Chapter 1: Introduction

This research investigates the internal marketing system that existed among enslaved persons in the South Carolina Lowcountry from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century. The unique historical development of the slavery system in the Lowcountry allowed enslaved individuals to create a marketing network within that of the dominant class. This marketing system enabled enslaved persons to obtain material goods to improve their standard of living, and also to develop and maintain social connections and a collective identity in the face of the slavery system. Many analyses of slavery in the American south have concentrated on its brutality and harshness. While not denying the inhumanity of such a system and its brutalities, this research seeks to illuminate the ways in which enslaved persons led meaningful lives despite the restrictions imposed upon them by this unjust system, and ultimately forged a strong and vibrant identity.

Colonoware, an unglazed, low-fired earthenware, may have been traded or sold within this internal marketing system. Colonoware was produced by enslaved African Americans, and free and enslaved Native Americans, and is found in both slave and planter contexts on rural and urban sites. Research has shown that enslaved individuals used Colonoware in the continuation of traditional foodways and religious/medicinal practices, thus its function transcended the strictly utilitarian (Ferguson 1999, 1992, 1991). Colonoware vessels from predominantly European contexts tend to be thinner,

nicely finished, and have forms that mimic European ceramics, such as scalloped rims and foot rings, suggesting a market that is sensitive to the tastes and needs of its clientele. Individuals use their material culture as a symbolic representation of their identity, and as a form of negotiation between differing groups (Dellino-Musgrave 2005:219; Robb 2001; Cohen 1985:103). An analysis of how the enslaved population in Charleston, South Carolina used Colonoware enables us to further illustrate the creative ways in which they used their material culture in the creation and maintenance of their identities and as a symbol of their resistance against the dominant planter class.

Within the harshness of slavery, enslaved Africans and Native Americans were able to develop a social identity through the construction of structures such as families and markets (Morris 1998; Hudson 1997). Analyses of the material culture that they used within these structures can allow us to better understand how enslaved individuals used the items obtained within the internal market to express what they themselves felt was important (Howsen 1990:85). Thinking about Colonoware as a commodity will lead to further information into how the enslaved used the internal marketing system to negotiate and maintain their social identities. This research also investigates how enslaved individuals from both urban and rural contexts worked together to create an internal market that would have further helped them in the establishment of a collective slave culture, and how these markets and internal economy strategies within their own distinct culture can influence and bring about new directions in the field of historical archaeology.

COLONOWARE

Colonoware is found mainly in the South Carolina Lowcountry (Anthony 2000; Cooper and Steen 1998; Singleton 1991; Joyner 1984). It was manufactured from the seventeenth to the early nineteenth century, with the eighteenth century being the height of its manufacture (Anthony 2000:2). Colonoware has been archaeologically recovered from both slave and planter contexts, on rural and urban sites (Espenshade 1996; Ferguson 1992; Singleton 1991; Wheaton and Garrow 1989; Anthony 1986). Enslaved Africans, as well as free and enslaved Native Americans, manufactured Colonoware vessels for their own use, trade, and sale. It has also been argued that Europeans could have produced it as well; however, this is less likely and a topic of much contention (Hiete 2002). It is clear that Africans, Native Americans, and Europeans all used Colonoware (Joseph 2002; Espenshade 1996; Crane 1993; Ferguson 1992; Cooper and Steen 1998). Because it is the product of interactions between Europeans, Africans, and Native Americans, it exhibits attributes from all three cultures (Anthony 2000; Cooper and Steen 1998; Espenshade 1996; Ferguson 1992). Variations within Colonoware are then directly related to the amount and type of interaction between all three cultural groups. My thesis argues that enslaved individuals actively used the production of Colonoware and the internal marketing system to create their own social and cultural identities (amongst these other ethnic and cultural groups).

Directions in Colonoware Research

For the most part, Colonoware research has focused on who produced Colonoware rather than how it was used and the ideological meanings it held (Singleton

1995:133). Ethnicity has been the main focus of Colonoware research in South Carolina. Within this research on ethnicity, the main focus has been to try to determine who produced Colonoware, whether Native Americans or African slaves (Mouer et al. 1999; Garrow and Wheaton 1989; Ferguson 1980, 1989, 1999; Anthony 1979, 1986). Historical archaeologists looked at socioeconomic status to show that Colonoware was used by plantation slaves (Wheaton et al. 1983; Drucker and Anthony 1979). Wheaton and Garrow used Colonoware to show acculturation, or the slaves' loss of traditional culture (1985).

Later, historical archaeologists demonstrated that Colonoware was a symbol of Creolization, or the mixing of multiple cultures within a new environment (Ferguson 1992; Cooper and Steen 1998; Garrow and Wheaton 1989; Anthony 1986). Ferguson argued that Colonoware was used as a tool for power and resistance against the dominating Euro-American culture (Ferguson 1985, 1989, 1991, 1992). In 2000, I used ethnicity to look at the cultural traits of vessels from a late eighteenth century Charleston site, associated with Miles Brewton, to determine if they were used by the urban enslaved residents (Isenbarger 2001). Other historical archaeologists have looked at temporal changes in vessel forms and use (Hamby and Joseph 2004; Espenshade 1996).

The Search for the Ethnicity of the Colonoware Potters

The focus on ethnicity within Colonoware analyses results from the development of its typology. Ivor Noel-Hume was the first to recognize and type the ware. He determined that it was a historic Native American trade ware, thus giving it the name Colono-Indian ware (Noel Hume 1962). Leland Ferguson later recognized that the ware

was produced by enslaved African Americans as well, and transformed its name to Colonoware to describe any low-fired, unglazed earthenware found within a colonial context (1978). Archaeological research on slave settlements found evidence of on-site production of Colonoware, including spall marked wares, further supporting the slaves' involvement in its manufacture (Wheaton et al. 1983; Anthony 1979; Anthony and Drucker 1979). These discoveries led future Colonoware research to focus on determining which cultural group produced the Colonoware they uncovered, mainly proving the contributions of the enslaved.

Colonoware ceramics have commonly been divided into the three broad varieties of River Burnished, Lesesne Lustered, and Yaughan (Anthony 1986, 2002; Ferguson 1985, 1989; Wheaton et al. 1983). The River Burnished variety was produced by free Native Americans from the late eighteenth to the early nineteenth century as trade wares for the Euro-Americans and African American slaves. It is characterized as a thin, three to seven millimeters, well-fired, highly burnished, and micaceous ware. Since these wares were produced for trade to Euro-Americans, they tend to exhibit more European attributes than the other varieties (Ferguson 1989; Wheaton et al. 1983). These wares are commonly associated with the Catawba Native Americans, comprised of several free Native American groups, as well as both free and enslaved African Americans, who formed together in the late eighteenth century. The later nineteenth century River Burnished wares are called Catawba Pottery. Due to the cultural diversity with the Catawba, or Native American groups who later became the Catawba Nation, during the eighteenth century it is safer and less misleading to call this ware River Burnished. During the nineteenth century, the Catawba Nation was fully formed and continued to

produce these trade wares. Therefore, River Burnished wares from nineteenth century contexts can be safely called Catawba Pottery (Steen 2002:6-430-31; Ferguson 1989; Merrell 1988:104).

The Yaughan variety was produced from the early eighteenth century to the mid-nineteenth century, and is the most abundant variety associated with slave occupation. Yaughan is characterized as thick, four to eleven millimeters in thickness, low fired, having a laminar paste, uneven walls, and commonly a smoothed rather than burnished surface. Due to its abundance in slave occupations, it is believed to have been produced by enslaved African Americans. Yaughan vessels are commonly small convex sided bowls and both large and small globular jars (Anthony 2002:54-57).

The characteristics of the Lesesne Lustered variety fall within the median between the nicely produced River Burnished trade wares and the less well-constructed Yaughan variety. In the Lowcountry, Lesesne Lustered Colonoware was produced from the early eighteenth to the early nineteenth century. It can be distinguished by being more fired with a less laminar paste than the Yaughan variety, but not as nicely burnished or finished as the River Burnished variety. Lesesne Lustered vessels usually have a moderate thickness, but the thickness range is three to eleven millimeters (Anthony 2002; Anthony 1986:7-26). The most common vessel form within the Lesesne Lustered variety is bowls, which tend to be larger, straight sided bowls (Anthony 2002:55). The cultural affiliation of the producers of the Lesesne Lustered variety has not been definitively identified (Anthony 2002:54-55); however, many researchers believe it was produced by African American slaves.

Close interactions between Africans, Native Americans, and Europeans resulted

in Colonoware being composed of mixed attributes, making it difficult to discern the ethnicity of the potter. The sharing and borrowing of cultural attributes between these groups also makes it impossible to guarantee the identification of the ethnicity of the potter from vessel attributes alone. A number of Native Americans were enslaved from the seventeenth to the early eighteenth century (Cooper and Steen 1998). Of all of the colonies, South Carolina had the most extensive Indian slave trade (Zierden 2005:10). Relationships between Africans and Native Americans such as friendships, trade relations, and marriages makes it even more difficult to identify and classify Colonoware attributes to any one ethnicity (Cooper and Steen 1998)[1].

Since the Lowcountry was so creolized, it created ambiguities which make finding the cultural origins of traits in the Colonoware assemblage less beneficial than looking at how these vessels were used and the meanings that were placed on them by those who used it. Noel-Hume originally thought that Colonoware was a trade ware, based on Native American interactions with European populations. Historical archaeologists have shown that there is a difference between wares found in rural and urban contexts, with urban or European contexts having thinner, more well-fired and nicely finished wares (Hamby and Joseph 2004; Espenshade 1996; Wheaton et al. 1983). I wish to return to the notion of Colonoware as a market ware in an attempt to gain insight into how enslaved individuals could have used Colonoware as a means to better their standard of living. My thesis focuses on how Colonoware was produced and

[1] The majority of the South Carolina enslaved population was comprised of Africans or African Americans, however, the presence of Native Americans makes it difficult to strictly segregate which cultural group one is studying. Due to the processes of creolization, the enslaved population was complex and mixed. It is for this reason I will refer to the enslaved population as "slaves." This is not only an attempt to create a simpler term, but to also keep from ignoring the Native American presence within and influences on the enslaved population.

marketed, and the meanings that were placed on it due to its role in the slaves' internal marketing system.

Archaeological Research of Colonoware Use on Plantations and in Charleston

Archaeological investigations on Lowcountry plantations have found that Colonoware use changed over time. Christopher T. Espenshade's research on nine coastal South Carolina plantations was the first study to lay out these changes, which have been continually recognized during further archaeological research in the Lowcountry. During the frontier period of Carolina's growth, Colonoware is prevalent in both planter and slave contexts. Jars are the most common vessel form. European vessel attributes, which include crenellated rims, foot-ringed bowls, chamber pots, teapots, pitchers, and Dutch-oven-like vessels, are common and are especially predominant within the planter contexts (Anthony 2002:49; Espenshade 1996:7). This may be due to the closer relationship between planter and slave (Wood 1996:97) and limited access to European goods (Espenshade 1996:7).

As the eighteenth century progressed, Colonoware use occurs more frequently within slave contexts. Bowls become the dominant vessel form, and the frequency of European attributes decreases. This reflects a change from the closer relationships established during the frontier period (Espenshade 1996:7-8, Wood 1996:97). In the early to mid-nineteenth century, Colonoware is no longer used in planter contexts and is used less frequently in slave contexts. Small bowls dominate the assemblages and are commonly found with markings. Colonoware use for this time period occurs mostly in more isolated slave communities (Espenshade 1996:8). Espenshade (1996) argued that the drop in Colonoware use in the nineteenth century may have been due to the planters

becoming increasingly fearful of uprisings and therefore less tolerant to anything African. Thus, Colonoware use was pushed to the fringes of the sphere of Euro-American cultural influence, and became more commonly used for rituals rather than for cooking (Espenshade 1996: 9-10). My research will test Espenshade's model to see if these changes occur in urban contexts as well.

Ferguson is the most prominent scholar on Colonoware use on Lowcountry plantations. He argues that Colonoware was used to continue traditional African foodways, which acted as a form of resistance against the dominating Euro-American culture (Ferguson 1991, 1992). In this, slaves would have been able to prepare, cook, and eat their foods in ways that were more familiar. This would have led to the preservation of African cooking traits, and their traditional ideologies that surround the processes of cooking and eating. These traits would have allowed them to better cope with their enslavement.

Upon the discovery of Colonoware bowls with an "X" carved into their center, Ferguson further suggested that Colonoware was used to practice traditional African religious and medicinal practices from the Bakongo region (1999:116-131; 1992:109-116). The markings on the vessels, looking similar to a cross, resemble Bakongo cosmograms. These cosmograms represent the earth and the underworld, separated by the water (Ferguson 1992:114). Bakongo cosmograms symbolize the interconnections between birth, life, death, and rebirth (Edwards-Ingram 2001:39). The Bakongo use medicines, called minkisi, to control the spirits of their cosmos and to connect the living with the dead (Ferguson 1992:114). These rituals usually involve water, since their belief is that water separates the living world from the world of the dead. Most of the marked

vessels were recovered from Lowcountry waterways. Further, the majority of Lowcountry slaves came from the Bakongo region of Africa (Ferguson 1999, 1992). Such Colonoware use would have allowed for the continuation of African ideology. Just as with cooking, the medicinal use of Colonoware would have also added humanity and agency to the condition of the slaves' lives.

Only a few historical archaeologists have focused on the Colonoware from downtown Charleston contexts. These studies have focused on the identity of those who used it, and the possibility of it being a marketed ware (Hamby and Joseph 2004; Isenbarger 2001). To date, no evidence of Colonoware production has been found in Charleston. Because the urban house lots were small, and foods for everyone were prepared in the same kitchen, it is very difficult to attribute the use of artifacts to specific individuals. Therefore, archaeologists have to look for specific patterns of use within the material culture in order to interpret who was using it. In 2000, my analysis of the late eighteenth century Colonoware associated with the Miles Brewton House (1694-present) found that the assemblage was most likely used by Brewton's urban slaves for their personal use, rather than their owners. This was concluded due to the fact that there were very few European influences seen in the vessels I analyzed, and that charring was found on a vessel shaped like a chamber pot, suggesting that it was used for cooking (cooking in chamber pots was probably an unconventional practice, and such a vessel may have been used out of necessity or innovation) (Isenbarger 2001). Several of the vessels exhibited markings, which may be associated with African religious rituals and beliefs, or traditional medicinal use (Isenbarger 2001; Zierden 2001).

Joe Joseph's research on the Judicial Center Colonoware assemblage (eighteenth

to the early nineteenth century) showed that both Colonoware and utilitarian European wares were common in the colonial period with the use of both dropping in frequency by the late eighteenth century (Hamby and Joseph 2004). Joseph further argues, that this change is due to social changes within Charleston, as the city moved from one marked with ethnic diversity prior to 1740, to a unified structured society focused on class and social status after 1770 (Hamby and Joseph 2004). This research will look for similar temporal patterns in the Charleston Colonoware assemblages in an attempt to gain a better understanding of the role of the wares within these changing social contexts.

Colonoware in the Urban Markets and Daily Life

Despite the fact that the ethnicity of the potters is clouded, Colonoware studies have the potential to shed light on day-to-day life within slave culture. Unlike written records, pottery has the potential to unselfconsciously reflect the lives and culture of those who used it. Therefore, despite the lack of documentation on slave culture and life, the abundance of Colonoware in the Lowcountry is a useful tool for studying it. Colonoware also gives one an opportunity to look at the intersection of the interactions between African, Native American, and European cultures (Crane 1993:20).

Another place to look at these interactions is within the internal marketing system that the slaves created, and the commodities they decided to buy, sell, and trade within such markets. These markets and the commodities within them helped to shape the lives of the Charlestonian slaves. However, these slaves shaped the ways their markets functioned and what they wanted sold in them, which in turn created a dialectical relationship between the markets and the slaves in downtown Charleston. Analyses of

these markets and the commodities within them enable us to better understand how the Charleston slaves used their material culture as a reflection of their values. Therefore, this research analyzes the Colonoware that would have been for sale in the urban markets to gain insight into how slaves used the wares within their new, urban setting.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

There is a larger debate over how to describe the experience of slaves under slavery. Both historians and anthropologists have shown the extremely cruel and brutal side of slavery, as well as a less harsh, more blissful version where the slaves were able to exert their agency to their benefit. I feel that both of these realities can be true at varying times and situations, and that, rather than siding with one extreme, we should think of the slave experience as a spectrum of both good and bad experiences. In his dissertation, Larry E. Hudson Jr. argues that our goal should be to present what W.E.B. Dubois called "the average truth", or the middle ground of common experiences of the slaves, for this is where we will obtain the best idea of how slavery affected the majority of slaves and what these experiences meant to the slaves themselves (Hudson 1989:3). Another argument in the archaeological analysis of the enslaved is that scholars tend to under-represent the complexities within slave culture and focus instead only on the cohesive aspects, which tends to result in a more static portrayal of slave life (DeCourse 1999:132). This thesis attempts to lend a more dynamic view of the experiences of Lowcountry slaves by looking for both similarities and variations within the Charleston Colonoware assemblages in an effort to gain a better understanding of how they used their material culture in the formation and maintenance of their own distinct culture.

When using the term slave culture, I am not suggesting that all enslaved peoples shared a collective identity that was the *only* aspect of their lives that they used to define themselves. The enslaved population was varied and would have identified themselves in complex and dynamic ways. Rather, I am referring to the larger overarching cultural ideals that the enslaved population would have shared due to the oppression that was imposed on them by the dominant class. I am not suggesting that the enslaved population fully accepted their imposed social position. It would be nearly impossible to account for every aspect of each enslaved individuals' identity formation. For the past twenty years it has been common for historic archaeologists to discuss slave culture on a macro-scale, since they would have definitely shared some cultural markers due to their enslavement (e.g., Colonoware found throughout North America and the Caribbean, as well as similarities in housing patterns, foodways, language, and religion), which shaped the ways in which they acquired and used material culture in the expression of their identity and cultural belief system.

In order to interpret how the slaves expressed themselves through their material culture I will use the theoretical framework of both "practice", and "structure" and "agency" theories. "Agency" and "practice" theories focus on the material culture and historical structures that guided and were manipulated by the individuals. This framework allows one to place the Lowcountry slaves within the historical and social structures that governed their actions, and look at the material evidence of their beliefs and values. Such analyses allow us to gain insight into the spatial, temporal, and mechanical aspects of the social contexts that the individuals lived within (Roberts 2005:12; Matthews 2001:73). People express their beliefs and values in many different

ways showing their varied individual identities as well as their inclusion into different group identities. Archaeologists have used "agency" and "practice" theories to interpret gender, varied cultural patterns in material culture, and inequality (Dobres and Robb 2000). In this framework I will first discuss the historical context of the social structures of the Lowcountry, and then I will explain the processes of identity formation and expression. By using "agency" and "practice" theory, one can give a more dynamic portrayal of how rural and urban Lowcountry slaves expressed themselves through their material culture, as individuals and as members of a collective group.

An Analysis of the Social Structures of the Lowcountry

Individuals, being a single person or group, form their self-identity through the combined interpretation of their lived experiences (Wilkie 2001:111; Hodder 2000:24). Giddens states that "agency" theory focuses on how an individual's actions, or their agency, are shaped not only by their personal experiences but also by the social structures of their society. Individuals have an understanding of the social consequences of their actions. Their actions, both intentionally and unintentionally, help to create or maintain these social structures, and at the same time add additional knowledge to themselves and others about the social structures (Wilkie 2001:111-112; Dobres and Robb 2000:5; Wobst 2000:40). Therefore, social structures are dynamic and continually changing and each act of agency effectively further shapes these social structures (Dobres and Robb 2000:5; Hodder 2000:24; Wobst 2000:40).

A useful frame for understanding the historical context within which the Lowcountry slaves operated is articulation theory as proposed by Morris (1988).

Articulation theory focuses on the structures that shaped the interactions between masters and slaves, and thus how they negotiated both conflicts and compromise. Articulation theory views slavery as a socio-economic system while incorporating local and temporal variations. Articulation refers to where the differing worldviews, or collective identities, of the masters and slaves intersected and overlapped with one another. The slave system as a whole is a capitalist system, however, the planters themselves were not entirely capitalists (Morris 1998:983-984). Being a capitalist system, it is able to work with non-capitalist systems instead of completely taking them over (Morris 1998:984; Wolf 1982:79). Some scholars argue that capitalist systems tend to influence the organization of economic activities while leaving the more traditional aspects of family and community intact (Morris 1998:984). These articulations, or negotiations, were not static, but rather varied according the slave system's own particular history and social structure, changing with location and time period (Dobres and Robb 2000:5; Wobst 2000:40; Morris 1998:1004).

Slaves and their masters had different motives that governed their interactions with one another, but when these motives articulated they used each other to help fulfill their "very different material, psychological, and cultural interests" (Morris 1998:985). The social structures of the slave system limited and determined the interactions of both master and slave, and thus helped to perpetuate the system. The development and maintenance of family, community, and economy were undoubtedly beneficial aspects of slavery for the slaves, but they were beneficial for their masters as well (Dobres and Robb 2000:5; Morris 1998:987). The two main places where the worldviews of both planter and slave articulated are in the formation and maintenance of slave families, and

the slaves' economic activities.

One area of articulation is within the economic activities of the slaves. In most slave societies, slaves were allowed to sell and barter goods that they were able to grow in their own gardens, hunt or catch, or make in their own free time. Just as with slave families, these activities were beneficial for both planter and slave. Slaves were able to obtain foods and goods that otherwise would not have been available to them. And most importantly, these goods were used to better their standard of living, and in the construction of their own separate cultural identity. Slave families were able to work together and care for each other. Planters saw these economic activities as beneficial because it lessened their burden for caring for their slaves and helped the slaves build a sense of place and family on the plantations, thus making them less likely to run away. McDonald's (1991, 1993) research shows that Louisiana slaves who participated in the internal market could earn anywhere from $15 to $50 a year. Some were able to make significant profits from their crops, earning almost $200 a year. Hudson (1989, 1997) and Morgan (1982, 1983, 1998) have shown that South Carolina Lowcountry slaves were able to own property. Morris argues that if a slave earned $20 a year they would have raised half of the amount of money planters needed for the yearly care of their slaves, making their slaves' economic activities beneficial to the planters (Morris 1998:994-995).

These economic endeavors were separate from but also worked with and within the planters' economy. These activities have been referred to as "slaves' economy" (Berlin 1998), "internal slave economy" and "internal economy" (Morris 1998), "informal economies" (Wood, B. 1995), and "independent economy" (Berlin and Morgan 1991). For my thesis, I prefer the term "slaves' internal economy" since it demarcates

that the economy is governed by the slaves; works within or internal to, but not independent from the dominant planters' economy; is not necessarily informal; and that it is not to be confused with the selling of slaves themselves. The slaves' internal economies in North America were not as extensive as they were in other slave societies, but historical evidence has shown that it was prominent and a key aspect of master-slave relationships. This economic system developed in the formative years of the colony when relations between planter and slave were closer, and before the establishment of a main staple crop. Later, when planters extensively cultivated staple crops with slave labor and conflicts arose over the amount of time slaves spent laboring for the planters versus for themselves, the slaves' internal economy was firmly established (Morris 1998:995). Therefore, the slaves' internal economy is a key position of articulation, in that both planter and slave would have had different motives in their negotiations and compromises surrounding the slaves' economic activities. How the masters and slaves negotiated these interactions would have determined the structure and development of the social, cultural, and economic relations.

The Formation and Material Expression of Identity

Individuals form their identities through the evaluation of their combined life experiences. There are many variables that individuals use to define themselves including, ethnicity, age, gender, kinship, language, religion, occupation, and social position (Roberts 2005; Smedley 1998:691-692). Bourdieu called these variables, or values used to determine ones identity, 'doxa'. John Robb (2001) explains that individuals use "genres of action", or material culture and social context combined, to

interpret their individual actions and beliefs. Thus, these "genres of action" are the material expressions of doxic beliefs (Robb 2001). Therefore, material culture holds symbolic meanings reflective of an individual's political, social, and historical identity (Dellino-Musgrave 2005:219; Cohen 1985:103). The use of material culture then shapes the ways that the individuals perceive themselves and society (Dellino-Musgrave 2005:221-222; Potter 1992:117). Because of the many ways in which people define themselves, identities are complex and in constant negotiation. Individuals express their identities according to their current situation, be they spatial or temporal. It is for this reason that individuals may identify themselves in various ways throughout even one day (Roberts 2005); e.g., male, husband, father, middle aged, Christian, Angolan, coachman, and enslaved.

Studies that look for these "genres of action" look for symbolism and artifact patterning within the material culture (Robb 2001). Scholars have shown that enslaved African Americans, as a group, shared a common cultural heritage which created distinct patterns within their use of material culture (Mintz and Price 1992:9-10; see Ferguson 1992, 1999; Singleton 1991, 1995). One has to be careful of their interpretations since different individual groups, such as planters and slaves, may have viewed the same material expressions of identity in very different ways. Therefore, concepts of the meanings of these "genres of action", such as status and resistance, need to take into consideration how each individual group would have viewed these actions. Material culture is often used as a form of negotiation between groups, like planters and slaves, wherein its use could be misinterpreted as assimilation, but actually be a form of resistance or compromise (Robb 2001; Orser 1998:77; Singleton 1995:7). If material

culture is used as a tool for negotiation, thus embedding it with social meanings, then archaeologists can analyze material remains to interpret these negotiations (Dellino-Musgrave 2005:222). Scholars have shown that the enslaved Africans maintained a collective group identity based on their African origins, while concurrently borrowing and melding new cultural traits from the Euro-American and Native American groups, which resulted in a new creolized cultural identity (Herskovitz 1990:145; Mintz and Price 1976). Therefore, slaves could have placed new meanings on the Euro-American material goods they acquired. Interactions may have carried different meanings depending on the context. Further, how individuals acquired their material culture would have influenced the meanings it held (Potter 1992:122; Orser 1988:740-741). A Colonoware vessel would have held very different meanings depending on its context and interactions within production, distribution, and consumption.

Identity is individualized according to ones experiences resulting in a variety of African-American identities, while concurrently maintaining a shared set of doxa among African-American individuals (Hecht et al. 2003; Robb 2001; Orser 1998:68, 74). Scholarly research has illustrated how the enslaved used their material culture in an attempt to express their individuality and solidarity. African American slaves were able to symbolically maintain and create their identities through material items like clothing, and ceramics (Heath 1999; Ferguson 1999, 1992, 1991; Groover 1994; Cohen 1985; among others). My research will look at how Lowcountry slaves developed and maintained their internal economy, and used the material goods acquired within it to better their standard of living and create their own cultural identity.

Through an analysis of the goods slaves acquired within their internal economy,

including Colonoware, we can gain insight into how they added meaning and comfort to their lives. As slavery progressed, slaves had to continually strive to survive and maintain their economy; it is within their struggle that we can gain insight into their worldviews. Despite the fact that their actions helped to perpetuate their oppression, slaves were able to benefit from their creative and industrious efforts. During slavery, their actions helped the slaves better their standard of living and add meaning to their lives. After emancipation, Lowcountry freedmen used the skills acquired during slavery to be more self-sufficient than in any other Southern state. Freedmen made every effort to maintain the right to obtain land, and control what crops they grew and how they grew them. By applying the theoretical framework of "agency" theory, we can gain insight into how slaves actively expressed their values, protected themselves from the harshness of slavery, and the long-term effects of their social and economic endeavors.

It has already been demonstrated how Colonoware, as a part of slave culture, was used as a coping device to adjust to and resist against the dominant European culture (Ferguson 1992). My Colonoware analysis will look to see how the Colonoware used in Charleston, South Carolina by enslaved Africans differs from that used in rural contexts. Further research into the relationship between the markets and Colonoware will help us to better interpret slave culture, which in turn helps us to understand how slaves made sense of their world on a day-to-day basis.

Chapter 2: The Development of the Slave System in the Lowcountry

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LOWCOUNTRY SLAVE SYSTEM

Historical research has shown that the structure of the labor system greatly affected the power and social relations between the planter class and their slaves (Morgan 1982; Hudson 1989; Mintz and Price 1976; Genovese 1974). Every slave society developed differently according to its own particular history, and these differences affected the social, political, and cultural interactions within each society. Scholars have shown that the slaves created their own internal marketing system within most slave societies (Morris 1998; Wood, B. 1995; McDonald 1991; Berlin and Morgan 1991; Hudson 1989; McD. Beckles 1989; Morgan 1982; Mintz and Price 1976). The creation and maintenance of such systems was affected and shaped by the slave society's own particular historical development. The internal marketing system in the South Carolina Lowcountry was unique in that it was more extensive than elsewhere in North America, and it allowed Lowcountry slaves to be more self-sufficient post-emancipation than freedmen elsewhere in the South (Morris 1998:1007; King 1985:158; Morgan 1983:418-420; Morgan 1982:598; Berlin and Morgan 1991). The following chapter discusses the development of the slaves' internal economy in the Lowcountry in order to gain more insight into how they used it to better their lives both during and after slavery.

Yeoman Farming in Seventeenth Century South Carolina

During the seventeenth century, British, Dutch, French Huguenot, Scottish, and Scotch-Irish colonizers from Barbados settled in South Carolina (Berlin 1998:65-66). They engaged in small-scale agriculture, timbering, naval supply, and animal husbandry. These first settlers did not rely solely on African slave labor, but also used indentured servants and several thousand Native American slaves (Berlin 1998:66; Wood 1996:115; Rosengarten 1986:42-47). Due to the small number of slaves and the rugged terrain, a unique, closer relationship between planter and slave developed, referred to as "sawbuck equality" (Berlin 1998:66; Wood 1996:97). During this time the planters and slaves labored side by side, creating a relationship based more on cooperation than dominance, as if they were on either side of a sawbuck, making the distinctions of status and color less recognizable (Berlin 1998:66; Wood 1996:97). The planters and slaves not only worked alongside one another, but also shared the same diet, dress, and material culture (Rosengarten 1986:48). This allowed seventeenth century slaves a greater degree of freedom within their situation. Because of the small number of slaves on these first plantations, labor was not divided into specialized tasks, and slaves were not separated into artisans and field hands, but instead they were used in all parts of work. Slaves became knowledgeable of all aspects of work on the plantations and were essentially “jacks-of-all-trades” (Berlin 1998:68; Wood 1996:104). Unlike later times, when docile obedience and dependence were merited qualities in a slave, the pioneering planters sought out slaves that were skilled and self-sufficient (Wood 1996:105).

Both the African and Native American’s were relied on for their hunting skills and their knowledge of the flora and fauna, which made them favorable scouts in the

wilderness. An account from 1726 shows a planter relying on his slaves for the collection and cultivation of plants that would attract cochineal beetles, which were used in making red dyes (Morgan 1998:141; Wood 1996:121). Slaves that were particularly knowledgeable about the flora were depended on for providing medicines and were used as doctors. Some slaves were freed and awarded pensions for their medical expertise. A South Carolina slave provided the whites with an antidote to poison, for which he was freed and given a pension of 100 pounds each year (Wood 1996:289). Charleston hatters paid slaves two shillings, six pence for fox and raccoon skins. Slaves were also rewarded for the capture of Native Americans, either alive or dead (Wood 1996:207). A runaway slave advertisement from September 30, 1761, describes a slave, Emanuel, who was "well known in Charles Towne having been patron of a boat upwards of twenty years," lending evidence to the established use of slaves as scouts and transporters (*Charleston Gazette* 1761). African slaves were used as guides, mail carriers, and significantly transporters of goods to the markets (Wood 1996:117-118).

The planters who focused on raising cattle allowed the cattle to roam freely in the woods. This gave the slaves greater autonomy in that there was a low level of supervision and they were able to become more familiar with the land (Berlin 1998: 68). The structure of these early plantations allowed slaves to have more control over their work, in that they were able to "set the pace of work, defin[e] standards of workmanship, and divid[e] labor among themselves, doubtless leaving a great measure of time for their own use," which would have given them somewhat of an upper hand (Berlin 1998:68).

This closer relationship was reinforced further due to the threat of attacks and the creation of maroon societies. The threats from the Spanish colonies in Florida, the

French in Mobile, Native American groups, and Atlantic pirates resulted in planters arming their slaves and even employing them in the militia (Berlin 1998:66; Wood 1996:96, 125). Slaves were noted for their skills with the gun and lance. In 1708, it was stated that any slave that killed an enemy in battle would be freed, and several slaves are known to have received their freedom in this manner (Wood 1996:126). Only a small number of slaves were freed for their military duties, which were often from non-combat services (Koger 1985:33-34). Cattle rearing enabled the slaves to learn the terrain and work in all areas of labor on a plantation, giving them the opportunity to run away and establish their own maroon societies. Although conditions in maroon societies were harsh, the mere fact that they existed caused planters to discourage the use of harsh punishments on their slaves (Berlin 1998:67).

The Beginning of the Slaves' Internal Economy

The early planters also encouraged slaves to provide for themselves through growing foods in gardens, raising animals, hunting, and fishing (Berlin 1998:68-69). By 1820 it was common for South Carolina planters to allot their slaves land of their own to cultivate (Hudson 1989:22). Some researchers see the use of slave gardens as a form of social control over, or further exploitation of, the slaves. Through the use of these gardens, the planters were able to reduce expenses, increase morale, and bind slaves to the system (Singleton 1995:129-130; Morris 1998:996-1006). Planters felt that gardens would supplement their slaves' diet at little cost to them and would create a psychological attachment to the plantation making them less likely to run away (Crane 1993:125; Singleton 1995:130). Slaves, however, used the foods they grew to create their own

internal marketing system, where they sold their goods to their owners, as well as in the markets.

Due to the shortage of labor in the colony, slaves also established a system of hiring themselves out, in which they would arrange to sell their labor and pay their owner a portion of their earnings in return. Slaves hired themselves out to perform a variety of jobs, including: washing clothes and linens, housekeeping, bricklaying, painting, and serving as sawyers, coopers, porters, and carters (Wood 1996:206-208; Morgan 1982; 579). This system of hiring out allowed slaves to leave the plantations and participate in less supervised activities, which furthered the growth of the slaves' independence (Berlin 1998:69; Wood 1996:205-211; Phillips 1974:17). Hiring out gave slaves the freedom to make their own decisions, travel between the plantations and Charleston, as well as establish relationships, which could have made escape more easy (Crane 1993:125).

While the planter class, as a whole, objected to these activities, it was the individual planters themselves who traded with the slaves and promoted their activities. This was due to the fact that the planters depended upon the slaves for the same qualities of the slaves' character that they also feared; the "knowledge of the countryside and a willingness to hunt down cattle or stand up to Spaniards were precisely the qualities the slaveholders valued in their slaves" (Berlin 1998:69; Littlefield 1991:142). The planters were afraid that the freedom that they permitted their slaves would allow them to gather in groups, and possibly conspire, but they allowed it to continue because of their deep economic reliance on their slaves to fill labor positions easily and cheaply (Berlin 1998:69; Phillips 1974:22). It is due to the imbalance between the Lowcountry's economic and social needs that the system of hiring out was able to continue (Phillips

1974:22).

The Emergence of a Slave Society in Eighteenth Century South Carolina

The eighteenth century saw a decline in the external threats to the colony, and an increase in internal threats with the growing population of African slaves (Wood 1996:130). During the eighteenth century, the introduction of rice changed the structure of the South Carolina Lowcountry plantation system from being less restricted to more rigid. These rice plantations consisted of approximately 60,000 to 70,000 acres of land along the South Carolina and Georgia coast (King 1995:33). The introduction of rice and indigo, and later Sea Island cotton, as staple crops led to the importation of massive numbers of African slaves (Berlin 1998:142-143; Rosengarten 1986:47, 50). With a larger labor force and the unpleasant working conditions of rice and indigo farming, planters now rarely worked alongside their slaves. Planters would spend the summer months in Charleston or elsewhere in order to escape the malarial conditions of the plantation fields (Phillips 1974:9).

Rice is a hardy crop and does not require a regimented labor force to cultivate it. This led to the development of a labor system known as the task system, in which slaves worked in groups in a schedule determined by the growing patterns of the crops and the status of the slave (e.g., full hand, three-quarter hand, half hand) (Morgan 1998:181; Berlin 1998:144-146; Hudson 1989:14-16; Rosengarten 1986:80-81; Phillips 1974:9). In the task system, slaves were required to complete a stated amount of work**,** "so many rows of rice to be sowed, so much grain to be threshed, or so many lines of canal to be cleared," after which they were released for the day (Morgan 1998:179-181; Berlin

1998:153; Rosengarten 1986:80-81). The planters partially used the task system as a way to instill in their slaves a sense of responsibility and pride in their work. By giving slaves the same task throughout the season, they were more likely to be thorough (Morgan 1983:401).

Another important aspect of the task system is that it allowed slaves some control over the length of their workday. Personal accounts suggest that slaves could have completed their tasks between noon and three o'clock. This enabled slaves to escape the sunup to sundown routine, and gave them time to labor for themselves (Morgan 1998:182; Morgan 1982:586). The amount of free time allotted to the slaves was affected by the planter's disposition as well as the type and amount of crop being planted (Hudson 1989:9). It was within this free time that slaves were able to tend to their own crops and livestock, hunt and fish, and produce other crafts (Berlin 1998:153). It is also significant to note that it was firmly understood and expected, by both planter and slave, that the slaves were not to be expected to work for the planter during their free time (Morgan 1982:578). Due to the large population of slaves, planters became more intent on maintaining contentment, rather than obtaining the greatest amount of labor out of their slaves (Phillips 1974:10). Over time, these combined aspects gave slaves the ability to be self-governing (Morgan 1983:402).

In the eighteenth century, African slaves demographically dominated South Carolina. A comment made in 1737 that the colony "'looks more like a negro country than like a country settled by white people'" illustrates the unique situation in the Lowcountry (Wood 1996:132). Within the first two decades of the 18th century, the slave population grew to a proportion of two slaves to every white person. The

Charleston area had a three to one proportion of slaves. It was at this time that the South Carolina plantation system changed from a yeoman farming to a slave system (Berlin 1998:142-146). Due to the uneven ratio of blacks to whites, the planters began to fear insurrection (Berlin 1998:150-152). Slave activities were increasingly controlled as the South Carolina slave system became increasingly racialized (Wood 1996:195). Church leaders tried to end the slaves' provision gardens to ensure that they would attend church on Sundays (Wood 1996:139). The planters' fears led to even harsher treatment of the slaves, and the establishment of absenteeism (Berlin 1998:150-152). This may be a reflection of how increased articulation created more cultural and ideological conflicts. Therefore, as the slave system progressed, more tension arose between the maintenance and negotiation of the planters' and slaves' values and needs. Direct conflict was avoided whenever possible through continual negotiations and compromises (Morris 1998:1003). Planters would have negotiated to try and benefit more from the slaves' internal market, but the very nature of the system was contradictory to their status as slaves; "this system of independent production prompted enterprise, not subservience" (McDonald 1991:205). Thus, the articulation of planter and slave surrounding the internal market is important for understanding how they negotiated such contradictions and appeased any overt conflict.

The planters built urban mansions within the cities and lived in them during the malarial months. However, their separation from the plantation did not mean that they were not involved in its day-to-day activities. They created a system referred to as "paternalism-at-a-distance", in which they were in between absenteeism and paternalism (Berlin 1998:152). Unlike most absentee situations in the Caribbean, these cities were

still within a day's travel of their plantations. The planters were concerned with the activities that were conducted on their plantations, but not to the degree of the Chesapeake planters. The South Carolina planters watched their plantations from a distance, and focused their attention on only a small portion of their slaves. This is in great contrast to the "sawbuck equality" that occurred in the seventeenth century (Berlin 1998:154).

THE DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN SLAVE CULTURE

The movement of the planters into the cities during the eighteenth century created two distinct slave cultures. Rather than the formation of one African American culture, the structure of the South Carolina system created an urban and a rural African American culture (Berlin 1998:154). Some historical accounts lead us to believe that the urban slaves were more accepting of Euro-American culture, since they spoke, dressed, and held similar religious beliefs as the dominant class (Berlin 1998:142). This reflection of urban slaves' acceptance of Euro-American culture does not mean that they were assimilated into the white culture, since the slaves most likely placed different values and meanings on the cultural aspects they accepted. Later in this chapter, I will discuss the ways in which slaves used material culture to express their individuality and their values.

During the eighteenth century, the proportion of blacks to whites in urban settings was relatively equal (Berlin 1998:154-155). Urban slaves interacted closely with whites working as household servants, marketing agents, and artisans. They continued to be hired out, which gave them more autonomy. Slaves were housed in the back rooms or lofts of their planters' mansions, or if they made enough surplus earnings, they were able

to establish their own households separate from those of their owners (Berlin 1998:156-157; Powers 1981:21-22). Charleston slaves that hired themselves out commonly paid the capitation tax that was placed on free blacks, and were frequently listed as free in censuses and other public documents (Johnson 1996:4). This makes any demographic analysis of Charleston very difficult.

The system of hiring out created two distinct groups of urban African American slaves: those who lived with their masters and those who did not (Zierden and Calhoun 1984:51). Those who lived with their masters were in close contact with their master and their family. These slaves were usually always on call to perform tasks and chores for the elite families. Those slaves who were able to live away from their masters had a variety of options for their living quarters, from rooms to houses. Slaves that lived away from their masters were able to gain a little more autonomy and interacted more with other slaves, free blacks, and whites (McInnis 2005:187-191). A discussion of the different living quarters that urban slaves used is provided in chapter three. Both Charleston and New Orleans had the highest number of free black artisans, and property owners than other Southern cities. Charleston free blacks were allowed to own property, a right that was not common in the South (Johnson 1996:3).

During the eighteenth century, slave women continued to control the urban markets, including Charleston (Berlin 1998:157; Wood, B. 1995:84). Urban slave women also controlled their owners' kitchens to the extent that they were the main purchasers of foodstuffs (Berlin 1998:157; Wood 1996:211). Their involvement in the markets could have led them to develop a gendered identity, which the female urban slaves could have used in the formation of their identities (Robb 2001). Slave family

units would work together, with the men butchering animals and catching fish and the women preparing and selling them (Berlin 1998:157). Men sold the butchered meat and breads in the markets (Wood, B. 1995:86). Urban slaves further controlled the market by purchasing foods from rural slaves, and then selling them to the urban whites at higher rates (Wood 1996:210).

This involvement in the market would have allowed the urban Charleston slaves to gain more independence. Not only were they able to gain a surplus that allowed them to obtain goods of material wealth, but they also were able to control a large portion of the foods that were distributed within the cities. They were allowed such freedom because the sale of their fresh foodstuffs did not interfere with the affairs of the white shopkeepers. In fact, the slaves would have helped to financially support the white shopkeepers since they used their surplus income to purchase clothing, fabrics, and utensils from them (Wood, B. 1995:132). Their choices enabled them to create a culture distinct from that of the urban Euro-Americans and at the same time influence the culture of the Euro-Americans.

The freedoms permitted to the Charleston urban slaves allowed them to create a unique social life. They were able to travel more freely and socialize with both whites and blacks, free and enslaved (Berlin 1998:158). Despite laws prohibiting them being out after curfew without a pass, gathering in large groups, and drinking without permission, these laws were often ignored and broken with minimal recourse (Powers 1981:19-21). Slaves established their own businesses, "cookshops, groceries, and taverns to cater to their own people" (Berlin 1998:159). Their economic endeavors allowed them to obtain a great deal of material wealth, which "far exceeded the modest prosperity of

even the most successful slaves in the Chesapeake" (Berlin 1998:159). Some have argued that the urban slaves were slaves only by their title, as they "hir[ed] their own time, liv[ed] apart from their owners, controll[ed] their own family life, ro[de] horses, and brandished pistols, these slaves forcibly and visibly claimed the privileges white men and women reserved for themselves" (Berlin 1998:160). The independence that urban life lent to them gave them the ability to develop their own tastes and preferences.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL SLAVE CULTURE

Rural slaves also developed their own African-American culture within the slave quarters. Unlike their urban counterparts, the rural slaves were slower to accept European cultural traits (Littlefield 1991:157). Berlin (1988:162) argues that despite the fact that planters designed slave quarters into well-regimented rows, slaves were the ones who constructed their buildings and they applied their knowledge of African architectural styles to them. By the mid-eighteenth century, the sex ratio between men and women slaves began to even out. Planters wishing for the benefits of slave reproduction encouraged their slaves to establish families. These families created a social unit that countered the control of the planter—now slaves also showed respect to kin and elders (Berlin 1998:163-164). This also allowed them to create identities based on their kin groups (Roberts 2005; Robb 2001; Smedley 1998:691-692).

Even though the planter ruled from a distance, there were negotiations between planter and slave. Slaves expected the planters to take care of their basic needs, including food, clothing, shelter, and medical care, but they also wanted the right to raise and market their own foods and goods. Since the slaves' internal economy "paralleled,

complimented, and complicated the struggle over the masters' economy," its use continually forced the planters and slaves to negotiate with one another (Berlin 1998:165). The planters were wary of the independence the slaves obtained through their internal economy, but the slaves' gardens made them content and further tied them to the plantation, compelling the planters to continue to permit their use (Berlin 1998:165).

The growth of the rice plantations created a constant influx of large groups of newly arrived African slaves. This allowed rural slave culture to maintain more distinct African qualities, "as reflected in their language, religion, work patterns, plaited hair, filed teeth, and country markings [on their bodies]" (Berlin 1998:173). The large numbers of slaves and the reduced interaction with the planter class resulted in rural slaves being less accepting of Euro-American culture (Berlin 1998:170-171). The structure of the South Carolina slave system permitted the slaves some freedoms and influence**,** which allowed for the rural slaves to develop and maintain their own distinct culture (Berlin 1998:172).

THE SLAVES' INTERNAL ECONOMY

The slaves' internal economy was most prevalent in the South Carolina and Georgia Lowcountry due to the use of the task system. Slaves used their free time and the gardens allotted them to create a surplus of foods and goods in order to make a profit, which they could use to get foods and goods that they themselves were unable to grow, catch, and make. Although the Euro-Americans were always dominant, the planters' economy and slaves' economy were interdependent upon one another (Morris 1998:996-1006). The use of the task system allowed planters to become less involved in their

slaves' daily lives while gaining more control and power over them (Hudson 1997:16). Slaves were able to gain independence in that they were able to decide how to use their own land. The slaves decided on their own what they would plant and rear, how they would plant their crops and raise their livestock, and how they then distributed and sold their crops and livestock (McDonald 1991:205). Slaves were also allowed to express their ideas on spatial organization. An example of this is that it was common in the Lowcountry for slaves to plant sesame at the ends of rows in their garden since they believed it would ward off intruders (Berlin and Morgan 1991:17).

Research into the slaves' internal economy allows historical archaeologists to look at how the slaves expressed their values through the material culture they purchased with their earnings. The slaves' internal economy gave the slaves economic independence from their masters, allowing them to distance themselves from the dominant planter culture and the freedom to develop their own distinct culture (Hudson 1997:17, 20; Berlin and Morgan 1991:1). Therefore, a focus on the slaves' internal economy essentially gives historical archaeologists the opportunity to further understand the development of slave culture in the Lowcountry and the material culture that they used to maintain it.

Historical Evidence of the Slaves' Internal Economy

Evidence for the establishment of the slaves' internal economy within the Lowcountry comes from the repeated attempts to pass laws to stop the slaves' marketing activities. During the eighteenth century, planters wished their slaves to expend their labor more on the staple crop rather than for themselves. Despite their repeated legal

attempts to limit the slaves' economic activities, planters were unable to dismantle the slaves' internal economy and eventually found ways to use it to their own benefit (Morris 1998:997-998). In 1683, a law was passed that made trading between servants and slaves illegal. This law was reestablished in 1687 (Berlin 1998:68). Other laws tried to limit the movement of slaves and to stop whites from trading with them. A 1691 law made giving Saturday afternoons off illegal, which suggests that Saturday was the main marketing day. In 1714, a law made it illegal for slaves to own hogs, cattle, and/or horses. Despite the repeated legal sanctions against the slaves' economic activities, the slaves' internal economy became well established during the eighteenth century (Berlin 1998:68). In fact, a 1740 law stated that slaves would be free to work for themselves on Sundays (Campbell 1991:132). During the nineteenth century the planters began to view the slaves' internal marketing system as a direct insult to their authority and the institution of slavery, resulting in the passing of stricter laws to control the slaves' economic activities. For example, an 1834 law stated that slaves needed their planters' permission to trade with anyone, thus allowing the planters the power to choose to whom slaves sold their goods (Campbell 1991:143-145).

Planters also kept records of the goods that they purchased from their slaves. These accounts show that the amount of money that the slaves were able to obtain was not insignificant. For example, planter James Sparkman showed that in 1858 his slaves received $240, and this amount only reflects the profits from goods traded with the planter, not those traded elsewhere or from hiring themselves out (Hudson 1989:34-35). A Midlands planter paid sixteen slaves $200 for cotton from the slaves' land (Hudson 1989:87). Lowcountry slaves commonly were allotted more land than those in the other

regions of South Carolina, so they may have been able to earn even more. Another planter's account from 1860 states that he paid 15 cents for a dozen eggs, suggesting that a considerable amount of money could be made from raising chickens (Hudson 1989:73).

Further evidence comes from historical accounts of slaves selling their goods in Charleston and other areas of commerce (Berlin 1998:69; Crane 1993:125). In Charleston, slaves sold their goods in the market or through huckstering, where slaves peddled their wares throughout the city streets, a practice which continued into the twentieth century (Zierden 2005:252). A 1772 account tells of slaves selling vegetables (Crane 1993:126). A 1773 article in the *South Carolina Gazette* states that "a large quantity of Earthen ware, etc, was seized from Negro Hawkers," possibly suggesting the sale of slave-produced Colonoware (Morgan 1999:235). An observer in 1778 described seeing sixty-four slave women selling goods in Charleston (Morgan 1999:250). In 1792 Gabriel Manigault wrote that he sent a slave to the Charleston market weekly (Morgan 1999:252). In 1850 Fredrika Bremer discussed how slaves went to market two to three times a week to sell eggs, fowl, and vegetables (Crane 1993:125-126). Historian Philip Morgan found that female slaves marketed "cakes, tarts, bread, milk, garden produce, fruit, and even sand" (Morgan 1999:250; Crane 1993:126). Male slaves were known for marketing fish and butchering livestock (Morgan 1999:251; Crane 1993:127; Wood 1996:201-203). The slaves' familiarity with the streams and swamps and aptitude with canoes allowed them to dominate the fishing market in South Carolina (Wood 1996:123). It also enabled them to travel greater distances to sell their goods, as illustrated in an account of a slave traveling more than fifteen miles through waterways to sell his produce (Morgan 1982:573).

Historical Evidence of What Slaves Produced

The benefits from the internal market varied according to the planters' disposition, as well as the aspirations and physical ability of the slaves themselves. Involvement in the internal market required the slaves to work beyond what was required of them by the planter. The slaves had to be ambitious and hardworking, in order to produce a surplus. Not all slaves had the inclination, or were physically able to participate (Hudson 1989:36).

Historical accounts suggest that the majority of Lowcountry slaves were involved in the internal economy to some degree (Hudson 1997:20). Despite the fact that slaves were themselves property, both planters and slaves understood that the rations distributed to the slaves, and the goods they obtained themselves, were the personal property of the slaves (Morgan 1982:386-387). These accounts also show that even non-skilled slaves had the opportunity to make a substantial amount of profit (Hudson 1997:25). In fact, the Southern Claims Commission, established to repay slaves for goods and property stolen from them during the Civil War, awarded the majority of their claims to field hands rather than skilled laborers, with a large number of the claimants under 35 years old (Morgan 1983:405-407).

Participation in the internal market helped slaves better their condition but did not guarantee their survival (Berlin and Morgan 1991:18-19). Archaeological and historical records have shown many illustrations of the creative and industrious ways in which slaves supplemented their diets and living conditions. The following section details historical evidence of how they used their gardens and the environment to diversify their diets and obtain goods for sale or barter.

Slaves in the Lowcountry had access to the ocean, rivers, and larger cities, thus giving them more opportunity to improve their well-being. Accounts suggest that slaves were allowed a considerable portion of land to cultivate, apparently about a quarter of an acre per slave (Morgan 1999:186-187). In these gardens they grew a variety of plants and vegetables to supplement their diets, including pumpkins, corn, sweet potatoes, Irish potatoes, tomatoes, collards, turnips, peanuts, okra, hot peppers, eggplant, cabbage, beans, peas, cucumber, and watermelons (Rhyne 1999:14, 84; Joyner 1984:95; Anthony 1989:18; Morgan 1982:566; Rawick 1977:134; Genovese 1972:535). Interestingly, historical accounts show that Lowcountry slaves were somehow able to obtain and grow African plants and vegetable in their gardens, such as certain yams, tania, millet, sorghum, sesame, peppers, and okra. These accounts also attest to the planters' knowledge of how important having these traditional foods was to the slaves (Morgan 1998:141). Lowcountry slaves were also able to grow rice, the dominant cash crop in the Lowcountry, on their land (Berlin and Morgan 1991:9). Raising animals further supplemented their diets, with the most common being chickens, other fowl, and hogs (Hudson 1997:118; Anthony 1989:18; Rowland 1987:142). A Works Projects Administration (WPA) narrative from Alex Woodward states that when he was a child he owned a blue hen, showing that even children were able to obtain livestock (Rhyne 1999:62). Raising chickens and fowls was an optimum investment since they were low maintenance and provided continual income through their eggs and the birds (Berlin and Morgan 1991:10).

Slaves fished in the waterways and ocean using wooden hooks, boats, nets, and dams, or simply collected off the shores (Morgan 1998:138; Hudson 1997:118-119).

They also used a method of drugging fish, in which they would construct a dam, apply a mixture of quicklime and plant juices to the water, and then gather the stunned fish (Morgan 1998:138; Wood 1996:122). Slaves were also known to dive for sharks and alligators, killing them with only a knife (Wood 1996:123). Accounts show that Lowcountry slaves caught a variety of fish and shellfish including mullet, whiting, drum, shrimp, oysters, crabs, clams, catfish, stingrays, and turtle (Morgan 1998:139; Hudson 1997:118-119, 135; Singleton 1995:125; Reitz et al. 1985:184). Historical accounts suggest that slaves were able to catch large amounts of fish, from which they could earn enough to support a family. One account states that an expedition caught 1,400 to 1,500 fish all at least three feet long. Another account claims that every ten minutes they caught a twelve to fifteen pound fish (Morgan 1999:241). Most important is the account of a slave named Ishmael, who "passed up ten shillings a day for domestic work in order to fish," showing that he was able to support himself and his significant other solely through fishing (Morgan 1999:241).

The slaves hunted with guns, dogs, or traps to catch possum, raccoon, rabbits, deer, fox, rabbit, squirrel, black bear, geese, ducks, turkey, woodcock, snipe, rice bird, pigeon, plover, and partridges (Rhyne 1999:68, 84; Morgan 1998:138-139; Hudson 1997:118-120; Joyner 1984:100; Rawick 1977:95, 245). An account by ex-slave Ed McCrorey, who was a child during slavery, stated that one of his tasks was to find turkey and guinea nests (Rhyne 1999:102). In his personal account, Rob Perry, who was also a child during slavery, tells of how he caught possum and rabbits without the aid of any tools: "I caught them when the water swelled and the animals came out of the woods to hunt dry land. They couldn't conceal themselves in the open fields, and that is how I

catched [*sic*] them so easy" (Rhyne 1999:7). This account suggests that hunting could at times be a relatively easy task. Another possibility for the slaves was to gather wild foods such as berries, herbs, and honey (Wood, B. 1995:57, 121; Wheaton et al. 1983:308).

With their earnings, slaves also bought goods that they could not harvest or make themselves, such as sugar, coffee, tea, tobacco, flour, liquor, fabric, clothing, and utensils (Hudson 1997:118; Wood, B. 1995:57; Anthony 1989:18). However, some accounts suggest that a few Lowcountry slaves planted sugar and tobacco (Morgan 1982:566). A few slave narratives suggest that children were allowed to spend the money they earned doing tasks beyond those helping the family unit; they often bought items such as candy and firecrackers with the extra money (Rhyne 1999:77, 88).

From the great variety of options open to them, even less-physically fit slaves had the opportunity to supplement their diet. Some of these options would have required a great deal of skill, while others would have been relatively simple. For example, setting traps, picking berries, and picking up crabs and shellfish off the beach are relatively low-cost activities. This means that even children and the elderly had an opportunity to participate in the internal market and to obtain goods that were not provided by the planter (Hudson 1997:32-33; Morgan 1983:402-403). One WPA slave narrative from Alexander Scaife states that when he was a child he would receive a nickel for polishing shoes (Rhyne 1999:80). A narrative from Sam Mitchell states that boys and the old men watched the cows; and they would have most likely have also been in charge of watching the livestock that the family themselves owned (Ryhne 1999:107). In her account, ex-slave Lina Anne Pendergrass states that when she was a young girl, she was paid by the

slaves for her nursing skills (Rhyne 1999:6). Slaves also picked Spanish moss, which they sold to Charleston upholsterers for stuffing (Morgan 1999:362). Henry Brown from Big Island remembers that during the winter, he and his siblings would pick the seed out of the cotton, which was most likely from their family's crop, every night until ten o'clock (Hudson 1989:79).

Historical Evidence of How the Slaves Used Their Profits

Planter records can be used to study how slave families spent their money, allowing us to see what they placed importance on. From such analyses we can better understand their individual choices and strategies. We can also gain insight into what items they desired, and it is within these items that the slaves were able to find some comfort and protection from the harshness of slavery (Morris 1998:999; Hudson 1989:67-69). We should not view the items they purchased as a representation of their acceptance of the dominant white culture's ideals and worldviews. Instead, the slaves then used these material items in their resistance to the dominant planter class and the maintenance of their own cultural ideals (Robb 2001; Singleton 1995:7; Morris 1998:999; Orser 1998:77; Howsen 1990). There is a great deal of evidence that the slaves valued cooperation and non-economic activities that benefited the community as a whole (Morris 1998:999). By focusing on the goods slaves chose to purchase with their profits, historical archaeologists can better understand how slaves created a world separate from the dominant planter class and shielded themselves from slavery.

Another important aspect of the slaves' internal market was that it allowed some slaves to purchase their freedom. An account from 1788 tells of a slave purchasing his

freedom through the sale of three of his horses (Morgan: 1982:580). A 1728 account details the impressive, but most likely uncommon, practice of a slave purchasing his own slave, whom he then bartered to his owner in exchange for his own freedom (Morgan 1982:574-575).

The material items that the slaves purchased were used not only to separate themselves from the planter class, but to also express their own individuality, wealth, and alliances with their countrymen. Slaves used their expensive purchases as a means to express their individual tastes, to display their wealth, and to illustrate their specific African cultural origins. Historical accounts concerning the slaves' clothing and looks further illustrate the importance of wealth and social identity among Lowcountry slaves. Slaves used finer clothing to help convey their individuality and wealth (Wood, B. 1995:134; Genovese 1972:559). Money obtained from their involvement in the internal economy could have been used to buy clothing and jewelry. Those who were able to obtain nicer clothing were seen as more economically sound and would also have a better chance of catching their suitor's eye. The quality of one's shoes was an important factor in demonstrating wealth through dress (Hudson 1997:155). Furthermore, slaves often used the color of their clothing to express their individuality or group identities (Heath 1999:54).

The Negro Act of 1735 stated that slaves were only allowed to wear clothes made from inexpensive cloth (Wood 1996:232). The South Carolina slave code of 1740 stated that slaves were only allowed to wear coarse clothing, with the exception of their work clothes. These clothing laws, however, were never adhered to and in the 1840's they were deemed unenforceable (Genovese 1972:559). A visitor to Charleston accounted

that well dressed slaves made fun of the dress of the poor whites (Powers 1981:18). Slaves used clothing, jewelry and hairstyles to set themselves apart from each other, as well as to illustrate their association with distinct cultural groups (Wood, B. 1995:61; Littlefield 1991; Cohen 1985; Mintz and Price 1976:26). Slaves used their clothing as a symbolic representation of their distinct cultural identities (Cohen 1985:13). The most common clothing items that slaves purchased were fabric, ribbons, and beads (Heath 1999:50). It is in this way that their involvement in the internal marketing system allowed them to express their "dignity, pride, and self-worth," and thus helped them to add meaning to their lives and endeavors (Wood, B. 1995:61).

Slaves also used the ownership of horses as a symbol of wealth. An 1873 account from ex-slave Leah Wilson describes how she felt more prestigious because she was able to go to church on a horse, just like her master (Morgan 1982:594). In 1862, Edward Philbrick stated that a horse was a slaves' "'badge of power and caste'" and that respect was paid to those with horses (Morgan 1982:594). Historical accounts show that Lowcountry slaves purchased horses with prices of $530-plus, $200, and $150 (Hudson 1997:22-25). Robert Bryant, a slave from Beaufort County, was able to buy a mule for $167 (Hudson 1997:24). The ownership of horses by slaves did not seem to be rare in the Lowcountry (Morgan 1983:412). Horses and mules would have been a very important factor in determining the potential economic earnings of slaves. A horse allowed a slave to work a larger area of land and made it easier to get to the markets, to family on other plantations, and to get-togethers. Slaves could have also hired out their buggies and horses, making additional cash off their property (Morgan 1983:410).

There are several means by which a slave could acquire horses and mules: they

could have saved up their money over time, or they could have been given one and worked off the price through performing extra labor, or selling their produce and goods to their owner (Hudson 1997:22-24). The latter would have allowed slaves that did not have a large area of land to work the ability to obtain a horse or mule, thus giving them the ability to become more productive and earn more. Ex-slave John Bacon described, in his claim to the Southern Claims Commission, the industrious method by which he obtained a horse:

> I had a little crop to sell and bought some chickens and then I bought a fine large sow and gave $10.00 for her. This was about ten years before the war and then I raised hogs and sold them until I bought a horse. This was about eight years before freedom. This was a breeding mare and from this I raised this horse which the Yankees took from me. (in Morgan 1983:413).

This shows how slaves starting out with only a small crop could make enough profit to buy a horse within just a few years.

Further evidence for classification among slaves comes from accounts suggesting that they maintained strong ties to their origins. Therefore, another factor to consider in the social relations of slaves was the maintenance of their original African traditions. Slaves would have used expressions of their African heritage as a means of resisting the dominant white culture illustrating their own cultural identity, thus offering a different perspective on time, work, and status (Hecht et al. 2003; Robb 2001; Ferguson 1999, 1992, 1991; Heath 1999; Morris 1998:1004; Orser 1998:68, 74). Historical research has found that slaves continued to identify with their countrymen. Littlefield researched newspaper accounts on runaways, showing that even the planters were aware of and could distinguish between the differing African groups (1991:115-117, 173). These differing African groups would have adjusted to their captive lives in varied ways and

rates (Littlefield 1991:151, 158-160). Due to the planters specifically choosing slaves from particular areas, and a constant influx of new arrivals, even into the early nineteenth century, Charleston urban slaves maintained a strong African ethnic consciousness (Littlefield 1991:30-34; Powers 1981:32-33). Charleston female slaves from St. Domingo set themselves apart by their fine dresses and by tying colored handkerchiefs on their heads (Powers 1981:17-18) (Figure 7). In this the urban slaves' use of clothing can be seen as a "genre of action" in that they used their material culture to distinguish their solidarity (Robb 2001).

Insurrections were divided into companies according to the ethnic affiliation of the slaves. Those who were apprehensive about joining rebellions were coerced through the threat of losing the support of their countrymen (Powers 1981:33). The majority of the slaves involved in the 1739 Stono Rebellion were Angolan (Wood 1996:320). Some historical accounts suggest that groups who were enemies in Africa maintained some angst toward one another. An example of this comes from one observer who recorded the taunts between Angolans and Igbos, "'You be Gulli Niga, what be the use of you, you be good for nothing.' The other will reply 'You be Iba Niga, Iba Niga great 'askal [rascal]" (Morgan 1999:458). Even though slaves cooperated with one another, they maintained their individuality and continued to identify with their countrymen.

DISCUSSION

The structure and development of the plantation society in South Carolina shaped the relations between planter and slave, and between rural and urban slave culture. The yeoman structure of the initial settlement allowed for the development of less restrictive

relationships. The onset of the slave society in the eighteenth century caused stricter and more distinct divisions between free and unfree. However, the freedoms allowed to the earlier generation of slaves gave the eighteenth century slaves a slight advantage and allowed them to negotiate with the planters. Therefore, the structure of the initial settlement influenced the later generations. Even with the development of a more racialized slavery, the slaves and planters maintained a dialectical relationship where each influenced the other. This relationship is best exemplified by John B. Adger, a Charleston minister: "'…they belong to us. We also belong to them. They are divided out among us and mingled up with us and we with them in a thousand ways'" (Powers 1981:2).

African American slaves utilized these dialectical relationships that were constructed during the initial settlement of South Carolina to their own benefit. They realized the planters' dependence upon them and used it to their advantage whenever possible. Working within the confines of the formal slave economy, the slaves were able to creatively use the opportunities and advantages allowed them to increase their standard of living. Slaves expected to have the right to grow and obtain their own foods and other necessities. These were then used in the continuance of their own culture, separate from that of their owners. They used the internal market to buy material goods that they desired and that expressed their values. It was the slaves' diligence and creativity that allowed them to use the internal market to add meaning and purpose to their lives in captivity. African Americans used the market items in the construction of their own distinct cultural identity. The greater the frequency of articulation, the more the slaves' symbols, ideologies, and worldviews would have conflicted with those of the dominant

white culture, resulting in a stronger, more distinct slave culture (Morris 1998:1004). Through looking at how they mediated their interactions with one another through their economic endeavors, we can gain a better understanding of the experience of slavery in South Carolina. The internal marketing system was an important part of the structure and development of slave culture in the Lowcounty. Urban slaves used material goods to express their own individuality, wealth, and cultural identities. Colonoware may have also been a marketed good. By looking at the role of Colonoware within the internal marketing system, historical archaeologists will be able to better understand the economic and cultural value Colonoware held in Lowcountry slave culture.

Chapter 3: Charleston Historical Background

In order to better understand the economic and historical context of the Colonoware assemblages within my analysis, I provide a brief discussion of the economic development of Charleston, with a focus on the economy, social structure, and slavery. I then give an historical overview of each site within my analysis. Whenever possible, I include information on the lives of the urban slaves that worked and/or resided at the gentry houses, and thus, would have been the consumers of the Colonoware from those sites.

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF CHARLESTON

The British settlement of Charles Towne was established in 1670 on Albemarle Point under a proprietary government. The original settlement comprised approximately ten acres surrounded by a double-palisaded wall (Saunders 2002:199). In 1681 the settlement was moved to Oyster Point, where Charleston is currently located, consisting of 300 acres from the point to Beaufain Street (Joseph and Zierden 2002:3; Zierden and Calhoun 1984:109). By 1690 they had begun cultivating rice and to establish naval stores (Zierden and Calhoun 1984). The original plan for the city at Oyster Point is known as the Grand Modell, which divided the city into long, thin lots with a common square (Saunders 2002:200-201). In an attempt to fortify the city against attacks from the Spanish, French, Native Americans, and pirates, Charleston was built as a walled city with a brick fortification along the ocean and an interior wall surrounded by a moat. The

fortification was completed sometime between 1704 and 1706 (Zierden and Calhoun 1984).

Rice cultivation proved to be very profitable, and the colony began to flourish. The increased wealth of the colony led to the establishment of artisans, craftsmen, merchants, and professionals. Charleston was especially known for its cabinetmakers and silversmiths. Due to the colonists' revolt in 1729, royal rule was implemented in place of the proprietary government. Instead of returning to England with their money, the new merchant class began to stay in Charleston and contribute to the local economy; as a result the planters and merchants became the social elite. During the 1730s, the limits of Charleston expanded to the west and beyond the city walls. The merchant district was located along Bay Street, Broad Street, Elliot Street, and Tradd Street (Zierden and Calhoun 1984). By the 1760s Charleston's involvement in rice cultivation led to a prosperous economy. Charleston was the wealthiest city in the American colonies and one of the largest commercial centers (Joseph and Zierden 2002: 3). To escape the malarial conditions on their plantations, planters established grand urban homes in Charleston. These homes were used as an outward reflection of the planters' wealth (Zierden and Calhoun 1984).

Charleston's social hierarchy was greatly influenced by English culture. The majority of the gentry class was educated in England, in fact, more than in any other state. Prior to the Revolutionary War, Charleston's elite was comprised of both planters and merchants. However, antebellum Charleston had two distinct classes of elite: planters (the aristocracy), and merchants (McInnis 2005:24-25). Charleston's social system was not only rigidly hierarchical, but also widely accepted, in that "both outsiders

and Charlestonians spoke openly of the city's aristocracy" (McInnis 2005:24). The aristocratic class consisted solely of the planters and their families. One received this privileged status only through birthright or family association; the elite were almost never self-made. The merchant class, although powerful and wealthy, were considered lower in the social hierarchy. Below the merchant class on the social ladder were the white and free African American laborers, mechanics, and artisans. Although slaves were the lowest hierarchical class, they comprised a large portion of the population (McInnis 2005:24-26). As in other cities with large number of African American residents, Charleston developed a three-tiered social hierarchy within the African American population. Charleston's system was similar to that of the West Indies in that it gave higher ranking to lighter skinned free African Americans, then the other free African Americans, with slaves holding the lowest social rank (Johnson 1996:3-4). It is unknown how the African American population truly identified themselves; therefore, this social hierarchy is only a reflection of the social rank that was imposed on them by the dominant Euro-American class.

Charleston's social hierarchy is significant in that, unlike elsewhere in the colonies, the wealth and power was controlled by a very small number of people; "throughout the antebellum period, the top 4 percent of the population controlled more than 50 percent of the city's wealth, while the bottom half of free society possessed no wealth whatsoever" (McInnis 2005:28). The elite class were planters, and therefore, the social order was demarcated by slavery and its perpetuation. High status was given to those who inherited it, rather than through hard work (McInnis 2005:28-29).

Also important to consider, but not of major importance to the sites within my

analysis, is that Charleston had a large free African American population. In 1790, there were 1,801 free African Americans in South Carolina. This number increased drastically by 1800, to 3,185 free African Americans. By 1820, slaveowners lost the power to free their slaves, and so the growth in the free population is very small (Koger 1985:34-35). In 1860, the free African American community consisted of 3,237 individuals, or 18.8 percent, of the total African American population in Charleston (Johnson 1996:4, 108). Despite the fact that these free African Americans tried to maintain their status as higher than that of the enslaved, they also interacted closely with slaves, owned slaves themselves, and even married slaves (Koger 1985). These interactions blur the distinctions between free and enslaved, and illustrate how difficult it is to gain a complete understanding of the African American experience in Charleston. Further studies that include information on both the free and enslaved Charleston African Americans will help us to better understand the development of Charleston's African American community.

During the Revolutionary War, the British occupied Charleston from 1780 to 1782. In 1783 Charleston was divided into wards, allowing for easier management and greater security of the growing city. Charleston's economic success led to increased expansion, causing the mercantile class to become dispersed throughout the city. East Bay Street remained the economic center, but now only the elite merchants could afford to establish their shops there (Zierden and Calhoun 1984). Charleston's economic centers spread to King Street north of Broad Street (McInnis 2005:194). During the early nineteenth century, Charleston's economy began to wane. The economic lull was due to decreased foreign commerce, some of the elite moving westward, and a resistance to

industrialization. This lull was short lived, and in the 1840s cotton prices began to rise and the Charleston economy flourished once again (Rosengarten 1986:89). Industrialization during the nineteenth century led to the development of commercial enterprises in the area known as the Charleston Neck, lying between Calhoun and Line streets (Zierden 2001:2-20).

SLAVERY IN CHARLESTON

Urban slaves had a greater opportunity to interact closely with other African Americans and whites than did plantation slaves (McInnis 2005:68). Historical evidence suggests that as a result of this close interaction with Euro-Americans, the urban slaves were more outwardly accepting of European culture, but they most likely valued the aspects they adopted in different ways than the dominant white society (Berlin 1998:142). The majority of Charleston slaves were employed as household servants: "according to the city census of 1848, 72 percent of adult slaves served [as domestics]" (McInnis 2005:68). Planters spent only part of the year in their urban homes. They came to Charleston during the summer months to escape the malarial conditions on the plantations, and from January through March they also socialized a great deal in town (McInnis 2005:243). Charleston urban slaves were also employed as artisans and marketing agents (Berlin 1998:156-157; Powers 1981:21-22). As I stated in Chapter 2, the system of hiring out in Charleston created two classes of urban slaves: those who lived with their masters and those who did not (Zierden and Calhoun 1984:51). Slaves who lived away from their masters enjoyed more autonomy and freedom, and they were more likely to interact with the white population than were plantation slaves (McInnis

2005:189).

Those who lived with their masters were in very close contact with them. Charleston's residential house lots, consisting of the main house and its outbuildings, remained quite similar throughout time. These lots have been likened to a compound, with its structures surrounded by a large wall (Zierden and Calhoun 1984:51). The outbuildings consisted of a detached kitchen with slave quarters above, and a carriage house or stable. Some house lots also had chicken coops, dairies, and privies. The yard was commonly divided into an ornamental garden and a work yard (McInnis 2005:38). The slave quarters on the gentry house lots were better constructed and more refined than those on plantations; "instead of roughly hewn boards, wooden partitions were typically made of neatly sawn and beaded boards, and many quarters have lath and plaster walls" (McInnis 2005:187-188). Although these structures had a higher quality of construction, the slaves were forced to reside and eat together in one building instead of having separate quarters. Another variation from plantation slaves is that urban slaves had to eat from their master's kitchen (McInnis 2005:188). This may have increased the quality of their food, but it may also have limited their African American culinary influences.

The residences of slaves who lived out were determined largely by the amount of money they were able to make. These slaves lived in a variety of places including shacks, tenements, or living quarters on the Charleston Neck (Zierden and Calhoun 1984:51). Tenement housing within Charleston was usually located in the back of commercial lots (McInnis 2005:193). An 1861 census shows that seven percent (n=447) of the households in Charleston were occupied by slaves living out. These households most likely consisted of several slaves, suggesting that the number of slaves living out

was even larger (McInnis 2005:189). Many slaves preferred to live in Charleston Neck because the property was cheaper and it was outside the city, which would have given them more freedom. In 1838 a Charleston city ordinance prohibited wooden structures within the city limits because they were a fire hazard. This resulted in a large influx of Charleston residents, many being free and enslaved African Americans, into the Charleston Neck area (McInnis 2005:190). Buildings in the Charleston Neck tended to be either large tenements or clusters of two-story clapboard single houses. Charleston Neck had a variety of occupants, "whites, free persons of color, and slaves" (McInnis 2005:190). Some areas were occupied solely by free and enslaved African Americans; this allowed the slaves residing there to intermingle with little white supervision, and to develop their own distinct culture (McInnis 2005:190-191).

Typically, urban slaves spent the majority of their lives in the work yards of the urban houses. These areas tended to be rather dirty and cluttered since these areas were used for the slaves' daily work, to house the animals (which included horses, cows, pigs, chickens, and other fowl), and for storage (McInnis 2005:173-174). Owners tried to strictly regulate the slaves' behaviors, so the outbuildings on the house lots tend to be areas where the power of both master and slave were exerted and negotiated (McInnis 2005:163). House lots were organized so that the world of the owners was kept separate from that of the slaves, with the service buildings serving as places where slaves could interact with one another. Although these spaces were segregated, the owners were always able to watch over the activities of their slaves (McInnis 2005:177). By the late eighteenth century the architecture of the kitchen buildings changed so that there was a separate entrance for the slave quarters, which allowed the owners to more closely watch

their slaves' daily activities. However, this also allowed the slave quarters to be separated from the smoke and heat of the kitchen and washroom (McInnis 2005:172). In an attempt to further control their slaves' behavior, eighteenth century owners changed existing buildings or built new slave quarters without windows overlooking neighboring house lots. Thus, they further segregated their slaves' activities (McInnis 2005:182).

The majority of Charleston slaves were household servants, thus most of Charleston's urban slaves' daily lives were spent completing household chores. The elite households had an unusually high number of slaves. In 1848 there were less than 3,000 households in Charleston, and more than 5,000 of the 10,000 Charleston slaves were listed as household servants. Historical accounts suggest that the gentry households commonly had over twelve domestic slaves. Some planters moved not only their house servants, but also their servants' families so that they would not be separated for a large portion of the year. An historical account from the Weston family states that they moved fifty slaves with them to town, consisting of their house servants and their spouses and children. Other slaves were not so fortunate and would have been separated from their families for half the year. As I stated earlier, a rigid social hierarchy ruled Charleston, and the gentry class saw labor as being beneath them. This meant that the household servants could be called on at all times (McInnis 2005:242-244).

An account of the daily chores of household servants can be found in the diary of Mary Pringle, an antebellum resident of the Miles Brewton House, one of my test sites. The following synopsis details common duties of the Charleston domestic servants. One of the most important domestic slaves was the cook, for they not only provided the daily meals, but also the elaborate entertainment that the urban elite used as a symbol of their

wealth and power. The cook was in charge of preparing the meals for both the planter and the other slaves. This entailed all of the prep work of shopping at the markets, and killing and cleaning livestock. Cooks usually had one or two assistants. Cooks were able to spend the majority of their day away from the constant watch of the elite, for the kitchens were detached from the main house, and the majority of their company consisted of other slaves (McInnis 2005:252-254). The butler usually supervised the other household slaves (McInnis 2005:258). At the Miles Brewton House, the butler was in charge of overseeing dining and entertainment; "he was well versed in the rituals of refinement, such as how to set a table, how to prepare the evening tea, and how to care for the finest objects; for example, he was placed in charge of the family's valuable silver, china, and glass" (McInnis 2005:258). The butler's assistants were known as footmen and were always on call to take care of the families, as well as any visitors' needs. The footmen were also put in charge of the upkeep of an area of the house. Stable hands cared for the horses and cattle. Coachman served as drivers and were in charge of the maintenance of the carriages. Gardeners cared for the elaborate gardens, and sometimes had assistants. Seamstresses were in charge of making clothing for the other slaves, the planter's family, and any other needed supplies or repairs. Personal servants were always on call and performed a large variety of chores including lighting fires, dressing and grooming their owners, and acting as chambermaids. Nurses cared for the planter's children. Slave children usually helped other slaves with their tasks as a means of training (McInnis 2005:260-263).

During the eighteenth century, the proportion of African Americans to whites in urban settings was relatively equal (Berlin 1998:154-155). Because slaves comprised a

large portion of the population in Charleston, strict laws were passed in an attempt to control their activities. An 1806 law stated that slaves were not allowed to smoke cigars and pipes or carry canes in public (McInnis 2005:68). Since these items signified status, this law was an attempt to stop slaves from openly displaying any status or wealth they may have acquired. Both free and enslaved African Americans were expected to give whites the right-of-way on the sidewalk. In 1819 another law stated that slaves were not allowed to have loud conversations in public (McInnis 2005:68). In the nineteenth century, slaves who were hired out were required to annually purchase and wear slave badges. Issued by the city, these badges made it possible to distinguish slaves from runaways and free African Americans. Multiple attempts were made to stop the practices of hiring out and living out, but they were futile (McInnis 2005:69-70).

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF COMPARATIVE SITES

The following section gives a brief history for each of the comparative sites used within the Colonoware analysis. This history details the different occupations that occurred at each site. Whenever possible, any historical evidence of the enslaved inhabitants is provided. These histories are meant to help in understanding the different social and historical contexts that occurred at each site. In no way have I attempted to link the slaves discussed below to the Colonoware or other artifacts found at the sites I analyzed.

Plantation sites are large and have many separate buildings, allowing for clearly separated occupation and activity areas. The urban house lots were small, confined areas where the discarded material remains from all inhabitants were combined together. As

illustrated above, the urban slaves were housed in multi-purpose structures. The mixed and complex nature of urban archaeological contexts makes it almost impossible to discern exactly who from each occupational phase, Euro-American or enslaved, used the recovered artifacts. Any historical data supplied on the enslaved inhabitants of the comparative sites is for the purpose of adding diversity to the historical record. The historical literature states that the story of Charleston is just as much about the enslaved inhabitants as it is the elite planters and other Euro-Americans that lived and interacted there.

Beef Market

The Charleston Beef Market site is located at the northeastern corner of Meeting and Broad streets in Charleston, South Carolina. The Beef Market is the location of the city's oldest market, established in 1692. The early Beef Market was informal and had no structure. By 1739 the expanding city needed a more formal market building, and so a large brick structure was constructed for the Beef Market. This structure was referred to in 1744 as "only a low dirty looking brick market house for beef" (in Calhoun et al. 1984:15). In 1760, a new market building was constructed and was described as a "neat building, supported by brick arches, and surmounted by a belfry" (in Calhoun et al. 1984:15). Also in 1760, two new market squares were added to Charleston (one for fish and another general market) and the main market was officially called the Beef Market. Although it was deemed the Beef Market the archaeological research has shown that a great deal of wild game, including fish, was sold there as well. The amount of wild game seems to increase in the eighteenth century, and may be reflective of African American

influences on the markets, since they were the main sources for obtaining wild game (Calhoun et al. 1984:7-19).

The Beef Market was destroyed in 1796 by a fire. By this time, the area of Broad and Meeting streets had become a more upper-class establishment, with elite housing nearby and St. Michael's Church becoming more prestigious. Therefore, the city wanted to move market activities elsewhere, and in 1800 the City Council of Charleston sold the property to the Bank of the United States. In 1818 the site became City Hall Square and the location of city government, which is still located there today (Calhoun et al. 1984:7-19).

14 Legare Street

14 Legare Street is located west of the original walled city of Charles Towne. The land was included in the original plan for Charleston and was granted to Richard Phillips in 1694. He died shortly afterwards, and the house was passed along to a number of individuals, most being wealthy merchants and planters. During the Revolutionary War, the property was owned by artisans. In 1765 the southern portion was purchased by Thomas Elfe, a cabinetmaker, Charleston's most successful and famous artisan. It was later owned by carpenters John Fullerton, William Miller, and Benjamin Wilkins. In 1786 it was purchased by John McPherson, a wealthy planter (Zierden 2001a:2-7 – 2-13).

By the late eighteenth century Legare Street was becoming a prestigious place of development for wealthy planters. The lot was once again passed among several owners, who were now wealthy planters. In 1800, Francis Simmons purchased the property and built the brick Charleston single house and outbuildings that are there today. This is the

first known house on this lot. At this time, it is believed that trash from the adjacent property of Miles Brewton (whose assemblage I also analyzed) was used to fill in low-lying areas of the Legare Street lot, and therefore, do account for some of the eighteenth century deposits. George Edwards acquired 14 Legare Street in 1816. In 1818, Edwards also purchased the adjoining Lot 12, on which he built elaborate formal gardens. Edwards sold the property in 1835. William Henry Heyward, a planter on the Combahee River, pruchased the lot in 1841. Heyward owned the property until 1863, when it again was passed from owner to owner, sometimes lying vacant for several years. In 1879, the lot was passed to J. Adger Smythe, whose family resided there until his death in 1920. Smythe converted the formal garden into a lawn, and constructed a pleasure garden in the rear of the lot (Zierden 2001a:2-15 – 2-23).

Miles Brewton House

The Miles Brewton House is located at 27 King Street, on the lower end of King Street outside of the original walled city. The lot was first granted in 1694 to John Jones, a gunsmith, who owned the property until 1731. It was passed along to several owners until 1732, when it was sold to Miles Brewton, a goldsmith. In 1765, the lot was acquired by Miles Brewton's godson, also named Miles Brewton, a prominent merchant and politician. Brewton constructed the large Georgian townhouse that reflects a Palladian architectural style. In 1775, Brewton and his family were lost at sea while traveling to Philadelphia (Zierden 2001b:20-24).

During the Revolutionary War, the house was owned by Miles Brewton's sisters, Frances Brewton Pinckney and Rebecca Brewton Motte. British soldiers also forcefully

occupied the house during the Revolutionary War. In 1791, Col. William Alston, a wealthy planter and son-in-law to Rebecca Brewton Motte, purchased the property. Alston built several outbuildings including the stables and storerooms, since he loved horse racing (Zierden 2001b:27-33). There was a two-story brick slave quarters, "organized into four two-room units with glazed windows on the front and end facades, but none on the northern [outward facing] wall" (McInnis 2005: 248). The Alstons also added a low brick wall topped with wood picketing to separate the work yard from the formal garden area (McInnis 2005:249-250).

In 1822, Alston's youngest daughter, Mary Motte Alston was married to William Bull Pringle. Mary and William shared the house with her family until her father's death in 1839, when she obtained full ownership of the property. Records indicate that Mary was mistress to three dozen household slaves. These slaves included servants, seamstresses, basket weavers, nannies, cooks, Cretia Mary's maid, Hercules a coachman, and Thomas Turner a jockey (Cote 2002: 186; Zierden 2001b:33-37). Interestingly, and a further reflection of slaves adorning themselves in an attempt to set themselves apart, is that Turner wore his hair in two long plaits, causing one servant to think he must have been part Native American. Col. Alston was very fond of Turner, and upon the sale of his racing horse he freed him, paid him $600 a year, and supplied him with breakfast and dinner until he died, sometime in the 1850s (Cote 2002:88; Zierden 2001b:33-37). Further evidence of Turner's rank comes from Mary's 1836 records listing Turner's bedding supplies as "a mattress, two pair of sheets, two pillowcases, a pair of blankets and two counterpanes" (Cote 2002:189). Mary's records also list the daily food allowance for the house servants as "one and a half quarts of whole rice, one pint of corn

grist, one pint rice flour, a spoonful of lard and one quart of rice every Monday for starch" (Cote 2002:187). Clothing was issued to the house servants twice a year (Cote 2002:187). Mary's records list the foods supplied for four slaves left to tend to the Brewton house during the winter: "three bushels small rice, three bushels grist (corn meal), one bushel small rice extra, one bushel whole rice, one Westphalia ham" (Zierden 2001b:37). This gives an idea of what foods the slaves would have needed to buy from the markets to sustain themselves (fruits, vegetables, etc.).

In 1858 Mary transferred the house to her father-in-law, William Bull Pringle. During the Civil War the family moved to Society Hill, South Carolina. In 1865 the Miles Brewton house was seized by Union troops and used as their headquarters. The war severely affected the family's finances, and they were forced to take in boarders. Mary and her daughters converted the coach house into a store where they sold marmalades and floral arrangements. Archaeological evidence of the presence of African American residents at this time is a cowrie shell; these originate in the Indo-Pacific and would have been brought from there, and are believed to reflect African occupation (Singleton 1996:144). William Bull Pringle died in 1881, and the house was passed on to his wife, Mary M. Pringle. After Mary's death, the house was divided among the children.

In 1918, three of Susan Pringle's nieces, the Frosts, purchased the house from their heirs. They maintained ownership by taking in boarders, giving tours, and gardening. The most renowned is Susan Pringle Frost, Charleston's first female real estate agent and the 1920 founder of the Society for the Preservation of Old Dwellings, now the Preservation Society. Frost was the pioneer for the Charleston preservation

movement, and thus influenced preservation nationwide. Rebecca Pringle Frost died in 1971, and the house ultimately was inherited by Peter Manigault, who began its restoration (Zierden 2001b:38-43; 102).

Nathaniel Russell House

The Nathaniel Russell House is located at 21 Meeting Street. The lot was purchased by Nathaniel Russell in 1779, and the grand townhouse was completed in 1808. Russell owned a farm in Romney Village, a few miles up Meeting Street, which supplied his townhouse with fresh fruit, vegetables, and livestock. The Russell's had twelve urban slaves, five of which were skilled: Ben, a blacksmith; Diego, a carpenter; Andrew, a carpenter's apprentice; and Pickle and George, fishermen. Nathaniel Russell died in 1820, and his family kept possession of the house until 1857. In 1813 Sarah married the Right Reverend Theodore Dehron. One of Sarah Russell's slaves was Tom Russell, a blacksmith, who kept a shop on East Bay Street. Tom Russell was a main conspirator in the Denmark Vesey affair, as he spent a great deal of time with Gullah Jack and supplied him with pikes and spears. He was sentenced to death and executed on July 26, 1822. When Sarah died in 1832, the house was passed on to Sarah Russell Dehron who married the Reverend Paul Trapier. Sarah Russell Dehron's son-in-law established Calvalry Church, an African American church, and several slave weddings were performed at the Russell House (Zierden 1996:22-37).

Governor Robert F. Allston purchased the Russell House in 1857 upon Sarah Dehron's death. Allston brought in a slave, Daddy Moses, to tend to the garden. The Allston household had nine additional servants; listed among these are William Barron,

who later became a caterer and cook; Joe Washington, the cook who later received training under restaurateur Sam Lee; and Aleck, the carriage driver. During the Civil War the Allston's also fled to Society Hill, leaving Daddy Moses to look after the house and garden. Not long after, Daddy Moses died of a stoke while gardening. Artifacts associated with Russell's slaves include two pierced Spanish coins and glass beads (including blue beads and Cornaline d'alleppo beads). Allston died in 1864, leaving the house and property to his wife and family. Financially hurt from the Civil War, Mrs. Allston opened a girls' school in the Russell House (Zierden 1996:37-41; 202-206).

In 1869, Allston sold the Russell House to the Sisters of Charity of Our Lady of Mercy. The sisters continued to use the Russell House as a school naming it, the Academy of Our Lady of Mercy, and 85 to 120 students,and eight teachers lived in the house. In 1908 the Sisters of Charity sold the property to Dr. and Mrs. Mullalay, and the Russell House reverted to a private residence. In 1919, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Pelzer bought the property. The Charleston Foundation purchased the property in 1955; it was opened to the public in 1956, and is currently protected by the preservation group (Zierden 1996:41-46).

Heyward-Washington Stable

The Heyward-Washington House is located at 87 Church Street. The Charleston Museum conducted archaeological excavations at the stable building, and so the site is referred to as the Heyward-Washington stable. The property was granted in 1694 to Joseph Ellicott, who died later that year. In the 1730s John Milner, a gunsmith, owned the property. Milner operated his business and lived on site, both of which were

destroyed in the 1740 fire, Milner rebuilt and continued his business. Milner owned eleven slaves, of which three are known to be skilled blacksmiths and one carpenter. Milner died in 1749, and his son continued to reside and conduct business there. The property was sold to Thomas Heyward in 1771, and the current three-story brick house was built (Zierden 1993:8-14). However, the kitchen building (c. 1740) is still intact, and is one of the few eighteenth century brick kitchens (McInnis 2005:171). It is comprised of a downstairs kitchen and upstairs slave quarters. The slave quarters are directly connected to the kitchen by a stairway, which would have carried the smoke and smell of the kitchen upstairs. The quarters are comprised of four rooms, "each approximately eight by fourteen feet," and a loft of two rooms, "each about thirteen feet square" (McInnis 2005:171).

In 1789, Heyward's aunt Rebecca Jameson resided and operated a boarding school for girls at the Heyward-Washington House. In 1790, seventeen slaves were know to reside at the house. The property was sold in 1794, and throughout the nineteenth century it served as a multi-family dwelling. During part of the late nineteenth century, the first floor of the house was used as a bakery. In 1929, the property came under the ownership of the Charleston Museum and the Society for the Preservation of Old Dwellings, and was the first historic structure in Charleston to have public access (Zierden 1993:8-14).

McCrady's Longroom

McCrady's Longroom is located on Unity Alley, and was within the original walled city of Charles Town. The property was granted to Jonathan Amory, a merchant,

but there is no evidence that he developed the lot. In 1723 Eleazer Allen, a merchant, bought the property and rented it out to Alice Hoy, a widow. Allen sold the property in 1732 to James Crockatt, a merchant, who rented it out to Bastian Hugo. The property was not sold again until 1767, and it continued to be used commercially and for rental and subletting.

In the 1770s, Edward McCrady owned the property and operated a tavern, used for meals and lodging. Ten years later, he purchased the adjoining property and constructed a Longroom, used as a meeting place and banquet hall. The excavations showed that the Longroom served the Charleston elite. The most famous event occurred in 1791, when George Washington attended a play and dinner at the Longroom. McCrady died in 1801; after his death the property was owned by a number of individuals, but seemed to continue to be used as a tavern (changing names several times). Archaeological evidence of African American residence comes from an 1844 slave badge for a servant. Later in 1884 the property became a warehouse. In 1913 Daggett Printing Company purchased the property and ran their print shop there during the early twentieth century. The property was abandoned in the mid-twentieth century. In 1971 it was placed on the National Register of Historic Places and was restored to its original condition (Zierden et al. 1983:5-10).

CHARLESTON MARKETS

Charleston residents received their foodstuffs in a variety of ways. Foodstuffs could be imported from the planters' own personal plantations or grown on their house-lots. Foodstuffs were also available for sale at formal markets and from peddlers who

sold their items throughout the city. These peddlers or hucksters traveled throughout the city selling their wares from baskets or carts. An early nineteenth century law allowed hucksters to sell "milk, grain, fruits, vegetables of kinds, as well as fresh butter and poultry, through the streets of the city" (Zierden 2005:252). Street peddling was common in Charleston well into the twentieth century (Coakley 2006; Zierden 2005:252).

Historical evidence suggests that women were the main purchasers at the markets. It is unknown how frequently people attended the markets to buy foodstuffs. It seems that lower and middle class residents were more likely to attend the markets daily. The Charleston elite had a greater ability to supplement their diets from their own livestock and provisions, and they were more likely to send servants to the market (Zierden 2005:253). Archaeological evidence further suggests that the markets were places to gather and socialize with one another (Zierden 2005:255).

The first market, later known as the Beef Market, was established in Charleston in 1692 as a large market square in the center of Charleston, at the intersection of Meeting and Broad streets. The early market was informal and most likely consisted of small farmers and slaves bringing their produce to town in wagons. Later, vendors may have built crude stalls. A variety of fruits and vegetables as well as domestic cattle and hogs were available in the early markets. During the eighteenth century, the market square served as a center for social and commercial activities (Zierden 2005:3, 13-15).

During the early market, governmental regulations over market transactions were not in place, much to the concern of the Charleston inhabitants. A 1710 law created absentee market clerks, who resided in England and were in charge of regulating Charleston market activities. These market clerks assigned their duties to local personnel

who made minimal efforts to implement any regulations. In 1739 a more formal brick market building was constructed at the Beef Market site, which was to be open daily. Heavier regulations were implemented to ensure that quality produce and meats were sold, and that sales did not occur before the markets opened each day (Zierden 2005:15-17).

Common nuisances for Charlestonians were the sale of poor quality meats due to the butchering of sick animals, and bad handling and transportation conditions. Cattle were commonly herded to the outskirts of Charleston, where they could graze and be fattened up before butchering. The butchering of animals usually occurred right outside the city limits, resulting in problems from the smell and dirty nature of such activities. Archaeological excavations outside of the 1783 city limits on King Street, the main road into town, found evidence of these butchering activities (Zierden 2005:19).

The majority of the vendors were slaves, who sold goods for both themselves and their masters (Zierden 2005:19). Historical accounts suggest that slaves most likely sold their own personal goods on Sundays, usually traveling to town on Saturday nights (Zierden 2005:19; Wood 1996:139; Campbell 1991:132). Female slaves dominated the Charleston markets having a great influence over the flow and prices of the goods sold in the markets (Zierden 2005:20). This was seen as a nuisance to the Euro-American Charlestonians, who made repeated complaints and attempts to curtail the female slaves' marketing activities to no avail.

By 1760, the area surrounding the market square had grown to become a prestigious part of Charleston. Also situated at the intersection of Meeting and Broad streets were St. Michael's Episcopal Church (c. 1756), the State House (c. 1753), and the

city treasury (Zierden 2005:3, 23). The market building was unimpressive and could no longer support the entire city. To counter this, the city constructed a larger, more appealing market building on the market square, deeming it the Beef Market (Zierden 2005: 23). The city further built two additional markets, one specifically for fish (c. 1770) (Zierden 2005:25; Calhoun et al. 1984:7-19). The Beef Market was a social center, especially for the middle and lower classes, where one could gather for drinking and games such as shuffleboard (Zierden 2005:24). Archaeological research at the Beef Market found evidence for the market being a social center in the recovery of a large proportion of tobacco pipes, drinking vessels, and utilitarian ceramic vessels recovered from the site (Zierden 2005:239-243). The Lower Market (c. 1764), a general market, was located on Tradd Street along the waterfront (Zierden 2005:25). The Lower Market had six stalls reserved for goods shipped in from the surrounding plantations (Zierden 2005:252). The Fish Market was located on Vendue Range, now known as Queen Street, also along the waterfront, where seafood could be easily obtained and disposed of (Zierden 2005:25).

In 1796, a fire destroyed the Beef Market structure, and the city decided that the area was no longer a suitable location for a market, as it was now the center of elite residential housing and prestigious social buildings. The construction of a new market, called the Centre Market, was already underway and so the Beef Market was not reconstructed. The Centre Market was onstructed on the northern boundary of the city between 1790 and 1806. It was composed of single-story market stalls four blocks long and headed by a Market Hall (c. 1837). The Centre Market was subdivided into a produce, meat, and fish market. Produce was more abundant in the new market, as were

buzzards, which were useful for removing waste (Zierden 2005:27-31). Similar to the Lower Market, the Centre Market reserved six stalls for goods transported from surrounding plantations (Zierden 2005:252). Unfortunately, there is very little historical evidence for the common marketing practices in Charleston (Zierden 2005: 31).

DISCUSSION

This chapter has placed the analyzed sites within their historical contexts. An understanding of the economic and social changes in Charleston through time will help the reader understand the changes in the Colonoware assemblages both within each site and among the sites. Historical and archaeological evidence of slave life in Charleston was presented in an attempt to help the reader understand the role and daily lives of urban slaves. The different marketing venues within Charleston were discussed so that the reader is familiar with how Charleston residents obtained foodstuffs and other market items.

Chapter 4: Colonoware Analysis Methodology and Results

INTRODUCTION

The previous chapters have discussed how planters and slaves articulated their separate interests in the creation and maintenance of the slaves' internal economy. Slaves used the goods they obtained through their use of the internal market to help them better their standard of living and to create their own distinct culture. The materials the slaves chose to purchase reflected what they placed importance on for the maintenance of their families and culture. Colonoware may have been a commodity used within the slaves' internal market. The presence of Colonoware at the Beef Market, the main market in Charleston, suggests that it was indeed a marketed ware. If it was used to store other goods that were for sale in the market, I would expect it to be thicker, less well finished, and more resemble Colonoware recovered from archaeological plantation contexts. Even though slaves could have acquired Colonoware from other venues of marketing and bartering, its presence at the main market in town suggests that it was used in some aspect of marketing. Colonoware sherds comprised only a small portion, only 8.3%, of the entire Beef Market artifact assemblage. This could suggest that the Colonoware was not sold in large quantities at the market, or that the majority of the vessels were sold and did not remain at the market. Colonoware tends to occur in low frequencies in Charleston as a whole. Colonoware from urban contexts usually makes up from 6% to 8% of the total artifact assemblage (Zierden 2005, 2001a). The low frequency of

Colonoware does not necessarily mean that it was not an important part in the slaves' daily lives. Since it is impossible to find evidence of Colonoware that was sold by hucksters, a comparison of the Colonoware from the Beef Market to other sites within Charleston may determine if Colonoware was a commodity. If Colonoware was a commodity, then the patterns of its use could help us to better understand what the urban slaves held as important in their daily lives. My analysis will attempt to demonstrate that the Colonoware recovered from the Beef Market and other Charleston archaeological sites was a marketed ware.

Perceived Attributes of Charleston Colonoware

Colonoware analyses have demonstrated that slaves used these vessels to help them maintain their traditional African foodways, medicinal practices, and rituals (Ferguson 1989, 1991, 1992). As I worked on downtown Charleston gentry sites from 1999-2004, I noticed that on gentry sites the Colonoware tends to be thinner, more well-fired and burnished, and that a low percentage of the vessels are decorated. This implies that, like at planter houses on plantations, this urban Colonoware tends to be more refined (Espenshade 1996; Ferguson 1991). It has been suggested that the Charleston Colonoware is more refined because it was a marketed ware in the Charleston markets (Joseph 2002; Isenbarger 2001; Crane 1993).

In 2002, I conducted further research into this notion by analyzing the Colonoware from two Charleston non-gentry sites: the Beef Market (c. 1692-1800), and McCrady's Longroom (c. 1723). Finding that the Colonoware from these businesses was also more refined suggests that Colonoware could have been a marketed ware in

Charleston and that there might have been a higher demand for the more refined wares. My research compares the Colonoware from the Beef Market, the main market site in Charleston (c.1692-1800) to five, late seventeenth to early nineteenth century urban Charleston sites, in order to look for temporal and spatial variations that will help to confirm whether or not slave-made Colonoware was indeed a marketed ware in downtown Charleston. This research will allow us to gain further insight into how Colonoware was used in the slaves' daily lives in the maintenance of their own distinct culture in an urban setting.

COLONOWARE ANALYSIS

Some archaeologists have divided Colonoware into different types by using empirical data from paste, temper, surface treatment, size, and form (Anthony 2000, 1986; Ferguson 1992, 1989; Wheaton and Garrow 1989). Because of the mixed cultural attributes of Colonoware, this is not always possible to do, and many of the attributes of the separate groups tend to overlap. Colonoware classifications can be associated with ethnicity, as with River Burnished (a very refined type of Colonoware) being identified only with free Native Americans and later the Catawba Nation, and the less well-made Colonoware being associated with African and African American potters. As stated earlier, these traits also vary regionally due to differing cultural interactions. Since the establishment of these Colonoware classifications, most researchers have stopped performing detailed analyses of Colonoware attributes. Commonly, archaeologists either place Colonoware in one of three loosely defined categories, or simply classify it as Colonoware, which may result in the overlooking of certain traits. Brian Crane

(1993:19), in his analysis of the Colonoware from the Heyward-Washington House in Charleston, noticed that it is not always possible to place Colonoware into discrete types. I, too, have noticed that some of the Colonoware from Charleston does not fit into any one type, but shows attributes of multiple types. To address this, I conducted a detailed analysis of six Colonoware assemblages, looking for changes in paste and finishing techniques through time, both within and between sites. The main Colonoware varieties were still used so that my analysis was comparable to other Colonoware analyses, but I also looked at more specific vessel traits.

Hypothesis

I hypothesize that the Charleston Colonoware was a marketed ware. Marketed Colonoware should show more uniformity within vessel construction, finishing, and firing. Since marketed Colonoware would be available to the urban residents, who had access to more refined Euro-American wares, it is expected that more care and time would be invested in their production. Marketed Colonowares are expected to have thinner more uniform walls, have finer finishes with the majority being burnished, and have been fired at higher temperatures resulting in harder pastes. Plantation contexts usually have mainly Colonoware vessel forms of bowls and jars. Since different activities may have occurred in an urban environment, it is anticipated that there will be more variety within the vessel forms.

The availability of a wider range of foods was more likely to occur in this colonial urban setting than a plantation setting, due to the shipment of food stocks from abroad, from other plantations, and from within the city itself. Planters who took residence

downtown for large parts of the year probably ate more elaborate meals in their urban setting due to these factors. The gentry often used their homes and material possessions as an outward expression of their prosperity and wealth. These elaborate meals would have called for more vessels and vessel types—thus more variation in Colonoware forms. There were a wider variety of foods available in this colonial urban setting, which allowed for the preparation of more elaborate meals. Along with all of the possible Colonoware vessels involved in cooking, there is also the possibility of vessels associated with medicinal and ritual use. If additional vessel forms are not present it suggests that the Charleston residents used the Colonoware vessels in similar methods to those on plantations. In this case the determination that the vessels are market wares cannot be based on vessel forms alone, but must also incorporate an analysis of how well made the vessels are.

It is anticipated that the Charleston Colonoware would be more uniform in vessel thickness and surface treatment. Archaeologists have found that on Lowcountry plantations the Colonoware that is associated with the planter's house tends to be thinner, more well fired, and moderately to highly burnished, while the Colonoware from the slave quarters tends to be thicker, be less well fired, have less uniform walls, and have little to no burnishing (Espenshade 1996). In planter contexts on plantations, Colonoware vessels tend to exhibit more European style in form. Historical accounts have shown that the urban slaves in Charleston tried to outwardly emulate the Europeans through dress and the acquisition of material goods (Berlin 1998; Powers 1981). If urban slaves emulated Europeans, then the majority of Colonoware in Charleston should be thinner, well fired, nicely burnished, and have more European vessel forms (e.g., scalloped rims

and foot rings).

To test my hypothesis I conducted a detailed analysis of the Charleston Colonoware from six Charleston archaeological sites, previously excavated by the Charleston Museum, using the Colonoware from the Beef Market site, the main market from 1692-1800, as my comparative assemblage. I analyzed a total of 558 sherds, of which 158 were from the Beef Market. I chose Colonoware assemblages from five other urban sites to compare to the Beef Market Colonoware. Three of the sites were gentry house-lots, 14 Legare Street (1780-1850), Miles Brewton House (1765-1870), Nathaniel Russel House (1730-1880); one was a service building on a gentry house-lot, Heyward-Washington Stable (1694-1820); and the last was a multi function site, McCrady's Longroom (1698-1884) (Calhoun et al. 1984; Zierden 2001a, 2001b, 1996, 1993; Zierden et al. 1983) (Figure 1). The variation in site functions should provide an example of the variety of Colonoware use in an urban setting. Although the Charleston Museum has excavated middle class sites in Charleston they were not included because they produced very little Colonoware. Hopefully, in the future the reason for this can be further investigated. All of the sites used for my analysis are located close to the Beef Market, ensuring that the residents of these sites could easily have access to the goods sold there.

As I mentioned earlier, I conducted an analysis of the Colonoware from the late eighteenth century features at 14 Legare Street. These vessels are not included in this research for several reasons. First, the eighteenth century features were re-deposited refuse from Miles Brewton, and possibly other neighboring gentry houses, that were used to fill in the low-lying portions of the 14 Legare Street lot in preparation for building. Urban contexts are complex, and with both free and enslaved living together in close

Figure 1. Map of Charleston, showing site locations (Charleston Museum).

Red = The Beef Market
Orange = Heyward-Washington Stable
Yellow = Miles Brewton House
Blue = McCrady\s Longroom
Green = Nathaniel Russell House
Purple = 14 Legare Street
[Area marked in blue is the Charleston Neck]

quarters it is hard to decipher who owned or used the recovered artifacts. The fact that the features were re-deposited and possibly from multiple households would make it difficult to assign ownership, which would allow me to look for changes from household to household. Also, the date of the deposits was too broad to correspond with just a single Beef Market temporal period. I did look at the remaining eighteenth century deposits from 14 Legare Street, these can only be broadly compared to the Beef Market phases I through III. I do provide a discussion of the data from my previous 14 Legare Street analysis when appropriate.

METHODOLOGY FOR COLONOWARE ANALYSIS

To ensure objectivity I analyzed the Colonoware by its field specimen number, and then later applied its provenience and date. In this I was not able to unintentionally influence my data to show patterns that fit my hypothesis. All non-residual sherds, those the size of a quarter or larger, were used in my analysis. I conducted a detailed analysis of the Colonoware focusing on paste, and finishing techniques Rice (1987), Orton et al. (1993), and Sutton and Arkush (1998) as guides for my criteria. The following table illustrates the criteria I used (Table 1)

Analysis of vessel form helps to determine the function intended by the manufacturer, however, it does not guarantee that the consumer utilized the vessel for its intended function. Vessel form was determined by the shape of the rim sherd, jar fragments have an inflection, and bowl fragments are curved without an inflection. A minimum number of vessels (MNV) analysis was not conducted due to the small number of rim sherds. The majority of the identified vessels did not appear to be from the same

vessel, and thus should be a close representation of the number of vessels had an MNV been conducted. I further looked at the form of different sections of the vessel itself; appendages, rim, lip, and base. Handles types included lug and strap. Lug handles are flat pieces of clay attached to the vessel and used for lifting. Strap handles are handles that attach to the vessel body in two separate places, for example a coffee mug handle. Finials are attachments found at the top of a vessel, and can be either functional or decorative, for example a teapot lid would have a finial for easily lifting it off. Rims

Table 1. Attributes Recorded in my Colonoware Analysis.

CRITERIA	ATTRIBUTES	SOURCE
Vessel Form	Bowl, Globular Jar, Pipe, Warming Plate, Chamber Pot, Mortar	
Appendage	Handle (lug, strap), Finials, Adornos	
Rim Form	Everted, Folded, Flared, Straight, Inverted	
Lip Form	Rounded, Squared, Punctated, Scalloped (finger, tooled)	
Base Form	Flat, Rounded, Footring (residual, straight, tapered)	
Feel	Harsh, Rough, Smooth	Orton et. al.1993: 235
Exterior and Interior Surface Treatment	Smoothed, Unevenly Burnished, Burnished	Rice 1987: 138 Orton et. al. 1993: 240
Sand Inclusions	Very fine, Fine, Medium, Coarse, and Very Coarse	Orton et. al. 1993: 240
Temper Inclusions	Grog	Rice 1987: 476
Inclusion Frequency	Abundant, Moderate, Sparse	Orton et. al. 1993: 235, 238
Paste Hardness	Very Soft, Soft, Hard, Very Hard	Orton et. al. 1993: 138, 233
Texture	Smooth, Fine, Irregular	Orton et. al. 1993: 235
Cultural Affiliation	River Burnished, Lesesne Lustered, Yaughan	
Fire Clouding	Yes or No	Rice 1987
Sooting	Yes or No, and location on vessel body	
Length, Width, and Thickness	In millimeters	
Diameter	In millimeters	Sutton & Arkush 1998

were divided into the subtypes; everted, folded, flared, straight, and inverted. Everted rims bend outwards away from the vessel at a sharp angle. Folded rims are created by folding back the clay until it touches the vessel body. Flared rims gradually bend outwards from the vessel. Straight rims are even and straight with the vessel. Inverted rims bend slightly to the interior of the vessel. The lip demarcates the termination point of the rim, or the very edge of the rim. Lip forms consist of rounded, squared, punctated

and scalloped. Punctated lips are impressed with a tool. Scalloped lips resemble a pie crust, and are subdivided into *finger impressed*, or created by using ones finger to make it wavy, and *tooled*, where a tool is used to shape the lip. Base types included flat, rounded, and footrings. Footrings were further subdivided into *residual*, where there is a raised platform rather than a ring; *straight*, the ring of attached clay has straight walls; and *tapered*, the ring of attached clay tapers outwards.

The surface of the vessel was analyzed by recording the feel of the vessel and the surface treatment applied by the potter. The feel of the vessel describes whether any surface irregularities can be felt and whether or not it is abrasive. The term *harsh* refers to a surface that is abrasive to the touch. A *rough* surface is one where irregularities can be felt, and *smooth* surface is void of any irregularities. The surface of the vessels was further analyzed to determine the treatment the potter finished the vessel with. A *smoothed* surface is one in which the potter rids the formed vessel of irregularities with a soft tool such as "cloth, leather, a bunch of grass, or the potter's hand" (Rice 1987:138). Smoothed surfaces have a matte finish and the surface particles are not aligned. Smoothing is the least time consuming finish. *Burnished* surfaces are ones in which the potter used a smooth, hard tool on the vessel surface. Burnishing compacts the sand and gives the vessel a lustrous finish. Uneven burnishing is when tooling marks are present on the vessel surface. Fully burnished vessels have a smooth lustrous finish with no visible sign of tooling (Rice 1987:138).

The paste was analyzed by looking at the type, size, and density of the inclusions, as well as, the paste hardness and texture. Paste inclusions were all sand (Rice 1987:476). Inclusion size was recorded using the standards set forth by the United States

Department of Agriculture for sand grains using millimeters, and is illustrated in the following table (Table 2). Inclusion frequency was recorded using a three-point scale, which divided it into sparse, moderate and abundant (Orton et al. 1993:235).

Table 2. Sand Inclusion Size**.**

SAND DEFINITION	SAND GRAIN SIZE
very fine	Up to 0.1 mm.
fine	0.1 to 0.25 mm.
medium	0.25 to 0.5 mm.
coarse	0.5 to 1.0 mm.
very coarse	larger than 1.0 mm.

Paste hardness was recorded to help determine the durability of the vessel, and the temperature it was fired at, with harder vessels being fired at higher temperatures (Sutton and Arkush 1998:131; Rice 1987:354). Paste hardness refers to the resistance of the paste to scratching. The standardized hardness scale is Mohs' 10-point scale of hardness and was created for also looking at ceramics that are more highly fired than Colonoware. Since my analysis is of only a single ceramic type, Colonoware, which is a low-fired earthenware, Mohs' hardness scale would not show the variability within the paste hardness. Therefore, I adapted Peacock's 1977 hardness test to my needs (Orton et al. 1993:138, 233). Peacock used a fingernail and a steel blade, however the steel blade would be too hard of a surface to illustrate very well fired Colonoware from lower fired Colonoware. I opted to use my fingernail only with very soft referring to a paste that is easily scratched with a fingernail resulting in a great deal of crumbs falling from the paste, up to very hard where the paste is very difficult to scratch with the fingernail and results in only a few crumbs. It is important to note that the information gathered from paste hardness tests is not precise since many factors affect a vessel's hardness. However, the information is still useful and can be used along with other temper and

firing data to help determine the original strength of the vessel (Orton et al.1993: 138). My hardness analysis was conducted as a rough sort of the sherds by hardness rather than their absolute density values (Sutton and Arkush 1998:131).

Paste texture refers to the pastes appearance at breaks, and was determined with the unaided eye. An analysis of paste texture can allow one to determine the density of a vessel. A *fine* texture is when the paste is flat or slightly curved at the break, and no irregularities are visible. An *irregular* paste has visible irregularities. A *hackly* paste has large angular irregularities.

I further cataloged the Colonoware into their associated cultural affiliation. Commonly Colonoware analysts subdivided their assemblages into the types River Burnished, Lesesne Lustered, and Yaughan. Including this data allows my analysis to be comparable to other contemporary Colonoware analyses.

Fire clouding is a darkened area on the vessel surface caused by uneven firing, in which a portion of the vessel is closer to the fuel (Rice 1987:476). Fire clouding can also occur when a vessel is exposed to a fire, (i.e. cooking on and open fire). When present, fire clouding was noted. The presence and location on the vessel body of sooting were also recorded. Fire clouding and the presence of soot will help me determine if vessels were used for cooking.

I measured the dimensions of each Colonoware sherd and vessel in millimeters. I tried to measure each sherd in a regular pattern with length referring to the portion running from the vessel lip to the base, and width being that from the circumference of the vessel. This was determined as accurately as possible by examining and feeling the curvature of each sherd. In this I expected that the thickness varied most often from the

base to the lip rather than around the circumference, and the curvature was sharper from base to lip, and more constant for the circumference. Since Colonoware vessels are usually unevenly walled vessels I took the thickness at the median thickness of each sherd (1998:126). Sherd thickness measurements were used to calculate a median and a mean thickness for each site and their separate occupational phases.

INTER-SITE ANALYSIS

I found that some of the data I collected was not useful for testing my argument and am omitting them from my discussion. I could not find any pattern in the sand inclusion data. Sand inclusions are not usually measured in Colonoware analyses, and therefore I could not compare my data to any other. Colonoware potters would have used whatever good clays they could find, and therefore the sand inclusions could be naturally occurring, and variable. If similar data is collected from the plantations surrounding Charleston, then the Charleston data could be compared to it and patterns may be visible. Chemical analyses from the clays at plantation sites with Colonoware would also help us to see such patterns. I have also omitted the data on rim/lip form since I could not find any temporal or vessel form patterns for their use. Perhaps further investigations into rim/lip treatments will help illustrate the reasoning for the different forms. The rim/lip data was presented when there was evidence of Euro-American styles such as scalloped rims.

During my analysis, I recorded the cultural affiliation data, but this was not very useful for finding any new patterns in the Charleston Colonoware assemblage. Only Lesesne Lustered and Yaughan sherds will be discussed in my analysis. River Burnished

sherds are not included, since they were produced by free Native Americans. In order to illustrate the slaves' involvement in the internal markets my focus is on Colonowares that are slave-made. The cultural affiliation data only showed that there is very little of the Yaughan variety of Colonoware, and that the most popular Colonoware variety is Lesesne Lustered. This pattern is already known to occur in planter contexts and urban centers. These classifications are useful, but broad, and my research goal was to present finite measurements of data to show empirical proof of a finer marketed ware. In my analysis I found both Lesesne Lustered and Yaughan wares to have varied paste hardness and thickness. Therefore, this data was collected to be consistent with other Colonoware analyses and may be useful in future work, but will be omitted since such broad groupings would not be helpful towards proving my argument.

In this analysis I will first present the data from each site separately in order to look for variations and patterns within the individual sites. I provide a guide for the how each site was separated temporally, explaining the family who occupied the site for each period, and which phase or provenience from the Beef Market it is comparable to. These temporal dates are based on the archaeological research performed by the Charleston Museum. I then give a descriptive analysis of the data collected from each temporal period, so that my results are clear and available to the reader. At the end of each site assemblage description I provide a brief discussion of any identified patterns. I then provide a discussion section in which I compare the data from all of the Charleston sites to Colonoware assemblages from plantations near Charleston. I then compare the data from the Beef Market assemblage to the other five Charleston assemblages.

Beef Market

My analysis of the Colonoware from the Charleston Beef Market Site is divided into 4 distinct temporal periods which correspond with the changing site use:

1. 1692-1739 – designated as a market square, without a formal structure.
2. 1739-1760 – the early market building.
3. 1760-1796 – the Beef Market.
4. 1818 – present – the location of city government.

I looked at the Colonoware for patterns within these time frames, which were then used to compare the other five sites. If the Colonoware was for sale at the Beef Market then the patterns found there at each temporal period should be reflected onto the other urban sites for the same time periods.

The early eighteenth century (phase I) assemblage consists of 67 Colonoware sherds, 52 of which are body sherds, and 15 rims. The majority of the body sherds are burnished, with only three smoothed body sherds occurring. The thickness range for the early eighteenth century assemblage is 3.5 to 8 millimeters, having a median thickness of 5.75 millimeters and a mean thickness of 5.1 millimeters. The majority of the rims are burnished and all of the four identifiable bowls are burnished. There are five identifiable jar fragments; three smoothed and two burnished. One of the jar fragments is a smoothed (Table 3). Within the analysis of the paste hardness, sherds with hard pastes whether smoothed or burnished are thinner. The smoothed sherds with hard pastes have a mean thickness of 3.5 millimeters, while the burnished sherds with hard pastes have a mean thickness of 5 millimeters. The burnished sherds with a hard paste are the most common variety and consisted of 86% of the total sherds from the phase I proveniences (Table 4).

The mid eighteenth century assemblage (phase II) consists of 48 Colonoware sherds, with 35 body sherds and 13 rim sherds. Almost all of the body sherds are

burnished with only four being smoothed. The mid eighteenth century assemblage has a thickness range of 4 to 8.5 millimeters, with a median thickness of 6.25 and a mean thickness of 5 millimeters. All of the rim sherds are burnished. There are two identifiable bowl fragments, both of which are burnished (Table 3). Paste hardness analysis shows that burnished sherds with a hard paste are thinner at 5 millimeters, as well as the most frequently occurring making up 52% of the total sherds (Table 4).

The late eighteenth century (phase III) proveniences contain 24 total Colonoware sherds, with 19 body sherds, and 5 rim sherds. Of the 19 body sherds only 2 are smoothed with the rest having burnished surfaces. The thickness range within the late eighteenth century assemblage is 5 to 10 millimeters, with a median thickness of 7.5 millimeters and a mean thickness of 7.1 millimeters, which is higher than the earlier phases. Of the rim sherds two are smoothed and three burnished. There are no identifiable bowls from phase III proveniences. Three sherds are identified as jar fragments, two body sherds, and one rim sherd. The jar rim sherd is smoothed. One of the body sherds is smoothed and the other burnished (Table 3). Analysis of the paste hardness shows that the burnished sherds with a very hard paste are the thinnest sherds at 5.8 millimeters. The burnished sherds with a hard paste are the most commonly occurring sherds consisting of 41%, and the burnished very hard sherds made up 31% of the total sherds (Table 4).

The early nineteenth century (phase IV) assemblage is comprised of 29 total Colonoware sherds, with 23 body sherds and 6 rim sherds. The thickness range for the nineteenth century sherds is 4.5 to 8.5 millimeters, having a median of and a mean thickness of 6.5 millimeters. Only three of the sherds are smoothed. All of the rim

sherds are burnished. Three of the rim sherds are bowl fragments. There is also one burnished handle fragment (Table 3). Colonoware sherds that were burnished with hard and very hard pastes are the thinnest at 6.3 millimeters, and the most frequently occurring variety with each consisting of 40% of the sherds (Table 4).

I had expected to find a greater number of vessel forms and European attributes at the Beef Market since the wares would have been available to both Euro-Americans and urban slaves. However, the only vessel forms recovered from the Beef Market assemblage were bowls and jars (Figure 2). This suggests that Euro-Americans were not the main consumers of Colonoware, and that Colonoware use in Charleston was similar to that on the surrounding plantations.

Figure 2. Example of Colonoware rim sherds from the Beef Market assemblage.

There seems to be a drastic decline in the frequency of Colonoware at the Beef Market after 1760 (post phase II). This may be due to the fact that the use of the area changed. With the economic growth of Charleston the region surrounding the market was becoming more elite and prestigious. In 1760 a new market building was constructed in an attempt to make the Beef Market appear cleaner and not detract from the surrounding elite establishments. The city also established two additional markets within Charleston (Calhoun et al. 1984:15-19). Colonoware may have begun to be marketed more on the streets by hawkers or at the other markets.

Table 3. The Beef Market Site: Colonoware Vessel Analysis for All Temporal Periods.

Temporal Period	Phase I			Phase II			Phase III			Phase IV		
Sherd/Vessel Type	#	%	Mean Thickness	#	%	Mean Thickness	#	%	Mean Thickness	#	%	Mean Thickness
Body Sherds:	48	70.6%	5.1	35	73%	5.4	19	73%	6.5	23	77%	6.5
Smoothed	1		3.5	4		5.1	1		8.0	3		7.3
Burnished	47		5.2	31		5.5	18		6.3	20		6.4
Smoothed Rim:							1	4%	6.5			
Rounded							1		6.5			
Flat												
Scalloped												
Burnished Rim:	11	16%	5.2	11	23%	5.5	3	11.4%	7.0	3	10%	5.8
Rounded	9		5.0	7		4.9	1		7.5	1		5.0
Flat	2		5.2	4		6.6	2		6.0	2		6.2
Scalloped												
Smoothed Bowl:												
Rounded												
Flat												
Scalloped												
Burnished Bowl:	4	6%	5.0	2	4%	5.0				3	10%	6.8
Rounded	1		5.0									
Flat	3		5.0	2						3		6.8
Scalloped												
Smoothed Jar:	3	4.4%	8.0				2	7.6%	6.5			
Rounded							1		6.5			
Flat	1		8.0									
Burnished Jar:	2	3%	5.5				1	4%	5.5			
Rounded							1		5.5			
Flat												
Other:										1	3%	
Burnished										1		
Handle												
Total:	68	100%	5.1	48	100%	5.0	26	100%	7.1	30	100%	6.5

Table 4. The Beef Market Site: Results of Colonoware Paste Analysis for All Temporal Periods.

	Smoothed/ Hard	Smoothed/ Very Hard	Burnished/ Hard	Burnished/ Very Hard	Total
Phase I # of Sherds	1	3	54	5	63
Mean Thickness in mm.	3.5	8.0	5.0	5.2	5.2
Phase II # of Sherds	5	-	25	16	46
Mean Thickness in mm.	12.7	-	5.0	5.6	6.1
Phase III # of Sherds	1	3	11	9	24
Mean Thickness in mm.	6.5	6.3	6.3	5.8	6.1
Phase IV # of Sherds	1	-	12	12	25
Mean Thickness in mm.	6.5	-	6.3	6.3	6.3

14 Legare Street

The proveniences of 14 Legare Street were divided into two categories, eighteenth and nineteenth century. The eighteenth century proveniences coincide with the property being owned by planters and artisans, but being rather undeveloped. These also correspond with the Beef Market phases II and III. The nineteenth century proveniences are associated with wealthy planters and the formal development of the lot. I compared the nineteenth century proveniences with the Beef Market phase IV. Archaeological evidence of African American occupation at 14 Legare Street include beads (white, blue, and a teardrop shaped Cornaline d'alleppo); two pierced silver coins; three small quartz crystals; and an 1803 slave badge for a servant, the earliest slave tag found within an archaeological context in Charleston (Zierden 2001a:8-11 – 8-14).

The eighteenth century proveniences contained 121 Colonoware sherds, consisting of 74 body sherds and 47 rim sherds. The majority of the sherds are burnished with only 21 smoothed sherds. The eighteenth century assemblage has a mean thickness

range of 3.5 to 12 millimeters, with a median of 7.75 millimeters and a mean thickness of 6.5 millimeters. There are 15 rim sherds with an indeterminate vessel form. The majority of these rim sherds are burnished, with only two of the 15 rim sherds being burnished. A large number of bowl rim sherds were recovered consisting of 2 smoothed bowl fragments, 25 burnished, and 6 burnished with scalloped rims (Figure 3). One of the burnished bowls had incised lines on the exterior (Figure 4). There are 3 jar sherds consisting of 2 burnished body sherds, and one smoothed body sherd. Excavations also recovered a smoothed finial, which could have been used as a grip for a lid (Table 5). The paste analysis showed that both burnished and smoothed sherds with soft pastes are the thinnest at 6 millimeters, and they occur in relatively low frequencies. Burnished sherds with hard pastes are the most common variety at 51% of the total, and they have the highest thickness (the same as smoothed sherds with a very hard paste) at 6.7 millimeters (Table 6).

Figure 3. 14 Legare Street, eighteenth century Colonoware bowl rim sherd.

The nineteenth century proveniences contained 21 Colonoware sherds (13 body, and 8 rim sherds); one handle; one partially reconstructed vessel; and one whole vessel. There are only four smoothed sherds. The thickness range for the nineteenth century assemblage is 4 to 8 millimeters, with a median of 6 millimeters and a mean thickness of 6.4 millimeters. There are only two rim sherds with an indeterminate vessel form. One of the rim sherds is burnished and the other is smoothed. There are two identifiable smoothed jar fragments, one body sherd, and the other a rim sherd. A smaller number of bowl fragments were recovered from the nineteenth century proveniences as compared to the eighteenth century. There are only three bowl rim fragments consisting of one smoothed, and two burnished. A burnished handle fragment was also recovered (Table 5). The paste hardness analysis found that burnished hard sherds are the thinnest at 5.6 millimeters, and have a moderate frequency of 17.4%. Burnished sherds with a hard paste are the most frequent at 48% (Table 6).

Figure 4. 14 Legare Street, eighteenth century incised Colonoware bowl rim sherd.

Table 5. 14 Legare Street: Colonoware Vessel Analysis for All Temporal Periods.

Temporal Period	18th c.			19th c.		
Sherd/Vessel Type	#	%	Mean Thickness	#	%	Mean Thickness
Body Sherds:	69	57%	6.8	11	46%	6.1
Smoothed	18		7.0			
Burnished	51		6.4	11		6.1
Smoothed Rim:				1	4.1%	6.0
Rounded				1		6.0
Flat						
Scalloped						
Burnished Rim:	15	12%	5.9	1	4.1%	4.0
Rounded	2		5.5	1		4.0
Flat	13		5.2			
Scalloped						
Smoothed Bowl:	2	1.6%	6.5	1	4.1%	8.0
Rounded						
Flat	2		6.5	1		8.0
Scalloped						
Burnished Bowl:	31	25.4%	6.2	4	16.7%	5.9
Rounded	10		6.0	2		5.7
Flat	15		6.0	2		6.0
Scalloped	6		6.0			
Smoothed Jar:	1	.8%	5.5	2	8.3%	4.5
Rounded				1		4.0
Flat						
Burnished Jar:	2	1.6%	5.7			
Rounded						
Flat						
Other:	2	1.6%		4	16.7%	
Burnished Base	1		7.5			
Smoothed Finial	1		-			
Warming Plate				2		-
Burnished Handle				1		-
Mortar-like Vessel				1		-
Total:	122	100%	6.5	24	100%	6.4

Table 6. 14 Legare Street: Results of Colonoware Paste Analysis for All Temporal Periods**.**

	Smoothed/ Hard	Smoothed/ Very Hard	Burnished/ Hard	Burnished/ Very Hard	Total
18th century # of Sherds	15	4	62	36	117
Mean Thickness in mm.	6.5	6.7	6.7	6.4	6.6
19th century # of Sherds	3	-	11	4	18
Mean Thickness in mm.	5.7	-	7.0	5.6	6.5

The partially reconstructed vessel has a flat body with a large thick footring. It is 12.2 millimeters thick and has soot on its underside. The vessel shape and the appearance of the soot seem to suggest the vessel was used as a warming plate or a very thick Colonoware lid (Figure 5 and 6). The whole vessel is a bowl with a large footring,

Figure 5. 14 Legare St, interior view of reconstructed Colonoware vessel.

Figure 6. 14 Legare Street, exterior view of reconstructed Colonoware vessel.

resembling a mortar, with an incised figure on the exterior. The incised figure seems to have wings and could possibly be a bee. Carl Steen has suggested that the figure is an eagle and the style resembles late prehistoric Native American pottery. Such symbols have been found on River Burnished Colonoware (Zierden 2001:8-13 – 8-14).

It is important to note that the nineteenth century colonoware has a larger variety of vessel forms than the eighteenth century. During the nineteenth century the Beef Market was no longer in operation, therefore it suggests that perhaps the market regulated the vessel forms. Looking for a higher number of vessel forms in other nineteenth century deposits may help us to better understand the consumer demands and cultural ideals that are reflected within the Colonoware assemblage.

The 14 Legare Street Colonoware assemblage, when looking at Colonoware sherd

counts, has an increased frequency during the eighteenth century, and then drastically decreases in the nineteenth century. This is similar to South Carolina plantation assemblages, and suggests that the use and the beliefs surrounding the use of Colonoware vessels is the same in both urban and rural contexts. Further analysis is needed to determine if the variation in the number of sherds is due to the number of archaeological deposits recovered for the different time periods or is a true reflection of the wares use.

Miles Brewton House

The Miles Brewton House proveniences were divided into four temporal periods:

1. **1720s/Colonial** – associated with John Jones, the gunsmith (Beef Market Phase I).
2. **Miles Brewton** – associated with Miles Brewton, the merchant, 1750-1775 (Beef Market Phase II).
3. **Motte-Alston** – associated with the Motte and Alston families 1775-1830 (Beef Market Phase III).
4. **Pringle-Frost** – associated with the Pringle and Frost families 1840-1890 (Beef Market Phase IV).

Unfortunately, like most of the early Charleston sites very few Colonoware sherds were recovered from the early proveniences. The 1720s colonial proveniences contained only one smoothed bowl fragment (Table 7). The bowl fragment has a hard paste and a thickness of 8.5 millimeters (Table 8).

The proveniences associated with Miles Brewton's occupation (mid eighteenth century) contained 26 Colonoware sherds, consisting of 21 body, and five rim sherds. Only 10 of the sherds are smoothed. The Miles Brewton assemblage has a thickness range of 4 to 7 millimeters, with a median thickness of 5.5 millimeters and a mean thickness of 5.6 millimeters. There are two rim sherds with unidentifiable vessel form, both of which are burnished. Three bowl fragments were identified. One of the bowls is

smoothed, and the other two are burnished (Table 7). Paste analysis shows that the burnished sherds with a soft paste are the thinnest at 4.8 millimeters. Burnished sherds with a very hard paste are the most frequent variety recovered making up 31% of the Miles Brewton sherds, with the second lowest mean thickness at 5.6 millimeters. Smoothed sherds with a soft paste are the thickest variety at 7.5 millimeters (Table 8).

The Motte-Alston, or late eighteenth century proveniences, are comprised of 55 Colonoware sherds, of which there are 42 body, and 13 rim sherds. There are 29 smoothed sherds, and 26 burnished sherds. The Motte-Alston Colonoware assemblage has a thickness range of 4.5 to 10.5 millimeters, with a median thickness of 7.5 millimeters and a mean thickness of 6.4 millimeters. There are seven rim sherds with unidentifiable vessel forms. Four of the rim sherds are smoothed, and three burnished. There are five identifiable bowl fragments, consisting of two smoothed, and three burnished. There is one burnished jar fragment (Table 7). Paste analysis found that the burnished sherds with a hard paste are the thinnest with a mean thickness of 6.1 millimeters. The most commonly occurring variety is smoothed sherds with a hard paste with a frequency of 33%. The thickest sherds, having a mean thickness of 7.2 millimeters, were burnished with a very hard paste (Table 8).

The nineteenth century Pringle-Frost proveniences include only eight Colonoware body sherds. The majority of the sherds are burnished with only two smoothed sherds. The thickness range of the Pringle-Frost Colonoware sherds is 4 to 8 millimeters, having a median thickness of 6 millimeters and a mean thickness of 6.2 millimeters (Table 7). Paste Analysis shows that the thinnest sherds were smoothed with a hard paste at 4.5 millimeters. The thickest sherds are smoothed with a very hard paste at 7.5 millimeters.

Burnished sherds occur at the same frequency and are more common than smoothed sherds. Burnished sherds with a hard paste are thicker at 7.0 millimeters than those with a very hard paste, which have a mean thickness of 5.7 millimeters (Table 8).

Similar to other Charleston assemblages the Miles Brewton assemblage contained very little Colonoware in the early period, or Phase I, with a peak in Colonoware use during the late eighteenth century, and a sharp decline in the nineteenth century. The majority of the sherds with identifiable vessel form were bowl fragments. My previous 14 Legare Street analysis looked at trash deposits associated with Miles Brewton. As I stated earlier, the Colonoware from Miles Brewton was determined to have been used by his urban slaves. Evidence for this is that there are few vessels with European attributes, the majority of the vessels are bowls, there were non-cooking vessel forms that were used for cooking, and several vessels exhibited marking which may be associated with African religious or medicinal use. This along with the fact that the Miles Brewton House assemblages follow the same vessel form and frequency patterns found on plantations suggests that the urban slaves the main consumers of the Colonoware.

Table 7. The Miles Brewton House: Colonoware Vessel Analysis for All Temporal Periods.

Temporal Period	**1720's**			**Brewton**			**Motte-Alston**			**Pringle-Frost**		
Sherd/Vessel Type	#	%	Mean Thickness	#	%	Mean Thickness	#	%	Mean Thickness	#	%	Mean Thickness
Body Sherds:				21	80%	5.6	42	76.3%	6.3	8	100%	6.2
Smoothed				9		5.9	25		6.2	2	25%	6.0
Burnished				12		5.4	17		6.4	6	75%	6.3
Smoothed Rim:							4	7.3%	6.7			
Rounded							2		7.5			
Flat							2		6.0			
Scalloped												
Burnished Rim:				2	8%	6.7	3	5.5%	6.3			
Rounded				1		6.5	1		8.0			
Flat				1		7.0	2		5.5			
Scalloped												
Smoothed Bowl:	1	100%	8.5	1	4%	6.0	2	3.6%	5.5			
Rounded	1		8.5	1		6.0						
Flat							2		5.5			
Scalloped												
Burnished Bowl:				2	8%	5.0	3	5.5	8.5			
Rounded				1		5.0	3		8.5			
Flat				1		5.0						
Scalloped												
Smoothed Jar:												
Rounded												
Flat												
Burnished Jar:							1	1.8%	6.0			
Rounded							1		6.0			
Flat												
Other:												
Total:	1	100%	8.5%	26	100%	5.6	55	100%	6.4	8	100%	6.2

Table 8. The Miles Brewton House: Results of Colonoware Paste Analysis for All Temporal Periods.

	Smoothed/ Hard	Smoothed/ Very Hard	Burnished/ Hard	Burnished/ Very Hard	Total
1720's # of Sherds	1	-	-	-	1
Mean Thickness in mm.	8.5	-	-	-	8.5
Brewton # of Sherds	7	3	7	8	25
Mean Thickness in mm.	5.8	6.5	5.7	5.6	5.8
Motte-Allston # of Sherds	18	13	10	15	56
Mean Thickness in mm.	6.3	6.5	6.1	7.2	6.5
Pringle-Frost # of Sherds	1	1	3	3	8
Mean Thickness in mm.	4.5	7.5	7.0	5.7	6.3

Nathaniel Russell House

The Nathaniel Russell House proveniences were divided into three temporal periods:

1. **Russell assemblage (1779-1857)** – associated with the Russell family occupation (Beef Market Phase IV).
2. **Allston assemblage (1857-1870)** – associated with the Allston family occupation, and the boarding school (Beef Market Phase IV).
3. **Sisters** – associated with the late 19th c. occupation of the Sisters of Charity (Beef Market Phase IV).

The majority of the Russell assemblage was deposited in the 19th century with only 21 of the 78 years occurring in the 18th century, and 17 during the Beef Market Phase III. For this reason I decided to compare the Russell assemblage to the Beef Market Phase IV or 19th century component. Therefore, all three of the Nathaniel Russell house assemblages are comparable to the 19th century component. In this section I give the data for each separate time period, in an attempt to see changes within the 19th century contexts.

The proveniences associated with the Russell family consist of 64 Colonoware

sherds, one handle, and one Colonoware pipe fragment. The majority of the sherds are burnished with only six smoothed sherds. The Russell assemblage sherds have a thickness range of 4 to 9 millimeters, with a median thickness of 6.5 millimeters and a mean thickness of 6.1 millimeters. There were 14 rim sherds with an indeterminate vessel form. All of these rim sherds are burnished with three scalloped rims. There are 12 burnished bowl fragments, two with scalloped rims (Figure 7 and 8). The handle fragment is burnished (Table 9). Paste analysis shows that the thinnest sherds, at 4.0 millimeters in thickness, are smoothed with a very hard paste. The sherd variety with the highest frequency are burnished

Figure 7. Scalloped Colonoware rim sherd from the Russell occupational phase at the Nathaniel Russell House.

Figure 8. Partially reconstructed Colonoware bowl from the Russell occupational phase at the Nathaniel Russell House.

sherds with a hard paste. The thickest, at 7.0 millimeters, variety are smoothed sherds with a hard paste (Table 10).

The Allston assemblage had 13 Colonoware sherds; 12 body sherds, and one rim sherd. Most of the sherds are burnished with only two smoothed sherds. The thickness range of the Colonoware sherds is 3.5 to 9 millimeters, having a median thickness of 6.25 and a mean thickness of 6.7 millimeters. The rim sherd is burnished, and a vessel form could not be determined (Table 9). Paste analysis revealed that the burnished sherds with a hard paste are the thinnest, at 5.9 millimeters, as well as the most frequently occurring variety (Table 10).

The Sisters of Charity assemblage recovered six Colonoware sherds; four body sherds, one rim sherd, and one jar fragment. There is only one smoothed sherd. The rim sherd is burnished and the vessel form could not be determined. The jar fragment is a burnished rim sherd (Table 9). The thickness range for the Sisters of Charity assemblage is 5 to 11 millimeters, with a median thickness of 8 millimeters and a mean thickness of 7 millimeters. Paste analysis shows that the thinnest variety is the smoothed sherd with a hard paste. The most commonly occurring variety is burnished sherds with a hard paste (Table 10).

Temporal Period	**Russell**			**Allston**			**Sisters of Charity**		
Sherd/Vessel Type	#	%	Mean Thickness	#	%	Mean Thickness	#	%	Mean Thickness
Body Sherds:	38		6.4	12		6.5	4		7.2
Smoothed	6	57.6%	6.6	2	92.3%	8.5	1	66.6%	5.0
Burnished	32		6.3	10		6.1	3		8.0
Smoothed Rim:									
Rounded									
Flat									
Scalloped									
Burnished Rim:	14		6.2						
Rounded	5	21.2%	5.7	1	7.7%	9.0	1	16.7%	6.0
Flat	6		6.7	1		9.0	1		6.0
Scalloped	3		6.2						
Smoothed Bowl:									
Rounded									
Flat									
Scalloped									
Burnished Bowl:	12		5.2						
Rounded	5	18.2%	4.4						
Flat	5		5.4						
Scalloped	2		6.5						
Smoothed Jar:									
Rounded									
Flat									
Burnished Jar:							1		8.0
Rounded							1	16.7%	8.0
Flat									
Other:	2								
Pipe	1	3%	-						
Handle	1		8.0						
Total:	66	100%	6.1	13	100%	6.7	6	100%	7.2

Table 10. The Nathaniel Russell House: Results of Colonoware Paste Analysis for All Temporal Periods.

	Smoothed/ Hard	Smoothed/ Very Hard	Burnished/ Hard	Burnished/ Very Hard	Total
Russell # of Sherds	4	1	33	22	60
Mean Thickness in mm.	7.6	4.0	6.3	5.5	6.1
Allston # of Sherds	2	-	10	7	19
Mean Thickness in mm.	8.5	-	5.9	6.4	6.4
Sisters of Charity # of Sherds	1	-	4	1	6
Mean Thickness in mm.	5.0	-	7.8	6.0	7.0

The majority of the Nathaniel Russell House Colonoware is associated with the Russell family, which is the earliest of the nineteenth century occupations. The Nathaniel Russell House assemblage follows the common pattern of Colonoware use dropping off in the nineteenth century. Interestingly, the Russell family assemblage also contained Colonoware with European attributes, which was relatively uncommon in the Charleston collections. The majority of the Russell Colonoware sherds are burnished and thinner. This suggests that either the Russell family used some of the Colonoware, or that their urban slaves preferred Colonoware that resembled European wares. There was no evidence of any jar fragments, and compared to the other collection there was a relatively high number of bowl rim sherds (Figure 9). On nineteenth century plantation contexts the majority of Colonoware vessels are small bowls, and are associated with slave contexts. Therefore, it is most likely that the Colonoware was used by the Russell slaves for their own personal use. If this is the case, then the appearance of European attributes is important, especially since they are uncommon for the time period and in the Charleston assemblages as a whole. This may be a reflection of the Russell slaves' own personal preferences and changing worldviews in regards to their material culture.

Figure 9. Examples of Colonoware Rims From Nathaniel Russell House.

Heyward-Washington Stable

The Heyward-Washington Stable proveniences were divided into three temporal periods:

1. **1730-1740** – associated with the occupation of John Milner (Beef Market Phase I).
2. **1740-1750** – associated with the occupation of John Milner after the 1740 fire (Beef Market Phase II).
3. **19th century** – associated with multi-family units and a bakery (Beef Market Phase IV).

The pre-fire of 1740 proveniences of John Milner consists of only 4 Colonoware sherds (Table 11). All of the sherds are burnished with a hard paste. There is one rim sherd. The thickness range is 4.5 to 7 millimeters, with a median thickness of 5.75

millimeters and a mean thickness of 6.1 millimeters (Table 12).

The post 1740 proveniences, associated with John Milner, contain 28 Colonoware sherds; 20 body, six rims, one bowl fragment, and one handle. Only five of the sherds are smoothed. The rim sherds are all burnished. The bowl rim fragment, and the handle fragment are burnished. The thickness range is 3.5 to 10 millimeters, having a median thickness of 6.75 and a mean thickness of 6 millimeters (Table 11). Paste analysis shows that the most frequent variety is the burnished sherds with a hard paste. The thinnest sherds are the burnished sherds with a very hard paste with a mean thickness of 5.9 millimeters. The thickest variety is the burnished sherds with a soft paste, which have a mean thickness of 8.7 millimeters (Table 12).

The 19th century deposits contain six Colonoware sherds; four body, and two rim sherds. The majority of the sherds are burnished, with only two smoothed. Both of the rim sherds are burnished. The nineteenth century assemblage has a thickness range of 5.5 to 6.5 millimeters, with a median thickness of 6 millimeters and a mean thickness of 7 millimeters (Table 11). Paste analysis revealed that all of the sherds have a hard paste. The two smoothed sherds with a hard paste had a mean thickness of 5.8 millimeters. The four sherds with a hard paste had a mean thickness of 7.6 millimeters (Table 12).

Only a small number of Colonoware sherds were recovered from the early occupation of the Heyward-Washington Stable, which is similar to other early proveniences in Charleston. This suggests that Colonoware use in Charleston was minimal until the late eighteenth century. The majority of the Colonoware from the Heyward-Washington Stable is from the middle eighteenth century occupation of John Milner. Unfortunately, no Colonoware was found in the late eighteenth century

Table 11. The Heyward-Washington Stable: Colonoware Vessel Analysis for All Temporal Periods.

Temporal Period	**Early John Milner**			**Late John Milner**			**19th c.**		
Sherd/Vessel Type	#	%	Mean Thickness	#	%	Mean Thickness	#	%	Mean Thickness
Body Sherds:	3	75%	6.0	20	71.4%	5.8	4	66.7%	5.9
Smoothed				5		5.2	2		5.8
Burnished	3		6.0	15		6.0	2		6.0
Smoothed Rim:									
Rounded									
Flat									
Scalloped									
Burnished Rim:	1	25%	6.5	6	21.4%	6.9	2	33.3%	9.3
Rounded	1		6.5	4		7.2	1		5.5
Flat				2		6.2	1		13.0
Scalloped									
Smoothed Bowl:									
Rounded									
Flat									
Scalloped									
Burnished Bowl:				1	3.6%	4.5			
Rounded									
Flat				1		4.5			
Scalloped									
Smoothed Jar:									
Rounded									
Flat									
Burnished Jar:									
Rounded									
Flat									
Other:				1	3.6%	-			
Burnished Handle				1					
Total:	4	100%	6.1	28	100%	6.0	6	100%	7.0

Table 12. The Heyward-Washington Stable: Results of Colonoware Paste Analysis for All Temporal Periods.

	Smoothed/ Hard	Smoothed/ Very Hard	Burnished/ Hard	Burnished/ Very Hard	Total
Early John Milner # of Sherds	-	-	11	4	15
Mean Thickness in mm.	-	-	5.5	5.0	5.4
Late John Milner # of Sherds	2	1	14	5	22
Mean Thickness in mm.	6.3	6.0	6.2	5.9	5.9
19th century # of Sherds	2	-	4	-	6
Mean Thickness in mm.	5.8	-	7.6	-	7.0

proveniences. During the late eighteenth century the study area was used as a stable building, so the lack of Colonoware in the associate proveniences is more a reflection of a change in activity, than a change in Colonoware use for that time period. Similar to the other Charleston sites there is also a low frequency of Colonoware in the nineteenth century deposits.

McCrady's Longroom

The McCrady's Longroom proveniences were divided into five temporal periods:

1. **1720s Colonial** – associated with the occupation of tenant Alice Hoy (Beef Market Phase I).
2. **1750s Colonial** – associated with the occupation of tenant Bastian Hugo (Beef Market Phase II).
3. **1770s Tavern** – associated with Edward McCrady's Tavern (Beef Market Phase III).
4. **1780s Longroom** – associated with Edward McCrady's Longroom (Beef Market Phase III).
5. **19th c. Tavern** – associated with the use of the site in the 19th c. as a tavern (Beef Market Phase IV).

The 1720s assemblage consists of only two Colonoware body sherds. Both of the sherds are burnished and have a thickness of 5 millimeters (Table 13). Paste analysis

shows that one has a hard paste and the other a very hard paste (Table 14). The 1750s assemblage also recovered only two body burnished sherds (Table 13). The thickness range is 6 to 7.5 millimeters, with a median thickness of 6.75 and a mean thickness of 6.7 millimeters. Both of the sherds have a very hard paste (Table 14).

The 1770s assemblage has 27 Colonoware sherds; 14 body sherds, one rim sherd, 11 bowl fragments, and one jar fragment. The majority of the sherds are burnished with only three smoothed sherds. One of the body sherds was very thick and most likely a basal sherd. The 1770's assemblage has a thickness range of 4 to 10 millimeters, with a median thickness of 7 millimeters and a mean thickness of 6.9 millimeters. The rim sherd is burnished. The jar fragment is smoothed and the bowls are all burnished (Table 13). Paste analysis found that the burnished sherds with a hard paste are the thinnest at 6.0 millimeters. The most frequent variety is the burnished sherds with a very hard paste. Sherds with a soft paste regardless of the finish are the thickest varieties (Table 14).

The 1780s component has seven Colonoware sherds; four body sherds, one bowl fragment, and one jar fragment. Only one of the sherds is smoothed. The late eighteenth century assemblage has a thickness range of 5 to 8 millimeters, having a median thickness of 6.5 millimeters and a mean thickness of 5.7 millimeters. The bowl fragment and the jar fragment are burnished (Table 13). Paste analysis found that the thinnest variety, at 5.0 millimeters, is smoothed sherds with a very hard paste. The most common variety is burnished sherds with a hard paste. As with the 1770s assemblage, sherds with a soft paste are the thickest variety at 8 millimeters (Table 14). The 19th century assemblage only recovered two burnished body sherds with a mean thickness of 7.0 millimeters (Table 13). Paste analysis determined that one sherd has a hard paste, and the

Table 13. McCrady's Longroom: Colonoware Vessel Analysis for All Temporal Periods.

Temporal Period	**1720's**			**1750**			**1770**			**1780**				**19th c.**	
Sherd/Vessel Type	#	%	Mean Thickness	#	%	Mean Thickness	#	%	Mean Thickness	#	%	Mean Thickness	#	%	Mean Thickness
Body Sherds:	2	100%	5.0	2	100%	6.7	14	52%	7.1	4	57.1%	6.7	2	100%	7.0
Smoothed							2		8.0	1		5.0			
Burnished	2		5.0	2		6.7	12		6.9	3		7.3	2		7.0
Smoothed Rim:															
Rounded															
Flat															
Scalloped															
Burnished Rim:							1	4%	7.0						
Rounded							1		7.0						
Flat															
Scalloped															
Smoothed Bowl:															
Rounded															
Flat															
Scalloped															
Burnished Bowl:							11	40%	6.4	1	14.3%	6.0			
Rounded							4		6.0						
Flat							7		6.7	1		6.0			
Scalloped															
Smoothed Jar:							1	4%	10.0						
Rounded							1		10.0						
Flat															
Burnished Jar:										2	28.6%	7.0			
Rounded										2		7.0			
Flat															
Other:															
Total:	2	100%	5.0	2	100%	6.7	27	100 %	6.9	7	100%	5.7	2	100%	7.0

other a very hard paste (Table 14).

Table 14. McCrady's Longroom: Results of Colonoware Paste Analysis for All Temporal Periods.

	Smoothed/ Hard	Smoothed/ Very Hard	Burnished/ Hard	Burnished/ Very Hard	Total
1720's # of Sherds	-	-	1	1	2
Mean Thickness in mm.	-	-	5.0	5.0	5.0
1750's # of Sherds	-	-	-	2	2
Mean Thickness in mm.	-	-	-	6.8	6.8
1770's # of Sherds	-	-	2	17	19
Mean Thickness in mm.	-	-	6.0	6.3	6.2
1780's # of Sherds	-	1	3	1	5
Mean Thickness in mm.	-	5.0	6.7	6.0	6.2
19th century # of Sherds	-	-	1	1	2
Mean Thickness in mm.	-	-	8.0	6.0	7.0

Colonoware was relatively absent at the McCrady's Longroom site except during the 1770's tavern occupation. The low frequencies from the earlier occupations suggests that the tenants did not use Colonoware, and that there may not have been any slaves present on site during this time. Taverns catered to all classes of peoples including slaves, therefore, the Colonoware may have been used in the kitchen for food preparation, or for serving meals to urban slaves. The majority of the rim sherds were from bowls, which suggests that they were used more for serving than cooking (Figure 10). The 1780 Longroom was a wealthier establishment that served the Charleston elite. In light of this the decline in Colonoware use is not surprising. Edward McCrady needed to serve his higher status clientele on more refined ceramics.

Figure 10. Examples of Colonoware rims from McCrady's Longroom**.**

DISCUSSION

For my analysis I calculated both the median and mean thickness for each site and their separate occupational phases. I have further calculated the standard of deviation for each site and the Charleston assemblages as a whole in an attempt to further test the degree of variation within the thickness ranges of the sherds (Table 15). The standard deviation is a statistical measure described as the square root of the variance, or the measure of the dispersion of the values within a data set. The use of standard deviation allows me to see the amount of variation around the mean thickness within my analysis. This allows me to see if a small number of very thick or very thin sherds are skewing my

mean calculations (Weinberg et al. 1981:32-34).

Table 15. Charleston Colonoware Assemblages Calculations of Sherd Thickness

Colonoware Assemblage	**Standard Deviation (in mm.)**
Beef Market	2.21
14 Legare Street	1.74
Miles Brewton House	1.25
Nathaniel Russell House	1.44
Heyward-Washington House	1.10
McCrady's Longroom	1.52
Entire Charleston Assemblage	**1.38**

The standard deviations of the sherd thickness data shows that the thickness of the Colonoware sherds within my analysis do not have a great deal of variation from the median thicknesses. This shows that despite a few relatively thin and thick sherds the Charleston Colonoware assemblage is consistent in thickness. One of the expected traits of a marketed Colonoware was that there would be standardization of vessel thickness. The calculations of the median thickness, mean thickness, and standard deviation within the sherd thickness data set illustrate that the majority of the Charleston Colonoware are similar in thickness.

In order to determine if the Charleston Colonoware is a market ware I will need to compare them to the thickness data of Colonoware vessels from Lowcountry plantations. This is not an easy task since most Colonoware analysts do not publish their data on thicknesses, because it is usually not a necessary element in their research. Early Colonoware research on plantation Colonoware found that it commonly has a thickness range of 5 to 11 millimeters, with an average thickness of about 7.25 millimeters (Anthony 1978; Wheaton et al. 1983). I was able to compile data for Colonoware on Lowcountry plantations from published data and personal notes (Table 16). I calculated a

mean thickness of the whole vessels from Leland Ferguson's published data in the

Table 16. Thickness Calculations for Lowcountry Plantation Colonoware Assemblages

Site Name/ Data Source	# of Sherds	Thickness Range	Median Thickness	Mean Thickness	Standard Deviation
Yaughan and Curiboo (Wheaton et al. 1983)	-	-	-	7.25 mm.	-
Uncommon Ground Ferguson (1992: Appendix 3)	66	4 – 10 mm.	7 mm.	6.83 mm.	1.57
Waterford (38GE550) (Huddleston)	71	3.7–11.7 mm.	7.2 mm.	7.04 mm.	1.52
Drayton Hall (Ron Anthony personal notes)	267	3-17 mm.	10 mm.	7.18 mm.	1.64
Parsonage Site (Ron Anthony personal notes)	77	4.4-11 mm.	7.7 mm.	6.65 mm.	1.37
Ford Plantation (Isenbarger 2005)	66	4.24-10.62 mm.	7.43 mm.	6.70 mm.	1.34
Daniel Island West (Isenbarger personal notes)	480	3.1-12.3 mm.	7.7 mm.	6.70 mm.	1.48
New Riverside Tract 38BU1957 (Isenbarger personal notes)	18	6.03-12.33 mm.	9.18 mm.	8.2 mm.	1.80

appendix of *Uncommon Ground* (1992:Appendix 3). This data represents whole Colonoware vessels found throughout South Carolina. I also compiled a mean thickness of whole vessels from Brockington and Associates, Inc. Colonoware analysis at Waterford (38GE550), a plantation in Georgetown County, using their published data on vessel thickness (Huddleston). Ron Anthony, from the Charleston Museum, graciously allowed me to look at his notes from his Colonoware analyses at Drayton Hall Plantation, and the Parsonage site, both of which are colonial sites near Charleston, SC (Anthony personal notes). I was also able to include data from recent analyses I have done for Brockington and Associates, Inc, this includes data from Ford Plantation (Silk Hope Plantation, Cherry Hill Plantation, and Richmond Plantation), consisting of three rural Georgia Lowcountry plantations situated outside of Savannah, in Bryan County; Daniel

Island West, located on Daniel Island outside of Charleston; and New Riverside Tract (38BU1957), located in Beaufort County in Bluffton, South Carolina (Isenbarger 2005, and personal notes).

The hypothesis is that if the Charleston Colonoware was a marketed ware it should be thinner than the Colonoware found on plantation sites. When combined the Charleston Colonoware assemblages slowly increased in thickness through time ranging from 5.24 millimeters in the early eighteenth century to 6.30 millimeters in the early nineteenth century (Table 17). Table 17 consists of all of the mean thickness data for the entire Charleston assemblage, separated by temporal period. When compared to the rural assemblages shown in Table 16 the data suggests that Colonoware found in Charleston is consistently thinner than any of the Lowcountry rural assemblages. This suggests that thinner wares were produced for urban consumers.

Table 17. . Mean Thickness Calculations for the Charleston Colonoware Assemblages.

Temporal Period	**Mean Thickness**
Early 18th c.	5.24 mm.
Mid 18th c.	5.98 mm.
Late 18th c.	6.22 mm.
Early 19th c.	6.30 mm.
Total Mean Thickness:	**6.01 mm.**

The comparative plantation data suggest that the Charleston Colonoware is thinner than vessels found on surrounding plantations. There seems to have been standardization within the Charleston Colonoware resulting in the urban wares being thinner than those from plantation contexts. Further analysis of Colonoware assemblages from plantations that focuses on measuring for standardization is necessary before this can be tested definitively. The following discussions entail my analysis of the Colonoware paste and vessel attributes, and vessel forms in an attempt to find patterns

within the Charleston assemblages that would further support that the Charleston Colonoware was a marketed ware.

Could the Charleston Assemblage Have Been a Marketed Ware?

My main hypothesis was that the marketed Colonoware would have a more standardized vessel thickness and surface treatment. If the Charleston Colonoware was marketed I would expect the majority of the sherds to be thinner, with a harder paste. I would also expect burnished surface treatments to be found in higher frequencies at each site. In order to see these differences I divided the sherds by surface treatment and paste hardness. At each site the sherds with soft pastes, whether burnished or not were the thickest sherds. Therefore, to answer my hypothesis I am focusing on sherds with hard and very hard pastes. The following tables illustrate the numbers and mean thickness of each variety within each time period. The first table is of the comparative assemblage,

the Beef Market, to which I am comparing the other Charleston assemblages. The second table shows the Charleston sites combined (Table 18 and Table 19).

A temporal analysis of the Beef Market Colonoware assemblage shows that the sherds slowly become thicker through time. Most importantly, during the eighteenth century (phase II and III), which is the height of Colonoware production, the total mean thickness is the same. The Beef Market has more sherds during phase I than the other sites. This may be due to the fact that few early sites have been excavated extensively.

Table 18. The Beef Market Paste Analysis Results for All Phases.

	Smoothed/ Hard	Smoothed/ Very Hard	Burnished/ Hard	Burnished/ Very Hard	Total
Phase I (e. 18th c.) # of Sherds	1	3	54	5	63
Mean Thickness in mm.	3.5	8.0	5.0	5.2	5.2
Phase II (mid 18th c.) # of Sherds	5	-	25	16	46
Mean Thickness in mm.	12.7	-	5.0	5.6	6.1
Phase III (l. 18th c.) # of Sherds	1	3	11	9	24
Mean Thickness in mm.	6.5	6.3	6.3	5.8	6.1
Phase IV (e. 19th c.) # of Sherds	1	-	12	12	25
Mean Thickness in mm.	6.5	-	6.3	6.3	6.3

Table 19. Non-Beef Market Sites Paste Analysis for All Phases.

	Smoothed/ Hard	Smoothed/ Very Hard	Burnished/ Hard	Burnished/ Very Hard	Total
Phase I (e. 18th c.) # of Sherds	1	-	12	5	18
Mean Thickness	8.5	-	5.5	5.0	5.5
Phase II (m 18th c.) # of Sherds	11	4	21	13	49
Mean Thickness	6.0	6.4	6.0	5.2	5.8
Phase III (l. 18th c.) # of Sherds	19	14	20	40	93
Mean Thickness	6.2	6.4	5.8	6.4	6.2
Phase IV (e. 19th c) # of sherds**.**	13	2	66	38	119
Mean Thickness	6.6	5.8	6.6	5.7	6.3
Total Count	44	20	119	96	279
Total Mean Thickness	6.4	6.3	6.3	5.9	6.2

During the mid-eighteenth century (phase II) the number of sherds found at the Beef Market and the other sites is relatively equal. This may be due to the fact that there are a higher number of sites with proveniences dating to this time period and that these provenience also date to the height of Colonoware production. During the late eighteenth

and early nineteenth century (phase III and phase IV) there are fewer sherds at the Beef Market than the other sites. This is most likely because the function of the market is changing during this time. Colonoware may have been less commonly sold at the Beef Market once it became a permanent structure and its focus shifted to selling Beef.

An analysis of the different varieties of Colonoware show that smoothed sherds with hard and very hard pastes are less common at the Beef Market than the burnished sherds. Smoothed sherds with a hard paste are more common during the mid-eighteenth century (phase II) at the Beef Market and the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century (phase III and IV) on the tested sites. Smoothed sherds with a very hard paste are less common at the Beef Market than at the other sites. These sherds occur at the Beef Market during early to mid-eighteenth century (phase I and III), and are most common on the sites during the late eighteenth century (phase III). Burnished sherds with a hard paste are the most common variety at both the Beef Market and the other sites. The Beef Market shows a peak in burnished sherds with a hard paste during phase I, and it is most common at the site during the early nineteenth century (phase IV). Burnished sherds with a very hard paste are the second most common variety at both the Beef Market and the sites. These are most frequent at the Beef Market during the mid eighteenth century (phase II) and on the sites during the late eighteenth century (phase III). These findings suggest that the Charleston slaves preferred burnished vessels. The main question this leads to is whether or not this preference is associated with function and/or appearance. Were the urban slaves looking for wares that looked more refined, or is the burnishing a reflection of their foodways and the ways in which they used the vessels?

An analysis of the mean thickness of each variety shows that the thickness of the

burnished sherds between the Beef Market and the tested sites are about equal and follow the same pattern. Both varieties of the burnished sherds are thinnest during phase I and slowly become thicker throughout time. The smoothed varieties do not seem to follow a pattern between the Beef Market and the other sites. The burnished sherds with a hard paste seem to be the main market ware for the Beef Market, with its peak being the late eighteenth century (phase III). The burnished sherds with a very hard paste seem to be the main ware at the market during phase I. This reinforces the fact that there is a preference for burnished wares. However, they are also showing a preference for more highly fired wares. The hardness of a vessel would affect its function. Vessels that are burnished with harder pastes would hold liquids better. The finishing technique and firing quality would also affect the vessels heat retention. Therefore, these preferences are most likely linked to both the function that the vessels were used for, and its nicer appearance.

When looking at vessel thickness on the tested sites, there seems to be more correlation between paste hardness, rather than surface treatment. The thickness of hard pasted sherds is relatively the same from the mid eighteenth century through the early nineteenth century (phase II through phase IV), while the thickness of very hard pasted sherds is similar during the mid and late eighteenth century (phase III and IV). The early eighteenth century (phase I) sherds deviate from this in that it is the burnished sherds that are similar. Possibly, during the earlier period when it was more common to emulate Euro-American vessels, burnished sherds were the thinnest. With the rise of Colonoware production the importance may have been shifted to the hardness of the paste. At the Beef Market the burnished sherds are the most frequent and thinnest variety and the

thickness gradually increases through time. Again, the hardness of the paste is most likely linked with the function of the vessels. The fact that paste hardness is more consistent than surface treatment suggests that harder wares were more functional for the needs of the Charleston consumers.

The Charleston Colonoware seems to have been a marketed ware, and some of which was indeed sold at the Beef Market. The most likely market ware were the burnished sherds with a hard paste since they are the most frequent and the thinnest variety. Burnished sherds were thinner and occurred in higher frequencies than smoothed sherds. I found that the thickness of the sherds increased slowly through time. My analysis has shown that the Charleston Colonoware was a marketed ware found within the main market of Charleston, and was most likely a component of the slaves' internal marketing system. This means that the production and sale of Colonoware could have been used as a means for rural African slave families to better their standard of living. Concurrently, the material culture choices made by urban slaves can be used to better understand what they themselves placed value on. Charleston slaves were using Colonoware vessels at a time when ones material culture was a reflection of their social status and the natural order of the universe. An analysis of vessel forms will help us gain insight into what the slaves used these vessels for and possibly the cultural significance of these Colonoware vessels in the slaves' daily lives.

An Analysis of Vessel Forms

I compared the urban Colonoware with Espenshade's temporal pattern to see if the Charleston Colonoware follows the same patterns as rural Colonoware (Table 20).

Table 20. Colonoware Vessels by Temporal Period.

	Bowls	Jars	Total
# in Phase I	5	5	**10**
# in Phase II	4	-	**4**
# in Phase III	17	7	**24**
# in 19th c.	20	3	**23**
Total Count	**44**	**15**	**61**

During the early colonial period jars are the most common vessel form, and Euro-American traits, such as crenellated rims, foot-ringed bowls, strap and loop handles, chamber pots, teapots, and bottles, are prevalent (Anthony 2002:49; Espenshade 1996:7). Within the Charleston proveniences dated to the Beef Market Phase I ten sherds where the vessel form was identifiable were recovered. Of these ten sherds five were jars and the other five were bowls. During the eighteenth century bowls become more frequent and Euro-American attributes are uncommon (Espenshade 1996:7-8). This phase is relevant to the Charleston proveniences dated to the Beef Market phase II and III. The Charleston assemblages from the mid eighteenth century deposits (phase II) had 4 bowls. The late eighteenth century (Phase III) proveniences recovered 24 vessels; 17 bowls and seven jars. During the nineteenth century (Phase IV) the most common vessels are small bowls usually with markings (Espenshade 1996:8). The nineteenth century Charleston proveniences have 23 identifiable vessel forms; 20 bowls and three jars. The Charleston assemblages follow Espenshade's patterns, in that bowls increase through time, and jars are consistently less common. Markings on vessels are also present on late eighteenth and nineteenth century vessels. Surprisingly, Euro-American traits are not very common in any time period.

Another hypothesis was that I would find several vessel forms beyond bowls and

jars. The only identifiable vessel forms recovered from the Beef Market, my comparative site, were bowls and jars. If other vessel forms are present on the tested sites, then they were most likely obtained outside of the main market, and perhaps even specially made for its consumer. My analysis found that only a small number of vessels were not bowls or jars, and these all came from only two of the tested sites, 14 Legare Street and the Nathaniel Russell House. These vessels were all recovered from nineteenth century deposits, when the Beef Market was no longer functioning. This may suggest that either the market had a regulating effect on the wares sold there, or that with the waning of Colonoware production social rules surrounding the production and use of Colonoware somehow changed.

The recovery of mainly only bowls and jars suggests that Colonoware was used for the same functions whether in an urban or rural environment. Historical archaeologists have shown that plantation slaves used Colonoware bowls and jars in the maintenance of more traditional African foodways (Ferguson 1992). The majority of Charleston Colonoware vessels are also bowls and jars suggesting that they may have been used by the urban slaves to continue to practice traditional African foodways despite their urban location. Other scholars have suggested that enslaved individuals prepared one-pot meals because they were faster and easier to prepare, and they had limited access to European wares (Heath 1990:209; Otto 1980:7-9).

Christopher Espenshade states that during the nineteenth century Colonoware is found most commonly in remote non-urban areas and its becomes more commonly used for ritual rather than cooking (1996:9-10). I was interested to see if these changes are found in the Charleston urban contexts as well. The divergent vessel forms found at 14

Legare Street were a warming plate and a mortar-like vessel. Both of these vessels could be used to prepare either food or medicine. Both vessels are also less refined, thicker, and unevenly finished. Incising on Colonoware vessels is associated with its use in religious activities (Ferguson 1999; 1992). Therefore, the incised figure on the mortar-like vessel does suggest that it would have most likely been used for medicinal purposes. Interestingly, it was found buried very deep, right above the water table. Ferguson has suggested that ritual vessels are placed in waterways; this may be evidence of such an attempt (Ferguson 1999; 1992). Even more interesting is that the incised figure on the mortar-like vessel resembles Native American religious figures. During the nineteenth century, on the adjacent property of the Miles Brewton House, Mary Pringle's jockey Thomas Turner wore his hair in two long braids similar to Native American hairstyles (Cote 2002; Zierden 2001b:33-37). However, the warming plate is less likely to have been used for medicinal purposes. The variant vessel form from the Nathaniel Russell House was a pipe fragment. I would expect to see Colonoware pipes in the earlier periods since pipes should have been more easily accessible later on. However, it does not point to ritual use either. Therefore, the only urban evidence of a nineteenth century shift to the ritual use of Colonoware is the mortar-like vessel.

The Colonoware analysis that I conducted in 2000 on the 14 Legare Street eighteenth century vessels found several jars with incised lines (Isenbarger 2001) (Figure 11). These lines were in groups of varying numbers, with some crossed out diagonally and others not. The lines were incised after the vessel was fired, suggesting that the Colonoware consumer rather than the potter did them. I originally thought that they could have been maker's marks associated with the user, similar to markings found in facial scarring. I now think it is more likely that they were used to keep track of the consumer's medicine or ritual use. They could have used the lines to keep track of each dose of medicine, helping them to be certain that they took it for the proper duration of time. If one medicine was to be taken for a certain amount of time and then another taken for a different amount of time, it would help explain the varying groups of crossed out lines. According to Ferguson (1992; 1999) medicinal vessels are usually discarded after one use, however the14 Legare Street vessels may have been used

Figure 11. Incised eighteenth century Colonoware jar from 14 Legare Street.

several times out of necessity. These incised jars could be further evidence of medicinal and ritual use in an urban context.

Colonoware Use and the "Georgian Mindset"

Joe Joseph's research on the Judicial Center Colonoware assemblage (eighteenth to early nineteenth century) showed that both Colonoware and utilitarian European wares were common in the colonial period with the use of both dropping in frequency by the late eighteenth century. Joseph further argues that this change is due to social changes within Charleston, as the city moved from one marked with ethnic diversity prior to 1740, to a unified structured society focused on class and social status after 1770. This time period is marked with the emergence of a new social worldview known as the "Georgian mindset", which emphasized balance and order, individualism, and ones place in society. The elite used their material culture as an outward reflection of their power and as a means to substantiate that power (Ferguson 1996:261-262).

Leland Ferguson's research on the Colonoware from South Carolina plantations showed that there was not evidence of the slaves adopting the dominant ideals set forth in the "Georgian mindset". Instead he argues that on plantations Colonoware is very homogenous reflecting the ideals of community and cooperation between slaves. On plantations, Colonoware was used in the maintenance of the slaves' own distinct culture (Ferguson 1996).

My research on two additional Charleston commercial sites, the Beef Market, the main market for Charleston from 1692-1796, and McCrady's Longroom (c. 1720s) which served as a tavern and longroom after 1770, also found that there was a decline in

Colonoware use between 1770 and 1780. However, my analysis of the Colonoware assemblages from 4 Charleston elite house lots found that the total number of sherds increases after 1770. This may be a reflection of an increase in archaeological contexts rather than an actual increase in the use of Colonoware during the late eighteenth century. Further investigations are needed in order to determine is the variations between the public and private spheres are an actual representation of an increased use of Colonoware.

The presence of Colonoware in nineteenth century deposits and the fact that the majority of the vessels follow more traditional vessel forms seem to suggest that the Charleston slaves were using the Colonoware as a form of resistance to the dominant Euro-American culture. Plantation archaeology has shown that during the nineteenth century Colonoware vessels are found in more remote rural areas. The majority of plantation slaves begin using European goods during the nineteenth century and Colonoware use decreases. Why do urban slaves continue to use Colonoware vessels? And most importantly, why is Colonoware production allowed to continue on the plantations after the popularity of Colonoware is supposed to have declined? If the urban slaves continued to use Colonoware because they could not afford other wares, then there should be a higher occurrence of vessels with European traits. Potters produce pottery that their consumers desire. If the urban slaves desired European wares, then the Colonoware potters would have produced wares in similar forms. Since the later Colonoware vessels are in traditional forms and were incised by the urban slaves, suggests that, at least within their use of Colonoware, they were purposefully choosing to not assimilate into the Euro-American culture.

My discussion in Chapter two showed that the urban slaves commonly showed their individuality and were strongly associated with their cultural origins. Therefore, their adoption of Colonoware as a tool to show their individuality and social position is understandable. Like plantation slaves, the urban slaves seem to have used their Colonoware as a material expression of the solidarity of their group identity. The material culture of the Charleston slaves is very important in understanding how they expressed their doxa. Because they chose to use a ceramic that was representative of their social position within the dominant Euro-American society, they were subtly challenging the "Georgian mindset". The urban slaves could have been using the Colonoware to further illustrate their rejection of the social hierarchy (Palkovich 1988:303-305).

By the nineteenth century rural slaves would have been increasingly involved in the internal market and may have been using their profits to obtain European goods that reflected a higher status. It has also been suggested that the planters became increasingly concerned with the health of the slaves, and therefore wanted Colonoware replaced with European goods, but this would not explain its continued use in Charleston. Further comparisons of nineteenth century rural plantation contexts and urban contexts where Colonoware use persists may help us better understand why it was continued to be used in these contexts.

Chapter 5: Conclusions

The core of my thesis was to determine if the Colonoware recovered from the Beef Market and other Charleston sites was a marketed ware. If the Colonoware was a marketed ware it would have been a component of the slaves' internal marketing system. Slaves would have used Colonoware to better their lives by being able to continue traditional African foodways and medicinal practices, as well as selling it for profit. Not only does Colonoware production add agency to the lives and actions of the slaves, but it was also a form of resistance. Enslaved potters and consumers both used the Euro-Americans capitalist system to their own advantage.

The expected attributes of a marketed Colonoware were a more standardized surface treatment and vessel thickness, with a higher frequency of thinner, more finely made vessels. In order to test this I focused most on surface treatment, vessel thickness, paste hardness, and vessel form. Colonoware from the Beef Market, the main market for Charleston from 1690-1796, was compared with the Colonoware from five other Charleston sites. A total of 558 Colonoware sherds were analyzed. I found that the Colonoware recovered from the Beef Market was most likely sold there, and that the majority of the urban Colonoware was also most likely a marketed ware. I found that burnished sherds with a hard paste were the most commonly marketed variety.

The vessel patterns were similar to those found on plantations. This is important because it means that the urban slaves would have been able to continue to practice the

same foodways and rituals as plantation slaves. This was not expected since it is believed that urban slaves were more accepting of Euro-American traditions. Foodways are a very significant factor in culture. Foodways tends to be the last and hardest aspect of ones' culture to be changed (Mintz and Price 1976). Finding that the urban slaves used the Colonoware vessels in similar ways to the plantation slaves is very important in that they were able to maintain their sense of identity through their foodways. As I explained in chapter one, individuals define themselves using a variety of variables or 'doxa' (Roberts 2005; Robb 2001). Therefore, the urban slaves' solidarity through foodways is only one of the many ways in which they would have defined themselves.

There is further evidence that the urban slaves took the standardized marketed wares and customized them to fit their own personal needs. An example of this is the incised jars from 14 Legare Street, the incisions were most likely made by the consumer and a reflection of medicinal or ritual use. Another example was found in my 2000 analysis of the 14 Legare Street Colonoware is a Colonoware vessel shaped like a chamber pot, but with sooting on it, which suggests that it was used for cooking rather than hygiene. This is an example of the consumer using the vessel in a different way than the potter intended (Isenbarger 2001). These reflect the individual actions of the consumers and allow us to better understand their values and worldviews.

An analysis of the Colonoware assemblages as a whole suggests that the main users of the ware were the urban slaves themselves. The material culture is similar to plantation assemblages in that the majority of the vessels are bowls and jars, with a higher percentage of bowls; the presence of incised vessels suggesting traditional religious practices; and that the frequency of Colonoware is highest in the mid to late

eighteenth century. This research has allowed for a better understanding of how the Charleston urban slaves created their identities. The Charleston Colonoware assemblages are similar to those found on plantations, suggesting that they would have used the Colonoware in an attempt to materially express their solidarity as a group, while also excluding the dominant Euro-American culture.

Slaves would have used their material culture in the process of negotiation between themselves and the planter class (Robb 2001; Orser 1998:77; Singleton 1995:7). The use of material culture is embedded with social meanings (Dellino-Musgrave 2005:222). Through an analysis of the contexts of use, archaeologists can interpret the meanings of these negotiations. Slaves placed their own values on the acquisition of Euro-American material culture or ideals. Through the use of "agency" and "practice" theory archaeologists can better interpret the social meanings placed on the material culture of the slaves (Potter 1992:122; Orser 1988:740-741).

There is further evidence that the Charleston slaves also used the Colonoware vessels as forms of resistance against the dominant Euro-American culture. This can be seen in their continued use of traditional vessel forms. As Charleston became increasing divided into a strict social hierarchy, social tensions would have been stronger during the nineteenth century. It is during this time that the urban slaves chose to adopt a larger amount of bowls instead of creating Colonoware plates, as has been seen on some plantations. The ideals of the "Georgian mindset" state that ones social standing within society is reflected within their material culture. By choosing to adopt a non-European ceramic and vessel form, the urban slaves may have been intentionally challenging and resisting against this ideal. Being a marketed ware the Charleston Colonoware would

have been a commodity. The fact that the Urban slaves would have intentionally purchased the Colonoware with their own money as a symbol of resistance, further strengthens their active resistance. Previous historical research on urban slaves suggested that they were more accepting of Euro-American culture (Berlin 1998; Powers 1981). When one uses the interpretive framework of "agency" and "practice" theories to look at the material culture the urban slaves used in the creation of their identities, it suggests instead that they used both Euro-American and non-Euro-American material culture as representations of their individuality and resistance against the dominant social class.

An important aspect of the slaves' internal economy system is that the slave's were able to gain some control over their labor—the very thing they were enslaved for. They then used this control to better their standard of living. The actual amount of money each slave earned within the internal economy is less important than what they gained socially from their economic activities. How they used their economic gains reflects what was important to them. It is through studying their choices that we can gain insight into what they themselves felt was important in their daily lives (McDonald 1993:167-168). Scholars' research into the internal economy has shown that the slaves also influenced those they traded with. Thus, their economic activities not only influenced the slave community, but were also an important factor in the development of Euro-American culture (Mintz and Price 1976; McDonald 1993:174-175). Research into the internal market will allow us to better understand the cultural development of Lowcountry South Carolina.

Another important aspect of the internal market is that it supplied the slaves with the some of the skills necessary to be more self-sufficient, such as independence, decision

making, and some economic gains (Marable 2000; King 1995; Morgan 1983). The internal market allowed them to be more independent in that they were used to working under little supervision and providing for themselves. They were used to making their own decisions and planning their economic activities. After emancipation the majority of Lowcountry freedmen became small landowners or tenants, whereas elsewhere in the South freedmen were mostly sharecroppers (King 1995:158; Morgan 1983:418-420). In 1880 the Lowcountry had the least amount of sharecroppers, and one of the largest groups of rural black landowners (Morgan 1982:598). Despite the difficulties of high prices per acre, and restrictions on what land was available to freedman, they were able to purchase a significant amount of land. Historical accounts show that in 1865, 347 freedman owned land on St. Helena Island (Rosengarten 1986:263). Another former slave purchased 382 acres of land on Sandy Island (Pyatt 2005;9). Freedmen were able to gain a level of autonomy in that they could support themselves without going into great debt or relying on white landowners (Morris 1998:1007). Freedmen expressed their desire to maintain control over their labor, "they wanted no part of gang labour or any system which limited their control over what they could grow, what they could rear, and what they could sell" (Berlin and Morgan 1991:23). Freedmen used to skills and autonomy acquired during slavery to help them in the creation of their new free life.

Urban freedmen were also able to gain autonomy and support themselves post emancipation. The records of Mary Pringle, Miles Brewton's great-great-great niece, show that her slaves went on to become a hair dresser; nurse; coachman and butler; hunter and artisan of caned chairs and baskets; and a fisherman for a prominent black owned fishing company (Cote 2002:352-353). Research into the slaves' internal

economy allows us to better understand the development of South Carolina's history, what the Lowcountry slaves placed meaning on, as well as the development of the labor system after Emancipation. Through this, we can gain insight into what items and values the slaves placed importance on, how they struggled to improve their lives, as well as the immediate and long-term effects of their social and economic endeavors.

Bibliography

Agha, Andrew
2001 An Analysis of the Cultural Material and Deposits in an Eighteenth Century Inland Swamp Rice Embankment, Willtown Bluff, Charleston County, South Carolina. On file, The Charleston Museum.

Anthony, Ronald W.
1979 Descriptive Analysis and Replication of Historic Earthenware: Colono Wares From the Spiers Landing Site, Berkeley County, South Carolina. In *The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers*. The Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, pp. 253-268.

1986 Colono Wares. In *Home Upriver: Rural Life on Daniel's Island.* Edited by Martha Zierden, Leslie Drucker, and Jeanne Calhoun, pp. 7-22 – 7-51. Ms. On file, South Carolina Department of Highways and Public Transportation, Columbia.

1989 Cultural Diversity at Mid to Late 18th Century Lowcountry Plantation Slave Settlements. Masters Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

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

2006 The Parsonage Site and Drayton Hall Colonoware Analysis. Personal notes.

Beckles, Hilary McD
1991 An Economic Life of Their Own: Slaves as Commodity Producers and Distributors in Barbados. In *The Slaves' Economy: Independent Production by Slaves in the Americas.* Edited by Ira Berlin and Philip D. Morgan, pp. 31-47. Frank Cass, London.

1999 Centering Woman: Gender Discourses in Caribbean Slave Society. Ian Randle Publishers, Kingston.

Berlin, Ira
1998 Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America. The Belknap Press Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Berlin, Ira and Philip D. Morgan
1991 The Slaves' Economy: Independent Production by Slaves in the Americas, edited by Ira Berlin and Philip D. Morgan, pp. 1-23. Frank Cass, London.

1993 Cultivation and Culture: Labor and the Shaping of Slave Life in the Americas. Carter G. Woodson Institute Series in Black Studies. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Calhoun et al.
1984 Meat in Due Season: Preliminary Investigations of Marketing Practices in Colonial Charleston. Archaeological Contributions 9, The Charleston Museum, Charleston.

Campbell, John
1991 As 'A Kind of Freeman'?: Slaves' Market-Related Activities in the South Carolina UpCountry, 1800-1860. In *The Slaves' Economy: Independent Production by Slaves in the Americas.* Edited by Ira Berlin and Philip D. Morgan, pp. 31-47. Frank Cass, London.

Carney, Judith
2001 Black Rice: The African Origins of Rice Cultivation in the Americas. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Charleston Gazette
1761 September 30, 1761.

Coakley, Joyce
2006 The Flower Ladies: Mothers of Invention. Charleston Magazine, July-August.

Cohen, Anthony P.
1985 The Symbolic Construction of Community. Routledge, Chichester.

Cooper, Margaret, and Carl Steen
1998 Potters of the South Carolina Lowcountry: A Material Culture Study of Creolization. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Atlanta, Georgia.

Cote, Richard N.
2002 Mary's World: Love, War, and Family Ties in Nineteenth-century Charleston. Corinthian Books, Mount Pleasant, S.C.

Crane, Brian D.
1993 Colono Ware and Criollo Ware Pottery From Charleston, South Carolina and San Juan, Puerto Rico In Comparative Perspective. Dissertation in American Civilization, University of Pennsylvania. Bell & Howell Company, Ann Arbor.

DeCorse, Christopher R.
1999 *Oceans Apart: Africanist Perspectives on Diaspora Archaeology.* In "I, Too, Am America": Archaeological Studies of African American Life, edited by Theresa A. Singleton, pp. 132-155, University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Dellino-Musgrave, Virginia
2005 British Identities Through Pottery in Praxis: The Case Study of a Royal Navy Ship in the South Atlantic. *Journal of Material Culture* 10(3): 219-243.

Dobres, Marcia-Anne, and John E. Robb
2000 Agency in Archaeology: Paradigm or Platitude? In *Agency in Archaeology*, ed. by Marcia-Anne Dobres and John E. Robb. Routledge, London, pp. 3-17.

Drucker, Lesley M., and Ron Anthony
1979 The Spiers Landing Site: Archaeological Investigations in Berkeley County, South Carolina. Carolina Archaeological Services, Columbia.

Edwards-Ingram, Ywone
2001 African American Medicine and the Social Relations of Slavery. In *Race and the Archaeology of Identity*, ed. by Charles E. Orser Jr. The University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City, pp. 34-53.

Espenshade, Christopher T.
1996 The Changing Use Contexts of Slave-Made Pottery on the South Carolina Coast. Paper presented at the conference, *African Impact on Material Culture of the Americas*, May-June 1996, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Ferguson, Leland
1978 Looking for the "Afro" in Colono-Indian Pottery. Conference on Historic Sites Archaeology Papers 12: 68-86.

1980 Looking for the "Afro" in Colono-Indian Pottery. In *Archaeological Perspectives on Ethnicity in America: Afro-American and Asian American Culture History.* Edited by R. Schuyler, pp. 14-28. Baywood Publishing Company Inc., Farmingdale, New York.

1985 Low Country Plantations, the Catawba Nation, and River Burnished Pottery. Paper presented at the Eleventh Annual Conference of the Archaeological Society of South Carolina, Columbia.

1989 Low Country Plantations, the Catawba Nation, and River Burnished Pottery. In *Studies in South Carolina Archaeology: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Stephenson*, edited by Albert C. Goodyear III and Glen T. Hanson, pp185-191. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Anthropological Studies 9, Columbia.

1991 Struggling with Pots in Colonial South Carolina. In *The Archaeology of Inequality*, edited by Randall H. McGuire and Robert Paynter, pp. 28-39. Blackwell, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

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

1996 "Struggling With Pots in Colonial South Carolina." In *Images of the Recent Past: Readings in Historical Archaeology*. Edited by Charles E. Orser, Jr. Originally published in 1991. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek.

1999 "'The Cross is a Magic Sign': Marks on Eighteenth Century Bowls From South Carolina. In *"I, Too, Am America": Archaeological Studies of African-American Life.* Edited by Theresa A. Singleton. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Genovese, Eugene D.
1972 Roll, Jordon, Roll: The World the Slaves Made. Vintage Books, New York.

Groover, MD
1994 Evidence of Folkways and Cultural Exchange in the Eighteenth Century South Carolina Backcountry. *Historical Archaeology* 28(1): 41-64.

Hamby, Theresa M, and J.W. Joseph, eds.
2004 A New Look at the Old City: Archaeological Excavations of the Charleston County Judicial Center Site (38CH1708), Charleston, South Carolina. Report submitted to Charleston County Department of Capital Projects. Submitted by New South and Associates, Stone Mountain, Georgia.

Handler, Jerome S., and Michael L. Tuite, Jr.
"The Atlantic Slave Trade and Slave Life in the Americas: A Visual Record." http://hitchcock.itc.virginia.edu/Slavery/. Cited on August 2004.

Heath, Barbara J.
1999 Buttons, Beads and Buckles: Contextualizing Adornment Within the Bounds of Slavery. In *Historical Archaeology, Identity Formation and the Interpretation of Ethnicity,* ed. by Maria Franklin and Garrett Fesler. Colonial Williamsburg Research Publications, Richmond, VA, pp. 47-70.

Hecht, Michael L., Ronald L Jackson II, and Sidney A Ribeau
2003 African American Communication: Exploring Identity and Culture. Second edition, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, Mahwah, New Jersey.

Heite, Edward F.
2002 Colono: Also a European Pottery Tradition? Heite Consulting, Camden, Delaware. See also http//heite.org/pdf/Colono-1.pdf.

Herskovitz, Melville J.
1990 The Myth of the Negro Past. Beacon Press, Boston.

Hodder, Ian
2000 Agency and Individuals in Long-term Processes. In Agency in Archaeology, ed. by Marcia-Anne Dobres and John E. Robb. Routledge, London, pp. 21-33.

Huddleston, Connie M.
1998 Plates and Scalloped Rims: Indications of Temporal Change in Low Country Colonoware Production. Paper presented at the 55th annual meeting of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference. Greenville, South Carolina.

Hudson, Larry E., Jr.
1989 'The Average Truth': The Slave Family in South Carolina, 1820-1860. Dissertation in Philosophy, University of Keele. The British Library, West Yorkshire.

1997 To Have and to Hold: Slave Work and Family Life in Antebellum South Carolina. The University of Georgia Press, Athens.

Isenbarger, Nicole
2001 Analysis of Colonoware in the Eighteenth Century Deposits. In *Excavations at 14 Legare Street, Charleston, South Carolina*. Archaeological Contributions 28, The Charleston Museum, Charleston.

2006 Necessity or Commodity?: An Analysis of the Ford Plantation Colonoware, Bryan County, Georgia. Paper presented at the Material Reflections of Georgia's African-American Past symposium for the Society Of Georgia Archaeology, May.

2006 Daniel Island West and New Riverside Tract Colonoware Analysis. Personal notes.

Johnson, Whittington B.
1996 Black Savannah, 1788-1864. The University of Arkansas Press, Fayetteville.

Joseph, J.W.
2002 From Colonist to Charlestonian: The Crafting of Identity in a Colonial Southern City. In *Another's Country: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on Cultural Interactions in the Southern Colonies.* Edited by J.W. Joseph and Martha Zierden, pp. 215-233. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Joseph, J.W., and Martha Zierden
2002 Cultural Diversity in the Southern Colonies. In *Another's Country: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on Cultural Interactions in the Southern Colonies.* Edited by J.W. Joseph and Martha Zierden, pp. 1-12. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Joyner, Charles
1984 Down by the Riverside: A South Carolina Slave Community. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

King, Wilma
1995 Stolen Childhood: Slave Youth in Nineteenth-Century America. Indiana University Press, Indianapolis.

Koger, Larry
1985 Black Slaveowners: Free Black Slave Masters in South Carolina, 1790-1860. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.

Littlefield, Daniel C.
1991 Rice and Slaves: Ethnicity and the Slave Trade in Colonial South Carolina. University of Illinois Press, Chicago.

McDonald, Roderick A.
1991 Independent Economic Production by Slaves on Antebellum Louisiana Sugar Plantations. In *The Slaves' Economy: Independent Production by Slaves in the Americas.* Edited by Ira Berlin and Philip D. Morgan, pp. 31-47. Frank Cass, London.

1993 The Economy and Material Culture of Slaves: Goods and Chattels on the Sugar Plantations of Jamaica and Louisiana. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge.

McInnis, Maurie D.
2005 The Politics of Taste in Antebellum Charleston. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Marable, Manning
2000 How Capitalism Underdeveloped Black America: Problems in Race, Political Economy, and Society. Updated edition, South End Press Classics Series, Vol. 4. South End Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Marx, Karl
1999 "The Values of Commodities: Use-Value and Value (The Substance of Value and the Magnitude of Value). In Social Theory: The Multicultural and Classic Readings. Edited by Charles Lemert. Westview Press, Boulder.

Matthews, Christopher N.
2001 Political Economy and Race: Comparative Archaeologies of Annapolis and New Orleans in the Eighteenth Century. In *Race and the Archaeology of Identity*, ed. by Charles E. Orser Jr. The University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City, pp. 71-87.

Merrell, James H.
1988 The Indians' New World: The Catawba Experience. *In Material Life in America, 1600-1860*, Ed. by Robert Blair St. George. Northeastern University Press, Boston.

Meyers, Allan D.
1999 West African Tradition in the Decoration of Colonial Jamaican Folk Pottery. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 3(4): 201-223.

Mintz, Sidney W, and Richard Price
1992 The Birth of African-American Culture: An Anthropological Perspective. Beacon Press, Boston.

1976 An Anthropological Approach to the Afro-American Past: A Caribbean Perspective. Institute for the Study of Human Issues, Philadelphia.

Morgan, Philip D.
1982 Work and Culture: The Task System and the World of Lowcountry Blacks, 1700 to 1880. *The William and Mary Quarterly* 34(4): 563-599.

1983 The Ownership of Property by Slaves in the Mid-Nineteenth-Century Low Country. *The Journal of Southern History*, 49(3): 399-420.

1998 Slave Counterpoint: Black Culture in the Eighteenth-Century Cheasapeake and Lowcountry. Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Morris, Christopher
1998 The Articulation of Two Worlds: The Master-Slave Relationship Reconsidered. *The Journal of American History* 85(3):982-1007.

Mouer et al.
1999 Colonoware Pottery, Chesapeake Pipes and "Uncritical Assumptions". In *I Too Am America: Archaeological Studies of African-American Life,* edited by T.A. Singleton, pp. 83-115. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Noel Hume, Ivor
1962 A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America. Random House, New York.

Orser, Charles E. Jr.
1988 The Archaeological Analysis of Plantation Society: Replacing Status and Caste with Economics and Power. *American Antiquity* 53(4): 735-751.

1996 Beneath the Material Surface of Things: Commodities, Artifacts, and Slave Plantations. In Contemporary Archaeology in Theory: A Reader, ed. by Robert W. Preucel and Ian Hodder. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, pp. 189-202.

1998 The Archaeology of the African Diaspora. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27: 63-82.

Orton, C. P. Tyres and A. Vince
1993 Pottery in Archaeology. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Phillips, Ulrich Bonnell
1974 The Slave Labor Problem in Charleston District. In Plantation, Town, and Country: Essays on the Local History of American Slave Society. Edited by Elinor Miller and Eugene D. Genovese, pp. 7-28. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.

Potter, Parker B. Jr.
1992 Critical Archaeology: In the Ground and on the Street. *Journal of Historical Archaeology* 26(3): 117-129.

Powers, Bernard Edwards, Jr.
1981 Black Charleston: A Social History 1822-1885. Dissertation in History, Northwestern University. University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor.

Pyatt, Thomas
2005 The Gullah People of Sandy Island. Published independently by T.J. Pyatt, Sandy Island, South Carolina.

Rawick, George P.
1977 The American Slave: A Composite Autobiography, Supplement Series One, vol. 2. Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut.

1977 The American Slave: A Composite Autobiography, Supplement Series One, vol. 12. Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut.

Reitz, Elizabeth, Tyson Gibbs, and Ted A. Rathbun
1985 Archaeological Evidence for Subsistence on Coastal Plantations. In *The Archaeology of Slavery and Plantation Life*. Edited by Theresa A. Singleton. Academic Press, Inc., Orlando.

Rhyne, Nancy
1999 Voices of Carolina Slave Children. Sandlapper Publishing Company, Inc.

Rice, Prudence M.
1987 Pottery Analysis: A Sourcebook. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Robb, John E.
2001 Steps to a Archaeology of Agency. Paper presented at Agency Workshop, University College London, November.

Roberts, Erika Sabine
2005 Digging Through Discarded Identity: Archaeological Investigations Around the Kitchen and the Overseer's House at Whitney Plantation, Louisiana. Masters thesis in Geography and Anthropology, Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge.

Rosengarten, Theodore
1986 Tombee: Portrait of a Cotton Planter. Quill William Morrow, New York.

Rowland, Lawrence S.
1987 "Alone on the River:" The Rise and Fall of the Savannah River Rice Plantations of St. Peter's Parish, South Carolina. *South Carolina Historical Society* 88: 121-150.

Saunders, Katherine
2002 "As regular and fformidable as any such woorke in American": The Walled City of Charles Towne. In *Another's Country: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on Cultural Interactions in the Southern Colonies.* Edited by J.W. Joseph and Martha Zierden, pp. 198-214. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Singleton, Theresa A.
1991 The Archaeology of Slave Life. In *Before Freedom Came*, edited by Edward Campbell and Kym Rice, pp. 155-175. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.

1995 The Archaeology of Slavery in North America. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24:119-140.

Smedley, Audrey
1998 "Race" and the Construction of Human Identity. *American Anthropologist* 100(3): 690-702.

Steen, Carl
2002 The MEHRL Project: Archaeological Investigations at the Hollings Marine Laboratory Fort Johnson, Charleston SC. The Diachronic Research Foundation, Columbia, South Carolina.

Sutton, Mark Q., and Brooke S. Arkush
1998 Archaeological Laboratory Methods: An Introduction. Second Edition. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, Dubuque, Iowa.

Weinberg, George H., John A. Shumaker, and Debra Oltman
1981 Statistics: An Intuitive Approach. Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, Monterey.

Wheaton, Thomas R., Amy Friedlander, and Patrick Garrow
1983 Yaughan and Curiboo Plantations: Studies in Afro-American Archaeology. Marietta, Georgia.

Wilkie, Laurie A.
2001 Race, Identity, and Habermas's Lifeworld. In *Race and the Archaeology of Identity*, ed. by Charles E. Orser Jr. The University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City, pp. 108-124.

Wobst, H. Martin
2000 Agency in (Spite of) Material Culture. In Agency in Archaeology, ed. by Marcia-Anne Dobres and John E. Robb. Routledge, London, pp. 40-50.

Wolf, Eric R.
1982 Europe and the People Without History. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Wood, Betty
1995 Women's Work, Men's Work: The Informal Slave Economies of Lowcountry Georgia. The University of Georgia Press, Athens.

Wood, Peter H.
1996 Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina From 1670 Through the Stono Rebellion. W.W. Norton & Company, New York.

Zierden, Martha
1993 Archaeological Testing and Mitigation at the Stable Building, Heyward-Washington House. Archaeological Contributions 23, The Charleston Museum, Charleston.

1996 Big House/Back Lot: An Archaeological Study of the Nathaniel Russell House (38Ch100). Archaeological Contributions 5, The Charleston Museum, Charleston.

2001a Excavations at 14 Legare Street, Charleston, South Carolina. Archaeological Contributions 28, The Charleston Museum, Charleston.

2001b Archaeology at the Miles Brewton House, 27 King Street. Archaeological Contributions 29, The Charleston Museum, Charleston.

2005 Archaeology at City Hall: Charleston's Colonial Beef Market. Archaeological Contributions 35, The Charleston Museum, Charleston.

Zierden, Martha, and Jeanne Calhoun
1984 An Archaeological Preservation Plan For Charleston, South Carolina. Archaeological Contributions 8, The Charleston Museum, Charleston.

Zierden et al.
1983 Archaeological Excavations at McCrady's Longroom. Archaeological Contributions 3, The Charleston Museum, Charleston.