficulties of situating in-depth research on dishes which are difficult to detect in the archaeological record, and rarely remarked upon by literate observers. Black cooks on both sides of the Atlantic, including Igbo and Virginians, often made and served relishes, sauces, and other semi-liquids to flavor other dishes, made from a wide variety of ingredients, including leafy greens, tomatoes, peanuts, and perhaps most iconically, hot peppers (e.g. Basden 2006: 47; Beoku-Betts 1994:427; Covey and Eisdach 2009:42, 43, 84, 89; Eves 2005:283, 288; Galan et al. 1990; Samford 2007:123-124; Stoller and Olkes 1989).

Leland Ferguson noted that in many West African cultures, these “[r]elishes, prepared in smaller pots, are placed in small bowls near the main dish” into which starches were dipped (1992:97), and sauces may have been served in a similar manner (Wilkie 2000a:147). While originally these small bowls may have been constructed locally in quarters across the South, with the widespread introduction of mass-produced teawares to the region in the 18th century, new options may have been available to the black women serving these condiments (Huddleston and Poplin 2003:5). Laurie Wilkie,
in her discussion of the teawares recovered from Louisiana’s Oakley plantation, suggested that teacups and saucers “would have been very useful for holding condiments such as hot sauce or pepper relish” (2000a:147). Patricia Samford has also suggested that teawares may have been used for “holding semiliquid mushes and stews” in Virginia (2007:99), although this does not rule out their use for condiments. This potential move in Virginia may have been aided by the fact that colonowares produced in the colony tend to reflect European forms more than their counterparts in other regions of the Atlantic World (Deetz 1993: 89; Madsen 106). Although several researchers have noted this possibility, no definitive research has been conducted on the topic, and as such, the connection between teawares and condiments at the moment is slightly tenuous. If, however, we can assume that with the advent of mass-produced teawares, these vessels began to replace the small colonoware bowls which previously held relishes and sauces, then it is possible that by assessing the ratios of teaware and small colonoware bowls from sites throughout the 18th and 19th century, we could see this change in action. And, if this change did occur, it is possible that with the introduction of more expensive vessels to hold these condiments, their serving may have taken on a new social role with the black community, thereby explaining the large amount of expensive teawares.

Archaeologically, evidence for the use of teawares for eating food cannot be seen in the vessel itself, as the use of teaware for condiments or for tea are not likely to have left distinctive wear patterns on the vessels. However, by looking at the collections as a whole, we might be able to glimpse how Montpelier’s black community used these saucers and cups. Amongst the entire ceramic assemblage used for this thesis, only four teapots were identified (two from the Southeast Duplex, and two from the Stable
Quarter), none of which were pearlware or porcelain. The relative lack of teapots may suggest that tea or coffee consumption was not an important activity for these households. In spite of this, the teaware from all three sites have a higher percentage of transferprinted and porcelain vessels (50-74 percent of recovered assemblages) than the reconstructed flatware or hollowware vessels (Table 3). A similar pattern is present at Monticello (Lentz 2010:28-29), suggesting that this is not particular to Montpelier, but possibly a wider practice amongst black Virginians in the Piedmont. Combining this data with the suggestion that these vessels may have been used for holding condiments, it appears as if displaying these sauces and relishes in expensive vessels was an important way through which the residents of these sites showed their wealth, possibly indicating the significance of these “soul-satisfying” condiments to the foodways, and identity, of black Virginians (Brunache 2011:246; see Franklin 2001 for a further discussion of “soul food” and identity in Virginia).

Table 3

Percentage of combined transferprinted pearlware and porcelain vessels recovered per site by vessel form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel Form</th>
<th>Southeast Duplex</th>
<th>Southwest Home</th>
<th>Stable Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flatware</td>
<td>32.59%</td>
<td>52.37%</td>
<td>32.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaware</td>
<td>59.37%</td>
<td>73.67%</td>
<td>49.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloware</td>
<td>38.08%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>43.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, even if other sites in Virginia are included in this interpretation, we are still only left with an understanding of teawares in the context of slavery, and as such,

---

10 The presence of teapots in slave quarters may not have been unusual, as a teapot was one of the few specific items a visitor to Virginia’s Mont Vernon plantation noted inside of a slave cabin (Katz-Hyman 1993:44-45), and Leland Ferguson noted colonoware teapots from 18th century South Carolina (1992:84-86).
there is still the potential that the local plantocracy influenced black Virginians’ use of teawares. To mitigate this, I attempted to assess the teaware from the four church sites mentioned in the previous chapter, all of which yielded evidence of communal feasting. Theoretically, if no teawares were deposited as a result of these feasts, then these vessels likely did not play a role in them, and therefore, at least in these contexts, did not play a large part in black table settings. For two of these, Illinois’s Wayman A.M.E. Church (Cabak et al. 1995), and an A.M.E. church in Arrow Rock, Missouri (Baumann 2009), no information on their teawares could be readily obtained. For the third, the African Meeting House in Nantucket, pearlware teawares were the second most abundant ceramics recovered, and the site also yielded several sauce bottles (Beaudry and Berkland 2007:408). Similarly, at Boston’s African Meeting House, Beth Bower noted that a large portion of the recovered ceramics were teawares, although she interpreted these, recovered alongside larger serving vessels, as indications of European style dining consisting of smaller appetizers and hors d'oeuvres (1986, in Felix 2007:86), rather than as remnants of African foodways. Although neither of these two Massachusetts church sites yielded more than a tentative connection between teawares and African American’s foodways, the presence of these ceramics suggests that a further exploration of this association may shed light on the dining activities that occurred in the Virginia Piedmont.

Amongst the reconstructed hollowwares, a different pattern emerged than that seen in the other vessel forms (Figure 15). Although the Southwest Home invested in a larger percentage of annular decorated vessels than common creamware bowls, their neighbors in the Southeast Duplex and the Stable Quarter in general purchased more expensive handpainted, transferprinted, and porcelain hollowwares. This indicates that
amongst the hollowwares, the residents of the Southeast Duplex and the Stable Quarter displayed the most wealth, although yet again, it is difficult to determine which of these two sites had the more expensive assemblage.

Figure 15. Hollowware per site by Miller CC Index category.

In considering the vessels used in the Miller CC Index, the Southwest Home appears to have displayed the most wealth with the plates and tea saucers they owned. However, the residents of this site owned the least expensive hollowwares of the three sites. Between the remaining two sites, there do not appear to be any large differences between the expensive flatware and hollowwares they owned. Despite this, the Southeast Duplex did have a higher percentage of expensive teawares, potentially suggesting that the residents of this site may have displayed slightly more wealth than their neighbors in the Stable Quarter (see Figure 15).

Overall, the three sites yielded substantial numbers of porcelain, comprising 10 percent to 20 percent of their total assemblages. Furthermore, porcelain comprises approximately 26 percent of the flatware, approximately 43 percent of the teaware
assemblage, and with only one exception, more porcelain vessels were recovered than transferprinted in each of the vessel forms (the exception being the Stable Quarter’s hollowware). In part, this trend is influenced by the large (57-65 percent) amount of recovered porcelain vessels associated with the Madison’s dining activities, the majority of which could only have come from this source. However, this suggests the possibility of these households possessing two distinct table settings: an expensive porcelain one, possibly for occasions when displaying wealth could be beneficial, and a less expensive one comprised of refined earthenwares for every day uses. This potential use of porcelain does not appear to negate the Southwest Home’s overall higher amount of displayed wealth seen in the ceramics they owned (see Figure 13).

*Household Ceramics over Time*

As noted earlier, not all of the refined earthenwares recovered from these sites fit into the Miller CC Index, which has been used so far to determine the wealth these sites displayed. By comparing the ceramic vessels manufactured prior to the advent of pearlware, and those which replaced this ceramic type, we can historicize the trends suggested above: namely that the Southwest Home displayed the largest amount of wealth with the ceramics its residents owned.

The Stable Quarter yielded the largest percentage of vessels that predate pearlware (17 percent), while the South Yard sites both yielded approximately nine percent of these vessels (Figure 16). Such vessels include creamware, white salt glazed stoneware, and whieldon-wedgewood. The higher percentage of these ceramics at the Stable Quarter corresponds with the site’s early occupation date (1790s), and the similar percentage from the South Yard duplexes likely stems from the fact that both sites were
first occupied at the same time (1810s). Unfortunately, these vessels are not able to shed additional light on displayed wealth in the early years of the sites’ occupations, especially since these ceramics were already falling out of favor by the time the Stable Quarter was occupied.
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*Figure 16. Recovered ceramics by era per site.*

Ceramics postdating the 1820s, however, are more informative (see Figure 16). These include whiteware, yellowware, ironstone, and Rockingham type refined earthenware, and comprise 16 percent of the reconstructed vessels from the Southeast Duplex, 29 percent of the vessels from the Southwest Home, and eight percent of the vessels from the Stable Quarter. The low percentage from the Stable Quarter likely is the result of the site’s abandonment in the 1830s, preventing a substantial number of these vessels from entering the archaeological record. However, a further examination of the recovered vessels reveals that this site had the smallest percentage of transferprinted whitewares, the most expensive decorative technique in this category, of the three sites (25 percent, versus 96 percent for the Southeast Duplex and 67 percent for the Southwest Home), and indicates that the residents of the Stable Quarter did not purchase expensive
vessels through which to display their wealth in the 1830s. Unfortunately, at the moment it is not possible to determine if this is related to the date at which this family stopped living in the Stable Quarter, internal shifts within the household (namely the aging of the residents; see Marshall 2011:56), or resulted from concerns for the economic downslide of Montpelier during this decade (see Chapter II).

Between the South Yard duplexes, the residents of the Southwest Home possessed the highest percentage of these ceramics (29 percent v. 16 percent). However, as the Southeast Duplex possessed a larger percentage of transferprinted wares, it is possible that the residents of this duplex preferred to purchase fewer, but more expensive vessels, while their neighbors in the Southwest Home did not, or could not, discriminate as much in the plates and bowls they chose to buy. Because of this, it is possible that the residents of the Southeast Duplex displayed more wealth than their neighbors in the Southwest Home during their final years they called these duplexes home.

Utilitarian Ceramics

Utilitarian ceramics, although generally not intended to be used in an open display of wealth, do have a cost associated with them, and therefore, may have been used indirectly to display wealth. For instance, in the 19th century, stoneware cost more to obtain than coarse earthenwares (Bloch 2012). Furthermore, differences in the utilitarian assemblages can also suggest different methods of obtaining and preparing food amongst these households; potentially shedding light on the trends noted above.

Ceramics in this category made up eight percent of the recovered vessels from the Southeast Duplex and Stable Quarters, while they only represented four percent of the Southwest Home’s reconstructed vessels. With only three reconstructed vessels
recovered from the Southwest Home, the composition of its utilitarian assemblage was not further analyzed. At both the Southeast Duplex and Stable Quarter, stoneware vessels occur roughly three times as often as earthenwares, suggesting the residents of these sites intentionally selected these vessels over the cheaper varieties. Each of these sites also yielded three chamberpots: two per site were of cheaper common creamware varieties and one from each site being transferprinted pearlware. These vessels are included in the utilitarian category due to the fact that their intended purpose as a waste receptacle may not have been their only use. George Miller, for instance, has previously noted the possible use of chamberpots being used as soup tureens (1991b:3). Both of the transferprinted chamberpots appear to have originated in the mansion, as they match design motifs associated with the Madison’s dining sets that do not appear to have been widely available in the western half of Orange County. If these vessels did originate in the big house, then it can be assumed that they were used for their intended purpose before becoming the property of these black households. Because of this, these vessels may not have been reused for food preparations, but rather for their intended purpose, or some other storage capacity. Regardless of how these vessels were used, the uniformity in the utilitarian assemblages suggests that neither the residents of the Southeast Duplex nor the Stable Quarter displayed more wealth than the other with their utilitarian ceramics.

Colonoware pots could also have been an important cooking vessels for black Southerners (cf. Ferguson 1992:90). Only minimal amounts of colonoware vessel fragments were recovered from the three sites (19 sherds in total), which were evenly distributed between them. Due to their low rate of recovery, these will not be analyzed
further, although their presence could either indicate a segment of the early ceramic assemblages of these sites (K. Trickett 2013a:41), or a continued adherence to black Virginian ethnic identities (cf. Ferguson 1991:28; Orser 1998:68).  

While the utilitarian assemblages from the Montpelier sites do not reveal large differences in displayed wealth, they can potentially offer explanation to some of the trends noted above. Laurie Wilkie suggested that households involved in domestic labor with fewer items related to food storage possibly “toted” food from the mansion back to their homes for meals, rather than cooking all of their food themselves (2000a:124-125). Given their lower percentage of utilitarian ceramics, many of which are involved in food preparation and storage, the residents of the Southwest Home may have brought more food home from the mansion than their neighbors. Even if these families were consuming this food, they appear to have been flavoring it with homemade sauces and relishes, assuming that the recovered teawares held these condiments. Willkie also noted a similar trend in her study at the Oakley plantation (2000a:124), suggesting that eating the same food as their masters did not overcome the ethnic tastes of black Southerners.

More research into this practice is needed through a comparative faunal analysis of the three sites used in this study, as well as an assessment of the utilitarian ceramics from other 19th century quarters at Montpelier. However, if this research were to indicate that the residents of the Southwest Home routinely ate leftovers from the Madison’s dining room, then it can be suggested that these families would not have had to eat as much of the food they grew and gathered themselves, allowing them more

---

11 See Laura Galke (2009) for an alternative view of colonoware as a marker of enslaved versus free households.
surplus food to sell, which in turn could have been spent on the expensive ceramics seen above.

*Ceramics and Displayed Wealth*

Overall, it seems as if the residents of the Southwest Home displayed the most wealth with the pearlware and porcelain vessels they chose to own. The residents of the Southeast Duplex appear to have displayed slightly more wealth than their neighbors in the Stable Quarter with these same ceramic types, but by the end of the occupation of the three sites, these individuals may have been displaying the most wealth with the transfer printed whiteware they purchased. Overall, it appears as if the family in the Stable Quarter displayed the least wealth with their ceramics.

*Glass Tableware*

Similar to ceramic vessels, Montpelier’s black community used glass tablewares for their meals. However, unlike ceramics, some of which could be obtained at a low cost, glass tablewares generally required a more substantial investment of a household’s resources. Due to this, the amount of these vessels recovered from a household can indicate the amount of wealth they displayed with these vessels (Galle 2011:218). Similar to ceramic tablewares, expensive glass tablewares were owned and used by the Madisons (Rich and Reeves 2009:33-36), some of which may have ended up in the possession the community they enslaved. However, if black households chose to keep these vessels and use them as their own, rather than trading them for other items, they could be added to the overall wealth displayed by that family. Unfortunately, both the assemblages used in this thesis, and those recovered from deposits associated with the Madison’s dining activities, were too fragmentary to allow for any vessel reconstruction,
and therefore, which vessels present in the South Yard and Stable Quarters originated with the Madison’s cannot be determined.

Table 4

*Recovered glass tableware shards per site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Total Shards</th>
<th>Total Weight (g)</th>
<th>Mean Weight per Shard (g)</th>
<th>Abundance Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Duplex</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>1,467.70</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.1482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Home</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>914.3</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.1454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Quarter</td>
<td>1,786</td>
<td>2,638.90</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.1722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Southeast Duplex yielded 593 glass tableware fragments, weighing a total of 1,467 grams (Table 4). The Southwest Home yielded 384 glass tableware fragments, weighing a total of 914 grams. The Stable Quarter yielded 1,786 glass tableware fragments, weighing a total of 2,638 grams. The higher number of shards recovered at the Stable Quarter is in part due to the smaller shards from the site, seen in the average weight per shard, 1.47 grams, versus the average weight per shard from the South Yard duplexes, approximately 2.4 grams. However, the Stable Quarter did yield more glass tablewares than the South Yard duplexes (seen in the overall weight, compared through an abundance index).

In order to further differentiate the glass tableware assemblages, the identifiable vessel forms were compared (Figure 17). While only 19 percent of these shards could have their vessel form identified, a glimpse of the forms each site possessed can be obtained from the fragments. This issue, however, is more pronounced in the Stable Quarter, due to the smaller shard size from this site. Amongst the stemware, the Stable Quarter yielded the highest amount, followed by the Southwest Home, and the Southeast Duplex yielded the smallest amount. All three sites yielded similar percentages of
tumblers (approximately 31.5 percent). The Southeast Duplex yielded the highest percentage of other vessel forms, followed by the Southwest Home, and lastly the Stable Quarter. These forms include “vases, cake stands, finger bowls and the like” which adorned enslaved tables (K. Trickett 2013a:56). Given the large amount of variation in this category, higher percentages of these forms could indicate a richer assemblage.

It must be noted, however, that as opposed to ceramics, the recovered glass tablewares could not be divided by date of manufacture. With the Stable Quarter being occupied for approximately ten years longer than the South Yard Duplexes, this gave the former assemblage additional years for these shards to accumulate. Subtracting 25 percent of the Stable Quarter glass tableware assemblage drops the sites abundance index for this artifact type down to the level of the South Yard duplexes (0.1349), suggesting that the residents of none of these sites displayed more glass tablewares than the other.

Figure 17. Percentage of glass tableware forms by site.
Clothing and Bodily Adornment

While costly ceramic and glass vessels could allow the enslaved families of Montpelier to display their wealth, these tablewares and tea sets rarely left the home. Clothing, however, seen archaeologically in the form of recovered buttons and buckles, and other articles of personal adornment, including beads and jewelry, potentially gave these individuals the opportunity to broadcast their wealth to others they met outside of their homespaces. Furthermore, as the recovered clothing and adornment related artifacts have a stronger association with enslaved men, versus ceramics, which have a stronger association with enslaved women, by assessing these objects we can see how Montpelier’s men displayed their wealth.

Table 5

Clothing and adornment artifacts by type and site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Southeast Duplex</th>
<th>Southwest Home</th>
<th>Stable Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>Buttons</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>Buckles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>Hook and eye</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>Shoe part</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>Grommet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>Snap</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adornment</td>
<td>Cuff Links</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adornment</td>
<td>Beads</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adornment</td>
<td>Jewelry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adornment</td>
<td>Watch Parts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adornment</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adornment</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Southeast Duplex yielded 102 clothing related artifacts, and an additional 40 related to other adornment practices (see Table 5). The Southwest Home yielded 67 clothing related artifacts, and an additional 25 related to other adornment practices.
Lastly, the Stable Quarter yielded 152 clothing related artifacts, and an additional 45 related to other adornment practices. Comparing the amount of clothing and adornment related artifacts from each site, it appears that these two categories were discarded at a fairly similar rate indicating that despite the different quantities recovered, we can compare these assemblages to arrive at potentially meaningful interpretations of displayed wealth at these sites.

**Buttons**

The ability to dress themselves in costly clothing may have been an important way in which the members of Montpelier’s black community displayed the wealth they acquired. Numerous contemporary references speak of bondspeople across the South who wore their “Sunday best” to religious services (cf. Penningroth 2003:100) and other social gatherings (cf. Camp 2004:60-92). Unfortunately for archaeologists, the cloth that comprised the majority of these outfits is not present in the archaeological record. We do, however, see the recovery of the fasteners used on these articles of clothing, usually comprised of more durable materials (such as bone and metal alloys), from slave quarters across the American South, and from these, we can gain a sense of the clothing worn by the past owners of these objects. Amongst the clothing related artifacts recovered from the Montpelier sites, buttons and button fragments were the predominant item recovered, accounting for approximately 80 percent of the clothing assemblage from each site.

While this consistency is useful for comparing the button assemblages of the sites, it only allows us to glimpse a portion of the individuals who called these quarters home, as they typically adorned men’s clothing (see White [2005:57] for examples of buttons on women’s clothing). Twenty-five hook and eye fragments, discarded from various articles
of women’s clothing, were recovered at these sites, forming 11 percent of the Southeast Duplex assemblage, 12 percent of the Southwest Home’s assemblage, and only four percent of the Stable Quarter clothing assemblage. While the differences in these ratios potentially are suggestive of household composition between the Montpelier sites, or the influence the Madisons had over the dress of their female domestic laborers, they will not be addressed further here, as these fasteners generally were not visible, and therefore could not have been used in displaying wealth.\(^\text{12}\)

In her recent assessment of cost signaling amongst late 18th and early 19th century black Virginians, Jillian Galle (2010) assessed the amount of wealth displayed in the buttons sewn onto clothing. This work focused on the metal alloy buttons; fashionable consumer goods available in local markets during these decades. Following the work of Barbara Heath (1999a:60-61), Galle divided the alloys into two categories, white alloys and yellow alloys. White alloys, manufactured from britannia, tombac, or other metal alloys with a greyish hue, were the preferred material from the colonial era into the 1790s (Galle 2010:32), and as such, should be the predominate material from households displaying large amounts of wealth during this time period. However, with the onset of the 19th century, yellow alloys (gilded and copper alloys buttons) came into fashion (Galle 2010:32). As the South Yard and Stable Quarter sites date, as a whole, from the 1790s to the 1840s, displayed wealth should be visible amongst these households in the form of higher amounts of yellow alloy buttons.

Building on Galle’s research, I divided the materials used in the manufacturing of the Montpelier buttons into six categories: organic, iron, ceramic, white alloys, yellow  

\(^{12}\) Future research may be able to compare the hook and eye fragments across a wider range of sites to assess the differences in the clothing they belonged too; garments which may have displayed wealth. However, at the moment, this is unfeasible for this project.
alloys, and glass. Fasteners made of bone form the majority of the organic category, although one shell button is present. It is possible that the inhabitants of these sites owned wooden buttons as well, but no examples were recovered, likely due to preservation issues. While the bone buttons represent one of the cheapest fasteners available during the 19th century, possibly being made at home, the single shell button, recovered from the Southeast Duplex, represents a more substantial monetary investment by its owner (K. Trickett 2013a:64; White 2005:71). However, as this was the only one recovered from the sites, it will not be considered further. Iron buttons, seen here in four hole varieties, represent an additional inexpensive option for obtaining buttons (Marcel 1994:4; K. Trickett 2013a:69), although not one which could be manufactured at home. The recovered ceramic buttons would have been an inexpensive and popular type of button widely available in local markets staring in the 1830s, and becoming more popular during the 1840s, in part due to the introduction of the Prosser mold and introduction of ceramic buttons to women’s clothing (Rogers 1991:4-6; Sprague 2002; Thomas 1995:125). These buttons were not recovered from the Stable Quarter, likely because the site ceased to be inhabited by the time they hit local markets, while their recovery from the South Yard duplexes suggests that these families continued to acquire clothing fasteners into the 1840s. This trend is similar to the distribution of later ceramic types between the three sites.

Again, following Galle (2010) and Heath (1999a), white alloys, which include buttons made from britannia, pewter, lead, and silver, are those which fell out of style by the time the South Yard and Stable Quarters were occupied. This category includes a wide amount of variation, with several britannia and silver buttons, which would have
been expensive during the 18th century. On the other end of the spectrum, pewter buttons were recovered, which while manufactured during the 19th century, would have been considered unfashionable, and therefore inexpensive. Montpelier archaeologist Eric Schweickart, based on a comparison of buttons from across the plantation, has suggested that the Madison’s may have issued pewter buttons to their enslaved community during the 19th century (personal e-mail, March 7, 2014), potentially explaining the fact that 44 percent of the white alloys from these sites are pewter. Yellow alloys, which include brass, other copper alloys, and buttons with gold gilding, were in vogue during the early 19th century, and were used as the predominant indicator of displayed wealth amongst the buttons from the South Yard and Stable Quarters. Lastly, buttons manufactured from glass were both popular during the 19th century, and available in a wide variety of forms. Those recovered from the Montpelier sites range from small, four hole sleeve buttons, to paste gems which would have been mounted to a metal base (K. Trickett 2013a:70).

Figure 18. Comparison of Button Material by Site.
In comparing the distribution of these material types between the three sites, all yielded similar ratios of the two least expensive materials, organic (average of 12 percent) and iron (average of seven percent). Approximately five percent of the buttons recovered from the South Yard duplexes were ceramic. Amongst the white alloy buttons, the Southeast Duplex contained the fewest (nine percent), while 14 percent of the buttons from the Southwest Home and Stable Quarter were manufactured from these metals. Both the Southeast Duplex and Stable Quarter yield similar amounts of yellow alloy buttons, approximately 60 percent. The Southwest Home, however, yielded the lowest percentage of yellow alloy buttons, 44 percent. Lastly, the Southwest Home yielded a considerably higher percentage of glass buttons than the other two (17 percent), both of which were fairly consistent (approximately four percent). Given the diversity within the glass button assemblage, a closer look at the composition of these fasteners from the Southwest Home was conducted to determine if costly glass buttons were worn at this site. Amongst these buttons, six were inexpensive four hole varieties, and the remaining three were more costly molded glass buttons attached with a copper shank. Alternatively, the majority of the glass buttons recovered from the Southeast Duplex and Stable Quarter were molded buttons with metal shanks, suggesting that even in their smaller assemblages these families displayed more wealth in their glass buttons than the Southwest Home.

Over all, the men living in the Southwest Home displayed less wealth with the buttons sewn onto their clothing than the residents of the other two sites. Between the two remaining sites, the residents of the Southeast Duplex possessed fewer white alloy buttons than the men in the Stable Quarter. However, this seems to relate more to the
earlier date of occupation for the Stable Quarter, as approximately half of their white alloy buttons were manufactured from britannia, which was popular before yellow alloys came into fashion, and may have been deposited as the residents changed out their white buttons for yellow ones during the course of the 19th century. The remaining white buttons at the Stable Quarter, and the entirety of the Southeast Duplex’s white alloy assemblage, are pewter buttons, which were available during the 19th century at a low cost, and potentially were distributed by the Madisons to their enslaved community. Given the similarity between the yellow alloy buttons at these two sites, we can tentatively suggest that men in the Southeast Duplex and Stable Quarter displayed similar amounts of wealth in the buttons they chose to wear.

Antebellum buttons, however, were sewn into a wide variety of clothing, including shirts, waistcoats, and coats, not all of which allowed for an equal visibility of expensive fasteners. Historian Larry Hudson related the tale of a bondsman in South Carolina who “stole out to see his gal” one night while he was “all dressed up to kill” (Farrow, quoted in Hudson 1994:85). Unfortunately, after arriving at her cabin, he was discovered by members of a local slave patrol. Once in their custody, the man begged the patrollers to not “let [his] gal see under my coat” when they whipped him, as he had been unable to afford a shirt to accompany the expensive coat he wore (Farrow, quoted in Hudson 1994:85). This anecdote illustrates one important aspect of the buttons recovered from the Montpelier sites; external appearances may have been manipulated to disguise a lack of costly clothing underneath. To account for this, the recovered buttons were compared to determine if the visibility of an article of clothing affected the amount of wealth displayed with its buttons.
The buttons were divided by the article of clothing they likely belonged to, based upon their diameter, following the classification established by Carolyn White (2005:57-62; also see K. Trickett 2013a:63). With this system, sleeve buttons from shirts range from .52 to .67 inches (13-17 millimeters), buttons from waistcoats range from .57 to .76 inches (14.5-19.5 millimeters), and lastly buttons from coats are larger than .7 inches (18 millimeters). To better adapt these ranges to the buttons seen from the South Yard and Stable Quarters, and to address the overlap between the size ranges, buttons smaller than .52 inches were classified as sleeve buttons, except when otherwise noted during the cataloging process, buttons ranging from .57 inches to .7 inches were classified as waistcoat buttons, and fasteners larger than .76 inches were classified as coat buttons. I assigned any recovered buttons which fell between .7 inches and .76 inches in diameter to an intermediary category of waistcoat / coat, as no further determination can be made based off their size.

*Figure 19.* Percentage of yellow alloy buttons by button type.
Amongst the two least visible categories of clothing (shirts and waistcoats), the men of the Southwest Home possessed fewer expensive yellow alloy buttons, while they possessed the highest percentage of costly coat buttons (see Figure 19). Alternatively, the men of the Southeast Duplex and Stable Quarter possessed more expensive shirt and waistcoat buttons, with those in the Southeast Duplex again possessing slightly higher amounts of these buttons. However, the men of the Southeast Duplex owned the smallest percentage of costly coat buttons. The size overlap seen in the waistcoat / coat category hampers our ability to see the button distribution given the fluctuation seen between this category and coat buttons. Regardless, based up on the data from the less visible sleeve buttons, and the smaller waistcoat buttons, it appears that the men of the Southeast Duplex and the Stable Quarter displayed more wealth under their coats than the men of the Southwest Home. As this corresponds with the overall percentage of yellow alloy buttons at each site, it can be assumed that the resident of the Southwest Home displayed less wealth on their clothing than their neighbors.

Recently, Eric Schweickart (2013) compared the quality of the flat copper alloy buttons recovered from the South Yard and Stable Quarter, seen in the amount of manufacturing flaws in the assemblages. Although this study combined the Southeast Duplex and South West Home into a single unit of analysis, he determined that the men of these households invested in higher quality buttons than the men in the Stable Quarter. This potentially indicates that while the Stable Quarter yielded a similar percentage of yellow alloy buttons than the Southeast Duplex, they may have invested in cheaper buttons in this process. Further comparisons between clothing and personal adornment below can aid in teasing out this suggestion.
Buckles

In addition to fastening their clothing with buttons and eye hooks, the members of Montpelier’s black community also used buckles, which were used in a wide variety of articles, from shoes and boots, to hats and undergarments (Table 6; Heath 1999a:57-59). Additionally, these fasteners were manufactured from various metals, including copper alloys, iron, precious metals, and pewter (Heath 1999a:57; K. Trickett 2013a:71). Given the wide array of choices available to enslaved consumers when selecting buckles, solely assessing displayed wealth through the metal alloys seen in the Montpelier assemblages does not promise to produce meaningful results. Furthermore, as seen in Table 6, assessing the presence of decoration on the recovered buckles does not reveal any larger trends, given that only three of the 18 buckles contained decoration. However, as buckles adorned a wide variety of clothing, by assessing the variation within the clothing indicated by the recovered buckles, a sense of the types of clothing worn by the residents of the South Yard and Stable Quarters can be gained, with, presumably, a more varied assortment of clothing indicating more wealth being displayed.

Table 6

*Recovered buckles by material, buckle type, and decoration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Buckle Type</th>
<th>Decorated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copper Alloy</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Silver Plated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Quarter</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Duplex</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No buckles were recovered from the Southwest Home. Amongst the remaining two sites, the Southeast Duplex yielded 12 buckles and the Stable Quarter nine. Within
the clothing assemblage from each site, the buckles from the Southeast Duplex form 12 percent of the assemblage, while the buckles from the Stable Quarter only form six percent. As the residents of the Southeast Duplex appear to have discarded buckles at twice the rate of their neighbors in the Stable Quarter, they appear to have displayed more wealth in their clothing. However, it is important to point out that in both the recovered buckles and buttons, the South Yard sites displayed a remarkable diversity in their assemblages, suggesting that the fasteners we are studying were not supplied to these residents in the form of livery to be worn while attending official duties in the mansion (Eric Schweickart personal e-mail, March 7, 2014; K. Trickett 2013a:71).

Seven of the recovered buckles from the Stable Quarter were shoe buckles, while one came from a boot or garter, and the remaining buckle was too fragmented for any determination to be made. The Southeast Duplex, however, yielded eight shoe buckles, three boot or garter buckles, and one possible fragment of a knee buckle from a pair of men’s pants (K. Trickett 2013a:72). Based upon the greater diversity in the buckles from the Southeast Duplex, indicating a wider variety of clothing fastened by them, and the presence of more buckles within its clothing assemblage, it can be inferred that the men of Southeast Duplex displayed more wealth in their clothing than those in the Stable Quarter. Again, the Southwest Home did not yield any buckles, furthering the suggestion seen with the buttons that this site displayed the least amount of wealth in its clothing.

Jewelry, Watches, and Other Accessories

In addition to their clothing, black Virginians could obtain wide variety of jewelry and other items of personal adornment to express their identity and wealth. Barbara Heath has noted that bondspeople in Virginia were commonly noted as having worn
jewelry (1999a:55-57). All three sites yield jewelry and other items of personal adornment which would have been costly consumer goods in the 19th century Piedmont, with the Southeast Duplex yielding six, the Southwest Home yielding four, and the Stable Quarter yielding nine. Despite the variations in these numbers, the number of jewelry and other items of personal adornment from each site forms six percent of their clothing assemblage, suggesting that they each owned similar amounts of these objects.

These artifacts, however, can be divided by gender, or at least into male specific and gender-neutral categories (none were exclusively worn by women), potentially allowing us to see differences in displayed wealth within a household. This is especially important due to the fact that the clothing related artifacts are predominantly associated with enslaved men.

Table 7

*Recovered jewelry and other items of personal adornment by site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Male Items</th>
<th>Watch</th>
<th>Indeterminate</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cuff Links</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Paste Gem</td>
<td>Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Duplex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Quarter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The artifacts associated with enslaved men are cuff links, watch parts, and the finial from a walking stick. These formed 83 percent of the Southeast Duplex assemblage, 33 percent of the Stable Quarter assemblage, and none were recovered from the Southwest Home. Artifacts associated with both enslaved women and men were paste gems, brass rings (likely from a chain rather than being worn on a finger [K. Trickett 2013b:45]), miscellaneous jewelry claps, and a small (8 millimeters diameter)
golden six pointed star with a hole in its center. These formed 17 percent of the Southeast Duplex assemblage, 100 percent of the Southwest Home assemblage, and 66 percent of the Stable Quarter assemblage. Based upon this, men in the Southeast Duplex appear to have been displaying wealth with personal adornments, and as were the women in the Southwest Home, based on the possible absence of male artifacts. Women may have displayed more wealth through these items at the Stable Quarter, but this distinction is clouded by the recovered male adornments.

_Beads_

Beads were a popular and widely available consumer good for most of the historic era. Amongst black Virginians, these could be used for a wide variety of purposes, from adorning the hair (Heath 1999a:56) to providing spiritual protection (Stine et al. 1996), and they could even help provide a source of income through their association with seamstress activities (Reeves 2004:14-19). Given this variation, it is nearly impossible to determine how their owners used the beads recovered from the Montpelier sites.

All three sites yield beads, with 35 recovered from the Southeast Duplex, 21 recovered from the Southwest Home, and 36 recovered from the Stable Quarter, and with each site containing an assortment of wound and drawn beads (see Table 5 for overall bead numbers). Comparing the number of beads to the number of clothing related artifacts, the beads from the Southeast Duplex were 35 percent of the clothing assemblage, 31 percent of the Southwest Home’s, and 23 percent of the Stable Quarter’s. The lower percentage of beads seen in the Stable Quarter is interesting given the presence of several borrow pits and other occupation-related features, which are natural receptacles for stray beads. However, what this dearth of beads says about the site’s inhabitants
cannot be determined at this time, as the discard rate for these artifacts does not always correlate with other costly consumer goods (see Galle 2011).

*Displayed Wealth on the Body*

In summary, the men residing in the Southeast Duplex displayed the most wealth with their clothing and personal adornments, as seen in the yellow alloy buttons, buckles, and other items of adornment they wore. This also coincides with Eric Schweickart’s (2013) assessment of the quality of the buttons recovered from the sites. The men in the Stable Quarter displayed the second largest amount of wealth, falling closely behind the Southeast Duplex. The men in the Southwest Home displayed the least amount of wealth on their bodies. However, as these recovered artifacts tend to be associated with males, these findings do not necessarily correlate with the women who lived in these homes, as seen in the jewelry from the Southwest Home.

*Miscellaneous Consumer Goods*

The analysis of displayed wealth so far has relied upon consumer items which may have been displayed as a symbol of the affluence that an individual or household presented to the others in their community, as more expensive items were purchased instead of cheaper ones. Therefore, the choices these families made when purchasing their ceramics and the clothing they wore had potential social implications. Such wealth, however, could also be seen in a variety of other household consumer goods which may not have been intended necessarily for display, but not intended to be hidden either. Therefore, the number of pharmaceutical bottles and other miscellaneous consumer items they purchased may reflect some of the large patterns in displayed wealth discussed above.
Throughout this entire discussion of displayed wealth, coins have not been assessed, despite the fact that five period coins were recovered during the South Yard and Stable Quarter excavations. Dylan Penningroth, in his treatment of property amongst Antebellum black kin networks, suggested that enslaved individuals did not publicly display the actual money they possessed in order to prevent theft, and to keep other member of their community from asking them for loans (2003:97). As such, the recovered coins most likely were not used in the public display of wealth at Montpelier.

Pharmaceutical Bottles

When illness struck the families of Montpelier’s black community, these individuals had a variety of cures available to them. They could rely on the medical knowledge retained by the earlier generations sold across the Atlantic, and augmented by year of experiences in dealing with the local ailments (cf. Sweet 2011). Alternatively, these households may have purchased mass produced medicine from local markets, with the glass containers which held these cures eventually breaking and entering the archaeological record left behind by these families. As these store bought elixirs cost money to obtain, the amount of glass pharmaceutical bottle fragments recovered from each site can potentially indicate how these families used their wealth (see Reeves 2011a:199).

The Southeast Duplex yielded 1,073 shards of pharmaceutical bottle glass, weighing a total of 963 grams (Table 8). The Southwest Home yielded 477 shards of pharmaceutical bottle glass, weighing a total of 422 grams. The Stable Quarter yielded 287 shards of pharmaceutical bottle glass, weighing a total of 755 grams. As with the discussion of the glass tableware, differences in the sizes of the shards recovered from the
South Yard and Stable Quarters prevents the raw counts from providing useful insights (Table 8). Comparing the weight of the recovered pharmaceutical glass from each site through an abundance index, Southeast Duplex discarded the largest amount of pharmaceutical bottle glass, followed by the Southwest Home, and the Stable Quarter discarded the smallest amount of these purchased cures. Therefore, tentatively, the residents of the Southeast Duplex displayed the largest amount of wealth with the medicines they purchased. However, two additional factors must be taken into consideration when dealing with this artifact type.

Table 8

*Recovered pharmaceutical bottle fragments per site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Total Shards</th>
<th>Total Weight (g)</th>
<th>Mean Weight per Shard (g)</th>
<th>Abundance Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Duplex</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.10246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Home</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>421.8</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.07282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Quarter</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>755.3</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.05622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, it is possible that the families living in the Southeast Duplex were affected by health issues to a larger degree than their neighbors, forcing these individuals to purchase more medicine from local markets. This has the potential of relating to the age of the occupants of these sites. However, as the residents of the Southeast Duplex owned a significant amount of costly consumer goods, then it is probable that they were predominantly middle aged, without young children (see Heath 2004), suggesting that age might not have effected their decision to acquire these medicines. Second, when the health of their enslaved community was at stake, it is possible that the Madison’s could have contributed medicine to their enslaved community (see Galle 2004:63-64). For example, in 1825, Madison wrote to Dr. Robley Dunglison for medical advice in treating
a “servant with [a] swelled [sic] neck,” receiving a “vial of tincture” and detailed instructions for its application (Larrabee-Cotz 2012a:25-26). Several years later, John Finch remarked that a bondsman who was “unwell… made known his complaints to Massa [sic]” and was “sent… to the house to get some medicine” (Larrabee-Cotz 2012b:5). During this exchange, Finch remarked upon “the great confidence” the man had that he would receive a “favorable hearing,” suggesting that such occasions were routine at Montpelier (Larrabee-Cotz 2012b:5). Because of this, it is possible that an unknown percentage of the pharmaceutical glass was given to these households, rather than purchased by them. However, based on the fact that this matches the distribution of the other miscellaneous consumer goods, discussed below, it does appear as if the resident of the Southeast Duplex were spending more on commercial medicines.

It is possible, however, that some these vessels held store bought food items instead of medicine (Matthew Reeves, personal e-mail, May 21, 2014). Regardless, if this was the case, then these vessels, and whatever they held, would have to still be purchased, and would therefore indicate the presence of consumer goods through which wealth might have been indirectly displayed.

Other Miscellaneous Consumer Goods

This last category includes other consumer goods recovered from the South Yard and Stable Quarter sites. For the sake of comparison, these have been divided into food related items, lighting, furniture, musical instruments, toys, and a sixth category of miscellaneous other objects which were not compared (Table 9). As with the distribution of pharmaceutical bottle glass, higher amounts of these consumer goods at a site potentially indicate that that site had, and displayed, more wealth than their neighbors.
The first category consists of consumer goods related to food preparation and consumption, namely kettle and pot fragments, and eating utensils. The Southeast Duplex yielded 19 iron kettle fragments, one brass pot fragment, and 21 whole or fragmented eating utensils. The Southwest Home yielded 11 iron kettle fragments, and seven whole or fragmented eating utensils. The Stable Quarter yielded three iron kettle fragments, and 20 whole or fragmented eating utensils. Compared through an abundance index, the Southeast Duplex possessed the most food related consumer goods, followed by the Southwest Home, and the Stable Quarter owned the smallest amount purchased food related goods.

Table 9

*Other miscellaneous consumer goods by category and site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Food Related</th>
<th>Lighting</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooking Vessels</td>
<td>Eating Utensil</td>
<td>Lamp Chimney Fragments</td>
<td>Lamp Parts</td>
<td>Lantern Glass Fragments</td>
<td>Lantern Parts</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Duplex</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Home</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Quarter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Furniture</th>
<th>Music Mouth Harp</th>
<th>Marbles</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Tacks</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Duplex</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Home</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Quarter</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second category is artifacts from lighting devices: lamps, lanterns, and candles. The Southeast Duplex yielded 101 lamp chimney fragments, 13 other lamp
parts, 14 lantern glass fragments, and one glass candle stick fragment. The Southwest Home yielded 57 lamp chimney fragments, and four fragments of lantern glass. The Stable Quarter yielded 13 lamp chimney fragments, one fragment of lantern glass, and one miscellaneous piece of lantern hardware. The distribution of lamp chimney glass was not affected by shard size, as the Southeast Duplex yielded the largest average shard size, and the highest amount of shards. After calculating the abundance index, the residents of the Southeast Duplex owned the most commercially available lighting devices, followed by the Southwest Home, while the Stable Quarter owned the smallest amount.

The majority of the furniture owned by Montpelier’s black community would have been constructed of wood, which does not survive in the archaeological record. However, metal fasteners, hinges, and other decorative elements present on these furnishings were recovered from the three sites, allowing us a glimpse at the items which these bondspeople placed in their homes. The Southeast Duplex yielded 61 artifacts related to furniture: 44 tacks and 17 other items. The Southwest Home yielded 49 artifacts related to furniture: 29 tacks and 20 other items. The Stable Quarter yielded 35 artifacts related to furniture: 28 tacks and seven other items. After calculating the abundance index, the Southwest Home yielded the greatest percentage of furniture related artifacts, followed by the Southeast Duplex, and the residents of the Stable Quarter owned the smallest amount of furniture related artifacts.

During the 19th century, while individuals could construct many musical instruments themselves, a variety of commercially available musical instruments were available in markets across the Virginia Piedmont. Four mouth harps (also referred to as
Jew’s harps) were recovered from the Montpelier sites: three from the Southeast Duplex and one from the Stable Quarter. As the Southeast Duplex, so far, has possessed the greatest amount of miscellaneous consumer goods, the distribution of the musical instruments seems to follow this trend.

All three of the sites yielded marbles. The bulk of this assemblage appears to have been manufactured within the local community from available clay and limestone sources, or purchased at a low cost in local markets. The residents of the Southeast Duplex, however, owned at least two porcelain marbles, which would have required a greater investment of resources. As similar costly marbles were not recovered at any of the other sites, the Southeast Duplex appears to have been displaying the largest amount of wealth with these toys.

The residents of the Southeast Duplex appear to have been displaying the largest amount of wealth with the miscellaneous consumer goods and pharmaceutical bottle fragments assessed in this section. Despite the fact that the Southwest Home yielded the largest amount of furniture related artifacts, the residents of this site appear to have been displaying the second largest amount of wealth overall with the commercial goods they purchased. Lastly, the family that lived in the Stable Quarter appears to have displayed the smallest amount of wealth in the miscellaneous consumer goods they bought.

Displayed Wealth and Gender at Montpelier

In combing the displayed wealth seen in each of the artifact categories discussed above, the residents of the Southeast Duplex may have owned the most expensive consumer goods, followed closely by the households in the Southwest Home, while the family living in the Stable Quarter had the least expensive assemblage. However, while
the Southeast Duplex displayed the most wealth with their bodily adornments, other consumer goods, and transferprinted whitewares, the Southwest Home displayed the most wealth with their pearlware and porcelain table settings and teawares. In order to make a meaningful interpretation about the role of wealth in structuring social relations, this variance, and the impact of gender on it, must be understood.

Several researchers (e.g. Galle 2010; Young 2003) have suggested that ceramics recovered from slave quarters have a stronger association with enslaved women. Within these vessels, the acquisition and display of costly teawares may have been particularly important for women, as they were the ones making the condiments which these vessels potentially held. Applying this to the artifacts seen above, the women of the Southwest Home appear to have been displaying more wealth than the neighboring women, at least for the majority of the site’s occupation. This is also illustrated in the larger amount of gender-neutral (versus solely male) jewelry recovered from the duplex.

Conversely, men, especially with their buttons, owned the majority of the displayed wealth seen in the clothing and adornment worn by the inhabitants of these sites, by virtue of the higher levels of preservation for the fasteners which visibly held their clothing together. Between the three sites, the men of the Southeast Duplex and the Stable Quarter displayed more wealth on their bodies than the men of the Southwest Home, even while the women of this site were displaying the most wealth with their plates, cups, and bowls. This discrepancy suggests that household composition may have played a large part in how black Virginians displayed their wealth.

Amongst Igbos in 18th century Nigeria, men controlled the production of yams, while women grew the majority of the other crops and tended their household’s livestock
Amongst the individuals who were sold to Virginian planters and became black Virginians, a gendered understanding of food production and economic participation appears to have been retained (Samford 2004). Although no evidence exists to support the continuation of men’s exclusive cultivation of yams and sweet potatoes, black women continued to play a large role in gardening and raising poultry, thereby making large contributions to the food their families ate (Samford 2004:156-158).

Revisiting the possible suggestion that toting may have contributed to a portion of the meals eaten in the Southwest Home, these practices may have been important to the wealth these households created. If these women were able to divert a larger portion of the food they made to market activities, they may have had a larger control of how their wealth was spent. John Oriji noted a similar pattern amongst 19th century Igbo households. With Britain’s increased interest in African palm oil in the latter half of this century, African families began producing and selling larger amounts of the product; with local women controlling and profiting from this process, based upon a continuation of traditional gender roles (Oriji 1998:60-64). This income greatly increased the variety of goods these women were able to purchase from local markets (Oriji 1998:63-64, 68; see Chuku [2005] for a continued discussion of gendered economics amongst the Igbo).

Although this occurred in different a context, it does show, given the impact of Igbo culture on black Virginians, the ability for women to independently create wealth for themselves within their household.

Jillian Galle (2010) previously addressed the role of gender and household composition in displaying wealth in Virginia, suggesting that either unmarried men, or men with wives on neighboring plantations may have inhabited households with larger
quantities of expensive buttons. Conversely, households with more expensive ceramic assemblages may point to nuclear, or at least kin based, households (Galle 2010:37). These observations, however, do not necessarily apply to the Montpelier sites, as all three appear to have been inhabited by family groups (see Chapter II). Furthermore, at the Southeast Duplex, men displayed the most wealth on their bodies, the women also owned a fairly expensive ceramic assemblage. While extrapolating this into larger patterns in black Virginia may be problematic, due to the influence of local contexts, this work does show that researchers investigating enslaved wealth should assess differences within an individual household as well as between households.

The other consumer goods recovered, however, generally cannot be engendered, due both to the wide range of artifacts they cover, and their general use around the home. However, as the Southeast Duplex yielded the highest amount of these items, these households can be assumed to have the highest amount of overall wealth.

Since displayed wealth amongst Montpelier’s black community appears to have been structured along gender lines, the influence of these identities of wealth on social relations similarly must be addressed with gender in mind. Because of this, for social interactions which appear to have occurred amongst the community’s men, the Southeast Duplex will be seen as displaying the highest amount of wealth, followed by the Stable Quarter, and lastly the Southwest Home. For social interactions which predominantly occurred between enslaved women, the Southwest Home will be seen as displaying the highest amount of wealth, followed by the Southeast Duplex, and lastly the Stable Quarter. Exceptions to this will be made for social interactions which can be historicized, as the Southeast Duplex had the most expensive whiteware assemblage. Similar to
displayed wealth, not all interactions can be categorized by gender, and amongst those which cannot be divided along these lines, the Southeast Duplex will be seen as displaying the most wealth, followed by the Southwest Home, and lastly the Stable Quarter.
CHAPTER V
INTERPRETING SOCIAL RELATIONS WITHIN THE BLACK COMMUNITY

With a working understanding of the wealth displayed by the residents of the South Yard and Stable Quarters, it is possible to examine if the fragments of Staffordshire tablewares and broken Scovill buttons once owned by these African Americans played a role in structuring their social lives. Ideas and material goods flowed between households who maintained social relationships with each other, and it is the items discarded from these interactions that can serve as indicators of these connections; providing their proper contextualization. The activities I compared to see these interactions were the exchange of ceramic vessels, the trade of equestrian related artifacts, the dispersal of craft knowledge, food acquisition and storage, involvement in Montpelier’s spiritual community, the use of communal spaces, and lastly, the need to prevent theft, each of which will be presented in its own section below.

Because of the influence of gender on displayed wealth, to investigate the effect of these costly consumer goods on social relations within Montpelier’s black community, social interactions must also be seen from a gendered perspective. Therefore, the activities listed above were subdivided into three groupings, based upon their association with women or men. The exchange of ceramic vessels, and gathering in communal areas for sewing were both associated with Montpelier’s women, and when considering the effect of displayed wealth on these activities, the women of the Southwest Home were considered to have displayed the most wealth, followed by those in the Southeast Duplex, and lastly those in the Stable Quarter. The trade of equestrian related objects, the dispersal of woodworking knowledge, and the use of communal areas to prepare guns for
hunting were associated with Montpelier’s men. Amongst the social relationships seen here, the men of the Southeast Duplex were considered to have displayed the most wealth, followed by those of the Stable Quarter, and lastly those in Southwest Home. Not all social interactions, however, can be divided by gender, including food storage, involvement in Montpelier’s spiritual community, gathering in communal areas for gender-neutral activities, and the need to prevent theft. For these interactions, the residents of the Southeast Duplex were considered to have displayed the most wealth, followed by those in the Southwest Home, and lastly the family living in the Stable Quarter. For the ease of the reader, the interpretation of displayed wealth on each of the social interactions is provided following the assessment of these activities, followed by an overall discussion at the end of the chapter.

It is important to note that in three of these social interactions, the exchange of vessels acquired from Madison’s dining room, the distribution of woodworking knowledge, and the trade of equestrian related items, the results may be influenced by the complexities of plantation life. Under ideal circumstances for contemporary researchers, the African Americans who lived in each household would have solely performed the duties associated with the workspaces located in the quarters they lived in, easily letting us determine that any Madison related tablewares recovered from the Stable Quarter were traded to these craftspeople by the domestic laborers living in the South Yard Quarter. Alternatively, the knowledge for using woodworking tools recovered from the South Yard, as well as any equestrian related items, could be safely deemed to have originated in the Stable Quarter.
In reality, however, Southern plantations were multifaceted agro-industrial complexes which almost seem destined to thwart any broad generalizations we place on their inhabitants. In particular, Brian Thomas, while looking at the enslaved community of Tennessee’s Hermitage plantation noted that the discrete boundaries of the plantation’s individual quarters did not necessarily correlate with the occupations of the African Americans who called these spaces home, primarily because these bondspeople do not appear to have married along occupational lines (1995:160-162). This suggests that an inhabitant of the South Yard or Stable Quarter may have labored at any of the tasks which kept the plantation running. Further complicating matters is the fact that in the Antebellum South, a bondsperson’s occupation could change numerous times during their life (cf. Morgan 1998:212-218).

Table 10

*Occupation-associated artifacts by site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Count</th>
<th>Acquired Madison Tablewares</th>
<th>Equestrian Related Artifacts</th>
<th>Woodworking Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Home</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Quarter</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abundance Index</th>
<th>Acquired Madison Tablewares</th>
<th>Equestrian Related Artifacts</th>
<th>Woodworking Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>0.00212</td>
<td>0.00189</td>
<td>0.000237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Home</td>
<td>0.00204</td>
<td>0.00221</td>
<td>0.000931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Quarter</td>
<td>0.00141</td>
<td>0.00338</td>
<td>0.000866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In spite of these factors, there does seem to be an association between the two discrete quarters, and the three occupation-associated artifacts assessed for social interactions associated with the quarters’ workspaces, as demonstrated in Table 10.
Based on this suggestion, the discussion of the exchange of acquired Madison tablewares will consider these vessels as originating from the South Yard, and the distribution of equestrian related artifacts as stemming from the Stable Quarter Complex. At the moment, there are no definitive indications that any of the individuals residing in the Stable Quarter served as carpenters for the Madisons, but as this possibly cannot be ruled out. For the South Yard sites, it does not appear at the moment that any of their residents were formally trained as carpenters, so any woodworking knowledge may have been taught to these men by their neighbors.

**Exchange of Ceramic Vessels**

Even though households acquired their own ceramic table and teawares, they do not appear to have always kept these vessels for themselves. In this section, the exchange of ceramic vessels between the women residing at the individual sites is considered.

*Giving Gifts*

While living with a black family in 1960s Illinois, anthropologist Carol Stack noted the presence of extensive systems through which both real and fictive kin transferred money, items, and children back and forth (1974). This exchange network served to connect the individual households of an extended kin network, and played a large role in how “outsiders” could socially reaffirm biological kinship, or enter into a family in with which they had no blood relations. While Stack focused her research on families cast into urban poverty following the Great Migration, this survival strategy does not have its roots in northern ghettos (see Chapter III). Rather, historian Dylan Penningroth, in his interpretation of role of property in structuring kinship in the late Antebellum and early Post Emancipation South, suggested that these social structures
appear to have emerged from West African understandings of ownership, where a family claimed property communally (2003). This African system similarly does not consider families to be static, bounded units, but rather are flexible, dynamic networks which freely allowed members to come and go (Penningroth 2003:9). However, in quarters across the South, the ability to enter into a kin group hinged on an individual’s ability to contribute to his or her new network; a facet of enslaved social life which could, at times, increase the personal trauma of being sold through the inter-state slave trade into communities in which an individual possessed no kinship connections (Penningroth 2003:83-88; see Amy Young et al. [2001] for the suggestion that hunting could serve as an element of this contribution). We can consider these material exchanges as gifts for the purposes of this research, as gift giving involves expectations of social obligations, whether it be membership into a group, with its commensurate privileges, or exchanging food with the expectation of a future return (Young 1997a:16).

Realizing the larger social systems which governed property amongst black Southerners does little to make sense of archaeological findings unless we can identify the movement of items between Montpelier’s women and men from the material residue of daily life we recover from the field. To this end, Brian Thomas saw the broad movement of a variety of material culture over a plantation’s landscape, including ceramic tablewares, glassware, and food, as evidence of these exchanges (1995, 1998, 2001). While several of these objects are discussed below, a finer scale approach to seeing gift giving in the archaeological record is needed for this research to allow the interactions between individual sites to be seen. This is provided by Amy Young’s study of gifting between the women of Kentucky’s Locust Grove plantation (1995, 1997a,
2003, 2004). Young’s work focused on identifying individual matched sets of buttons, and glass and ceramic tablewares which were primarily associated with a single household, but also recovered in limited numbers at other homes, with the assumption that these similar items entered into the additional assemblages through gift giving, allowing us to interpret broader patterns of social relationships from these associations (1997a:27). Unfortunately, at the Montpelier sites, the majority of the buttons did not possess enough decoration to be divided into groupings, with the exception of the pewter buttons potentially doled out by the Madisons, and the glass tablewares were too heavily fragmented for the laboratory staff to identify potential vessel sets (see Chapter IV). Ceramic vessels, however, which have been reconstructed and grouped into vessel sets, do afford us the opportunity to see gift giving within Montpelier’s black community.  

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel Set Composition</th>
<th>1 Vessel</th>
<th>2 Vessels</th>
<th>3 or More Vessels</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sets</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Vessels</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the ceramic reconstruction, 87 percent of the vessels identified from the three individual sites could be placed into vessel sets, based on their observable decorative motifs. A total of 105 of these vessel sets contained only one vessel, 47 vessel sets contained two vessels, and 30 sets contained three or more vessels, the minimum number needed to begin assessing gift giving practices (see Table 11). Of the sets containing three or more vessels, six (20 percent) are comprised of vessels which have a

13 I have previously used these vessels in an attempt to identify gift giving interactions at Montpelier (Greer 2013, 2014a). However, I reassessed this research in this thesis to better account for the specifics of the project.
strong association with the Madisons’ tablewares, likely seeing use in the mansion before their appropriation by the black community. These six sets are assessed in the next section.

Amongst the vessels that the residents of the South Yard and Stable Quarters likely purchased for their own use, the majority (63 percent) belong to vessel sets which contain fewer than three identifiable vessels. Amongst the remaining larger vessel sets containing five or more vessels, 66 percent are comprised of shell edged wares, blue willow transfer prints, and creamware varieties, despite their uniformity, may not have been purchased together, as these were some of the more common designs shipped out from English factories. The large amount of smaller vessel sets provides the overall impression that, unlike the Madisons, Montpelier’s black community acquired their vessels piecemeal, with new vessels being purchased as needed from local markets (also see Kimberly Trickett 2013a:17). This does not appear to have been a localized pattern, as Patricia Samford noted a similar one at other Virginia plantations (2007:100). This, however, does cause difficulties for archaeologists attempting to see gifting through identifiable vessel sets. Regardless, six sets, with a total of 23 individual vessels, were identified as having a strong association with a particular site, while being recovered in lower quantities at another. These sets, and their potential to demonstrate gift giving practices at Montpelier, are the focus of this section.

The first vessel set (Vessel Set #255) is a fine lead glazed tea set, with three vessels, including a teapot, recovered from the Stable Quarter, and one vessel, another teapot, coming from the Southeast Duplex. Because both sites yielded a teapot (which did not crossmended between the sites), this vessel set most likely does not represent gift
giving. Rather, it is probable that the residents of both of these sites purchased these teapots independently, especially due to the lower cost associated with these vessels compared to the other pearlware, whiteware, and porcelain discussed below.

The second vessel set (#279) is an overglazed Chinese export porcelain tea set with a mountain and flower motif. Two teacups were recovered from the Southeast Duplex, and one saucer was recovered from the Stable Quarter. In the Piedmont, tea cups and saucers could be purchased independently (K. Trickett 2013a:24), but the recovery of this motif from both sites suggests that the saucer may have been given to the family of the Stable Quarter as a gift.

The third vessel set (#138) was a red transfer-printed whiteware table setting with a floral motif. The Southeast Duplex yielded two vessels from this set, a plate and an unclassifiable teaware, and a single plate was recovered from the Stable Quarter. Interestingly, this plate is one of only three transfer-printed vessels recovered from the Stable Quarter, further suggesting the possibility that one of the residents of the Southeast Duplex gave the vessel as a gift to this family. The choice of a whiteware vessel is intriguing for historicizing social interactions at Montpelier, as red transfer-printed vessels date both to the last decade of the South Yard’s occupation, and the last years of the Stable Quarter’s. Unfortunately, this represents the only social interaction which could be historicized.

The fourth vessel set (#30) is a collection of green rococo shell edge pearlware flatware. Three plates and a platter were recovered from the Stable Quarter, while a single plate was recovered from the Southeast Duplex. When assessing the vessel sets owned by a particular household, edged wares, due to their wide availability and general
uniformity, can be problematic. However, as four of the five vessels in this set are associated with a single site, there does seem to be an association between it and the family living in the Stable Quarter, with the remaining plate possibly arriving at the Southeast Duplex through gift giving.

*Figure 20. Vessel sets showing potential gift giving. Clockwise from the bottom left, Vessel Set #138, #143, #93, and #255. Photographs by Kimberly Trickett.*

The fifth vessel set (#153) is a handpainted pearlware tea set with brown and yellow geometric designs. Two teacups and a saucer were recovered from the Stable Quarter, and one saucer was recovered from the Southwest Home. Similar to the overglazed porcelain mentioned above (#279), it is possible that these vessels were
purchased independently, but their stronger association with the Stable Quarter suggests that the presence of the saucer at the Southwest Home may have been the result of gift giving.

The last vessel set (#93) is one of three transferprinted sets with a blue willow motif identified amongst the recovered ceramics. This motif was the most popular design manufactured in England during the early 19th century (Samford 1997:8), and therefore, similar to edged wares, it can be difficult to determine its association with a particular household. This is particularly evident in this particular vessel set, as it was recovered from all three sites. Five of these vessels are rather generic flatware and hollowware forms, from which larger patterns cannot be determined. The remaining four vessels, however, are all soup plates, with three recovered at the Stable Quarter, and the fourth recovered from the Southwest Home. The fact that these vessels are seen nowhere else in the South Yard or Stable Quarters suggests that the soup plate from the Southwest Home may have been gifted to its residents by the family living at the Stable Quarter.

Based on this analysis, there appear to be indications of five gift giving interactions. Three of these took place between the residents of the Southeast Duplex and the Stable Quarter, with the residents of the Southeast Duplex gifting two vessels (from Sets #279 and #138), and the family in the Stable Quarter giving one vessel (from Set #30). The remaining interactions took place between the Stable Quarter and the Southwest Home, with the family in the Stable Quarter gifting two vessels (from Sets #153 and #93) to the residents of the latter site. No interactions between the residents of the Southeast Duplex and the Southwest Home were identified.
Returning again to the wealth displayed by these households, the women of the Southwest Home displayed the most expensive ceramic assemblage, followed by those in the Southeast Duplex, and lastly the Stable Quarter. This indicates that, overall, more wealth did not create more social relationships, as the Southwest Home did not give or receive the most vessels. Furthermore, between the residents of the Southeast Duplex and the Stable Quarter, the residents of the Duplex gave more vessels to their neighbors; a practice which continued up until the last years the Stable Quarter was occupied. However, the lack of displayed wealth may have played a role in social relationships, as the residents of the Stable Quarter appear to have given gifts to their more affluent neighbors in the Southwest Home, possibly in an effort to create and maintain social ties with these women.

*Exchange of Acquired Madison Tablewares*

Objects can have long, complicated histories, with each new chapter adding another layer of meaning to the lifeless things we own. For example, take the few sherds of “blue china” that an unnamed former bondswoman in Georgia’s Lowcountry used to decorate the grave of her late husband (Gonzales, quoted in Young 2007:163). The fragments had come from a pitcher she, as a girl, had been assigned to fill for “the Missis,” before tripping; landing on and cracking this container. Fortunately, upon seeing the girl’s tear streaked face, “the Missis” not only spared her any physical abuse for the incident, but allowed her to keep the cracked vessel, endowing this item a particular meaning to the girl, which it retained for years as the pitcher adorned her home (Young 2007:163). During this time, she married “Old John,” and through the “blue china” pitcher’s association with the home they kept together, it must have adopted additional
personal meaning, as upon John’s death, she “took a hatchet [and broke] the pottery to pieces,” placing the broken fragments over his grave (Young 2007:163). This act of destruction gave the broken pieces of this pitcher their meaning, a remembrance.

Unfortunately for archaeologists, these layers of meanings are often elusive unless we can identify the larger social context, and the individual history, of the broken, discarded possessions of past communities. The ceramics Montpelier’s black women gifted to one another are one such artifact from which we can potentially glimpse the meanings the residents of the three sites placed upon their things. To a large extent, one could say, this chapter is all about identifying such meanings, as they illustrate the larger social context which existed in the plantation’s quarters. However, one group of artifacts stands above the rest when it comes to reading its long journey into the archaeological record: the ceramic vessels acquired from the Madisons’ dining room.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the excavations of Dolley’s Midden has been invaluable to archaeologists studying the ceramics owned by Montpelier’s 19th century black community, as it allows us not only to see which vessels may have originated from the mansion, but also the social networks these vessels traveled through. For instance, the presence of Chinese export porcelain vessels decorated with a Fitzhugh Moth motif at a tobacco barn refurbished as a temporary home for enslaved families (K. Trickett 2013c:25), or fragments of a Bamboo and Peony transfer-printed porcelain plate unearthed at the site of a cabin lived in by the plantation’s agricultural laborers demonstrate that the vessels the Madison’s and their guests ate from actively moved throughout the black community, giving them a new set of meanings. Because of the visible second chapter of these vessels’ history, they were not assessed above with the
ceramics purchased by the members of Montpelier’s black community from local markets.

As there is a higher chance that the residents of the South Yard Quarter toiled at domestic tasks in the mansion, the tablewares from the mansion recovered from these duplexes were assumed to have been acquired by these individuals. This acquisition may have occurred through several methods. For instance, the Madisons may have replaced an older ceramic set with a new one, doling out their still usable plates and bowls to their enslaved domestic laborers (Samford 2007:100). Alternatively, when vessels broke or became chipped, they may have been given away. Lastly, bondspeople may have also taken the vessels from the mansion without the Madisons’ permission, either through outright theft, or to hide a fresh crack in an expensive platter, thereby evading the wrath of “Miss Dolley.” However, as discussed earlier, as there is a lesser chance that the residents of the Stable Quarter performed domestic duties, they would have had less access to the vessels used in the main house. Therefore, they may have acquired these vessels in exchanges with their neighbors, either in the form of gift giving, as seen with the vessels above, or through bartering within the plantation’s internal economy. Such networks extended over large segments of the plantation, and possibly reached neighboring estates.

Based on the vessel sets seen at Dolley’s Midden, 47 vessels from 12 vessel sets that have a strong association with the Madisons were recovered from the South Yard and

---

14 Into the 20th century, former Montpelier slaves and their families reported being haunted in the mansion by the tapping of Dolley Madison’s ghost’s high heels (Baker 1901); a fact which is particularly revealing as to their views on the mistress, as the black Virginian who revealed this was dutifully taking care of the owl he believed to be the reincarnation of James Madison, Jr. Matthew Reeves has suggested that the broken remains of one Chinese export porcelain platter, half of which was recovered from the mansion’s rear lawn, was hidden from the Madison’s view at the Stable Quarter, where the remainder of the vessel was recovered (2011b:11).
Stable Quarter. These include transferprinted vessels with an Imperial Park at Gehol and Bamboo and Peony motifs, Nast, Dagoty or Dihl Gerad French porcelain, and several Chinese export porcelain motifs, including Fitzhugh Moth or Fitzhugh Medallion (Rich and Reeves 2009). Due to the cost associated with these vessels, and their likely unavailability in local markets, the only probable source for these ceramics was the Madisons’ dining room. The three sites yielded an additional 54 vessels from 17 vessel sets also recovered from Dolley’s Midden. These tablewares, however, were all widely available forms and motifs, such as green shell edge flatware, and as such, can safely be assumed to have been available in the local markets for the black community to purchase, indicating that they may not have arrived into the South Yard of Stable Quarter through the mansion. As the original source for these vessels cannot be determined, they were considered in the previous section rather than being treated as Madison tablewares.

In the previous assessment of the gifted ceramics, seeing the invisible threads which structured social life at Montpelier hinged upon the ability to identity matched sets seen in the sites’ reconstructed ceramic assemblages. For the Madison tablewares which passed through the hands of the black community, however, vessel sets most likely do not serve as a reliable indicator of social interaction, as these tablewares most likely were not acquired in sets. Rather, the number of vessels recovered was used to assess the presence of Madison tablewares at all three sites.
Table 12

**Acquired Madison tablewares by site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Number of Acquired Madison Tablewares</th>
<th>Abundance Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Duplex</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.00212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Home</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.00204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Quarter</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.00141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Southeast Duplex yielded 18 acquired Madison tablewares, the Southwest Home yielded 11, and the Stable Quarter yielded 18 (see Table 12). Comparing the frequency of these vessels through an abundance index, the South Yard duplexes both had similar amounts of acquired Madison tablewares, which should be expected given their residents’ likely domestic occupations. The family living at the Stable Quarter appears to have owned fewer Madison tablewares. While identifying any solid trends in social interaction with these vessels is difficult, one thing can be said: despite displaying the least amount of wealth in their ceramics, and in their overall possessions, the Stable Quarter was involved in the exchange of plates, bowls, and cups from the mansion. This suggests that wealth may not have been the most important element in structuring these social relationships.

*Displayed Wealth and the Exchange of Ceramic Vessels*

The women living in the South Yard and Stable Quarters exchanged ceramic vessels through social interactions. Our best window into these practices is evident in the plates, teawares, and soup plates they purchased from local markets and later gave to each other. None of these exchanges took place between the households living in the Southeast Duplex and the Southwest Home, despite the fact that these two sites yielded the highest amount of displayed wealth. The family living in the Stable Quarter
interacted with their wealthier neighbors, both through the exchange of the vessels they purchased, and through their acquisition of ceramics once used in the mansion. This indicates that displayed wealth, overall, did not structure social relationships amongst Montpelier’s black women. Rather, as seen in the interactions between the Southeast Duplex and the Stable Quarter, other factors, such as preexisting kinship ties, may have played a large role within this community.

The lack of displayed wealth, however, may have had an impact on the social connection of these women. The family in the Stable Quarter gifted a soup plate and a saucer to the resident of the Southwest Home, without any ceramics being given back to them. In her original treatment of the exchange of ceramic vessels, Amy Young focused on the role of risk management in the establishment of social ties between enslaved households (1997a, 2004). This potentially suggests that the women of the Stable Quarter were attempting to create social ties with their wealthier neighbors to mitigate the effects of slavery.

Trade of Equestrian Related Items

The long histories of individual artifacts can also be glimpsed in the equestrian related objects recovered from the Montpelier quarters. These metal horseshoes, saddle buckles, snaffle bits, and carriage parts likely began their lives in the care and maintenance of the plantations beasts of burden, or in providing the transportation the Madisons’ guests used to arrive at the property. After replacing faulty or worn out items, Montpelier’s farriers and craftsmen could discard these equestrian related objects straightaway, allowing them to immediately enter the archaeological record. In this case, their recovery should be restricted to the area adjacent to the plantation’s stables or other
workspaces in the Stable Quarter Complex. Additionally, it is possible that any of these items may have been recycled for the official maintenance of the plantation’s animals and vehicles before entering into the property’s clayey soils. Neither scenario, however, accounts for the recovery of 71 equestrian related artifacts from the homespaces of the South Yard and Stable Quarter.

Table 13

*Recovered equestrian related artifacts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Horse / Ox Shoes</th>
<th>Buckles</th>
<th>Harness Parts</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Duplex</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Home</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Quarter</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed in the previous chapter, Kenneth Brown and Doreen Cooper (1990) have highlighted the importance of context, rather than functional groupings, in interpreting how artifacts were used in the past. To this end, they used the example of a horseshoe, which had been previously delegated to the functional categories of “domestic rituals” through their adornment of homes for good luck, “household pastimes” through their use in the game horseshoes, and “agriculture and husbandry,” the use they were intended to fulfill (Sprague 1981, quoted in Brown and Cooper 1990:7). However, stepping back from our contemporary understandings of horseshoes, they could also have been used for “culinary” tasks through their use “as a trivet,” in an office setting as a “paperweight,” or in “domestic safety… as a weapon” (Brown and Copper 1990:7), with the context the item was recovered from being the only way to find clues for it past usage. In considering the equestrian related items recovered from the sites used in this thesis, all 71 came from the context of a home, suggesting that they were used for various domestic purposes. Merrick Posnansky previously suggested that West African cultures,
as a whole, have large emphasis on substituting and repurposing the objects available to them, potentially with a “broken pot serv[ing] as a chicken coup… or a basin to hold seeds”; a trait which Posnansky suggested survived the trauma of the Middle Passage (1999:31-33). Given the wide range of activities equestrian related artifacts could be recycled for, their recovery from the South Yard and Stable Quarters suggests that the residents of these sites acquired these metal objects for their own uses through the same network that dispersed plates and bowls once used in the mansion (Greer 2012:7; Reeves and Greer 2012b:77).

Table 14

_Equestrian related artifacts by site_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Equestrian Related Artifacts</th>
<th>Abundance Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Duplex</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.00189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Home</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.00221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Quarter</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.00338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If such a network did exist at Montpelier, it should be evident in its end results: the distribution of equestrian related artifacts. Sixteen equestrian related artifacts were recovered from the Southeast Duplex, 12 came from the Southwest Home, and the Stable Quarter yielded 35 (see Table 14). Comparing the frequency of these items through an abundance index, the residents of the Stable Quarter owned the largest amount of equestrian related artifacts, followed by the Southwest Home and the Southeast Duplex. As the largest single source for these metal objects was the Stable Quarter Complex, we can roughly assume that the majority of these objects flowed outward form these workspaces. At the moment, we cannot determine if any of the residents of the Stable Quarter performed the duties which would have afforded them access to discarded equestrian related objects, or if they simply maintained closer social ties with these
craftsmen than the residents of the South Yard, so no larger social interactions can be teased out from their possessions.  

Between the remaining two sites, even though more equestrian related goods may have reached the Southwest Home, it appears as if all the families living in these duplexes had access to these objects. As both women and men likely used these items, the purposes they were put to and the reasons they were obtained are difficult to assess them by gender. The initial acquisition of these buckles and horseshoes, however, is gender specific, as Montpelier’s women did not play a role in shoeing horses, or repairing carriages for the Madisons. Based upon the higher recovery of equestrian related artifacts at the Southwest Home, the site which displayed the least amount of wealth through the clothing worn by its male inhabitants, the men exchanging these metal objects may not have taken into account the wealth displayed by other men, or the overall wealth of a household, before making these transactions. This suggests that displayed wealth may not have structured the social, and economic, relationships of Montpelier’s men. It is possible, however, that the wealth displayed by women influenced these exchanges.

Lastly, an alternative source for the equestrian related artifacts must be considered. Several historians have noted that enslaved men owned their own horses in the Antebellum South (e.g. Penningroth 2003:103; this ownership does seem to have been restricted to men), and at the moment, we cannot rule out this as a possibility for the residents the South Yard or Stable Quarters. If any of these individuals did own their own horse, then the recovered saddle buckles or bridle bits may have come from these

---

15 Also, as none of the families living in these three sites may have been the initial source of these goods, this distribution allows us to see social interactions coming into these sites from households not assessed here.
animals, rather than from the stables. However, in considering the plantation landscape, neither the South Yard nor the Stable Quarter would have been a likely place to keep these animals, due to their proximity to the mansion, and the amount of space these horses would need.\(^{16}\) Therefore, owning a horse would require the animal’s owner to have social connections with members of the black community living in other quarters around Montpelier, or in the neighborhood as a whole. As bondswomen do not appear to have owned horses, we can assess the role of wealth displayed by the men of the Southeast Duplex and the Southwest Home in creating and maintaining the social ties needed to secure places to keep any potential animals they owned. Since the site whose men displayed the least amount of wealth yielded the largest amount of equestrian related artifacts, it appears that, similar to the potential trade of these items, men’s displayed wealth would not have played a role in structuring their social relationships.

Dispersal of Woodworking Knowledge

During the official hours African Americans toiled for their owners, they used a wide variety of tools, from scythes and hoes, to saws and porcelain platters. However, these objects also routinely made their way into the homes of the bondspeople who used them. John Michael Vlach suggested that when seen in these domestic contexts, we should not necessarily view work tools as “instruments of oppression,” but rather as items black families used to better their situation (1991:62). In fact, a tool could function in both capacities within a single day. For instance, in the fields a black woman could use a heavy iron hoe to cultivate tobacco for her master’s profit, with the tool reinforcing her status as a slave through her arduous, and unpaid, labor. After her day’s tasks were

\(^{16}\)The residents of the Southwest Home did own a dog (Greer 2012c), but given the spatial limitations of these quarters, it is highly unlikely that they could have kept a horse here as well.
completed, however, she could then use the same hoe to cook hoe cakes for her family's dinner (Franklin 2001:98), reinforcing their ethnic identity through the food they consumed. This duality of plantation material culture has profound implications for the interpretation of the 18 woodworking tools recovered from the South Yard and Stable Quarter homespaces.

The recovered woodworking tools from the Southeast Duplex include a draw knife fragment and a wedge. Two saw blades, two chisels, and a carpentry dog were recovered from the Southwest Home. The largest amount of woodworking tools came from the Stable Quarter’s occupation-related deposits, which included three wedges, two chisels, a draw knife fragment, a punch, three drill bits, and a claw for pulling nails. A variety of knifes and files also came from these sites, which may have been used in woodworking, but as such items could be used for a wide variety of tasks, forming the “toolkit of daily living” for black Virginians, we cannot firmly connect these items with woodworking (Heath 1999b:48). Because of this, they are not discussed below. Taken together, the carpentry tools deposited by the men of these sites suggest that Montpelier’s black men actively engaged themselves in woodworking during their free time.

Woodworking has a long tradition in West Africa, with these skills used to create both everyday objects, and highly stylized ritual items (cf. Basden 2006:141), a tradition which captive Africans carried with them to the Americas (Vlach 1978:27-43). Once enslaved on Southern plantations, black men could use their talents to craft items which

---

17 The Southeast Duplex yielded three files and a pocket knife, the Southwest Home yielded a pocket knife, and the Stable Quarter yielded a miscellaneous knife blade, a file fragment, two pocket knives and a clasp knife. See Kimberly Trickett for a full description of the woodworking tools from the Stable Quarter (2013b:50-51), and the South Yard Sites (2013a:60, 80-81).
could be used to help their own families directly, by making furniture and utensils (cf. Vlach 1991:78-91), or indirectly by selling their crafts for cash or credit (see Chapter IV). Of course, given the very nature of plantation slavery, planters could also force these men to put their abilities to use for them, seen in the high percentage of enslaved carpenters in 18th century Virginia (Morgan 1998:210-212).

It is, in fact, this dual utilization of woodworking skills which demonstrates how black Virginians learned how to make useful items out of wood. As planters employed a portion of their workforce as carpenters, a segment of a black community could receive formal training in these tasks. In considering the woodworking tools recovered from the Montpelier sites, it is possible that some of the men who lived in the South Yard and Stable Quarters received this formal training. This is especially true for the residents of the Stable Quarter, as they lived in the plantation’s craft complex. However, as woodworking appears to have occurred at all three residential sites, it is not conceivable that men in all three areas were formally trained in carpentry. Alternatively, another source for this knowledge was available within the broader black community, with men learning these skills from others in their social network. This shared transmission of knowledge, which likely allowed these men to use the woodworking tools seen in the South Yard, was itself a form of social interaction in which the wealth displayed by the members of a household could increase the likelihood of obtaining these skills (Greer 2012b:7-8; Reeves and Greer 2012:77; also see Wendrich ed. [2012] for extended discussions of the social relationships involved in apprenticeship).

Laurie Wilkie’s research into the Post Emancipation community of Louisiana’s Oakley plantation provides a similar example of the social transmission of skills amongst
black Southerners. The excavation of three African American homes at this site yielded 35 glass knapped razor blades (Wilkie 1996). Although these objects were used into the 1930s, the knowledge of how to make these implements began dying off in the early 20th century following the introduction of low cost metal razor blades (1996:45-46).

Although no worked glass was identified at the Montpelier sites, this does help to illustrate the importance of the social dissemination of knowledge within a community, as once Oakley’s plantation community stopped passing on the knowledge of how to glass knap, the evidence of that skill began disappearing from the archaeological record. ¹⁸

Unfortunately for this research, it is not possible to determine if any of the residents of the Stable Quarter received formal woodworking training from the plantation’s craftsmen. However, the diversity seen in the sites’ tool assemblage does seem to suggest that these men had the most familiarity with their use. Because of this, we cannot extrapolate any larger meaning about the social transfer of woodworking knowledge from this site. Between the two South Yard duplexes, the Southeast Duplex yielded fewer woodworking tools (two), despite the men of the site displaying more wealth. Conversely, the men of the Southwest Home appear to have owned and discarded a larger amount of woodworking tools, despite the lowest amount of displayed wealth. While abundance indexes have proven useful in other comparisons presented in this thesis, the low number of woodworking tools recovered from the South Yard sites prevents this metric from providing useful interpretations about the transfer of woodworking knowledge within the Montpelier community. However, simply comparing the total number of recovered tools from the two South Yard sites suggests

¹⁸ Worked glass tools have been recovered from enslaved contexts at Virginia’s Monticello plantation, suggesting that black Virginian’s did make glass tools (Wilkie 1996:47).
that the display of wealth did not impact the ability of men enslaved on the plantation to acquire woodworking knowledge, as both sites yielded such tools, and the site with the least amount of expensive items worn by men yielded the largest amount of woodworking tools.

Food Acquisition and Storage

For Montpelier’s black community, getting food to supplement meager and monotonous rations assigned to them could involve social relations. Amy Young et al. suggested that hunting served as one of the key ways in which men were incorporated into social networks, as these actions provided the food black women and men relied upon to feed their families (2001). Furthermore, black women may have passed along the location of wild plants with one another, actions which may have taken place within the various social circles on a plantation (Bowes 2011:104). Unfortunately, the faunal and floral samples from the Montpelier sites are still being analyzed (see Samantha Henderson [2014] for preliminary result from the recovered floral samples). However, once this process is complete, the distribution of the hunted and gathered food recovered from the sites may yield insights into social relationships at Montpelier. The features used to store food at the South Yard and Stable Quarters, however, can provide a glimpse of these social interactions for the time being.

Amongst historic Igbos, yams served as a staple food. These root crops were so centralized in Igbo life that one of the major annual festivals in 18th century villages was the new yam festival (Samford 2007:186), a tradition which retained its cultural relevance into the 20th century (e.g. Achebe 1988:37-38; Basden 2006:69, 186; Oriji 1998:10), and which may have crossed the Atlantic, celebrated in annual Jonkonnu

Similarly, the importance of yams amongst the Igbo is evident in the fact that when an individual was in need of help, they only had to declare “Igbo who eat yams” in order receive assistance from anyone within earshot (Oriji 1990, quoted in Chambers 2005:39).

Given the significance of yams in Africa, it is no surprise that black Virginians, many of whom were descended from captive Igbos (see Chapter II), continued to grow them, and their new world equivalent sweet potatoes, across the state. In her research on subfloor pits in the colonial Tidewater, Patricia Samford noted that one of the major uses of these features was the storage of yams and sweet potatoes, particularly in subfloor pits which abutted hearths; as warm, dry conditions aided their preservation (2007:137).

During the 2010 season, the Montpelier field crew identified and excavated two subfloor pits at the Stable Quarter. The smaller of the two (Feature 1020), was located near the southwest corner of the cabin; a location which, in combination with its size and shape, does not suggest that the feature was used for food storage (Marshall 2011:53-55; see below for further discussion). However, the second subfloor pit (Feature 1027) was an approximately four foot by four foot square, located immediately adjacent to the cabin’s main hearth, a size and placement which suggests it was used for the storage of sweet potatoes. Additionally, two cabins excavated during 2012 and 2013 field seasons at Montpelier’s Field Quarter Site, occupied by agricultural laborers in the early 19th century, possessed subfloor pits used for sweet potato storage (Henderson 2014:2),

19 While yams were preferred amongst African Igbos, sweet potatoes were introduced to these communities during the Atlantic Slave Trade. However, once in the Americas, sweet potatoes, given their greater accessibly, became predominant, and were consumed in the traditional manner of yams (Moore 1989: 74-75; Samford 2007:131-132).
indicating that these features, and the food they kept, may have played an important role in the lives of the plantation’s black community.

No subfloor pits, however, were identified during the excavations of the two South Yard duplexes. It is possible that the inhabitants of these homes were prevented from constructing such features due to the quarter’s location within the formal grounds of the mansion, as subfloor pits could serve as a point of contention between plantation management and enslaved communities due to the former’s concerns over the role these features could play in the storage of stolen goods (McKee 1992:204). However, the fact that the residents of the Southwest Home were able to bury a dog approximately seven feet from their duplex, an act of ownership over this contested space (Greer 2012c), casts some doubt on this interpretation. Alternatively, the duplexes are located downhill from both the Stable Quarter to the south and the mansion to the north. During the 2011 season, the field crew constantly had to mitigate the effects of rain runoff; which appears to have been a concern during the Madison era, as well, based upon a thick layer of colluvial wash intermixed with the sites subsoil at the base of the hill (M. Trickett 2013a: 76, 98) and the identification of a brick “French drain” excavated during the 2008 field season, used to prevent excessive slope wash from entering the quarter (Trickett 2009:31-33). These conditions could not have been ideal for the subterranean storage of sweet potatoes, or any other items, potentially explaining the absence of subfloor pits in this quarter.

Regardless of the reason for the lack of subfloor pits in the South Yard Quarter, such an absence does not indicate that these households lacked access to storage facilities for root crops. Patricia Samford noted that, although rare, black Southerners occasionally
used external pits, lined and covered with straw, for sweet potato storage, particularly after the 1820s (2007:9, 125; Marshall 2011:61; see Ryder [1991] and Westamacott [1992] for additional examples of external storage pits). Additionally, George McDaniel mentioned that both white and black inhabitants of southern Maryland used “vegetable kilns,” circular pits excavated to approximately two feet in depth, in which “vegetables were stored on a bed of straw and then covered with more straw and a mound of dirt” for their preservation (1982:154-155). While these do not represent specifically African American storage facilities, they do suggest other storage features black Virginians employed.

While no such features exist in the South Yard, seven large borrow pits were identified in the vicinity of the Stable Quarter, six of which were excavated during the 2010 field season (Borrow Pit 3 was identified but not excavated). Likely, the residents of the Stable Quarter initially excavated these features to obtain clay for both daubing the gaps between the logs of their cabin and the lining of the dwelling’s two stick and mud chimneys (Lounsberry ed. 1994:77, 110). After the inhabitants extracted the need of clay, such features often became trash pits, evident in the large quantity of artifacts recovered from them. However, the general size and shape of these features also make them potential candidates for the external sweet potato pits Samford described, or vegetable kilns, before being filled with refuse after they were no longer of service. Additionally, Adam Marshall suggested the pits potentially served as storage pits for ash (due to the recovery of a layer of ash from Borrow Pit 7), or as sump pits to prevent rain water from entering the cabin (2011:61-64). The initial analysis of these features could not determine the order in which they were filled due to both ambiguous mean ceramic
dates and terminus post / ante quem dates for these contexts, indicating that, potentially, any number of these features could have been open simultaneously during the site’s occupation (Marshall 2011:57-59).

Regardless of the precise order in which the occupants of the Stable Quarter filled these borrow pits, an understanding of how many pits were open at any single point in time has profound ramifications on the potential utilization of these features for sweet potato storage. If the pits were filled in one after another, then there is a high likelihood that these features solely served as a source of clay and as a depository for refuse. However, if several borrow pits were filled in a simultaneous fill episode, then multiple pits would have had to be open at a single point in the site’s history. Given that log cabins have a finite need for clay daubing at any time, it would be unlikely that the occupants of this site dug multiple pits at once, as simply digging deeper would have provided the necessary clay. For instance, the average depth of the Stable Quarter’s borrow pits was just under a foot, while a similar feature, used to provide clay daubing for three tobacco smoke houses at Montpelier’s Tobacco Barn Quarter, was excavated more than two feet into the site’s subsoil (Marshall 2011:64-76; M. Trickett 2013b:151). Furthermore, given the imposition of these pits on a household’s yardspace, it should be unlikely that the inhabitants of the Stable Quarter would leave these features open for extended periods without provocation (see Beck 2006). Since the initial analysis reported by Adam Marshall (2011), the crossmending of the site’s ceramic assemblage has taken place, and the distribution of sherds from individual vessels between the six excavated borrow pits has the potential to determine if the site’s occupants filled any of them in at the same time.
To conduct this analysis, the individual sherds from vessels reconstructed from the pits’ ceramic assemblages were compared to identify any vessels which crossmended between the borrow pits. This process identified 113 sherds from 13 vessels which were recovered from two of the borrow pits, and 56 sherds from six vessels which crossmended between three of these pits. Despite the fact that features are generally considered to be undisturbed contexts in the archaeological record, there is always the possibility of that variety of formation processes could result in artifacts making their way into a feature’s soils after it has been filled. Because of the possibility of such processes skewing our understanding of these features, the crossmended sherds were assessed based on their location within the borrow pits soils, with the assumption that if the crossmending sherds only occur in the upper strata, then the pits may still have been filled in at separate times, with the crossmending sherds being “trampled” into the feature fill at a later date (see Schiffer 1987:126-129; see Appendix A for the tables associated with the analysis presented here).

Although Borrow Pit 2 yielded sherds from 24 crossmended vessels, the majority of the feature, and its ceramic assemblage, was excavated during the 1990s, and its stratigraphy could not be reconstructed from the available reports. The three sherds that did come from the 2010 excavations were all located in the upper strata of the feature, and as such, they were not used further in this analysis. Borrow Pit 1 contained sherds from five crossmended vessels. Two of these vessels were also recovered from Borrow Pit 2, and no further determination could be made from these. One vessel crossmended Borrow Pits 1 and 4, with its sherds recovered from lower strata of both, suggesting that these two features were open simultaneously. The lower strata of Borrow Pit 4 also
yielded fragments of three vessels recovered from the lower strata Borrow Pits 5 and 6, suggesting that Borrow Pits 1, 4, 5 and 6 were open simultaneously. Two vessels crossmended between Borrow Pit 1 and Borrow Pit 5, and while the sherds of one of these vessels was only recovered in the upper strata of both features, the sherds from the second vessel were solely recovered from the lower strata of both features, suggesting that both borrow pits were open at the same time. Borrow Pit 5 also yielded fragments of two vessels recovered from the lower strata of Borrow Pit 6. Borrow Pit 7 contained only one crossmendable sherd, and although the vessel it belonged to crossmended to Borrow Pit 5, it was in the upper stratum of both features, preventing any further assessment here.

Based on the stratigraphic position of these sherds, it appears that at least Borrow Pits 1, 4, 5, and 6 were open simultaneously, while no determination could be made for the remaining three borrow pits. With so many features open at once, there is a very strong likelihood that the inhabitant of the Stable Quarter used these features as more than a source of clay to line their fireplaces and chink the gaps in their walls. Given the lack of information at the present about external sweet potato pits, identifying the general morphological traits of these features is impossible at this time. However, by comparing the borrow pits to the excavated subfloor pit, we can assess the capability for the borrow bits to provide adequate sweet potato storage. Additionally, based on the dimensions given by George McDaniel, it may be possible to identify potential vegetable kilns.

Borrow Pit 1 was excavated to a depth of 2.2 feet, almost a foot deeper than the subfloor pit, suggesting that this is the single most likely candidate for the storage of sweet potatoes, or other crops as it is similar in depth to McDaniel’s vegetable kilns. Borrow Pit 3, which was identified but not excavated, had a rectangular shape at its surface,
similar to the subfloor pit’s square shape, although it appears to have been twice as large. Patricia Samford, however, noted that over 80 percent of subfloor pits used for sweet potato storage are oblong, suggesting that the angular shape may not indicate the presence of a storage feature (2007:113). Four of the remaining borrow pits (Borrow Pits 2, 4, 5, and 6) are approximately .8 feet deep, roughly half a foot shallower than the subfloor pit. Furthermore, subfloor pits used for the internal storage of sweet potatoes across the state tend to be between 1.5 to two feet in depth (Samford 2007:114), suggesting that these pits may have been too shallow for this purpose or for storing other vegetables, but as mentioned earlier, given the lack of information on external storage pits, these features cannot necessarily be ruled out. Lastly, Borrow Pit 7 was only excavated to a depth of .35 feet, indicating that it should not be considered a likely candidate for the external storage of sweet potatoes.
If these pits were intended to catch rainwater, one of the possible explanations offered after the initial excavations (Marshall 2011:63-64), then a layer of colluvial slope wash should have been seen at their base, indicated by the presence of loamy soil. Alternatively, if these borrow pits were reused for storage purposes, then it would be unlikely that they would have been allowed to fill up with such deposits, theoretically resulting in a predominately clayey matrix for the features’ basal strata. Only Borrow Pits 2 and 6 possessed loamy soil, potentially indicative of colluvial wash at their base. Interestingly, both of these are located immediately uphill from neighboring borrow pits.
(Borrow Pit 2 is located just uphill from Borrow Pit 1, and Borrow Pit 6 is located uphill from Borrow Pits 5 and 7), suggesting that they have been used as rain catches, protecting the other pits used for storage. Regardless, microbotanical samples taken from these features, which are still being processed, may be able to provide more definitive evidence of how the family at the Stable Quarter used these features.

If, however, we can suggest that these features held sweet potatoes or other crops, then it might possible that the residents of the Stable Quarter were actively aiding their neighbors in the South Yard food store, as the residents of the Stable Quarter would not have needed all of these features for their own storage, particularly since they already used a subfloor pit in their home. This process likely would have either created, or strengthened, any social bonds which existed between the households, a process in which availability, rather than wealth, played a key role. Such interactions, however, are elusive at the moment, and while it is possible that the residents of both South Yard sites may have maintained access to these potential sweet potato holes or vegetable kilns, the presence of only a single noteworthy candidate for such uses (Borrow Pit 1) throws some doubt on this. Rather, if the Stable Quarter did maintain kinship ties with at least some of the residents of the Southeast Duplex, as suggested by the reciprocal exchange of ceramic vessels between these two sites, then it is possible that familial relationships afforded the residents of the South Yard access to storage facilities in the Stable Quarter.

Involvement in Montpelier’s Spiritual Community

Since the 1990s, archaeologists studying the African diaspora have focused their attention on the religious beliefs captive Africans carried with them across the Atlantic Ocean. After this first generation was forced into slavery across the Plantation South,
they continued to retain their cosmologies, and pass them on to their children, morphing Christian beliefs and imagery to fit into these views during the 19th and 20th centuries (cf. Brown 2011; Pitts 1989; Young 2007). In most of the studies on the presence of African cosmologies operating in American plantation communities, there has been a focus on identifying the material residues of these spiritual beliefs (e.g. Groover and Baumann 1996; Orser 1994; Russell 1997; Stine et al. 1996; Wilkie 1997; Young 1996).

However, while these spiritual understandings were often passed down within a family, especially as they were inseparably linked to healing practices (cf. Handler 2000; Sweet 2011), they did not exist solely within the household.

Christopher Fennell (2007) considered the use of religious imagery as one of the key ways through which diasporic identities, such as being a “black Virginian,” could be created out of the various cultural threads Africans brought to the Americas. Furthermore, in his biography of Domingos Álvares, a Vodun priest enslaved in 18th century Brazil, historian James Sweet (2011) referred to groups of Africans jointly practicing their religious beliefs as “spiritual communities.” In Sweet’s example, Álvares served as the leader of his spiritual community, performing both spiritual and healing rituals for the Africans who joined his network. Kenneth Brown at the Levi Jordan plantation (1994; Brown and Cooper 1990) has also proposed this role of a spiritual leader for the local community, and Jerome Handler has previously discussed the role of “Obeah men” and “Negro doctors” in spiritual and healing communities in the Anglophone Caribbean (2000). Numerous other references exist to individuals on Southern plantations who could be contacted to perform spells or create potions. At the moment, we do not know if there was a spiritual leader (or leaders) operating at
Montpelier or any of the plantations in its neighborhood during the 19th century.

However, spiritual communities could have also functioned without these heads, as black Virginians did not practice their beliefs in isolation. Because of this, we can assume that the more items associated with black Virginian religious beliefs recovered from a site, the more they interacted with their local spiritual community, and as these are, essentially, social interactions, the effect of a households’ wealth on their participation in the local spiritual communities can be assessed. As a comparison of the overall spiritual / ritual assemblage of a household is more likely to demonstrate its level of participation in these communities than a comparison of individual artifact categories, each site will be assessed individually, following a brief discussion of some of the individual objects which were looked at.

One hindrance to scholars attempting to interpret the religious practices of past African Americans is the “truly mundane objects” incorporated into their cosmologies, (Davidson and McIlvoy 2012:111; also see Reeves in press; n.d.). While several specific artifact types previously noted to have an association with black spirituality were assessed, the context of other, more mundane, artifacts were looked at to broaden our understanding of spiritual practices at Montpelier (see Reeves [in press; n.d.] for a similar example of identifying potential ritual assemblages from the mansion cellar).

Furthermore, it is important to note that many rituals used in these belief systems did not incorporate material culture, sometimes solely incorporating words, or did so using perishable items, rendering them invisible in the archaeological record (Davidson and McIlvoy 2012:120-121, 126). Mark Groover and Timothy Baumann (1996) have previously noted numerous plant species which black Americans used in African based
healing remedies, providing archaeologists with one method of mitigating this issue. However, as noted above, the floral samples for the Montpelier sites are still being analyzed, and as such, cannot lend their weight to this discussion.

When considering the African religions brought to the Americas, it is important to note that no single, monolithic African religion existed. Rather each individual cultural and ethnic group maintained their own distinctive religious practices, and even these may not have been uniform within these groups. Despite this, anthropologists have been able to identify several unifying spiritual themes amongst West Africans, allowing for a general understanding of the spiritual practices of black Southerners (cf. Stine et al. 1996). As most Africans who survived the Middle Passage held these ideas, they may have been instrumental in the creation of new African American religions and cultural identities (Mintz and Price 1992). However, in compiling these shared traits, researchers have placed an emphasis on the beliefs of the BaKongo and Yoruba (e.g. Brown and Copper 1990; Fennell 2007; Galke 2000; Thompson 1984). While such views are incredibly pertinent to regions of the South which enslaved large amounts of BaKongo or Yoruba individuals and their children (such as South Carolina and Georgia [Young 2007]), they may not provide the best lens through which to view black Virginians, whose views Patricia Samford has demonstrated are more closely aligned with Igbos, given the influence of this group on the creation of black culture in the Chesapeake (1999, 2007). Because of this, Igbo beliefs were consulted for this research whenever possible.

One broad category of items related to African religious beliefs are personal charms: ritual items, or item assemblages, worn on the body. Due to their bodily nature,
the discussion of potential personal charms recovered from the Montpelier sites will not
consider their context in detail, as they may not have been intentionally placed in the
archaeological record. Rather, their potential spiritual nature was interpreted from their
relationship to previously noted charms. Many types of perishable and non-perishable
objects were used in African Americans charms (Davidson and McIlvoy 2012:126-127),
and as such, this discussion solely focuses on the objects which can be seen
archaeologically. Perforated coins and mass-produced amulets are both commonly
associated with charms (Thomas 1995:116-122; Young 1996), and jewelry could also
play a role, especially when made from copper (Davidson and McIlvoy 2012:137-138).
Personal objects used as charms were sometimes inscribed with an “X” or a cross to
increase their spiritual power (Young 1996:142-145). Perhaps one of the most discussed
elements of African American charms are blue beads, which have been suggested, due to
their common recovery from the homes of black Southerners, and their use in African
religious practices (including Igbo rituals [Davidson and McIlvoy 2012:132]), to have
been worn for spiritual protection (cf. Stine et al. 1996), possibly with a single bead on a
string worn against the body. Some researchers, however, have suggested that these
observations are more likely due to the availability and low cost of blue beads (e.g.
DeCorse 1999:144). However, by assessing variations within the sites’ bead
assemblages, it might be possible to determine if these beads were individually selected
for spiritual purposes, or purchased for more mundane purposes.

Charms and shrines could also be placed around a homespace to ritually protect,
or harm its inhabitants (Davidson and McIlvoy 2012:138-145). James Davidson and
Karen McIlvoy have noted that household charms are a commonly occurring
phenomenon across Western Africa. In particular, amongst the Igbo they noted that, “nobody builds a new house without first of all asking for the services of a magician or spiritualist to bury some protective charm in the ground” (Offiong 1991, quoted in Davidson and McIlvoy 2012:142). Similar to personal charms, many of these take the form of apparently everyday objects and activities. For instance, chickens kept in one’s yard were believed to be able to dig up any malignant charms placed in the area (Wilkie 2000a:185), thereby serving, in a way, as a charm to protect the residents of a house.

Multiple gullet stones recovered from the yardspaces indicate that chickens were present at the Montpelier sites, and although these animals may have been thought to be providing spiritual protection, identifying this from the archaeological record is nearly impossible due to the mundane nature of these artifacts. To mitigate this issue, artifacts with a known association with African American rituals and house charms were discussed when they were recovered from a context which allowed a ritual interpretation to be provided. Known artifact types from ambiguous contexts were considered separately.

Some of the most common items associated with black Virginian spiritual beliefs are quartz crystals (although these objects have been associated with other ethnic groups in the Americas [cf. McEwan et a. 1997]). Broadly speaking, these items may have been believed to have the ability to capture, or control, spirits, especially those related to water due to the manifestation of these entities in naturally occurring crystals (Davidson and McIlvoy 2012:135-136; Leone and Fry 1999:372, 384), resulting in quartz caches seen across the South. It is not uncommon for such caches to also include quartz projectile points (cf. Logan 1995:154-155), possibly serving as a stand in for naturally formed
crystals. Amy Young (1996) has also noted the presence of faceted glass chandelier fragments in ritual assemblages, potentially serving as yet another stand in for natural crystals. In addition to their potential role in evoking benevolent spirits, the multifaceted nature of natural and manmade crystals allowed them to reflect light to either capture malevolent ones, or prevent them from entering a home (Davidson and McIlvoy 2012:144). James Davidson and Karen McIlvoy noted the recovery of a quartz crystal from under the pier of a slave cabin at Georgia’s Couper plantation, suggesting that its placement was due to its protective qualities (2012:139, 144). The vast majority of the identified quartz crystals at Montpelier have been recovered from enslaved contexts, rather than in association with the mansion and its formal landscape, strengthening the association between these items and the plantation’s black community. Interestingly, this protective quality of crystals may have extended into personal charms, as a blue bead worn to ward off evil could only have its power strengthened by its ability to reflect light, and faceted beads tend to reflect light better than smooth beads. This association is loosely supported by the fact that recovered blue beads included in household spiritual assemblages are frequently mentioned as being faceted (e.g. Davidson and McIlvoy 2012:128-129; Leone and Fry 1999:378; Russell 1997:69; Stine et al. 1996:57, 62; Thomas 1995:117; Young 1996:142), and Christopher DeCorse has mentioned faceted blue beads used in this manner Ghana (1999:144).20

While quartz points may have been given a specific meaning by black Virginians, other Native American artifacts were similarly incorporated into African derived rituals.

20 DeCorse, however, dissuades American archaeologists from making too much of this connection without more concrete evidence. William Adams (1987:) may have first postulated the specific use of faceted blue beads, but later research focused primarily on bead color. Adam’s original connection was based upon Islamic beliefs, which do not appear to have been as relevant as more traditional African beliefs when considering many regions of the United States.
Both projectile points (cf. Wilkie 2000a:188-189) and scrapers (cf. Brown 1994:109) are seen in ritual contexts across the South. One conjurer in 1920s Mississippi stated that projectile points recovered from the area “were not made by man at all, but were fashioned by God out of thunder and lighting,” and they could provide good luck when used to spark “powered punk” (Puckett 1926, quoted in Wilkie 2000a:189). Similarly, black Jamaicans in the Juan de Bolas district referred to indigenous projectile points as “thunder stones,” and used them to cool water stored in earthenware jars (Matthew Reeves, personal e-mail May 21, 2014). At the Montpelier sites, 16 projectile points, stone axes, and scrapers were recovered, all from occupation or post-occupation deposits, suggesting that the inhabitants of these homes intentionally collected them, rather than their deposition in undisturbed contexts by the previous inhabitants of the Piedmont hundreds if not thousands of years prior to their recovery by the field crew.

As any potential ritual assemblages can be considered, to a degree, the material residue of social interactions within a spiritual community, the amount of possible charms seen at each site can be compared against the amount of costly consumer goods recovered from each site in order to determine if households which displayed larger amounts of wealth participated to a larger degree in these exchanges.

Southeast Duplex

During the 2008 and 2011 excavations at the Southeast Duplex, four blue beads were recovered, with only one being recovered from an identified occupation surface. This bead came from the area directly in front of the dwelling, suggesting that it was deposited during sewing activities, rather than as the result of a ritual practice. Three of these were wound beads without any facets, while the remainder were not identifiable.
As approximately two-thirds of all recovered beads from this site were of this manufacture type, the blue beads seen at the Southeast Duplex appear to have been selected for mundane purposes. The only jewelry recovered from the site were three cufflinks and the finial from a walking stick, none of which have previously been identified as having spiritual significance. Taken together, there does not appear to be evidence for personal charms at this duplex.

Table 15

_Beads recovered from Southeast Duplex by color and manufacture technique_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Drawn S</th>
<th>WN</th>
<th>Molded S</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S stands from smooth beads, F stands for faceted beads

Three quartz crystals were recovered from the Southeast Duplex, two of which were recovered from the topsoil that accumulated following the destruction of the duplex. The third was recovered during a baulk removal in the yard area of the site. Given such contexts, the possibility of these crystals having been used for ritual purposes cannot be further elaborated upon. One projectile point was recovered from the site, although it was recovered from the area around the French drain southeast of the main yard area, and therefore may not represent any ritual intentions.

A second Native American artifact, a whole greenstone celt, was also recovered from the Southeast Duplex. No previous work on African American ritual practices has identified these artifacts as playing a role, especially as greenstone is unlikely to provide
the sparks mentioned in the example above. Similar stone axes have been recovered from 17th century sites in the Chesapeake, with Al Luckenbach and David Gadsby considering these item to either be curios collected by colonists, or tools they acquired for their own uses (2004). However, if the residents of this duplex had recognized the celt for its antiquity, then it may have been acknowledged as being “made by God,” and therefore incorporated into ritual assemblages by the residents of the Southeast Duplex. The celt was recovered from just inside the southern edge of the duplex’s southern bay, and although it was officially recovered in the post-occupational strata, it appeared during excavation be resting on top of the occupation era surface below the structure. Given this location, and the importance of house charms to the Igbo, it appears as if the residents of the Southeast Duplex may have used this ground stone celt in a ritual fashion for their protection or wellbeing. Overall, despite the fact that the Southeast Duplex yield the larger total amount of expensive consumer goods, only one possible ritual assemblage, suggesting a tenuous connection between the affluence of a household and their involvement in the local spiritual community.

**Southwest Home**

The excavations of the Southwest Home yielded three blue beads, with only one being recovered from the identified occupation surface. This bead came from the yard area in-between the two duplexes, suggesting that none of these were ritually deposited. All three beads are of different types, including one faceted bead. While this amount of variation may be due to the small sample size, and there is more variation with the blue beads than amongst the other colors, potentially suggesting that the residents of the Southwest Home may have selected these beads individually for ritual purposes,
especially the single faceted bead, although no definitive evidence for this is available.

Additionally, two multifaceted paste gems, both blue, were recovered from the site.

Their color and shape may possibly indicate their use for spiritual protection, although this association is tenuous at the moment.

Table 16

*Beads recovered from Southwest Home by color and manufacture technique*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Drawn</th>
<th>Wound</th>
<th>Molded</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S stands from smooth beads, F stands for faceted beads*

*Figure 22.* Possible personal charms from the Southwest Home. Left is the copper alloy button with Maltese cross motif, and right is the golden six pointed star. Photographs by Kimberly Trickett.

Other artifacts, however, provide more tantalizing evidence for the use of personal charms at this site. One is a small men’s button manufactured with a Maltese...
cross across its face. Since the 1990s, archaeologists have recognized an “X” or cross to have spiritual significance when seen in ceramics (e.g. Ferguson 1992) or etched onto other personal items (e.g. Young 1996). Although this button was manufactured with this cross, it does seem to fall into this general category, making it a potential personal charm. Mark Leone and Gladys-Marie Fry have noted the use of buttons as good luck charms, suggesting a potential function of this charm (2001:148). The second artifact is a small, golden six pointed star perforated with a hole in the center to allow it to be either sewn onto clothing or worn on a string. Although star motifs have not been widely studied in black spiritual beliefs, Kenneth Brown noted the recovery of a shell button with a six pointed star etched on it from the Levi Jordan plantation (1994:108-109). This etching was carved into the interior face of the button, suggesting that the button was intended to function as a personal charm, rather than as an item of adornment, similar to both the button discussed above, and potentially the golden star. When considering both the button and the six pointed star as potential elements of personal charms, it is important to note that they also played a role in the wealth these individuals displayed. Rather than these items serving to signify a single identity of their wearer, they could simultaneously broadcast multiple identities through which these black Virginians structured their lives, similar to the potential use of the costly teacups purchased by these families (see Chapter IV).

Three possible household charm assemblages have been identified at the Southwest Home. The first was identified based upon a large quartz crystal recovered from the debris associated with the duplex’s northwest pier (Figure 23). As mentioned above, during their reanalysis of a Couper plantation’s “Third Cabin,” James Davidson
and Karen McIlvoy noted the recovered of a quartz crystal from underneath the dwelling’s northeast pier, interpreted as an element of a household charm, potentially as a ritual offering or to repel malicious spirits (2012:113, 122, 139, 144). While the crystal from the South Yard was recovered from debris, rather than in an in situ location, this may not diminish its potential recognition as a household charm. Due to the formal way in which the South Yard duplexes were built, the sites’ residents may not have been able to ritually place the crystal until after the dwelling was constructed, resulting in it being placed above ground, potentially in a wall or on the building’s frame. Upon the demolition of the Southwest Home it could have been knocked out of place, and left behind by the remaining African Americans, fearful of upsetting any spirits associated with the crystal (see Samford 2007:153). Interestingly, the pier associated with this crystal is located at the northernmost point in the dwelling (excavation grid was not aligned to true north, see Chapter II), and the crystal identified by Davidson and McIlvoy was located underneath the northernmost pier of the structure. Although this association at the moment is tenuous, further comparison with other sites exhibiting this particular use of crystals may yield noteworthy results.21

21 Mark Leone and Gladys Fry (1999) have previously noted an association between ritual assemblages, including crystal caches, and the northeast corner of a structure. However, given the variety of uses for these rituals, it is possible that specific assemblages were placed in specific areas.
The second possible household charm is represented by an additional quartz crystal, recovered from the debris deposited from the demolition of the dwelling’s chimney. Davidson and McIlvoi suggested the presence of a silver spoon and a brass shoe horn from the chimney fall of a second cabin at the Couper plantation as evidence of a charm placed in its chimney. They note that household charms were routinely associated with entryways, including doors, windows, and chimneys, as these are the most spiritually vulnerable locations within a home (2012:139-140). As fireplaces were typically associated with the production of a family’s meals, these locations could be particularly important to protect (Davidson 2012:140). Based on this connection, it is possible that the crystal recovered from the debris may have originated in the chimney for such purposes, as the chimney base is located approximately seven feet south of this deposit, being left behind after the structure was razed.
The last possible household charm was a concentration of animal remains located in the southern third of the southern bay of the duplex, identified in the field as Feature 1061. This concentration appears to have rested on the occupation surface under the structure. Mark Trickett tentatively suggested that this feature may have been created by the scavenging activities of a dog, possibly the same animal later interred behind this duplex, while also acknowledging the potential for this feature to have had ritual significance to the family living above these bones (M. Trickett 2013a:108). Patricia Samford has previously identified the use of bones, specifically cow bones, in ritual assemblages in Virginia (2007:158), and the practice of burying an animal under the floor of a dwelling as part of the ritual dedication of a new home has been noted in West Africa, suggesting that Feature 1061 may have been a ritual assemblage (Davidson and McIlvoy 2012:138; though no Igbo examples were provided). This suggestion is given further weight by its spatial association with the greenstone celt recovered from under the
Southeast Duplex, both of which are located in nearly identical locations within the structures. Both duplexes likely had windows on their south façades, and as they were located on a slope (see Figure 24), the location of the bone cache and the greenstone celt may indicate the closest such assemblages could be placed in relationship to these openings, following the logic that charms were commonly associated with entryways (Davidson and McIvoy 2012:139). A further assessment of the species recovered from Feature 1061, presently listed solely as “mammal,” may shed further light on how this collection of bones came to rest under the Southwest Home; as a wide range of species would likely relate to scavenging, as opposed to ritual deposition.

Five additional quartz crystals and nine Native American projectile points and scrapers were also recovered from the Southwest Home, but none were recovered from contexts which suggest their belonging in ritual assemblages. Overall, a large number of potential charms seen at the Southwest Home further prevent us from determining if wealth played a role in a households’ involvement in the local spiritual community, as more charms were recovered here then from the Southeast Duplex, which yielded the largest amount of costly consumer goods. Data from the Stable Quarter, however, does have the potential of casting light on this research.

**Stable Quarter**

The excavations of the Stable Quarter yielded ten blue beads. Seven of these were recovered from the borrow pits, with the remaining three coming out of the yard surfaces, suggesting that none of these were ritually deposited. Seven were drawn beads without facets, two were drawn with facets, and the remainder was wound without facets. It is difficult to determine if these blue beads were intentionally selected for ritual
purposes, as they conform to the overall trends within the sites’ bead assemblage. The possibility of the two faceted beads being selected for ritual purposes exists, although no definitive evidence is available at the moment. The metal jewelry recovered from the Stable Quarter cannot be assigned a spiritual role, as it includes a watch part, cufflinks, and four small rings, likely from an indeterminate brass chain. No quartz crystals were recovered from the excavation of the Stable Quarter. However, a clear, faceted paste gem was recovered from the subfloor pit’s fill, but as it does not appear to have been placed into the feature in a ritual fashion, no further determination could be made. Four projectile points and an unidentified stone tool were recovered from the site, although all were identified from yard contexts, preventing any association with ritual activities.

Table 17

Beads recovered from Stable Quarter by color and manufacture technique.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Drawn Smooth</th>
<th>Faceted</th>
<th>Wound Smooth</th>
<th>Faceted</th>
<th>Molded Smooth</th>
<th>Faceted</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>99.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, two potential ritual assemblages were explored, but found to lack any tentative spiritual association. The first was Feature 1020, a shallow basin located in the southwest corner of the cabin, identified as a subfloor pit. Based upon Patricia Samford’s research on these features, the location and its depth indicate that this feature may have served as a shrine (2007:149-173; also see Marshall 2011:54-55). However,
Adam Marshal has previously noted that no artifacts identifiable as possessing ritual value were recovered from the base of this feature (2011:55), and the only likely candidate from the entire feature was an angular pebble with an “oil like” finish (see Samford [2007:154] for role of pebbles in shrines). Based on this, it appears as if this feature did not have ritual significance to the occupants of this site. Second, the role of coins in ritual assemblages have been previously noted (e.g. Brown 1994; Davidson and McIlvoy 2012; Wilkie 1997). A half penny minted in 1809 was recovered from the lower strata of the main subfloor pit in the cabin. However, this layer contained extensive refuse and debris, suggesting that the coin was not intentionally placed in the pit as part of a ritual. Similarly, several large iron tools were recovered from the fill of the subfloor pit, including a drawknife fragment, assemblages which Samford has previously used to identify ritual deposits in these features, when they occur on a single surface (2007:161-164). But as these items are mixed in throughout the feature fill, no ritual use can be suggested.

**Levels of Participation in the Spiritual Community**

This discussion of ritual assemblages at the Montpelier sites is not, by any means, considered to be definitive, as many spiritual activities did not involve materials which are recovered from the archaeological record, and even items that were used may be invisible to us, generations later, either due to their usage of truly mundane items which did not become deposited in identifiable contexts, or our lack of understanding about the intricate rituals black Virginians performed to keep themselves safe and ask the assistance of their ancestral spirits. Rather, this brief exploration into the spiritual practices of the families living in each of the three sites has allowed us to gain a rough
understanding of the degree to which each participated in the local spiritual community. Although blue beads were recovered from each site, none could be definitively determined to have been used as personal charms. At the moment, the best evidence of items used in this manner are the button with the Maltese cross and the small golden six pointed star, both recovered from the Southwest Home. Furthermore, four potential household charms or shrines were identified at the sites, three from the Southwest Home and one from the Southeast Duplex, while none were identified at the Stable Quarter. Based on this, it appears as if the families in the Southwest Home participated the most in ritual activities, followed by those in the Southeast Duplex, with the Stable Quarter placing little to no identifiable effort into these practices.

Performing rituals could be an expensive process, as it required black Virginians to gather the cash needed to purchase whatever materials were needed (cf. Samford 2007:149-150), and at times, to pay for the services of local spiritual experts (cf. Hurston 2008). This potentially explains the greater presence of ritual assemblages at the South Yard, as the residents of these sites, overall, displayed more wealth than the family at the Stable Quarter. Although the residents of the Southeast Duplex displayed more wealth overall than their neighbors, fewer identifiable ritual assemblages were identified at this site, suggesting that if wealth did effect a household’s participation in local spiritual communities, then the wealth displayed by women may have played a larger role than the costly items worn by men. Comparisons with other sites may provide us with a clearer understanding of these trends.

Previous research into spiritual practices at the Hermitage plantation have also noted that not all households participated to the same degree in the spiritual communities,
with the Yard Cabin site yielding the least amount of evidence for ritual practices (Russell 1997). While comparative data on the wealth displayed at these sites was not readily available for this thesis project, other aspects of the assemblages of the Hermitage sites can aid in illuminating at least one aspect of spiritual communities: need. Despite their potential lack of participation on their local spiritual community, the occupants of the Yard Cabin do not appear to have invested in more store bought medicines to make up for this (Thomas 1995:132), suggesting that need, in this case to find remedies, drove the purchases they made in local markets, but did not influence their spiritual beliefs. A similar example can be seen in the Southeast Duplex, where despite the fact that this site yielded the largest amount of pharmaceutical bottle glass, its inhabitants do not appear to have matched this need with increased focus on maintaining ritual assemblages.

Conversely, need may have played a role in the rationale for the residents of the South Yard Quarter in acquiring ritual assemblages, while their neighbors in the Stable Quarter did not. The South Yard Quarter is located in an area of the formal mansion landscape, making it an area which is at once both an area controlled by the Madisons and the homespaces of multiple enslaved families. The greater body of evidence for ritual assemblages in the South Yard, therefore, may be a reflection of the need for these families to claim their ownership over the dwellings assigned to them, a statement which the residents of the Southwest Home may have also made by keeping and later burying a dog in the quarter, or simply due to a greater need for spiritual protection to their residency in this contested space.\(^{22}\) This suggests that other factors besides wealth may

---

\(^{22}\) A statement of ownership which the residents of the Southwest Home may have also made by keeping and later burying a dog in the quarter (see Greer 2012c for further discussion)
have influenced the degree to which black Virginians at Montpelier participated in their local spiritual community.

Communal Spaces

One of the most important areas in black households on both sides of the Atlantic was the yardspace which surrounded the physical structure of their home (cf. Gundaker 2005; Heath and Bennett 2000). In the swept clay of these yards, a wide variety of activities took place, especially work which could not be carried out in the cramped confines of the homes black Virginians lived in. With so many people working and relaxing outside, the yards found in slave quarters could be the site of a wide variety of social activities, serving as a “bridge connecting several individual families” (Battle 2004:48). In discussing enslaved yardspaces at the Hermitage planation, Whitney Battle (2004) suggested that African Americans, particularly black women, may have formed social bonds through jointly performing household chores (such as cooking) in the yard spaces they shared with their neighbors. This connection between activity areas and social interactions does not, however, seem to be limited to the swept clay yards seen around the rim of the African Atlantic, as similar patterns have been noted in the homes of English laborers during the early 20th century (Casella 2012:293-294).

Given this importance of shared spaces in social relationships, outdoor activity spaces at the three sites were compared to see where on the landscape the members of these households spent their free time. Unfortunately, no definitive features serving as the nodes of community interaction (e.g. fire pits) were identified during excavation.23 Therefore, activity areas were defined through the assessment of artifact distributions

---

23 Again, as we cannot determine if the black inhabitants of the South Yard used the barbeque roasting pit for their own purposes (M. Trickett 2013a:86).
using Surfer contour plots. Specifically, the locations of straight pins, other sewing equipment, and beads were looked at to determine the activity areas associated with the sites’ women, the distribution of lead shot and gun flints were assessed to identify the workspaces associated with the sites’ men, and the location of the recovered pipe fragments, marbles, and musical instruments were used to determine the location of general activity areas (see Fesler [2004b] for a similar gendered division of recovered assemblages). As opposed to larger artifacts, such as the woodworking tools discussed earlier, these smaller items have a higher likelihood of being trampled into the clay yard surface than larger artifacts, allowing us to identify in situ activity areas. While the individuals whose social lives we are attempting to unearth were generally restricted from leaving the Madisons’ property, they still maintained their own agency in choosing where on this broad landscape they performed activities. If displayed wealth played a role in where these African Americans spend their time, then we could expect the activity areas used by the men to concentrate near the Southeast Duplex, and the areas in which the women congregated to be in the vicinity of the Southwest Home. Given the large number of plots used in this analysis, they are presented in Appendix B rather than in this chapter. Each plot has been numbered in the appendix, and will be referenced in the text for the ease of the reader.

South Yard Quarter

As the two South Yard sites are adjacent to one another, they are discussed as a single unit to better assess their communal spaces. Located off the east façade of the

24 Gun flints may have been used for a variety of purposes in the 19th century, such as starting fires (see Ahlman et al. [2014] for a discussion of the role of flint tools as strike-a-lights). However, as seen in the distributions, gun flints were recovered from the same areas as lead shot, suggesting that prior to their deposition, they were used from their intended purpose.
Southwest Home was a porch running the length of the building extending eight feet into the South Yard’s central corridor, identified by three post holes (M. Trickett 2013a:100). This provided the residents of this duplex a shaded area in which outdoor activities could take place. Similarly, located approximately eight feet off the western façade of the Southeast Duplex are several features identified as planting holes (M. Trickett 2013a:81). As they are located a comparable distance away from the structure as the porch was from the Southwest Home, they both may have served to delineate the spaces associated with these duplexes, either through the wishes of the sites residents or through Madison’s designs. The artifact distributions discussed below generally follow similar patterns for both areas, suggesting that, at least, they were used in similar manners. These two sets of features are separated by approximately twenty feet of the quarter’s central corridor. This area appears to have been maintained as a clay yard while these families lived in the quarter, providing a shared yard space which could be used for outdoor activities. Due to the location of the mansion, less than one hundred yards north of the duplexes, any activities which occurred in this area would have been observable by the Madisons, and their guests. Therefore, it is possible that these individuals may have opted to gather behind their homes to create some sense of privacy for themselves.

Before continuing on to these distributions, two factors of the site’s stratigraphy must be taken into account. First, the duplexes and the central yard area are located on an approximately two foot slope at the bottom of a hill (Plot 1), which terminates near the sites’ northern edge. Near the bottom of this slope is a layer of colluvial soils; the product of years of runoff occurring at the site (M. Trickett 2013a:76, 98). These soils are considerably looser than the clayey subsoil further uphill and it is possible that
smaller artifacts may have rolled down hill and collected in the colluvium. Special care was taken to ensure that this did not skew the distribution of the recovered artifacts. Lastly, the demolition and post-occupation history of the South Yard has the potential to skew the locations of the artifacts recovered from the sites’ occupation surfaces. To account for this possibility, the distribution of the artifacts in both the occupation surfaces and the post-occupation soils were compared.

The straight pins recovered from the South Yard’s occupation surfaces tend to cluster on the edges of the area enclosed by the Southwest Home’s porch and the Southeast Duplex’s planning holes, as well as in the central yard area (Plot 2). A concentration of post-occupation straight pins also occurs in this area, but this was not deemed to have effected the occupation surface, especially as the both distributions respect the location of the two structures (Plot 3). Several smaller concentrations, however, do occur in the area behind the Southeast Duplex, from which a pair of scissors and a bone sewing spindle were also recovered. Few straight pins came from the post-occupation soils in this area, suggesting that these represent activities which occurred during the sites’ occupation. Similarly, concentrations of beads occurred outside of the areas between the two duplexes in both the occupation and the post-occupation surfaces, similar to the distribution of the straight pins in this area (Plots 4 and 5). However, the largest concentration of beads occurred to the rear of the Southeast Duplex, in the same location as the recovered straight pins and other sewing equipment. The sites’ slope and colluvium do not appear effected the artifacts distributions. Overall, it appears as if the women of the South Yard did spend time working in the communal areas joining the two duplexes, but they spent more time sewing behind the Southeast Duplex. It is impossible
to say with any certainty if the women of the Southwest Home joined their neighbors behind the other duplex, but the fact that a portion of these activities occurred in the communal spaces between the structures indicates that all of these women did work in the same areas part of the time, potentially fostering social bonds. As the sewing activities did not concentrate around the Southwest Home, wealth may not have played a part in where these women chose to gather.

Men, on the other hand, used the yardspace of the South Yard in a slightly different manner. The lead shot recovered from the sites’ occupation surfaces were generally distributed adjacent to the porch/planting hole areas of each duplex, and in the colluvium located at the north end of the sites’ central corridor (Plot 6). The recovered gun flints from the two sites were recovered from the same area, with two gun flint chips coming from the Southwest Home, and two mostly whole gun flints recovered from the Southeast Duplex. In the post-occupation deposits, the majority of the lead shot was also recovered from the central area in-between the duplexes and from the colluvial soils (Plot 7). However, as these distributions respect the positions of the quarter’s structures, and match the location of the recovered gun flints, it can be assumed that the location of the recovered lead shot does indicate activity areas used during the sites’ occupation. Despite the amount of lead shot recovered from the colluvium, it does support the assertion that the men in the South Yard prepared their guns for hunting in the communal spaces in-between the two homes. Similar to the women of the South Yard, the men do not appear to have been congregating around the homes of the quarters’ richest members.

While men predominantly smoked tobacco pipes, it was not uncommon for women to do so as well (Fesler 2004b:203). Furthermore, for black Virginians, pipe
smoking could occur during both work and leisure times. These two factors indicate that the distribution of pipe fragments may indicate generic activity areas in the South Yard. From the occupation soils, the vast majority of the pipe fragments were recovered from the yard area in-between the two structures, a distribution which is also seen in the post-occupation deposits, but as these both respect the location of the occupation features, this distribution does appear to indicate the location of pipe smoking activities in this quarter (Plots 8 and 9). As the distribution of pipes and lead shot both occur predominantly in the shared yard space, pipe smoking can be associated with the men of the South Yard.

No musical instruments were recovered from the South Yard’s occupation surfaces, but three marbles were. One was recovered just to the north of the Southwest Home, while the other two came from the area behind the Southeast Duplex. In the 19th century, both children and young men used marbles (cf. Beaudry and Berkland 2007:406). However, as the majority of the marbles were recovered from the same area as the sewing activities, it is likely that these toys were lost by the children living in the South Yard, playing in the areas their mothers gathered in. Overall, this continues to suggest that where the women and men who lived in the South Yard chose to interact on the landscape was not dictated by the display of wealth. Data from the Stable Quarter, discussed below, can help in teasing out this pattern.

Taken together, these activity areas suggest that the South Yard’s men mainly worked, relaxed, and socialized in the yard areas between these two homes. This use of space may have served to foster the social bonds seen in the discussions above. The women and children of the Southeast Duplex appear to have gathered both behind their home, and in the central yard area connecting the two duplexes. When working and
socializing in this central area, they most likely would have interacted with the women and children of the Southwest Home, potentially allowing social bonds to grow (assuming that the women and children of the Southwest Home did not join them behind the Southeast Duplex, which would have only served to increase their social bonds).

**Stable Quarter**

While the two South Yard sites are adjacent to each other, allowing their activities areas to be compared as one, the Stable Quarter is located approximately fifty feet south of these homes. However, as the cabin is located less than a minute walk from the South Yard Quarter, the areas in which this family worked and relaxed were potentially visible to the residents of the South Yard, and vice versa. As, overall, the family living at this site displayed less wealth than those in the South Yard, where they situated themselves on the landscape can further our understanding of the effect of wealth on social interactions.

Again, several considerations must be taken into account before meaningful interpretations of these distributions can be offered. As noted above, a series of borrow pits existed directly south of the cabin, potentially making this area unusable for social activities. Second, similar to the South Yard, the Stable Quarter’s yardspace was located on a 4° grade, with the lowest area located in the northwest corner of the site (Plot 10). The distributions of artifacts on this slope were assessed to determine if the slope effected to location of the recovered assemblages. Lastly, post-occupation deposits were excavated at the Stable Quarter. However, unlike the South Yard, only a few artifacts were recovered from these soils. Because of this, the post-occupation distributions were
not assessed and the recovered artifacts from the occupation surfaces were considered to represent the in situ location of activities at the site.

The straight pins from the South Yard were primarily recovered in a cluster located approximately fifteen feet southwest of the cabin (Plot 11). Regardless of whether this cluster occurred through activities at the site, or through cleaning activities, it does seem to indicate that sewing activities took place in this area, as cleaning would be unlikely to result in the large scale movement of smaller artifacts. The beads from the site are generally distributed downhill from this cluster, furthering the suggestion that sewing took place here, with the small beads rolling downslope after being dropped (Plot 12). A second cluster of beads was located immediately off the south façade of the cabin, an area which also yielded a pair of scissors, with a thimble recovered halfway between this area and the straight pin cluster. Lastly, a small concentration of beads and a second thimble were recovered from the area in front of the smaller hearth in the northeast half of the cabin, suggesting that some sewing took place in the home. Between the distribution of the straight pins and beads, it appears as if the women of this family worked in the areas to the south and southwest of the cabin.

The majority of the lead shot recovered from the Stable Quarter was recovered from the same cluster as the straight pins, approximately fifteen feet southwest of the cabin (Plot 13). Regardless of whether this cluster occurred through activities at the site, or through cleaning activities, it does seem to indicate that men congregated in this area. A gun flint chip was recovered in the same area, and a whole gun flint was recovered approximately fifteen feet north of this cluster, further supporting this suggestion.
The recovered pipe fragments were distributed off the west, south, and east facades of the cabin, with the highest concentration being recovered approximately ten feet southwest of the home (Plot 14). Furthermore, one mouth harp was recovered from the area of this concentration, and three marbles were recovered within ten feet of these pipe fragments. A fourth marble was recovered from the occupation surface immediately off the cabin’s northwest corner, and does not appear to have reached its location as the result of the site’s topography. Taken together, the distribution of women’s and men’s activity areas at the Stable Quarter indicate that the majority of the work and leisure time was spent to the southwest of the cabin, although some activities took place south of the cabin. Furthermore, where these individuals chose to spend their time did not appear to be influence by the displayed wealth of their neighbors.

Communal Areas and Social Interaction

Looking at both quarters together, patterns about the use of yard spaces at Montpelier begin to emerge which have ramifications for the social bonds created in these areas. The majority of the activities areas, including all of the men’s workspaces, took place in the central yard in the South Yard Quarter, and off the southwest corner of the Stable Quarter, both of which are mutually visible. It is highly probable that the ability of these women and men to see their neighbors on a regular basis created some form of social bonds, even if they existed at a superficial level. This community ethos, interestingly, may have been more important than the wealth displayed by these households, as the distribution of the activity areas was not skewed toward the sites from which larger amounts of costly consumer goods were recovered.
Figure 25. Activity areas in the South Yard and Stable Quarters. Red areas indicate general / men’s and women’s areas, while blue indicates secondary / women’s areas. Reconstructed Stable Quarter cabin is in foreground of photo, and reconstructed South Yard Duplexes are in background. Note the mansion in back of the photo. Photograph by Matthew Reeves.

At both quarters, however, women appear to have performed sewing and childcare in less visible areas, just outside the doorway to the Stable Quarter and behind the Southeast Duplex. At the moment, these are difficult to interpret, in large part due to the fact that we cannot tell if the women of the Southwest Home joined their neighbors in this area, but they may relate to the more selective nature of social relations amongst Montpelier’s women, also seen in the distribution of the gifted ceramics. However, it may also relate to a desire to escape the panoptical gaze of the mansion’s residents, who had full view of areas in which the majority of the activities took place.

Theft Prevention

Across Virginia, archaeologists have unearthed padlocks from former slave quarters. For black Virginians, life in the close confines of a quarter community often resulted in a lack of privacy (Heath 1999b:62-63); an issue further compounded by the desire of plantation managers to extend their control into these homespaces. At times,
this openness could be beneficial for enslaved households, as it allowed the display of ceramics within a home to serve as a public expression of their wealth (Galle 2010:27). At other times, the ability for a community to see what a person owned socially affirmed her or his ownership of their belongings, limiting the ability for anyone else in a group steal what most people recognized as someone else’s (Penningroth 2003:91-97).

Despite these advantages, being able to create a sense of privacy may have been one of the ways that black Virginians could create a home out of the buildings they were assigned to live in, especially in Montpelier’s South Yard Quarter, where the frame duplexes would have at first been foreign to their residents, all of whom would have likely been born and raised in cabins. One way that this privacy could be created was through the padlocks we see recovered from enslaved households (Heath 1999b:63; Upton 1988:367). While locks could not deter the entrance of a planter or overseer into their homes (Penningroth 2003:91), this privacy could give African Americans a sense of separation from their neighbors. In addition to privacy, the ability to lock their homes could also prevent their belongings from being stolen. Upon their arrival to the Americas, captive Africans often used subfloor pits as “safety deposit boxes” in an attempt to secure what few objects they owned (Neiman 1997; Samford 2007:138-148). Specialized shrines could also be used to ritually “vex” potential thieves (Reeves n.d.; in press). However, with the introduction of improved mass-produced locks in the later 18th and 19th century (Priess 2000:82), black Virginians had the ability to lock their belongings to prevent them from being stolen (Genovese 1976:606-607; Heath 1999b:63).

Theft, in many ways, can be considered a form of social interaction which could take place within and enslaved community, albeit not a positive one (see Chapter III).
Identifying most social interactions in the archaeological record hinges on the ability to see the discarded material objects used in them. Conversely, when considering theft within a community, the presence of items which could prevent this activity from occurring, namely locks, can be used to see how much a household invested in devices to keep their belongings secure, thereby preventing this interaction. Based on this, if more locks are recovered from one site than another, then its inhabitants may have gone to extra lengths to prevent theft. The presence of displayed wealth may have played a large role in this process, as a family which possessed more expensive items may have been at a greater risk for that property to wander off. However, it is possible that the interpersonal connections a household maintained could work to prevent people from stealing from them, as it is unlikely that an individual would steal from members of their own social network.

Table 18

*Keys, padlocks, and furniture locks by site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Keys</th>
<th>Larger Padlocks</th>
<th>Smaller Furniture Locks</th>
<th>Total Locks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Duplex</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Quarter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three padlocks were recovered from the Southeast Duplex, in addition to a brass escutcheon plate with a keyhole cover (see Table 18). A similar plate was recovered from Dolley’s Midden (K. Trickett 2013b:79), suggesting that the furniture piece associated with this lock may have originated in the mansion. Three padlocks were recovered from the Southwest Home. Four larger padlocks were recovered from the Stable Quarter, in addition to a small brass padlock used for furniture. Five keys (three
from the Southeast Duplex and two from the Stable Quarter) were also recovered, but as these could have fit into any lock on the plantation, not just those used in these residential area, they were not included in this analysis. Furthermore, it has been suggested that keys may have been used as musical instruments, by being scraped against the jawbone of various animals (Samford 1996:110-111), providing more evidence that the recovered locks and keys may not have been used together.

Unlike ceramic teawares or metallic buttons, a household may have had a finite need for the amount of locks they owned, as each household would have only had a single door. This potentially indicates that comparing the recovered locks against the rest of a household’s assemblage may not yield realistic indications of past cultural activities. Looking solely at the number of locks recovered, the residents of the South Yard owned the fewest, despite the fact that they displayed the most wealth, while the family living at the Stable Quarter owned the most. It is possible, however, that the number of locks seen at these sites relates to the visibility of these homes. The doorways of the two South Yard duplexes were highly visible, as both faced the central corridor of the quarter. The doorway of the Stable Quarter, on the other hand, faces south southeast, away from the known structures in the area a direction which may have made it easier for an individual to access the cabin without being seen, thereby requiring increased security measures. Regardless of how this data is read, we are left with the impression that the social connections the women and men of these sites maintained did not diminish their need to secure their belongings.
Gender, Wealth, and Social Interaction

The social interactions between Montpelier’s black women can be glimpsed through the exchange of ceramic vessels, and the areas in which they chose to carry out sewing activities. Overall, wealth did not seem to play a role in structuring these social relationships, as the exchange of ceramic vessels did not occur between the two sites which displayed the most wealth. Rather, the Southeast Duplex and the Stable Quarter appear to have maintained the closest social bonds, in spite of the fact that the women of these two sites displayed the least amount of wealth. Wealth, however, may have influenced the residents of the Stable Quarter to gift two vessels to their more affluent neighbors in the Southwest Home, potentially to establish social relationships as a risk management strategy. Some women in the South Yard gathered to sew behind the Southeast Duplex. At the moment, we cannot say with any certainty that this act excluded the women of the Southwest Home, or incorporated any women of the Stable Quarter, but if it did, then the activity areas associated with the women of the Southeast Duplex could reflect the social bonds between them and the other households.

Regardless, we are left with the impression that social relations amongst the plantation’s women were selective, but that wealth did not drive this selection. Rather, it is likely that the bonds of kinship had a larger influence over these interactions.

Montpelier’s men structured their social lives in a different fashion. As seen in the households involved in the trade of equestrian related items, and the dispersal of woodworking knowledge, the wealth displayed by men does not appear to have played a role in structuring social interaction, as both households of the South Yard had equal access to such networks, despite the fact that the men of the Southeast Duplex displayed
the most wealth, while the men of the Southwest Home displayed the least. Furthermore, in the South Yard, men from both sites appear to have interacted with each other in the shared yard space which connected their homes, regardless of the wealth they displayed. Overall, this gives the impression that social relationships amongst Montpelier’s men were open to most (if not all) of the men residing on the plantation and that wealth did not structure who could gain access to these networks.

Lastly, several activities could not be divided by gender. If one or more of the borrow pits from the Stable Quarter were used for the storage of sweet potatoes, or other vegetables for the residents of the South Yard, then this social interaction would have likely been created by need and convenience, rather than being driven by displayed wealth. Similarly, the need to prevent theft appears to have effected all five households, regardless of the social relations they maintained, or the wealth they possessed. When gathering outside, it does appear that the residents of these sites interacted in communal areas in which they all would have been visible to each other, suggesting that this proximity should have created some sort of social bonds between the individual households. Based on these interactions, it appears as if the families living in the South Yard and Stable Quarters created and maintained some level of community identity based upon the areas they lived and socialized in. Displayed wealth, however, may have played a role in a household’s participation in the local spiritual community, possibly due to the cost involved in performing rituals, but at the moment, we lack a comprehensive enough understating of spiritual practices at Montpelier to say this with much certainty.

Based upon the information presented in the previous chapter, it appears as the members of Montpelier’s black community did place an emphasis on acquiring costly
consumer goods, most likely in an effort to express an identity of wealth to the other women and men in their social networks. These displays of wealth, however, do not appear to have played a large role in how they structured their social relationships within their local community. Regardless, some mechanisms for ordering social interactions must have been present. In the next chapter, alternative systems for structuring social relations at Montpelier seen in the data interpreted so far will be considered.
CHAPTER VI

SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS AND BELONGING AT MONTPELIER

Previous research on black communities has conceived of social relations in many ways, as discussed in chapter III. However, after looking at some of the social interactions that took place within Montpelier’s black community, it appears that wealth did not play a large role in structuring the social lives of the families in the South Yard and Stable Quarters. Rather, when considering the various levels at which these interactions took place, and the potential affect that belonging had on them, it appears as if intimate culture groups played a key role in constructing the social world of this black community.

Intimate Culture Groups at Montpelier

In her assessment of social relations in Lafayette County, Mississippi, ethnographer Marilyn Thomas-Houston focused on the role of the culture of social relations in structuring how the county’s black community created social networks (2005). This conception, based on the work of Claudio Lomnitz-Adler (1991, 1992), looks at the various levels of interaction existing within a community, and suggests that each interaction creates its own cultural environment, as deeper meanings are imbedded in not only who we interact with, but how we interact with them (Thomas-Houston 2005:16). Structuring this myriad of cultural environments are “intimate culture groups” which provide an identity to their members, and a shared “common sense” through which they view both the world and the social interactions they participate in (Thomas-Houston 2005:17).
Membership in intimate culture groups, like a person’s identities, is not mutually exclusive, as an individual can belong to any number of groups. For instance, Thomas-Houston identified being a member of a county’s black community as one intimate culture group. On top of this, an individual can belong to the particular community they live in, their church (and any internal divisions within this congregation), a local sewing club, and the county chapter of the NAACP (Thomas-Houston 20005:72-91). With their membership in each group, an individual adds on consecutive levels of belonging, which structure how they interact with others and how this interaction is conducted. At the same time, a person’s belonging to a particular intimate culture group is not a static identity, but rather a dynamic process which requires them to constantly reaffirm their membership in that group and its values. For instance, a woman who acts too “white,” despite her earlier belonging to the black community at large, can lose her place within this group, and the access to any social relationships it entails (Thomas-Houston 2005:151-152; see Gordon and Anderson 1999 for a similar discussion of the fluidity of racial identification and its use in broader social processes). Furthermore, individuals can also involve themselves in their intimate culture groups to varying degrees, choosing to fully participate in all of the groups they belong to, participating heavily in some but not others, or only to participating marginally in all of their groups. How involved in a group an individual is determines the degree to which its cultural values will be reflected in the world view of that person. This web of tangled identities and belongings encapsulates the social world of those who belong to these intimate culture groups, and although we can, to a degree, identify the individual threads which structure a person’s social world, we must take care not to overemphasize one belonging over others.
The information presented in the previous chapters allows us to identify several of the intimate culture groups which the residents of the Southeast Duplex, Southwest Home, and Stable Quarter belonged to. The largest intimate culture group seen from the artifacts deposited by these individuals appears to be the shared identity of being a black Virginian. Although being born an African American in Virginia allowed an individual to belong to this group, they still had to constantly reaffirm this identity on a regular basis, potentially through the songs played on the recovered mouth harps and in selecting appropriate buttons to sew onto their clothes (see Heath 1999a:63-64). Any individual looked at in this study, however, could have chosen not to publicly profess their identity as a black Virginian, instead perhaps choosing to act whiter. However, even if the residents of the Southwest Home toted food back from the mansion, they may have gone to lengths to add their own sauces and flavorings to this food in order to demonstrate their belonging to the black community, assuming the recovered teacups and saucers were used in this fashion. Thomas-Houston noted that public displays of wealth made by the residents of a black community, ranging from gold necklaces to new homes, also had to conform to black ideas of how wealth should be spent, rather than being used to purchase items perceived as being white (2005:151-152). Regardless of how they were used, the residents of all three sites appear to have made an attempt to purchase transferprinted and porcelain teawares, suggesting that this was deemed an acceptable way for an individual to spend their hard earned cash. Even if this intimate culture group existed beyond the cognition of its members, being a black Virginian still appears to have mattered, as this is perhaps the one identity which all African American intimate culture groups in the state shared. By demonstrating their belonging to this group, the members of the five
households in this study were able to participate in the social world of the enslaved Piedmont and join the various intimate culture groups in this region, where as if they were perceived as acting too white, then these social doors may have been closed to them. Interestingly, both Laura Galke (2009) and Robin Ryder (1991) have proposed that free African Americans in Antebellum Virginia may not have fully participated in this shared identity, suggesting that slavery may have played an important role in how this level of belonging operated.

Narrowing our scope on the area around Montpelier, the next intimate culture group that can be seen is the black community of western Orange County. On Sundays, Madison’s bondspeople were able to travel to the local market towns of Orange, Gordonsville, and Somerset, where they could interact and form social relationships with other African Americans from the region, thereby creating an intimate culture group through which these interactions were structured. Given that these were the largest social gathering places in this portion of the county, this may have been the largest level of belonging which these individuals recognized themselves as being a part of. If the display of wealth structured social relationships within any of the intimate culture groups involving Montpelier’s black community, it would have occurred here, as Jillian Galle’s conception of “cost signaling” works best with larger groups of people (2010:22, 24-25, 37; see Chapter III). As all three sites yielded broken, discarded items purchased from these towns, the individuals whose lives we have discussed in the previous chapters likely belonged to this intimate culture group, and used it to create and maintain social ties with others African Americans they met.
Figure 26. Intimate culture groups at Montpelier. Map on left depicts the location of the three market towns and location of neighboring plantations in 1860, with Montpelier’s early 19th century boundaries show in purple (Reeves and Lewis 2005:23). While this does postdate the enslaved community studied in this thesis, it does provide a glimpse of the broad social world beyond the extent of property which existed during the early 19th century. Map on right depicts location of dwellings in the vicinity of the study area, with the main sites in red, and other households in pink. Map by Matthew Reeves.

The interactions at these markets, however, may not have structured the daily life of Montpelier’s black community, especially when they involved women and men enslaved miles away. Historian Anthony Kaye proposed the role of neighborhoods of adjacent plantations in creating an inter-plantation black community whose members could interact on a daily basis (2007; see Boroughs [2013] for an application of this concept in the archaeological literature). These networks, therefore, created their own intimate culture groups through their role in structuring the day to day social lives of black Southerners, and as this sense of community did not pay respects to the arbitrary
boundaries imposed upon the landscape by local planters, it is at this level that we can begin to interpret the evidence of social interactions discussed in the previous chapter, specifically the trade of equestrian related items and acquired Madison tablewares, and the dispersal of woodworking knowledge, which may have incorporated bondspeople on adjacent plantations. The families living in both South Yard duplexes and the Stable Quarter appear to have had equal access to the internal economic networks within this intimate culture group, suggesting that belonging, rather than the display of wealth, structured these social relations. This neighborhood intimate culture group appears to have been established within the first ten years of the plantation’s existence, as Pompey, one of the three slaves tried for the 1732 poisoning of Ambrose Madison, resided on Joseph Hawkins’s nearby estate (Chambers 2005:8).

The spiritual community these households belonged to also may have operated at an inter-plantation level, and can be considered a separate intimate culture group, as it could have operated differently than local mundane interactions. Interestingly, Pompey may have served as a leader in the local spiritual community, seen through his role in supplying the poison used on Ambrose Madison (Chambers 2009:324), suggesting a similarly early date for the establishment of this network across the hills of western Orange County. At the moment, it is difficult to say with any certainty if all five households belonged to this network, but based upon the identification of more potential ritual assemblages and personal charms at the South Yard sites, both of which displayed more expensive assemblages than the Stable Quarter, wealth may have played a role in the degree to which a household could belong to this group, if only due to the material cost associated with these rituals. However, as it appears based on the available data that
the residents of the Southwest Home participated in this intimate culture group to a larger extent than their neighbors in the Southeast Duplex, who appear to have displayed the largest amount of wealth, the members of Montpelier’s black community could choose the degree to which they participated in this group based upon either their own belief in these religious practices, or their need to gain spiritual protection due to the contested location of their homespaces.

Although no data supports the assumption at the moment, it is also possible that being an enslaved individual at Montpelier could have created a specific intimate culture group within the local neighborhood. It might, however, be possible to trace out the reflection of such distinction in the material record if the distribution of Madison acquired tablewares known to be unique to the plantation (such the transferprinted Bamboo and Peony motif) are not recovered from the homes of bondspeople residing on adjacent plantations in spite of their near ubiquitous presence at Montpelier.

While the women and men of Montpelier’s black community could interact with others in their neighborhood and their plantation on a daily basis, they also lived in smaller quarter areas, which further structured who they could see and interact with. Although the Madisons’ formally defined the South Yard and Stable Quarters as separate entities, divided by a fence line, the women and men who lived in the Southeast Duplex, Southwest Home, and Stable Quarter may not have recognized this division in their daily lives. This is best demonstrated in the fact that the men living in these sites chose to work and relax in parts of their yardspaces which were visible to the men at the other sites, potentially helping to create not only social relationships, but their own intimate culture group. Although the women who lived in these homes may not have spent as
much of their time in these same, visible, locations, they may have spent enough to allow
an intimate culture group to form in this specific set of dwellings. At the moment, we do
not know if the women and men living in the closest homes to these sites (the Northeast
Duplex, Area A of the Stable Quarter Complex [located near the Stable Quarter], and
potentially the South Kitchen’s loft) were involved in this intimate culture group, but
future excavations can shed light on the extent of this belonging. Typically, the study of
social relations has occurred at this level in quarter sites across the Americas (e.g. Brown
1994; Brown and Cooper 1990; Fesler 2004b; Galle 2004; Neiman et al. 2013; Reeves
1997, 2011; Young 1995, 1997a, 2003, 2004; Young et al. 2001). Although these studies
can advance our ability to interpret the social world of the black South, we must keep in
mind that such relationships represent only a portion of those which tied together African
American communities throughout the region.

Cross-cutting the neighborhood and quarter intimate culture groups were various
kin networks, which Carol Stack (1974) and Dylan Penningroth (2003) have noted as
structuring social relations and property ownership amongst black Americans. While
such lifelines (see Aschenbrenner 1975) can be difficult to detect archaeologically, the
distribution of gifted ceramics may provide us with the material remnants of one such kin
group. Both the residents of the Southeast Duplex and the Stable Quarter appear to have
given tablewares to one another, potentially to reaffirm their kinship. Through these
social connections, the women (and possibly the men) of these two sites may have
created their own intimate culture group. The women of the Stable Quarter also appear to
have given two vessels to the women of the Southwest Home, potentially to establish
further connections with the residents of this site. If the women of the Southwest Home
did enter into this kinship/intimate culture group, they may have existed on its periphery, not participating in this belonging to the same degree as the households of the other two sites, as they do not appear to have given any tablewares away. Furthermore, if Borrow Pit 1 was used for the storage of crops by residents of the southeast Duplex, then it is possible that this may have been made possible by their kinship connections to the residents of the Stable Quarter. While several scholars have focused primarily on the role of kinship groups in structuring black social life, other intimate culture groups present at Montpelier had their own impact on social relationships, reminding us again that no one level of belonging defined the women and men living in quarters across the South.

Many factors appear to have affected which intimate culture groups the women and men enslaved at Montpelier participated in, including where they lived and the degree to which they participated in the religious practices their carried with them from Africa. Gender also appears to have played a large role in women and men’s participation in these networks, as the social interactions which could be gendered male tended to operate within larger intimate culture groups (neighborhood and quarter associations), while interactions amongst the quarters’ women appear to have had a closer association with the intimate groups formed from kinship connections. In his discussion of social relations in the Anglophone Caribbean, Peter Wilson suggested that black men formed “crews” with other men around them, rather than selecting their acquaintances from specific institutions, such as church or kin groups (cf. 1995; see Besson 2002:12-14). Within these crews, which can be considered intimate culture groups, men established their belonging through their solidarity with the other. The social interactions which occurred between Montpelier’s men all appear to have included
the residents of both the South Yard and Stable Quarters, suggesting that, similarly to Wilson’s research, membership in social networks beyond their own kin group played a large role in determining how Montpelier’s men participated in the various intimate culture groups they belonged to.

Alternatively, Carol Stack (1974) primarily focused more on the role of women in kinship networks. This theme resonates with the social interactions seen amongst Montpelier’s women, given that the gifting of ceramic vessels appears to have only occurred between selective households. At the moment, it is difficult to say with any certainty how much of a role conceptions of kinship played in the social lives of the women who lived at these sites, based on the relatively few interactions which could be gendered as female. However, from the available information, it appears as if the kinship intimate culture group of Montpelier’s women played a larger role in structuring their social lives than the other groups they belonged to.

Regardless of how these individuals entered into intimate culture groups, which ones they belonged to, and how much they chose to participate in them, overall, it seems as if these connections played the largest role in the creation and maintenance of social connections within Montpelier’s black community, allowing us to state that wealth did not affect social relations within this enslaved community.

Contexts of Stability and Mobility

Montpelier’s black community had a long, and fairly stable, history. Despite the fact that individuals were forced to leave this community, either through being willed to Nelly Madison Hite in 1801, or by being directly sold by James Madison, Jr. during the 1830s (Chambers 2005:132-138), the members of Montpelier’s various 19th century
intimate culture groups did not have to worry about the integration of new members from within their plantation community. In this context of stability, wealth may have not played a role in structuring social relationships because the social actors in question were all known to members of this community, and therefore the creation and display of an identity of wealth would not have been more influential in establishing social relationships than the identity an individual already derived from their connections to the intimate culture groups they belonged to (see Galle 2010:22).

Alternatively, the black communities residing on other plantations in the Piedmont, and across the Antebellum South, may have existed in a context of mobility; a condition forced upon them by their owners. This could exist within a single community, such as the black population of Virginia’s Poplar Forest plantation, which saw large numbers of black Virginians brought into and forced out of the plantation regularly based upon the wishes of Thomas Jefferson (Heath 1999b:62). Jessica Bowes has suggested that within this state of flux, the plantation’s women told newcomers where to gather edible plants (2011:104), suggesting that a neighborhood, or at least quarter specific, level of social belonging existed in spite of the plantation’s turbulent social topography. However, this mobility may have forced the other intimate culture groups present at this Piedmont plantation to operate under different rules than seen at Montpelier. Such considerations may be particularly important to our understanding of social relations in parts of the Plantation South that saw the importation of large numbers slaves during the 19th century, such as the Lower Mississippi Valley. Within these contexts of mobility, it is possible that the display of wealth may have played a larger role in allowing black individuals to size up the social value of their new community members.
Because of the effects of these contexts of black life, future research into social relations in the Plantation South should take into consideration the history of the black community in question, as the conditions of slavery cannot be fully divorced from our understanding of life within slave quarters. Regardless, based upon the research presented here, it appears as if intimate culture groups can provide a multi-scalar approach to understanding black social life in the South, as it incorporates the various levels of belonging that structured the daily lives of the these women and men, and can provide a lens through which the effect of wealth on social interactions in other locations can be interpreted. Similarly, intimate culture groups afford us with a flexible set of interrelated levels of belonging, each of which can be addressed individually, allowing the effects of forced mobility on slave communities across the South to be addressed.

Concluding Thoughts

In 1817, Mary Cutts, Dolley Madison’s niece and a resident of Montpelier, noted that “Mrs. Madison’s younger relatives” found a great interest in bringing uneaten items from their breakfast to give to Granny Milly, the elderly enslaved woman who likely lived in the cabin now referred to as the Stable Quarter (Marshall 2011:6; Cutts 1817, quoted in Miller 2007:109). During these visits, Granny Milly would occasionally “rummage” through “an old chest” to show her prized possession to her guests, “an old worn French copy of Telemachus… given to her as a keepsake by the wife of the [former plantation] gardener Bezee’[sic]” (Cutts 1817, quoted in Miller 2007:109). This quotation, unfortunately, highlights some of the issues with attempting to see displayed wealth and social interactions through the lens of the archaeological record. Granny Milly’s prized possession was an old worn book, which she kept out of sight in an old
chest, not a transferprinted teacup or porcelain platter she displayed for her visitors to see. Furthermore, while this thesis was primarily concerned with identifying repetitive social interactions between members of the enslaved community which left a material signature in the clayey soils of the South Yard and Stable Quarters, the worn copy of *Telemachus* is representative of a social interaction that cannot be seen in the archaeological record, as the book would have decayed had it been discarded, or, perhaps more likely, it would have ended up in the possession of another family member who carried it off the plantation, either while being sold away from their home in the 1830s and 1840s or during their final emancipation from the plantation in the 1860s. Furthermore, the interaction between Granny Milly and Bezee’s wife is not one which was likely to have been seen in this research, as it did not occur between two members of the black community, and we have no way of knowing if materials regularly passed between these two women, allowing some trace of this friendship to be interpreted from the Stable Quarter’s deposits (see Lori Lee [2012] for a discussion of a similar transfer of goods in social interactions). Unfortunately, how we choose to structure our research and construct our narratives of the past can never be fully separated from our end results.

While certain social realities cannot be acknowledged in the research presented in this thesis, embodied in the copy of *Telemachus*, this research does, I feel, provide a more nuanced approach to social interaction than previously offered, primarily through three components of the research design. First, the role of social status and material wealth, while central to numerous interpretations of enslaved social worlds (cf. Galle 2010), had

---

25 Mary Cutts, at least, believed this to be Granny Milly’s “only treasure” (1817, quoted in Miller 2007:109). Whether this was true in the mind of this ageing matriarch, an item which Granny Milly knew would excite her white guests and therefore was displayed to them, or simply a reflection of Cutt’s own cultural values remains to be determined.
yet to be assessed against indications of social interaction within these communities. Testing the implications of displayed wealth against visible indications of social interaction available in the archaeological record allowed this research to suggest that, at least within the Montpelier community, ownership of costly consumer goods did not structure social relationships. Second, while pervious archaeological studies of social interactions within black communities have made considerable headway in theorizing how we can meaningfully see social connections through recovered material culture, they have not made an attempt to evaluate the motivating factors behind such relationships, which this research has done both through assessing the impact of material wealth on social networks, and through applying the conception of intimate culture groups to structure the entangled social worlds of the black Piedmont. Lastly, this research looked to identify multiple lines of evidence for social interaction and combine them into a single interpretive framework, highlighting the fact that within communities, a wide array of factors structure the way in which people interact with each other.

How we order our findings similarly impacts on our interpretations of the past. For instance, the various intimate culture groups, as have been presented in the last section, appear to be neatly nested entities, each fitting comfortably inside the other and each existing within its own formally defined boundaries. Social realities, however, rarely fit into such tidy categories. Rather, they tend to be messy, entangled affairs, whose boundaries may have never been formalized, or even existed, by the members of the black community. Despite the utility of this approach in helping to order the way in which we can interpret social relationships both within Montpelier’s black community, and within enslaved communities across the broader Atlantic World, we must take care
not to fully impose the rigidity of these separate groups into our narrative of the social world of black Southerners. While each of these social entities may have been intact during the early 19th century, they began to fracture and disappear during the 1830s and 1840s as the black community of Montpelier was dismantled. However, from the material items left behind by the inhabitants of the South Yard and Stable Quarters, we can begin to reconstruct these intangible social constructions through contextualizing fragments of social interactions seen in the teawares that potentially held condiments used to flavor the meals of the women and men who lived here, the tablewares they gave to one another, and the equestrian related items that were traded within this community. As we continue to conduct research into the intimate culture groups operating in the region, we can further refine and tease out how these various levels of belonging effected the way in which African Americans interacted with each other, and the degree to which they were actually recognized by these individuals.

Lastly, Ian Hodder has suggested that archaeological research should be approached as a hermeneutic spiral (cf. 1999). In this conception, the interpretations we derive from the archaeological record are constantly being reevaluated against new data and new concepts which allow us to further refine ideas which seem to work, and discard those which do not, before considering more data through which we can further assess our new conceptions (Hodder 1999:33-44). In many ways, the research presented in this thesis has followed this model. Previous interpretations of social interaction within enslaved communities were collected, and then tested against the material evidence from the South Yard and Stable Quarter sites, suggesting that, at least at Montpelier, the display of wealth did not have an impact on the social interaction. Rather, Marylin
Thomas-Houston’s (2005) conception of the role of intimate culture groups in structuring social relationships through various levels of belonging seemed to best explain how this social world was arranged. Now that these interpretations have been offered, they should be further assessed in the context of other enslaved communities. This should allow us to both determine if the apparent disconnect between displayed wealth and social interaction within a planation community is a general trend in the Virginia Piedmont, or if the particular history of Montpelier’s black community created a common sense unique to these households. Interpretations from other communities could also aid in refining our conception of intimate culture groups, providing a better sense of how they operated in the early 19th century, and the degree to which they impacted the lives of black Virginians. Moving outside of this time and space, seeing the applicability of this thesis to other regions and eras in the Atlantic World can aid in our understanding of enslaved life in a variety of ways. In the end, if such research is conducted, we should be able to add yet another chapter to the story of how captive Africans and their descendants found ways to cope with the horrors thrust upon them during slavery through the social worlds they created and lived in.
APPENDIX A

BORROW PIT CROSSMEND ANALYSIS

Below are the tables from the analysis of the crossmended vessels recovered from the Stable Quarter’s borrow pits. When used, the abbreviation BP stands for borrow pit, and therefore BP 1 indicates Borrow Pit 1.

*Number of vessels crossmending between individual borrow pits. Number in light grey indicates the total number of vessels from each borrow pit.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borrow Pit #</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of sherds and vessels from each borrow pit crossmending between features*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borrow Pit #</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of crossmending vessels</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>48.38%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Sherds crossmending</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>76.78%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of individual vessels between the excavated borrow pits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel Number</th>
<th>BP 1</th>
<th>BP 2</th>
<th>BP 4</th>
<th>BP 5</th>
<th>BP 6</th>
<th>BP 7</th>
<th>Number Of Cross Mending Sherds</th>
<th>Features Recovered From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>957</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>984</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>987</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>994</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>995</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1028</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1223</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1224</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1397</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1399</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stratigraphic association of recovered sherds from Borrow Pits 1 and 4. Vessels with strong associations are displayed with bold typeface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel #</th>
<th>BP 1</th>
<th>BP 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1224</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stratigraphic association of recovered sherds from Borrow Pits 1 and 5. Vessels with strong associations are displayed with bold typeface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel #</th>
<th>BP 1</th>
<th>BP 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1382</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stratigraphic association of recovered sherds from Borrow Pits 4 and 5. Vessels with strong associations are displayed with bold typeface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel #</th>
<th>BP 4</th>
<th>BP 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>957</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>987</td>
<td><strong>Lower Strata</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lower Strata</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>994</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>994</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td><strong>Lower Strata</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lower Strata</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1223</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1397</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stratigraphic association of recovered sherds from Borrow Pits 4 and 6. Vessels with strong associations are displayed with bold typeface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel #</th>
<th>BP 4</th>
<th>BP 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1223</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1223</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1397</td>
<td><strong>Lower Strata</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lower Strata</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1399</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stratigraphic association of recovered sherds from Borrow Pits 5 and 6. Vessels with strong associations are displayed with bold typeface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel #</th>
<th>BP 5</th>
<th>BP 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1028</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lower Strata</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lower Strata</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1223</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1389</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lower Strata</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lower Strata</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1397</td>
<td>Upper Strata</td>
<td>Lower Strata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attributes from the excavated borrow pits and the subfloor pit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name</th>
<th>Feature #</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Shape at Surface</th>
<th>Shape at Base</th>
<th>Possible Colluvium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrow Pit 1</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>2.2'</td>
<td>420 Gal.</td>
<td>Roughly Circular</td>
<td>Irregular Basin</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow Pit 2</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>0.8'</td>
<td>178 Gal.</td>
<td>Oblong</td>
<td>Two irregular basins</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow Pit 3</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Roughly rectangular</td>
<td>Not excavated</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow Pit 4</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>0.75'</td>
<td>177 Gal.</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>Irregular Basin</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow Pit 5</td>
<td>1031-I</td>
<td>0.85'</td>
<td>156 Gal.</td>
<td>Irregular oblong</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow Pit 6</td>
<td>1031-II</td>
<td>0.8'</td>
<td>65 Gal.</td>
<td>Irregular circle</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow Pit 7</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>0.35'</td>
<td>17 Gal.</td>
<td>Oblong</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subfloor Pit</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>1.4'</td>
<td>168 Gal.</td>
<td>Square</td>
<td>Square</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

ANALYSIS OF COMMUNAL SPACES

Below are the Surfer contour plots from the analysis of the communal areas of the South Yard and Stable Quarter. All artifact counts have been adjusted for the total area of each unit, insuring the size of the units does not skew our view of these distributions. North is located to the top of each plot. Numbers on left and bottom of map depict excavation grid coordinates at 10’ intervals.

South Yard

Southwest Home is located on left, with porch post holes displayed in yellow and intact brick structural elements in red. Southeast Duplex is in right, with planting features seen in the two circular features to its left, and stone structural features are displayed in grey. Outline of the structures is in black.

Plot 1. Topographic map of South Yard Quarter. Elevation contours in half foot intervals.
Plot 2. Straight pins recovered from South Yard occupation surfaces. Units yielding additional sewing material displayed with crosshatching: red as location of bone sewing spindle, and blue as location of scissors.

Plot 4. Beads recovered from South Yard occupation surfaces.

Plot 5. Beads recovered from South Yard post-occupation surfaces.
Plot 6. Lead shot recovered from South Yard occupation surfaces. Units gun flints displayed with crosshatching: red as location of gun flint fragments, and blue as location of mostly whole gun flints.

Plot 7. Lead shot recovered from South Yard post-occupation surfaces
Plot 8. Pipe fragments recovered from South Yard occupation surfaces. Units yielding marbles displayed by red crosshatching.

Plot 9. Pipe fragments recovered from South Yard post-occupation surfaces
Stable Quarter

Outline of Stable Quarter cabin shown in brown.

Plot 10. Topographic map of South Yard Quarter. Elevation contours in half foot intervals.
Plot 11. Straight pins recovered from Stable Quarter occupation surfaces. Units yielding additional sewing material displayed with crosshatching: red as location of scissors, and blue as location of thimbles.
Plot 12. Beads recovered from Stable Quarter occupation surfaces.
Plot 13. Lead shot recovered from Stable Quarter occupation surfaces. Units yielding gun flints displayed with crosshatch: red as location of three gun flint fragments, and blue as location of mostly a whole gun flint.
Plot 14. Pipe fragments recovered from Stable Quarter occupation surfaces. Units yielding marbles displayed by red crosshatching and unit yielding a mouth harp displayed by blue crosshatching.
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